

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. XII

OCTOBER 1941

No. 10

THE WORLD AFTER THE WAR

When the manuscripts for some of the commissioned articles on the above subject which are published in this number were reaching India, the historic meeting between President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill was taking place. That Britain should give a glimpse, (even if she does not fully define its plans), of a new social order for the world, was not only desirable; it was imperative. For it was not clear to the world why Britain was fighting this war. That the United States of America should assist as it alone can assist in building that order was and, even now, is not only hoped for but expected by all who aspire to live in a better world. The statement issued after the historic meeting at sea has disappointed the thoughtful portion of the world-public. A grand opportunity has been lost. Many, many hopeful hearts have been disillusioned. Can there be a German who will not redouble his effort to support Hitler after noting the last or eighth clause of the declaration? Germany

was disarmed after Versailles, and Britain and France remained armed! What assurance is there in the declaration for the small states of Europe other than the assurance vouchsafed at Versailles? And all the world knows what came out of it. What is there in it to enthuse the subject people or the weak states of Africa and Asia? No, the declaration is not one to inspire confidence in those who desire a better morrow; and this is a pity inasmuch as we believe that President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill meant to give a better lead for the right reconstruction of the future world. The desired success will not be attained by European humanity unless this declaration is improved upon speedily by the fresh minds and young hearts of every country in the world.

The human mind-Soul is ever resourceful. The power to dream and to build anew is not exhausted even in Europe. In Britain—and, we doubt not, in other countries of the continent—there are men and

women who know that the defeat of Hitlerism will not be achieved if the treaty of peace contains one thought of vengeance; and more—there are many who hold the view of Miss Irene Rathbone (not Miss Eleanor Rathbone, whose letter on the Indian political situation has not been forgotten, nor the magnificent reply to it of the late Rabindranath Tagore) that “this war is not—and the common people everywhere feel it—merely a war to end Hitlerism.” Unless the fashioners of the new world determine to plan for the good of the whole remembering the injunction “look not behind or thou art lost,” their plans will not be free from the vitiating currents of a dying order. Only political practicality, whose true name is short-sighted expediency, talks and will talk of maintaining party-spirit, national states, colonization and such like already exploded notions. The British writers whose articles appear in this number of THE ARYAN PATH refer to one or another weakness of the political machinery of the 20th century Great Britain. Mr. G. D. H. Cole writes about “the decay of Parliaments” and the “huge political organisations” which weakened and killed democracy. Mr. Hugh I’A. Fausset fears the rise of Totalitarianism and remarks how some of the present-day leaders “follow Hitler’s lead, while hoping to preserve in a mechanised totalitarian society of their own the more essential human values of a pre-mechanical era.” Similarly, Miss

Elizabeth Cross, a thoughtful and experienced educationist says: “The democratic countries may deplore such a system but they have gone dangerously far on this road themselves,” while Miss Rathbone characterizes Britain’s “democracy” as “really finance-capitalist gangsterism.” Stella Gibbons, like Swinburne, sings of “a mighty march of the Common People” determined to live in continued peace and increasing social prosperity. All of them see an awakening; it is already taking place and there are individuals, among whom are our esteemed contributors, who aspire to lay foundations for a federation of the world governed by a League of Humanity.

The subject of a New World and its fashioning has to be considered now; those who want to postpone discussing the future are really blind; those whom they call impractical visionaries are the “blind fools who see.” Thus G. D. H. Cole who does possess political and social insight puts his finger on one major weakness, the Leviathan; he also discerns that at the close of the war “a great weariness will come upon most men and people will be apt to lie down and accept any advice which offers them rest.” They will “believe incompatible things, if only to be comfortable to believe and to do irrational things.” Therefore, now, at this very hour, people should form little groups as he suggests and there must be intermediaries to link them in friendship and neighbourliness

and these small groups must discuss and plan their own future. The result of honest discussion, of friendly exchange of ideas, will reveal what truth there is in such a scheme as that of the Social Credit System which Miss Rathbone champions so ably, arousing genuine interest. Again in the ideas put forward by Miss Elizabeth Cross there are important truths, and all agree that the education of the children is most intimately linked to the future of civilization and especially useful is the idea put forward by Stella Gibbons that we should teach children to love all other children "white and yellow, brown and black." What an opportunity the prejudiced and insular British have lost in India by not bringing British children in large numbers to this country, letting them learn from and teach our Indian children. One of the most, perhaps the most important problem awaiting solution is that of what is called the colour-bar. If this crass stupidity is not destroyed in London and Washington, in Delhi and Tokyo, the world will be compartmentalized between the coloured and the 'colourless' people, leading to an internecine strife before which the present war will pale into insignificance. But a more pressing problem is the immediate education of the adult population in the questions which affect their own near future—the fundamental underlying all of them is according to Mr. Fausset "to inaugurate effectually a new way of living;" or according

to Mr. Cole "the final end...of all human effort, is not to pile up goods, but to make good men."

Our readers will find some thought-provoking statements in the article of Stella Gibbons. She is right in her deduction that man should follow his own life-pattern. We could, however, wish for the sake of our Indian readers that her terminology were somewhat different. We fear it may lead to the assumption that she believes in an anthropomorphic God instead of in all pervasive intelligence guided by impersonal Law. How did man come to encrust "a horrible growth of injustice, greed, selfishness, ignorance, devilish cruelty and lust for power" upon the pattern? She refers to "the old Christianity...before there was a Church" and which, we agree with her, is capable of illuminating the paths of men, and telling them among other things, why they are what they are. Law, Nemesis, Karma governs the physical as the moral universe. In individual as in national affairs the truth is (*St. Matthew, 7-2*):—

For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

Unless the builders of tomorrow prepare the plan today, inspired by the rejected ideas of Jesus, Plato, Pythagoras, the sages of Arabia and China, the rishis of India, Mr. Fausset's hope that "the old may truly be re-born in the new" will not be fulfilled. Economics, finance,

politics, are poor directors, but will prove to be excellent channels for moral ideas and spiritual principles. Good men are made by true thoughts and this age needs their help. Of

true ideas there is no dearth, but persons are needed to examine them. The best work for the small groups advocated by Mr. Cole is to consider the sage ideas of the ancient Seers.

LEVIATHAN AND LITTLE GROUPS

How are little men to live lives of their own amid the hugeness of modern world forces? That, as I see it, is the supreme question for all those who care for the human spirit. It is not, as some would suggest, a question of 'the man *versus* the State': if it were, the individual would stand no chance in face of the modern Leviathan. It is a question of men, with their natural sociality and their social ties and powers of association, finding means of asserting the power of the human spirit over the vast mechanical forces which threaten to centralise all authority in the hands of a very few—and those few the worst.

Men are showing all around us, under stress of war, a capacity for improvisation—for making new social tissue when the old tissues are broken or destroyed. They can do this on a small scale, and probably better in proportion as the essentials of their previous life were simple and depended on relations of close neighbourhood. There is much more resilience under intensive air bombardment in the old, working-class districts of London

(or indeed of any great city), where there exists a tradition of social organisation and mutual help, than in the new suburbs where every household lives a private life of its own with hardly any contact or social sympathy with its neighbours. The will to endure, and therewith the basic understanding of what is worth enduring for, is much stronger where men have close bonds of neighbourhood to hold them together, and have practised democracy in their own small groups, than where the individual, or the household, has been standing isolated. *It is one lesson of the war, and not the least, that democracy in the large can be built securely only on the practical democracy of small groups.*

Where the individual or the household stands alone in face of the great Leviathan, evil consequences follow. Suggestibility is raised to its highest power; so that the few who manipulate the powerful apparatus of State propaganda and education can wreak their will almost without let—especially on the young, who have no remembered traditions of independence to sustain them. Moreover, under

severe strain the isolated individual losing the controls which the accustomed ways of living made work easy within him, is flung back merely on his unreasoning and amoral under-self, which is ruled by appetite, and is capable of believing anything that will serve its appetitive ends. The social man, on the other hand, has much more to fall back upon when things go amiss. The destruction of his normal ways of living need not break the shared social consciousness of his group. He gains and gives strength and self-control : he remains much more rational than his atomistic fellow-man.

I conclude, then, that it is vital in the after-war world, to base our new societies on groupings small enough for neighbourhood to give men—ordinary men and women—collective social strength. If the basic unit of collectivity becomes too large for the feeling of neighbourhood to work throughout its membership democracy is killed, and tyranny inevitably ensues. Power is concentrated in those who are adept at managing vast aggregates of people ; and these are not the best, but those in whom the spirit is ruled by vast appetites, resistless urges dredged up from the unconscious, amoral lusts for power and unrestrained self-assertion regardless of others' claims. Leviathan cannot be governed by good men unless Leviathan itself is built up upon lesser groupings, right down to the smallest, so that

power and responsibility and the habit of social action based on thought are diffused right through its members.

Leviathan we must have : there is no escape from it. The necessary basis of economic living requires huge organisations for the production and distribution of essential goods and services. Even if electrical power can be supplied to small workshops, the power houses and the transmitting system need to be on the grand scale. Nor do economic conditions alone require hugeness of organisation. Man's advance in the arts of war requires it too ; for only a giant police system can keep the peace until men have learnt by long practice the art of living peacefully together, and have got their intellectual controls over the underman not merely reestablished, but infinitely better developed than ever hitherto. We must endure Leviathan, the monster we have made with a cunning that has far outrun our wisdom. The problem for us is, how to live as citizens of Leviathan and not as slaves.

Society is natural to man—not something artificially imposed upon him. But the controls which a successful working of Society demands are not natural, but highly artificial. They belong to the higher life which overlays the primitive gregariousness as well as the primitive appetitiveness of the individual. But they are built on this gregariousness, and are successful in the measure of their utilis-

tion of its potentialities. *The decay of Parliaments has accompanied the democratisation of the electorate not because democracy is wrong, but rather because we have allowed the growth of huge political organisations to be accompanied by the atrophy of smaller ones, on which alone they can be securely built.* The evil of centralisation and bureaucracy is not only congestion of business and unimaginative routine in high places, but even more the loss of the need for small groups continually to take decisions which directly affect their own lives. Such decisions put the whole man in motion, teach him to control and coordinate his impulses in fellowship with his neighbours, and provide the only possible foundation for democratic practice on a large scale.

All this is very relevant to the problems of rebuilding which the world will have to face after the war. It means that totalitarianism and tyranny necessarily go together. Even if the totalitarian State is socialist in its basic economic institutions it will degenerate into tyranny. It must do so, because it stands for a central unification of power, and aims at making the smaller groupings within it no more than the detailed executants of a centrally pre-determined plan. To attempt this is to deny life to the smaller groups, within which alone the ordinary man is capable of playing a creative part. Such an attempt dries up the springs of democracy at the source.

To say this is not to deny the need for large-scale planning, which is imperatively called for by the modern scientific basis of society. There must be planning, but it must be based on the recognition of diversity, and must be conceived as a guide to diffuse initiatives, and not as an iron rule. The plan itself must be built up from below, out of countless lesser plans: it must be continually modified in action by the lesser groups which are its executants; and it must be open continually to the fire of democratic criticism. Moreover, this criticism must be free to assail the plan itself, and not merely its details.

A plan built up on these principles will be conceived not exclusively in terms of technical engineering, but basically in terms of human life. The best method of production is not that which, according to the engineer, is capable of turning out most goods, but that which will yield a sufficiency of goods under conditions compatible with the happiness of the makers and the cultivation of their social qualities of practical citizenship and private fellowship one with another. *The final end of the productive system, as of all human effort, is not to pile up goods, but to make good men.*

Can we make, after the war, a world based on these principles? The task is formidable, for the line of least resistance is to let hugeness rule over us, and to ask of Leviathan no other boon than a rest from the torments of war. There will be upon

most men, when this war ends, a great weariness — at a time when they will be called upon to gird up their lives for supremely important tasks. What is to keep them from lying down, and accepting the mastery of whosoever offers them rest, at any price? Nor is this all; for men will be not only weary, but also more than wontedly irrational. *The sheer irrationality of war, of itself shakes the precarious power of reason in the minds of men, and leaves them readier to believe incompatible things, if only they be comfortable to believe, and to do irrational things, if only they serve to satisfy a present craving.* With men in such moods, can we use democratic means for building democracy? Will not democratic methods rather lead men straight to the abrogation of democracy and the Fuehrership of the most unscrupulous and the most demoniacally possessed?

It will, if we rely on the democracy of the parliamentary plebiscite—of the mass, voting as individuals in groups much too vast for the spirit and tradition of neighbourhood to organise or control. Our chance lies in the organisation now, while war still rages, of little groups of men and women determined to keep, amid all the turmoil, their sanity and their goodwill, and to do this, not by standing apart from the people, but by living with them, sharing in their troubles, and establishing among them a position of democratic leadership. There are men and women who are doing this

now in every blitzed city, in every town and village desecrated by enemy occupation, and in every walk of life. But these, the only true builders of the new Society, are isolated one from another. The normal communications have broken down, and no new ways of communications have yet been made. Nor is it easy to make new ways; for Leviathan is ever on the watch to prevent them. Leviathan, all the world over, hates the natural leaders of the people, in their little groups, to know one another; for they are the chief enemies of Leviathan's plans for keeping the people in chains.

