



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. V

AUGUST 1934

No. 8

GOD AND MODERN DEMOCRACY

In proportion to the love existing among men, so will be the community of property and power. Among true and real friends, all is common; and, were ignorance and every superstition banished from the world, all mankind would be friends. The only perfect and genuine republic is that which comprehends every living being Once make the feelings of confidence and affection universal, and the distinction of property and power will vanish.—SHELLEY.

Of all teachings that which presents a far distant God is the nearest to absurdity. Either there is none, or he is nearer to every one of us than our nearest consciousness of self. An unapproachable divinity is the veriest of monsters, the most horrible of human imaginations.—GEORGE MACDONALD.

The immanence of God and the omnipresence of Deity are generally accepted by religionists, and nowadays by many a scientist also. Yet an examination shows that the concept of omnipresence is understood differently. Thus, the God of the Christian is not present everywhere but only in Christendom; nor is He the very self in man, for the Christian is saved by his faith in the Saviour who died for him some 2,000 years ago. Similarly, Allah is the inspirer of the splendid feeling of brotherliness among the Muslims, but among

them only—for, outside the community all are infidels. Neither an orthodox Christian nor a Muslim would deny that good men and true are to be found in other folds, but he considers himself a chosen one somehow, and he is safe because saved. The Jew too makes a similar claim, as also the modern follower of Zoroaster, very tolerant indeed of other creeds but withal with a smug belief that his is the best and most superior religion.

Shelley who is quoted above was called an Atheist: and verily he was one in a sense, for he was

philosophically logical and showed the moral courage to express his own disbelief in the Personal God of the churches, whom George Macdonald describes as an absurd invention of horrible human fancy. But Shelley was truly a more religious man than many a prelate, and George Macdonald who left the pulpit for the broader profession of letters served the community better thereby.

Purposely we put together the two extracts. If there is any one single belief which hampers the cause of friendship among all peoples it is that in a Personal God. This false notion is mainly responsible for the havoc prevailing in Chistendom and elsewhere. The character of the individual is weakened by a belief in a Personal God and a Prophet-Saviour. A state composed mainly of such believers cannot possibly rise to the status of a true Democracy; nor can it help in cosmopolitanizing the world. On the other hand, a rejection of Deity and the embracing of a thoroughgoing materialism as in modern Russia also must fail in democratizing the international world. Both Fascism and Bolshevism are enslavers of human will and thought, though the former is an ally of religion and the latter rejects it as an opiate. Even the Republics of France and the U.S.A. have not escaped the influence of these two autocracies—that of atheistic materialism aided by science, and that of the Personal God of the priest-ridden religions.

But the day of the orthodox religion is done. Everywhere its place

is being taken by Nationalism which is mainly guided by the economist, the scientist and the sociologist. Even this powerful combination will not succeed in making all mankind friends as Shelley desires, though it may dethrone the monster invented by human folly and priestly fancy. The modern reformer badly needs the study and acceptance of the great fundamental of Indian philosophy—the Immanence of God and *therefore* the solidarity of Man. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of Man must go together; one without the other is a half-truth more dangerous than a lie. Acceptance of the truly philosophical concept of Deity as the very self of man to which George Macdonald refers produces that feeling of love which, according to Shelley, would make all mankind friends. But that God must be really omnipresent, if *universal* Brotherhood is to prevail.

The League of Nations at Geneva has a very useful department of intellectual co-operation which labours for unifying the world of thought with a hope of precipitating co-operative action. Remote and abstract as the subject of God may seem, it is one which has a practical bearing on the affairs of mankind, and therefore, it is worthy of attention by practical reformers whose task is the reconstruction of a shattered world and who aim at establishing peace everywhere. Give people a true knowledge of their own divine nature and the ideal of universal brotherhood is on its way to realization.

A NOTE UPON REINCARNATION

[L. A. G. Strong is three parts Irish and one part West Country English—a fact which will enable the reader to appreciate his article in which reason counters the intuition about Reincarnation. For twelve years he was in the teaching profession but since 1930 he has devoted himself to writing. He has to his credit verse, short stories, three books of criticism, and five novels, of which the most recent is *Sea Wall*.—EDS.]

When, a couple of years ago, a newspaper asked what was my favourite quotation, I gave without hesitating the final three lines of Sir Herbert Warren's Inscription for a Sun-dial.

Thynges diurnalle
Bin a shade
Of eternalle.

These lines have for many years been in the forefront of my mind because they epitomise my outlook upon the universe. To me, the material universe is simply the representation, in terms perceptible to our limited senses, of ideas, facts, and relationships in the infinite. It is a dramatisation of these ultimate facts etc., in terms of three dimensions (or four, if we regard time as a fourth dimension). The objects of which it is composed are not in themselves reality, but the interpretation put by our senses upon that reality: as much coloured by our limitations as human beings, as are the interpretations put by sleepers in their dreams upon noises which they hear without awaking. In the words of the Platonist, Peter Sterry:—

The Creation of the World was a Vail cast upon the Face of God, with a figure of the Godhead wrought upon this Vail, and God himself seen through it by a dim transparency; as the Sun

in a morning, or Mist, is seen by a refracted Light through the thick medium of earthly Vapours.

The philosopher Berkeley once said that physical objects were a sort of universal language in terms of which we apprehended the universe. What we see is not the Thing in itself, but, in this sense, the word for the Thing—with the qualification that it is not detachable, but is our only way of apprehending the Thing in the conditions under which we live. In human language, the word for a thing may become obsolete without affecting our perception of the thing, which we may find in an attic long after the word for it has passed out of use. But a physical object is a "word" in a more fundamental sense. It is not separable: it does not only connote, but *manifests*, what it stands for. The "word" for John Jones, *i.e.*, the physical organism through which John Jones manifests himself to us, is all we can know about him here; and when it becomes obsolete, *i.e.*, when John Jones dies, nothing is left which represents John Jones.

If, then, the objects of the physical world are a representation or a manifestation of reality in certain limited terms, it probably

follows that the space and time by which we are accustomed to measure these objects are likewise not a part of reality, but only conditions under which we apprehend it. In other words, they have no necessary validity outside the special conditions of the physical universe. Here, then, is the first difficulty I encounter in considering the theory of reincarnation. It is a time theory. It seems to presuppose that time outside the physical universe is of the same nature as time inside it. If, that is to say, a given soul is supposed to undergo reincarnation at intervals of a hundred and fifty or two hundred years,* we must assume, if the argument is to have any weight, that the time into which it regresses between those incarnations coincides with or runs parallel to earthly time. This, or so it seems to me, is a great deal more than we have any right to assume. The immediate hostility of the Roman Catholic Church to the theories of Einstein is probably due to the fact that their philosophers have seen that, if time is relative (that is to say, if time measurements as we understand them are valid for this particular part of the universe only), then we have no right to say that a life not subject to these physical conditions (in heaven, hell, purgatory, or wherever it may be supposed to be) comes "after" a life here; and this to

the popular mind would seem to sweep away at once all idea of an "after" life being a reward or a punishment for this one. The same difficulty applies to the theory of reincarnation.

This may seem a far-fetched objection to a theory towards which, at some time or another, every thinking man must feel drawn. I have always wanted to hold the doctrine of reincarnation, because it seems as reasonable to believe in the evolution of the spirit as in the evolution of its material envelope. If the tendency of physical life is to develop in an upward direction, and to become more and more highly specialised in order to cope with its environment, why, considering the economy of nature, should one suppose the spirit to work upon different lines? But the doctrine is in its essence a time theory. Not until quite recently, except in the more or less unregarded *obiter dicta* of a philosopher here and there, has the human conception of time differed or been seriously questioned. Time and space were part of the universe. It is only in the last forty years that there has been any general disposition to regard them as conditions only. The new physics is making it necessary to restate our views upon all psychic matters, and it seems that the time factor will become more important the more deeply these are studied.

* The teaching of the Esoteric Philosophy is that the average time is from 1,000 to 1,500 years; but it depends on the degree of spirituality and the merit or demerit of the last incarnation. But we must not overlook that the condition of the soul after death is entirely *subjective* and therefore it has no knowledge of the passage of time, just as the sleeper is unaware of the passage of time and even in dream-state his conception of time is entirely different, *e. g.*, in a moment of objective time human consciousness experiences events lasting hours and days.—EDS.

Personally, I feel that I want to know more about time before I can examine to my own satisfaction this theory to which I have always been attracted.

Another reason, if not for suspecting the theory of reincarnation, at any rate for approaching it with caution, is its extreme human plausibility. We must in duty bound look with care upon any theory of divine order which seems like wish-fulfilment. It has been observed that immortality is a mask drawn by man over the ugly face of death. In the same way, reincarnation may be a mask drawn over the ugly face of accident. Why should one man be born to luxury and another to rags? Why should one child inherit disease and another perfect health? Obviously the best way out of these tangles, the best explanation with which to justify the ways of God to man, would be to suggest that the soul had a taste of every kind of life. If each of us must run the whole gamut of human fortunes, then, in the last reckoning, it will be impossible to say that one has been favoured above another. I am, of course, stating the theory in its crudest form, if only because the space allotted to me will allow me to go no deeper. My point is that the whole theory of reincarnation has a suspiciously human ring, and, whatever my private feelings may be about it, on rational grounds I should not feel justified—yet—in urging it upon anyone else.

Nor is the so-called evidence in favour of reincarnation very

strong. Most of it, even the most impressive instances, lies open to other explanations. I have even a small hint in my own experience, which I mention only to show how easily it may be explained, if indeed any explanation is thought necessary. From earliest childhood I used to have a recurring nightmare. I would be walking along a road close to Plymouth, with railings on either side, a road of which I had actual daily experience. Presently a vague terror would become crystallised, and I would hear a tremendous rumbling behind me. Looking over my shoulder, I would see that I was being pursued by a succession of enormous wheels, of a kind which I had never seen, except in these dreams. I would try to run away, but be hardly able to move. The rumbling would become louder, the shadow of the foremost wheel would be thrown in front of me, and, just when I was about to be crushed, I would wake up. When I was seven years old, I was taken to stay at a place in the country where there was a water-mill. Seeing the wheel, I recoiled in terror, for it was a miniature version of the wheels that pursued me in my dream. I had never before seen such a wheel, nor any picture of such a wheel, and there was no possible explanation for my dream until I discovered, some years afterwards, that my West Country ancestors on my father's side had, up till a hundred and fifty years previously, owned a water-mill. This instance is too slight really to require any explanation at all, but

I can find three or four perfectly sensible ones which do not involve any necessity for my previous existence.

A really striking incident, quoted by some as an instance of reincarnation, was told me some years ago by Mr. W. B. Yeats—whom, incidentally, it did not impress. A young Hindu girl, when she came of marriageable age, to her parents' consternation refused to consider the question, declaring that she was already married. Her parents thought she must be mad, but she declared with the utmost conviction the name of the man to whom she was married, said where he lived, and described his house in the greatest detail. The place she mentioned was some distance away, but finally her parents, in order to show her that the idea was a delusion, took her there. They found the place, and the house, and an old man bearing the name which the girl had given. The old man did not know the girl at all, but he told them that his wife had died many years ago. The girl, however, persisted in her assertions, described her clothes, ran upstairs to the chest in which they lay, brought them down, and was indignant to discover, from a mark on one of the dresses, that another woman had worn it. She went on to recall any number of incidents, which the old man in growing bewilderment confirmed. Finally she demanded to be left with the old man; but he had now become a Mahomedan, and the Hindu girl who claimed to be his bride was led weeping away.

Such an instance as this lies open to the same criticisms that can be brought against most so-called instances of communication from the dead. It is, first of all, very difficult to exclude the possibility of communication between the girl's mind and a living mind. Yet even this is not necessary. There is a type of phenomenon known as psychometry, whereby a medium can reconstruct, from a physical object which has been in contact with someone whom the medium has never seen, not only a description of that person, but of incidents in that person's past. The only reasonable explanation for this faculty seems to lie in the theory that some sort of chemical record clings to the object in question. We are familiar enough with the belief that "Thoughts are things". The theosophist who sees and reads an aura, and the chemist who is endeavouring to photograph the chemical discharge or effervescence which, as the late Sir Frederick Mott suggested, is given off by thought and emotion, may possibly be confronted by the same phenomenon. I myself, sleeping in a bed for the first time, have been awakened in a violent mental reconstruction of something entirely unknown to me which once took place upon it. There is strong evidence that on such occasions a definite physical or chemical record clings like an odour to various objects, and, under suitable conditions, in contact with a sufficiently sensitive mechanism, repeats itself, calling up, on the analogy of a gramo-

phone record, the ghost of that which caused it. If this is so, (and the evidence for it is very strong), we have yet another possible explanation for such apparent feats of memory as that of the Hindu girl. She need not even be in contact with another mind. Even though no living brain contained the information which she was receiving, she might yet be deriving it from purely earthly sources.

The more one is inclined to believe a theory, the closer and more dispassionate should be one's scrutiny of it. By temperament and circumstances I have personally often been brought near to what, for want of a better term, we call the unseen world. I have strong private reasons for believing in many things which I do not, and dare not, profess publicly, because one's own beliefs, unless supported by rational and unassailable evidence, are no argument. If I tell a man, on unsupported personal testimony, of some thing in which he cannot believe, I do the thing no good, and merely put him in the

embarrassing position of having to decide that I am either a liar or a lunatic. Thus, though, for example, I privately believe that we survive death, I cannot assert that this is so, nor ask anyone else to believe it, because none of the evidence which I have yet seen seems to me conclusive. I agree that, in many of the instances put forward, survival seems a more natural and simpler explanation than any other. But, where any explanation is possible in terms of knowledge we already possess, we have no right to posit knowledge which we cannot yet claim to possess on the same terms. The doctrine of reincarnation, humanly reasonable though it is, and satisfying to our ideas of human justice, seems to me at present to lie open to grave objections, and to be bound up with a possibly obsolete view of the nature of the universe. Whatever my private beliefs, then, I feel in duty bound to state these objections, and regard the theory as not proven.

L. A. G. STRONG

MENACING BARBARIANS OF TO-DAY*

[Leo Chestov, the Russian philosopher, now living in exile, is the author of *In Job's Balances*, *La Nuit de Gethsémani*, *La Philosophie de la Tragédie Dostoievski et Nietzsche*, and other works.

Jean Guéhenno wrote in our issue of last January: "There is, I think, nothing greater in the European consciousness than a certain sense of human dignity. . . . Christianity is dying. Let it die, for it has ceased to nourish our souls."

Count Carlo Sforza wrote in our May number: "The very experiment of Dictatorships has already proved that Liberalism and Democracy are the only ideas still worth saving in European civilization."

Julien Benda, in the June ARYAN PATH, said: "Behold the state of open hostility between the national cultures. . . . European civilization is collapsing day by day before our very eyes! . . . How can we recover it? By restoring . . . the feeling of this universalism of intellectual function and of cosmopolitanism of mind; . . . by calling upon Europeans to honour moral and especially intellectual values."

And now Leo Chestov finds a Tartar under most European skins and adds: "The barbarians who are menacing modern European civilization come from within. . . . The Tartar regards freedom as his undying and most formidable enemy and he devotes all his strength to its suppression. . . . We must save Liberty." But how? "Plotinus was irresistibly impelled towards liberty and independence of mind . . . Plotinus had eradicated the 'Tartar' within himself; . . . his gaze was directed towards Asia as the source of spiritual light."—Eds.]

The nineteenth century was the happiest and most tranquil period in the history of the human race. After the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, until the Great War of 1914–1918, life flowed in a steady current but confined to a channel which seemed to have been dug once for all. There was nothing to foreshadow the dire events we have witnessed during the last two decades. No doubt there were wars and revolutions between 1815 and 1914, but they were soon over and were speedily forgotten. True, also, that all over the world, and especially in Europe and the Americas, an intense social struggle was in progress. We may say without exaggeration that

the social problem was a child of the nineteenth century. Although Karl Marx founded his teachings on the principle that (under capitalism) there was an irreconcilable conflict between the classes, many believed that the unprecedented and marvellous development of industrial technique would serve as a harmonising factor. Many economists, historians, sociologists, and legal experts, as well as statesmen and political theoreticians, were optimistic enough to believe firmly that our institutions were endowed with an assured stability. They believed that the Rights of Man and the Citizen were secure for countless centuries to come. Almost everyone was ready

* Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul from Leo Chestov's original Russian article especially prepared for THE ARYAN PATH.

to hold as axiomatic that the extant social order was safeguarded, not by force (which cannot be trusted, since brute force has no regard for one order or institution more than for another, and the apostles of force do not care whether peace reigns on earth or not), but by man's profound faith in the sanctity and inviolability of the loftiest moral and legal principles. Those who spoke of civilization and its advantages were thinking of the triumph of spirit over force, of mind over matter. There is a saying in the West, "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar." This implies that there is a profound distinction between a Western European and a Russian; that there is no Tartar, no semi-barbarian, hidden beneath the Westerner's skin; that, in the West, civilization has become second nature.

But the Great War burst upon us none the less. Thereafter, one of the first notable utterances of a European* was Bethmann-Hollweg's, when the German Chancellor declared: "A treaty is nothing but a scrap of paper!" This signified that, in his view, morality and law were trifles invented by the simple-minded, and that really force rules the world. Bethmann-Hollweg, though a mediocrity, showed himself to be a prophet. Much that has happened since this "justification" for the Germans' disregard of the neutrality of Belgium has gone to show that

extremely second-rate persons can be prophets. Indeed, for certain kinds of prophecy, the prophet must perforce be narrow-minded. The true significance of the Chancellor's words was, "Scratch me, and you will find the Tartar." A man of subtler and keener intelligence would have avoided "giving the show away". But the remark about "scraps of paper" has become proverbial, like the saying about "Russians and Tartars," and will make Bethmann-Hollweg's name live in history longer than his other words and deeds would seem to warrant.

