AUM

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*

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. IX SEPTEMBER 1938 No. 9

INDIA AND THE WORLD

No people in the world have ever attained to such a grandeur of thought in ideal conceptions of the Deity and its offspring, MAN, as the Sanscrit metaphysicians and theologians. It is to India, that all the other great nations of the world are indebted for their languages, arts, legislature, and civilization.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in *Isis Unveiled*

The tendency of Indian civilization is to elevate the moral being, that of the Western civilization is to propagate immorality. The latter is godless, the former is based on a belief in God. So understanding and so believing, it behoves every lover of India to cling to the old Indian civilization even as a child clings to the mother's breast.

—M. K. GANDHI in *Hind Swaraj*

How many even among the thoughtful seriously took to heart the warning given in the last quarter of the last century, that modern civilization was no civilization, and that it would soon die a violent death if it persisted in its modes of life? The West was too intoxicated with its scientific inventions and the rest to think of "those higher and nobler conceptions of public and private duties which lie at the root of all spiritual and material improvement" to quote the words of H. P. Blavatsky. More; the intoxicated West had reeled into the East, and many had taken his bravado and brawl to be words of knowledge and strength and, infected by his company, had begun to follow his example. Japan was the first to succumb and she has already begun to reap the evil effects, as has the Continent of Europe.

Madame Blavatsky, looking on the plane of causes which were lead-

ing modern civilization from guilt to punishment, condemned it as "degraded". India's living leader—the greatest man in the public world of to-day—experiencing some of the effects of the drunken civilization proclaimed it "as a civilization only in name"; for it "takes note neither of morality, nor of religion". Speaking of India Gandhiji made a distinction: "It is my deliberate opinion that India is being ground down not under the English heel but under that of modern civilization". For this curse of civilization Madame Blavatsky gave—between 1871 and 1891—a cure in her writings which contain principles and applications, but these were not practised on any large scale even among those who called themselves Theosophists. When Gandhiji wrote his *Hind Swaraj* in 1908 and advocated in his own way and words almost the same cure, there were many, and not only "a dear friend" (to whom he refers in his message to us printed below) who called him—"Thou fool!"

In 1908 the drunkard was drinking still; the East was still in the grip of the glamour produced by Western civilization. Then came the war, and showed how true was the vision of Madame Blavatsky, how prophetic were the words of Gandhiji. That war was to end war; but the leaders who produced the Treaty of Versailles were so full of the intoxication of their civilization that they manufactured the germs of future wars fancying that they were sowing seeds of future peace! Recent events clearly prove that moral principles are openly set at nought—a nemesis for conniving at immoral principles in years gone by.

There are many who think that the disease of this civilization is not curable, and that death must result. There are others who hoping for a radical recovery suggest a variety of panaceas, most of which are devoid of real guiding principles. "Civilization is not an incurable disease", wrote Gandhiji in 1908 and explained at some length the treatment to be applied.

In the hope of seeing the principles of his psycho-philosophy practised in the country most ready for it, he expounded it still further, and led his people to gain for themselves a suitable opportunity for application which has now emerged. By an irony of fate, a large number of Indians, especially among the youth, are still under the bad influence of Western socio-political doctrines. Even such doctrines as the West has found wanting and abandoned are still being pursued by many Western-educated men and women.

There are numerous important problems which the world is facing to-day; in our opinion there is none more vital for the whole world than that which is before India. Not only is India's own future bound up with her acceptance or rejection of Gandhiji's teachings in building her own civilization founded upon immemorial moral principles, but that of the world also. An increasing number of thinkers in the West are beginning to appreciate the ideas propounded in *Hind Swaraj* as the nine thought-provoking contributions

which follow clearly indicate. We print them in this particular order ; they are so arranged that adverse criticisms and objections raised in earlier articles are mostly answered in subsequent ones. Space forbids a thorough analysis and detailed examination of their contents ; but this much must be said—the points of view presented in *Hind Swaraj* are so opposed to the ideas which guide Western humanity that it is surprising that so much appreciation and earnest zeal are evinced in this issue of THE ARYAN PATH. Nobody in 1908 (and how many in 1921 ?) would have thought that India would be led by Gandhiji to the very point of readiness to apply actually the teachings of *Hind Swaraj.*

The ideas of this small book have changed the hearts of anarchical revolutionaries ; why would they not succeed in changing the hearts of suffering because misguided European humanity ? But European thinkers and leaders have first to effect a change in their own hearts ; and nothing will aid them in this transmutation like the actual effort of politically-minded India to create a social order founded upon the doctrines of Satyagraha which are in the little book, *Hind Swaraj,* and in other writings of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, whose message we publish here, and whom we salute wishing him many happy returns of his birthday which, according to the Hindu Calendar, falls in 1938 on the 21st of this month of September. May his work soon be consummated so that India, to whom he has been so faithful, may fulfil her mission to the world !

A MESSAGE

I welcome your advertising the principles in defence of which *Hind Swaraj* was written. The English edition is a translation of the original which was in Gujarati. I might change the language here and there, if I had to rewrite the booklet. But after the stormy thirty years through which I have since passed, I have seen nothing to make me alter the views expounded in it. Let the reader bear in mind that it is a faithful record of conversations I had with workers, one of whom was an avowed anarchist. He should also know that it stopped the rot that was about to set in among some Indians in South Africa. The reader may balance against this the opinion of a dear friend, who alas ! is no more, that it was the production of a fool.

M. K. GANDHI

Segaon
July 14th, 1938.

"AN ABSTRACT ACCOUNT"

[**Frederick Soddy**, the well-known Chemist and Economist, surveys the contents of *Hind Swaraj*. The survey although sincerely meant as a faithful portrait turns out to be a very clever caricature ; but caricatures have their use. In emphasising his own message, however, **Professor Soddy** has so handled the proportions, that he has missed the very soul of his subject. To his matter-of-fact mind the views of Gandhiji appear as made up of the stuff of fiction ; whereas they are but a practical expression, in words, of a vision which must be glimpsed by others for themselves in order to be appreciated. Applicable are the words of H. P. Blavatsky who in introducing her *Secret Doctrine* wrote—"Every reader will inevitably judge the statements made from the standpoint of his own knowledge, experience and consciousness, based on what he has already learnt". These views, however, of so eminent an authority as **Professor Soddy** deserve to be read with respectful attention.—EDS.]

In this little booklet, the seminal book as it is aptly described in a Foreword by Mahadev Desai, Mahatma Gandhi expounds the principles of non-violence and non-co-operation which have had such fateful political consequences in India. Some 200 small pages and now costing less than 6*d*., it was written in Gujarati in the form of a serial in 1908, and, though it has suffered vicissitudes including proscription at one time by the Bombay Government, it is presented here in English in its original wording. It will, it is to be hoped, enable many English readers, to whom the author and his doctrines have hitherto been rather nebulous, to study them at the source. *If you want to know anything about any one outstanding, probably the worst thing to do is to read other peoples' impression about him and his work.*

How far it is to be regarded as a complete or abiding philosophy and how far a temporary political weapon of expedience, the reader must decide for himself. The author evidently believes in it in the first sense more than ever and says, in a preface, that India has nothing to fear or lose and all to gain by discarding "modern civilisation", whilst admitting that the time is not yet ripe for it. But one would have thought it was even less ripe in 1938 than in 1908, and, short of time going backward or a similar miracle, the likelihood of India ultimately doing so seems remote. Certain features, even the whole of the philosophy may survive, as founded on one of the eternal verities, incorporated with the positive achievements of modern civilisation which, just as much as they, are also founded on the eternal verities. The days when this self-satisfied assumption of the superiority of one sort of truth over another was considered the highest form of it seem to have passed away. But, then, in Gujarati, civilisation means simply good-conduct, which rather begs the question !

For the benefit of the new reader, the writer, who is one himself, may be permitted to give an abstract account of this much discussed philosophy or/and tactics. The

discourse is in the form of questions by READER and answers by EDITOR, and it may be at once admitted that the teacher puts into the mouth of the pupil some difficult conundrums, as when, in the chapter teaching the abolition of machinery, he asks whether it is a good or bad thing that everything he is saying will be printed by machinery and is answered that sometimes poison is used to kill poison. This may perhaps serve also as a good enough example of the absence of mere word-spinning and sophistry which characterises the book. It is all as pat as that, take it or leave it, and to this no doubt it owes its power.

In the first chapter, READER, wanting to know about Indian Home Rule, is rebuked for not treating with respect the English fathers of the idea and the Indians, favourable to the English, who were devoting themselves to India's interest, also Congress then regarded by Young India as an instrument merely for perpetuating British rule. The next deals with the partition of Bengal and the opposition it aroused, the birth of the Swadeshi movement of active resistance, and the split in their own ranks into two parties, moderates and extremists. In the third we reach the divine uses of discontent and unrest, and with these preliminaries arrive at the discussion on the meaning of Swaraj or Home Rule.

After drawing out READER as to his idea of it—"As in Japan, so must India be—with its own army and navy, so that India's voice may ring round the world", he is rebuked for really wanting English rule without the Englishman. In the Chapter "Condition of England", after a pungent description of Parliament as a costly toy of the nation with very unpleasant characteristics and of the newspapers, more original in 1908 than to-day, the evils are ascribed not to the faults of the people but to modern civilisation. It may not be an incurable disease and the pious hope is expressed that in time the English may recover from it.

Questioned as to why then the English had been able to take India and hold it, the reply was that, on the contrary, the Indians had given it them and kept them there for their own base self-interest, for the sake of their commerce and its subtle methods. Really it was the British flag that waved over Japan, with whom they had a treaty for the sake of trade. With regard to the condition of India, it is not the English heel but modern civilisation under which it groans, it is becoming irreligious. The evils of religious charlatanism and strife are more bearable than those of civilisation, and Thugs, Bhils and Pindaris, are lesser evils than the effeminacy resulting from relying on English protection from such possible aggressors, who after all are Indians.

The destructive criticism then takes in its sweep railways, lawyers and doctors, the very institutions "we have hitherto considered to be good", complains READER, and to which the fostering of internal dissensions between the various religions in India is imputed,—the argument, (the 'Seminal' one?) being that India is and always has been one nation in spite of the wide

differences in religion. The lawyers foment religious and civil quarrels and if they abandoned their professions the English could not rule for a day. No lawyers, no Courts, no English.[1] As regards doctors, quacks are almost better. They violate our religious instincts, tempt us to indulge and become effeminate, obtain honours and riches, charge exorbitant fees and delude the populace.

At this stage the constructive ideas as to what a true civilisation should be are introduced. In the vein of the Calvinist Scotchwoman, ticking off the rest of the minister's flock as beyond the peradventure of election to grace, and ending by saying "There's left only my man, John, and me, and whilst I am not sure of John," EDITOR says "Rome went, Greece shared its fate, Egypt's broken, Japan has become Westernised, China is in doubt, but old India somehow or other is still sound at the core." Civilisation really means no change from the teaching of our wiser ancestors. A common people living independently in agricultural occupations enjoy true Home-Rule. Some of the ancient institutions, like child marriage and worse, were defects to be remedied, but the tendency of Indian civilisation is to elevate the moral being whilst that of the West is godless.

How can India become free? It was only because it had adopted Western civilisation that it was not free. There is no comparison between India's case and that of Italy under Mazzini and Garibaldi, for Italy remains enslaved. Nor can it be done by arms at all for that would be to accept Western civilisation. Assassination? What we need to do is to kill ourselves. It is a cowardly thought, that of killing others. Those who will rise to power by murder will certainly not make the nation happy, and reforms won by fear can be kept only *while the fear lasts.* There is the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as between the seed and the tree. Even to drive out a housebreaker by force can do no good. Fair means alone can produce fair results. There was another sort of force, love-force, soul-force or more popularly passive resistance, against which the force of arms is powerless. "You can only govern us so long as we remain the governed; we shall no longer have any dealings with you."

READER: Is there any historical evidence of the success of what you have termed soul-force? EDITOR: History in Gujarati means "It so happened", but, as we know it, it is merely the record of the world's wars. The unimpeachable evidence of the success of soul-force is that the world lives on in spite of them. Being natural, it is not noted in history. READER: You would disregard the laws? We are a law-abiding nation and this is rank disloyalty and going even beyond the extremists. EDITOR: That is a

[1] Compare *The Lawyer, Our Old Man of the Sea.* By William Durran. The thesis is that the British legal system had ruined every country, including India and the United States, that had adopted it, and only the Mother Country had been leathery enough to stomach it at all.—F.S.

new-fangled notion. There was no such thing formerly. To obey laws repugnant to our conscience is slavery. Even the government only say, if you don't we'll punish you. It is unmanly to obey laws that are unjust. This is the key of self-rule or home-rule. It is gross ignorance to say it is only for the weak. Do you think a coward can break a law he dislikes? It is superior to the force of arms. If the extremists succeed in driving out the English and become governors they will want you and me to obey their laws. But a passive resister will not, though blown from the mouth of a cannon.

Even a man weak in body can practise it. Control of the mind only is necessary and, that attained, man is free. Those who defy death are free from fear and that nation is great which rests its head on death as on a pillow. But all the same, it is difficult to become a passive resister unless the body also is trained. Those who want to practise it must observe perfect chastity, adopt poverty, follow truth and cultivate fearlessness. But it is not to be supposed that that is very difficult. Even those trained in arms must do much the same and Nature has planted in the human breast the ability to endure any hardship.

The discussion then turns on education. Is this too no use? It is an instrument simply that may be used well or ill. Many abuse it and few make good use of it. A peasant can have ordinary knowledge of the world, earn his bread honestly and know how to behave in his community but yet cannot write his name. Do you wish to make him discontented? ("Divine" discontent evidently must not imperil our daily bread!) It does not make us men or help us to do our duty. "I have never found the sciences of use for controlling my senses." But READER asks, "How could you explain to me the things you have without it?" And is answered, "Even then it is not for the millions, for I can use it only for such as you, which supports my contention." We must not make it a fetish. It may be an ornament but character-building has the first place in primary education. By receiving English education we have enslaved the nation. Is it not a sign of slavery that English, not the mother tongue, is the language of the courts of justice? (O! I thought you disapproved of them.) We have to improve all our languages and get translations of valuable English books. A universal language for India should be Hindi, with optional Persian or Nagari characters to cultivate closer relations between Hindus and Mahomedans, and we can drive out the English language in a short time. One effort is required to drive out Western civilisation and all else will follow.

READER: I suppose this includes machinery? EDITOR: It has impoverished India. The workers in the mills of Bombay have become slaves. If the machinery craze grows it will become an unhappy land. It is no easy task to do away with a thing that is established. If mill-owners were good, they would contract their business and establish in thousands of households the ancient and sacred handlooms, but whether

they do this or not the people can cease to use machine-made goods. What India did before the influx of machine-made articles should be done again to-day. Tram-cars and electricity should go like the railways. It should be done gradually and what the leaders do the populace will gladly follow. If we look on machinery as an evil it will ultimately go.

The concluding chapter deals with the attitude to be adopted to their own political parties, to the English, and to the nation, the latter in 19 points that may be condensed as, speaking English rarely, doctors and lawyers to give up their professions and take to hand-looms, also the wealthy, all to realise it is a time for repentance, expiation and mourning in which gaol, banishment and suffering are insufficient rather than excessive prices. The attitude towards the English is less easy to condense save as involving their abandonment of Western and adoption of the Indian civilisation. If they remain it is as the servants of the people. (" Indian " civilisation evidently meaning a somewhat idealised and futurist aspiration), they may if they please police India, not derive commercial benefit from the land, Manchester cloth in particular to be kept out, they must do nothing contrary to the religions, eschew eating beef because of the Hindus and pork because of the Mahommedans, learn Hindi, stop spending money on railways and the military, so that the two nations may mutually learn from one another with the root of the relationship in a religious soil.

The interest in this remarkable doctrine lies, of course, in its immediate measure of political success, and any one who wishes to change the world would do well to study it. Having only just returned from a visit to India, the reviewer can honestly say he saw little outwardly there to suggest it, except, perhaps a certain race consciousness. On the other hand, the internal combustion engine seems to have been at least as busy there as elsewhere in altering the mode of livelihood of peoples, not to attempt any more profound analysis of the situation.

FREDERICK SODDY

There is no such thing as compulsion in the scheme of non-violence. Reliance has to be placed upon ability to reach the intellect and the heart—the latter rather than the former.

—GANDHIJI

A DISTURBING BOOK

THOUGHTS ON READING "HIND SWARAJ"

[G. D. H. Cole is Vice-President of the Workers' Educational Association, Vice-Chairman of the New Fabian Research Bureau, and the author of numerous volumes, among them valuable expositions of Guild Socialism. He finds that the West needs "leaders who are masters of themselves, as Gandhi is, but masters after our Western fashion". He is of the opinion that in the West Gandhiji could not be a leader, "but only a martyr at most". Is not this tantamount to admitting that even after 2000 years the Occident is not willing to accept Jesus Christ?—EDS.]