So, for those of us who have the art of speech by writing, the great task of today is to make these natural leaders of world democracy aware of one another by acting as intermediaries between them. We can bid them take heart, for others elsewhere are trying to do just what they are trying to do — to keep the heart and spirit of the people alive, and to preserve an essential nucleus of sanity and reasonableness in a world gone mad. What matters most now is not to make blue prints for the post-war organisation of a better world (for who knows what the material conditions of the rebuilding will be), but to *get ready groups of men and women who, when the time comes, will know how to face the situation, whatever it is, on a firm foundation of reason and principle and with a courage based on know-*

tion of its potentialities. *The decay of Parliaments has accompanied the democratisation of the electorate not because democracy is wrong, but rather because we have allowed the growth of huge political organisations to be accompanied by the atrophy of smaller ones, on which alone they can be securely built.* The evil of centralisation and bureaucracy is not only congestion of business and unimaginative routine in high places, but even more the loss of the need for small groups continually to take decisions which directly affect their own lives. Such decisions put the whole man in motion, teach him to control and coordinate his impulses in fellowship with his neighbours, and provide the only possible foundation for democratic practice on a large scale.

All this is very relevant to the problems of rebuilding which the world will have to face after the war. It means that totalitarianism and tyranny necessarily go together. Even if the totalitarian State is socialist in its basic economic institutions it will degenerate into tyranny. It must do so, because it stands for a central unification of power, and aims at making the smaller groupings within it no more than the detailed executants of a centrally pre-determined plan. To attempt this is to deny life to the smaller groups, within which alone the ordinary man is capable of playing a creative part. Such an attempt dries up the springs of democracy at the source.

To say this is not to deny the need for large-scale planning, which is imperatively called for by the modern scientific basis of society. There must be planning, but it must be based on the recognition of diversity, and must be conceived as a guide to diffuse initiatives, and not as an iron rule. The plan itself must be built up from below, out of countless lesser plans: it must be continually modified in action by the lesser groups which are its executants; and it must be open continually to the fire of democratic criticism. Moreover, this criticism must be free to assail the plan itself, and not merely its details.

A plan built up on these principles will be conceived not exclusively in terms of technical engineering, but basically in terms of human life. The best method of production is not that which, according to the engineer, is capable of turning out most goods, but that which will yield a sufficiency of goods under conditions compatible with the happiness of the makers and the cultivation of their social qualities of practical citizenship and private fellowship one with another. *The final end of the productive system, as of all human effort, is not to pile up goods, but to make good men.*

Can we make, after the war, a world based on these principles? The task is formidable, for the line of least resistance is to let hugeness rule over us, and to ask of Leviathan no other boon than a rest from the torments of war. There will be upon

most men, when this war ends, a great weariness — at a time when they will be called upon to gird up their lives for supremely important tasks. What is to keep them from lying down, and accepting the mastery of whosoever offers them rest, at any price? Nor is this all; for men will be not only weary, but also more than wontedly irrational. *The sheer irrationality of war, of itself shakes the precarious power of reason in the minds of men, and leaves them readier to believe incompatible things, if only they be comfortable to believe, and to do irrational things, if only they serve to satisfy a present craving.* With men in such moods, can we use democratic means for building democracy? Will not democratic methods rather lead men straight to the abrogation of democracy and the Fuehrership of the most unscrupulous and the most demoniacally possessed?

It will, if we rely on the democracy of the parliamentary plebiscite—of the mass, voting as individuals in groups much too vast for the spirit and tradition of neighbourhood to organise or control. Our chance lies in the organisation now, while war still rages, of little groups of men and women determined to keep, amid all the turmoil, their sanity and their goodwill, and to do this, not by standing apart from the people, but by living with them, sharing in their troubles, and establishing among them a position of democratic leadership. There are men and women who are doing this

now in every blitzed city, in every town and village desecrated by enemy occupation, and in every walk of life. But these, the only true builders of the new Society, are isolated one from another. The normal communications have broken down, and no new ways of communications have yet been made. Nor is it easy to make new ways; for Leviathan is ever on the watch to prevent them. Leviathan, all the world over, hates the natural leaders of the people, in their little groups, to know one another; for they are the chief enemies of Leviathan's plans for keeping the people in chains.

So, for those of us who have the art of speech by writing, the great task of today is to make these natural leaders of world democracy aware of one another by acting as intermediaries between them. We can bid them take heart, for others elsewhere are trying to do just what they are trying to do — to keep the heart and spirit of the people alive, and to preserve an essential nucleus of sanity and reasonableness in a world gone mad. What matters most now is not to make blue prints for the post-war organisation of a better world (for who knows what the material conditions of the rebuilding will be), but to *get ready groups of men and women who, when the time comes, will know how to face the situation, whatever it is, on a firm foundation of reason and principle and with a courage based on know-*

ing that they have the love and confidence of even a few friends with whom they have worked and suffer-

ed and won little victories as the promise of greater to come.

G. D. H. COLE

THE SOCIAL CREDIT STATE

"Never again," was said last time. "Never again," is being said this time. I think people mean it, though there is less hopefulness than before. The important thing is that there should be a sufficient number who, knowing that modern wars are an unnecessary infamy, also understand the system that produces the infamy. Then it can be ended and the right one set up.

Actually, the system is ending of itself; not, however, passing into something better—something worse. Left alone, 'Democracy', which is really finance-capitalist gangsterism, will become a form of Nazidom. Seized and dealt with rightly it will become Democracy in truth. And it must be dealt with *now*. The choice for Britain is tyranny, the Totalitarian State; or freedom, the Social Credit State. The first means—in every sense—defeat. The second means—in every sense—victory.

It is a grimly pitiful fact that at any period during the 'twenties or 'thirties the structure of the Social Credit State could have risen to completion with a fragment of the time and effort that will be needed for its building now. Conditions were favourable: material abundance—a pre-requisite for the true

functioning of Social Credit—prevailed; only the home enemy had to be fought. Now conditions are unfavourable: material scarcity prevails; the foreign as well as the home enemy has to be fought. Useless to lament Might-Have-Been, but hard not to. Neither the rulers nor the people of Britain, save a few, listened when we declared that a second and more colossal tragedy *must* swamp society if the Social Credit State were not built: plainly, if the change-over from the old economics to the new were not effected. Certainly there were other Cassandras, a multitude, but none with just our angle of sight on causes, and none with our remedy. For what we perceived as *the archcause of modern ills was the Money Power: the power of banks to create, issue and destroy money*. And what we proclaimed as the cure was the socialising of money (credit), the transference of its control from private bankers to the Sovereign People, the subduing of it to people's needs. Social Credit is merely the rather arid-sounding title for a human money system. Under which the human being is free.

I am going to assume for a few moments—a few pages—that we are

back in the 'twenties or 'thirties. Say, the middle 'thirties. From that point in time I shall outline the Britain envisaged by Social Credit advocates; envisaged and known to be realizable. Then coming forward again to today, I shall try and show how much of this Britain can still be realized and by what means.

The human being will be free. Is that too vague? I mean precisely that the individual—Jim, Bill, Dorothy, in London, Plymouth, Newcastle or Margat—will be free. Under no bondage either to employer or State. Free to choose a job, to walk out of it. Free from the toil and misery of our Work-or-Starve system. Free from any form of charity. Free from fear of war. Free to love. Free at last to live.

Such freedom, reaching into every orbit of the citizen's material and spiritual life, will be conferred on him through, and because of, an income. Not a dole—a dividend, a flat rate share of the nation's Real Wealth, starting, say, at £ 100 a year, mounting as the country's production mounts, and irrespective of existing income (wage or salary). The nation's Real Wealth consists in its physical assets, its industrial or agricultural production, in fact, its Things. Money will be made to balance Things. Whatever physically exists will therefore be financially obtainable. At present there is a glut of Things—not only in Britain

but the world; there is nothing like enough money. The State will create it. The State will distribute it as and where required: to every citizen in the form of a dividend, to the various services (Education, Transport, Defence, etc.,) in the form of grants. Inflation will be prevented by means of a price adjustment. Taxes will be unnecessary. All *debt* unnecessary. That monster inanity, the National Debt, will cease to exist. Not that it ever has existed; the idea of it, like the idea of eternal punishment, has been useful in the hands of the financial high priests to keep communities cowed and at work. Exports too will be unnecessary, as we understand them now. We will export merely what is over when our citizens have had all they want here. No scramble for foreign markets: we shall be our own market. The immensely increased purchasing power at home will cause that 'effective demand' always sighed for by producers and desperately sought abroad. It follows that Britain will be lifted clean *out* of commercial world competition. Further, that other nations, viewing our bounding prosperity, will imitate our methods—transform their own money systems. As this process goes on, as on all hands the fevered commercial war dies down, so will military war die down and fear of its outbreak. The root cause of the world's greatest nightmare will have been cut.

It comes to this, that if we wish

to live we must deal effectively with the three essentials of human life on this planet—Food, Warmth, Shelter. We must demonstrate to the world how to make and use Real Wealth, which can only be done by establishing a debt-free Britain operating the social-credit technique of debt-free national accountancy. That base made firm, how will particular aspects of the national life be dealt with?

Agriculture. Soil fertility will gradually be restored. Small scale self-contained mixed farming be taught and encouraged. Tithe payments and debt duties on land abolished, and all bank debts and mortgages. Large scale re-afforestation will be carried out. Land badly farmed will be sequestered. All marketing boards closed down. Almost entirely we shall live on home-produced food. Not only is this a sound defence policy, it is a sound health policy. Fresh food, not frozen, not packed, not having travelled thousands of miles, not impoverished or alloyed but full of its native goodness, alone ensures racial vigour. The malnutrition, due to restricted purchasing-power as well as to poor food and which now makes it impossible for the majority of citizens to attain their full capacity of health and life-enjoyment, will vanish.

Health. Medical services will be preventive, not palliative. Adequate grants be made for research. Adequate grants to all hospitals, health centres and clinics, thus rendering

charity needless,

Industry. Bankers' control of it will go. Obsolete methods of production be scrapped. All inventions now held in check by vested interests be released for the benefit of the community. Mining be fully mechanised.

Building. Slum areas will be speedily cleared. Unhealthy or hideous towns demolished, new ones founded according to a general plan. The country will be country; the town town. No suburbs. No ribbon-development horrors. No advertisement hoardings. All buildings, from universities to cottages, will have solidity, dignity and comeliness. All worthy of preservation because of historical interest will be kept intact. Power stations and certain factories be sunk below the surface of the earth.

Transport. Great new main roads will be planted with trees, and be, throughout their length, *one-way*. Old roads, attractive and winding and characteristically English, be left untouched. The use of inland waterways re-developed. Of the entire merchant fleet a survey will be made. Unseaworthy craft be scrapped, and grants made towards the building of fast medium and small-sized merchant ships of the latest type with good accommodation for crews. Seamen will be highly paid, as is consistent with their dangerous and vital work.

Defence. In this sphere, above all, can no red-tape or vested interests or any type of sabotage be

allowed. War being, alas, more than possible we must see to it that the people of Britain are well guarded *while* the Social Credit State is being established and *until* its beneficent influence has spread abroad. Today, technical quality counts for more than drilled quantity, so the Army, Navy and Air Force must be mechanised to the full. Officers and men must be selected for a high standard of intelligence and initiative.

The Press. Freedom of the Press will be guaranteed. Publication of all news dealing with current affairs be compulsory. No suppression of facts. The people must be told the truth.

Work. Following the introduction of Social Credit, with the release of science and inventions, there will be progressively less and less work. This is not a matter for alarm but rejoicing. Work, as such, and undertaken for what is called 'a living', has nothing noble or even respectable about it. People will learn in time to live on their National Dividends, to use their leisure and work at things they have an inclination for. The object of a sane economic system is not to provide employment but to provide goods (and services) as and where needed.

Education. This will be reorganised throughout, so that it forms a ladder from nursery school to university. Schooling will be free

of charge and open to every child in the land. Probably compulsory from five to seventeen, after that voluntary. All text books will be examined and revised so that the manner of presenting facts is as nearly as possible free from distortion, confusion and sentimentalisation. Skill in making and doing (as distinct from mere book-learning) will be encouraged. So will body culture, all forms of gymnastic and dancing. The aim of the New Education is to integrate and develop the individual in order that he shall be able to live, and live splendidly.

A civilisation worthy to be so called is distinguished by two things: happiness, variety. Both will distinguish and make fragrant that civilisation that springs from a Social Credit groundwork.

We exalt variety. It will be encouraged in every sphere as against uniformity. There will be *separate* little firms and shops; immensely *diverse* newspapers, journals, outlooks, ideas, occupations, crafts, clubs, customs, costumes—food. De-standardisation. Decentralisation. Local government vigorous. In England, once called 'Merry',* there used to be character among her inhabitants, eccentricity. These have been, if not lost, dimmed. (The Money Power has seen to that.) They will return. They will flourish more strongly than of old. All that is the reverse

*In a book, *The Decline Of Merry England*, by Storm Jameson, this epithet is interpreted as 'high-hearted'.

of robot-hood, of mass-mindedness, will be the rule.

We exalt happiness. Yes, pleasure. Pleasure is valuable, it sweetens, educates—although the half-puritan Anglo-Saxon peoples have a bias against it. It is part of a wise civilisation. We might well in this connection learn something from France. France (as civilisations go in our dim era, the most illumined, life-loving and adult) looks on it benevolently, always has. Apart from anything else, pleasure is a subtle safeguard against power-lust. It is lack of the enjoyment faculty, lack of self-fulfillment, it is that frantic internal emptiness which drives men to seek dominion over their fellows, to disturb, harass, enslave.

In the new civilisation spreading to other countries from our own, each country can learn from all, give to all, while remaining itself. For not only individuals but countries will be essentially, deeply, themselves. Oh, as never before will England be 'Merry', and France be 'la douce'.

Happiness...Variety...A herba-ceous border of humanity...