The Imperial Chancellor set the ball rolling, and since then no one has blushed to proclaim himself a Tartar. Many boast of it. Some even say with pride: "Scratch me as deep as you like, and you will find in me nothing of the European; I am Tartar through and through; Tartar I wish to remain, for thus I shall conquer, which is the chief purpose in life." Such was the spirit of the ancient Romans, who coined the phrase, "Vae Victis". We can easily read the same signification in Hegel's famous dictum, "What is real is rational". Bethmann-Hollweg was not thinking of Hegel when he talked of "scraps of paper," but he might well have quoted the distinguished German philosopher. There was a Tartar beneath Hegel's skin. The Hegelians of the Left, the Marxians, do not hesitate to make their acknowledgments to Hegel, and

* Although *geographically* Russia is part of the European continent, in current parlance Russians distinguish between "Europeans" and themselves. For a Russian, Europe begins at the western frontier of Muscovy.—Translators' Note.

in the preface to the second edition of *Capital* Marx declared himself "a disciple of that great thinker". But the Hegelians of the Right, no less, valued above all in their master his cult of reality, that is to say his genuflection before visible and tangible brute force. Hegel's Philosophy of Spirit was but a fig leaf to hide the non-spiritual lusts of Europeans. When life was running a normally tranquil course, the fig leaf was worn in accordance with the conventions. But as soon as troublous times began, Europeans stripped off this last vestige of clothing, for even the fig leaf had become oppressive.

In very different circumstances, across the Atlantic, kindred phenomena have been discernible. When the Prohibitionists tried to deprive the citizens of the United States of alcoholic drinks, the country rallied like one man to the defence. "At all costs we will keep our whisky!" Within a marvellously short space of time a formidable army of bandits ("bootleggers") was organised to supply the demand for prohibited drinks, and the Government was soon compelled to beat a retreat. It was plain to the whole world that unless the "dry laws" were abolished, the nation would become enslaved to the bandits. Anything, anything, rather than give up whisky.

However paradoxical it may seem, there is an intimate connection between the ideology of Bethmann-Hollweg, which made him describe treaties as "scraps of

paper," and the revolt of the Americans against Prohibition. Neither in Europeans nor in Americans has civilization been able to extirpate the vestige of the primal beast. Man will fight like a tiger for his whisky, but will show very little energy in the defence of the loftiest moral achievements.

Not long ago the civilized world would have been outraged by the way in which average Europeans and Americans are often treated to-day. But, in view of all that we have witnessed of late years, it would be hard to find any one bold enough to deny the statement with which the previous paragraph ends. Noted University professors and celebrated authors may insist that "great ideas" are the motive forces of history; and in *The Philosophy of History* and *The Philosophy of Religion*, Hegel strenuously maintains this thesis. But "wise reality" has made mock of the idealists. Treaties have been torn up by those who found them inconvenient; and Americans organised bandits on behalf of their beloved whisky. In Russia, when the Soviet Government deprived the Russian people of its God (the Bolsheviks restored vodka after a brief period of Prohibition!), there was no movement strong enough to enforce concessions to the religious spirit. The Bolsheviks systematically destroyed churches, shot priests of all denominations—but the Russian people made no sign.

In Germany, following the Bolshevik example and animated by

the cynicism of Bethmann-Hollweg, the Government has declared war on Christianity. Hitler, having learned from Gobineau the supremacy of the Aryan race, has become rapidly anti-Semitic. Can a good German patriot be properly guided by the prophets and apostles who have delivered to the half of mankind the good tidings of the existence of the One All-Powerful God, Creator of Heaven and Earth? Why should he be thus guided? The Bible is a Jewish book. Jesus and Mary, Peter and Paul, were all Jews. Obviously, then, a good German patriot's first duty is to emancipate himself from Biblical doctrines which are alien to the German spirit.

It need hardly be said that anti-Semitism is not a new phenomenon. A few years ago I heard the following remark, uttered in German though not in Germany: "The devil take the two Jews, Jesus and Paul; what we need is pure Christianity, as we received it from the Greeks." But the modern German has no more use for the Greeks than he has for the Jews. He wants to dominate the world. Away, then, with God! Away with the Greek philosophers! It is likely enough that before long there will, to the applause of the crowd, begin another book-burning in Germany, when the Old Testament and New will be committed to the flames, and perhaps also the works of the Greek philosophers whom the Fathers of the Church regarded as the forerunners of the Christian prophets and apostles. The German is ready to sacrifice

his faith, and to jettison spiritual values as he has jettisoned liberty. The matter would not be so simple if he were asked to give up his beer. But no one is trying to deprive him of that!

What is going on in the contemporary world cannot but remind a reflective observer of the period of the barbarian invasions. There is this single difference, however. The barbarians who overthrew Roman civilization came from without; the barbarians who are menacing modern European civilization come from within. Yet it would be wrong to believe (as many believe) that this new "barbarian invasion" is in actual fact likely to sweep away our civilization. It is true that we learn from history and archæology how civilizations, many civilizations, have disappeared almost without leaving a trace. But this happened very long ago, when the population of the world was widely dispersed over the continents in groups of various sizes having little or no connection with one another. Not many centuries ago, what we call the New World was, for practical purposes, as far away from the Europe-Asian mass of land as the moon is from the earth, or the earth is from the planet Mars. To-day, on the other hand, it would be difficult to find upon the surface of the globe a spot so isolated as not to be organically linked with all the rest. If, as the outcome of a geological or historical catastrophe, Europe were to be submerged or put out of action, European civilization would not

thereby be destroyed. There would be preserved in various other regions whatever that civilization has conferred on us. In distant, unimportant, and even backward lands, there are libraries, universities, and museums, etc., in which the acquirements of the human race are preserved and fostered. Not even the most widespread cataclysm could engulf civilization, if we include within the scope of that word the multifarious conquests achieved by man in the different domains of science and technique.

Furthermore, the "barbarians" of whom we are now thinking are by no means inclined to hinder or arrest the normal development of positive science and technique. They understand perfectly well that science and technique are not merely serviceable but are indispensable. Germany has expelled Einstein and many other famous scientists, but the Germans continue to make every possible use of scientific achievements without worrying as to their source. In Soviet Russia, such a man as Pavloff is tolerated though he makes no secret of his dislike for the present regime. Speaking generally, we may say that the more the Bolsheviks rail at bourgeois science and technique, the more busily do they gather honey from the West. It is an open secret that the most remarkable conquests or creations of the Bolsheviks, those with which simple-minded tourists and ostensibly simple-minded foreign statesmen are so much impressed, are effected with

the aid of foreign engineers, in accordance with plans drafted by foreigners, and even with the aid of foreign capital. All that the Soviet Government has contributed is the labour of Russian muzhiks, who were promised an earthly paradise, and have in fact been enslaved. There is, then, no reason for being afraid as to the fate of science and technique. The modern barbarians, like those of old days, will save and will even perfect whatever can contribute to the triumph of brute force.

But, the reader may ask, of what advantage will that be to mankind? Shall we benefit because brute force has constituted itself guardian of the advance of science and technique? Light can be thrown on this question by a very strange phenomenon in the history of nineteenth century thought. A hundred and thirty-six years ago, in Malthus's *Essay on the Principle of Population*, was launched the Malthusian doctrine that man was condemned to penury, and perhaps to extinction, because population tends to increase more rapidly than the means of subsistence. Even John Stuart Mill, an earnest and able economist, accepted Malthus's teaching as correct, and did much to promote the spread of the idea that the human birth rate must be controlled. At the present juncture, however, we are faced by a Malthusianism turned topsy-turvy, for we are told that there is a crisis of over-production, and that over-production is much worse than under-production. Consequently, production is restricted in

various ways, and what has actually been produced is destroyed instead of being used—cereals, coffee, etc., being burned or thrown into the sea in order to get rid of the surplus and to limit supply. This does not mean that all the inhabitants of the world have as much bread or coffee as they want. Far from it! Over-production notwithstanding, vast numbers of persons are in a state of destitution, and multitudes even die of hunger. Unemployment (the modern scourge) has not spared any land, whether in the Old World or the New. But producers continue to destroy grain and other crops, while the out-of-works who are willing to work and vainly seek jobs are fobbed off by being told that it is impossible to escape the iron laws of economics. Who are the would-be consolers, that voice such strange arguments? Who is entitled to disseminate the belief that poor humanity is at the mercy of such iron laws? At the mercy of laws which, in the best event, must lead to dependence and enslavement? The birth rate is so high that the increase in the means of subsistence cannot keep pace with the increase in population—man must be kept in bondage, in the bondage of birth control. Or, production has increased to such an extent that it has outrun the birth rate—the remedy is the same, and human beings must become slaves.

Now, what determines these various inferences? The answer is, I think, obvious, in view of what was written above. We are perpetually confronted with the Tar-

tar, whose only thought is to attain the one ideal he can understand—the triumph of brute force, of physical force, of material force. That is why he prostrates himself before the “iron laws of economics,” since these incorporate his own nature. He believes that what makes Truth true, or makes the Truth the Truth, is nothing but its desire to constrain and its power to exercise constraint.

Let us follow up this line of thought. “The Tartar” is conceived to be an Asiatic. The phrase, “Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar,” implies that Russians are thought of as Asiatic barbarians, and are stigmatised as such. But there is another Western apophthegm which bears a very different significance—“Ex Oriente lux.” Light has come from the East, that is to say from Asia to Europe. Europe has not bestowed upon the world either prophets or apostles. Asia has been the cradle of all the religions, and all the great prophets were born in the East. Historians have good reason for dwelling upon the magnitude of Oriental influence even as concerns the philosophers of ancient Greece. The works of Plotinus, the last of the great Greek thinkers, are a fervent appeal to the enlightened among his contemporaries, imploring them to modify the spiritual conditions of Europe, conditions which were the inevitable outcome of the developmental conditions of the Western world. Although Plotinus did not use the phrase “Ex Oriente lux,” his gaze was directed towards Asia as the source

of spiritual light. Zeller, the famous historian of Greek philosophy, said aptly of Plotinus that he had lost confidence in thought, the thought which the Neoplatonist's brilliant predecessors of all schools had been sedulously cultivating for nigh on a thousand years. Plotinus's celebrated formula, "Beyond reason and reasonable knowledge," and his Testament, in which he refers to the need for "outstripping knowledge," bear witness to the fact that in the middle of the third century of the Christian era European philosophers had become aware of the impossibility of advancing farther along the lines hitherto followed. Mere "thought" no longer sufficed. There was need for "something much more important, much greater, and much more indispensable than thought," something that "would transcend thought". Plotinus's body filled him with shame. He could not endure this reality which has been arbitrarily imposed upon man and which is perennially imposed by what we term daily experience. Already he had come to feel that what men regard as supremely real (that to which Hegel has given the benediction of reason by saying that all the real is rational) is in truth devoid of reality, and should neither be blessed nor loved, but should be cursed and hated.

Plotinus was irresistibly impelled towards liberty and independence of mind. He had come to look upon and to develop philosophy, not as a "discipline," not as "knowledge"—for these always

imply coercion, and coercion is fatal to the life of the spirit—but as a self-existent "absolute". He opened his soul to this truth which, several centuries earlier, had inspired the prophetic genius and the researches of the best incorporators of the spiritual power of Asia. Plotinus had eradicated the "Tartar" within himself. Philosophy signified that the moment had come when European mankind must at length grasp that life is to be maintained, not by brute force, not by visible and tangible coercion, but by liberty, which is an invisible good. The coming of Plotinus and his works coincide strangely (as if fore-ordained) with one of the most mysterious and inexplicable happenings in European history. The omnipotent Græco-Roman world, the Imperium Romanum, a far more extensive State structure than had ever before existed, bringing numberless and widely diversified peoples under its yoke, was now to bow before the truth of a little people among its subjects, weak and universally despised. Europe, strong and civilized, renounced its strength, renounced the civilization founded and maintained by the strong hand, and put its trust in a truth that seemed to provide no safeguards, to be weak, inactive, even illusory—the truth revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Many, many attempts have been made to explain this page of history. Why did all-powerful Rome bow the knee before the feeble province of Judæa, why did glorious Athens abase herself before Jerusalem?

None of the alleged explanations explains anything. So inadequate are they that they leave us asking whether any explanation is possible. I shall not here attempt to solve this everlasting enigma, the fact being that no explanation is forthcoming since the demand for an explanation implies the belief that it is possible to discover a visible, tangible, and measurable force—the very thing which does not exist in the present case, and is therefore undiscoverable.

The mystery becomes intensified when we remember that the “powerless” Biblical revelation gained, not merely one victory over brute force, but two successive victories. The first victory was when the resistance of the Romans was broken, and the second was when the barbarian invasions were stayed. The barbarians, like the Romans, appeared to be all-powerful. They swept away whatever stood in their path, and it seemed as if nothing could resist them. Well, after a fashion the barbarians were victorious all along the line, but in the end the vanquished dictated laws and conditions to the victors. The “Light from the East” began to shine anew upon Europe; and brute force, if it did not lay down its arms, at least retired into the

background. European civilization went on developing under the ægis and in the spirit of Holy Writ.

To-day the “Tartar” hidden away beneath our European skins shows signs of reanimation. I have already said that this Tartar is making no attempt to invalidate the conquests of science and technique. He is instinctively aware that neither science nor technique is fundamentally hostile to him. On the contrary, they can both serve him as trusty allies. What is most dangerous to him, what he hates most, is neither science nor technique, but that which has been revealed to man in the Scriptures, that which has been bestowed on us by religion; the understanding and the love of liberty—the liberty of others no less than one’s own. The Tartar regards freedom as his undying and most formidable enemy, and he devotes all his strength to its suppression. Here, then, we reach the answer to the question: “what is worth saving in modern civilization?” We must save what is most seriously imperilled, must do so because it is imperilled, and because it forms the very essence of civilization.

We must save liberty.

L. CHESTOV

DIONYSUS IN MODERN LIFE

[Though issues of political economy are generally considered as of supreme importance, for by them civilization is said to be shaped, a growing number of thoughtful people regard the problem of our age to be psychological and moral. The effects of the nineteenth century materialism are not worn out, and their influence is visible on the ethical outlook of to-day. Shall the man of senses let himself go and live out his life as a candle, or shall he as a soul control and purify the flesh and transform his body into a Living Temple? These two extremes are represented in the Myth-Mystery of Dionysus—once a Pure God whose degradation was brought about by human frailty and weakness; this is described in the first of the following articles.

The dual application of this myth is represented by two articles which follow—one recommends the life of “free happiness” while the other expounds the view that “doing what we like” is a slave’s conception of freedom.

The fourth and final article of the Series offers help and guidance to the man in the street, whose intuitions warn him against sense-exuberance but whose mind somehow revolts against rigid asceticism, and who wants to tread the Middle Way.—EDS.]

I.—THE MYTH OF DIONYSUS-BACCHUS

[M. Oldfield Howey is the author of *The Horse in Magic and Myth*, *The Encircled Serpent*, and *The Cat in the Mysteries of Religion and Magic*.—EDS.]

To comprehend the occult significance of the Myth of Dionysus-Bacchus it is necessary to recall to our minds its ancient, storied past, commencing with that of its originators, the Chaldean astrologers and diviners who lived in Babylon during the earliest times of which we have record and taught the Babylonians the “Mysteries,” the sacerdotal language, and their religion.

The Chaldeans were a tribe of the Akkadians who descended from the Hindu-Brahmans, now known as Aryans. The nomad Akkadian tribes introduced the conception of Bacchus-Dionysus to the Western world from its birthplace in Indian thought. Dionysus is the god Dis from Mount Nysa, and when Bacchus is pictured as crowned with ivy, or *kissos*, the allusion to Christna,

one of whose names was *Kissen*, can easily be recognised. At least when enthroned as the omnipotent Dionysus Zagreus, “the highest of the gods,” Bacchus is unquestionably of Hindu origin. This is confirmed by the Grecian poet, Euripides (*circa* B. C. 480), who says that Dionysus came from India to Greece, where he was reverently regarded as second only to Zeus, whilst the Theban poet Pindar (*circa* B. C. 520) stresses his equality and harmony with the Father of the gods, asserting that “Father Zeus governs all things, and Bacchus he governs also”.

This lofty and mystical conception of Bacchus-Dionysus as identical with the abstract deity of Grecian thought, enables us further to realise his essential unity with Osiris, the great God of Egypt, Son of Seb, celestial fire, and

of Neith, primordial matter and infinite space; the self-created, self-existent God, the first manifesting deity, and in this we are again confirmed by Euripides. Of the many ideations of the Supreme God, the Egyptian is the grandest and most suggestive, for within it is contained the whole scope of physical and metaphysical thought. Osiris being imaged as a solar god, the twelve signs of the Zodiac were personified as minor gods who reigned beneath his sway. According to Diodorus, like Dionysus, Osiris was brought up in Nysa* and was the son of Zeus, and named after his father (nominative Zeus, genitive *Dios*,) and the place "Dio-Nysos," *i.e.*, the Zeus or Jove of Nysa.

The initiated Jews worshipped Bacchus-Dionysus-Osiris under the name of Jehovah, Yava, or Iao, the secret title of the Phœnician Mystery God, which the Chaldeans had used to designate the Creator: and we may read in "Exodus" xvii, 15, that "Moses built an altar and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi," which Kabalistically is "Dio-Iao-Nysssi," thus proving that the god of Sinai or Nyssi, was known indifferently by the titles of Bacchus, Osiris, and Jehovah.

But when "Osiris, the collective unit," is differentiated and personified, he assumes many apparently opposing aspects, and is seen not only as Horus, his radiant sun-god son, but also as Typhon, the black shadow of himself, the material realization of the universe projected by his creative thought. Thus,

if regarded as Bacchus, when viewed exoterically and superficially, he is the god of wine, and drunkenness, and licentious pleasure, whilst Jehovah is degraded to be the sensual, jealous, malignant, tribal god of the Jews.

It was the dark and exoteric aspect of the cult of the disintegrated, personified attributes of the Deity that appealed with special force to the masses of the Jewish people, and this differed so profoundly from the esoteric creed we have been considering, that we shall scarcely be open to controversy if we describe it as an antagonistic religion. The two aspects made their appeals respectively to the cultured and uncultured sections of the Jews. These were further divided by difference of descent. The plebeian Israelites were of Canaanite and Phœnician origin, and to them the dark aspect of Osiris as Typhon became identified with their limited, racial idea of the phallic sun-god whom their primitive forefathers had worshipped under the various titles of Bacchus, Baal or Adon, Iacchos-Iao or Jehovah.

The Chaldean initiates throughout the ages continued to hold the golden key of the symbology that veiled the religion of Bacchus-Dionysus-Osiris from irreverent eyes, and in spite of bitter persecution, continued ever faithful to its spirit. Though scattered in every nation, their headquarters always remained in Babylon and Chaldea. To their cult belonged the Chaldean kabalists known as the *Nazars* (*i. e.*,

* Diodorus places Nysa between Phœnicia and Egypt.