Why must I write about Gandhi's thirty-year-old book, when it would be so much easier to let it alone? Across thirty years it has, to me who belong to the West, deep power to disturb—much deeper power than it could have had when it was written. For in 1908 Gandhi's conception of Swaraj involved, at its very root, a thorough repudiation of the very basis of Western civilisation, of Western ideals and standards of value, of Western action and of Western thought. Gandhi was repudiating these things, not merely for himself or for India, but for humanity, regarding the civilisation of the West as but an episode—as an ephemeral thing destined to disappear before the unwinking gaze of the older and more permanent civilisation of the Indian people. Western law, Western medicine, Western machinery—upon all these was the dust of ages soon to settle down. India, so far from imitating the West, was to ignore it: Swaraj, so far from involving an adoption of Western habits of life or thought, was to blot them out almost as if they had never been.

Thirty years ago, when Gandhi wrote in this strain, the foundations of Western civilisation looked stable—under Western eyes. England might 'lose' India—some of us hoped she would, in the sense of losing the power to rule over the Indians as subject peoples. But we were hardly thinking of the possibility that England itself—the England we knew, changed out of all recognition by the events of less than two hundred years—might be swept away, and all the civilisation of Western Europe melt into a mangled mass of twisted metal-work and torn flesh, the harvest of human inventiveness mishandled by human devilment and fear. But to-day who among us has confidence that this Western civilisation will survive at all? It is not 'doomed'; but it is threatened, and it grows plainer and plainer that it can be saved from destruction only if it can be quickly and radically transformed from within.

Gandhi's case against the West looks, then, infinitely stronger than it looked, to us Westerners, thirty years ago. For it does seem as if all our material advances in machine mastery were unloosing upon us, not the plenty for which we had hoped, but an overmastering capacity for destruction. Nor is it merely that we have grown more efficient in dealing out death and mutilation. We have also grown more cruel—or some of us

have ; and those of us who are untouched by the recrudescence of cruelty know not how to prevent its spread without dire risk of falling ourselves under its spell. We are torn horribly between the will to resist evil and the sense that in resisting it we may become evil and fail to achieve anything except an universal desolation. Stalin perhaps is troubled by no such fears : I do not know. He at any rate is trying to save the machine-age from destruction by developing further, on a basis of mass-ownership and unrestricted consumption, the power of the machine. But we, further West, watch the great Russian venture with growing anxiety ; for there too we find cruelty and mass-persecution and intolerance. And, in the Western 'democracies', we arm feverishly for defence, without even the sense of creation and what the Greeks called ATHLOS that, I am sure, makes dictatorship an exciting experience to many in Nazi Germany as well as in the Soviet Union.

And yet—I am not a Gandhist. I do not believe that Western civilisation is of sharp necessity at enmity with the human soul. I do not believe that science is man's curse, or that the world would be better without doctors or without machines. I do care about the body as well as the soul, and about the enjoyments of the body. I do not believe that the peasant life is best, or that homespun is to be preferred to machine-made, or that it would be better for men to sweep all their discoveries of the past two centuries aside, and go back to take up their lives again at a point, I know not where in history, before these things had become their masters. I make no judgment for Indians concerning the road they should travel ; for I am not competent to make any judgment. But for myself and the men and women I know I am not prepared to say that Western civilisation is inherently false to the souls of men.

In this book Gandhi speaks of the evils of the Indian civilisation—of child marriage and child widows, of prostitution, of the sacrifice of sheep and goats in the name of religion. But these things, he says, are defects of Indian civilisation, and not of its essence. I say that the horrors in Spain and Abyssinia, the perpetual fear that hangs over us, the destitution in the midst of potential plenty —even the money-grubbing that we have allowed to become the master of our lives—are defects, grave defects, of our Western civilisation, but are not of its very essence, however much appearances may seem to-day to make against this defence. I believe that we can save and ennoble our Western civilisation if we will : that we can make a better world without wholesale destruction of the very roots of our way of life. I do not say that we shall mend this civilisation of ours ; but I do not believe it to be past mending. I do not believe that it rests upon a sheer denial of what is necessary to the human soul.

I do, however, agree that politics will not save us, and that something must happen simultaneously in the minds (or souls) of many of us if our civilisation is to be saved at all. I agree that for us, as well as for Indians, Swaraj must be an individual as well as a political experi-

ence. It must come to us as something that fills us with a power to deny fear. To-day our fears are hurling us towards our destruction. Fear breeds counter-fear ; it causes us to huddle together under this or that dictator, to cry out for protection or for an aggression which is the self-assertiveness of panic. *If there were no fear, the might of dictators would melt in an hour, and 'democracies' would turn democratic in the twinkling of an eye.* There would be no rulers and no ruled : no bullies and no victims. We should be civilised peoples, masters of ourselves, and strong enough to make ourselves without peril the masters of nature.

If there were no fear ! But Gandhi knows, much better than he knew thirty years ago, that fear cannot be driven out of men's minds by exhortation. A man here and there may conquer fear ; but not even a saint can expel it wholly from him. I think Gandhi admits that, because of the fear in men's minds, he must work, in any movement that involves co-operation of many for a common end, for something that falls far short of his ideal. Alone, he can aim directly at his ideal —for its realisation in himself. Corporately, as he says in his preface of 1921 (prefixed to the present reprint of his book) he must work " for parliamentary Swaraj in accordance with the wishes of the people of India ".

We have all, individually, to face this problem of translating our ideals into political practices. Indeed, we have to face two problems. We have both to discover terms on which we work with others towards the realisation of our ideals, and, as individuals, to translate into action, personally as well as politically, our ideal of ourselves. Gandhi solved long ago, for himself, the second of these problems. That is his immense strength —that *he is as near as a man can be to Swaraj in a purely personal sense.* But I think he has never solved, to his own satisfaction, the other problem—that of finding terms of collaboration that could span the gulf between man and man, between acting alone and helping others to act in accordance with their lights, which involves acting with them and as one of them—being at once one's self and someone else, someone one's self can and must regard and criticise and attempt to value.

Indeed, I think this problem is insoluble in any final sense. It requires constant adjustments and accommodations ; and unless a man is very firmly seated in himself his *alter ego* all too easily ceases to be objective to him, and usurps the place of his soul. Gandhiji's strength is to have made himself proof against that usurpation ; and we in the West shall go down to defeat unless we can find guides and leaders who are also proof against it.

But, to make ourselves proof, need we be ascetics as Gandhi is ? And need we put our own civilisation behind us ? If we must, then there is nothing before us but bloody destruction to clear the encumbered way ; for it is impossible, in the West, to make a movement on these terms. If our civilisation is radically wrong, it will destroy itself ; and in proportion as we are skilled in science the work of destruction will be horrible and the

suffering intense. Men in the mass cannot be led against all their ingrained habits and values. The Gandhi of this book could not be, in the West, a leader, but only a martyr at most.

If, however, the fault in our civilisation is but superficial, however pervasive and disastrous ; if our men are men underneath the veneer, and our technicians and scientists ready enough to work for good human ends given but half a chance, then we need not despair. We shall need leaders who are masters of themselves, as Gandhi is, but masters after our Western fashion, which is not his, or India's.

I ask pardon, if this is not the article I was meant to write—if it says too little about India, and too much about our own Western perplexities. In writing about a book, one can write only trivialities unless one sets down what the book made one think and feel. Therefore, I must end with yet another Western application of Gandhi's lesson.

Swaraj, for Gandhi, involves non-violence, because non-co-operation is the finally effective weapon. So it is, I daresay, where a people of many millions is set against a handful of foreign rulers. But is it so when German and Italian airmen are massacring the Spanish people, when Japanese airmen are slaughtering thousands upon thousands in Chinese cities, when German armies have marched into Austria and are threatening to march into Czechoslovakia, when Abyssinia has been bloodily bombed into defeat ? Until two years or so ago, I believed myself opposed to war and death-dealing violence under all circumstances. But to-day, hating war, I would risk war to stop these horrors. I would risk war ; and yet, even now, that second self of mine shrinks back appalled at the thought of killing a man. Personally, I would much sooner die than kill. But may it not be my duty to try to kill rather than to die ? Gandhi might answer that no such dilemma could confront a man who had achieved his personal Swaraj. I do not claim to have achieved mine ; but I am unconvinced that the dilemma would confront me, here and now in Western Europe, less disturbingly if I had.

G. D. H. COLE

It is *neither prevision, nor prophecy ;* no more than is the signalling of a comet or star, several years before its appearance. It is simply knowledge and mathematically correct computations which enable the WISE MEN OF THE EAST to foretell, for instance, that England is on the eve of such or another catastrophe ; France, nearing such a point of her cycle, and Europe in general threatened with, or rather, on the eve of, a cataclysm, which her own cycle of racial *Karma* has led her to.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in *The Secret Doctrine*, (1888)

THE TEACHING OF GANDHI

[C. Delisle Burns is a University Lecturer, British Editor of *The International Journal of Ethics*, author of several books ; but to these academical qualifications he adds a practical experience gained at the British Ministry of Reconstruction and as Assistant Secretary of the International Organizing Committee of the League of Nations Labour Office. His views on machinery and morality are cogent. He stresses the point, sometimes apt to be overlooked in India, that Western Civilization is not merely mechanical.—EDS.]

The influence in India of Mahatma Gandhi is one of the most important factors in contemporary social development. Historians will undoubtedly treat it as more important in the long record of the growth of civilized life in the whole world than the more limited influence of such leaders in the false gospel of violence as Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. The extent of Gandhi's influence is well enough understood, even in the West ; but the kind or quality of that influence is hardly appreciated outside a very small circle in England, France and America. The reprint, therefore, in a cheap form of Gandhi's summary of his own teaching, called *Indian Home Rule*, is greatly to be welcomed. Even if those who are accustomed to think in terms of the ideals in Western civilization, will not agree with all that Gandhi has to say, they will, no doubt, feel that he expresses a point of view which is seldom clearly stated in any community. The book now reprinted was written in 1908 ; and the preface of the reprint includes a warning given by Gandhi in 1921 that although he " maintains his old principle of ' self-rule ' in private life, his corporate activity is devoted to the attainment of parliamentary Swaraj ".

A student of the history of civilisation will note, first, the governing principles of Gandhi's thought, which are in the main valid and would have been treated as undeniable, if we were not faced by the recrudescence of barbarism in Hitler's Germany. *Gandhi's first principle is that moral distinctions between good and bad, right and wrong, justice and injustice, are of fundamental importance, as compared with more superficial distinctions between men in race, sex, religion or political opinion. No civilisation at all is possible unless this is admitted.* The application of this principle may be difficult because of social traditions or habits of mind based upon unconscious prejudice. But no civilised man in the East or the West doubts that moral values, as expressed in right action or just social conditions, are of more importance than the pursuit of wealth and power. It follows from this principle that the means for attaining justice are not mainly physical forces. But at this point the teaching of Gandhi becomes less intelligible to those who belong to the tradition of the West. Perhaps the reason is to be found mainly in a difference of language and in different uses of certain terms or phrases which cannot well be translated from one language into another. According to Gandhiji " The Gujarati equiva-

lent for civilization means 'good conduct'"; but it is by no means clear what Gandhi thinks the English words "good conduct" usually imply. He is perhaps not considering the distinction between good intentions and right action; for he continues—"if this definition be correct, India has nothing to learn from anybody else". It is a commonplace, at least in the Western tradition, that a man may be "good" in so far as he has good intentions, but his actions may be wrong or evil. The inquisitor who burnt heretics in the Middle Ages, no doubt had the best of intentions; but he could have learnt something from somebody else about right action.

We can see, however, a correct meaning in Gandhi's opposition to the use of force as an instrument of justice, even if it is the force used by victims in revolt against oppression. In the Western tradition this principle would be stated somewhat differently from the way in which Gandhi expresses it. We admit that all questions of comparative force or physical strength must be ruled out, if grievances are to be redressed and claims recognised upon the basis of justice. But we admit also that, if revolutionary force is useless to establish moral authority, so also the superior force of the rich and the privileged, of the conquerors of alien nations and the controllers of races other than their own does not give them moral authority. If therefore, force ought not to be used to destroy oppression, oppression equally ought not to be maintained by the use of force.

And this implies that there must be some practical means for the removal of oppression and the redress of grievances other than the use of force. But if such means are to be found in the free discussion of opposing views, any Government worthy of the name must suppress, if necessary by armed force, the use of force by any one group of citizens or subjects against another. Such force used by a Government which is based upon moral authority, is an instrument for the maintenance of toleration. Discussion and persuasion are impossible if any one group in politics or religion can use the concentration camp or political murder against its opponents. *Civilized life is the toleration of all opinions except one—that is, the opinion of those who advocate and use intolerance against their opponents.* But it is by no means certain that Gandhi distinguishes, at least in this little book, between force, as an instrument of moral authority, and force used by any group of gangsters or political irreconcilables. He is right in saying that India ought not to copy the methods of armed rebellion, which were used to make the nationalism of Italy and other countries. India has something of her own to contribute to the tradition of civilized life; and Indians ought to be able to ensure that no force is ever used except as the instrument of moral authority. But when moral authority decays or is in dispute, there is always a danger that force may be used, not as an instrument of moral authority, but as a substitute for it.

Gandhi's belief in what he calls "soul force" would be accepted by the best representatives of Western

civilization. He identifies this "soul force" with what Kropotkin called "mutual aid", the "love" which binds families and neighbours and nations together. The sympathy and co-operation upon which the progress of civilised life has always depended, as Gandhi rightly says, has been too much neglected in the study of history. But in the conscious use of this "soul force" Gandhi proposes to identify it with "passive resistance". In his discussion of policy he implies that a refusal to obey the law in passive resistance rests upon an obedience to a "conscience" which is morally superior to the law. All kinds of difficulties arise from such an appeal to conscience, but here again it may be merely a matter of words. No one denies that a Government without moral authority must sooner or later collapse, because its citizens or subjects will not co-operate, however great the armed forces of such a Government may be. But there are other difficulties of language. "Truth force" seems to be used by Gandhi for what is more commonly called truthfulness as the moral quality of a person. And again, no one doubts in the West or the East that civilized life and a community worth living in, depend upon the reliability of its members and the tendency of most of them to treat the common good as superior to any private gain. So far, at least, the teaching of Gandhi reinforces, and perhaps improves upon what we, in the West, have learnt to believe about civilized life. *It would be a very great advantage in English and American politics as well as in the conduct of industry and common life in the West, if the influence of such a man as Gandhi were to spread among us.* It would reinforce moral principles which tend to be obscured by the pursuit of wealth and power.

On the other hand, there are elements in the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi which are completely mistaken. He himself, no doubt, will admit the right of criticism ; and therefore it is as well to say quite clearly, from the point of view of a student of Western civilization, that that civilization does not consist of trains, tram-cars and hospitals. Nor are lawyers and doctors, whatever their excellencies or their defects, the chief representatives of Western civilisation. We have, in the West, a great tradition of music and the plastic arts, of drama and lyric poetry in many different languages, of selfless devotion to the pursuit of truth among scientists, and examples of religious and moral insight and enthusiasm which are not less great than those of any other type of civilization. *Unfortunately the small groups of English men and women who control other countries and reside in them, are generally ignorant of the arts and the sciences of Western civilization itself. Even missionaries, who go to alien races to spread what they believe to be the truth, are generally ignorant of the greatest achievement of Western civilization in the arts and the sciences and the history of religion and morals.* To condemn Western civilization, therefore, because of the mechanisms which are taken to be its characteristic expression, is to misunderstand what is being opposed. And unfortunately many young Indian students come to Europe and

hear nothing of the music, see nothing of the plastic arts and have no experience of the varied religious experience of the West, but confine their studies to abstract, bookish economics or politics, or—worse still—to engineering. They miss the essentials in concentrating upon the obvious.

Another mistake in Gandhi's teaching is his condemnation of machinery as evil. " It is necessary to realise ", he says, " that machinery is bad." And in the list of books given at the end of *Indian Home Rule*, the books of Tolstoi and Ruskin have a prominent place. Ruskin clearly had what psychologists would call a " complex " about railways ; and Tolstoi was an extreme egoist who never understood the services of others upon which he depended. But Gandhi goes so far as to say that railways spread epidemic disease, and that " railways can become a distributing agency for the evil one only." Presumably aeroplanes, radio and cinemas and other mechanisms that are yet to come, would be thought by Gandhi to be still worse. This is a fundamental philosophical error. It implies that we are to regard as morally evil any instrument which may be misused. But even the spinning-wheel is a machine ; and spectacles on the nose are mere mechanisms for " bodily " eyesight. The plough is a machine ; and the very earliest mechanisms for drawing water are themselves only the later survivals of perhaps ten thousand years of human effort to improve the lives of men. In ancient Athens they used to condemn in a Court of Law the instrument which had been used to kill a man. But it is ridiculous to treat as morally good or evil the mechanisms which may be used equally by saints and villains. This is a mere transference to material objects of moral judgments which have no reference to them. Any mechanism may be misused ; but if it is, the moral evil is in the man who misuses it, not in the mechanism. There is, indeed, a danger that the teaching of Gandhi may lead back into the old mistake of village-pump politics, in which the distinction between good and evil is identified with the distinction between what is familiar and what is strange. If Gandhi's teaching is to have its highest value in its emphasis upon moral issues and opposition to the pursuit of private wealth and power, it must be freed from the confusion which arises when mechanisms are given the moral qualities which really belong to those who use or misuse them.