Now I come forward to today. Here we are in this hell's mess of a war. What now is our vision? The same. Can we bring about what we saw in the 'thirties? We can. In the perils and miseries of today we are presented with a catastrophic opportunity. At this point or that —

half England in cinders, perhaps, portions of the Empire gone — there will be an awakening. A perception, an uprising, a revulsion of the people, not against carrying on the war but against carrying it on by present methods and without a definite hope. This awakening will be met by a *political-economic change-over* carried out by a few who will be able to interpret the needs and signs. In a world of war the basis is laid of the world after the war. We build now (literally) from the ground up.

We apply the principles of Social Credit to our internal economy: consumption balancing production. We abolish taxes, we wash out debts, we distribute Things. As in the peace years abundance would have been shared, so today scarcity is shared. What does exist in the way of life necessities (Food, Warmth, Shelter) is equitably rationed. The country is run like a beleaguered city. Less than ever — not at all — does money count. The whole show is on chit system. Remember, this war-time rationing is not Social Credit proper, but it can be the stepping-stone that leads directly to it. When industry is turned back from war production to consumer goods, the Social Credit Government will continue the rationing process. As abundance begins to reappear, we shall go step by step from Too Little to Enough and Too Much; go to the physical limit of individual demand. Money by then can have replaced chits, but it will continue

to *act* as chits. As a measurer. Never again as a something inscrutable, tyrannical, unrelated to goods, to human needs.

Along with siege rationing, will go special care for the bombed-out. Intelligent immediate expansion of ship and 'plane production. Intelligent immediate expansion of home food production. Intelligent, flaming, and *constantly kept-up* Propaganda. Three weeks of this on the right lines and Hitler's position is undermined. The home population and the foreign enslaved populations breathe in hope like mountain air. For *this war is not — and the common people everywhere feel it — merely a war to end Hitlerism*. As well, it is a war to end the seething fester of social-economic conditions that flung us into war in 1914; that (grown more noisesome) flung us into war in 1939; that enables Hitlers to come to power at all. It is a war to abolish such a system and to establish its opposite: the security plus freedom of each individual.

Let the Nazis watch out when we begin to broadcast *our* new order and begin to live it. Decency the world over will rally to us. Just as filth the world over rallies to Nazidom. Our new order — a spiritual one fought for on the physical plane

—enshrines the values of all who in history have sung or preached or lived the fullest humanity. The values of Christ are there; the values of Shelley, Blake, Goethe, Diderot, Pasteur, Tom Paine, Keats, Madame Curie, Niëmoller; the values of sufferers in concentration camps; of the Spanish Republicans; of all the nameless heroic humble. It will be made clear in our Propaganda, sun-clear, *what* our value are; alongside whom, living or dead, we stand. Equally it will be made clear what were the values—manifested in what policies and persons—that led us to our present pass. The common people must see. They must both love and hate more ardently, their hope must be energised.

It is obvious that with this heavy task of fighting, our new order cannot be put into full effect. Freedom itself can only be partial. Nevertheless there can be a deal more of it than our citizens are allowed at present. In its every department not excepting Education, the new Britain I have outlined can be founded *now*. Founded. The fair whole structure, the myriad details must wait for peace. But the founding is of such moment that failure there means night—on Britain and the world. With no predictable morning.

IRENE RATHBONE

EDUCATION FOR RESPONSIBILITY

The present state of the world is, surely, a sufficient condemnation of past educational practice. History and biology both emphasise the fact that present events are the result of past ones and it is futile as well as dishonest to try and throw all the blame on the other fellow!

Even disregarding the present state of world war and considering only the economic and social chaos that preceded it—with starvation in some quarters while food was ploughed in or burned in other places in order to keep prices up—surely that was a sign that our educational ideals and system were in need of a drastic overhaul.

By education we must mean the whole of the outer influences that are brought to bear upon the child and adolescent—not merely the specialised teaching and training that he receives in school. The Greeks recognised this fundamental truth, as Plato is at pains to point out, emphasising the fact that the whole social order—including the architecture of the city—will have a good or bad effect on the growing citizen.

How does our modern educational system stand up to such an analysis? To begin with it would seem that few parents have any such conception of education, contenting themselves with leaving character training as well as subject teaching to the schools. The little child is, too often, 'allowed too run wild' with the vague

hope that all faults will be corrected later.

This desire to give freedom is, to a certain extent, understandable and is a reasonable reaction from a period of over-strictness when children were presumed to be seen and not heard. This so-called Victorian discipline, however, has been largely exaggerated, and was usually only employed at certain times of the day when the children had to behave in the adults' special rooms, (most of the time the children played in their nurseries or the fields and had all the freedom necessary to development). However, the reaction has taken place, and a perfect mania for 'self-expression' and 'independence' encouraged, with no understanding of the need for co-operation with ones neighbours.

This 'independence' has flourished throughout society and the adolescent has had a pattern held up, by means of films, newspapers and general conversation, in which the ideal personality appears as an isolated unit, free of social or domestic ties, ready for any pleasurable experience, able to plunge into emotional entanglements with never a backward glance but with an equally clear determination to clamber out again just as soon as he or she pleases. This same 'unit' attitude has been encouraged in the totalitarian countries in a somewhat paradoxical manner...here the individual finds his or her ideal existence in a wholesale immolation on a

state altar. He also recognises no true domestic or social ties, nor any moral claims, but merely obeys the claims of the state which in return promises him unlimited power and glory.

The totalitarian state also, in addition to its lure of power, offers almost complete irresponsibility. The citizen has only to obey and he need not bother about moral, physical or mental problems....the state will make all decisions for him, he need only work and (so the promises go) the state will care for him in his old age, will deal with his neighbours' needs and leave him free from the demands of charity.

The democratic countries may deplore such a system but they have gone dangerously far on this road themselves. We have all become extremely complaisant concerning our obligations, and because we have not had any great demands from our governments but have achieved a fair measure of social services, our attitude has been possibly even more selfish. The mere payment of taxation should not lead us to consider our duty done, but this has been the general attitude up to the moment and still persists to a great extent. There is a feeling that pensions, parks, hospitals—free this and free that—are a right, not an arrangement that has to be paid for by someone. As things work out a great many of the social services are paid for by some citizens and used entirely by others, which is a bad

system indeed. Another result of so much state organisation is that the individual citizen, once he has paid his rates and taxes and perhaps given a little to some vast organised charity, feels that his whole duty is done and that he need take no *personal* interest in social service. As society is now organised it is only the exceptional person who spends any time at all on what our grandmothers liked to call 'good works', and there is a great diminution of neighbourly kindness. The emergencies of war have altered this here and there, particularly where any great disasters have occurred. However, even the impact of hostilities have had less effect than sentimental writers would have one believe, and in spite of the greater need for neighbourliness there is still this attitude of 'it isn't my business.' Now, this analysis may seem to have little direct application to education, but in reality it is of the utmost importance. The child is moulded by the whole of its environment, therefore we must realize that it is going to need a great deal of determined effort on the part of individual schools and homes if we are to counteract the general attitude of the world at large. One of the greatest influences, that of the popular press, is showing signs of understanding the need for co-operation, but there is little acknowledgement of our past selfishness. For it is writ very large that we *have* been criminally selfish....with our indifference to the fate of Chinese sufferers for so

many years, and with the fate of Abyssinia to add to the list.*

Everyone who has contact with the young can do much to start a new spirit in education, the spirit of responsibility. Instead of the old aim for 'self-expression' which has left the individual a unit, we need to stress our social natures and show how every privilege must bring with it an added responsibility. This theme can permeate every activity and every lesson both at home and at school.

The mother has, of course, the first and finest opportunity of helping her child to a happy and worthwhile development, and can begin from the very earliest years. It is essential that the child should have sufficient companions and if there are no brothers and sisters then some arrangements must be made to let him play (and quarrel!) with the neighbour's little ones. This is the only way in which he can learn how to share, and the sooner this is started the better. Although the small child must be considered and respected, treated as a personality with worthwhile potentialities, he must not find the household revolve round him. He must have his own toys, his own corner, but he must learn that other possessions belong to other people, that others have their wishes and that social bargains have to be made. This may seem very elementary and a mere matter of commonsense.... but there are still countless house-

holds where the child is allowed to tyrannise and where all has to be hushed when he goes to bed or where a tired father is never permitted to eat a meal in peace.

When we come to the matter of school the teacher has an opportunity of furthering the work, partly by showing the pleasure of co-operative schemes and by discouraging all competition, partly by the very content of lessons. Without sacrificing truth it is possible to emphasise similarities instead of differences....in the geography schemes, in history, in biology, we can show how the fundamentals of life are always the same even though climatic conditions and political changes may make some striking differences. For instance the Eskimo and the Negro all need food and water, their lives are similar in that they sleep and wake, suffer and dream, work and rest even though they live thousands of miles apart. In biology we can show the great rules of life at work in both plant and animal worlds.... the rhythm of the tree has a similarity to that of the child himself....it has periods of activity and rest, it grows, it may flourish, it may sicken, it may be struck with the very same shaft of lightning.

The teacher can cooperate with the parent in introducing the child to a larger world of social service. The child can learn many useful crafts that will make him more truly independent. The wise mother will let the little child help in the

* And what about indifference towards India?—ED.

household tasks while he is still eager to join in, she will make it plain that she expects all her family to take their fair share of running the home that makes them comfortable. Foolish 'unselfishness' is extremely harmful and prevents the children developing the much needed sense of responsibility.

There is a danger that children will be even more indulged — in a great desire to shield them from the horrors of war....a desire that their rightful carefree happiness should not be lost. This is a mistaken attitude and can only make for eventual misery. An indulged child is bound to be unhappy as it becomes more and more selfish and more and more unpopular with

its companions and with all who have to care for it. The child who is educated wisely and helped to develop a willing sense of responsibility and a genuine love of service will have a far safer background. Such a child will be truly independent and better balanced. Furthermore he or she will be able to fit in easily wherever fate may take them. We cannot all be sure that the family circle will remain intact. *We must try and help our children to be citizens of the world, so that, by reason of their characters, they will be at home everywhere.* Unless they are educated for responsibility and to understand the possibilities of international brotherhood then we can have little hope for the future.

ELIZABETH CROSS, N. F. U.

THROUGH THE CRAFT OF LIVING

It needs a high degree of faith at this moment, when the tide of mutual destruction is in full flood, to believe that any ideal worth cherishing will be realizable in the 'world after the war'. Yet it would be as much a failure of faith and also as absurdly short-sighted to despair of man's future as it is to suppose that we have only to win the war to inaugurate a new world of social justice and economic well-being. The war itself is only the inevitable climax of a failure to create such a world, of a long series of evasions of which it is the ghastly extreme. It is so despairing an

evasion that it may at last compel men to face the real issues. Daily before our eyes it is destroying much. And if men lack the vision or the courage to renew life when it has gone rotten or freely to cut away the dead wood of vested-interests, spiritual and material, destruction descends upon them as a terrible purge. Revolution always denotes a failure in evolution. And this war is, of course, a world-revolution, so deep and universal in its implications, that the claims and counter-claims of national propaganda have little relevance. Nor can a process of destruction guaran-

tee in any way a subsequent capacity for creation of which it is the denial. The longer this war should continue and the more desolating its violence, the less likelihood there is that a devastated mankind will be in any state, for decades at least, to create that ordered and enlightened human society which most men desire and which our 'democratic' leaders proclaim that victory will ensure. The physical victory they have in mind is, I believe, obtainable only at the almost certain cost of material chaos and spiritual defeat. And the kind of order which would then have to be imposed, however different from the individualistic anarchy which war has destroyed, is more likely to resemble a state of martial law than one of human brotherhood. But just as the war itself cannot last indefinitely, so the war-like organisation, which will certainly succeed the war for some time unless chaos intervenes, can only be a phase, long or short, in man's social development. The tragedy of our time is, of course, at bottom a spiritual tragedy, the failure of man's spirit to exert itself over the deathly material drag of acquisitiveness, of knowledge to combat the inertia of ignorance, and of faith to quicken the creative power of good-will.

And because man has for so long lived unspiritually the material world has increasingly lost the order which, as a being responsive to eternal values, he did infuse, however imperfectly, into it. He has become, indeed, so much a slave of

matter and as such so incapable, with all his ingenuity, of humanising it that the disaster which has come upon him might seem, on a superficial view, to be due to a failure to solve certain simple economic problems of distribution, just as his forefathers were decimated by plague through not having mastered the technique of sanitation. But the cause of all failures on the material plane is, of course, spiritual. And although it is true that the whole world today is multiplying instruments of destruction because they are the only things which it is prepared to give away and so to pay the unemployed to produce, no mere economic readjustment, as no mere redistribution of the earth's surface, can cure man of the disease which has driven him to self-destruction. We have only to realize that the machines which are now enabling him to blow cities into heaps of rubble are merely doing more spectacularly what their like in factories and elsewhere have been doing ever since the Industrial Revolution to see how little any advance in material efficiency can better man's state unless it is an expression of a renewed being and subordinate to that end.

While, therefore, the immediate problems after the war are likely to be practical ones such as how to maintain order in a shattered world and how to feed and employ the millions who have become cogs in the military machine, *the essential problem will be how to inaugurate*

effectually a new way of living through which men may in time cease to be cogs in any machine and may become responsible human beings freely co-operating in all the arts and industries of real community. Even to state such an ideal today may well seem wildly visionary with all the weight of mechanism which the modern servile state has accumulated, like some doomed Dinosaur, crushing what is original and sensitive in man into rigid acquiescence. Yet it is against this order of death that an order of life must, and, I do not doubt, eventually will be affirmed. It is easy, of course, to denounce the 'new order' of which Hitler is the evangelist and to see in it only a national and economic strait-jacket to be clamped upon a captive world. *But those who speak for democracy show little sign of realizing what a true 'new order' will cost, so that they themselves are forced to follow Hitler's lead, while hoping to preserve in a mechanised totalitarian society of their own the more essential human values of a pre-mechanical era.* We may be grateful that they still can so hope. But already it is obvious that their hopes are in many ways delusive. Individual liberties have almost disappeared under the stress of total war and the assurance that they will be restored when the war is over is as naïve as the supposition that human sensitiveness will emerge undamaged by the torrent of brutal fact which daily descends upon it, often in gleeful tones, from the air. Yet

I stress this only to assert more strongly that a new conception of liberty and a more deeply grounded humanity must and will arise, not as a hang-over from some past era, but as an expression of the unconquerable spirit of man called into renewed being by the very extremity of mechanical tyranny which would stifle it.