"set apart") or "Sons of the Prophets," the law-giver Moses, the theurgists, whose function it was to evoke the gods during the celebration of the Mysteries, and the initiated prophets. So strong was their opposition to the idolatrous and exoteric materialism that was the leading characteristic of the "chosen people" of Jehovah-Bacchus that they might easily be regarded by an outsider as an anti-Bacchus caste, but a closer investigation proved that they were followers of the esoteric and higher ideal of the ancient god. Their assemblies were held in secret in Nazara, the modern Nazareth, and at them they celebrated the initiation ritual which was named by them the "Mysteries of Life". In this the spiritual significance of the symbolism was made apparent to accepted candidates by the hierophant initiator.

The law of the Nazarite who "separateth himself unto the Lord," is described with much detail in the sixth chapter of Numbers, and we may recognize the ritual and laws of the Priests of Bacchus, and his feminine aspect Ceres, in the commandments given to Moses by the "Lord". It is impossible to overlook the significance of the strict taboo of "the vine tree, from the kernels even to the husk," and the offering that must be made of "a basket of unleavened bread, cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, and wafers of unleavened bread," together with the permission that when the "wave offering" had been made "before the Lord after that the Naza-

rite may drink wine". The identity of the Hebrew Nazars with the hierophants of Bacchus-Dionysus is yet further emphasized by the ritual abstinence and purity so strongly insisted upon by the latter before the celebration of the Mysteries wherein the wine represented Bacchus, and the bread Ceres. The goddess was the personification of the female productive principle which was conceived of as pervading the passive or material elements of the earth that, when united with the active or spiritual, became the cause of the organisation and vivification of its substance. The candidate partook of the wine and bread as token that within himself the Divine Spirit was about to quicken his lower nature through the revelation of the Sacred Doctrine. In the Eleusinian mysteries known as the Anthesteria, or Feast of Flowers, the necessity of purification was yet further stressed, and after the usual rite of Baptism had been performed in the temple lakes, the new initiates were made to pass through a gate which was known as "the gate of Dionysos," and of "the purified".

The sublimer scenes in the Mysteries were invariably enacted in the night time to emphasize that "the life of the interior spirit is the death of the external nature; and the night of the physical world denotes the day of the spiritual". "The one Universal Light, which to Man is Darkness, is ever existent," says the Chaldean Book of Numbers. Dionysus, the night-sun, is therefore the divinity adored, rather than Helios, lord of day.

But these mystic celebrations of initiation which unfolded the inner significance of the sacred doctrines to the reverent and adoring aspirant must not be confused with the popular Mysteries celebrated at Byblus in honour of Adonis. We may glean from "Ezekiel" (ch. viii) a vivid idea of the nature of these latter, orgiastic "abominations". He tells us that he was "brought in the visions of God to Jerusalem" from "the land of the Chaldeans" (i. 3), and there saw, standing before the idols "portrayed upon the wall," seventy of the senators of the house of Israel. The Lord enquired of him: "Son of man, hast thou seen what the ancients of the house of Israel do in the dark?" He also showed him how, at the gate of the Lord's house, "there sat women weeping for Tammuz" (Adonis), and—

at the door of the temple of the Lord, . . . were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east; and they worshipped the sun toward the east. Then he said unto me, . . . Is it a light thing to the house of Judah that they commit the abominations which they commit here? for they have filled the land with violence. . . . (viii, 16-17)

Ezekiel was appalled by the degradation of the "chosen" people and it would be difficult to imagine that any "Pagan" cult had ever surpassed it. The prophet speaks guardedly, and often veils his meaning with allegory, but here his righteous indignation escapes, with tumultuous threatenings of the wrath to come: "Therefore will I also deal in fury: mine eye

shall not spare, neither will I have pity: and though they cry in mine ears with a loud voice, yet will I not hear them." (viii, 18).

David, the king of Israel, described as "a man after his (the Lord's) own heart" (I Sam. xiii, 14), also paid homage to the degraded phallic aspect of Jehovah-Bacchus, when he danced nude "with all his might" before the "ark of the Lord" that symbolised the *yoni*, or womb of Nature. His predecessor's daughter's sarcastic reproof: "How glorious was the king of Israel to-day, who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants," only caused him to exclaim:—

It was before the LORD, which chose me before thy father, and before all his house, to appoint me ruler over the people of the LORD, over Israel; therefore will I play before the LORD. And I will yet be more vile than thus, and will be base in mine own sight: and of the maidservants which thou hast spoken of, of them shall I be had in honour. (II Sam. vi, 21, 22).

The Ark, which David worshipped with Bacchic frenzy, was the Jewish representation of the Ark of the Chaldean Noah, "The Universal Mother," the Ship of Life, who carried in her fertile womb the germs of all that lived, throughout the boundless Sidereal Ocean. It was the sacred *Argha* of the Hindus, and was symbolised by the Ark of Noah, and the Ark of the Covenant; the oblong vessel used by the high priest as a sacrificial chalice in the worship of Isis, Astarte, and Venus Aphrodite (all of whom were goddesses of the generative powers of Nature) embodied the

same idea. From this it will be clear that the Jewish initiates had knowledge of the "Wisdom-Religion" and universal language, and its symbols. "With the ancient Aryans the meaning was grandiose, sublime, and poetical" but the "stiffnecked," "chosen," Semitic people dragged all down to their own low level of gross realism and sensuality.

We are now in a position to understand the contemptuous hatred of the Nazarenes, the descendants of the Old Testament Nazars, for the orthodox Jews, who adhered to the exoteric Law of Moses, and their bitter taunt that this sect of the "chosen" are actually the worshippers of Iurbo Adunai, or Bacchus-Jehovah, the impure, material and jealous god that Ezekiel had so scathingly denounced. This is the deity referred to in the prohibition in the Codex of the Nazarenes: "Thou shalt not worship the Sun who is named Adunai." The allusion is clearly painted by the prophecy that follows it:—

This Adunai will elect to himself a ration and congregate *in crowds* (*i. e.*, his worship will be exoteric) Jerusalem will become the refuge and city of the *Abortive*, who shall perfect themselves (circumcise) with a sword and shall adore Adunai (*Codex Nazaræus*, i, 47,).

Madame Blavatsky says:—

Were we to suggest, that the Hebrew *nazars*, the railing prophets of the "Lord," had been initiated into the so-called Pagan mysteries, and belonged (or at least a majority of them) to the same Lodge or circle of adepts as those

who were considered idolaters; that their "circle of prophets" was but a collateral branch of a secret association, which we may well term "international," what a visitation of Christian wrath would we not incur! (*Isis*, II, 140)

Yet it is easy enough to demonstrate that the Christian fathers in their zeal to confine the new wine of their doctrine to the old wineskins of Judaism, and so avoid Paganism, but burst the worn bottles, and proved them to be already filled with the familiar mythology of the ancient faiths. The Christian of to-day is the inheritor of the semi-barbarous Israelites of ancient epic; not of the Hebrews of the period of Roman governance under the Heroës, who, with all their shortcomings, remained strictly monotheistic and orthodox, but of the Jews, who under the title of Jehovah-Nissi worshipped Bacchus-Osiris, Dio-Nysos, and the multiform Jove of Mount Nyssa, the Sinai of Moses, in their debased exoteric, disintegrated and material aspects.

"All the gods of the nations are devils,"* (*Psalm xcvi*, 5), exclaimed David, and his own standard of theology makes his attitude comprehensible. The popular gods of exoteric cults, the Baal-Adonis or Jehovah-Bacchus, worshipped with impure rites in debased mysteries, are but the distorted shadows of the true Deity. The Christian churches, blindly adhering to the exoteric interpretation, like David transformed all the ancient gods into demons, and failed to realise that

* A. V. "idols".

in the Bacchus myth was concealed, not only the vindication of "the gods of the nations," but the clue to the enigma of their own lauded deity, Jehovah of Sinai, who required "the strong wine to be poured" in "the holy place" as a drink offering unto himself. (Numbers, xxviii, 7). "The great universal symbols were universally distorted," yet beneath the exoteric fables of Purānas and Bible is concealed more wisdom than in all the exoteric facts and science of the literature of the world, and H. P. Blavatsky writes that "once the *Jehovistic* portions are eliminated, the Mosaic Books are found full of purely occult and priceless knowledge." (*Secret Doctrine* I, 335-6)

It is possible to trace how the cult of Jehovah-Bacchus was prepared and adapted by Ezra, that "ready scribe in the law of Moses" who "went up from Babylon" (Ezra, vii, 6), from the Chaldeo-Akkadian account of sacred history for its later culmination in the Christian creed, but we have not space to follow the modifications of the intervening period here; suffice it that the centuries bring us to the Christian era.

Jesus was a Nazarene reformer and innovator who preached the philosophy of Buddha-Sakyamûni, and his doctrine constituted for the orthodox Jews a heresy within a heresy, since as we have seen even the older Nazars were not really followers of the Hebrew religion, but a class of Chaldean theurgists. The object of Jesus's teaching was clearly like that of Gautama-Buddha to bring about a religious

reformation that should bestow on mankind a true knowledge of ethical principles which before had been strictly confined within the esoteric sects. Accordingly he taught the ideal of a spiritual God whose temple is within the heart of man, in whom we live and move and have our being, and upbraided the lawyers with having "taken away the key of knowledge" (Luke xi, 52).

It is noteworthy that the Christian priesthood applied one of the most ancient names of Bacchus, IHΣ, to Jesus, and, as if unaware of its true significance, actually misinterpreted it as *Iesus Hominum Salvator*, and *In hoc signo*. When Jesus took the wine-cup and said: "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood" (Mathew xxvi, 27-28), he was speaking in the metaphorical language of the Mysteries. He assimilated himself with the vine that bore the grape, the juice or "blood" of which became the wine. In mystical terminology the priestly initiator was known as "Father," and Jesus wished to initiate others, as he himself had been initiated. His "Father" was the husbandman, himself the vine, his disciples the branches, but he warned them against taking his words in a literal sense, saying: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing."

Yet more and more does the weight of evidence adduced by comparative theology oblige us to realise that the consistent aim of Jesus, the initiate of the inner sanctuary, was to reveal to the ignorant and fanatical people the

gulf existing between the Great God, the mysterious and never-named Iao of the ancient Chaldean and later Neo-Platonic initiates, and the Hebrew Yahuh, or Yaho (Jehovah-Bacchus). Had time not been denied him to overcome the hardness of his hearers' hearts, the cruel era of Christian wars and bloody persecution of sect by sect need never have been. But fear of "the wine of the wrath of God" (Rev. xiv, 10) on one hand, and the "great wrath" of the devil (Rev. xii, 12) on the other, ever instigated Christians to new atrocities, and blinded their eyes to spiritual light, until the Church became fittingly symbolised as "the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (Rev. xvii, 6).

Small wonder can we feel to-day that the vices attributed to Paganism by slanderous critics are everywhere current among Christian Fathers and Christian Churches who persist in the worship of Jehovah-Bacchus, the Lord whom David likened to "a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine" (Psalms lxxviii, 65). From the devotees of this crassly material deity the mysteries are more and more deeply veiled. "Take the wine-cup of this fury at my hand," he commands Jeremiah, "and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it. And they shall drink, and be moved, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among

them. . . . Say unto them, thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more." (Jer. xxv, 15-16, 27)

The karmic results of the worship of Jehovah-Bacchus are overwhelming in chaos the material civilizations of to-day. Still must we lament with Isaiah that

The new wine [of the mysteries] mourneth, the vine languisheth. . . . There is a crying for wine in the streets; all joy is darkened, the mirth of the land is gone (Isaiah xxiv, 7,11).

The unenlightened people remain an "evil and adulterous generation" whom even "the men of Nineveh" have the right to condemn (Matt. xii, 39,41). The tragedy of Prometheus bound by the Olympic tyrant, sensual Zeus (Jehovah-Bacchus), is enacted daily by suffering humanity; the lower passions chain the higher aspirations to the rock of matter where the vulture of agony and remorse tears its very vitals. "Is there no way of escape?" we cry. "Yes" replies the Holy Spirit within the heart of man. Even in this terrific emergency, the eternal Law of Spiritual development is tending always to adjust contraries, and produce the final harmony of religious outlook, which shall reveal the uncorrupted, immaterial image of the Spirit of Being, Dionysus, the Pure, the Holy and the Good, and lead the peoples of the earth to the Golden Age of Love, and Joy, and Enlightenment.

M. OLDFIELD HOWEY

II.—THE DIONYSIAN RELIGION

[Llewelyn Powys, author of *The Pathetic Fallacy*, *Impassioned Clay*, and *Earth Memories*, recently said that "in New York I have been turned away as useless from employment bureaus, and know what it is to drink coffee out of a common mug". His article is a commentary on his faith: "For the sake of society we have need to curb our instinctive and natural wishes but this discipline has been carried to absurd lengths. The measure of our freedom is our consciousness. The great secret is to let our minds roam free over every aspect of life, and hold to poetry, to the poetry in life, for this is a religion that nobody can find untrue."—EDS.]

Not long ago an article of mine provoked the following protest from a friend:—

You say the churches stand between us and our vision of the true Jesus. I quite agree . . . Jesus forgave the woman taken in adultery, though the law of Moses condemned her. He broke Moses' law about the Sabbath. He may be said to have pointed out the impossibility of chastity by saying that every man that looketh on a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery with her. Jesus, like Dionysos, of whom he was probably another incarnation, was a Wine God. He turned water into wine at Cana, and the wine into God at the Last Supper. He was known as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and harlots. His sacrament is almost precisely the same as that left to his disciples by Dionysos, only more human. Why should we oppose him rather than try his teaching first, and secondly, try to make others understand it and so Christianize the unbelievers, and even those more difficult people the Christians.

This letter set me once more meditating upon the similarity and difference between the Christian and the Dionysian cults, between these two imaginative deities who have had so memorable an influence upon Europe. Out of the fecund earth the race of men arose rank protagonists, moon-mad, sun begotten, their fleeting stay above ground be-

wildered by the violence of their emotions, by the ineffectual ratiocinations of their leaf-light brains. Their distracting predicament quickened their spirits to invent dreams of redemption. In every race, in every land these religious interpretations have sprung up, and the figure of Jesus and the figure of Dionysos have undoubtedly represented centres of worship for two very significant streams of religious philosophy.

There exists a persistent legend that the mysterious Nysa where the nymph suckled Dionysos in a cave, is actually situated on the bank of a tributary of the river Jordan, not far from the city of Beisan in Palestine. It is possible, therefore, that not only on the spiritual plane, as my friend suggests, but on the physical plane as well, by a natal chance of actual geographical proximity, these two Gods of human liberation may be closely associated. I like to think it is so. I like to think that the wild sensitive spirit of Jesus, and the wild sensitive spirit of Dionysos were both of them incarnate upon the same parcel of Syrian soil, that they both saw the sun rise and set over a similar landscape as they played by day; and after darkness

had fallen, lay in the arms of their mothers intent to listen to the voices of the night.

There is however very little that can really be said in support of my friend's contention. It is perhaps true that Jesus shared with Dionysos the gift of prophecy, shared with him an impatience with human bigotry, and like him could upon occasions display the unpredictable temper of a God. But there the convergence of the two ends. The teaching of Jesus in its ultimate essence is more subtle, more sophisticated, more decadent and, with all reverence be it said, more subversive to human happiness. The Apollonian ideal of moral order, of intellectual enlightenment, of sanity, has been less dangerous. One recalls the words of the Chinese philosopher: "It is necessary to respect spiritual beings and at the same time to keep out of their way." Jesus through his idealism, through the example of his personal heroism, sought to exorcise for ever the despair men feel on discovering that the grass-fields of their familiar earth hide cracks and gulfs of horror. He called upon his followers to bring redemption to life by denying life, to save their souls by losing them; and not only was earth-life repudiated by him on the score of its darker secrets, but also on account of its lure "of things too sweet".

The Dionysian guidance, the Dionysian art of life, was simpler and braver. This Aryan God, hailing ultimately from the far north and immediately from Thrace, taught that the recoil

from lurking terror can only be resolved by a still more abandoned acceptance of the vital principle. The true Dionysian spirit endeavours always to become one with the very Yggdrasil root of existence so greatly to be feared, so greatly to be adored. It does not attempt to undertake the impossible task of controlling life after the Apollonian tradition, still less does it turn aside from life after the Christian manner. It ratifies life, embraces life, and aims through ecstasy of worship to become identified with the reality behind matter, behind the shivering wave lengths of the objective universe; to become one with that mysterious stir that first troubled the inanimate. In those moments when the authentic transport, the true Dionysian rapture has taken possession of a man, all is forgotten. He is verily God-full and shares with the cat the glare of her green eyes, and with the mouse, already damp with her spittle, the ecstasy of martyrdom. Then when the madness is over, when the enthusiasm has passed, there follows in the lull, in the succeeding hush "of the silence of the Bacchae," the most strange, the most precious of all religious experiences, when in a state of mystic quietude the worshipper meditates with imagination, with compassion, upon the thronging irresponsible dream presented to his day-by-day senses. There exists always an undying antithesis between the regular and the irregular, between the ordered and the disordered; and although in practice it is incumbent upon all

civil spirits to engage in the hopeless struggle against stupidity, injustice and cruelty, we can still preserve with edification an area of secret conviction, an area of personal affirmation of the more oblique, the more implacable metaphysic.

Whenever we separate ourselves from nature we do so at our peril. The restrictions, however necessary they may be, imposed upon our free happiness by society are in themselves pernicious, and when we add to them the gratuitous restraints of ascetic persuasions the health and generosity of the strongest soul is in jeopardy. Any inordinate forcing of selflessness defeats its own end, for a stage is reached when the outraged person will turn upon himself, upon others. In the religion of Dionysos this tension finds relief. When the satyr train left "their brooms and cold mushrooms"; when the Bacchae, thyrsus in hand, danced with heads thrown back; when the wise Silenus was on foot behind the triumphant leopard-drawn chariot, civilized ceremony was annulled, discounted under a blithe and blessed dispensation. Once more the flood gates of nature were open and for a time within a time the world was happy. It was not for nothing that the ancients named India as the country of his most important conquest, India that more than any other earth-land has harboured thoughts recreant to the sun.

At any moment a Dionysian neophyte may in a state of exultant consciousness be in communion with the vital leap which exists

beyond and below all human commitments. Yesterday as I came along a lane in April sunshine I experienced the perennial thrill. It came to me with so common a spectacle as nettles growing in the ditch and smelling rough in the new heat of the spring, of nettles, unknown in heaven, thrusting themselves up through the cow parsley and Lords and Ladies with all the wilful assurance of the vegetable world at the approach of a new season.