C. DELISLE BURNS

A SPIRITUAL CLASSIC

[**John Middleton Murry** is a Christian and a Socialist, but not an orthodox churchman nor a partisan waving a red flag. He has been seeking ways and means to give a concrete embodiment to his theories, dreams and hopes, and naturally finds great inspiration in *Hind Swaraj* which we sent him last April.—EDS.]

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule is a great book. Gandhi wrote it in 1908. It is his statement of the ideal : his original exposition of his deepest convictions. But, in spite of its clarity and beauty, it confronts us with the awkward question: how far, in allying himself with the nationalist political movement in India, Gandhi has negated his own religious philosophy. For example, few more scathing criticisms of the parliamentary system of government have been written than that in Chapter V, which teaches also (probably with truth) that the parliamentary system is integrally connected with modern mechanical "civilization", which Gandhi abhors. He concludes : "If India copies England"—in establishing parliamentary government, —"it is my firm conviction that she will be ruined." One cannot refrain from asking how Gandhi justified to his own mind his devotion of his "corporate activity to the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj". The contradiction appears to be insuperable and it is hardly to be wondered at that Gandhi refers to "writings which suggest that I am playing a deep game, and that I am using the present turmoil to foist my fads on India".

True, no reader, sensitive to the moral beauty of the vision of *Hind Swaraj*, could possibly suppose that Gandhi was "playing a deep game"; but the contradiction is only the more bewildering. No doubt Gandhi himself has offered explanations of it. Unfortunately, I am ignorant of them. The only one that occurs to me is that, first, Gandhi must make an absolute distinction (which I should find untenable) between "individual" and "corporate" activity ; and, second, that he decided that it was worth *any* sacrifice to establish the idea and practice of non-violence in the Indian Nationalist movement. I conjecture that the crucial decision, for Gandhi, must have lain here ; and that he convinced himself that the establishment of non-violence as a mere technique of political pressure, even though in pursuit of ends diametrically opposed to his own, would, in fact, ultimately promote his real ends and not the ostensible ones. That is not, indeed, to play a deep game; but it is something which cruder souls would thus describe. In other words, Gandhi must hold, or must have held, that the use of non-violent means by natures and for ends still essentially violent does in reality tend to change both the natures and the ends.

The issue is one of great and urgent importance. Recent experience of the stay-in strike in France certainly seems to indicate that the efficacy of non-violence is quickly exhausted when used as a mere tech-

nique of political pressure, in situations where violent methods are manifestly doomed to fail. But whether that is to be interpreted as confirming what we may suppose to have been Gandhi's intuition is still doubtful. One may accept wholeheartedly Gandhi's dictum in Chapter XVI : "The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree, and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree." But the question remains : "What *is* a non-violent means ?" Is non-violence, *faute de mieux*, really non-violence at all ? Gandhi, himself, is acutely aware of the difficulty. His complaint that "non-violence is not being carried out in the spirit of the book" is essentially a complaint that non-violence has become a mere technique of pressure.

If it were (carried out in the spirit of the book), India would establish Swaraj in a day. If India adopted the doctrine of love as an active part of her religion and introduced it into her politics, Swaraj would descend on India from heaven. But I am painfully aware that that event is far off as yet.

Yes, but the Swaraj that would be thus established is emphatically not the Parliamentary Swaraj for which the non-violent technique is being used, and to the achievement of which, Gandhi says, his corporate activity is devoted. The contradiction emerges undiminished.

It generally betrays a lack of imagination to criticise a great spiritual leader for his contradictions. I hope that I shall be acquitted of unimaginative criticism of Gandhi, whom I deeply admire, and whose book, *Hind Swaraj*, I consider one of the spiritual classics of the world. It is precisely because *I feel that we in England are faced with the same fundamental problem as Gandhi*, that I insist on dragging this central ambiguity into the light. What Gandhi means by real Swaraj, as distinct from and even diametrically opposed to Parliamentary Swaraj, would be expressed in Christian idiom as something between the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, and the restoration of the primitive village-community. By calling it something between the religious dream and the historical fact, I do not at all imply that it is a hybrid ; I mean simply to emphasise the necessity of deciding whether the goal is essentially other-worldly, or not : so that the intimate connection between Gandhi's perplexity and the present condition of Christian thought may be plain. For *the real question that is now tormenting the souls of European Christians who are not merely nominal is whether the fundamental Christian notion of the Kingdom of Heaven has its validity only in a supra-terrestrial condition.* But if that were once to be admitted, many Christians, myself among them, feel that the vitality and truth of Christianity would largely be lost.

I find it impossible to discern any essential difference between Gandhi's vision of real Swaraj and what I believe to be the authentic Christian vision of the Kingdom of Heaven. But there are distinctions. One is that Gandhi can, more easily than

we, make his vision concrete by turning to the actual village-community which still survives in India ; whereas the Christian thinker has to turn to the village-community of the European middle ages. And another more obvious distinction is that, whereas Gandhi has made up his mind that the technical "civilization" of Europe is altogether evil and is to be wholly rejected, the European Christian thinker is compelled to ask himself whether it is not absolutely necessary to preserve some basic elements of the mechanical technique : first, because European life is now so completely bound up with them that it would collapse into ruin if they were withdrawn ; and secondly, because the same spiritual imagination which can conceive as a reality a society based on Love (which is Gandhi's real Swaraj) can also conceive that such a society could just as well make true and humane use of the machine. For although the machine —or power-production—has so disastrously become the master instead of the slave of European "civilization," it does nevertheless offer an immense and universal liberation from human drudgery. Simply to reject it, as Gandhi, following Tolstoy, does, is to declare that mankind is inherently incapable of using the most tremendous and therefore the most ambiguous gift of God except to its own damnation. Probably it is the fact that at the present stage of human evolution, mankind is incapable of using the Machine except to its own perdition, and it seems quite doubtful whether mankind can pass beyond its present stage, except at the price of universal disaster which takes all meaning from that "beyond". But are we not, as spiritual beings, *compelled* to believe that the advance is possible ? To put it otherwise, does not Gandhi's own belief in "the gospel of love" compel him also to believe that Love can control even the Machine to the purposes of love ?

I do not see how Gandhi can escape this conclusion, except by dogmatically holding the position that the spiritual life, or the life of Love, can be lived only in primitive communities, which are artificially made inaccessible to the temptation of the Machine. Gandhi, if I understand him aright, would object to the word "artificially" here ; and would say that there was nothing artificial in the conscious decision of a community to reject the Machine. And that is true, up to a point. But does not the very achievement of the spiritual insight sufficient to resist the introduction of the Machine, necessarily also imply the achievement of the spiritual power, the self-discipline, to use the Machine beneficently ? In other words, if *Satyagraha* is a real condition permeating and inspiring a community, must not that community obviously possess the wisdom and self-control to use the Machine for truly communal ends ?

Here, I feel, Gandhiji's magnificent insight fails both him and us. If I am mistaken, I desire to be corrected. For this is *the* fundamental problem of the world to-day. To declare, as Gandhi does in *Hind Swaraj*, that the Machine is just simply evil, and necessarily and for ever creative of evil, seems to me finally to

be turning one's back on the actual perplexity of mankind. Gandhi's apparent conception that any mechanical aid to the capacities of the unaided man is unnatural and evil is surely arbitrary. "I should like to add" (he says in Chapter X) "that man is so made by nature as to require him to restrict his movements as far as his hands and feet will take him." I am very far indeed from regarding such a statement as absurd ; on the contrary, I think Gandhi is trying to bring into currency an all-important but forgotten truth, but I also think he makes the mistake of trying to state it so simply that it becomes false. He forgets, in the urgency of his vision, that the very spinning-wheel he loves is also a machine, and also unnatural. On his principles it should be abolished.

The truth, the profound truth, of which Gandhi is one of the greatest prophets, is that Nature—considered as a pattern of the harmonious life of man—is indeed our guide ; but he forgets to emphasise that Nature grows and expands, and that the true guidance of Nature is discovered only in Man, and, alas, through human suffering. Thus, and not otherwise, is the discovery made that Nature demands that Man should be guided by Love : and that if Man does not submit his new powers and potencies to the rule of love, he must end by destroying himself. The guidance of Nature is not *given*, as a simple datum, to Man ; it is revealed to him by suffering. We cannot look back on any actual order of society—not even the village-community of India—and say "There Nature reigned ; there Love was supreme." It was not. When man lacks the power to do evil, we must not speak of him as refraining from evil by the virtue of Love.

To put the point otherwise, *the asceticism of the spiritual leader is of a different order from the simplicity of the poor peasant.* Innocence is not the same as Imagination ; any more than non-violence, *faute de mieux,* expresses the soul-force of Love. So, in the social history of mankind, the pre-machine community may be a far better, more human and more spiritual society, than the mass-society produced by the Machine ; but its weakness is that it has no power of resistance against the Machine. In so far as Gandhi believes that it has, he appears to me mistaken, though I profoundly agree with him that the only power which can resist the devastation of the Machine is the soul-force of Love. But precisely *that* power is not in the pre-machine community ; if it were, the Machine would have done no harm. But it is not in any natural community, because it is developed only in the twice-born soul. That power, of definite and conscious self-renunciation, may just as well be used, and would be used more creatively, to control the Machine than to annihilate it. Thus I am forced to the conclusion that *the ultimate social goal of the spiritual leader in the modern world should be not to withdraw backwards to the pre-machine community, but to advance forwards to the creation of a society capable of using the machine without incurring material and spiritual self-devastation.* As far as my imagination carries me, such a society would have to be

based on the pattern of the village-community. It would be a great federation of village-communities, enriched by so much of mechanical aid as could be admitted without danger to its spiritual well-being ; therefore such a society would have to be pervaded by the ethos of self-renunciation. Gandhi's criticism, I imagine, would be that if the ethos of self-renunciation were ever to be so established as to permit such a society, that society would just as easily forego the saving of human effort produced by the machine : which is, in fact, the exact converse of my criticism of his position. At this point, the opposites become one : for it is equally easy for the ethos of self-renunciation either to renounce the machine completely or to use it in ways consistent with the spiritual well-being of the community.

So that, apparently, if my own may be taken as a typical Western mind, the Eastern mind meets the Western mind in a genuine unity today—in the absolute necessity, if there is to be any solution of the universal human crisis which impends upon us all, of a new preaching of the gospel of Love and Renunciation. The only name in which that can be preached to Western man is the name of Christ ; and I suppose that, if Christ who loved even unto death, were to become the real leader of the West,—the truly acknowledged and loyally followed pattern of human behaviour—he would become the leader of the East also. We should " be gathered together from the East and from the West " in his name. Assuredly, I see absolutely no hope for Western " civilization " except the kindling of a vast and consuming flame of Christian Love. The choice appears to be between that, or mass-murder on a scale at which the imagination sickens. If the miracle should come to pass in Europe, it will not be all our doing. The influence of Gandhi will have counted for much. He has reminded us that the way of non-violence is a possible way, not indeed towards the achievement of parliamentary democracy (for that we have, and it is with the failure of it that we are confronted in England), but a possible way out of the horrors into which the mass-democracies of Europe are preparing to plunge. The greatest Christian teacher in the modern world is Gandhi ; and *Hind Swaraj* is (I believe) the greatest book that has been written in modern times.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

Blind unintelligent asceticism is mere folly.—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE LAW OF LOVE

[J. D. Beresford not only appreciates but accepts for personal practice the doctrine of soul-force. But he inclines to doubt the practicability of the Gospel of Gandhiji as applied to a State. If a person can by knowledge and application overcome his greed, so can a country which is but made up of persons. It must be remembered, however, that the real spiritual work of *Hind Swaraj* has not begun in the State of India, for her sons and daughters are not yet free to shape her destiny. Only when those convinced of the efficacy of the Law of Love occupy the places of the legislator and the administrator will the leaven of *Hind Swaraj* do its beneficent work for this ancient land. The problem is : Is there a sufficient number of Indians who recognize the great worth of the Law of Love, of *Ahimsa,* as a Way of Life on earth ?—EDS.]

Hind Swaraj, cast in the form of question and answer, was written by Gandhiji just thirty years ago, and published by him serially in *Indian Opinion,* which he was then editing. Nothing has been altered in this reprint. There was nothing to alter, because the lessons there taught are not those of a political creed that must adapt itself to ever-changing conditions, but of that fundamental creed which has been known and lost alternatively through the long cycles of human development that reach back into abysses of time beside which the 10,000 years or so of modern history is but a single tick of the great cosmic clock.

Nevertheless, since so few people in Western Europe have anything approaching a true estimate of Gandhiji's creed—the vast majority of the English ruling class regarding him as a politician who is, in their phrase, " playing his own game " in Indian affairs—it will be as well to touch first upon that aspect of his general principles which have at the present moment a definite bearing on the problem of Home Rule for India in its political sense.

In the first place, then, let it be stated quite plainly that Gandhiji does not hate the English, and would never be party to any revolution designed to turn the English out of India by force of arms. This point is made clearly and repeatedly in more than one of the dialogues, in which the questioner, conceived as an average, patriotically minded reader of *Indian Opinion,* represents the militant, rebellious attitude of Young India, fiercely resentful of a completely alien Government and eager to expel them from the country at any cost. That is an attitude with which any thoughtful, unprejudiced onlooker may have a certain sympathy. It is typical of the political methods of the present day, and if we are ready to admire ardent nationalism in the West, we cannot in all honesty condemn it in the East—*from a political point of view.*

Gandhiji's point of view, however, is not political in its narrow sense. It is true that he deprecates the English Rule, not because he criticises its methods, which are as good as any other methods of modern civilisation, and better than some, but because he desires to see the ancient culture of India left unim-

peded, uninterfered with, to achieve its own proper and natural development. For him the English are worthy of honour as representatives of the prevailing civilisation of the West. In his brief historical retrospect of their gradual control of the country in the days of the old East India Company, he is strictly fair in his judgments. He would not, necessarily, even if the thing could be done peacefully, turn them out of India. But his gaze is steadily fixed on an ideal that can never be realised under English rule.

If this ideal is examined in detail, as it is, indeed, examined in these dialogues, those who understand the esoteric teachings of THE ARYAN PATH will find nothing with which they can be in disagreement ; we may take for granted that we shall find here accepted as a first and last commandment, a recognition of the law of universal charity. The chapters on "Brute Force" and "Passive Resistance" are eloquent arguments on the plane of common experience, for the keeping of that law were it only for the immediate worldly benefit of mankind. That love is the single agent of "soul-force" or "truth-force" is for Gandhiji, as he says, "a scientific truth". And it is this criterion that he uses throughout to solve the problems put to him by his impatient interlocutor. He shows, for instance, how the exercise of the rule of love, or failing that of tolerance and sympathy, is the only possible solution of the strife between the Hindu and Mahomedan populations.

But, beyond this, he goes on to demonstrate that his ideal of a happy India cannot be achieved until she is ready to abandon all the seductions and conveniences, for what they may be worth, of Western Civilisation. One of his instances is that of the use of lawyers, the settlement of disputes and grievances by reference to a supposedly impartial tribunal which has no personal knowledge of the parties concerned. He points out that the arrangement of all quarrels may and should be made between the parties themselves, and that the whole principle of paying a lawyer to whose personal interest it will be to lie and cheat if need be to win his case, is fundamentally an evil one.

Further than this, he asserts that machinery is one of the false gods worshipped by modern man, a god that will ultimately help to destroy him. The craze for movement about the face of the Earth, for speed and still greater speed, the increasing restlessness, the demand for distraction, all so typical of our present civilisation, can only lead, says Gandhiji, to destruction. His vision is of a peasant India, indifferent to the world about her, practising her immemorial arts and crafts, and moving slowly towards that consummation of philosophy, the knowledge of her own soul.

Now, as has been said, this is a doctrine that no Theosophist can find fault with,—and also, the condemnation of machinery in this connection is now becoming, on some ground or another, a familiar outcry, —the more so since we witness the ingenuities of its employment in devising and manufacturing instru-

ments of death. But as a matter of practical service to the present condition of India, Gandhiji's gospel will be of no more value than was the same gospel preached by Gautama to India twenty-four centuries ago. We praise and honour Gandhiji for his courage in bearing witness to the eternal truths. We know that if there were enough righteous men in India to-day, they might save the city. But the eternal purpose, so far as mankind as a whole is concerned, cannot be served by any attempt to re-establish an earlier condition. The law of spiritual evolution demands change no less than that of physical evolution. The appearance of this change that has come with such a terrible increase of pace in the past half-century may be evil. It may bring suffering and death to uncountable millions throughout the world. But we have to accept it in the same spirit as that in which Gandhiji accepts British rule in India, by meeting it with passive resistance. In the midst of this wild, useless competition begotten by modern civilisation, we can still practise in our own lives, the law of love to mankind.