This is the fundamental need which faces the world after the war. By satisfying this alone can mankind really cease to be at war and enter on the eternally fruitful struggle to create. But when we ask how it is likely to be satisfied and what practical measures each of us, who recognise the need, will be able to take to further its fulfilment, we can speak with far less certainty. A man living at the time of the break up of the ancient world and ignorant of the new dynamic which Christianity was to release could only view the defeat of civilization by barbarism with a sick heart and turn his eyes from the future in despair. We, too, stand on the brink of an unknown era, having spent all the spiritual capital which we inherited from both Christianity and Paganism in a five hundred years orgy of humanistic self-assertion. In the process our individualism has lost its spiritual centre and in gravitating ever more avidly to the circumference man has become the slave of necessity and in the power of non-human forces. The creative impotence which made this war inevitable and against which the violence

of the 'aggressor' powers is itself a frenzied recoil is the doom of an individualism cut off from its eternal roots. So deep is man's self-dereliction that no liberal ideas of the old intellectual order can save him. For they cannot fill his emptiness, cannot restore to him the sense of the infinite mysteries of Being and the sanctity and sanity which such a sense brings to the whole conduct of life, like springs that make the desert blossom. Yet the springs are there and beneath them the inexhaustible well. And so we cannot doubt man's capacity for regeneration. Nor, of course, has he exploited his powers as an individual for nothing. In the era of humanism which has now collapsed he has learnt much. The reason which he has abused he has also developed, and in the freedom which has now become his bondage he has cast off many ancient chains. However much, if he is to find himself again, he must learn to accept realities which he had conceitedly rejected, he knows and is not likely to forget for long that there is virtue only in a free and responsible acceptance. Yet the immediate outlook is dark enough since it is just that free and responsible acceptance of which the mass-man of today is incapable. The first reaction from a false self-consciousness is to a mechanical atomism and it will be in a regimented world, however efficient its economy, that the secret of organic living will have to be re-discovered. But no new world was ever born

save out of darkness. Corrupt civilizations die in barbarism and the barbarism which we and our descendants will have to civilize may well be outwardly a mechanically expert ordering of society. That in the world after the war society everywhere will be organised along totalitarian lines is certain. Practically there will be no alternative. It is the order that fits the mechanised man and economically it may ensure him security and even material comfort. How, within the framework of such a world, can men and women become really human again and create a really human society, organic in all its parts? There are some who visualize a return to the catacombs for the remnant who will not bow the knee to the modern Baal. Others put their faith in groups of men and women living in community on the land and developing a real society of real persons, tolerated at first by the State for its productive uses and eventually, in federation with other similar societies, transforming the national and international life from within. Others believe that man's scientific and technical control of the forces of nature, once it is released from the selfish interests which have thwarted it and turned it to destruction, will open up immense possibilities of human betterment and free human energy from servility to matter for creative effort on many planes. For these the task is, not to turn away from the machine, but to become more expert technicians until human-

ity, having subdued its instruments to its needs, is once again able to be itself. And there are those who knowing that man's greatest need is enlightenment and that the truth concerning both himself and the nature of life, the truth that will make him free, is awaiting the courageous searcher behind all the interested half-truths or untruths of established but now obviously moribund authority, will feel that their chief labour must be to seek the light of ancient wisdom where it may be found and by living it spread it, so that the old may be truly re-born in the new.

On the material level of life we cannot tell what the conditions will be after the war, though we may be sure that for a time at least they will be both straitened and revolutionary. But spiritually we may be confident. For it is the Light that stirs up the darkness in the pit of life and the greater the darkness the

greater the light which will eventually manifest. *The suffering and discipline which mankind is undergoing in passing through a new barbarism is the price of a new dawn.* Would that the least selfish were not those who are called as ever to suffer most and so gratuitously. The soul of man for long after the war will be struggling for life against soulless mechanism. And in many other ways than I have mentioned, from the intense concentration of the creative artist or thinker to the devotion of millions of humble men and women to the craft of living, the soul may be re-inforced. The horrors of these times will not have been for nothing if they compel men to stake all upon their humanity. For a world in which we have the courage to be human, whatever the cost or the interested clamour of those who would exploit our ignorance, is the only tolerable world left to us.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

FOLLOW THE PATTERN OF LIFE

As I have been given permission by the Editor of THE ARYAN PATH to approach the subject in my own way and as I cannot think about the world as I want it to be after the war without my mind returning again and again to some first principles, I will begin at the beginning by asking :

Am I content with the world as it is ?

The question seems ridiculous.

What human being given by God a brain and a heart could be content with the world as it is at this moment of time (four o'clock in the morning, Double Summer Time, 1941, in London. I am writing during my spell of Fire Watching, as no air raid warning has so far sounded.)

But it is not so ridiculous as it at first appears.

If I am content with the world

as it is, this content will affect my desire to change it. If I am deeply discontented with it I shall desire wider changes. Let me try to find out if I am content with the world.

The broad pattern of the life of man, designed by God, continues to move in its immemorial track. He is born, he works, mates, reproduces his kind, worships God, and dies. Wars, and good or evil social conditions, only change these facts more or less. They cannot destroy them. For the main mass of humankind this pattern existed a hundred thousand years ago and it exists now. A mosquito and a marigold, an elephant and a sea-urchin, have their life-patterns and we have ours.

And the broad mass of us is content with, or at least accepts, the pattern we have been given. If we accept the pattern with knowledge and joy, we shall be—happy is too weak and misused a word to express our state. We shall be *living*, which is what God put us here to do; we shall be fulfilled and used like a saucepan or a pair of shoes belonging to a poor family; and if at the same time we are praising and loving God in our living we shall also be royally happy.

Our happiness (or "sense of life", which is a clumsy expression but more nearly expresses what I mean) is deeply affected by how far we accept God's pattern.

There are millions of rebels against it; people who are born

with the seeds of fear of living in them and if they are not wisely guided when they are children they will grow up as non-accepters of the ancient pattern; people who will violently reject mating and reproduction and work and the worship of God, which are the parts of the pattern that we are most at liberty to influence.

By the rebels I do not mean the artists or those with a religious vocation, but the millions who ask "Why does God allow it? Why should such horrors be part of life?" when they see some sickening cruelty or injustice overtake an innocent fellow being. Such people are often so tender-hearted that their love for their fellow-men takes the inverse form of hatred for God, who "allows" such things to be.

These rebels are misfits, struggling and unhappy even in the enormous and loosely-woven net of the pattern, in which there is room for every imaginable human being, even for those who long to die and escape from it and who at last kill themselves!

We cannot completely escape. *We are what we are*; to think for long upon this sentence is to be filled with awe, as one is after thinking of the awful *I am that I am*.

Before I can write about the world I want after the war I must answer whether I accept or reject the Pattern.

I accept it! with joy and bewilderment and worship. (Carlyle, the

English philosopher, is said to have retorted grimly "By Jove, she'd better!" when told of a lady who made a similiar affirmative statement about the Universe.)

But upon the ancient pattern designed by God, Man has encrusted a horrible growth of injustice, greed, selfishness, ignorance, devilish cruelty, and lust for power. This is what I (and a few people before and after me) want to change.

But may not this be a part of the Pattern? The question cannot be avoided.

Well, there is not much doubt that pain and suffering and loss are a part of the pattern. "Life is the richer for the presence of the Serpent," says William James (I quote from memory) in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*, "always provided that we bruise his head under our heel."

But there are wickedness and diseases that God gives Man the power to control and to cure, and these, surely, are not part of the pattern. Jesus cured blindness and madness and leprosy, and rebuked the wicked and told them to be good. There can be little doubt that God wants us to clothe the naked and feed the hungry and love one another.

There are people who complain that if everything were tidied up and there were no more evils to fight, the world would be a boring place and we should quickly degenerate into weaklings and die. To

such people it is necessary to reply tartly: Look around you, dear. There is plenty to be done and it will probably be quite a long time before any of us die from boredom because everything is too perfect.

There are other people (I am one of them) who are so fascinated by the sheer spectacle of life, the play of brilliant light and dark shadow upon the ancient Pattern, that they waste the morning of their days hanging out of the window with their arms folded, just marvelling.

Both types of people are selfish, of course. It will be one of the millions of tasks in the post-war world to teach people not to be selfish.

Even the most selfish of us feels a pang of anger, pity, and guilt when we see a sick and wretched fellow human being, and we all want to be like the person who is brave and good.

(I have just remembered that there is someone brave and good living quite close to me whom I haven't the faintest desire to be like and am much confounded at this discovery but there is no space to discuss it here. Also, it would not be interesting.)

The Pattern is accepted. The vile crust upon it is loathed. The crust must be scraped away and the beautiful bold design gradually, splendidly, revealed.

II

Well, first of all I want a world in which all the nations know about

every other nation and feel friendly towards it.

The first humble instrument, the little bit of firewood that shall begin to scrape patiently away at the vile crust on the Pattern, is in the hands of the mothers.

The Jesuits and the Catholics, the Nazis and the Communists, have always known that the minds of children can be moulded for life.

It must be the holy task of mothers to teach their children all over the world to admire and feel an interest in the other children, white and yellow, brown and black. Personally, I would prefer that pity did not come into the teaching; there has been too much of the "poor little Chinese children, they don't know about Jesus, we must teach them" attitude, and it has encouraged the feeling of natural superiority that belongs to the white races because they live in manageable climates and have enough to eat. Towards the truly backward races such as the unhappy Germans and the cannibals they *should* be taught to feel pity, coupled with respect for their good qualities (in the case of the Germans it is possible to admire their superb music and their philosophy and their efficiency, and the cannibals can be admired for their bravery and powers of endurance and skill with their hands). Also, they should be taught that it is their duty to *help* such people, not destroy them.

In this teaching of the children to

love other children of other races, there is a superb *new* chance for Christianity — the old Christianity that Christ taught, before there was a Church, the Christianity that is like a morning in May or a pink cherry tree flowering above a rushing clear stream.

After the child has gone on to school, I would have him taught *world* history, as well as the history of his own country, with a great deal of geography, simple geology and astronomy (to keep him humble), economic history (to teach him that most wars are economic in origin and many of them need never have happened if economic adjustments had been made), and the history of art (to puff him up and show him what the human race can do when it isn't fighting and being greedy).

But the real problem is not that of the children, but that of the adults.

The problem towards which all economic and social history has been steadily moving for the past hundred years is this:

How free shall we be?

How far shall we control our own lives, and how far shall they be managed by the State for the good of us all?

Many of us know by experience that since this war, in spite of bombing and shortage of food and fear for our dear ones, we are happier than we were in the uneasy days of peace, just because we are doing some kind of public work, however small; serving and helping.

It is possible for lives to be too private. There is an appetite (starved, in most people) for public service in the human soul just as there is an appetite for worship and love of God.

In my post-war world I would like to see this appetite fed, but not by force. I would like to see *the voluntary adoption of some form of public service all over the world, so that every village, town and city was vocal about the affairs of its nation and could influence them.*

Food and property should be distributed more fairly. Food could work miracles with those races that have been for centuries starved; racial characteristics that have troubled or shamed them for generation after generation might be eradicated by proper and sufficient feeding; and if every propertyless family in every part of the world were given a small piece of land *to do as they please with*—grow flowers, potatoes, rice or cocoanuts, make a bower or a cricket pitch—this would increase their love for their own country and counter-balance the internationalism taught in the schools.

Before it is too late and her riches are exploited or exhausted I would

like to see the post-war world turn back to the earth and cultivate her as the Chinese, perhaps the wisest race on her bosom, have always done. (If one realizes how close the Chinese have kept to the Pattern one knows why they are a happy race).

And I dream of a mighty march of the Common People on the palaces of their leaders, of their voices shouting, "We will make no more weapons of war. You can starve us and take our jobs away and shoot us. *We will make no more bombers and battleships and tanks.*" I dream of laughter and gaiety sweeping across the world like a tidal wave, after the years of fear and torture, with brilliant clothes and gay fantastic hats and music and dancing and friendship, and all the peoples of the world happy together.

A. P. Herbert, the English Member of Parliament, remarks that it is easy to become enthusiastic, but quite another matter when it comes to drafting the simplest Bill to pass some small piece of social reform through Parliament.

With this thought in mind I cannot write any more about what I want the post-war world to be.

STELLA GIBBONS

THE EVOLUTION OF INDIAN MYSTICISM

V.—EARLY INDIAN MYSTICISM

[Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, District and Sessions Judge (Retired), brings to this series of studies of the evolution of mysticism on the congenial soil of India—the fifth instalment of which we publish here—a wide acquaintance with this country's mystical lore and an understanding sympathy with its varying expressions.—ED.]

The Soul of India has expressed itself most fully in and through Religion, and especially through Religion of a metaphysical or mystical or introspective kind rather than through religion of a formal, dogmatic and ritualistic nature. Even in the *Vedas* amidst the worship of the deities presiding over various aspects of nature and guiding and directing various cosmic functions, we find a clear realization and a clear declaration of the truth that "there is only one God-head, though the sages call it by various names." In the *Upanishads* this realization has a greater expansion and a clearer and more multi-coloured expression. The final synthesis of these experiences and expressions is in the *Bhagawad Gita*.