Dionysos was essentially a vegetable God. His life, they used to say, was in "the sap and bark"; and in our time his unstable influence is still suggested by the more wanton growths of the open country, by the sprawling trailer of the blackberry, by the vigour of the throttling ivy, and by the gnarled and contorted vine stump out of which the images and idols of the God used to be carved. These vegetable growths, then, are his most apparent symbols suggesting the bountiful aspect of his religion that leads our minds to a comprehensive acceptance of a condition of intense poetic sensibility which recognises as sacramental the plain food of our nourishment—brown meat, yellow honey, bread, and above all wine.

It would seem that intoxication was not used by his followers as a substitute in the Freudian sense, but rather as a positive instrument of grace through the use of which life could be experienced more abundantly, all the manifestations of the physical world being then seen through "divine eyeballs".

We have here the highest reward of the Dionysian mood, the power it can exert to stir men out of their congenital lethargy, out of their gross habit of accepting existence with the blank unilluminated stare of the use-and-wont besotted.

Such blindness is not possible to those who follow in the train of "mad Dionysos" and his nurses, who follow in the train of him "who lives in the tree". For as that man of many mischiefs, Plato, said "the madness sent by God is better than the moderation of men". No higher function is possible to religion than to evoke an enraptured contemplation of the mystery of existence here on earth. During these inspired states dolour is dissipated and our petty preoccupations are vanquished. True religion derives directly from the sense of awe natural in man at his first wakening to consciousness. "Shall things of dust the God's dark ways despise?"

There was and is a valuable secret in the orgiastic tradition of this God of the snake and of the bull. Civilized society has not been satisfied to subject our individual desires to its service, but apprehensive of the insubordinance of abstinence, it has set about deliberately to disparage sensuality, to belittle the delirium of carnal delight, wilfully coercing it to minister to its ideal of submissive domesticity. With this cardinal consummation of man's life decried, it is small wonder that the faces in our streets are careworn and bitter, so that it has come to seem almost a mockery to mention this deity of the gleam-

ing grape cluster. The Dionysian spirit gives its blessing to every declaration of freedom, it stands in stubborn opposition to all fine spun theories of idealistic teaching, in stubborn opposition to the machinations of every time imprisoned mind. Wherever two or three are gathered together in liberty, in happiness, there is present the God-like figure of Dionysos. He is the deity who brings to man the greatest wisdom, teaching him to turn back to nature, to turn again to natural joy, to drink, to laugh, to dance, with free mind. What can we do better than to cast ourselves before this great Nature God, accepting the presence of cruelty and ugliness as inseparable from being, recognising them for what they are, and yet continuing our laudations of life, of life for its own sake, with an infatuated trust? There is no more deadly enemy of the lust for power, of the lust for empire, that curse of the human race, than the Dionysian compassion, the Dionysian happiness, the Dionysian generosity and strength. This Dasyllios, the dweller in the thickets, this Agrionios, the ruthless one, puts us into a state to accept all the riot of the visible. With our sight purged by his exultation we can experience God-like excitement from the simplest spectacle, from the crafty look on the physiognomy of an owl peering down at us from its beam stool, from the feckless life of gaudy butterflies flitting from flower head to flower head.

To meditate continually upon the handiwork of the Sun, "whom

men call Dionysos," we can do nothing better. There is no cry that approximates more nearly to the voice of the spirit of the earth, to the voice of the spirit of all that moves over the face of the earth than the terrible "goat cry" of this suffering and debonair God. From the forests it rises, from the vineyards, from the rustling corn fields, reaching up to the furthest stars whose light has turned red with age. "O Dionysos, in no wise endured by mortals." It is a cry charged with thought beyond the scrupulous reason, with thought born of the senses, of the more errant emotions, the cry of the pagan body of the planet, explicit of terror, explicit of ecstasy. How in the height of summer, at the time of the solstice, the thick-grown hayfields, the tangled festooned hedges,—the most inconspicuous meadow corner decked as for a gala—put us in mind of this ancient adoration, fill us with the assurance that Dionysos will come again, will return to earth once more with his fox-maidens swarming about his triumphant car! To be utterly possessed by the delicacy and vigour of the vine, to surrender ourselves utterly to this consciousness that surpasses consciousness—this is our largest release. It is a religion that can never die. It has in it a natural solace for the yearning of the human heart. For this reason it was strong enough to force its acceptance upon the temperate Greeks. At first the Hellenic mind found difficulty in assimilating its wild rout. Eventually, however, it came to share equal honours

with the cult of Apollo, as is proved by the huge stone at Delphi with these words carved upon it "Here lieth the body of Dionysos the son of Semele." What trust can we have in priestcraft? It is not true. Dionysos, with his race of "worthless, idle satyrs," can never die.

By his own joy I vow

By the grape upon the bough.

This faith lies below Christianity, below science. It is as much opposed to transcendental values as it is to matter-of-fact values. Always it draws its indestructible power from the senses. It acclaims the glory of life as revealed to the flesh of man. In the face of all ultimate issues it is profoundly sceptical, profoundly disillusioned. At the best our difficult compromises are inconsequently ephemeral, comparable to the thriftless applications of gnats, which doomed instantly to an ignominious extinction whirl through a twilight air above a swiftly flowing river without dykes or weirs. What has happened to all those heroic causes of the past for which so much human blood has been shed, and for the achievement of which so much human passion has been expended? The most selfless magnanimities, together with the most despicable villainies, all have been swept away, all have been forgotten. The evening of the crucifixion did not stay for one single second the untiring procedure of manifold nature. The hyæna with hind-quarters slouched came slinking that night over the dusty hillside to sniff after the buried brown bones of a punctilious Pharisee;

the mangled Palm Sunday ass brayed at the Mount of Olives as indifferently she turned her grey head towards the heap of fodder piled high in the corner. On a battle-field where a thousand men lie dead or mutilated, the dandelions and buttercups patiently, punctually close their petals at the going down of the sun. The basic structure of earth life is subject to an appalling precipitation. The religion of Dionysos accepts this fact, makes no pretence that it is otherwise. Its votaries are content to celebrate existence without exacting reservations, to worship the unthinking omnipotent force with inebriate fervour as the red sap of

confident life pours through their veins.

If once we have given ourselves to this redeemed vision then we can afford to tamper with our preconceived moralities. For every day through an open window, in a city street, or on the high road, we shall hear the unmistakable immortal cry, fortifying our infirm bodies, scattering our ghostly mistrusts, and compelling us to acknowledge the triumph of disobedient life. In so far as we succeed in impressing each one of our experiences with the Dionysian spirit we shall be happy. This is the test, the ultimate loyalty.

LLEWELYN POWYS

III.—SELF-RESTRAINT VERSUS SELF-INDULGENCE

[**Claude Houghton** is a novelist with a message, about whom Mr. Geoffrey West wrote in our issue of August 1933.—EDS.]

That is the title of Mr. Gandhi's book.

Given another author, we should pick it up feeling that we could hazard a fairly accurate guess as to its contents. After all, most of us have heard quite a lot about Self-Restraint, and know quite a lot about Self-Indulgence. A book with this title, therefore, does not come to us in any questionable shape. It looks familiar enough. We feel there's no harm in glancing at it.

But the fact that Mr. Gandhi is its author gives Western readers pause. We have all heard of him. His lightest word, his most trivial act, is News—world News. Con-

sequently we all have very definite opinions concerning him. These opinions vary fantastically, it is true, but each is definite. We may regard him as an Agitator, or a Madman, or a Charlatan, or a Legend, or a Mahatma,—but, whatever it is, it starts with a capital letter.

And now we find that this great Figure has written a book. And he has called it Self-Restraint versus Self-Indulgence. We don't like the sound of that too much—particularly when we remember that he does not smoke, or drink, or eat meat; that he fasts frequently, and believes in the doctrine of non-resistance to evil.

So, if we pick up the book at all, we do so gingerly.

Even so, shocks await us, for—to most Western readers—this volume will seem more like a bomb than a book. And that statement is soon proved by summarizing certain of the Mahatma's contentions. Mr. Gandhi holds:—

A. that sexual indulgence for its own sake is not a human necessity.

B. that men must cease to indulge their animal passions after the need for progeny has ceased.

C. that sexual enjoyment is not only not necessary for, but is positively injurious to, health.

D. that a life of perfect continence in thought, speech, and action is necessary for reaching spiritual perfection.

E. that it is the force of habit which makes us think the sexual act to be necessary.

F. that most cases of irritability, hysteria, and even insanity which are wrongly ascribed to attempts at continence will in truth be found traceable to the incontinence of the other senses.

G. that birth control by contraceptives is race suicide.

It is mere butcher's work thus to hack to bits a subtle argument, but the method is adopted in order to indicate the nature and scope of the issues raised in this book, and to show, from the outset, how fundamentally Mr. Gandhi's creed conflicts with current, ignorant, Western ideas—especially with the modern conception of "freedom".

What is this freedom—actually, not theoretically? Was it obtained at a great price, or is it a pottage payment received for an abject surrender of our spiritual birth-right? Freedom is to serve. It is positive, not negative. It is not attained by abdication, by the re-

jection of responsibility; by the denial of any necessity for discipline; by "doing what we like". That is a slave's conception of freedom. And it is the one that is popular to-day.

Nothing reveals it so clearly as modern notions concerning sex. We can all say and do what we like. Any talk of discipline is nonsense—a survival of Puritanism. Most of our ills, psychic and physical, are direct results of "repression". The fact that now, at last, we have escaped from the tyranny of restraint is proof conclusive that we are free.

Those, roughly, are the tenets of the modern sex-creed. Nevertheless, the people who hold them would instantly admit the necessity for continence in the case of a boxer training for an important fight. They would admit it without realizing in the least the implications of their admission. Of course a man must conserve his strength to get "fit"! Such people readily understand the necessity for continence in order to become a champion. *That* they understand, but not the chastity of a Saint.

Anyhow, Mr. Gandhi's book is not for them. It blows self-satisfaction, self-delusion, and herd-beliefs sky-high. Whether you agree with all of it, or some of it, or none of it, you will discover that it turns your mind into an arena—and that it blocks all the exits.

There is space for only one example. Take Mr. Gandhi's statement, quoted above, that birth-control by contraceptives is race suicide—and let us assume that

you regard that statement as arrant nonsense. Well, instead of tossing the book aside, read its first section, "Towards Moral Bankruptcy," which is a review by Mr. Gandhi of a French work (*D'Indiscipline des Mœurs*) by M. Paul Bureau. Then, having read it, and having related it to your own personal experience and observations, ask yourself whether you are still quite certain that Mr. Gandhi's statement is arrant nonsense.

The fact remains, however, that only those will read this volume who have looked deep into the abyss of themselves, and who realize the world's chaos—and what it portends. It is not a book for the many, though it is possible that Mr. Gandhi would vigorously contest that assertion. Nevertheless, with respect, I submit that it is true, for, although his book deals with social, moral, and psychological problems, it is not concerned with them on their own level. *Mr. Gandhi's essential theme is the conquest of life by the spiritual will. Given the regeneration of man, the evils that threaten extermination will vanish. Lacking regeneration, they will triumph—and one more civilization will perish.* If this be the essential contention behind all the Mahatma's arguments, then his book will have substance only for those who, in some degree, have had a vision of the Kingdom. They, and they only, will have some understanding, however inadequate, of his statement that "he who has realized the misery of mankind in

all its magnitude will never be stirred by passion". And, to them, his first paragraph on page 15—and the four paragraphs that follow it—will be either a revelation, or a challenge. To read them is to discover, or to realize, the mystical facts that all are responsible for all, and that what happens to another happens to oneself.

The subject of Continence has been stressed in this article because Mr. Gandhi states, in the opening lines of his chapter on "The Necessity of Continence," that no other chapter is so important. In it, he tells us that there is one thing needful, above all others, and that is Brahmacharya.

Brahmacharya properly and fully understood means search after Brahma. As Brahma is present in every one of us, we must seek for it within with the help of meditation and consequent realization. Realization is impossible without complete control of all the senses Brahmacharya means control of the senses in thought, word, and deed.

Finally, this book clearly reveals that India is no longer half-hypnotized by the West.

Let us beware of the strong wine of libertinism that the intoxicated West sends us under the guise of new truth and so-called human freedom. Let us, on the contrary, listen to the sober voice of the West that through the rich experience of its wise men at times percolates to us

Such a warning is inevitable. The Western orgy of materialism is now revealed for what it is. We have pulled the house about our ears, and are now staring at ruin. We can continue to boast, if we

will—but the background is not impressive. People get bored by a bankrupt who keeps telling them how rich he used to be.

Let us not deceive ourselves by imagining that Englishmen are to be despised as competitors in a race for personal virtue. Without making

any spiritual parade of the fundamental virtues, they practise them at least physically in an abundant measure.

It is such Englishmen that will continue to compel respect in India—not by the power of their arm, but by the might of their spirit.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

IV.—THE THEOSOPHICAL THEORY OF LIFE

[William Kingsland, M. I. E. E. is the author of *The Real H. P. Blavatsky*, *The Great Pyramid in Fact and in Theory* and other volumes.—EDS.]

Every man has, within the limits of his knowledge, and either consciously or unconsciously, his theory of life. It is his idea of what is *desirable*, of what he should strive to obtain or to accomplish or achieve.

It does not follow that every individual has formulated that theory to himself; indeed I think that there are comparatively very few who have done so. The great majority conform to the general standard of life of the community in which they live without asking whether there is any wider, deeper knowledge to be obtained. They accept life as it comes. As to whether there is any after-life or what it may hold for them—that is a question with which they never concern themselves.

To this class belong, not merely the great masses who unfortunately have to live from hand to mouth and whose whole energies are absorbed in doing that; not merely, either, the great criminal class which is such a problem for our modern civilization, but also a very

large proportion of well-educated men and women who have both the time and opportunity for reading and study. To this latter class belong the great bulk of what is known as “society,” which is very largely a feverish round of thoughtless excitement and “amusement,” and the great middle class community, whose spare time is taken up with less exciting but still trivial efforts to get “amusement”—theatres, cinemas, novel reading, bridge, etc. These in general have no theory of life beyond that which they can apply to the present time or to the immediate future. It has never occurred to them to ask whether there is any *reality* in such a life as they live—or perhaps we should say that they are absolute realists, the only things that are real for them being just these physical things which they can touch and which *are* to them just what they *seem*.

But in both these latter classes there are a small number for whom life has deeper and more serious

aspects. They are what we may term broadly the religious-minded. They have a theory of life which extends beyond the present material world, a theory which, stated broadly, recognises that man possesses or is an immortal soul or spirit, which survives his bodily death, and which will be rewarded or punished in after-death life for the deeds done in the body. Here we enter the troubled region of religious strife, of the conflict of creed and sects; and here we find that for the most part the individual has not thought out his own theory of life, but merely accepts, and conforms to, that of the race or community of which he is a member. He has not thought out his own theory because in general he has no wide and comprehensive knowledge, or perhaps more generally because his own theory or creed does seem to correspond with his very limited outlook on life and the world in general; or again, because that theory is placed before him with *authority* which he has not sufficient interest, intellect or courage to question or examine.

Doubtless there are in this whole class which I here specify broadly as the religious class, many who have deliberately thought out their adherence to this, that or the other form of belief; and if we question these as to the grounds of their acceptance of beliefs with which perhaps we ourselves are at variance, we find that there is always some primary premise, on which their beliefs are built. Granted that premise, the conclu-

sions may be logically true. For example, the Christian "faith" in its broad traditional and historical form is based on the theory that the Bible is literally the inspired word of a personal God; and whatever may be the modifications in this belief which are taking place to-day it is hardly a hundred years since in this England of ours it was considered a most shocking thing to question this, and one which branded a man as an *atheist*, not fit for respectable society. Only a little earlier still it meant torture and the stake.

If we ask why this traditional basis of Christian doctrine is so widely questioned and rejected to-day, it is quite evident that it is owing to our greatly extended knowledge, not merely of the structure of the Bible itself, but also of the nature and constitution of the world in which we live, of its relations to the larger universe around us, and of the biological history of life in general on this globe, and of man's history in particular. It is a matter of quite recent history that each step in this wider knowledge has been bitterly opposed by the upholders of the Christian theory. We have almost, but not quite, outlived this opposition to progressive knowledge on the part of this particular Western religion; but what of other religions?

Mahomadanism, based on the authority of the *Koran*, stands too near to the Christian type of belief to be free from the intolerance of dogma, though the Christian himself is regarded as an "infidel" by this religion.

We turn then to the Far East, and here, although we are not altogether free from religious strife, we discover theories which are profoundly philosophical in their premises, and which, indeed, are based on such a wide and comprehensive view of the nature of man, and of the universe in which he lives, that they not merely stand in no fear of being upset by any scientific or other discoveries, but they also serve to explain the evolution of religion in general. In other words, they are not *a* religion, but Religion itself in its very root and source.

It is these great comprehensive theories which constitute the basis of that teaching which was introduced to the Western world during the last quarter of last century by that great teacher and writer, Madame H. P. Blavatsky, under the term, *Theosophy*. Those of us who have studied these teachings are continually finding confirmation of them not merely in the great Scriptures of the world, in the teachings of the best and wisest men that the world has ever known, but also in the progressive discoveries of modern science. One could not desire a better basis than that for a working hypothesis or theory of life though, until we have each in some manner or other proved it in our own experience, the teaching must be considered to be merely a working hypothesis. No one is asked to accept it on any authority whatsoever.

Let us glance briefly at the fundamentals of the theory. Every

thinking man admits that there is some One great fundamental Principle which is the Root and Source of the whole Universe, no matter whether that Principle be thought of as a personal God, an abstract Principle such as the *Absolute* of philosophy, or merely as some unconscious root Substance-Force. Let us here, in accordance with theosophical theory, call it the One Life for we cannot imagine that what we know in ourselves as life and consciousness is a fortuitous product of *dead* matter and force, as some materialists have professed to believe. We might also call it Spirit-Substance, even as Jacob Boehme writes :—

All is through and from God himself, and it is his own substance, which is himself, and he hath created it out of himself.

We have then this One Life or Spirit-Substance as the Root and Source of everything that has been, is, or can be in the Universe, both subjective and objective ; and the fundamental teaching as to the nature of man is simply this : that the *self* in man is nothing less in its real essential nature than this One Life ; and that a real and true knowledge of what we are in the depths of our nature will disclose to us this oneness. As a matter of fact this is no mere philosophical postulate or deduction ; it is the universal *experience* of those who have sought by intense aspiration to penetrate the depths of their own nature, and who are more generally known as Mystics.