J. D. BERESFORD

We, Theosophists, say that your vaunted progress and civilization are no better than a host of will-o'-the-wisps, flickering over a marsh which exhales a poisonous and deadly miasma. This, because we see selfishness, crime, immorality, and all the evils imaginable, pouncing upon unfortunate mankind from this Pandora's box which you call an age of progress, and increasing *pari passu* with the growth of your material civilization. At such a price, better the inertia and inactivity of Buddhist countries, which have arisen only as a consequence of ages of political slavery.....

To the masses, who need only practical guidance and support, metaphysics and mysticism are not of much consequence ; but for the educated, the natural leaders of the masses, those whose modes of thought and action will sooner or later be adopted by those masses, they are of the greatest importance. It is only by means of the philosophy that an intelligent and educated man can avoid the intellectual suicide of believing on blind faith ; and it is only by assimilating the strict continuity and logical coherence of the Eastern, if not esoteric, doctrines, that he can realise their truth.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in *The Key to Theosophy* (1889).

A REVOLUTIONARY MESSAGE

"ONE OF THE BEST HANDBOOKS"

[**Hugh I'A. Fausset** puts his finger on the right key when he describes the purpose of *Hind Swaraj* as the saving of India from "the modern civilisation which is eating into the vitals of the West"—in which West now "we are more ready to listen....for our self-complacence has received some rude shocks". We wish a greater number of Indians, especially among the young, clearly perceived the failures of the Occidental civilisation, as do Mr. Fausset and many thinkers like him.—EDS.]

Hind Swaraj was written in 1908 in answer to those Indians who preached violence as a remedy for their country's ills. It was published serially in *Indian Opinion* and later in book form. But for some years it has been out of print. It is now issued in Mr. Gandhi's own English translation at a price within the reach of everyone and at a time when we in the West are more ready to listen to its revolutionary message than we were when it originally appeared. Our self-complacence has received some rude shocks since then and we are being compelled by events to recognise the truth of Mr. Gandhi's claim that civilisation requires the use of a different and higher weapon for self-protection than that of brute-force. This in fact is a profoundly revolutionary little book and the fact that it is addressed to Indians and concerned with their specific problems does not make it less relevant to Englishmen, though it may be harder for them to accept it. *For the whole purpose of the book is to save India, not from Englishmen, but from the modern civilisation which is eating into the vitals of the West.* To-day Mr. Gandhi's conviction of the disease of modern civilisation is deeper than ever. But while continuing to work individually for the ideal self-rule pictured in these articles, he admits that it requires a higher simplicity and renunciation than the people are to-day prepared for. And so he is ready to tolerate Parliamentary Home Rule, railways, hospitals, law courts, machinery and mills as at best necessary evils which will die a natural death when enough people come into possession of their true selves. It is likely, even in India, to be a long and painful process and for the Westerner in particular the problem, though fundamentally a spiritual and moral one, is perplexingly involved in the question whether we can use or must abandon the machine.

For Mr. Gandhi no compromise is ultimately possible with that Frankenstein's Monster. He applauds the wisdom of his ancestors who saw that our real happiness and health consisted in a proper use of our hands and feet and so rejected anything which would curtail that use. "Machinery", he wrote, "has begun to desolate Europe. Ruination is now knocking at the English gates. Machinery is the chief symbol of

modern civilisation, it represents a great sin." "I cannot", he wrote elsewhere, "recall a single good point in connection with machinery", and rather than benefit by it he would "make wicks, as of old with home-grown cotton and use hand-made earthen saucers for lamps". The destruction of Indian handicraft by Manchester mills was for him a typical example of the way in which man's moral being was inevitably sapped by machinery. And he would reject outright the suggestion that it may be used eventually for the spiritual and material benefit of all.

It is difficult, for me at least, not to agree with him. But it seems questionable whether the whole of this industrial revolution of which the machine is materially the prime factor is no more than a terrible aberration from the rural economy of handicrafts to which man must ultimately return. *Machinery, we may admit, represents a great sin, is in fact the outward embodiment of the split in man's being, which at present it deepens, tending everywhere to deaden his creative spirit.* Yet the machine, if once it ceases to be an instrument of private power and greed might, one imagines, be employed to liberate man in some ways from a merely creative servitude to matter for creative service and expression on a more spiritual plane. At any rate he will not be the same when he has passed through the hell of the machine age as the countryman of the past. He will either have grown through the agony of self-consciousness into a fuller consciousness, or he will have been reduced to a mere automaton. And I have enough trust in the indestructible vitality of the human spirit to be sure that it will not allow itself to be lastingly mechanised. The spiritually mature man of course, cannot be in servitude to machines, or to what they produce, because it is of his very nature not to be attached by desire to things. And the spiritually mature society of the far future, if it is to exist, must be equally organic. But meanwhile the machine is doing a certain service to us in the West by exposing with an inescapable ruthlessness the terrible consequences that must happen to men and nations who lose their integrity. Ultimately, I do not doubt, it will compel us after much waste and suffering to reaffirm our humanity and the sovereignty of spirit. To speculate, therefore, on the future of the machine is a waste of time. We should concentrate all our energy upon the restoration of man to his true estate. And it is because Mr. Gandhi has devoted himself to this task with unflagging sincerity that *Hind Swaraj*, containing as it does the core of his teaching, is *one of the best modern handbooks of that real revolution which must happen in us all, if we are to fulfil the creative purpose of life.* Since he wrote it the truths he enunciated that real home-rule is self-rule and that the way to it is passive resistance, that is soul-force or love-force, have been taken up and expounded by others, but by no one with a more lucid and persuasive simplicity than by him. For he not only preached

passive resistance, but practised it in thought and act. The humility, the patience, the determined reasonableness of his approach to his fellowmen are nowhere more convincingly revealed than in his refusal to hate the English because they are the agents of a civilisation which he deplores, in his desire to save them from it no less than his fellow countrymen and in his insistence that India has forged her own chains and can only be free when She has the strength to affirm through suffering and sacrifice her true spirit. To a world rapidly becoming quite irreligious he taught here the practice of the religion which underlies all religions. It is still not too late for us to listen and learn.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

Truly and indeed it is high time that at last something should be done in this direction, and before the deceitful civilization of the conceited nations of but yesterday has irretrievably hypnotized the older races, and made them succumb to its upas-tree wiles and supposed superiority. Otherwise, old arts and artistic creations, everything original and unique will very soon disappear. Already national dresses and time-honoured customs, and everything beautiful, artistic, and worth preservation is fast disappearing from view. At no distant day, alas, the best relics of the past will perhaps be found only in museums in sorry, solitary, and be-ticketed samples preserved under glass!

Such is the work and the unavoidable result of our modern civilization. Skin-deep in reality in its visible effects, in the "blessings" it is alleged to have given to the world, its roots are rotten to the core. It is to its progress that selfishness and materialism, the greatest curses of the nations, are due; and the latter will most surely lead to the annihilation of art and of the appreciation of the truly harmonious and beautiful. Hitherto, materialism has only led to a universal tendency to unification on the material plane and a corresponding diversity on that of thought and spirit. It is this universal tendency, which by propelling humanity, through its ambition and selfish greed, to an incessant chase after wealth and the obtaining *at any price* of the supposed blessings of this life, causes it to aspire or rather gravitate to one level, the lowest of all the plane of empty appearance.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in "Civilization, the Death of Art and Beauty", (1891)

CIVILIZATION, THE PATH OF DUTY

[With intuition **Claude Houghton** here penetrates into the very soul of *Hind Swaraj*.—EDS.]

It is necessary to stress at the outset that this remarkable book was written in 1908 ; that Gandhiji, in 1921, had nothing to withdraw—and that, in Lord Lothian's opinion, it contains in embryo everything that Gandhiji is now teaching.

This slim volume, therefore, enshrines the creed Gandhiji has preached and lived for thirty years.

What would the average Englishman make of it ? The answer can be only a guess, but as the average Englishman assumes that England is the most ' progressive ' country in the world, and that one of her many missions is to bring the glories of Western Civilisation to India, he would inevitably experience a shock on reading :—" The condition of England at present is pitiable. I pray to God that India may never be in that plight." Before he has recovered from this shock, he will encounter another. " This civilisation is irreligious and has taken such a hold on the people in Europe that those who are in it appear half mad."

One fact, however, the average Englishman would be forced to admit, and it is this. That a man, with the beliefs of Gandhiji, is a mighty force in India, shows that India and England are not different countries—they are different worlds. There can be no doubt about that—none.

This book ranges over a number of subjects (Home Rule for India, Railways, Lawyers, Education, Machinery etc.,) but, essentially, it has two themes, and these themes are organically related.

The first is that Western civilisation, with all its skyscraper glories, is a plague—and that therefore the greatest misfortune which could overwhelm India would be for her to become wholly infected by it.

The second, and the main, theme of the book is that love, and love alone, has power. It is madness, therefore, to fight evil with its own weapons. But this does not mean that one must serve it. One must resist it—passively.

> Passive resistance is a method of securing rights by personal suffering ; it is the reverse of resistance by arms... If I do not obey the law and accept the penalty for its breach, I use soul force. It involves sacrifice of self.

To fight evil with its own weapons is to deny the righteousness of God. You do not believe in Him if you seek to avenge yourself. Who *is* the enemy ? According to Karl Barth, it is he who incites you to render evil for evil. To strike a blow " for the right " is to proclaim—God's impotence. It is precisely what your adversary has proclaimed. The fact that he has come in arms against you is proof conclusive. Meet him on his own level, with his own weapons, and you—become him ! Hidden in your enemy, is the image of God. It matters nothing that he has denied it. See only that image

in him, serve only that image,—serve it with love—and it will be made manifest. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him. If he thirst, give him to drink." Compel him by the power of love to reveal himself as he is in reality. Refuse to accept him at his own valuation. Judge not by the appearance, but judge righteous judgment. Affirm in him that which he is denying. To descend to his level, to fight him with his own weapons, is to collaborate with a nightmare.

These are some of the more obvious implications of "passive resistance". What do we make of them? What are we to think of them? Do we *really* believe that love has this alchemy, or are we certain in our secret hearts that fear is the power which dominates mankind? It is easy to answer these questions with one's brain; difficult to answer them with one's blood. But it does seem probable that, *the state of Europe being what it is, this doctrine of passive resistance will not be dismissed contemptuously as the dream of a super-crank.*

It is pertinent to point out that Gandhiji's doctrine does not relate simply to war. Many of us, who abhor war, will fight like shock troops for our personal ambitions. We may not take up arms, but we fight none the less. In fact, our "acceptance" of civilisation, or our "rejection" of it, is determined by what we "get out of it" to a much greater extent than many of us imagine. But Gandhiji holds that "Civilisation is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty". Duty! Not rights—not ambition, not self-glorification.

Perhaps, in a last analysis, whatever is discussed in this book—be it Home Rule for India, or Civilisation—Gandhiji's main contention is that if, and only if, we have inner freedom, nothing and no one has power over us. If we are slaves to any one or anything, we have created this slavery. "If we become free, India is free. If we serve evil, if we take up arms to defend our 'rights', we become the slaves of evil."

We must take responsibility for ourselves. There are no short cuts—there are no scapegoats. If we find ourselves in chains, *we* have forged them—link by link. And we must break them—link by link.

In other words, Gandhiji asks us to do what is impossible for the "natural" man, who finds justice in the code: "An eye for an eye: a tooth for a tooth." It is possible only to the new, the risen, man who realises that we war not with flesh and blood but with principalities and powers; that our enemies are not outside the gates, but within them. Pride, envy, lust, sloth, inertia, greed—these are our enemies, because we have served them. They are the cause of the misery of man.

And it may be that, with shadows lengthening and deepening across the world, more and more people will be impelled to attain in varying degrees this self-rule which is the only freedom.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

A GREAT NATURAL PHENOMENON

THE VISION OF A NEW ORDER

[Gerald Heard, author of *The Third Morality*, sees in Gandhiji's ideas the beginnings of a new world-order. He visions how the citizen and the leader of to-morrow can be trained through a proper restoration of the old Hindu system of caste which has now become a degraded institution.—EDS.]

Hind Swaraj is one of those books about which it may be said that they are not so much books as great natural phenomena. Rousseau's *Social Contract* was such a book, another was Karl Marx's *Das Kapital.* Such books, important as they are in what they say, are infinitely more important in what they do. Yet *Hind Swaraj* is superior to the other two mentioned above. They were the crystallisation points, the catalytic agents round which precipitated the last two phases of Europe's Revolutionary Epoch—the political and the economic phases. *Hind Swaraj* is more significant because it does not mark, as did each of those, an end of an age but the beginning of a new order. They were symptomatic of Western Man awakening to a new sense of self-consciousness—feeling himself to be "born free but everywhere in chains". Using the same technique which had mastered him, violence, these newly aware individuals would break their chains and chain their masters. These Revolutions led therefore inevitably to reaction.

The first psychological truth which every revolutionary must grasp, *Tat twam asi,*—Thou art That—these Occidental revolutionaries overlooked and all their work has only left new tyrants more firmly on the thrones. Mr. Gandhi, realising this fact, opened a New Path. He put into practice a new means, the right means which alone can lead to the right end, for as Buddha taught only correct means will lead to desired ends, wrong and evil methods can only lead to wrong and evil results.

The world-wide and age-long interest of Mr. Gandhi's experiment lies in the fact that he has attempted to make the method work in what may be called the wholesale or national scale. For millenia, saints and religious schools have shown that, on small, clear-cut issues, dynamic non-violence, spiritual activism does work. Those who are the spiritual superiors of their physical assailants can conquer them by an attitude of Spirit. Richard Gregg's important compilation *The Power of Non-violence*[1] leaves no doubt about that.

What this generation needs to know is whether oppressed masses, meek (but many of them broken spirited), unarmed, (but most of them debarred from the temptation, the test and the training which the offer of arms would give them), whether such untrained numbers can win by non-violence against an armed and resolute government. It seems unlikely. For what overcomes the

[1] Reviewed by GEOFFREY WEST in THE ARYAN PATH, for July 1936.—EDS.

user of violence when confronted with non-violence is seldom the compassion which is stirred by helpless misery and utter collapse. It is most commonly the realisation that the oppressed and the attacked could have used violence and did not, that though wronged they harbour no sense of wrong or injury, that they are fearless and friendly. When, to this, the oppressed can add something more and show, by their understanding action, that they have a true insight into their oppressor's needs, that they understand his nature and actions better than he does himself, and can therefore show him how to satisfy his needs better than he can by his blind misguided self, then non-violence becomes all-powerful.

Can simple masses, long pressed between the hard facts of unproductive economy and a tax-demanding government rise to such " non-attachment " ? Can they by their spiritual superiority to their masters and their circumstances, win the initiative from those who are motivated by lesser loyalties ? The whole conception of Karma does not suggest a favourable answer to this supremely important question. The question which confronts not merely India but all mankind is whether we have reached the limit attainable while we remain subject to present circumstances and confined to the use of certain means.

Mr. Gandhi has attempted to solve the economic issue, at the same time as the political, by making every peasant his own manufacturer. He would, however, be the first to allow that our issue is not solved even then. We are confronted not merely by a twofold but a threefold problem. If we are to enter on a life in which we are neither subject to, nor employ violence, then we must have not merely a policy and an economy but also a psychiatry. The height of moral standard which can be attained, as long as men are in the body, as long as they possess no more than the powers and means which physics gives them, derived wholly from that aspect of the world which is material and mechanical, is strictly confined by the physical, economic and political conditions under which they live. If further spiritual advance is possible, while still in the body, while living among men and following the life of marriage, reproduction and householding, making wealth, rearing families and constituting states, it can only be if the pattern of the society, the way of creating material goods and the diet and routine which each individual experiences is directed to one co-ordinating end, a higher consciousness, a continual unwavering awareness of a vaster reality than common sense discloses. This means a rational planned way of life for avowed intentional living—in short another Great Order, training its members so that in their noviciate they master first the psychiatry, the re-fusion of the surrendered psyche ; in their mastership they become full members and work co-operatively a new psychologically-based economy, a manifest social pattern of avowed intentional being ; and finally, in their doctorate can pass back again into the world demonstrating the Path. Such an Order may well be the answer of the Spirit to rising chaos. Should such an Order win the attention of mankind it might re-

cast human Society. That however could only happen should mankind accept the authority of such an Order, when again we should have a dynamic caste pattern making of humanity a single organic whole.

The doctorate would be the reborn Brahmin caste ; the mastership, the director-administrative rank ; the associate-in-training, the sub-administrative. Outside the order would be the technician and craftsman rank, and finally the simple routineer. There would be no tyranny in this. The Brahmin has no goods though direct power. Each individual in any rank may rise to another if he can stand the strain.

Such seems the vision Non-Violence opens up. We may never attain that level in this world. Our ignorance and self-will may be too strong. But if we do the world will always remember the name of Gandhi as one of its pioneers.