It is a wrong view to hold that the Aryans leaned to ritualism or to metaphysics and that it was the Dravidian culture that brought in the rich tributary stream of Devotion (*bhakti*) and Love (*prema*). The Aryan culture was as much home-born in India as any other culture, and the Dravidian Culture, which was also home-born and should be described in terms of

latitude and longitude rather than of race, blended with the Aryan culture long, long ago. Can any one say that any Dravidian contribution enriched the *Bhagawad Gita* and the *Bhāgawata*? And yet is there a book that thrills and quivers more than the *Gita* or the *Bhāgawata* with the raptures of Prema and Bhakti? The Dravidian genius excelled in architecture and in sculpture while the Aryan genius excelled in painting and music and poetry, in drama and dance. But this is a territorial, and not a racial, diversity of efflorescence.

I have already shown how Mysticism is the flower that blooms on the tree of moral purity, whose sap is faith in God. It is not a mere intellectual attitude. It is an inner experience of seeing God and of union with God. These characteristics apply to all aspects of mysticism in ancient India. Some aspects are specially emphasised in the Karma Kānda of the Veda while other and higher aspects are emphasised in the Jñāna Kānda or the Upanishads. In the Karma Kānda, a great potency was attributed to *Yajnas* or Sacrifices. These could

give us all benefits and blessings in life on earth or in *Swarga* (heaven). Professor S. N. Das Gupta enlarges the definition of Mysticism and then speaks of the sacrificial mysticism of the *Veda*. This seems to be a wrong way of looking at things. He says that Western writers regard mysticism as an instinctive or ecstatic union with the Deity through contemplation and communion. He expands the concept of mysticism by defining it as a doctrine which considers reason to be incapable of discovering the ultimate truth but believes in the certitude of some other means of arriving at it. Such an amplification is no real amplification but is, on the contrary, a dilution and distortion. Mysticism is the certitude that we can commune with divinity. The concept of Godhead and the concept of union with God are of a lower and more limited order in the Karma Kānda than in the Jñāna Kānda. The former leads to the latter and is included in and transcended by it, as is well stated in the famous forty-sixth verse in Chapter II of the *Gita*. Professor Das Gupta damns the *Veda* with faint praise when he refers to what he calls sacrificial mysticism and says that the Karma Kānda means a blind submission to the *Veda* as an impersonal authority that holds within itself unalterable and inscrutable laws of sacrifice which carry with them their own fulfilment. The Karma Kānda describes the means of communion with the Cosmic Divinities through

prayers and sacrifices whereas the Jñāna Kānda is its fulfilment and describes the means of communion through Yoga and Bhakti and Jñāna, with the Supreme Iswara of whom the Cosmic Divinities are but aspects and modes. The former union brings us many great blessings here and hereafter, but the latter union brings us the supreme blessing of eternal liberation and eternal bliss. In the latter union itself there are different degrees of intensity, though all kinds of union are of the nature of infinite immortal bliss. The *Upanishads* now speak the language of Dwaita, now of Visishtadwaita, and now of Adwaita. Are we to steam-roller all these into one uniform macadamised road of Dwaita or Visishtadwaita or Adwaita? No. We should rather enter into the spirit of the incessant and passionate search which went through such experiences and gave them to the world without imagining any mutual incompatibility among them. The concept of the Creator, the concept of the immanent (*antaryāmi*), and the concept of Sachchidānanda—are they mutually incompatible and exclusive? Not at all. The concept of the eight blessed qualities (*apahatapapa, vijarah, vimrutyuh, visokah, avijighatsah, apipāsah, satyakāmah* and *satyasan-kalpah*, i. e., holiness, eternal beauty, eternal being, eternal bliss, absolute freedom from hunger and thirst, omniscience, omnipresence and omnipotence) and the concept of *Nirgunatwa* (or the unconditioned Blissful Absolute beyond all Name

and Form and Causality and Quality)—are they mutually incompatible and exclusive? Not in the least. The concept of *Sālokya* (co-existence) and *Sameepya* (affinity) and *Saroopya* (similarity) and *Sāyujyā* (union) and the concept of *Kaivalya* (identity)—are they mutually incompatible and exclusive? Not at all.

Yoga is the name given to the latter union, *i. e.* the union of the Soul with the Oversoul. The impure mind is an obstacle to such union but the purified mind facilitates it. Yoga frees us from sense-determination and mind-determination and bestows on us self-determination. The mind and the senses are like multi-coloured domes intercepting and refracting the white light of the Soul. The *Yoga Sastra* of Patanjali tells us how to still the mind till in *Samadhi* we can realize the white light of the soul. By recalling the scattered activities of the mind and reaching a re-collectedness, we attain a deepening, a widening and a heightening of vision. In the beautiful language of St. Bernard we become a reservoir instead of being a canal. Only by the inhibition of the conscious and the sub-conscious can the

superconscious radiance of the Soul have perfect and unhindered self-expression. But the Yogic concept of the Purusha is deficient because God is not realized as the creator and preserver and destroyer of the world — as Brahman or Paramātma or Bhagawan. It was by correcting this deficiency that Sri Krishna lifted Yoga Dhyāna to the level of one of the supreme means of the supreme mystical experience. (Chapter VI, Verse 47).

Equally important are the mystic Sādhana of Bhakti and Jñāna. By them also we can attain communion with the Oversoul. They are easier than Yoga Dhyāna, and of them all Bhakti is supremely easy and sweet. Nay, Bhakti is of the essence of success in every Godward Sadhana — Karma Yoga or Dhyāna Yoga or Bhakti Yoga or Prapatti Yoga or Jñāna Yoga. Sri Krishna says in Chapter X of the *Gita* that He can be attained most easily and securely by Bhakti and affirms in Chapter XII that of the two forms of Devotion, *i. e.*, Passion for the Absolute and Passion for God, the latter is easier and sweeter and more secure, though both lead to the same goal of God-realization.

K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

TOWARD SCIENTIFIC HISTORY

From the *Bhagavad-Gita* to the chronicle of Frankish times set down in the sixth century by Gregory of Tours is a far cry, yet both are history. The one contains the timeless archetypes of experiences through which the striving human spirit must pass in any cycle of evolution; the other, "artless memoranda of a contemporary," a naïve account of the dark and bloody events which blotch the pages of early European history. The difference is simply that Gregory tells what some men did and what happened to them, while the *Gita* presents the alternatives faced by *all* men, revealing what shall happen to them in consequence of choices made. The latter is history in essence, or abstracted from the temporal process.

The old, old question of what history is and what it means has been variously answered. Lovers of "fact" are prone to regard any effort at evaluation as a sort of blasphemy against scientific method. Others urge that meaning necessarily emerges from the "just" arrangement of historical data—which really means, arranged in some pattern having the approval of a prevailing school. To cool the ardour of enthusiasts of special theory, the skeptical relativists have assembled a large body of evidence showing that men always find in history the meanings they are seeking and that studies of events written to prove the validity of a given theory of interpretation disclose only that the protagonists

undertook historical investigation with certain prejudices or preconceived ideas about the nature of things.

Augustine's *City of God* is often cited to illustrate the religious type of "special pleading." Following his example, Orosius, a Spanish presbyter of the fifth century, produced a "universal history" from creation to 417 A. D., having for its object the demonstration from historical evidence that the cultural break-down of his period was entirely the fault of the pagans. The work of Orosius became the favourite text of the middle Ages, being translated into Anglo-Saxon by Alfred the Great in the ninth century. The Augustinian doctrine was founded on a plan of "Seven Ages," derived by analogy from the Days of Creation in Genesis, a scheme followed in principle by all later theological historians from Orosius to Bossuet. The seven ages are terminated by the reign of Christ on earth, as related in Revelations, this marking the final chapter in the history of the world and the consummation of Christian prophecy.

Such, in outline, was the Christian interpretation of history. Karl Marx took another view. He drafted every significant historical event in the service of dialectical materialism. This was the new "Revelation" implicit in the facts, at once evident when history is studied as a series of sequences arising out of the class struggle—that almost cosmic antagonism between the proletariat and their economic exploiters.

Even the *Dialogues* of Plato are explained away by contemporary Marxists as a consequence of his "class alignment." Plato was "illogical," driven to visionary dreams and speculation because he was an aristocrat of the leisure class, out of touch with the "fundamentals" of material existence. It is not enough to admit that the economic environment exerts a profoundly modifying influence on human life and thought; the Marxist demands that the conditions of the struggle for food and shelter be raised to the status of an absolute cause. His dialectic is infallible. The events of history, like the working class, must all be "converted" to his view.

The modern student, regarding these illustrations of special pleading and distortion—to which many more could be added—quite naturally turns a skeptical eye toward *any* theory of history. Most contemporary historians console themselves by devoting all their attention to what they hope are "indisputable" facts, arguing that if they refuse to rise to a general conception of development on the wings of some plausible theory, they are at least protected from such monumental deceptions as that imposed on the Christian world by Augustine, and on our own age by Karl Marx. The historian of today is surrounded by the debris of fallen theories; he sees in the scattered fragments of yesterday's promises of Utopia an ever-present testimony to the delusions of doctrinaire historiography. So it is not without cause that most attempts at constructive interpretation leave him unimpressed.

In the Introductory to *The Secret Doctrine*, H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

Over the gateway of Century I. of our era, the ominous words, "the KARMA OF ISRAEL," fatally glowed. Over the portals of our own, the future seer may discern other words, that will point to the Karma for cunningly made-up HISTORY, for events purposely perverted, and for great characters slandered by posterity, mangled out of recognition, between the two cars of Jaganatha—Bigotry and Materialism; one accepting too much, the other denying all. Wise is he who holds to the golden mid-point, who believes in the eternal justice of things (I, xli).

The tragedy of the "Karma of Israel" lay in the literal acceptance by the early Christians of the books of the Old Testament, in their adoption of the tribal God, Jehovah—who was to educated Jews simply an exoteric "blind"—as the personification of the "Most High." Christian thought despoiled the Jews of their allegorical legends and raised them to the status of divine revelation. The colourful tales of Hebrew history were gradually joined with Greek metaphysics by the Platonizing Fathers of the Church, producing a sort of Christian "philosophy" which reached, in the course of a thousand years, its highest expression in the works of Dante and Thomas Aquinas. The first real victory of true philosophy over the Judaic influence came some two centuries later, with the Revival of Learning in Florence and the spread over western Europe of the literature of the eastern Platonic Schools. This return to Greek philosophy was a major factor in the great historical adjustment we call the Renaissance and sowed the seeds for the birth of modern science.

For the genesis of the empirical method in science as in the writing of history, we need to recall the darker side of European development—the

culturally stultifying reflexes of Christian Dogma. The paramount cause of modern materialism, as is now becoming well known, was the intolerant attitude of the Church toward thinkers who dared to present evidence tending to controvert any of the established doctrines of theological Christianity. Infant modern science was forced in self-defense, as much as by choice, to limit its investigations to those areas of experience which, to the then thinking world, seemed to reveal no implications damaging to religious tradition. The vanity of this pious "defense mechanism" soon became clear, but the consequences of restricting science to a study of the physical remained to blight with materialism all subsequent intellectual growth. Scientific history, along with the other branches of social science, fell victim to the bias attending its birth.

As science and modern philosophy gained a measure of autonomy, theories of historical interpretation at once arose from the new contexts. Men began to prophesy on the authority of Nature instead of the Bible. Humanism had done its work well and from theories founded on the dignity of God men turned with zeal to the newly discovered dignity of man. Bursting with indignation, Rousseau sounded the cry of Revolution. The Social Contract replaced the Vicarious Atonement as symbol of the path of Salvation. Augustine's "Heavenly City" was brought down from the Empyrean sphere and planted just around the historical corner. The Revolution, said the *philosophes*, would bring the march of humanity around the turn.

But the *philosophes* were wrong. Napoleon, not the Promised Land, was

around the corner.

More than a century was to pass before the students of history could see the perversions of fact, the romantic optimism and the fantastic ignorance of human nature that lay in the revolutionary doctrine. For fifty years the liberal movement lent a willing ear to the persuasive accents of the *Communist Manifesto*. The fault, lovers of freedom were told, lay not in the revolution, but in the failure of revolutionaries to annihilate the opposition. The horrors of mob violence gained a rosy glow from the glamor of mob mysticism. A heroic figure arose, the symbolic Man of the Masses. Christ was born in a manger, but this new deliverer emerged from the factory. The Marxian interpretation of history was taught to the world by fierce slogans and dramatic posters, by tabloid denunciation and threat. From Darwin the revolutionary movement borrowed the classical thesis of the evolutionary movement—"the struggle for existence." All the logic of Biology was appropriated by this sociology of the jungle.

A small but determined minority, ruthless, and coldly brilliant, saturated most of modern social thinking with Marxian implications. The great neglect of economic factors in previous studies of historical trends lent special plausibility to the materialistic dialectic. It was hard to accept Marx's analysis of the past without regarding sympathetically his proposals for the future. What well-disposed man can fail to long for a "classless society"? And if, as Marx seems to show, achieving the Millennium for all involves the slaughter of a certain number of innocents, why then, it is deplorable but probably true. Have we not learned from

Science that the truth is not always " good " ?