What then arises in a practical manner from this fundamental

principle? Simply this, that very evidently mankind as a whole has *lost* the knowledge of this unity! That ignorance of our true and rightful nature and powers, whereby we become subject to material and other conditions over which we ought rightfully to rule, results in the first place in a wholly false consciousness of *self*, and secondly in transgressions of the natural laws of our material nature, bringing about sin, sickness, and death. In a word, all the *evil* in the world is due to man's ignorance of his real nature, and of his rightful powers as a *spiritual* being.

What is it then that hinders that we as individuals and as a race should obtain a realisation of our true nature and powers? The vast majority of our fellow men never have heard and never can hear of these teachings: and indeed would not understand them if they did. Moreover, although this fundamental teaching of *the divine nature of Man* has been presented over and over again, as far back as we have any literary records, it has just as often been materialised and debased by reason of ignorance, superstition or priestcraft.

Yet surely we must grant to each individual, however low in the scale of evolution, the opportunity to rise to the highest. But how is that opportunity to be given? The reply which this teaching makes is, by *reincarnation*.

We see on every hand that nothing is ever learnt save by *experience*. It is by experience

that the individual, and through the individual the race, evolves from lower to higher types; but how much is accomplished by any one of us in one single incarnation of what there is to accomplish in the realisation of our true spiritual nature and powers, the powers of a "Son of God"? Therefore must we incarnate again and again, until happily we have acquired that knowledge and those powers which will free us from this recurring cycle of birth and death, and make of each a pillar (a Cosmic Power) in the temple of our God, so that we go out thence no more (into incarnation).

But even when we come to know of these deeper teachings, there is much to overcome, much to conquer of the atavism which remains in our nature, always tending to repeat automatically the *material* experiences and desires of the past. And thereby it has been the teaching of all great spiritual teachers that the way to liberation is by *non-attachment* to "the things of this world".

In all the essentials of the teaching I here so briefly present, the teachings of Jesus and of Paul differ in no wise from those of Krishna or of Gautama Buddha. It is only the *form* that differs. In the one case the teachings were addressed to a race and a community familiar only with a concept of an anthropomorphic personal God; and so Jesus endeavoured to purify that concept by presenting the One Life "in whom we live, and move, and have our being" in the guise of a heavenly "Father".

Knowing the deeper truth, and realising it very fully in his own nature, he did not hesitate to claim his spiritual oneness with "God"; and he taught also that we are all "Sons of God," however much the Church may have obscured this teaching.

Paul also, being an initiate, taught that that same Christ consciousness which was in Jesus must be "born" in each of us if we are to attain unto "the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." (*Eph. iv, 13-14.*) Gautama Buddha, on the other hand, having to deal with a race and community already familiar with the deeply philosophical teachings of the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*,—albeit hardened into a rigid caste system, and certain formal religious observances—had no teachings of any personal god or gods; and when questioned as to the nature of the one Absolute Principle, he remained silent, recognising only its action in the manifested universe as immutable Law—a moral law, the law of *Karma*, as well as what we commonly call *natural law*. But the core of his teaching, as also of the great Indian Scripture, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, is also *non-attachment*. It is simply the attachment to "the things of this world," the desire for sentient life (*Trishna*), which brings the individual back again and again into incarnation.

Here, then, very briefly, is the theory of life which Theosophy presents, and which lies at the root of all the various religions which we have had to reject in their mere conventional or *exoteric* form. The Bible, itself, when the mere letter of the narrative is rejected and its *symbolism* begins to be understood in the light of these principles, is seen to be a veritable storehouse of the Ancient Wisdom concerning man's essential nature, origin and destiny.

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

In *Theosophy* we have once more in the world a re-presentation of "what the cloak covers".

To sum up: the Theosophical theory of life is based on the fundamental premise that the Self in man is one with the Cosmic Self. The consciousness of that oneness having been lost, the great object in life, the only *desirable* thing is to regain it. This is possible only after the individual by bitter experience of the worthlessness of "the things of this world" in life after life, learns at last to cease to desire them, and turns his face towards his "spiritual home". The race as a whole can only regain its former spiritual status and glory as the individuals composing it achieve this conquest over their lower nature, and are "born again" (*Dwijā*, twice born) into the "kingdom of heaven".

W. KINGSLAND

“SPIRITUAL” VALUES OF CONTEMPORARY AMERICA

[C. E. M. Joad visited the United States of America in the first quarter of this year and writes of his impressions, which our readers will find it interesting to compare with those of Prof. Irwin Edman, published in our last issue.]

I

In the lounge of my hotel at Detroit there were enthroned two automobiles, surrounded by thronging crowds of worshippers. The speed, the beauty, the prowess of these cars were the themes of universal conversation. In a factory outside the town their fellows were being produced at the rate of six or seven hundred a day. I visited this factory, the famous Ford works, observed the sixty thousand cars of its employees parked outside them, and, having talked with their chief, the great man himself, came away with the feeling that here, indeed, was the heart and soul of modern America, and that of its gods of efficiency and speed the cars in the hotel lounge were the visible idols.

To say that cars are the idols of modern Americans is a quite literal statement of fact. A man in St. Louis told me that he had two weeks' holiday a year. Last year he had marked a place on the map just two thousand miles away which he wished to see. To this place he had driven with his family in his car, covering some three hundred miles a day. When he arrived he dined at his hotel, went to the movies, slept, and then got into his car to drive home again. He had, in fact, spent his holiday

in his automobile and nowhere else. A man at New Orleans told me that he had now attached a trailer caravan to his automobile in which he lived, thus at once saving his rent and having at his disposal perpetual motion. His house, in fact, had become a mere adjunct of his car; it was like the tail to the dog.

I wondered whether this mode of living might not be a signpost pointing to the future. The difficulties of parking cars are now very great, and it seems to me not impossible that Americans will presently take to living in them entirely, being born in them, married in them, carrying on their business from them, dying in them. Thus will they pass their lives entirely in, about, and in the service of cars.

The car is symbolical of the American worship of machines, which leads them to regard any mechanism as a good in itself. Most of all do they admire those machines that will save them time. Hence their worship of cars that transport them rapidly from place to place, and their almost ecstatic admiration of ingenious gadgets which will perform two functions at once. For example, I purchased a pencil. My dismay at its apparent costliness was only parti-

ally mitigated when, unscrewing the bottom, I discovered that it contained an automatic cigarette lighter. I sat down to play bridge, and was confronted with an ingenious mechanism which proceeded to deal the cards for me, turning on its axis like a top and ejecting one card at each player in turn. I drove in a taxi and my astonished ears were assailed with the strains of jazz proceeding from a radio set installed in the vehicle. Why? Presumably to save time and labour. The cigarette-lighter-cum-pencil was designed to prevent me from having to carry two gadgets when one would serve; the card dealer to save me the trouble of dealing for myself; the radio in the taxi on the assumption that the rider likes "music," yet has so little time at his disposal that he can spare none to listen to music in and for itself; he must take his music as an incidental to his ride.

But, the question inevitably presents itself, for what is time being saved? The answer is not clear. To win leisure for meditation? Apparently not, since nobody seems to have so little time to spare as those who are always saving it. No people, in fact, are so rushed as the Americans. To cultivate the spirit, or to pursue Beauty and Truth? This does not seem likely. America is not remarkable for the cultivation of the spirit; it produces few works of art and discovers little Truth. The only conclusion seems to be that machines are used to save time in order to make more ma-

chines in order to save more time in order to pursue what?

But it is not only because they save time that ingenious mechanisms are admired. They are valued for their own sweet sakes irrespective of their effects. I was taken to the biggest music hall in New York, Radio City, where three—or was it four?—thousand people witnessed the same performance. The stage, of course, is incredibly remote, but the audience uses opera glasses and the voices of the players are heard over a microphone. After the wonders of this mammoth building had been duly exhibited I was taken to the basement in order to be shown what was described to me as "the cutest thing in the little old place". The basement was devoted to the provision of elaborate toilet arrangements. Solemnly we washed our hands, and I proceeded to look round for a towel. No towel was to be seen. "That's just where Radio City comes in," said my friend, and pressing a lever let loose from an aperture in the wall a stream of hot air. One held one's hands in the stream and very soon they were dry. This process took longer than using a towel, and was not in my view so pleasant—for my part, I like the feel of the coarse linen against the skin—but its virtue was nevertheless taken for granted. It was new; it was a gadget; and it did something for you that otherwise you would have had to do for yourself. It symbolised, in fact, the delegation to machines of one more function previously performed by human beings.

But, if we are to invent contrivances to save us the trouble of dealing at bridge, why not go further and save ourselves the trouble of playing bridge? If we cannot be at the trouble of lighting our cigarettes, why should we go to the trouble of smoking them? If we can delegate to cars more and more of the functions of living, why should we bother to live at all? It seems not inconceivable, if the tendencies observable in America continue, that Samuel Butler's prophecy will be realised and that Americans will come to cede the functions of life entirely to machines, so that just as men, whom the animals have evolved, have superseded them, so will the machines which mankind has evolved supersede human beings. Thus, having transferred all the functions of living to mechanisms, we shall find it unnecessary to live.

To an American the questions I have asked would seem meaningless. He takes it for granted that machines are goods in themselves. He is not concerned with them as means to ends beyond themselves. To me, and—for I do not wish to be alone in my scale of values—I hope to my readers, the questions seem inescapable, the perversion of values flagrant, the mistaking of means for ends as obvious as it is regrettable.

II

"But why discourse at such length, and with feelings of such apparent surprise upon this subordination of ends to means, upon this worship of false gods? The

tale of American eccentricities has been told often enough, and there is nothing particularly new in the telling." Precisely, that is just my point. There is nothing particularly new in the telling.

I had been led to expect that I should find America in the throes of a moral revolution. Nor was the expectation unreasonable. That human beings chastened by depression should be prepared to change their values and, finding that Mammon had so catastrophically let them down, should look to other gods—such things, after all, have happened to communities in the past; why not, then, to Americans in the present? The expectation was for the most part completely falsified. The gods of speed and efficiency are as firmly enthroned as ever, and why should they not be? They at least have not disappointed their worshippers; they have merely not been worshipped with sufficient zeal. Faster and ever faster cars, quicker and ever smoother elevators, labour-saving devices ever more efficient and ingenious. These things still are demanded by Americans. "Let us," they cry, "oxygenate the air of factories so that workers will be stimulated to greater output." Also and with the same breath, "Let us bribe planters to destroy cotton, manufacturers to curtail production, lest we be ruined by too much output."

As for Mammon, although it is now recognised that it is more than his feet that are of clay, the number of his worshippers shows no signs of falling off. Americans

are inveterate optimists. Even after four years of depression, the majority still believe prosperity to be just round the corner. They may starve and rot in idleness, but they do not agitate, riot, or even turn Socialist—the Socialist Party in the United States is still small, the Communist Party negligible—because each man hopes that with the return of prosperity he will "make good". Now a man is not likely to plan the overthrow of the capitalist system when he hopes himself to be a capitalist to-morrow, or to turn from the worship of Mammon when he believes that his services may at any moment be handsomely rewarded. In all these respects, then, the spiritual barometer shows no change.

In two respects only the indicators seem to be moving. The first of these is, I suspect, merely a passing phase, a testimony to the truth of the old adage that "when the devil was sick, the devil a saint would be". The second, however, is, I think, of fundamental importance. It is the outcome of a passionate indignation which has opened men's eyes to the evils of graft and corruption, which for years have been staring them in the face, and refuses to allow them to rest until the evils are mitigated if not removed. One of those secular stirrings of the human spirit which prompted the Puritan English to get rid of Charles I, the revolutionary French of the Government of Louis XVI, is now at work in America to produce a radical change in men's attitude

to public life. But of this more in a moment.

In the first place the slump is said to have engendered an increase of kindness as between one man and another, a kindness from the embarrassment of which the rich at any rate seem in the past fairly successfully to have escaped. At times it has seemed during the past four years that even the very rich have been sufficiently chastened to become human. People "have been so much nicer," a wealthy broker told me, enumerating the consolations, such as they were, which the depression had brought, in return for nearly ruining him. There is, then, a diminution of arrogance and conceit and an increase of humility and kindness even among the most arrogant. More important is the demand born of the stirring of the spirit to which I have already referred, the demand that American political and municipal life shall become clean. The lack of a disinterested public service is not only the outstanding defect of American public life; it is also the outstanding topic of American conversation. It is impossible to enter into conversation, however casual, in train, street car or hotel, without finding the talk coming round sooner or later to the corruption and graft of American politics. There is, it is pointed out to you, no permanent Civil Service in America, whose members hold their office independently of politics. Political and municipal jobs are the reward of service to party. Three evil consequences result.

First, those who wish to hold jobs must be prepared to bribe politicians. Secondly, the concern of politicians returned to office is not to put their policies into practice but their men into jobs. Thirdly, the best men keep out of politics. Upon all these evils friends and acquaintances would bitterly dilate, ending with the assertion that they had got to stop. There seems, in fact to be on all hands a determination to introduce the spirit of disinterested service into the administration of public affairs. I heard of young men of good qualifications and high academic distinction who were for the first time making politics and not business their objective. I heard of some of these young men who had begun service in Miss Perkins's Department of Labour whose morals are so strict, whose public conscience so austere, that they have been nicknamed the Early

Christians. "There are many things that I would like to do that I can't," the Head of the Department is said to complain with mock seriousness; "my Early Christians won't let me."

The gulf that in America separates public affairs from private is something of a mystery to the stranger. In the one sphere crookedness and graft have reigned supreme: these, one feels, are the affairs of knaves and rogues; the other is instinct with helpfulness, kindness and service: these, one feels, are the affairs of a friendly, a trusting and a good-natured people. If the depression should have helped to close this gulf it will not have occurred in vain. It should surely not be beyond the wit of Americans to imbue with the virtues of American private life, the public life, which, after all, individual Americans conduct.

C. E. M. JOAD

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

PLATO AS DICTATOR*

[D. L. Murray sees a similarity between the conditions of to-day and those of 350 B. C. when the *Laws* was written. This is, alas, an era of dictators whose philosophy of life and of government is not modelled on the wisdom of Plato.—EDS.]

The *Laws* of Plato, now translated with a wholly admirable Introduction by Prof. A. E. Taylor, may be reckoned his most important political treatise; for the better known *Republic*, while it plunges deeper into his thought on ethics, logic and the nature of the Ultimate Reality, is more frankly a Utopia, the pattern of a city not made with hands and scarcely to be realized among mortal men. But in the *Laws*, that imaginary dialogue between an Athenian, a Spartan and a Cretan — representatives of three great contrasting types of Hellenic culture — which was composed in its author's extreme old age, we get an idea of how Plato would have ruled had a dictatorship ever been put into his hands. There was need for practical guidance at the period when the *Laws* was written (between 360 and 347 B.C.); for, as a result of a series of great wars, the institutions and culture that had made the glory of Greece were breaking down on all hands, while the half-barbaric Macedonian Power was rising to overshadow them, and as with us in our rather similar position to-day the most radical political experiments were

advocated and received a hearing in the general despair with established institutions.

Work of old age as it is, the *Laws* is no work of failing power or senile obstinacy. Plato is still capable of revising his opinions and his mental flexibility is as remarkable as ever. As always he pierces to the core of the problems with which he has to deal; and while he is not afraid to prescribe in minutest detail—amusingly minute detail sometimes—the way of life on which he insists for his ideal city, he sees that these rules and customs must be founded on first principles of thought and conduct, without which any political organization will slowly or quickly fall to pieces. For Plato, now as when he wrote the *Republic*, the bases of man's life in community are two—religion and the preference of spiritual to material goods. In the Tenth Book of the *Laws* is expounded what Prof. Taylor calls the foundation of all subsequent "natural" theology, the first attempt to demonstrate God's existence and moral government of the world from the known facts of the visible order.

It is a theology more conservative in structure than any

* *The Laws of Plato*. Translated into English by A. E. Taylor. (J. M. Dent & Co. Ltd., London. 10s. 6d. net.)

that is to be deduced from the *Republic*; but in this book Plato is, wherever possible, building on the ideas and institutions he already found to hand among his fellow-Greeks, and his argument for the spiritual origination of the universe, for soul as the source of all movement and life, can be adapted to the modern scientific view of things even more successfully than it could to the materialistic science (based on the speculations of the Ionian philosophers) which prevailed in Plato's own time. The laws of Plato's pattern State will be based on the recognition of the "gods"—on the acknowledgment we may say that the ground of Reality is spiritual—and just because his city is thus bathed in the radiance of religion it will be impossible for its citizens to prefer the accumulation of wealth or the exercise of tyranny and dominion to the pursuit of virtue as the aim of their corporate existence.

Plato is quite ruthless in the measures he propounds to guard his city against growing into one of the large commercial or imperial Powers of which his prophetic soul seems to have foreseen the rise in later ages. The size of the population is to be kept fixed; foreigners are not to be permitted to immigrate and swamp its character; it is to be self-sufficient economically, setting agriculture before industry in honour and importance; not too close (Plato hopes) to the sea, in order that it may be delivered from the temptation to give its soul to commerce

or to seek foreign empire. It is significant that Ruskin was a deep admirer of Plato's political thought with its opposition to a commercial and money-making civilization, and there are undoubted affinities between the imaginary city of the *Laws* and the Utopian land of William Morris's *News from Nowhere*. In the internal regulations he proposes for his State Plato anticipates with uncanny foresight much that has gradually been worked out by subsequent humanity in its historical process. He sees the need of a mixed government, as a safeguard against tyranny whether monarchical or democratical (a truth not the more assailable because the world has lately begun to forget it again), the desirability of separating civil from criminal law, the need of a general system of State education, the wisdom of educating men and women so far as possible in the same way both mentally and physically. In the abundance and dogmatic detail of the regulations he sketches on all these topics he reminds us of that other great Utopist of Humanity, Auguste Comte, and he reminds us of the rigour of that great modern admirer of medievalism in another way.

The *Laws* contains, in Professor Taylor's words,

the first proposal ever made, so far as we know, to treat erroneous beliefs about God and the unseen world as crimes and to erect an inquisition to suppress "heretical pravity".

Although he had seen his teacher Socrates martyred by the Athenians on a charge of impiety, Plato,

though he believed passionately in the importance of right thought, did not believe in the value of free thought. It is worth while to see how it came about that the greatest of philosophers thus made himself the apologist of persecution; indeed it is more than ever necessary to do this to-day when the ideal of intellectual repression has passed from those sections of the Christian Church which have inherited it and still hold it to the champions alike of nationalism and communism. For it is not so easy as often supposed to frame an argument for the toleration of what is believed to be deadly error. As Professor Taylor observes:—

It is difficult, if one grants his premises, that certain beliefs are known to be at once false and morally poisonous, to dispute his conclusion that the State is false to its duty if it allows the poison to be disseminated.