GERALD HEARD

Great is the power of Ahriman ! Time rolls on, leaving with every day the ages of ignorance and superstition further behind, but bringing us in their stead only centuries of ever-increasing selfishness and pride. Mankind grows and multiplies, waxes in strength and (book-)wisdom ; it claims to have penetrated into the deepest mysteries of physical nature ; it builds railroads and honeycombs the globe with tunnels ; it erects gigantic towers and bridges, minimizes distances, unites the oceans and divides whole continents. Cables and telephones, canals and railways more and more with every hour unite mankind into one "happy" family, but only to furnish the selfish and the wily with every means of stealing a better march on the less selfish and improvident. Truly, the "upper ten" of science and wealth have subjected to their sweet will and pleasure, the Air and the Earth, the Ocean and the Fire. This, our age, is one of progress, indeed, an era of the most triumphant display of human genius. But what good has all this great civilization and progress done to the millions in the European slums, to the armies of the "great unwashed" ? Have any of these displays of genius added one comfort more to the lives of the poor and the needy ? Is it not true to say that distress and starvation are a hundred times greater now than they were in the days of the Druids or of Zoroaster ? And is it to help the hungry multitudes that all this is invented, or again, only to sweep off the couch of the rich the last-forgotten rose-leaves that may uncomfortably tickle their well-fed bodies ? Do electric wonders give one additional crust of bread to the starving ? Do the towers and the bridges, and the forests of factories and manufactures bring any mortal good to the sons of men, save giving an additional opportunity to the wealthy to vampirize or "sweat" their poorer brother ? .....

Selfishness is the chief prompter of our age ; *Chacun pour soi, Dieu pour tout le monde,* its watchword. Where then is the truth, and what practical good has done that light brought to mankind by the "Light of the World", as claimed by every Christian ? Of the "Lights of Asia" Europe speaks with scorn, nor would it recognize in Ahura Mazda a *divine* light. And yet even a *minor* light (if such) when practically applied for the good of suffering mankind, is a thousand times more beneficent than even infinite Light, when confined to the realm of abstract theories.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in "Thoughts on Ormuzd and Ahriman", (1891) —U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 7.

"WHAT ABOUT THE CHILDREN?"

[Irene Rathbone's novel *They Call It Peace* and her labours on behalf of the Social Credit movement indicate the school of political thought to which she belongs. She describes *Hind Swaraj* as an "enormously powerful" booklet; it has forced her "by its tremendous honesty to search my own honesty"; therefore—"I would implore people to read it". She feels that she could manage to suffer herself and be killed in living up to the doctrine of "Resist not Evil". But—should she not resist the tyrants who "offend one of these little ones"?—EDS.]

This booklet was written in 1908. Now, thirty years later, with nothing altered, it has been reprinted by an Indian firm. Its author has said of it that "It replaces violence with self-sacrifice, it pits soul-force against brute-force." The language of it is simple and logical; the form of it dialogue; it is economical, condensed, poetic. And enormously powerful.

I can conceive of no better moment for the re-publication of such a work. Never before have the minds of sensitive men and women been so despairingly exercised about Life, Peace, Civilization. Never before have so many paths been followed, theories expounded, nostrums produced. *Wherever we look there is death, or the threat of death;* evil, on a hitherto unimagined scale; fear. If Gandhi's work is to reappear in England as well as in India—as I sincerely hope it is—it will prove a light and a solace to many. Already its message is being preached, in different forms by certain English writers, and will not seem such an unfamiliar one as would have been the case twenty, or even ten, years ago. Its applicability to Europe is at least as exact as to India. When we have a Hindu prophet—Gandhi—and the most cultivated woman writer in England—Virginia Woolf—both saying the same thing, then East and West have indeed joined hands.

"Remain indifferent", they say, in effect, these two. "Have nothing to do with violence. Ignore war preparations, ignore evil. Follow your consciences though it means derision, though it means death."

That Christ, in his own way, also said it, two thousand years ago, tends to be less to the point, at the moment. The words even of a Son of God become flattened and conventionalized by repetition in churches; lose their vividness. A greater impression tends to be made on us by the words of our contemporaries. Not unnaturally, after all. We need to remind ourselves that Christ himself was a 'contemporary' when he uttered his words. His disciples heard them direct. Why should not we be more sharply stirred when we hear the voice of God direct—through the mouths of some of his lesser sons and daughters?

Passive Resistance, Gandhi's doctrine, is one of profound—irresistible—charm to certain minds. Which does *not* mean that its practice is easy. It requires a more stringent training (Gandhi tells us) and a greater fearlessness, than the warrior's. Nevertheless its appeal is potent, and, as I say, to *certain types*, finally convincing, finally satisfac-

tory. But—because I cannot remain objective in reviewing a book of this kind—because it challenges one's personal truthfulness—I must come forward and admit that the Passive Resistance creed, for me, is not convincing in its entirety. I would like it to be so ; I could pray to step right over the edge and be swallowed by it. Yet doubts remain.

Here is a question which I, a humble human being and writer, a woman distracted and sickened by the conditions round her, feel compelled to put : "*What about the children?*" Gandhi (and others) say, in effect : "Don't move against evil. Keep quiet. Walk in the way *you* think right, and if they kill you for walking in that way, then suffer yourself unprotestingly to be killed." Very well. That, I think—hope—I could manage. But *the forms which evil is taking now in the world are so subtle and atrocious that it is no longer a matter of suffering one's own death, but the death of one's children.* The modern tyrant says : "You won't obey me? You refuse to accept my outlook and my rules? All right, your family shall pay the penalty." What, I ask, is the answer to that? What human being on this earth, normal or saint-like, can endure that small boys and girls should perish (possibly lingeringly, fiendishly) if, by bowing to the tyrant and denying his own conscience, he can save them? That question Gandhi does not answer. He does not even pose it. The omission may be due to the fact that when he wrote his book there was no need either to pose or answer it. The situation was different. There were fewer fiends abroad. But Virginia Woolf does not deal with it either! And *she should*—together with Aldous Huxley and others of her contemporaries who preach the pacifist doctrine. They are writing at this moment—not thirty years ago. They are writing for us—not for Indians. For *us*, staring around us, stupefied, at the ondrawing horrors of what we term Fascism. They should be run-clear on this point, for there are many and many who would embrace Passive Resistance if *their own deaths only* were in the balance.

Is Christ any clearer?—living in the old Roman world, a gentler world than ours, though brutal enough. I think he is. For although he said ; "Resist not evil", he knew our humanity. Son of God, he was also son of man. He did, on an occasion, make a scourge and drive those money-changers out of the Temple. That was action—man's action. Now, here are words. "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, it were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Violence in action. Violence in words. Not often—but on occasions. I submit that Christ is more 'modern' than our own moderns ; a greater help to us than they ; a greater help to us than Gandhi. I would sooner turn to him for guidance in this tyrant-ridden world.

For mark how *significant* are those two outbursts. Mark the two types of men which aroused them. (1) Money-changers. (2) The offenders of little ones. Deeply significant. There they were, those two types, a couple of thousand years ago ; here

they are to-day—and more evil and powerful than ever. What would Christ do about them, say about them, to-day? Anything so very different? I think not. Money-changers to-day are called 'Bankers' or 'Financiers'; and they have defiled our temples, *i.e.*, our countries (India, England and all others), and must be got rid of. Those who offend our little ones are called 'Nazis' or 'Fascists'; and they bomb, burn, imprison and starve children's bodies, *or* poison their minds, and must be got rid of. But is this possible without violence? It is certainly possible without *war*—whether without any degree of violence whatever remains to be seen. *Effort* of course will be required. Luckily however, in only one direction. That is to say, *if the Bankers are got rid of, or rather rendered powerless, the child-killers will be rendered powerless too.* The activities of the latter depend upon the system of the former. At the base of all material ills (and many of the spiritual ills) of the modern world lies the inhuman, un-Christ-like, sinister system of Orthodox Finance. Hang a millstone (metaphorically) round its neck, and the world can begin, at last, to resemble the Kingdom of Heaven. The method is known. The key to Righteousness and Peace is in our hands. The two *can* kiss each other—in spite of all the assertions of all the politicians. There is no need whatsoever for the world to be *either* at peace under a shameful tyranny *or* at war under a righteous banner. No such choice confronts us—though it appears to. We have only to use the key, and, I repeat, we enter realms of day. What that key is, it is not my business here to explain—my business being to talk about Gandhi's book. But perhaps I could not have paid that book a greater compliment than to have found myself forced, by its tremendous honesty to search my own honesty. *I would implore people to read it.* It is not dated—not in any essential way. It is suffused in light. It gleams with cogent passages; phrases at which the mind wistfully, assentingly smiles.

Listen to this:

> The condition of England at present is pitiable.... That which you consider to be the Mother of Parliaments is like a sterile woman and a prostitute.

And this:

> They take away our money from year to year. The most important posts are reserved for themselves. We are kept in a state of slavery. They behave insolently towards us and disregard our feelings.

That is written concerning the English in India, but who can deny that it applies to the rulers and common people of any European country?

And what about this?

> I can have nothing against Prime Ministers, but what I have seen leads me to think that they cannot be considered really patriotic.

If that doesn't fit the English domestic situation in 1938, I have read little that does! Gandhi's 'patriotism' is of the true sort. He means by the word, *the good of his country*, and of every man and woman in it; not the good of a class merely. Would that our so-called 'patriots' meant the same.

And here is something less grimly

and contemporaneously human; something eternal:

Strength lies in absence of fear, not in the quantity of flesh and muscle we may have on our bodies.

There are views held by this great man and teacher—with regard, for instance, to machinery, with regard to bodily chastity—which many of us must find distorted and fantastic. Machinery *need* not be the curse Gandhi declares it is; in a world where the money-changers had been rendered powerless it would be used for the release of man, not, as now, for his degradation. Complete chasti-ty, except for the very few, is less likely to be a source of spiritual strength than of bitterness, obsessions, intolerance, cruelty. Such views, however, based on the scant knowledge of thirty years ago concerning economics and concerning psychology, need prove no deterrent to those wishing to drink at the deep well of Gandhi's wisdom. That well remains. It can never run dry. Easterners and Westerners will alike return from it refreshed: be enabled to pursue their varied, arduous journeys with quieter minds, firmer steps, and greater courage.

IRENE RATHBONE

None know more keenly and definitely than (Theosophists) that good works are necessary; only these cannot be rightly accomplished without knowledge. Schemes for Universal Brotherhood, and the redemption of mankind, might be given out plentifully by the great adepts of life, and would be mere dead-letter utterances while individuals remain ignorant, and unable to grasp the great meaning of their teachers. To Theosophists we say, let us carry out the rules given us for our society before we ask for any further schemes or laws. To the public and our critics we say, try to understand the value of good works before you demand them of others, or enter upon them rashly yourselves. Yet it is an absolute fact that without good works the spirit of brotherhood would die in the world; and this can never be. Therefore is the double activity of learning and doing most necessary; we have to do good, and we have to do it *rightly*, with knowledge.....

It is well known that the first rule of the society is to carry out the object of forming the nucleus of a universal brotherhood. The practical working of this rule was explained by those who laid it down, to the following effect:—

"HE WHO DOES NOT PRACTISE ALTRUISM; HE WHO IS NOT PREPARED TO SHARE HIS LAST MORSEL WITH A WEAKER OR POORER THAN HIMSELF; HE WHO NEGLECTS TO HELP HIS BROTHER MAN, OF WHATEVER RACE, NATION, OR CREED, WHENEVER AND WHEREVER HE MEETS SUFFERING, AND WHO TURNS A DEAF EAR TO THE CRY OF HUMAN MISERY; HE WHO HEARS AN INNOCENT PERSON SLANDERED, WHETHER A BROTHER THEOSOPHIST OR NOT, AND DOES NOT UNDERTAKE HIS DEFENCE AS HE WOULD UNDERTAKE HIS OWN—IS NO THEOSOPHIST."

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in "Let Every Man Prove His Own Work", (1887) —U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 31.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THUS FAR AND NO FURTHER[1]

[J. C. Kumarappa is the hard-working patriot whose love for the poor manifests in his duties as the Secretary of the Harijan Sevak Sangh. He is a devoted follower of Gandhiji. This review once more reveals how economic ideas act as a thick wall even for altruists like Mr. Kirby Page and prevent them from seeing the truth of Gandhiji's philosophy.—EDS.]

In a world surcharged with wars and rumours of wars Mr. Kirby Page presents the thoughtful with a volume to guide their conscious decision. He sees war as planned devastation and organised slaughter supported by a steady stream of distortion and falsehood. He views the trained soldiers, sailors, etc., not as we are usually told to regard them—as patriots—but as men trained in the business of killing human beings. The world seems occupied by a number of dying nations and a few virile ones. The latter consider it their duty to cut up and utilise the former for their benefit and sole enjoyment. The jungle law of competition and survival of the fittest governs their mutual relations. In such a jungle, he thinks, Democracy cannot be preserved by armed preparedness and by resort to war.

The large section of the book he has devoted to proving the evils of war—a telling commentary on our outlook; a whole chapter of over forty pages satisfies the reader that the teachings of Jesus are contrary to war mentality—a damnation of the Church to-day. Such statements should have been considered axiomatic. But by its behaviour, its self-delusion and its propaganda these many centuries the Church has aligned itself on the side of violence, and hence Mr. Page's task. He shows that Jesus's method is the way of the Cross and not the way of atrocity. Jesus did not remain passive. His was not acquiescence and inactivity but a sustained attack on entrenched iniquity with vigour, abandon and a readiness to suffer the consequences. This last forms the vicarious suffering, of which Mr. Page sees the most illuminating contemporary example in Gandhiji. He does not understand a church which allows its adherents to sin and collects that sin in a heap, and lays it on a lamb spotless and without blemish. Each idealist has to suffer like Jesus for his ideals and principles. In his message to the Jaipur Peoples' Conference a few weeks ago Gandhiji said :—

> To obtain peace from conflict is to hope to beget a son from a barren woman... Experiment of peace lies in attaining power to die even when we are totally faultless.

If we find war an evil we have to sacrifice our all in our attempt to remedy this evil.

In all this Mr. Page will carry with him every lover of peace, but when he analyses the causes of war from an economic standpoint he goes off the track by laying too great an emphasis on private ownership of the means of production as the main source of trouble. Is it not the system of centralised production that goes to the bed-rock of the trouble? Who owns the means of production makes little difference. It is the method of production rather than the form of ownership. With heavy plant and machinery for large-scale production it becomes imperative to feed the machine with a steady stream of raw materials at one end, and when the finished goods appear at the other it is equally imperative to find suitable markets for them. These two needs—*raw material and markets— form the basis of all violence and disturbance of International peace.* Mere change of ownership does not improve the situation.

---

[1] *Must We Go to War?* By KIRBY PAGE. (Farrar and Rinehart. New York. $ 1.)

We see around us, (whether it be Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, or Imperialist Great Britain,) States which need to resort to violence to keep the organisation going. However helpful lubrication may be, it is the petrol that makes the car go. What petrol is to a car, that violence is to the present form of centralised economic organisation irrespective of ownership. If we decide to do away with violence we have to devise a system of which violence and untruth shall not be the cornerstones. Competition is also of the essence of our present system, and leads to concentration of wealth and to the jungle law. Because of its very nature the centralised method of production concentrates wealth, and thus causes slumps for lack of an equitable distribution of purchasing power in the very process of production. Just like an internal combustion engine which generates the electric current that helps it to propel itself, economic production should also distribute purchasing power in the process of production. This means that labour should form the greater proportion of the cost of production. This is against all the accepted principles of centralised production, but is the basis of all Gandhian economics, rooted in non-violence and truth. It is at this point that Mr. Kirby Page glances off at a tangent from a thesis which would otherwise be in line with Gandhiji's ideas.

If we merely change the ownership, again we have to resort to violence to force distribution and to obtain raw materials. We then come back to war. This brings us to the inescapable corollary that *to follow non-violence and truth and to abandon war it is necessary to simplify our lives.*

Mr. Page does not feel that an enduring world peace can be built up on the foundations of capitalism and nationalism. He considers the transformation of competitive capitalism into a co-operative commonwealth essential to the abolition of war.

He suggests that all nations should surrender part of their sovereignty to an International Government, which should maintain an international armed police force in an unarmed world. He is conscious of Herculean difficulties to be overcome before the present selfishness and greed among nations will make room for consideration of the good of humanity, but he looks forward to changes in fundamental attitudes and policies which will bring about a family spirit among nations. He would have all churches decide against war, the people organise themselves into peace movements, and renounce war by their united efforts and strive to remove the causes which provoke it. Mr. Page's is a clarion call to peace and goodwill, to non-violence and truth, but alas, how few will hear it in this den of robbers !

This is a book which calls for careful study, especially from those who advocate the industrialisation of India, in spite of the example of Japan before us. Conditions in the U. S. A. and India may be different, but the theme is one of eternal values. Man has more or less abandoned the law of the jungle in his personal relations, but clings to it pathetically and helplessly in his social and national dealings. Is it too much to hope that the time is not far off when even in that sphere he will rise above the level of the brute beast ? Mr. Kirby Page, though he addresses himself to his American nationals, deserves the ear of all thinking peace-lovers.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

EDUCATIONAL REFORM[1]

[Below we print a review and an article which deal with the important subject of educational reform. H. P. Blavatsky's views provide both the writers with a basis for survey.]