For several generations past, articulate liberals, excepting only a few, in their discussion of social objectives have been gradually substituting the material fruits of " the good life " for the tree that was to have borne the harvest. Security and plenty were taken as operational evidence of the presence of freedom itself, growing to greater ideal eminence than basic civil liberties and freedom of thought and conscience. Unaware of this materialization of their original goal, the liberals kept on repeating the watchwords of freedom while contributing in large part to its downfall. Themselves disciplined in the desire to give and serve, they taught others a different doctrine; they schooled the masses in the desire to get and receive. It is easier to denounce than to educate, to accuse than to build, and many so-called liberals gave their energies to this unworthy occupation. From lovers of free men they became haters of some men. Belial was attacked no longer, but his sons, the political Bourbons, the " economic royalists, " and all the personal devils of caste and class were ready targets for righteous libertarian ire. No soil of public opinion was left without its quota of dragon's teeth. The result of that sowing is before us in the present cycle of destruction and moral revulsion.

The root of modern social evil, from the viewpoint of the interpretation of history, lies in the pseudo-scientific separation of "fact" or "truth" from moral values. By secularizing science, the intellectual leaders of modern civilization reduced the dynamic of social reform to an emotional level.

The inhuman dispassion of abstract science now finds its dark counterpoise in the seething fury of outraged humanity. If knowledge be unconnected with purpose, then purpose must eschew knowledge. Purpose will not be denied: there is no motiveless man. The flames of hate engulfing western civilization were lit by sparks from a moral short-circuit in both science and society. And the end, it appears, is not yet.

What is obviously needed is some knowledge of the principles of social psychology, of the springs of human action, individually and in the mass. This will not be learned from a discipline which elevates sense perceptions to greater authority than the moral intuitions which whittles into non-existence the spiritual force of altruism and self-sacrifice. There can be no shot-gun wedding between social ethics and materialism while Liberty, ravished and insensible, lies dying. We must rather begin all over again. For science and history, this means an unprejudiced return to the facts; a willingness to admit, with Descartes, that " the greatest minds, as they are capable of the highest excellencies, are open likewise to the greatest aberrations, " and to cast aside the tragic aberration of *a priori* materialism.

For some years past, particularly in England, investigation of the materialistic "conditioning" of science has been exposing the metaphysical assumption under which the founders of scientific thought laboured. As this work continues, it must prepare the soil for the growth of a new science, unhampered by the false psychology which sprouted and spread with weed-like luxuriance outside the pale of

religious orthodoxy. In America, too, there are signs that positivist arrogance is waning. Writers like E. A. Burt are uncovering the fallacies of mechanistic preconception, the philosophical naïveté of scientists generally. Arising at a time when Baconian optimism has received its *coup de grâce* from culture-destroying reaction, this critical movement should gain the immediate support of thinkers who realize that scientific research has need of deliberate ethical orientation.

What is probably the first conscious attempt at revaluation in history comes from the pen of Frederick J. Teggart, Professor of Social Institutions in the University of California at Berkeley. His *Rome and China*, published in 1939 by the University Press, is literally revolutionary in its implications for historiography. The thesis is quite simple. Briefly, Prof. Teggart contends that the *correlations* between events, hitherto neglected by historians, are as significant facts for historical study as the events themselves.

That these facts [the correlations] have not previously been discerned is due to the practice of by which the history of each and every country is treated in isolation by specialists. Up to the present moment the procedure of comparing events throughout the Eurasian continent has not been brought to bear upon the study of historical problems.

Choosing the problem of barbarian invasion to investigate, the author details the uprisings on Roman frontiers in Europe between 58 B. C. and A. D. 107—a total of forty disturbances. Then, by the method of correlation, he establishes “the positive conclusion that the barbarian invasions were occasioned by wars either on the western borders of the Chinese or the eastern borders of the Roman empire.” Put simply, when

Roman military adventures in the distant eastern regions of Bosphorus, Syria, and Armenia dislocated the economic life of peoples ranging far to the North, in what is now Russia, the result was a precipitation of war on the northern imperial frontier. War in the Roman East communicated its destructive impulses progressively, until, like ripples in a pool, they finally returned to the Romans themselves. Chinese disturbances were similarly transmitted along trade routes in the Tarim basin, producing wars in Europe. “Out of a total of forty occasions on which uprisings took place in Europe, twenty-seven are to be attributed to the influence of events in the “Western Regions” [of China], and about half that number to the aggressions of the Romans in the Near East.” Prof. Teggart points the moral in his final commentary :

The details on the preceding pages indicate that wars which were undertaken by the governments of China and Rome in pursuit of what were conceived to be important national aims led inevitably to conflicts among the peoples of northern Europe and to invasions of the Roman empire. It is of some importance to note that the statesmen who were responsible for or advocated the resort to war, on each of forty occasions, were entirely unaware of the consequences which this policy entailed. The wars of the Chinese, indeed, were initiated only after lengthy discussions at the imperial court by ministers who were well versed in Chinese history, and who reasoned from historical experience no less than from moral principles and from expediency. But the Chinese emperors and their advisors were unconscious of the fact that their decisions were the prelude to conflicts and devastations in regions of which they had never heard. The Romans were equally in the dark with respect to the consequences of their wars in Bosphorus, Armenia, and Syria, but here the fact is striking, for the reason that their wars in the

East were followed invariably by outbreaks in Europe (pp. 241-2).

It would be difficult to picture with greater clarity the vicious circle of imperialism. Only ignorance of historical processes—of the law of karma, theosophists would say—allows men to suppose that *any* good, economic or otherwise, can come from military conquest. The Romans “observed the barbarians from a distance and from behind the protection of an armed frontier, and saw in the incursions only the spasmodic activities of tribes who appeared to be actuated by an unalterable disposition to maraud and war.” Attempts at permanent “pacification” proved futile, for always new invaders arose. The barbarians were likewise dismayed by the Roman policy. “The barrier maintained by the legions deprived them, in a manner at once sudden and incomprehensible, of an immemorial freedom of movement.” The author observes: “Hence the immediate factor in the border wars was not the martial spirit of any particular tribe or tribes, but the mutually unintelligible conduct of men responsive to different modes of existence.” *Rome and China* is thus primarily an appeal for understanding. As the only possible alternative to “any *a priori* philosophy of history,” Prof. Teggart advocates “wholehearted concentration, in the spirit of modern scientific work, on the study of World History, conceived as the comparison of histories for the elucidation of the problems of human existence.”

This is the scientific method legitimately conceived and usefully applied. Scientifically written history can have no *a priori* theories to prove, but rather should display the facts in their

obvious relation to the central problems of human welfare. For, as the author remarks, “if we are not to be swamped by the dogma that Revolution is the Way of Progress, we must be prepared to exercise every possible effort to discover the actual conditions and the actual means under and through which human advancement has been effected.” In his Preface, Prof. Teggart indicates the enormous field of research opened up by this technique of correlations. Its application to barbarian invasion is to be taken as a particular study illustrating the use of a principle of universal value. Classes of events, he points out, are “in number practically unlimited,” and his choice of a direction for future research is suggestive:

As an example of a wholly different type, I may point to the great religious movements associated with the names of Zoroaster in Persia, Lao-tzu and Confucius in China, Mahavira (founder of Jainism) and Gautama Buddha in India, the prophets Ezekiel and Second Isaiah, Thales in Ionia, and Pythagoras in southern Italy. All these great personages belong to the sixth century B. C., and their appearance certainly constitutes a class of events. Yet, though the correspondence of these events has frequently been observed, no serious effort has ever been made, so far as I have been able to discover, to treat the appearance of these great teachers—within a brief compass of time—as a problem which called for systematic investigation. But without this knowledge how are we to envisage or comprehend the workings of the human spirit? (pp. xi-xii).

How, indeed? Theosophists may be well content with histories written from this point of view and with this objective. Prof. Teggart's work merits the unqualified encouragement of both scientist and student of occultism. While the former may regard *Rome and China* as an ideal exemplification of humanitarian science, the latter

will see in it the type of undertaking that must some day lead to fulfillment of the prediction contained in the closing pages of *The Secret Doctrine* :

The public has hitherto had access to, and heard but one side—or rather the two one-sided views of two diametrically opposed classes of men, whose *prima facie* propositions or respective premises differ widely, but whose final conclusions are the same—Science and Theology....But when it becomes

undeniably proven that the claim of modern Asiatic nations to a Secret Science and an esoteric history of the world, is based on fact ; that, though hitherto unknown to the masses and a veiled mystery even to the learned, (because they never had the key to a right understanding of the abundant hints thrown out by the ancient classics), it is still no fairy tale, but an actuality—then the present work will become but the pioneer of many more such books (II, 794-5).

HENRY HOLLAND

NEW WORLDS FOR OLD *

There are many contentions in this illuminating book, but the central one is that "It is the very essence of Europe that it conceives man as free and equal." When the beliefs of Spiritual Man collapsed, the ideals of freedom and equality were projected into the Intellectual sphere—then into the Political—then into the Economic. The position, and the problem, today is that the era of Economic Man has come to an end and "in marked contrast to historical precedent no new positive creed appeared as the old one collapsed." It is this non-emergence of a new positive creed which creates that air of unreality which robs events and institutions of substance to-day, and it is this negativity which is the cause of modern despair. If we want to find the key to fascism, it is to be found in the despair of the masses.

It is doubtful whether, even yet, it is fully realized that despair is the enemy which threatens Europe and that Nazism is what it is because, although it represents despair, it promises miracles. If this is contended—if it is regarded as melodrama—it will have to be explained why Nazism

has its adherents in every country. It is a world movement—and glib explanations of that grim fact will not suffice. And it is because it is a world movement that it would be only too easy to make a good case for the contention that, in a deep sense, this war is a civil war. But let there be no masking one fact :—Nazism is wholly outside European tradition. Not only is it wholly outside that tradition, but it denies it—and would destroy it to its least and last root.

If there is a book which ought to be read and studied now—two years after its publication—this is the one. To those who read it when it was issued, certain subsequent facts, such as the Russo-German pact of 1939, was no surprise since its inevitability is emphasized in the final section of this book. Another prophecy, in the same section, regarding relations between Russia and Germany, is interesting in retrospect. "They may arrive at an agreement by partitioning Poland or by driving Italy and Great Britain out of the eastern Mediterranean."

Many a pipe-dream of the Appeasement years is dissipated by this

* *The End of Economic Man*. Peter Drucker. (Heinemann. 8/6 net.)

illuminating analysis of the inner dynamic of Nazism. The long-treasured pre-war hope of an internal collapse in Germany is dealt with in sentences which demand repetition now—when the war is twenty one months old. "The collapse will come as soon as there is an alternative to the belief in the demoniac nature of the leader, that is, as soon as there is a new order and a new creed. But—and this is the mainspring of totalitarian successes and strength—it cannot come otherwise." And now, after twenty one months of war, collapse—in *that* sense—will not come unless the German people become so exhausted that they prefer chaos to the present régime, or until a genuine positive alternative to that régime shines on the horizon.

All the blunders committed by the non-totalitarian countries, during the last eight years, in dealing with Hitlerism originated in ignorance of the nihilistic nature of Nazism. If the chapter headed "The Return of the Demons" does not make that fact clear, then nothing will. And if the chapter, "Fascist Non-Economic Society," does not show how a totalitarian state regards economic objectives as entirely secondary and, *inter alia*, that there is nothing miraculous about totalitarian economics, then it is difficult to see what will make these things plain. What has to be realized, once and finally, is that Nazism is the result of the collapse of Europe's spiritual and social order and that therefore it is despair who is the enemy—and one which might survive Hitlerism.

What of the future? Dr. Drucker believes that the destruction of the fascist countries will not lead to the

restoration of capitalism or socialism. A new non-economic society, striving for individual freedom and equality, must emerge. That is the *only* alternative to totalitarianism. And, according to the author, there is hope that this new-economic society will emerge in the fact that "personal religion" has become the refuge of many of the best minds in Germany and Italy; for it was out of a similar resignation of scholars—in the thirteenth century—that the Renaissance concept of freedom and the society of Intellectual Man, eventually emerged.

Only a new, positive, non-economic society can successfully challenge negative 'nihilistic' totalitarianism. And there is hope for the future in the fact that ordeal by battle has quickened vital spiritual forces which are beginning to flow, like an underground river, below the surface ruin of the old order.

It is imperative to read this illuminating prophetic book.

*The New Order** is an attempt at planning on a big scale, a scale far too extensive to be more than indicated here. It relates to the British State, the House of Commons, the Government, Money, Land, Property, Law, Defence, Justice etc. etc. Also, in Part III of the book, the application of the proposed new British order to the British Commonwealth of Nations, to Europe, and to the world is outlined in some detail.

A lot of hard work has gone to the making of this book but the fact remains that, if one opens it at random, one encounters proposals which, one is

**The New Order*. C. B. PURDOM (Dent. 7/6 net.)

convinced, just could not be implemented by anyone less powerful than a dictator.

For instance, the author proposes that no one under the age of forty nine shall be eligible for election to Parliament. (Incidentally, had this been law for the last hundred years, the only Prime Minister "eligible" during that period would have been Chamberlain. Which may be funny—or which may not). Later in the book, the

author proposes that "the marriage age will be delayed, and generally will be postponed for men until twenty eight years of age is reached." Well, lacking absolute power, how are those proposals to be implemented? The author says he anticipates this criticism, but, he does so very unconvincingly.

Readers of this book are advised to re-read that section of *The Possessed* in which Shigalov outlines his note-book plan for world organization.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

LIVING BY SERVING

The Editor gives me 600 words in which to deal with Mr. Mumford's book. I must make the most of them, for it is an important book. But just as the author is conditioned by his personal reaction to his times, so, too, is the critic conditioned by personal experience and particular angle of vision.

In order to make clear the present reviewer's attitude towards this book the reader must be made aware of two circumstances. The first is that the reviewer is in the midst of terrific events which are viewed by the writer from a distance; that he has, indeed, suffered in his person from the attentions of the Luftwaffe, and in his property, too. The second is that, by sheer chance, shortly before finding this book on his desk, he had been engaged in putting into book form a series of investigations into the state of the city of Birmingham, and had, in the course of much reading on town planning, found in *The Culture of Cities* the outstanding contribution of our time to that tremendous problem.