The basis of this whole position is really the denial or failure to recognize the fact that knowledge

is progressive. Evolution, though Greek thinkers before Plato had had an intuition of it, is alien to Plato's thought. He,

like Greek Philosophers in general, does not take *time* very seriously. He is not stirred, as a more modern thinker might be, by the vision of a people's life as an adventure, through an innumerable series of generations, into the unknown with the prospect of unending "progress" towards ends which cannot be discerned in advance.

That is why he hopes to lay down once for all the laws and size and destiny of his ideal city, even to the number of its inhabitants. His whole philosophy is static. And that is why he sees no purpose in free discussion and criticism. If we possess the final Truth, what madness to risk throwing it away! Only if it is believed that time and thought can add to our treasures and deepen our apprehensions can the plea for toleration be sustained. Philosophies that deny novelty are philosophies of the Inquisition.

D. L. MURRAY

CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICS*

[**John Middleton Murry** approaches from a different angle his favourite topic—the revolutionizing of the present social order through a proper blending of Christian Mysticism and Marxist Monism.—EDS.]

It is well, before discussing Reinhold Niebuhr's new book, to quote the summary of its purpose from the cover. This declares that "the basic conviction which runs through the book" is:—

That the liberal culture of modernity is quite unable to give guidance and direction to a confused generation which faces the disintegration of a social system and the task of building a new one... Adequate spiritual guidance can come only through a more

* *Reflections on the End of an Era.* By Reinhold Niebuhr (Charles Scribner's Sons, London, 10s. 6d.)

radical political orientation and more conservative religious convictions than are comprehended in the culture of our era.

I should be inclined to translate this slightly cumbersome profession into a declaration that in the Western world to-day the only faith that is adequate to guide men is a synthesis between Christianity and Marxism. That is, in fact, what Niebuhr means; and that synthesis he seeks to achieve. In the main, I am in deep agreement with him.

But there is at least a nuance of difference between his convictions and conclusions and my own. I may most quickly approach it by asking the question why he uses the adjective "conservative" for the religious convictions which he desires to see allied with "radical" political views. (It should be said that "radical," in American, means very nearly what we English call "revolutionary".) For, on Niebuhr's own showing, the form of the Christian religion which is most naturally reconcilable with revolutionary political convictions is not Christian orthodoxy at all, but the religion of Jesus. Niebuhr quotes the crucial words of Jesus concerning the divine tolerance to be shown by "the sons of God".

That thus ye may be the sons of your Father: for he maketh his sun to rise upon the evil and the good and his rain to fall upon the just and the unjust.

Nothing, Niebuhr very truly says, "in the conceptions of orthodox and conventional religion approaches this profundity". But

if that is so, and indeed it is so, what becomes of the demand for "more conservative religious convictions"? This religious conviction of Jesus is itself revolutionary in regard to any form of Christianity which finds general acceptance to-day. It looks as though what Niebuhr really desires is a synthesis of more revolutionary political and more revolutionary religious convictions than are customary in the modern world.

And if we examine carefully Niebuhr's various utterances concerning the nature of religion we find that there is nothing particularly "conservative" or "classical" in them. Thus he writes:—

An adequate view of human nature, which does justice to both the heights and depths of human life, and which sees the moral ideal in purest terms and judges historical realities in the light of that ideal is possible only to religion. *For the individual never comes to full self-consciousness, and therefore to a consciousness of what is nature and what is spirit in him, until he strains after the absolute and the unconditioned.* This yearning after the absolute is the very core of religion.

The italic is mine. The statement is profound. But this essential "religion" is not "conservative". In its purest forms it has always been heretical and subversive in respect of Christian orthodoxy.

That Niebuhr does not stress this point appears to be due to the fact that his hold on his own essential conception is precarious. He appears to believe that the antithesis between Nature and Spirit must be dualistic, in spite of the evi-

dent absence of dualism in the crucial saying of Jesus which, he recognises, surpasses for profundity anything in "the conceptions of orthodox or conventional religion". Only intermittently does he appear to grasp the simple but elusive conception that Spirit is the consciousness of Nature; and that for this reason there can be no ultimate conflict between them. The purest realisation of Spirit is inseparable from the most comprehensive realisation of Nature; and the most radical religious *katharsis* is that which attends upon the knowledge that the self is wholly immersed in the flux of animal existence.

No doubt this subtle conception is extremely difficult to express; and quite impossible to express save in the form of paradox. And it might be argued that religious dualism is itself a form of precisely this paradox. But it seems to me that it is a coarse and dangerous form, which always tends to degrade the conception of pure Spirit. For Spirit is "beyond Good and Evil," and can only be contaminated by any attempt to relate it directly to the Good in the world of Good and Evil. It may be, nay it is, the highest Good in the world of Existence to achieve the knowledge of Spirit; but that is precisely because Spirit is high above all the relative moralities of the world of existence, and cannot be involved in them.

In other words, Spirit is essentially the consciousness of Nature, including the self that is conscious, as a monism. Niebuhr is rather

scornful of Monism; and no doubt the facile Monism of modern liberal culture is an appallingly shoddy thing. He says:—

This superficial Monism is discarded whenever ethical passion rises to a pitch where prudence is discarded, or when philosophical and religious penetration discloses life in both its heights and depths.

And that is true; but it is not true to imply, as he does, that this "superficial Monism" is discarded for a Dualism. On the contrary, the Dualism which arises when the striving soul courageously confronts the seeming inertia of Nature, both in the outward world and in itself, though indubitably far nobler than the complacent Monism which it shatters, is itself untenable. The striving soul *cannot* stay there. Nor is it true to say, as Niebuhr does, that "if it is recognised or believed that the moral imagination conceives ideals for life which history in any immediate form or even in any conceivable form is unable to realise, a dualistic world-view will emerge". That condition is merely the beginning, not the end of the soul's journey. The soul cannot acquiesce in the finality of a sheer opposition between its desires and ideals and the nature of things. And it overcomes this fatal opposition not by the facile belief that somewhere, somehow, the nature of things will prove to be in accord with its desires and ideals—the belief which Christian orthodoxy with its dualism of the natural and the supernatural offers it—but by a devastating self-scepticism, a

slow and painful struggle towards the recognition that the desires and ideals of the soul, however noble and precious, are themselves animal desires and animal ideals. At this point, and not before, is the authentic birth of the Spirit. Spirit and what is called Spirituality or "idealism" have no relation with one another. Spirit is the concomitant of the most ruthless realism, applied both to the world and to oneself.

That is not to say that historically the Christian religion has not been for the Western world the husk in which the seed of true Spirit has been enwrapped. Indubitably, it has been. Christian mysticism, which had its perfect expression in Jesus himself, has always been profound as it is beautiful. But mysticism is not, and cannot be dualistic; it represents the conquest of dualism. To Christian mysticism, the doctrines of Marxism present no challenge at all. Marxism, with its revolutionary insistence that the "individual" man is totally involved in a nexus of social relations of which he is unconscious, has nothing to tell the mystic that he does not know essentially already, and nothing that he is not anxious and eager to learn. The man who has experience of the mystical "self-annihilation" does not shrink from it in a new form; on the contrary, it is a law of his being that he should seek it. Nor has the Marxist Monism any terrors for him. For such an one, Marxism is simply a necessary completion of the vision of Spirit. He is in no

danger of surrendering himself to a naïve faith that the social revolution will inaugurate a heaven on earth. It will do no more—and no less—than to give every individual the opportunity of the experiences out of which the religion of the Spirit is born. Nor is there any reason to suppose that Marx himself expected any more. His expectations were modest: the social revolution was for him the gateway into a new phase of human history,—a phase in which the more flagrant of the remediable injustices of modern society would be abolished, but the irremediable ones remain.

On this side, the defect of Niebuhr's book is that it treats of a kind of Marxism which is markedly inferior, in philosophic and religious content, to Marx's own. No doubt, this is fairly widespread; it is popular Marxism as it is generally retailed. But this popular Marxism will be quite deaf to his appeal for an alliance with "conservative" and orthodox Christianity; it is itself the new form taken by popular Christianity. Its millennium is the new form of the millennium of so popular a Christian writing as the Book of Revelation. While for those familiar with what may be called the "esoteric" aspects of Marxism—the philosophic and religious thought of Marx from which his revolutionary attitude directly derived,—the synthesis of Marxism and Christianity is both simpler and subtler than any Niebuhr suggests. The Marxian doctrine of "revolutionary Praxis" is the natural ally of any forthright

Christianity in the world of action; and though a moment may be imagined at which they would conflict, that moment is seen to be very far distant in a society in which, like the English, the political and economic evolution foretold by Marx has been most complete. Niebuhr, being an American, sees the situa-

tion more abstractly than an Englishman can. The Englishman knows that the moral factor is likely to be decisive in this conflict of power, and that the main effort in an effective socialist strategy, in England at any rate, is to ensure that the onus of violence is upon the enemies of Socialism.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

Outline of Hinduism. By F. HAROLD SMITH, D. D. and

Confucianism and Taoism. By B. S. BONSALE, M. A., D. Lit., B. D.

(Great Religions of the East Series. Edited by Eric S. Waterhouse, M. A., D. D. The Epworth Press, London. 2s. 6d.)

Dr. Waterhouse and his co-workers have undertaken the task of describing God—not their own but other people's! In a series entitled "Great Religions of the East," they are seeking to give accurate descriptions of mighty philosophies. Though other men may not seek Him as they do, it is right and fitting to show "the way in which other faiths have faced the same spiritual issues—a contribution to the work of the Comparative Study of Religion". This is the aim, and a noble one, as set down by Dr. Waterhouse in the Editor's Foreword. Unfortunately there is no mention of the fact that in his mind as well as in that of the writers (if one may judge by the two volumes under review) the Christian God is the only righteous one. Dr. Bonsall sums up Confucianism (p. 76) :—

It is obvious that there is much in the religion which has just been described which cannot survive contact with modern knowledge, but surely it is not a great step to the idea of the Christian God from the conception which has been preserved down

the centuries in the Confucian Classics of Shang-ti as a being exercising supreme moral rule.

Confucianism must evolve and reach the higher level of Christianity !*

In the publishers' announcement, as in the volumes, there are signs and omens which make us suspect the real object of the series to be a showing up of the Christian religion as superior to other faiths. It is not meant so much for converting the heathen as for assuring the decreasing numbers of church-going westerners that with Christianity came "The Dawn of Religion". All that went before in philosophy, ethics and metaphysics is made to look if not childish at least immature.

Narrowed down by the idea of a personal God, a being created on the pattern of man, the writers themselves seem unable to grasp the depth, the richness and the glory of eastern metaphysics. The conception of God as an impersonal Law, with the added responsibility it brings to man who finds himself the maker of his own destiny, turning to no outside deity for help or comfort, baffles them completely. Eastern philosophies have helped their people to realise the impersonality of Nature and the sublime grandeur of existence, while the western theologies have kept man tied to the apron strings of One who could at will curse them

* Those westerners who desire to get a better idea of Confucianism than this volume gives are advised to study the quotations gathered in the brochure, *The Wisdom of Confucius*. (C. W. Daniel Co., London. 1s.) It contains ethical sayings of the Chinese sage and his disciples.—EDS.

with eternal damnation or bless them with the stupid blissfulness of heaven.

We do not go into the technical details and refute the statements and side remarks which twist and turn the main tenets and the detailed principles of the philosophies. It would really necessitate a whole book to correct adequately the misconceptions, to include the omitted. We are only concerned with the spirit of the books and of the Series, since it is on this point that Dr. Waterhouse lays the greatest stress. With a mask of benevolence and of erudition a distorted picture is presented for the benefit of the western public. The books are written in simple enough style to interest the layman. He will perhaps accept without question those erroneous ideas, feel himself superior, different, way above the low masses of the East, a condition which can hardly bring about the "closer sympathy and respect" of which Dr. Waterhouse so glibly speaks. The keynote of the whole Series is struck in the last paragraph of Dr. Smith's *Outline of Hinduism* (p. 132) :—

..... India still needs the healing touch, and the Christian is convinced that Christ alone can answer the prayers of her best reformers for the eradication of such evils as child-marriage, caste or purdah—but this task it is held, cannot be adequately accomplished by external methods of legislation or social reform, it involves a *moksha* or redemption from Hinduism itself and baptism into Christ, whose service, a spiritual *swaraj*, is perfect freedom, and a new birth of living and acting as becomes the children of God.

What has the Church, with its innumerable denominations, done for the entire West? Let Dr. Smith examine the West with an unbiased mind and maintain if he can that child-marriage is worse than the evil of immorality disclosed by thousands of cases brought before the juvenile courts; that caste is worse than the persecution of the Jew in Germany, the hate of the Negro in America and the coarse and brutal treatment of the dominated blacks and yellows by the fair skinned conqueror; that purdah is a greater evil than the craze for psychological self-expression, especially in night-clubs. Egotism and selfishness, immorality and sensuality, stupidity and cruelty—these prevail in every Christian country. Shall we judge the Christianity of Jesus by these? If 2,000 years of Christian promulgation has not wiped out these and other abominations, how can its acceptance "heal" the Orient? No, the educated oriental knows that the churches have been tried and found wanting; he also knows that the ethics which Jesus taught are the same as those of Lao Tzu and Confucius, Buddha and Krishna, and that the churches themselves have been false to the teachings of Jesus as orthodox Brahmins are false to those of Krishna. My prayer as a born Christian who reveres Jesus and therefore rejects the churches, is: May the East ever remain Heathen and free from the "healing touch" of Dr. Smith.

A FRENCH CHRISTIAN

The Living Religions of the Indian People. By NICOL MACNICOL, D. Litt., D. D. (Student Christian Movement Press, London. 10s. 6d.)

This book consists in an enlarged form of the Wilde lectures delivered by the author at the University of Oxford during 1932-34. As the title indicates, it deals with the religions of India at the present day—Hinduism, Jainism, Sikhism, Zoroastrianism, Islam and Christianity. There are thus six parts, and each is subdivided into historical and descriptive sections. The arrangement inevitably involves a good deal of repetition, for no hard and fast line can be drawn between the history of a religion and its spiritual values. The author tries to be impartial, but the old missionary spirit cannot be wholly suppressed. For instance, he says that the Hindu Bhakti is in many of its expressions "a prophecy and a forecast of the *Christian revelation*". And yet he speaks of his Indian fellow-Christians being dispersed among multitudes of Hindus and Muslims "who are dominated by ancient and *arrogant beliefs*". (The italics are ours).

No writer can ever take a correct view of Hinduism who cannot rise above mere theism. For it is one of the cherished beliefs of a very large majority of Hindus that theism is only a half-way house, that Bhakti leads to Jñāna and that the human soul finds its fulfilment and consummation in the Absolute. Even such a popular theistic scripture as the *Gita* is not silent about the higher way. In fact in this great scripture we have a perfect combination of Karma, Bhakti and Jñāna. Dr. Macnicol is not unaware of this. Only he ruefully exclaims that it is an uneasy balance between Bhakti and Jñāna. And he notes with regret the presence of the same "uneasy balance" in Jñānesvar, Tulsi Das, Ramakrishna Paramahansa, Swami Vivekananda and Rabindranath Tagore.

There is no doubt that Vedantic Monism has been the bed-rock of Hinduism from the Upanishadic period

up to the present day. That is why the Samaj movements of the nineteenth century which owed their origin to the influence of Christian theism have languished and are gasping for breath, while the Ramakrishna movement based on a fuller Hindu religious experience is growing strong, day by day. "We have in this movement," says Dr. Macnicol, "a deeply interesting attempt to adjust the old Vedanta orthodoxy to the needs and the demands of a new world". Thus on his own showing, those who like Keshab Chandra Sen have responded to the call of Christian theism in this land and ignored the deeper truth of Vedanta, have gone to the wall; and the future lies with those, who, while loyal to the intuitions of the Upanishads, are trying their best to inculcate the ideals of devotion and service in the spirit of the *Bhagavad-Gita*.

Dr. Macnicol concludes his survey by saying that India may learn to ignore Jesus Christ, but it will only be "if India abandons her great tradition as a God-intoxicated people". We thank him for the compliment, though we wish that some of our people were more sober about God and "God's own words". We may also assure him that India will never ignore Jesus but give him his due place in the hierarchy of the Teachers of Mankind. An old Buddhist monk is reported to have said, "From all that I have heard of your Jesus Christ he appears to me to be a Bodhisattva and not a Buddha." That is the Hindu view also, though we express it in different terms. Jesus is a great Bhakta rather than a Jñāni. He died comparatively young and did not grow to the full stature of his spiritual powers. His ethic was an interim ethic largely shaped by his Jewish apocalyptic visions which never came true. But that does not mean that he has no message for us. The religion that is named after him is strong where Hinduism is weak. It carries the gospel of love and hope to the homes of the oppressed and the down-trodden. It takes the sinner

by the hand and sets him on his feet once more, saying "Go thou and sin no more". It fires the heart of the missionary with courage and zeal so that he is prepared to forsake all to follow his Master. It teaches that all men are equal in the eyes of God, though in practice Islam has been far

more successful in establishing the brotherhood of man. It is these aspects of Christianity that appeal to us and that are really helpful to us in our great task of reconstruction and not the dualistic Christian theism which Dr. Macnicol holds up to our admiration.

D. S. SARMA

The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism. By HUMPHREY TREVELYAN. (Longmans, Green; London. 7s. 6d.)

The modern reader interested in the history of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries finds in them certain spiritual movements profoundly akin to those of his own time. But in the very midst of the study of revolutionary and libertarian tendencies he comes upon one of completely different nature: the Hellenistic revival. Not even the fact that its importance was sweeping and profound can stop him from feeling that it is utterly alien to the interests of his own day.

It has estranged many admirers of Goethe, for example, to see how this ruling spirit, after having carefully shaken off the bonds of eighteenth-century formalism and rationalism, could at the very summit of his development have surrendered his freedom and proclaimed his return to classic order. It has made them feel that at the time of its peak his art was suddenly blunted off and forced into a curious archæological formula. The same blunting-off and imitation took place throughout the fine arts of the turn of the century, when even Christian churches were built as Greek temples. Many students of the age, when surveying this reaction, can do little but register baffled disappointment.