"OF REAL VALUE"

[Elizabeth Cross has had an interesting educational career. For six years she taught at Bertrand Russell's co-educational Boarding School, where she met many philosophers of many nations—East and West.—EDS.]

This pamphlet, which consists of certain portions taken from Madame Blavatsky's *The Key to Theosophy* is of particular interest at the present time of world unrest, showing, as it does, the way towards national regeneration through education.

It is of great interest, not only to theosophists, but to all who care about the education of our children and who hope for racial improvement and a bettering of the social order.

In a Foreword it is agreed that some of the defects of our Western system of education have been removed, but it is also shown how the true spirit of regeneration has not been grasped.

We are led through a careful criticism of the basis of so-called Christian education which shows a real appreciation of the good that has been achieved in the matter of technique (*e.g.*, the author shows the value of certain classroom details, particularly it would seem in our infant schools) but then proceeds to an equally real condemnation of the fundamental aims underlying the whole.

Many will agree that although we may boast loudly of our creative aims and ideals, our desire for mutual brotherhood, co-operation and so on, the real aim and object of the whole system is, as she says, "to pass examinations".

All those who have the welfare of children at heart, all who desire world peace, will admit the evils of the competitive spirit. There is never any need to encourage this, rather a necessity to sublimate it and to develop true co-operation. Selfishness needs no encouragement, it is part of our lower natures, but competitive examinations, in fact all examinations, which so often are the results of mere memory training, must tend to this selfishness. Knowledge is never able to be loved for itself or for any noble end, but merely as a somewhat dreary means to a doubtful end.

In dealing with this matter of selfishness caused by the examination system Madame Blavatsky gives considerable detail concerning elementary, "middle class" and Public schools, showing how, although the form is different, the animating spirit is the same; un-theosophical and unchristian.

Many memories are awakened by the section which deals with the pernicious method in which the child is fitted to the system instead of having any regard paid to its natural aptitudes. The final plea for a truly theosophical education with an emphasis on true moral training towards unselfishness, self-reliance, and an encouragement of real thinking and reasoning instead of the mechanical memory work of the present, will find many echoes.

Those pioneer educationists in England and elsewhere who are trying to put the theosophical ideal into practice, often in face of great opposition, will find much to encourage them in this pamphlet. Those who have not deeply considered the evil effects of the present system will, it is hoped, be led to a realisation of its dangers. We can recommend it as being of real value both to the specialist in education and to all who take an intelligent interest in world affairs and world peace.

ELIZABETH CROSS

[1] *Theosophy and Education.* By H. P. BLAVATSKY. U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 35. (Theosophy, Co., (India), Ltd.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE WARDHA SCHEME

[Dr. J. M. Kumarappa, M.A., S.T.B., is Professor of Social Economy in the Tata Graduate School of Social Work in Bombay.—EDS.]

> We would endeavour to deal with each child as a unit, and to educate it so as to produce the most harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, in order that its special aptitudes should find their full natural development. —H. P. BLAVATSKY

In the evolution of society, religion, as a cohesive force, has been a powerful aid to mass control and social solidarity ; but, as a divisive factor, it has been a prolific source of group conflict and communal hatred. Whenever religious differences happen to coincide, however slightly, with lines of political or racial cleavage, the opposition developed becomes hopelessly implacable and often fearfully destructive. Hence, in the West, *political evolution has tended toward progressive separation of the church and the state,* thus making religion the concern of the individual rather than that of the state.

In India the plea of non-interference in religious affairs has been remarkably successful. In the interest of religious neutrality, our educational system has been secularized. How we, who are known to be 'incurably religious', have been so far satisfied to receive a purely secular education is, indeed, hard to understand ! Perhaps the fear of sectarian dissensions and conflicts has been at the bottom of it all. Albeit the secularized school has for a century or more been trying, however imperfectly, to develop the pupil's physique and to train his mind, neglecting entirely the cultivation of his spiritual resources.

We must be thankful for the new national awakening which has made us conscious of our moral deterioration, and of the shortcomings of the present system of education. Our leaders now feel that something must be done to save the people from a moral collapse. And the most difficult task of tackling this problem has fallen to the lot of Mahatma Gandhi, who has undertaken to revolutionize the whole scheme of education.

We are not alone in seeking to evolve a system of national education for the realization of the best in our culture ; for history reveals that nations have organized and reorganized their education as a means for the attainment of the things they valued most. As power, learning, piety, skill, wealth and the like, became in turn the object of desire, so the means of securing them became the object of study. To illustrate, Athens valuing beauty, symmetry and harmony, both physical and intellectual,—sought through her great teachers to cultivate a love of the true, the beautiful and the good. Ancient Rome, exalting law, authority and conquest, instructed her youth in oratory and military science. Even so, Modern Russia is using the school as an agency to raise up a new generation of citizens to uphold the Soviet ideology and support the new state. Similarly, if we seek to preserve the spiritual elements in our civilization and provide our youth with the necessary moral stamina to bear the burdens and responsibilities of a free India, we should make these the objectives of our education.

In any school founded on spiritual principles, " children ", to quote Madame Blavatsky, " should above all be taught self-reliance, love for all men, altruism, mutual charity, and more than anything else, to think and reason for themselves." And this is exactly the aim of the Wardha scheme which is based on the spiritual principles of *Ahimsa,* Non-Violence, and *Satya,* Truth. But a casual

reading of the scheme does not give one an idea that any sort of spiritual or moral instruction has been made a part of the curriculum of the new school. It is no wonder, therefore, if Gandhiji is asked time and again why he has not stressed religious education. In answer to such queries, he says that religious instruction is not emphasized because his aim is to train the pupil in practical religion. Many have not yet understood the significance of the nature of instruction involved in the Wardha scheme on account of the all too common tendency to separate religion and morality. To such religion means only ritualism whereas to *Gandhiji religion and morality are inseparably connected*. Viewed thus, religious education is a training not in rituals and dogmas but in morality, a method to build character. And as such it seeks not merely to inform the intellect by means of moral standards and ideals but to train the will to choose aright.

The fundamental objective of moral education is, as Madame Blavatsky states, to create "*free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish*". In other words, it is the function of religious education to make the social application of religion effective. Social stability, altruistic service and moral temperance must begin with the character training of children. In this new type of religious education, we have to break away from obstructing traditions. To this end, religious education in the Wardha plan has been made a non-sectarian programme of social education. And in order to enlarge the pupil's outlook, widen his sympathies and promote respect for all religions, a well-considered scheme of social studies is provided from the first grade right up to the seventh. Such training, it is believed, will help the pupil to accept gradually certain basic principles of social evolution.

However, it must be pointed out, in justice to the Wardha scheme, that though its social education process does not include religious teachings, much less religious propaganda, it does include a dispassionate study of the social values of all religions, and the cultivation of respect for them all as the finest achievements of human effort. The programme of social studies would therefore lay stress on the religious ideals of love, truth and justice, of co-operative endeavour, national solidarity and the brotherhood of man. It would also emphasize the superiority of non-violence in all its phases, and its concomitant virtues over violence, fraud and deceit. Furthermore, it would seek to cultivate the personal and social virtues which make a man a reliable associate and trusted neighbour, and develop mutual respect for the world religions.

The Wardha scheme is based on sound educational principles. Apart from participation in social life, the principles and precepts of ethics have no significance. Formal education in morals is good, as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. It often gives one only an intellectual appreciation of the principles of conduct, and that is why mere knowledge of what is right does not make a person do the right. Such instruction therefore must be supplemented by opportunities for practice. Hence the social life of the school must be natural and as nearly as possible a reproduction of the healthiest social life of the community.

But moral training, some may say, is not the concern of the school ; it is the business of the home. There is, of course, no question about the value of home training, provided the home is an ideal one and the parents are not only alive to their obligations but also able to discharge such duties. Unfortunately, owing to social and cultural decay, the home also has become unfit to assume this important function. Truth to tell, parents themselves are now in need of such training. How then can we shift the entire responsibility for character training to the home? Further, such objections, it must be pointed out, arise from too narrow a conception of the school. But the school, viewed as a social institution, has a larger function than that

of merely imparting a little formal knowledge. As envisaged in the Wardha scheme, the school is a medium of social conservation and regeneration.

Thus Mahatma Gandhi, who began his attack on education some twenty years ago, is now completing it in all constructive seriousness. In this field, as in many others, his far-sighted leadership has helped to formulate a system of education which is an embodiment of his own spirit. "My Hinduism", says he, "is not sectarian. It includes all that I know to be best in Islam, Christianity, Judaism and Zoroastrianism. I approach politics in a religious spirit. Truth is my religion and *Ahimsa* is the only way of its realization." And it is this religious ideal of citizenship that underlies the Wardha plan of religious education, and is responsible for its many points of originality. Being vitally connected with our culture, the Wardha scheme is most suited to draw out the best in the child. This system may therefore be rightly summed up in the phrase, "From the hand and the senses to the heart and the brain, and from the school and the home to society and God."

J. M. KUMARAPPA

THE INFLUENCE OF ISLAM

I.—IN THE OLD WORLD[1]

Readers of these two interesting volumes, which fulfil a need of special importance at the present time, will be pleasantly surprised to find such a wealth of information so judiciously compressed into convenient space. The field covered is an immensely wide one both in point of time and variety of subject, and Dr. Shushtery is to be congratulated upon the successful achievement of the difficult task he set himself. He himself best describes this task when he calls it an accurate summary of the development of Islamic culture.

After referring briefly to the ancestry of the Prophet and to his life and teaching, Dr. Shushtery passes on to a survey of Muslim history in all those countries to which Islam so rapidly spread, and which was chiefly due, he believes, to the simplicity of its teaching.

A chapter devoted to the principal Muslim sects, in which are included the Bahai movement and other modern movements, is followed by one on the political history of Islam, which traces the development of Muslim administration under the Kalifate and its vicissitudes from the time of its inauguration upon the founding of tribal unity to that of its final abolition by Mustapha Kamal, in 1924. Each chapter of the first volume is devoted to one particular aspect of Islamic development. Such diverse subjects as art, trade, science, and æsthetic culture are thus adequately covered and examined.

The chapter upon Islamic literature will be of special interest to Western readers. In it, Dr. Shushtery draws a comparison between the Syrian philosopher-poet Abul-ula Maorri and Umar Khayyam both of whom he regards as fatalists although some readers may think that Umar Khayyam's apparent fatalism embraced a comprehensive knowledge of karmic law.

The chapter devoted to education and universities will interest all readers. The library at Tripolis, we learn, contained 3,000,000 volumes while that at Shiraz, roofed with domes, contained 360 rooms and pavilions and was surrounded by parks.

Dr. Shushtery's wide erudition covers an equally varied field of philosophy and religion. "Muslim philosophy", he says, "is a blend of Eastern and Western thought under the dominating influence of Islamic doctrine." The second volume

[1] *Outlines of Islamic Culture.* By A. M. A. SHUSHTERY: Vols. 1 & 2. (The Bangalore Press, Bangalore City. Rs. 16.)

commences with a study of Zoroastrianism and continues with a brief consideration of the lives of the principal Greek philosophers and their systems. The author continues with a survey of Muslim philosophy referring in detail to the principal systems and their exponents.

The Greek philosophies, we learn, were translated into Arabic from Syriac translations and not from the original Greek as might have been expected. Greek influence appears in the philosophy of Ibn-e-Sina, who in his elaboration of a theory of evolution through the cultivation of an appreciation of beauty, has evidently borrowed from Plato while the influence of Hinduism is apparent in the Sufist expounder, Farabi when he declares that a man living in the world without attachment is really living out of the world.

In his chapter on Sufism, Dr. Shushtery mentions ten points possessed by it in common with Vedantism. A chapter on scholasticism, the basis of which is contained in passages from the Qu'ran, is followed by final ones on Muslim theology and sociology.

L. E. PARKER

II.—IN THE MODERN WORLD[1]

The writer, a doctor of medicine, left Egypt, his home, in 1931, and went to Europe on a medical mission. While there, he was struck by the deplorable ignorance and misunderstanding of Islam amongst the peoples of Europe, and consequently started on this book.

His aim is, firstly, by placing before people a concise and comprehensive presentation of Islam, to dissipate false notions regarding it and the Muslims, and, secondly so to depict the salient aspects of the transformation taking place in Islamic countries in their bearing upon world affairs as to show that the revival and progress of Islamic peoples of today, far from constituting a menace to the West, will conduce to world peace and stability.

Not all will concede everything the author claims, *e.g.*, that the *Quran* was directly revealed to Mahammud through the angel Gabriel, that it is therefore perfect and inerrant, containing all needful truth including the findings of modern science. At the same time it must be admitted that Dr. Zaki Ali's book contains a great deal of valuable information carefully gathered together from reliable sources, and convincingly demonstrates the great significance of Islam and its culture, the part it has played in the past and the part it may be expected to play in the future.

Books such as this are necessary in the case of every major religion, more especially in the case of a religion like Islam which numbers almost one-fifth of the human race and whose followers are bound together in a unity unknown in any other religion and therefore certain before long to make its influence felt on world affairs. Further, Islam has been much maligned. The Christian church being bitterly hostile to it, Christian writers are chiefly responsible for the distorted and unsympathetic view of Islam and its history prevalent in the West. Similarly in India, communal propaganda against Islam, whether carried on by Christian missionaries or by other non-Mahammudan agencies, has done much to create prejudice against Islam. In this world of suspicion and strife if mutual understanding and co-operation between peoples of various faiths are to be secured it can be done only by a true and faithful account of the principles underlying a faith and the civilisation based on it, such as we find in this book. Books of this type can do more to promote international peace and good will than innumerable Leagues and Conferences. The author is to be congratulated on the able way in which he has performed a difficult task.

BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

[Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa is a member of an old Indian Christian family of South India.—EDS.]

[1] *Islam in the World*. By DR. ZAKI ALI. (Shaikh Mahammud Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore. Rs. 4-8-0.)

TENDENCIES IN MODERN SCIENCE

I.—A NEW MATERIALISM[1]

The trend of modern science, especially of mathematical physics, is towards an idealistic philosophy of the universe, as exemplified in the works of Eddington, Jeans and other authorities. Not only what were termed the secondary properties of matter, such as colour, but also its so-called primary properties, shape and size, are seen to depend on the observer. In short, matter evaporates into a mental phenomenon. Moreover, the "iron" laws governing the behaviour of material bodies are seen to be no more than statistical laws, and determinism reduces to probability. But some minds seem wedded to materialism in spite of all evidence to the contrary. Prof. Levy realises that the old materialism is dead, and so endeavours to create, by avoiding all important issues, a new materialism. This is a pity, as his view that science proceeds by the method of "isolation" is essentially a sound one, only what science does do is to isolate certain elements of experience for investigation, not certain aspects of matter. The longest chapter in the book is devoted to a defence of "scientific determinism". Whether determinism holds with respect to the conduct of individuals can easily be settled by a simple test. Will Prof. Levy determine what I shall eat for breakfast on a certain day to be chosen by himself and notify me of his determination? I will then prove him to be wrong by eating something else. Of course, Prof. Levy will reply that he is not sufficiently acquainted with my past history and the various influences affecting my conduct to make the determination. But does he contend that given all this information it would be impossible for me to prove his determination to be wrong by acting contrary to it? This contention, surely, would contradict common sense, which Prof. Levy admires.

Prof. Levy appears to be desirous of reducing individual human beings to the level of historic and social phenomena. Yet, in the domain of science he recognises the existence of men of genius. What are they?

H. S. REDGROVE

II.—A SCRIPTURE OF SOCIALISM[2]

Notwithstanding the manifest illogic of the definition that "He who works for the *Socialist* movement is a *Socialist*" (Italics mine) I commend this volume to the attention of students interested in the scientific study of social development. After setting forth what he considers to be the fundamental principles of "change", qualification and modification, Professor Levy shows how these principles govern society and argues that classless society is the divine event to which creation is moving or must move if humanity is to save itself. "For us", he observes, "the problems of philosophy are resolved into those of guiding ourselves and others towards this classless society".

If Professor Levy had presented classless society as but one passing stage among many through which mankind must pass, one need have no quarrel with him, but, when he seems to suggest that after the energisation of the characteristic behaviour patterns involved in the abolition of class-ridden capitalism,

[1] *The Universe of Science.* By PROF. H. LEVY. Revised and Expanded. (C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., London. 1*s.*)

[2] *A Philosophy for A Modern Man.* By H. LEVY. (Victor Gollancz, Ltd., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

the millennium will be reached he is indulging in socio-economic pseudo-mysticism.

In India philosophy is restricted to inquiry into the nature of the relation between God and man—*Brahma Jignyasa* to Professor Levy is laughable. Similar spiritual pursuits have been common in other lands as well, but again he would have none of that speculative stuff. His book is the confession of faith of a socialist who swears by a materialist philosophy, a philosophy of nature.

