

# EAUAS

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

## THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. II

SEPTEMBER 1931

No. 9

### SCIENCE AND THE PATH OF THE SOUL

During this month the British Association for the Advancement of Science will celebrate the Centenary of its birth. In numerous ways the achievements of modern science will be lauded and the future prospect envisaged.

Ancient Science investigates the realm of Spirit as modern Science that of Matter; each has its own views and opinions about the other. Very often that soul-science or Theosophy is regarded as the enemy of modern science. This is not really true. There is a wider gulf, one of dangerous depths, between Theosophy and creedal religions than between Theosophy and modern science. That there are great divergencies in their outlooks and methods cannot be gainsaid. But there can be no possible conflict between them where the conclusions of science are grounded on a substratum of

unassailable fact, which has not always been the case.

The greatest help Theosophy has received in this cycle has come from Science, and on an occasion like this it must be recorded once again. What was that help?

Science dethroned the religious institution of the miracle; and chiefly due to its splendid demonstration the first proposition of Oriental Philosophy and Psychology is now universally accepted even if it be not universally applied, *viz.*:—

There is no miracle. Everything that happens is the result of law—eternal, immutable, ever active.

Science has shown beyond questioning that Law reigns in Nature and that everything without exception is an effect from a cause. But as it has so far dealt only with the outer crust of living

Nature, strictly confining itself to the use of its own inductive method of reasoning and research, it has not succeeded in seeing the Law at work on the moral plane of the human kingdom, however vast it has stretched the universe of atoms.

Science wields a tremendous influence on the human mind. Claims of infallibility are made on its behalf. When Leverrier discovered Neptune and Darwin wrote *On the Origin of Species* Science was quite sure of its own infallibility; though humble expressions of "we do not know" are becoming more frequent, even its present-day attitude is one of superiority which laughs at the suggestion that there may exist a different approach to knowledge of Nature and Nature's laws. And yet, how true are the remarks of a reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement* for the 9th of July:—

Science to-day does not hold quite the authoritative position it did, mainly because its fallibility has been exposed by itself. What science says to-day it unsays to-morrow. But the legend of scientific infallibility dies a lingering death, what "science says" is still an irrefutable truth to many, especially if they understand it imperfectly, as is generally the case.

For this reason among others the moral responsibility of Science towards society assumes vast proportions. What steps are being taken to fulfil this duty?

Take one phase of this moral responsibility. It might be asked what steps are modern scientists taking to protect their discoveries

and inventions against petty and even degrading uses? Some time ago Professor Joad wrote thus in our pages:—

Science has given us powers fit for the gods and we bring to their use the mentality of schoolboys . . . . Men of genius by the dozen, men of talent by the hundred have laboured that wireless might be. They succeeded, and the tittle tattle of the divorce court and the racing stable is broadcasted to the remoter Pacific, while the ultimate ether vibrates to the strains of negroid music. In war time our medical science displays an almost incredible skill in patching up shattered bodies, in order that the equally incredible imbecility of our political science may set chemical science to work to blow them to bits again. In our scientific knowledge, we are gods; in our ethics and politics, quarrelsome babies. And the babies are entrusted with the powers appropriate to the gods.

There is a double aspect to this problem—the wireless reveals the one, poison gas the other. The former type of invention introduces ugliness, multiplies sense-objects not necessary for healthy and decent living, enhances sense-life which weakens and deadens high and noble thinking, and generally lowers the right standards of social well-being. Not the invention, but the commercial use made of it, has been wrong. The other is far more dangerous and degrading, where scientific knowledge and power are not only commercially exploited but shamefully prostituted. Some time ago Professor Soddy and others emphatically and nobly protested against scientific investigators selling their gifts to the state or other concerns which follow the way of competition. Neither

international political rivalries nor the class strifes in every nation have abated; and co-operation, which L. P. Jacks described only the other day as "the most difficult and beautiful art in the world," is itself stealthily employed by various groups whose religion is competition, and whose commandment, "Thou shalt not be found out". The scientist's moral responsibility to humanity is crucial. Have those who have attained to knowledge the moral right to pass it on to others, fully aware that it will be used for deteriorative and even destructive purposes? This is an acute problem, and on its right solution depends the future of civilization, and of science itself.