Mr. Trevelyan's monograph on the popular background to Goethe's Hellenism does not attempt to fathom the founts from which this æsthetic counter-revolution sprang. Indeed, the author seems to shy off from any dealing with fundamental spiritual

issues and to take refuge in a mass of documents dealing with surface manifestations. But the theory which he presents, through a hundred pages of close scholarship, is one of great historical interest.

Mr. Trevelyan believes that at the time when Goethe—surely the most outstanding exponent of Hellenism in Europe—launched forth upon his study of the Greeks, there was very little knowledge of the Greeks available. Worse than that, the conception which literate people entertained of the nature of Greek life was abysmally confused. The major trends of German thinking in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries had conspired to eliminate classic interest from the scene. German pietism stood against it; the utilitarianism of the *Aufklärung* could find no use for it; French taste found Homer irrational and vulgar. When Greek was taught in the schools, it was only for the sake of reading the New Testament—which was very bad Greek.

The classic world was no more than a sort of junk-shop for antiquarians; it was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that educators and scholars saw some real life in it. Scholars such as Gesner and Heine, writers such as Herder and Gottsched slowly awakened the German world to regard Hellas not as a dusty museum but as a fount of wisdom. After a century and a half of oblivion, the works of Greek dramatists and philosophers began again to appear in print — although, as Mr. Trevelyan is clear to state — with much confusion of choice and historical treatment.

Not until Winckelmann rediscovered and restated, through a study of ancient works of art, the beauty of Greek man and Greek life, did the revival become fully humanistic. And then the difficulty was that Winckelmann and the others of his belief were so ardent in their revolt against the old hostility to the Greek world that they went too far in their exuberance over it.

The whole Hellenistic revival, then, was cradled, when not in ignorance, then in confusion. Historical scholarship was incomplete and pedantic, and frigid disparagement varied with passionate enthusiasm. Goethe, says Mr. Trevelyan, grew up at the time when the confusion was at its worst; had he been born twenty years later, he might have had the advantage of more knowledge and more clarity. No wonder, then,

that his own Hellenism seems so alien to us; for his picture of Greek man was distorted and to a large degree sentimental.

While the book is a valuable addition to the literature of the movement it does not, of course, clear up its essential mystery. Perhaps the only man who has advanced any credible explanation of it is Spengler, for whom the whole mood of revival served to bear out his thesis of the exhaustion of Western cultural forms and the weary return of modern man, through an age of imitation, to "the womb of the mother". A person who is not Spenglerian in his viewpoint awaits with interest the appearance of a work which will give a less pessimistic and still credible explanation of it.

WILLIAM HARLAN HALE

The Archæology of Herod's Temple, with a Commentary on the Tractate 'Middôth'. By F. J. HOLLIS, D. D. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London. 18s.)

As its title indicates, Dr. Hollis's book is concerned mainly with archæological and architectural questions regarding Herod's Temple. His aim is to locate the exact site of the Temple, involving as that does a consideration of the early significance of the Sacred Rock and its relation to the Mount of Olives and the Temple Hill, and to determine the extent of the buildings.

The data are obtained primarily from three sources, *viz.*, (1) the works of Josephus, who was born about fifty years after Herod's Temple was completed, (2) the *Middôth*, a Mishnic tractate embodying Jewish traditions regarding the Temple measurements, written about a century after the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D., and (3) the results of excavations and exam-

ination of the site itself. Unfortunately the evidence from these sources is conflicting, and scholars differ widely as to the conclusions to be drawn from them. Our author is duly critical regarding his sources and it is on a very careful examination of them that he bases his conclusions.

The *Middôth* is given in English translation with a detailed commentary. Besides, there are three Appendices bearing on the *Middôth*, thirty full-page plans and diagrams, a bibliography and an index. The book is one which scholars working in this field cannot afford to ignore. The general reader may complain that the author enters into too much detail, but no work which seeks, by careful study and research, accurately to reconstruct what existed in the past can afford to neglect detail, and the author is to be congratulated on the results of his labours.

BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

Secret Ways of the Mind. By W. M. KRANEFELDT, Introduction by C. G. Jung. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd., London. 6s.)

Indian Psychology. By JADUNATH SINHA. (Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner and Co., Ltd., London. 15s.)

Secret Ways of the Mind is a book which the layman has been waiting for. It outlines with brilliant success the main contributions made to psychology by Freud, Jung, and Adler. There has been, as we know, a considerable amount of bickering between these leaders. That is not our business; we recognise that each has made a special and personal contribution.

Freud is, and will always remain, the master of sexual analysis. It is to him that we owe our practising recognition of the ocean of unconscious, unsublimated sexual urge that lies behind conscious action. It is to him that we owe our knowledge of the dangers of repression and the means of guarding against it. In short, after Freud sex is no longer a bogey. It can be faced and dealt with.

Jung's contribution is deeper. He is the philosopher, not to say mystic, of the movement. For him, as Mr. Ralph Eaton the brilliant translator says in his excellent Preface, "the facts of sex are not only physiological occurrences. They are also symbols, expressive of some of the deepest feelings that unite man with Nature. The cure for morbid sexuality is not sexual sophistication, or even a scientific knowledge of this morbidity; it lies in a restoration of the psychical overtones of sex buried in the unconscious." Jung's contribution is not a contradiction of Freud or a subtraction, it is an addition. Freud, the great sex doctor, the healer *par excellence* of sexual neurotics, mapped out a field of sexuality lying behind our feelings and acts; but Jung has enormously widened our conception of that field with his "Collective Unconscious," a sort of invisible ocean within everyone which harbours images, memories, mythical

motives, ancient personal wisdom, racial experience. He writes:—

The unconscious is for me not only the receptacle of all unclean spirits and other odious legacies of dead situations.....it is in particular the one ever-living and creative seed-ground which manifests itself through ancient symbolical images and yet by means of these points to a renewal of the spirit.

The difficulty about Freud and Jung for the ordinary person is that one is forced by them into the position of being treated as a patient. One is considered guilty unless otherwise proved innocent. We are not all abnormally neurotic and hysterical and do not want to be treated as such. Jung, of course, has some wonderfully stimulating things to say such as: "If I wish to effect a cure in my patients I am careful to recognise the significance of their Egotism; I would be blind indeed if I did not see in it the true Will of God." But the tendency is to make the reader feel he is in a consulting room. Adler, however, speaks more practically to the normal man. His chief contribution is with children—and therefore possibly his work is more far-reaching than the others.

There is a tendency to believe that these doctors are handmaids of religion, capable of "giving the patient a new set of values, a new religion". This seems to me to be going too far. Western Psychology is still a long way off from true Religion. Indian Psychology, on the other hand, is profoundly wedded to Indian Metaphysics. We are indebted to Professor Jadunath Sinha for making this abundantly clear. He is undertaking the task of making a constructive survey of Indian Psychology. This means that he has to go to Indian Metaphysics and disengage his material from the metaphysical setting of the different schools of the Philosophers—for there is no empirical psychology to be found, Indian psychology being based upon introspection and observation, not upon experiments. Professor Sinha has therefore set himself a formidable task. This is the first volume—dealing only with

Perception. It is a systematic exposition and interpretation of the most fundamental problems of Perception in their logical development and thought. As Perception is the very gateway to

Creative Understanding, the foundation of religious experience, Professor Sinha's first volume is of the greatest interest.

J. S. COLLIS

Orient and Occident. By HANS KOHN (The John Day Company, Inc., New York. \$1.75)

Modern Russia. By CICELY HAMILTON (J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London. 7s. 6d.)

Friends of humanity like Norman Angell and Gilbert Murray continue to preach the gospel of Internationalism, but men of action lead willing peoples along the path of militant Nationalism. Mr. Kohn points out that the menace to world unity comes not only from a morbid Post-war Europe, but also from the Orient, which has developed "a consciousness of a common political destiny". The Oriental peoples are struggling against absolutism at home, whether native or foreign, and for "recognition of perfect equality of rights with Western nations". They are also determined "to secure an active participation in world economics," not to accept passively the part assigned to them by the West—to serve as a market for Western manufactures and as a depot of raw materials. Western culture no longer rules the Eastern mind, which is now aware of "the insufficiencies and contradictions of European culture," and cognisant of "the depth and beauty of its own inherited culture". All these have sharpened the conflict between Orient and Occident, and there is "opposition to a further advance of occidental power, and a growing attempt almost everywhere to regain the political and economic positions lost two centuries ago". Unless the conflict is warded off, Mr. Kohn apprehends "world-wide combats of unthinkable cruelty". He discerns the mantle of the peace-maker on the shoulders of Bolshevik Russia; for Russia has been a meeting place of

the East and the West, while Bolshevism is leading the re-awakening of the East, and has recognised in 1924 the claims of the Oriental peoples to equal rights in the new world order.

Miss Cicely Hamilton would certainly demur to this exaltation of Bolshevik Russia. In her bright and vivid account of modern Russia, she does not indeed set down aught in malice, but she is nothing if not critical. She disarms criticism, however, by a frank avowal of her political faith: She is a confirmed Individualist, to whom planning is "the negation of freedom". It follows that the failures and the shortcomings of Bolshevik Russia have caught her keen and condemnatory eye. She speaks, however, with warm approval of the Bolshevik doctrine of voluntary motherhood, and is not at all shocked by legalisation of abortion. Her only regret is that "the Marxian experiment was not first tried out in a country the size of the Irish Free State—or better still, in Andorra".

Miss Hamilton is not alone in holding the Marxian experiment in Russia to be a failure, but the case for Planned Economy would be hardly affected by the failure of the Russian experiment. We are emerging from the era of *laissez-faire* and the Sovereign National State into that of economic planning and International co-operation. But neither a world economic plan nor a scheme of International co-operation, towards which men's minds are turning, can afford to ignore the claims of the Eastern peoples to equal rights and equal responsibilities in the New Order. It will be perhaps the task of India to bring about the much needed rapprochement between Orient and Occident.

N. S. SUBBA RAO

Determinism, Indeterminism and Libertarianism. By C. D. BROAD. (The University Press, Cambridge. 2s. 6d.)

The meaning of "ought" in ethical judgments is undoubtedly a very important problem in moral philosophy and that of free will is inseparably associated with it. In this book Dr. Broad gives a penetrating analysis of the notion of "ought". Determinism is defined as "the doctrine that every event is completely determined," while being completely determined is simply negatively interpreted as having zero range of indetermination. Indeterminism is described as the doctrine that some events are not completely determined, in the sense that they have finite range of indetermination. Libertarianism is understood as the doctrine that some voluntary actions have a causal ancestor containing the putting forth of an effort by a self. It will be noticed that this definition of Libertarianism amounts to a definition of self-determinism as it is usually understood.

Dr. Broad seems to advocate Determinism of a particular type. It is a Determinism of mental states as distin-

guished from a Determinism of substances, to borrow a distinction from his earlier work, *Five Types of Ethical Theory*. He vigorously argues against the belief in free will and in the determination of actions by a self, and regards "Reason," "Conscience" and "Moral Law" as "impressive names" which possess no causal efficacy. We find it difficult to go with Dr. Broad in this merely nominalistic interpretation of the guiding forces of our moral conduct. For, if an abiding self has no determining influence on the choice of actions, moral responsibility, we are afraid, will be a mere word without meaning. The doctrine of Karma in Indian Philosophy throws fullest moral responsibility on the agent. The Karma doctrine does not imply Determinism as it is sometimes supposed. For, though its rigorous logic allows no escape from the results of actions once performed, it provides fullest freedom at the initial stage. Moreover, in enjoying the fruits of our past deeds we are, as free agents, winding up the clock-work of our future states. It will thus be seen that the doctrine of Karma presents a unique reconciliation of free will and Determinism.

D. LONDHEY

These Hurrying Years: An Historical Outline, 1900-1933. By GERALD HEARD. (Chatto & Windus, London. 1s. 6d.)

This is a book, and by an author, extraordinarily characteristic of the present Western "moment". It and he are alike time-conscious to the last degree. The quite arbitrary period of a century, the twentieth from a not very certainly established event, being one-third over (a generation by common estimate), there is nothing for it but a stock taking, a stop-press report to date. So we have an account of these past thirty-three years, in four parts, each of which is in three sections. The parts are time-dated: 1900-1910, 1910-1919, 1919-1929, and 1929-1933. The sections present in

turn first "The Outward Scene," a panoramic account of actual events of the years under review; next "The Forces Behind" which come to the surface in the period, as the Labour Movement and Women's Suffrage Campaign in 1900-1910, and in all such general activities as Research, Discovery, Literature, Philosophy and Hygiene; and last "The Trend," summarising "the profound subconscious drive" impelling these forces and events. It is all quite ably if at times rather sketchily done. Mr. Heard has real, even rare, intelligence, a penetrating eye for the essential. He "sees through" both individual and social pretences and pretensions. He contrives, in no small degree, to see through the limited "Western outlook" which was

the fruit of nineteenth-century scientific dogmatism. But it is, really, his attitude here which makes him so very characteristic. It is his book's continuous theme, summed up in his conclusion, that all our time is a phase of a new development of consciousness. First, the suggestion seems to be, men gain through science their extraordinary knowledge of the exterior universe. Next, in the fruits of psychology and psycho-analysis, they move forward in self-knowledge. But a third step is needed, to bring the two knowledges into a single and true relation, in "the discovery that not only is our most detached observation of the outer world an act of creative selection but that that selection is made because of and through a fundamental relatedness between inner consciousness and outward experience," in the understand-

ing that finally outer knowledge rests, is dependent, upon inner knowledge, that the two truly are one, and in a sense much more than merely individually subjective.

Just so—may we not all say: Agreed! But what is so typical in Mr. Heard of the Western intellectual is his instinctive effort to present this essentially and profoundly religious and mystical realisation in purely secular terms. More, he totally neglects the influence of Eastern thought and of its Western advocates in furthering—perhaps initiating—this awakening of wider consciousness. Nevertheless, his book is genuinely both instructive and illuminating, not least as a study of current world troubles as "all projections of inner conflict striving to avoid the crisis that must be fought out in itself".

GEOFFREY WEST

Essentials in the Development of Religion: A Philosophic and Psychological Study. By J. E. TURNER, Ph. D. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 12s. 6d.)

This is a work on general metaphysics, dealing with different aspects of human experience, and especially with the problems of selfhood, good and evil, immortality and God, which are particularly connected with man's religious consciousness. The argument proceeds on familiar Hegelian lines and is maintained throughout at a high level.

The main emphasis seems to be on the fact that religion is inherent in human nature. All mystical elements appear to be eliminated from religion when it is defined as "man's total response to his *entire* realised universe" (p. 54). Our mind no doubt always works as a whole but ordinarily one of its aspects, knowing, feeling or willing, is explicit while the others remain implicit. But when, on comparatively rare occasions, these activities of the mind become simultaneously explicit and are "inextricably fused together into a completely unified experience, some

mode of religion arises and persists so long as unity is unimpaired" (p. 43).

I doubt whether this definition will be acceptable to all religious-minded people. It presupposes that there is only one type of spirituality, implying the simultaneous presence of knowing, feeling and willing. Cannot each of these modes of consciousness claim a religion of its own, *viz.*, that of *jñāna*, *bhakti* or *karma*? Moreover, though religion is a characteristic response to some reality, should that reality be one's whole universe so that the world of sense and thought cannot be excluded from it? In religion one often turns away from the world to some reality which, though highest in one's own estimation, need not be all-inclusive.

The book is interspersed with apposite quotations from contemporary writers on science and philosophy.

The work on the whole is a valuable addition to philosophical literature and although it may not convince the skeptic on many points, it will surely strengthen the beliefs of those who are already in sympathy with idealistic positions.

RASVIHARI DAS

The Great Design: Order and Progress in Nature. Edited by FRANCES MASON, with an introduction by Sir J. Arthur Thomson. (Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., London. 8s. 6d.)

It is no business of science to answer ultimate questions. Science is concerned with the observation of phenomena. Her first aim is accuracy in observation: her second the welding of accurate observations, as far as this may be possible, into a self-consistent whole. She vouchsafes no replies to the Whys? and Wherefores? which the human mind so persistently asks. But—and it is a rather important but—she undoubtedly points the way. She cannot rid herself of metaphysical implications.

And a few decades ago, the way seemed clear. Science was held to point most conclusively to the remarkable metaphysical system known as "materialism". The Cosmos was composed of material particles whose behaviour was ruled by an iron necessity. Given the positions, masses and motions of all these particles at any point in the history of the universe, and it was theoretically possible to predict the whole of its history. A certain arrangement of these particles had once occurred. How, it was not clear, but chance was invoked, although the concept of chance ran absolutely contrary to that of natural law as envisaged by the theory. And from this chance arrangement, by the operation of necessity, arose all the varied phenomena of life and inanimate nature.

During the past few years, a revolution has taken place. Modern physics has exposed the fundamental error of the older physics on which materialism was largely based, namely the attempt to explain the behaviour of individuals in terms of that of groups. The realm of group behaviour is that of natural law, or of seeming necessity. In the realm of individual behaviour chance

or freedom finds a place. Mechanical models have been forced to give place to mathematical equations.

The volume under review contains a number of essays by prominent men of science indicative of the metaphysical implications of modern science. As knowledge grows, so does the consciousness of purpose and design become more definite and secure.

I select Professor Hans Driesch's essay "The Breakdown of Materialism," for especial mention, because his biological researches have led him to conclusions so thoroughly in harmony with those of modern mathematical physics. "The structure of the world," he writes, "is decidedly *dualistic*. There is, as far as we *know*, plan *and* absence of plan or, to put it shortly, *design mingled with contingency*."

This dualism of design and contingency permeates all nature. There is design in relation to the whole; but every constituent element, whether electron, germ-cell or the entity which we call the soul of man, possesses a measure of freedom. Such a concept gives life a meaning which no other concept can do. There is a plan underlying the universe, a plan towards whose achievement we can co-operate, or which, if we so please, we can endeavour to frustrate.

The question of immortality is one on which Professor Driesch touches. As he points out, with the breakdown of materialism, this, together with the problem of free will, again becomes "discussable". Indeed, these are problems of the greatest importance and interest. Professor Driesch refers to *Psychical Research*, the youngest of all the sciences, which he says he appreciates and esteems very highly. "*Here and only here*," he adds, "there may some day be solved what might be called the problem of all problems, the question of immortality."