" Within a certain range of temperature ", Professor Levy explains to the distracted modern world, war-weary, class-ridden, " the passage from inanimate to animate was effected ". From amœba to socialism, we have advanced. What next ? It is in giving a straightforward answer to this vital question, I feel, that Professor Levy's book fails completely. Under the inexorable law of change, classless society also is an adjustment which can by no means be final ; it cannot satisfy scientific-minded mankind, and reorganization on other lines will have to be attempted.

In India socialistic ideology is slowly but steadily spreading, and Professor Levy would doubtless be delighted to know that the working-classes here have commenced organizing themselves and demanding their rights. If " labour power " and " access " of that power to " machinery " be the gods of a modern man's philosophy enthroned in a classless state, Professor Levy may be described as " God-intoxicated ". The title of the book is positively misleading. " Scripture of Socialism " would be an apposite title.

R. Naga Raja Sarma

III.—INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION[1]

One of the last acts of Sir Jagadis Chunder Bose was to pass the proofs of this volume on November 20th, 1937, only three days before his death at Giridih. A melancholy interest thus attaches to the pages before us, for they serve to remind us that science is bereft of one of her most brilliant exponents, and that the world is the poorer by the loss of a great and kindly spirit. Bose was, indeed, imbued with a fervent love of humanity, and saw in the science which he enriched so much a means whereby the lot of mankind could be made happier and fuller. Of his personal contributions to the advancement of scientific knowledge, this is not the place to speak ; it must, however, at least be said that he was inspired by that genius of originality which is not bound within the limits of the ordinary mind, but perceives problems previously unsuspected and devises means of solving them. He impressed his characteristics deeply upon the School which grew up around him, and though, like Kekulé, he would have cried " Let us learn to dream, Gentlemen, and then perhaps we shall learn the truth ", he would as certainly have added, with Kekulé, " but let us beware of publishing our dreams before they have been put to the proof by the waking understanding." His own high standard of scientific integrity he demanded also of his students, and India has good reason to be proud of his and their achievements.

In the present volume, the articles are mostly biological and physical, but include also an account of a careful and interesting investigation into the racial characteristics of the Rajmahal aborigines by Mr. Sasanka Sekher Sarkar, who concludes that the Mālér hillmen are autochthonous, and represent one of the earliest remnants of the pre-Dravidian tribes inhabiting this particular region. Mr. H. N. Banerjee describes research upon the chemical constitution of Clerodin, a crystalline bitter substance isolated from the leaves of *Clerodendron infortunatum* or Bhant, a plant much used in Ayurvedic practice. He shows that it is

[1] *Transactions of the Bose Research Institute, Calcutta, Vol. XI. 1935-36.* Edited by the late Sir Jagadis Chunder Bose. (Longmans, Green & Co. 18*s*.)

probably an unsaturated hydroxy-ester, and has verified its anthelmintic power by experiments *in vitro* with earthworms and worms obtained from the intestines and peritoneal cavities of fish. Messrs. B. K. Dutt and A. Guha Thakurta have observed the effects of low atmospheric pressure upon certain physiological activities of plants, such as autonomous pulsatory activity. They find that the pulsation of a *Desmodium* leaflet is at first increased in frequency of pressure, but that at 260 mm. or 500 mm. below normal it is completely arrested. It is, however, significant that the pulsations are quite unaffected under reduced pressure as long as the partial pressure of oxygen is kept equal to that under normal atmospheric pressure. Of the other articles, space does not permit us to make individual mention. They are, however, all stamped with the hallmarks of carefulness in experiment and restraint in hypothesis without which Sir Jagadis would never allow the publication of any work carried out under his supervision. The book is well printed, and the general *format* is a credit to the publishers ; we wish, however, that the price could have been made lower.

E. J. HOLMYARD

Veda and Vedanta. By ERNEST P. HORRWITZ. (Advaita Ashrama, Mayavati, Almora. Rs. 2.)

This attractive volume is a vivid presentation by an American writer, calculated to be of special interest to the lay Western reader, who is interested in Eastern culture, but who has neither the inclination nor the facility for a proper study. It gives us brief and colourful vignettes of the Vedic seers, Buddhistic teachers and Advaita protagonists. The author subscribes to Tilak's view as to the Arctic Home of the Aryans, but in this, as in other debatable views, *e.g.*, that Kalidasa was born in Kashmir, the author would have done well to refrain from offering them as if they were established facts. While the author's theorising may attract, it can hardly convince ; and this failure becomes inevitable when one considers his numerous lapses in matters of detail. It is highly questionable if the Buddhist *Suttas* were reset in *Vedanta Sutras* or *Brahma Sutras*. Sankara's preceptor was Govinda Bhagavatpada, not mere Bhagavatpada. There is no warrant worth the name for the assertion that Sankara annotated the *Gita* " in a mood of impatience with married men who turn sannyasins ".

A little care would have guarded the author from stating that, in the Sankhya school, Prakriti or matter is a fifth category added to soul and its three attendants ; the so-called attendants are themselves evolved from Prakriti. And the magnificent teaching of the Maitreyi-Brahmana is distorted in the rendering : " A wife should love her husband not only because he is her husband, but chiefly because she loves the *atma* in her husband " ; there is no question of " should " or " ought " ; the Self is Bliss, since it *is* the object of supreme love, the one constant factor in all that is loved ; the appeal of the metaphysician is to a psychological fact, not an ethical duty. The identification of Vedanta with Advaita, the dubbing of Ramanuja as a Neo-Vedantist, these and other lapses are likely to detract from the value of the book. Its brief compass coupled with the racy style of the writer will, however, commend it to the general reader. The printing and get-up leave nothing to be desired.

S. S. SURYANARAYANA SHASTRI

My India. By LILLIAN L. ASHBY. (Michael Joseph, London. 15*s.*)

Turn Eastwards. By PASCALINE MALLET. (Rider and Co., London. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

These two books tell us, but in very different ways, of the India which the authors have known.

My India by Mrs. Ashby is the autobiography of the wife of a retired police officer, who served, under rather trying conditions, in Bengal and Orissa. It is a full and interesting narrative, going back to the Mutiny and reaching down to the present day. Mrs. Ashby can, and does claim to be a native of India : " I and my family for several generations back have spent our whole lives here." She certainly shows first-hand acquaintance with Indian life and scenes.

My India is essentially a picture of the Anglo-Indian India of the *sahiblog*. Page after page is replete with details of the *mem-sahib's* domestic economy, her troubles with native servants, official transfers, *shikars* and the like. There is also the usual propaganda-stuff in abundance—the ignorance and superstition of the people, cases of polygamy and child-wives, ill-treatment of women and children, etc. The fact is that her position precluded her from making close contacts with any but the lower strata of society—*Āyāhs, Bhistis,* etc. But it is irritating to find her generalising on this :

> Where scrupulous honesty has never been generally considered as a desirable standard, dishonesty is no disgrace ; but failure to practise cunning would be so considered...
>
> I had grown up with native children to whom a knowledge of sex-relationship comes with their earliest ability to talk and understand the conversation of adults. Discussion of such matters is not restricted in the presence of children... The Hindu religion tends to put an emphasis on sex-acts.

The volume abounds in such pernicious *obiter dicta.*

Probably it is not unkindly meant, and has no ulterior motive. But the author evinces little interest and understanding of the spirit and culture of India. And this in spite of the suggestion thrown out by one of her acquaintances : " You cannot write about India unless you set forth our religion clearly."

Quite a different spirit pervades *Turn Eastwards* by Mlle. Mallet. Her journey from Cape Comorin to Kashmir, which is the theme of the book, was no pleasure-trip. It was a real pilgrimage to the sacred shrines, to Arunachalam and Madura in the South, and Prayag and Hardwar in the North, among others. The volume is an appreciative record of her " observations and personal contacts " during a nine-months' stay in India. One is particularly struck by her wonderful capacity and sympathy to enter into the life and the ideas of people so remote from her own, often without the mediation of language. No doubt her adoption of the *saree* and third-class travel have helped her greatly in this.

Ramana Maharishi of the Hill of the Holy Beacon impresses her most by his spiritual grandeur, and likewise one other *Sannyasin* she met in Kashmir. Of the fundamental teaching of India she says :

> Wherever we went, " Know Thyself " was thus repeated in different ways by the spiritually minded people.... Mere conformity to rites and ceremonies is repeatedly shown as having no value unless personal experience can illumine the understanding and turn theory into practice.

She does not however profess to write on Yoga and the spiritual path with the easy confidence characteristic of the Western dilettante.

Some of her observations may be quoted, if only to contrast them with those found in *My India.*

> Hindus, far from being less clean than Europeans, have a far more rigid conception of cleanliness than that prevailing in the West.
>
> An Indian crowd is never ugly or vulgar, as is nearly always a crowd in the West. The poorest people have a natural refinement and even when ragged and dirty are never repulsive.
>
> There are many things one learns in India, and one of them is to be able to concentrate in whatever circumstances. This faculty is very common among Indians.

T. R. V. MURTI

Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names. Vol. II. By G. P. MALALASEKERA—(John Murray, London. 31*s.* 6*d.*)

Bearing out the general character of the work and its importance for the history of Pāli tradition which were pointed out in the review of the first volume (THE ARYAN PATH, Jan. 1938,) this its companion volume keeps up the standard of scholarship. It brings to conclusion this "Who is Who" of Pāli-Buddhist tradition, most remarkable both in its comprehensivesness as in its variety of detail. From whichever angle we look at this vast material we are fascinated and incidentally gain new insight into the psychology of names. Whether we dwell on their stereotyped character, or analyse them according to their auspicious significance, or as reflecting the worship of certain devas, or embodying spiritual qualities : in every case we here have ample material to satisfy our enquiry.

A name is not to be derogated ; how effectively a name keeps up the tradition associated with the first (usually distinguished) bearer of the name, is evidenced by the many teachers who in the line of Gurus (ācārya-paramparā) bear the names of their patron-saints. It is this age-long tradition which has helped to keep the Buddhist Order together inasmuch as right view (orthodoxy) coincides with like name (homonymy). It appears that the most frequent names in the Hīnayāna are associated with earlier church-fathers (it is doubtful whether their tradition goes as far back as Aśoka) around whom the doctrines are grouped. Thus in the P. N. D. the name Uttara occurs with about 30 namesakes, the great Kassapa has been the model of many lesser lights (about 35 plus 2 Mahākassapas), Tissa is more frequent than any (50 plus 16 Mahātissas), and Mahinda with 24 follows suit.

When we take note of the human quality of vanity which shows in the fondness for titles (being as conspicuous in the Church as in the State !) we are not surprised to find that the names which show the attribute of distinction "mahā" cover more than 120 pages ! It would be a tempting task to write the history of Pāli (and Sanskrit) names from the point of view of human psychology and to find out how many human foibles as well as ideals are hidden in them. Nothing perhaps bears greater testimony to the faith of the soul in the "Good" and its striving for it than the enormous amount of names which incorporate the little word "well" in their form as su- (Sujāta, Sudassana, Sumana, etc.,) and which occupy a space of approximately 100 pages.

The Pāli Names Dictionary is a treasure-trove for all those who undertake research in the fields of Archæology, Folklore, History, Literature and Religion.

W. STEDE

The Importance of Living. By LIN YUTANG. (Heinemann, London. 15*s.*)

In temperament Dr. Lin Yutang is a little like Montaigne, a little like Thoreau, whom he admires, and rather more like Santayana. He dislikes hustle and handshaking, condemns abstract thinking, praises "loafing", is a quietist and does not believe in any kind of after-life. His direct and limpid English is delightful ; his manner urbane and persuasive. He has read widely in Western literature.

His book, which might have been called "A Philosophy of Living", covers a large area. We have chapters on Flower-Arrangement, Smoking, Sitting on Chairs, Tea, Humour, Drinking, Happiness, Conversation and fifty other themes. In addition we have an outline of Christian, Greek and Chinese philosophy, and also—perhaps the most valuable part of the book—a number of extremely interesting excerpts from old Chinese philosophers and poets. The book is flavoured with humour and made spicy with paradox. "The distinction", he says, "between Buddhism and Taoism is this : the goal of the Buddhist is that he shall want nothing, the goal of the Taoist is that he shall not be wanted at

all. Only he who is not wanted by the public can be a carefree individual, and only he who is a carefree individual can be a happy human being." A little earlier he observes that "Belief in our mortality, the sense that we are going eventually to crack up and be extinguished like the flame of a candle, I say, is a gloriously fine thing. It makes us sober; it makes us a little sad; and many of us it makes poetic. But above all, it makes it possible for us to make up our mind and arrange to live sensibly, truthfully and always with a sense of our limitations." A fair summary of his general view may be seen in the following passage:

> How can we remedy the situation? The critical mind is too thin and cold, thinking itself will help little and reason will be of small avail; only the spirit of reasonableness, a sort of warm, glowing emotional and intuitive thinking, joined with compassion, will insure us against a reversion to our ancestral type... I consider the education of our senses and our emotions rather more important than the education of our ideas.

His ideal seems to be the friendly, unambitious and sensible man who can enjoy tea and flowers, pork and poetry, and who rejoices to be alive and does not resent extinction. He is a charming and companionable writer, and within the limits of its philosophy this book is an excellent corrective to the strain and the passion for success which characterise the Western world. The author finds much to admire in the English, though he underrates our sense of humour; and, although he is at pains to show the good in Chinese civilisation, he is quietly critical alike of East and West. The book-jacket describes him as "the most distinguished Chinese author now writing". This is probably true.

CLIFFORD BAX

Japanese Tales of All Ages. By OMORI HARRIS. (The Hokuseido Press, Tokyo. $ 2 or 7*s*. 6*d*.)

The book jacket tells us:—

> These well-known tales from native sources of its [Japan's] heroes and outstanding events from the cloud-land era of the gods down to the present day, limned with light touches and in prismatic colours... serve as a good index and most convenient approach to the mental make-up of the nation, whose people have been familiar with them almost from their cradles.

For once the publisher's claim is fully justified. The author's praise of peace (p. 209) does not offset the disturbing emphasis in many of these narratives upon martial qualities. The military stalwart is very much to the fore in gripping tales of danger, whose hero not infrequently is the warrior-monk. The possible connection between these popular legends and the present warlike temper of Japan is obvious. One cannot, on the other hand, but wonder that imitativeness should have survived among a people brought up on that delightful bit of satire, "The Rolling Potatoes", depicting untutored villagers at a banquet, copying every move of their social mentor, down to the very errors he commits in the confusion into which their antics plunge him.

But, moralizing apart, these stories live in their own exquisite and enchanting right as stories. Some of them are almost as brief as the Japanese Hokku, full of the subdued light of the moon, of stars and flowers, and murmurous with birds, brooks and waterfalls; and most are, for their utter simplicity of both style and subject-matter, a delicious blend of Æsop and Hans Andersen.

> She wondered to see that instead of picking pretty flowers he was pulling out bunches of some small-leaved water-weed; and as she made a slight sound of surprise the boy looked up and saw her face—and, seeing it, thought that all the flowers of field and brook were paled and dimmed in beauty by comparison.

Sentences like these could be picked at random and in any number; they do not stop with weaving mere webs of shining conceits. Mr. Harris's hand never loses its cunning in producing an exhilarating effect with his genuine gift of narration, his quicksilver humour, his allusive comment. *Japanese Tales of All Ages* is pleasing for its unfailing naïveté and profitable for its revelations of Japanese life, flowering as profusely as Japan's own bright cherry blossoms.

MANJERI S. ISVARAN

Strangers. By CLAUDE HOUGHTON. (Collins and Co., Ltd., London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

Strangers is a transcript from life, not a story concocted by any special device of plot, incident, or character. The theme is simple, even conventional—husband, wife and mistress—and the story progresses pitilessly right from the first step to the last with realism and sincerity in an atmosphere irradiated with the psychological reactions to conventional morality—a subdued tolerance and a careful dissection of the polygamous instinct in man.

Hector Grantham is the hero and Hilda is his wife. Crystal Heatherly is the woman who "came in by the wrong door". She kindles the action of the whole story. The march of events from the first meeting to the last is portrayed with patience, and an enormous wealth of details. The background is psychological and is created more by description than by dialogue or incident. The final conflict is resolved by the sudden death of Grantham.

The central conception is good, and clear. By a special process realistic and psychological, peculiar to his art though seemingly laborious, Mr. Houghton makes his effects. He is very good at dialogue but he prefers to expound his vital ideas in special paragraphs of description. These are excellent but they take away from the influence of silent suggestion which is considered so vital to creative art. The descriptive paragraphs are many and they are rich.

I like best the character of Hilda. It is drawn true to life and she has escaped the psychological touch. She is homely, simple, sweet, radiant with the mother instinct—the wife fulfils herself best in the mother. Hector Grantham is more an idea than a person. In some places Mr. Houghton succeeds in equating him with mind-consciousness itself—conflicting, agonised, unhappy, dual, predatory, acquisitive, longing for a glimpse of the real. Grantham's union with Crystal is like the anguished cry of Beauty to be wedded to Truth in this sordid and unreal world.