In other words, the reviewer opened *Faith for Living** with lively anticipation: nor was he disappointed. Mr. Mumford is commonly described as a Liberal, and in these pages one might describe him as a disgruntled Liberal who laments the disappearance of the world he knows. But that would be, indeed, a shallow view. Mr. Mumford is, first and foremost a Pragmatist. Whatever his Liberalism in the past he is by now one who sees very clearly that what we have been pleased to term "civilization" is in process of liquidation and that, if man is to survive, he must now do some exceedingly hard thinking.

Only those who had made acquisition their end object in life would desire the perpetuation of the present way of living, whether it be that exemplified by the United States, Great Britain, or Nazi Germany. We in England see that we fight for the bad against the worse. That is our inescapable destiny.

Mr. Mumford asks the ageless question: Whither?

* *Faith for Living*. By LEWIS MUMFORD. (Seeker and Warburg, London. 7s. 6d.)

By putting business before every other manifestation of life, our apostles of the machine have forgotten the chief business of life, namely, growth, reproduction, development, creation. They have paid infinite attention to perfecting the mechanism of the incubator—and have forgotten the egg.

In this passage one seems to hear the echoes of another hater of the acquisitive society, Professor Tawney. And, like that lucid thinker, Mr. Mumford sees that if humanity is to survive the present catastrophe and emerge with the rough drawn plans of a new way of life, we must abandon most things hitherto held in high repute and most richly rewarded by our rotten societies.

We must not deify the man whose acquisitive sense is a pathological hangover from the anal-erotic phase of infancy. We must not base our values on property, nor bend our energies to its acquisition. On the contrary, we must think in terms of function and fulfilment, knowing that (since shrouds have no pockets) the term "property" is a mockery of the truth, which is that all man can ever possess of the earth's treasure is the use, to the limits of his capacity for enjoyment, of some small part of it.

Whether Mr. Mumford is right in his tracing out of the pedigree of our philosophy of harsh materialism from the hard rationalism of the eighteenth century is really not important.

What is important is that he draws our attention to fundamental things: to the fact that man does not live by bread alone; that he lives only insofar as he *serves*.

Haven't I got a right to a car? Haven't I got a right to a new suite of furniture? These are the questions asked by the pathetic starvelings in a recent novel: a study of a family on relief. And the answer now, to rich and poor, must be a firm one. The only right anyone has is to an equal share in the good life. Not a life of material abundance; but a life of comradeship, art, and love.

You may say that this has been said before. It has. But there are truths which must be repeated many times if they are to penetrate the minds of the masses. One is that the essence of life is service. Mr. Mumford knows that. His fine book, with its deep humanism, is one that should be read by all who ponder the unknown future to the sound of falling bombs and the crashing of cities.

GEORGE GODWIN

CORRESPONDENCE

PILLARS OF PEACE

The world is in flames. A flood-tide of destruction is sweeping on, engulfing in its pitiless advance, all that millions of human hands and human brains have devoutly toiled to build. And men and women are dreaming the while of a new fireproof world—a world of peace and plenty, to replace the mad old world going up in flames.

And everyone is ready with his own diagnosis of what was wrong with the old world and his own remedy for it, but it is they who win the war that will make the peace. Therefore it may seem vain for me to match my small voice against the deafening blare of trumpets. Yet I believe that thought will slowly burn its way into the hearts of men and affect the destinies of nations. Faith in the progress of mankind is conditional on belief in the potency of thought. It is in that belief that I set down my own thoughts—although they are in no way startling—on the burning problem of the day.

The first condition of peace, in my view, is respect for the individual. "To treat every man as an end in himself and not as a means to an end," as Kant would say. The individual must not be regarded as a dot on a graph, nor as prospective cannon fodder. The individual should be looked upon as a final fact of nature, as a unique entity with his own feelings, ideas and desires and possessed of a personality to be perfected. The individual is like a flower, whose blossoming has no ulterior end.

No doubt the individual has to live in society and his conduct cannot be allowed to be destructive of society. But it is dangerous to deify Society or the State and to think of either as an entity over and above the individuals who make it up and for whose alleged welfare the individual must surrender his freedom. Society exists for the growth of the individual. The happiness and growth of the individual, the freedom and the opportunity for self-development that are provided for him, are the only tests of the progressive nature of society.

This doctrine is different from *laissez-faire*, which presupposed a conflict between the individual and the State. *Laissez-faire* tried to define limits to the authority of the State. It was born out of a desire to trade without being bothered by the State. It meant in effect liberty to one class of people to exploit, to starve and to enchain the masses.

We have now found that political freedom is not enough. What is the good of setting a man on a desert island, without food, clothing, shelter or the means to acquire knowledge and use it, and then telling him that he is completely free? Freedom will be a mockery unless the means and the opportunity to use that freedom for self-development are secured to the individual.

Therefore our doctrine of respect for the individual means that the individual is economically free; that

he is assured of food and security ; that he is provided with the means of acquiring knowledge and of using it ; that he is free to choose his profession ; that his medical needs are attended to and that he is able to obtain some hours of leisure and recreation every day.

To work out the implications of respect for the individual would need volumes. I will not venture to do so here. But I must draw attention to one aspect of the problem which, as a working journalist, I have felt very keenly.

I am referring to the problem of freedom from propaganda. Today every State claiming sovereignty and even lesser organisations with lesser powers are exploiting the school, the pulpit, the platform, the press and the radio to convert their youth into a mass of hysterical, blood-thirsty monsters.

The schools, as at present organised, tend to produce fanatics and robots. The new school must set itself the task of producing men capable of self-direction. The radio at present is merely an instrument of State propaganda. In the new world we are planning it will have to confine itself to providing entertainment and imparting information and shed its propagandist rôle. The press today, both on account of its internal limitations, arising out of problems of financing and of the equipment and the prejudices of its personnel, and on account of the external limitations placed on it by the State, reflects only a limited cross section of public opinion. Meanwhile an avalanche of propaganda is let loose on a public not merely gagged but bound hand and foot.

I want to make it clear that I am not merely making out a case against the suppression of opinion. That case was put quite clearly long ago by John Stuart Mill (*On Liberty*) :—

The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that it is robbing the human race ; posterity as well as the existing generation ; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth ; if wrong, they lose what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.

I go a step further. While the organised instruments of propaganda fill the air with their raucous cacophony, the ordinary individual finds himself choked and powerless. How exactly every individual should be given an opportunity for self-expression, and how he should be protected from organised propaganda is a question of methods which will have to be worked out in detail. But I would like to stress the principle that respect for individuality means the cessation of false propaganda by interested parties through the press, the radio and other means.

So far we have dealt with the individual within the unit of a social or political organisation. But what of the numerous such units which go to make the world ? What should be their status and their relations with one another ?

I am afraid this is one of the saddest chapters of human history. The intransigence, the callousness, the utter stupidity of warring nations who fill the pages of history with their futile conflicts is such as will fill a thoughtful man with despair. Today in the world

there are a few powerful nations each with a number of client States moving in their orbit. Then come Dominions, Dependencies, Colonies, Mandated territories, Possessions—a chaos of disorder and discontent.

Imperialism and Capitalism have enslaved the brown and dark peoples of the world. The dark man is bearing the burden of the white man's prosperity. The desire of some white peoples to have as much as some others has driven them to Nazism and Fascism. The main cause of the present and the previous war are economic. It is a very simple fact that there will be no peace in Europe and the world, as long as there is the distinction between Have's and Have-not's among European powers. The disappearance of this distinction will automatically liberate the darker peoples of this earth. It is as simple as A. B. C.; only our statesmen seem to be blind to it. Peace in this world is a costly affair and nothing less than the renunciation of possessions by the Have's is going to bring it about.

Yet what do we see today? Even in the midst of a great world conflagration brought about by the possessive greed of Nationalist States, the European Nations are not prepared to discard the idea of Empire. Great France lies humbled at the feet of a ruthless conqueror and yet French leaders are fighting about their possessions and Colonies in Central Africa, in Syria and Indo-China and dragging the peoples of these distant lands into the maelstrom which has submerged her.

And little Belgium, who in the course of a tragic campaign of but eighteen

days lost her freedom, refuses to set free the colonies and the possessions which she acquired and exploited with such sickening brutality. She more than atoned for her past in the campaign of May 10-28, 1940. But in the very book which so vividly sets out the heroic part played by the King and the army of Belgium, the Hon. Paul Van Zeeland, the former Prime Minister of Belgium writes :—

Beyond the grasp of the enemy, there remain free Belgian forces, such as *the Congo Colony*, the merchant fleet, important assets and several military corps. These forces *must be put to work to the full*¹ (*Italics mine*).

Not even in this hour of national sorrow and humiliation can the ex-Premier of Belgium forget to put to full use a colony which Belgium has conquered and enslaved so that Belgium, herself now a slave, may be liberated!

And what of Britain herself—"the Citadel of Democracy"? Why, when this nation of forty million people is fighting for her very survival, as her leaders say, why, I ask, should she burden herself with the onerous task of defending, safeguarding and playing the rôle of trustee to a great nation of four hundred million people? I am, however, not concerned here with politics—not at any rate with that game of large-scale fooling of the public which goes under that name.

My purpose is rather to suggest a principle that will put an end to all these conflicts of interests. And that principle is this: The status of the Nations of the world and the relation between them must be the same as the status of the individual and the relation between the individuals who compose

¹ *The Belgian Campaign and the Surrender of the Belgian Army. May 10-28, 1940. Issued by the Belgian-American Foundation, New York.*

each nation. *A nation of free and equal men and a world of free and equal nations.*

I hasten to stress that I do not for a moment contemplate a chain of sovereign National States. By individual freedom we mean only freedom for self-development ; not freedom to commit murder, nor to take the law into one's own hands, nor the right to decide for oneself the rights and wrongs of a dispute between oneself and another. In the same way our free and equal nations of the world will not have the right to wage war on one another, nor to conscript their nationals

for that purpose, nor the right each for itself to decide the rights and wrongs of a dispute between itself and another. This means that not only should the great possessing nations give up their possessions but also that they must be prepared to shed the sovereignty which they at present so much cherish.

This is a radical proposal ; but a chronic disease must have a radical remedy. Palliatives are of no use. Only, I am afraid, men are not yet bold enough, nor yet have they the faith, to try the radical cure.

Bombay

G. N. ACHARYA

THE INEVITABLE OUTCOME

Everything that happens in the world releases a certain amount of force that will usher in an era bearing no strong resemblance to the immediate past. Even so is the present war potential enough to bring about a change that will be at once sweeping and progressive in its operation over the face of the whole world.

Although past history provides no sufficient justification for the above hope, the very oppressive and intolerable feeling of childish aimlessness generated by the colossal failure, that had been the lot of humanity and which threatens to engulf it in the future, unless determined efforts are made to stave off the calamity, possesses the necessary strength to release humanity from its present state of suspended animation and engage it actively in the task of building up a better world where the regnant factors will be peace and happiness.

Science elated man in his own estimation. And for a long time it

seemed as though the last word on progress had been pronounced. The conquering spirit of man over nature was considered invincible.

The world of science and material progress admired the reflection of its own self in the mirror so long that it failed to realize its evil consequences. That this attitude was not scientific and rational did not give it a moment's trouble ; it went on believing in its own inherent good and infallibility.

But all these fantastic dreams have vanished ; they no longer tie the mind down and blur the vision. The breaking out of the war has cured the jaundice that had so long been the one malady from which humanity was suffering and which kept it from approaching all the questions that confronted it with an open mind and equally wide-open eyes.

Before the War people were simple enough to hug the fond hope that soulless industrial life and diplomacy were capable of transforming the world

into a heaven where every one, even the lowliest and the most oppressed, would live amidst peace and perennial plentitude. Hollow and high sounding talks woven with scintillating phrases conjuring up visions of a world flowing with milk and honey were thought sufficient to ensure peace on earth. And when all nations vied with one another to declare their intense love for peace and universal brotherhood in the loudest manner possible, the snare was perfected beyond belief. But, as always happens, high hopes raised up on flimsy grounds never fail to fling people down to the lowest depth of disappointment. And the present war has only brought in another bitter experience.

However, such disappointment stimulates a searching of the heart. Finding itself alone in a land of barrenness and strife, the world today is occupied in the act of ruminating over the past. The question that continually comes uppermost in its mind is: how could these nations who were loud not so long ago in proclaiming their peaceful intentions pounce on one another? The answer is not far to seek. There was too much reliance placed on material progress. Human personality found no place assigned to it in the scheme of modern life. Ingrained in material progress were strife and discord, competition and certain destruction.

But as most of the nations were not known for their humanitarian outlook, naturally the gaze of the world was turned in the direction of Russia who professed to stand guard over the inalienable rights of the common man. The picture that Russia presents today is worse than the philosophical Maya.

The most thoroughgoing and dictatorial harnessing of material progress with the avowed desire of alleviating the unnecessary sufferings of the people has foundered on the rock of reality in Russia. The onetime champion of the people no longer retains that position; human dignity and freedom have been so suppressed that a revival of religion is gradually coming under way there

where the spirit of man was overruled in favour of material progress.

The great powers of the world are once again betraying incongruities and deliberate inconsistencies inherent in their structure. The trend of events has shown beyond any doubt that to hinge a new and better world to the present mentality of humanity at large is futile. That is: the new world order will be translated into a reality only if there is a complete change in the heart of all. It has further been realized that, when there is insistence on right, there is bound to be conflict. Therefore the future world can be made to rest only on the sure foundation of duty, if it is to be enduring and not plunge itself into another calamitous war after a brief interval.