H. S. REDGROVE

FROM LONDON

With the General Commission of the Disarmament Conference again in session at Geneva, and the slowly increasing awareness in the public mind that vital issues are at stake, I feel that the subject of Peace again demands our first attention. Could there, indeed, be any social and political question of greater urgency at the present time? This, not because we fear a European war in the course of the next five or ten years, but because unless we can arrive at some means of determining the race for armaments, we shall be postponing the hope of release from the present economic stringency and be laying up the material that will inevitably lead, sooner or later, to the destruction of our present civilisation. Whether or no that destruction might eventually lead to a world of new thought and greater spiritual progress, is not a question for us to consider at the present moment. In this, at least, we may follow the words of Arjuna in the first book of the *Bhagavad-Gita** :—

How can we be happy if we slay our own kin? These would I not kill though they slay me even for the kingdom of the three worlds, much less for this earth.

I have already written in THE ARYAN PATH of the obstacles and restrictions that beset the activities of the League of Nations; but a short further analysis is demanded by recent events. There can be no sort of question that the most

obvious impediment which still stands between us and the most tentative disarmament convention is provided by the mutual distrust and animosity of France and Germany. No further evidence of the truth of that assertion is needed than the report of the proceedings of the Conference to be found in *The Times* for May 31st. For after Sir John Simon, the British representative, had pointed out that Germany had made a step towards a possible convention, M. Barthou, in a brilliant but destructive speech, aspersed Germany's bona fides and cited the testimony of their last budget, which contained an admitted increase in armaments of over two thousand million francs.

Nevertheless, if this is for the general public the most obvious impediment, there is another of still greater weight which never appears in the public press. If I were to state this quite simply by saying that the great financial interests of Europe do not favour peace propaganda, I should run the risk of being misunderstood. That is certainly a very important factor. Very great wealth is sunk in private firms for the manufacture of armaments, and other huge financial interests would profit (temporarily), by an outbreak of war. But that fact must not be taken alone. What we must consider also is the gross inertia and restric-

* Charles Johnston's translation.

tions of the minds of those whose chief interest is the amassing of wealth. It is our unhappy custom to speak of such minds as being shrewd and practical and to attribute the worldly success of the millionaire to his gift for foresight. The truth is that the "shrewdness" is confined to the mere business of money-making,—often oblivious of the ruin and misery brought on hundreds of thousands of small speculators and investors*—and the "foresight" is limited to the anticipation of future profit, without regard to such larger issues as the possible destruction of a civilisation.

And we must not forget in this connection that it is the power of wealth which dominates and guides both statesmanship and politics, a power that is essentially conservative, self-seeking and, when the larger issues are taken into account, short-sighted. This is not to say that the true rulers of Europe and America are a group of financiers, but that they are the mass of those—a small numerical minority of the whole population—who, because they have the same interests and ambitions as the successful money-makers, think as they do in matters of International Policy.

This, I believe, is the true obstructive influence at Geneva, unrecognised by the general public and not even consciously in the minds of the majority of our politicians and statesmen. Wherefore

the outward parade of suggestion and counter-suggestion for a Disarmament Convention is carried on from month to month and year to year in order to "save the faces" of each country's delegates, but without any sincere belief in the various proposals being accepted and, worse still, without any real desire for peace. In my last letter, I wrote of the possibility that France might rise in a socialist revolution against the capitalists who rule her from Paris. In my opinion, such a revolution would be conducive to the spiritual health of Europe.

Let us next consider, however, what is the chief force that puts a brake on this evil influence of wealth as the ruler of our destinies. This force is not, unhappily, an admirable one. It is not an uplifting spiritual power, inspired by faith and love, but that paralysing, restrictive force which we know as Fear. Is it not, for instance, fear that has driven Russia once more to make advances to the League? Is she not becoming increasingly conscious of the menace to her eastern borders provided by the establishment of the industrious, unethetical Japanese in the heart of China? If Germany comes back into the League, will it be because she has abandoned her ambition to conquer Europe and desires peace, or because she is afraid of the jealous nations that encircle her, and is playing for time to perfect her own plans? In a

* "What work is begun without regard for consequences, for the loss it may cause, or injury to others, or waste of Power, through delusion, this is declared to be of Darkness." *Bhagavad-Gita*, Book XVIII.

word, is not one of our best arguments for peace the threat of all the horrors and disasters of war?

This is not a pleasant deduction. In the spiritual life, fear is an enemy that must be conquered, and there can be no advance in self-development until that victory is won. And since the spirit of a nation has a close analogy with that of an individual, we can never hope for any real progress towards international sympathy and understanding as a result of peace founded on so base a motive. But the dread of war haunting the thoughts of a large body of people, may serve a purpose by giving us more time to preach the gospel of international fellowship, and much is being done in that direction. There is, at the present time, a recognisably larger proportion of people who are able to think sanely on this subject.

Nevertheless, returning to that point of playing for time almost at any cost, we know so well that if a colourable pretext for war were found in the course of the next few years—such a pretext as the threat of German ambition, for example,—an enormous number of people who are now pacifist in principle would be submerged by a wave of patriotic emotion. They would not lack stimuli. The Press would see to that, because the Press is controlled by those financial interests which, as I have already said, are far-sighted enough to see a future profit, and short-sighted enough to look no further. Wherefore, even though we use the unworthy instrument of fear, we must do all

in our power to postpone any serious issue.

As an illustration of clear thinking and, at the same time, of its futility in the modern, money-ruled world, I may cite a recent suggestion put forward at a Congress of the Labour Party. This was that no Government should be permitted to declare war on another until it had taken a plebiscite of the whole adult population. Further it was suggested that every voter in favour of war should, *ipso facto*, become liable for active service, or to an immediate tax up to 25% of his or her income for the cost of maintenance. This suggestion is eminently reasonable. If the majority of the people desired war, the burden of it should be borne by them, rather than by the minority who voted for peace. Also, it may be safely inferred, the realisation of the price to be paid would considerably influence the nature of the vote. Much patriotic fervour would be checked by the consideration that it would entail an immediate personal penalty. No proposition could be more just and logical, yet we know that it has no chance whatever of becoming law, nor even of being made the issue of an election. Is it any wonder that, watching the political issues without prejudice, we realise that their surface values have little or no relation to their true intention? We are ruled ultimately by the agents of Mammon and those who hold the same faith.

One other little side light on this great problem has been provided by the reasonable suggestion that

we should cease to provide Bolivia and Paraguay with the munitions of war, all of which have to be imported. America took the lead in this connection, and the first reply was from Paraguay to the effect that if their munitions were cut off, they would cease to abide by the laws of "*civilised warfare*," a description that may give us food for thought. That threat has since been withdrawn; it was, in any case, a double-edged sword; but at present no fervent response has been made to the proposal,—nor will be, unless, as is quite possible, the armament firms begin to suspect that they are making a bad debt. It is still fresh in our memories that the suggested embargo on British ammunition to Japan was never carried into effect. Such gestures as these serve further to remind us that the spirit is sometimes willing but that it has no chance of practical expression in the national life.

In conclusion, I need hardly, in addressing readers of THE ARYAN PATH, underline the necessity for serving the Cause of Peace, in the only way it can be truly served, by inculcating the principle of Universal Brotherhood, by recognising and continually practising the truth that in every human being resides the spirit of which we are ourselves a member, and that every effort towards unity is positive and good, every effort towards separation, negative and an aspect of evil.

I had recently an opportunity to realise something of the effect that this spirit of brotherhood may

have upon a large audience. The meeting in question was at the Dome in Brighton, once the riding school of King George IV, a hall capable of accommodating 3,000 people, and on this occasion completely filled. The attraction was the names of two speakers, who had come to address this large audience on the text "Peace in Our Time". Both of them have a great reputation in England, as teachers who have sincerely endeavoured to put the principles of Christ into practice, to work by love and understanding without regard to such personal rewards as power, popularity or even gratitude. One of them was Dr. Maude Royden, a woman minister who has her own, slightly unorthodox, Church in London. The other was "Dick" Sheppard, for many years Vicar of St. Martin's, for a short time Dean of Canterbury, and at present not attached to any Church of England office. Both of them spoke very well, and were enthusiastically received, not for the dramatic effects they obtained, since neither of them is a great orator, but because all they said was inspired by the spirit of toleration and a sincere love for humanity of every degree.

Now what I wish to emphasize by citing this instance is the fact that the reputation of these two teachers was such that there was not enough room in the Dome for all those who wanted to hear them, although so notable a political figure as that of Sir John Simon had failed to fill the same building a few weeks earlier. What then, we must ask, was the

attraction exercised by the names of Dr. Royden and Dr. Sheppard? They are not, as I have said, particularly eloquent speakers. They have no new and exciting doctrine to preach. They have done nothing dramatic or unusual of the kind that would make them famous in the Press. I can find but one answer to my own rhetorical question. These two people stand

for that one aspect of universal truth, which is the basis of all true religions, the preaching and, more important still, the practice of love towards all men. And whenever a man or a woman is inspired by that spirit to such a degree as to regard all objects other than the service of humanity as worthless, he or she will become a power to move the crowd.

J. D. BERESFORD

CORRESPONDENCE

WAS BUDDHA A HINDU?

No! answers the orthodox zealous exponent of traditional Hindu thought. This literalist section which unfortunately is numerous in Hindu society resorts to a type of argument based on superficial study and thought. They tell us that Buddha attacked the three essential features of Hinduism, namely, (a) the Pantheon of Gods, (b) the scheme of rituals and (c) the rigid inflexible caste system. No catholic Hindu would admit that the above mentioned three principles constitute the basic essence of Hinduism. To a philosophically minded Hindu it would seem quite alien to the central teaching of Hinduism to worship a hundred thousand gods. The division of mankind into privileged and unprivileged classes and castes revolts the conscience of a humanitarian Hindu. The Sages of the Upanishads have declared that ritualism is futile if unlit by knowledge. The orthodox Hindu who professes to be the sole trustee of the Hindu scriptures, with exclusive authority for their interpretation, would hesitate to regard the greatest Hindu of modern times, Mahatma Gandhi, as being within the pale of Hinduism.

On the other hand, Western interpreters have concentrated on the negative implications of Buddha's teaching, which has led them to the

absolute conclusion that Buddha preached an arid and barren Nihilism. Some of the interpreters, among them Dr. Keith, seem to think that Buddha's philosophy was merely an unreasoned agnosticism. Even Mrs. Rhys-Davids until the other day strangely enough held the negative view common to her Western compeers. To reduce Buddha's teaching to mere agnosticism is to misconceive totally his true philosophical stature. Agnosticism is only surface deep. The great agnostics and sceptics of the world of thought have only used it as a method. "Descartes passed from a doubt to a dogma, Balfour defended the philosophical doubt only to lay the foundation of belief." *Nasthika-Vada* (atheism) was looked upon as a *Darsana* and it was called a *Samika Darsana* by the Hindu philosophers.

Having ruled out all these interpretations we are obliged to resort to the positive interpretation of Buddha's teaching. If Buddha was agnostic were not the Upanishads agnostic? The Upanishadic doctrine of Brahman in negative terms is an illustration of the failure of the human mind to grasp a higher Reality which has to be intuited. What Buddha denied was not the fundamental Sat. He denied only the false view of the surface self.

The principal weapon of Buddha,

like that of the Upanishadic Sages, was an imperious intuition of the self-prolonged meditation on life and its problems—not the weapon of barren logic. Where Buddha pleaded for a suspension of judgment, his orthodox interpreters recklessly repudiated. Scientific students of Advaita would find much in common between Buddha and Sankara. Once we understand Buddha in this light we can without any damage to Advaitic thought call Sankara not a *Prachhanna* Buddha but a *Prakata* Buddha, a popular Buddha. The silence of Buddha is nothing but the *Anirvachaniya* of Sankara renamed. Sankara when pestered by a disciple constantly about the nature of Brahman said *Upasantoyam Brahma* (Silence is Brahman). So what Sankara castigated in his commentary on the Vedanta Sutas was only the misunderstood Buddhism of his day. Buddha did affirm the central Reality of the Absolute and denied only the empirical self. Buddha was a Hindu. He was a Hindu Protestant.

Madras

P. NAGA RAJA RAO

WHO WILL EXPLAIN?

I wonder if any reader of THE ARYAN PATH can offer an explanation of, or a parallel to, an experience which has often been mine, especially when I was younger. It is a state of consciousness into which I would sometimes find myself plunged quite suddenly—much as if I had fallen unawares into deep water, except that I could not float up to the surface again. The principal symptom is that all the sensorial perceptions seem to reach my consciousness with a considerable delay, and, as it were, at secondhand. If people are talking around me, I think “Aha! A has said this or that, and (I go on mentally noting) B has replied, but he must have said more than I can remember; and now C is speaking, but I shall never be able to keep time with them!” Sight seems to become restricted to a quite narrow field; I feel as if I must choose if I shall see

this or that object, just as I would have to focus a camera in this or that direction. The outside world then looks very much like a picture on the screen, much too quick and too intricate to be all taken in. My own words or actions I perceive with the same remoteness, as if they came from somebody else. The internal feeling we normally have of the weight of the body, tension of the muscles, etc., is completely numbed, so that I am in dread of losing my balance. Unfortunately I was never able to experiment what would have been the exact effect of a blow, a burn, or a pin-prick. I cannot understand how I am still standing; if I decide to move in a certain direction, and to a certain spot, I seem to get there by just wishing it (as sometimes in dreams), not by muscular action. This sort of trance usually lasts a few minutes and ceases as suddenly as it came on. It is probably some variety of sleep. I always found it decidedly unpleasant when it occurred at school, or in the army, or in crowded streets. The first instance I can remember, and quite vividly, happened when I was 14 or 15. I have never been able to connect it with digestion, or hunger, or fatigue, or any bodily or mental circumstances whatever. At such times I was always in the best of health, I had not smoked or taken tea or coffee, much less wine. I have not met anyone who has experienced the same phenomena. To be sure, there is nothing sensational about them but there may be as much to learn from them as from more spectacular abnormalities.

And by the way, is it not to be regretted that so-called “psychic” phenomena are always approached in their most intense and extraordinary forms, when the facts are probably far more intricate than we can imagine? A quite elementary abnormal, or super-normal phenomenon, however inconspicuous it may seem, would probably better repay earnest research.

Paris

J. B.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

“—————ends of verse

And sayings of philosophers.”

HUDIBRAS.

In the midst of the strife and tumult of the world, amongst articles of accusation and denunciation, predicting the downfall of common sense and morality, it is refreshing and delightful to come across an article like that of M. Guillet entitled “L’Elite de la Jeunesse en 1934” (*Revue des Deux Mondes*—June). M. Guillet is the director of L’Ecole Central, an engineering school, and is therefore in daily contact with youths of 19 to 23. He analyses impartially their qualities and faults, their tendencies and aspirations. Although they are more careless in their drawing-room manners and in their dress, are not so well versed in the art of writing, especially spelling, youth shows on the whole,

more simplicity, less bluff, less arrogance than thirty-five years ago. It is conscious of its worth, but never boasts of it. Less sensuous and more sportive, we insist on this last point, there are far fewer of those “liaisons” which cast a dark shadow over a whole life. Youth is frank, straightforward, it doesn’t know how to lie. Very independent and, curiously enough, it can be guided, but it demands a great deal from those who are to command. It wants to come together, to help, to co-operate, to follow examples, but these must be clear, precise, pure. . . . Social spirit is very marked. . . . They are passionately interested in movements which will teach them to do good. . . . They turn to the poor to give them bread, clothing and consolation. . . . Groups cheer

the slums, bettering them, cleaning them, decorating them.

And all these young people want to marry young, to have a family, children, a home.

In two maxims, M. Guillet expresses all that the elders are trying to teach and that youth accepts, and more important, practises (p. 640) :

La vie ne vaut que par le bien que l’on peut faire en la traversant.

On n’est riche que de ce que l’on donne.

How is it then that the evil psychic after-effects of war are subsiding first in France, the land which suffered most next to Belgium? Is it because of the culture of many long years which forms part of the very atmosphere of France? There is a great deal of talk about Germanic culture, and because it is so much shouted about people are apt to overlook the more powerful and more refining influence of France. George Slocombe in his book just published, *The Heart of France*, says :—

I am convinced that France is the most highly civilized country in the world. Other nations may enjoy a greater literacy, a more enlightened Press, a system of education which reaches to the nethermost layers of the population. Other countries may enjoy a greater illusion of public liberty. . . . But nowhere in the world is the spirit of man more free, nowhere are men more conscious of their own rights and of the rights of others.

Some types of dreams escape the ordinary classifications of psychology, since they bring to light the powers latent in man and prove the existence in him of a soul whose knowledge and capacity are far above the ordinary reasoning consciousness. A case in point is noted in *The Observer* (6th May). Professor C. V. Boys, past president of the Physical Society of London, began to dream one night of the construction of an extraordinarily intricate machine for measuring the value of the gas used for domestic purposes, and on awakening started out at six o'clock in the morning to objectivise the dream. The result is a machine which is claimed to be fool-proof, designed to last forever, which costs little and needs only one gallon of water per year as against 300,000 gallons required by old-time machines.

"But don't let me be mixed up with any of this absurd spook nonsense," said the professor, yesterday. "It is nothing more than having the mind saturated with a subject and then — if your mind is on it — thoughts come to you, not by direct intention, but out of the sky, out of nowhere.

"At the time I had not been considering such a machine at all. I had been thinking for twenty years about the problem — but what came into my head in the dream was entirely apart from anything I had contemplated. Few can appreciate the mathematical processes that followed. They were so intricate that if I had not been inspired and impelled by that phenomenon I don't think I should ever have got through it at all. I think it is far more perfect than anything that is known in this direction."

Analogous cases are known of scientists who, after a long period of steady concentration on a problem, found the answer in a flash of intuition, not necessarily in dream, but certainly at a moment when the conscious mind was not occupied with the problem. What, then, is this "accurate discerning power" that leaps to the goal instead of slowly pacing out the distance? It is no explanation to say that the idea came out of the blue. Why should the process of conscious concentration only prepare the way? Make steady that aspect of the mind commonly called "wandering" so that it affords, in place of its usual protean modifications, a smooth surface, able to reflect the almost omniscient ideation of the spiritual mind. The passionate mind, called in Hindu psychology Kama-Manas, being stilled, and mere intellect, Manas *per se*, allowed to drop into abeyance, the highest power of intellection, Buddhi-Manas, is able to manifest.

But few people have such dreams, since the memory of them depends on the clarification of the brain. Few people in their waking state feel arising spontaneously within them the clear insight of the highest mind. They are too much caught up in their own limited personal identity to be able to draw upon that inner storehouse of knowledge. By daily practice mind must be freed from passions and prides and trivialities and the brain made porous to the influences and the impacts of the spiritual-soul.