Strangers is one of the best books of the year, deeply instructive and interpretative of human ambitions and ideals. It is a moving search, a holy quest—for peace, harmony and happiness with a conviction that it can be found only by bringing into greater play the intuitional faculties of man in daily life, and by cultivating the consciousness that lies above, far higher than the cloud-swept and storm bitten hills and dales of the mind.

K. S. VENKATARAMANI

What I Believe. By J. D. BERESFORD. *Problems of Religion.* By GERALD BULLETT. Nos. 1 & 2. "A Series of Personal Statements." Edited by R. ELLIS ROBERTS. (Heinemann. 5*s.* each.)

What is happening to religion in the West? That is perhaps the most interesting and important question that can be asked to-day, because basically peoples and nations are determinable by their religions. Their ethics, their politics, economics and ultimately their manners are finally determined by their religion, because religion is the expression of being and belief, and what a man is is the criterion of what he will do. And the West has, or appears to have, power. It will exercise that power according to what it is, and what it is is determined by its religion.

All through the nineteenth century there was a steady decline of religion in the West. The idea of the power of doing overwhelmed the idea of the importance of being. The builders of empire and the apostles of self-help rebuilt the Tower of Babel sincerely believing that it would reach up to heaven if only the ground plan were carried out. Their discomfiture is now obvious; but they are at a loss to know what to do except to go on building. Orthodox Christianity does not know whether to uphold the pillars of the tower, or to disown the whole edifice. It wants to bring doing into harmony with being; but the power-

ful sense of being has perished, and the power of doing has become tremendous. Religion in the West is thus in a terrible quandary : it is almost paralysed by the sense of its own insufficiency.

To reintegrate religion and bring it again into the social fabric has therefore become a matter of urgent concern ; and since religion is primarily an individual matter, perhaps the best way to begin is to enquire of those who see the necessity of belief what it is they believe. Hence the present series, which has received the benediction of the Archbishop of Canterbury—sign enough that orthodox religion in England is concerned about its pitiful weakness.

Significantly, neither of these books is written by an orthodox Christian. Mr. Beresford is well known to readers of THE ARYAN PATH. He is typical of the emancipated rationalist : a man who brings to his perception of religious truth the meticulous regard for accuracy which a scientific training teaches. He has the gentleness of slowly-generated power, and the Englishman's disbelief in over-statement. His book is chiefly a spiritual autobiography which epitomises the principal changes that have taken place in Western theological conceptions during the last generation.

Mr. Bullett is more youthful in his approach : more concerned to discover and discuss the validity of his own convictions with the reader. Occasionally there is a naïveté about his frank independence which might make the religious pundit impatient ; for then he writes as if it were possible to dismiss profundities in a chapter. But he is deeply sincere, lucid, and truly religious in the sense that he is impressionable by experience and not merely subject to the force of rational argument—the besetting sin of the professional theologian. Both these books are to be highly recommended to all who are now concerned about the evolution of religion in the West.

MAX PLOWMAN

Twelve Religions and Modern Life. By HAR DAYAL. (Modern Culture Institute, Edgware, Middlesex. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

Religion may be defined as a liaison-officer between this world and the beyond. But a multiplicity of religions is embarrassing to a poor human traveller in the wilderness of the world. The modern man finds himself in an age of science, technology and warring socio-cultural ideologies. A study of historical religions with a view to finding out the elements of permanent value in them is likely to be helpful to the modern man in search of spiritual guidance. Dr. Har Dayal's book is an admirable digest of the main doctrines of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Shintoism, Taoism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Sufism and Positivism. One is a little surprised to find Positivism placed on a par with Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, etc. For Positivism is a body of theoretical beliefs which lacks the recognised marks of a historical religion, *viz.*, prophet, church and dogma. Though neither erudite nor scholarly, our author's method of presentation is lucid and gives the characteristic teachings of the different religions in a compact form. The defects, superstitions and unacceptable points in each faith are also briefly indicated. Humanism is the vantage-ground from which the author takes a panoramic survey of the various religions. Humanism while emphasising science and a healthy attitude towards life fights shy of a belief in God and condemns metaphysics as a "refined and fashionable superstition". It is, in our opinion, an unexamined prejudice to suppose that a rational belief in Deity is logically and necessarily contradictory to science, and a sound metaphysics is, certainly, the backbone of any religion which can have an abiding appeal for man.

D. G. LONDHE

The Gospel of the Peace of Jesus Christ by the Disciple John. The Aramaic and Ancient Slav texts compared and edited by EDMOND SZÉKELY. Translated by EDMOND SZÉKELY and PURCELL WEAVER. (C. W. Daniel Co. Ltd., London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

[By a curious circumstance, after a review of the above book was in the press for our March issue, Mr. Jack Common's estimate of it reached us. As his view differs so considerably from that of the former reviewer, we have decided to include it in this number.—EDS.]

To most of us this work is likely to come as a salutary shock. We have inherited a conception of Jesus shaped most preponderantly by the traditions long ago canonised and accepted by the Churches of the West. That there are other traditions we know as a matter of historical fact, but we have acquiesced so long in their rejection that they mean nothing to us. There is a good deal to be said for reopening the question of their authenticity, however. To-day, in the world of practical affairs at any rate, we no longer insist on the exclusive truth of the Christian revelation ; we are tolerant of other creeds and remain quite unperturbed at the failure of the Christians to become anything more than an influential minority in the British Empire. To be honest, then, we should receive a work of this kind with an open mind.

Some of the texts are familiar, being rival versions of such things as the parable of the Prodigal Son, and the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians I. The parable seems to me very definitely inferior to the New Testament story, and the Pauline passage suffers by the use of the word "love" instead of "charity" —but that is most likely only a question of translation.

The novelties are more interesting. For example, there appears here a doctrine of healing which is much more rationalistic and "practical" than the curing by faith or miracle to which the Bible gives emphasis.

> Seek the fresh air of the forest and the fields, and there in the midst of them shall you find the angel of air. Put off your shoes and clothing and suffer the angel of air to embrace all your body.

That, and the recommendations to fast, to bathe, to eat no meat, and restrain the appetites, represents the simple healing-wisdom which is common to the wise men of so many religions. It is not unlikely that Christ had it. But the early churches were concerned to show that Jesus was the only truth, and to that end, perhaps, they would stress the teachings which seemed most uniquely his, and suppress the common factor where they were able to recognise it. Practical politics then, part of the sterile deifying of Jesus since.

There is also the preaching of a kind of Demeter-cult :—

> I tell you in very truth, Man is the Son of the Earthly Mother, and from her did the Son of Man receive his whole body. ...For you receive your blood from our Earthly Mother and the truth from our Heavenly Father.

There we seem to have a development in the Nestorian Churches of the East which parallels the Mariolatry of the Roman Catholics. Yet if the date assigned to these texts is correct (first century after Christ) then it occurred much earlier than the Western cult. But was it really a part of Christ's teaching which had to be rejected in the interests of Christianity ?

That raises again the question of the authenticity of the texts. Sometimes as in this passage, they seem to me to be their own vindication :—

> And for a long while yet the company sat still [Jesus had just left them] and then they woke in the silence, one man after another, like as from a long dream. But none would go, as if the words of him who had left them ever sounded in their ears. And they sat as though they listened to some wondrous music. But at last one, as it were a little fearfully, said : "How good it is to be here." Another : "Would that this night were everlasting." And others : "Would that he might be with us always. ..." And no man wished to go home, saying : "I go not home where all is dark and joyless. Why should we go home where no one loves us ?" And they spake on this wise,

for they were almost all poor, lame, blind, maimed, beggars...

That incidentally indicates the excellence of the translation, which is so good that we should look forward to the complete edition of the texts (this book contains a fragment only) promised us in the preface.

JACK COMMON

The Fellowship of Reason. By ERNEST THURTLE, M.P. (Watts & Co., London. 6*d*.)

This booklet, by a member of the Rationalist Press Association, appeals to all individuals who unreservedly accept human reason as the one and only guide to Truth, not to fight the battle against religious superstitions single-handed, but "to have the fellowship of an organisation" which stands for the cause of intellectual freedom. Such a "Confraternity of the Faithless", *i.e.*, of those men and women who have discarded "the beliefs which are generally understood as coming within the category of faiths" fulfils two important purposes.

(1) "The edge is taken off their sense of isolation by the knowledge that they are linked up, be it never so loosely with friends who share their views and confront the same sort of problems." (2) "It is only by ordinary men and women banding themselves together in an organisation that they can hope to promote to a maximum extent any common purpose they may share."

Though the influence of orthodox Christianity is steadily waning, "there still remains a great deal of ecclesiastical irrationalism to be overcome". In its impersonal fight against the illogical and immoral dogmas of separative creeds which divide man from man, the Rationalist Press Association has the support of all well-wishers of humanity who regard freedom of thought and liberty of conscience as the birth-right of every soul. Unfortunately the Rationalist (with honourable exceptions) has but transferred *worship* from the religious Church to the fane of modern Science. Eradicating superstition "wherever and whenever it exists and under whatever guise" is a praiseworthy aim. In actual practice, however, this is confined only to the religious sphere, while dogmas questioned or rejected by certain enlightened scientists themselves are blindly accepted as gospel truth. This irrational attitude called forth a deserved protest from a front rank scientist himself. Sir Oliver Lodge thus referred to

> a certain Group to-day who have arrogated to themselves the honourable titles of Rationalist and Free Thinker, who aim at a kind of inverted orthodoxy in a negative direction, who pride themselves on a disbelief in every kind of Theology, and who carry on a sort of war against those who are led by their rationalistic studies in Astronomy and other subjects to speculate on great themes...They have, it seems to me, overshot their mark, and become rather irrational and prejudiced on the other side.

Iconoclasm towards illusions is but the negative aspect of the search for Truth. The denial of the Divinity in man and nature has resulted in a civilisation in which the lower personal animal self is the be-all and end-all of life. This, because the positive step, indicated by reason itself, has not been taken—namely, the search for a philosophy of life, which takes the *whole* of existence into account, satisfying alike the reasoning mind and the intuitive heart of man. Such knowledge is priceless—nay, indispensable—and it has been hidden only from those who overlooked it, derided it, or denied its existence.

N. K. K.

The Stolen Sword. By L. P. JACKS. (Methuen and Co. Ltd., London. 6*s.*)

Suggestive of an ancient morality play and a modern thriller, here is an allegory of rare beauty, remaining in our memory like some form of set jewels, glowing with many significances for our pondering. The tale is laid in the England of to-day, but the two-edged sword, dating from 1407, fought in the battle of Agincourt. It was said to have been accompanied by miracle, and it came to be reverenced by a collector who imagined it to have been with his family since its forging. After his death it was stolen, to be discovered a quarter of a century later by his son in the hand of a statue of St. George, where it was believed to have slain a murderous Bengal tiger.

The son is a distinguished Chinese scholar, convinced of occult doctrines Conceiving a passion for this treasure he declares :

> Beyond all doubt I am a reincarnation of the Flemish armourer who forged my father's sword....I am the maker of the sword and not its keeper only. My mission is to carry it over the bridge of death.

He is a worshipper of his ancestors and strongly feels his father's guidance ; his ardent wish is to have the sword buried with him finally in the depths of the sea.

The story is tense with mystery, for the sword cannot be kept, nor the ultimate purpose accomplished without much wariness and the foiling of intriguing robbers, even becoming the accomplice of murder, when the author asks : " Alas is that not what we all are ? "

The sub-title of the book is " *The Unbroken Covenant* ".

It is said that Dr. L. P. Jacks,—the distinguished editor of *The Hibbert Journal* and clergyman,—has " freely treated certain incidents of his own life, not unconnected with contemporary events ".

To some the sword will symbolize racial duty and Dharma, but here it means more than that, symbolizing the very soul of man, the divine spiritual light which in the depth of his being he is. Regarding our constancy to that, the book repeatedly contains these words : " We are not pursuing a policy : we are keeping a promise."

E. H. BREWSTER

Easter—The Legends and the Fact. By ELEANOR C. MERRY. (The Modern Mystic's Library, No. I. King, Littlewood and King Ltd., London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

This little book is curiously straitened in its scope. To present, out of the wealth of Easter legends, only those which fit a pre-conceived theory reduces the account to propaganda. Even the reader's familiarity with the Biblical account is taken too completely for granted, though a cosmic import is claimed for the resurrection of Christ. Nearly half the book is given to the Grail legend and to Goethe's *Faust,* and an old Irish legend is introduced, apparently to support Ireland's claim as the seat of the original nucleus of religion and culture.

Mrs. Merry urges observing the natural festivals of the year, related both to Nature and the human soul : Spring, when the life of the Earth is streaming out to meet the Sun ; Summer, when Earth reflects the Cosmic Light ; Autumn, a season of " in-breathing of ourselves to know ourselves " ; and Winter, a period of inner concentration of the soul of the Earth, of outer quiescence and inner activity.

Sometimes the propagandist for the Anthroposophical doctrines slips into the woman of intuition and of the singing pen, and then the reader's pulse is quickened by the poignant beauty of a page out of the writer's own experience. Such is her description of her childhood reaction to autumn, which is a wholly satisfying bit of writing.

E. M. H.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

Religion is dear to me and my first complaint is that India is becoming irreligious. Here I am not thinking of the Hindu and Mahomedan or the Zoroastrian religion but of that religion which underlies all religions. We are turning away from God.

—GANDHIJI

The world needs no sectarian church, whether of Buddha, Jesus, Mahomet, Swedenborg, Calvin, or any other. There being but ONE Truth, man requires but one church—the Temple of God within us, walled in by matter but penetrable by any one who can find the way ; *the pure in heart see God.*

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

The methods by which the growing citizens of any State are educated are important to its future ; but they are a matter of life and death to the success or failure of the New Order which Gandhiji, his colleagues and followers, are trying to build at the present hour in India. In this issue besides the discussion on *Hind Swaraj* there is a consideration of an important item of the Wardha Scheme of Education ; in our May number, devoted to Education, some aspects of that scheme were considered. Since then a discussion has been taking place about religious education for Indian boys and girls, and Gandhiji has removed any doubt which need not, but may have, existed in the minds of some sectarian religionists. In *Harijan* for 16th July he writes that—

> Religious instruction in the sense of denominational religion has been deliberately omitted. ... I regard it as fatal to the growth of a friendly spirit among the children belonging to the different faiths, if they are taught either that their religion is superior to every other or that it is the only true religion.

We should add that to teach that would be to teach falsehood. The ideal would be to instruct each child in the beauties of every faith, and not only his own, but prevailing conditions make that impossible. To establish Parsi Schools or Hindu Colleges would be only one degree less untheosophical than to permit, as so many Indians do, the Christian missionary to teach his churchianity to our children. In this field of religious education there is a greater need for instructing parents, teachers and leaders than children.

Hindus have often claimed, and not without a good basis, that they are very tolerant to members of other religions. Parsis also evince a similar tolerance. Muslims and Christians, though belonging to proselytising creeds, are willing to follow the policy of live and let live, in spite of their respective priests and missionaries. But that tolerance is a passive tolerance rooted in ignorance of religions other than their own. The average Hindu is not well-read in the *Koran,* nor the average Parsi in the *Gita* or the *Upanishads,* nor the average Muslim in the *Gathas* and the *Vendidad,* nor the average Christian in the Bibles of any other people. Once in

1925, Gandhiji speaking to a Christian Missionary Conference in Calcutta, stated :

I said to myself, if I were to find my satisfaction through reasoning, I must study the scriptures of other religions also and make my choice. And I turned to the *Koran*. I tried to understand what I could of Judaism as distinguished from Christianity. I studied Zoroastrianism, and I came to the conclusion that all religions were right, but every one of them imperfect. . . .

This is a purely Theosophical position. Wrote Madame Blavatsky in 1888 in her article " Is Theosophy a Religion ? " (U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 1) that all religions " are true at the bottom, and all are false on their surface." She indicated their common source which made them true and also described the process which corrupted them. To solve the problem of religious education for the young, India has to educate her adult population. Men and women of different sects must be shown in the words of H. P. Blavatsky written in 1877 that—

As the white ray of light is decomposed by the prism into the various colours of the solar spectrum, so the beam of divine truth, in passing through the *three-sided* prism of man's nature, has been broken up into vari-coloured fragments called RELIGIONS. And, as the rays of the spectrum, by imperceptible shadings, merge into each other, so the great theologies that have appeared at different degrees of divergence from the original source, have been connected by minor schisms, schools, and off-shoots from the one side or the other. Combined, their aggregate represents one eternal truth ; separate, they are but shades of human error and the signs of imperfection.

Then only there will be on the part of every man not merely passive tolerance but active appreciation of and friendly help for religions other than his own. But till a sufficient number of Indians acquire that faculty it is but right that no religious sectarian instruction be given to the children. And we must not overlook that Gandhiji's scheme of education is shot through and through with moral vitality and ethical *prana*.

[As *Hind Swaraj* by Gandhiji is an Indian publication difficult to obtain in Europe, arrangements have been made and copies will be available at THE ARYAN PATH office, 17, Great Cumberland Place, London, W. 1.]