Now what is this change of heart, this observance of duty? It presupposes the suppression of the savage instincts in man. For it has been due to man falling a victim to his emotions that the world is suffering today. Thus it is religion in action.

Just as there is a revival of religion in Russia today consequent to the disillusionment of material progress there is going to be an intense and earnest effort made by humanity at large to live up to the true spirit of religion.

That the fallacy of clinging to rituals is as much instrumental in sowing seeds of discord and animosity as material progress, though not in the same vast dimensions, has been brought home to all in a manner which is at the same time forceful and conducive to stimulated and determined action. Not only that. It is regarded as the worst form of slavery. Man cannot be a slave even to God, for religion is freedom.

Therefore the chances are that every individual will lead a conscious, just and righteous life. Hence there is justification for hoping that the truth that "there are as many religions in the world as there are people in it" will be realized in its entirety.

Calcutta.

N. V. ESWAR

ENDS AND SAYINGS

“ _____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers.”

HUDIBRAS

If we enlarge the science of nature, it is necessary that we should also devote attention to the science of Spirit.

We heartily agree with this statement of Sir Radhakrishnan which he addressed to the Rotary Club at Ahmedabad. We must get a scientific religion and a religious science, before we can expect to change world conditions permanently. We have ideals but they are not based on true wisdom. We have knowledge but not of things vital. We have energy but we do not know into which channels we should direct it. Even saintliness would be useless unless wisdom guided it. Sir Radhakrishnan went on to say :

The millions who are fighting today and the millions who fought before have always put service before self. Today the world is not lacking in either scientific enlightenment or abundance of moral force. There is so much goodwill, so much emphasis on moral understanding and so much readiness to die. If such things could save us we must be very near salvation today but every one knows that we are as far away from salvation as in other periods of history. The ideals to which this civilisation is wedded and the equipment of this civilisation are defective and misleading. They are ideals without a human bearing. That is why all the great moral qualities are being subordinated to a purpose which is unworthy of man.

In another speech which Sir S. Radhakrishnan delivered at the South India Club in Calcutta, he pointed out where we might find some of the precious wisdom which we so greatly need and how we might acquire it. He lays

the lack of wisdom at the door of wrong education.

The world is in an unfortunate position today, and after centuries of energetic enlightenment and scientific progress we are specializing in slaughtering one another without mercy. Why is this so ? To me it seems the fault lies in mis-education, in the mental twist we give to young people. Young people are treated as animals and their minds are manipulated, and we are not getting them to think as human beings..... Education should awaken an individual's soul and enable him to perceive truth in freedom..... Man's nature here below is rooted in another and a higher reality, and the meaning of *Upanayana* is to awaken man to the fact that this higher reality exists, and that this has an intimate connection with man's life in the world of space and time.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan feels that India can offer this ideal of education, for which it has always stood, to the world at large. For India is still producing men who follow in the footsteps of the old Rishis and the Buddhas. They represent the spiritual values of life. They would lead us, if only we were wise enough to follow, towards the type of philosophy and education that the world needs.

The fact is that India has today many prominent men who wish to give to education spiritual and cultural ends rather than have it used only as a means of finding employment or the putting of information into the student's brain. Sir. S. Varadachari speaking at a meeting of the Kellett

High School Literary Society (Madras) said students ought to cultivate the curiosity to know and the capacity to acquire and absorb knowledge. If we really want to lead the Higher Life then we have to know what it is and what it demands. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri feels that a study of Sanskrit culture would give students the basic principles of the higher life. The spirit of tolerance and co-operation are ideas that run right through the literature of India from the Rig Veda up to the present day. He too, like Sir S. Radhakrishnan, is convinced that India has an important contribution to humanity, for the thoughts that could save the world are to be found in Sanskrit culture. Its ideal would serve to revive spirituality and the unity between man and man as the inevitable outcome of the essential unity of all humanity in God.

A vague feeling of mistrust attaches itself to the terms "religious education". It brings to mind dogmatism, ritualism and narrow mindedness. We are sure, however, that this is not what Pandit Malaviya, Rector of the Benares Hindu University, wanted to express when he gave "religious education" as one of the aims of the University. For he coupled "religious" with "ethical" and ethics are universal principles which transcend the limitations of sectarian creeds. Good and evil are the eternal ways of life, as Krishna taught. Furthermore, Pandit Malaviya went on to say :

I wish you to know there is God everywhere. Regularity, identity and similarity in nature's creations goes to show that there is a power responsible for all these. The work of creation cannot be accidental. It must be the work of intelligence. Hindus

call this power "Parmatma", Mohammedans call it "Allah" and Christians call it God. As this power is invisible Rishis and Saints have declared it "Alakh".....When one comes to the conclusion that the same God is everywhere and lives in everybody, he will do no wrong. He will try to keep himself pure as one would not like to keep a shrine, a temple, a mosque dirty. He will not do anything wrong, cruel, to anyone. He will not think of anything immoral. Thus he will be good to himself and good to all.

It is no use quibbling about words, so long as we understand the word God not as a super type of human being but as an Immutable Presence. Each being is an emanation of that One Life and therefore Universal Brotherhood is not an Utopian dream but an actual reality. If education did but spread that one concept, it would be fulfilling its duty. This is indeed what Sir M. Venkatasubba Rao implied when, addressing the students of the Anjuman High School of Nagpur, he said :

Within the precincts of the school, your business is to pursue truth untrammelled by notions of race or creed, putting love and tolerance before every other consideration. Before age hardens your minds, learn to think of India in terms of the entire people, not those of a particular sect or creed.

The students were gathered together to celebrate the birthday of His Exalted Highness the Nizam. Referring to him Sir M. Venkatasubba Rao's words were :

His Exalted Highness has said : Whatever may be the religion of my House and my own personal beliefs, I am, as a Ruler, the follower of another religion as well, which must be characterised as love towards all. He goes on to say, 'I do not desire to distort the practice of my own religion in such a manner as to earn the title of a bigot.' He proclaimed that, in his capacity of a Ruler, he considered himself to be without any religion, not in the sense of being an atheist, but in the sense of being without bias as a ruler, for or against any particular religion or community.

Is there not here a lesson to be learnt not by India alone but all the peoples of the world? Religion is what concerns oneself and is distorted and debased if made a factor of party politics or state policies. It is tragic that religion instead of being a unifying force has been through ages a cause of strife and discord.

Members of the bar do not realize their immense power and responsibility. Their position is such that they can influence for good or bad hundreds of people. They could, by their combined action, change to a considerable extent world-conditions and the actions of men. It is not without reason that in ancient tribes Judges and advisers were chosen from among the wisest and the good. Before the legal body as such was organized men sought advice from the wise men of their tribes. Registered lawyers and solicitors have taken their place, but the spirit of service is not the ideal which prompts them to lean with understanding and compassion over the troubles of man. Their profession has become a trade, a job, a means of furthering their own interest. With remuneration as a goal, consciously or unconsciously they are led to foster competition, quarrelling, dishonesty, to further the growth of the spirit of litigation rather than its destruction. Although, as Sir S. Varadachari pointed out when he addressed the Law College Representative Council in Madras, there is a preventive aspect to the legal as well as the medical profession, at present it has not a very prominent part. And indeed that "job attitude" which is characteristic of the legal profession can also be outstandingly discerned in medicine and in the Church. Doctors are not healers of the body, lawyers are

not healers of the mind, clergymen are not healers of the soul. For they would rather have a sinecure than work with devotion and abnegation.

It is natural that scientists should defend science and claim that it can usher in a new era of material well-being. Science is now used as a means of killing and destruction. It is not the fault of science but of the use that is made of it and also, according to Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarker speaking at the Calcutta University of Science, due to the fact that there is not enough co-operation and co-ordination between the scientist, the industry and the government. Mr. Sarker is right but he does not go far enough. Science will not be a help to man and its true rôle will not be properly appreciated until the fundamental principles upon which it rests are completely changed. Science will only admit the existence of matter and through matter it tries to explain man and nature. Giving out but partial knowledge, it becomes, dangerous. Until it accepts the existence of the unseen, and of the fact that matter is but the outward manifestation of universal law, science will be powerless to satisfy the aspirations of the race; it will make the future a void and bereave man of hope.

Numerous are the pleas for, and the affirmations of, the revival of Spirituality after the war. Some kind of revival will certainly have to take place, for, as Mr. Ashley Sampson says (*John O'London Weekly*):

At least one thing is as certain as anything can be, and that is that the appalling catastrophe will not only affect our bodies and our brains. It will affect our souls. Right

down deep at the core we have been shaken ; and that is bound to have a deep effect upon the spiritual life of Europe And there has probably never been a time in the history of civilization when so much disloyalty was practised in high places.

Mr. Sampson analyses the present-day moral conditions of humanity with great insight. The mood of the past years has been one of despair and that in itself is a sin, "a slow and sedulous disease of the soul." The failure of all peace movements and organisations is due to man's preference of "security" rather than "large-sightedness or integrity." Still, even in the midst of such evil, there were great minds, writers and preachers, who were desperately trying to discover "what was wrong with Man and society" and who made "a frank admission of their innate evil."

Mr. Sampson sees in the immediate future the necessity of the revival of religion in general and Christianity in particular. We agree that the materialism we trusted is false but equally false have been institutional religions. We have tried them out and found them lacking. There must be something wrong with the system itself when even Mr. Sampson, so partial to organized Churchianity, can say:

There is today a hatred of cant and humbug and hypocrisy that is quite distinctive—something that I do not believe is purely reactionary. Unhappily these soul-destroying vices are often found in religious people.

It is not because its leaders have betrayed it that the Christian Church has failed but because its very constitution has permitted its leaders to betray. It is not because the Church has been an obedient wife to the State that it has failed but because it could do so, being built upon the quick-sands

of hypocrisy and greed. It is not because the Christian *knows* that he is guilty that he will redeem himself and the Church. An even summary study of Church history will show that leaders and led alike have always *known* that they were guilty.

It has been said that the priests of any and all Churches were responsible for the evils of this world. If that were not true why should all the great teachers of humanity have so carefully refrained from organising any Churches and have so ruthlessly condemned the existing religious institutions? History is a great teacher, but we do not want to be taught. It is so much easier to feel that some organisation or another will help you, save your soul and take on the responsibility of your sins. Unless man can learn to stand on his own feet without leaning on the crutch of priestcraft, he will commit the same errors again and again.

And how can anyone have the audacity to talk of the brotherhood of man and in the same breath say :

It is the curse of modern Christianity that the difference between those who are Christians and those who are not is no longer in any sense distinct.

Why speak of the universal Fatherhood of God and say "Christianity supplies a need, as nothing else quite does?" Is Christianity to be imposed upon the whole world? Then what are we to do with liberty of thought? Confine it to the Museum of Dead Ideals? In that case, we shall indeed be just as far from realizing Christ's ideal for the world as we are today and have been for one thousand nine hundred and forty one years !

In his speech at the Non-Party Leaders' Conference at Poona, Sir Mirza M. Ismail stressed the necessity of sacrifice in order to bring about the best good for all:

Every group or community must be prepared to make some sacrifice—sacrifice of self-interest and of self-esteem—in the furtherance of our common aims and ambitions. The law of sacrifice is the ethical principle that dominates all life, the only light that guides human conscience. It is an essential element in the realisation of our national destiny.

Sacrifice must however be guided by true knowledge, otherwise it becomes useless and at times even nefarious. Undoubtedly Sir Mirza Ismail would have developed this aspect of the question had time allowed him. The acquisition of true knowledge as to what to sacrifice and what ideals are worthy of sacrifice can be acquired only through right education. It is in the school room, when we are in close contact with children of all communities that we can best perceive the law of Brotherhood. It is by the give and take of common study that we can learn how and when to sacrifice, and develop what Sir Mirza feels we need above everything else:

So far as our country is concerned, the greatest need of the hour is a spirit of unity and tolerance, tolerance for the views and acts of others.

And he adds :

The unity of India has to be preserved at all costs. The more closely the various Provinces and States come together in the service of their common Motherland and in the pursuit of their common ideals and interests, the greater will be India's strength and, correspondingly, the greater will be her influence in the councils of nations.

Mr. P. R. Das implied the same thing when he said (at the Patna Cultural Conference) addressing himself to the students :

I wish to impress upon you that you have a sacred duty to perform. Your cultural conference is of no use at all unless you resolve to be a cultural unit and it is quite impossible for you to be a cultural unit unless you devise means to be a national unit. There are undoubtedly difficulties in your way ; but we have at least a common homeland and as I have said, the will to be a nation is the most potent factor in developing the idea of nationality. We, older men, may quarrel among ourselves and raise the false cry " Hinduism is in danger ", " Islam is in danger ", but it is for you to convince your elders that neither is in danger, provided there is national consciousness.

He too wants us to know what to sacrifice and to what. Not to materialism, not to prejudiced ideas :

The unreasoning acceptance of practices and prohibitions in minute details of life, the complete sacrifice of individual initiative forced upon our unthinking millions by a system of social tyranny and political obscurantism more perfectly organised than in any other country of the world, the terribly efficient machinery for a wholesale manufacture of cowards and slaves constantly working in our domestic surroundings, these are the powerful enemies that are in alliance with the evil star of national misfortune. Our immediate duty is to throw off the deadening burden of crude materialism, imposed upon us by dead centuries, the idolatry of spiteful genius of local boundaries inciting in us unreasoning passion of hatred against neighbours, the fury of which recoils upon ourselves to degrade our being.

There is nothing except our own cramped mentality, to prevent us from utilising all our resources and developing a generous national consciousness which will open before us a perspective of genuine freedom from which the poisoned accumulation of mutual suspicion and petty jealousy will be dissipated