Then, another problem: Science is no longer materialistic as it was in the nineteenth century; yet it persists in its view, in spite of onslaughts from various directions, that human thought, will and feeling are products of brains of flesh. The thinker, the human soul, as a separate and distinct entity using the body with its sense-orifices, taking it at birth and leaving it at death, is a truth not likely to be looked upon favourably by science for a long time. The survival of human passions after the death of the body, their disintegration and subsequent reintegration, the attraction of the immortal soul to a new incarnation, are no more subjects of scientific discussion to-day than they were fifty years ago. Eschatology is taboo, and even the anthropological sections

of Science congresses discuss it only in the light of religious superstitions or interesting folklore. Neither Spiritualism nor Psychological Research, any more than Theosophy, has succeeded in making a dent in the stolid armour of the exponent who asserts—"When the candle is exhausted the flame goes out."

Now, the ancients claimed *knowledge* of these subjects and it is high time that science became less presumptuous about them. The claims of the old-world heroes cry aloud these days as archæologists excavate buried cities of thousands of years in age. Their work in metal and colour, their knowledge of sanitation and town-planning, and of many other arts, stagger the up-to-date beholder of the marvels of yore. These old-world masters have made strange claims of possessing unbelievable powers and their visible feats call for a respectful consideration of those claims. They built Pyramids and Pagodas, they created Angkor and coloured Ajanta, they worked with gold and made glass, they knew the science of numbers and used the Zodiac. How did they achieve all these? By animalism and instinct? Still more, their sublime philosophic ideas—were these the children of mindless men? And these same teachers who knew how to produce fire, to grow wheat, to cook food, talked of pre-natal life and post-mortem states; and evolved a science full of details about the evolution of the soul. A more

serious, not an academic but a practical examination of the Ancient Science and its propositions is overdue, and the world is poorer because, fighting the dogmatic attitude of religions, science has become entrenched in its own dogmas.

The two urgent requirements of modern science seem to us to be (1) assignment of social and ethical values to its knowledge, discoveries and inventions, just as it is doing on the plane of commerce and economics: and (2) reorientation of its enquiry and investigation, seeking for new methods once rife in the old

world. In more than one branch, Science has reached the dead wall of invisibility. Microscopes fail in their power, exquisite balances in their function, as matter is now the stuff of which dreams are made. It looks as if the power of mind over matter is going to be defeated, unless, leaving the beaten track of the last century, Science strikes the highway of the scientist-philosophers of Egypt, Chaldea and ancient Aryavarta, who dreamed bold dreams and realized them by the power of their own spiritual faculties.

Knowledge is man's greatest inheritance; why, then, should he not attempt to reach it by every possible road? The laboratory is not the only ground for experiment; *science*, we must remember, is derived from *sciens*, present participle of *scire*, "to know,"—its origin is similar to that of the word "discern," "to ken". Science does not therefore deal only with matter, no, not even its subtlest and obscurest forms. Such an idea is born merely of the idle spirit of the age. Science is a word which covers all forms of knowledge. It is exceedingly interesting to hear what chemists discover, and to see them finding their way through the densities of matter to its finer forms; but there are other kinds of knowledge than this, and it is not everyone who restricts his (strictly scientific) desire for knowledge to experiments which are capable of being tested by the physical senses.

—*Light on the Path*

## LO! IN THE ORIENT

[Lloyd Morris is the pen-name of one who would like to remain "just a voice" and not allow us to introduce him to our readers. But here are some facts about this Englishman who has for some years been resident in sunny California. He was born, and his boyhood was spent, within sight of the steeple alleged to have been climbed by Clive, with whom he can trace some kinship. From the same Shropshire locality the family gave to England as sacrifice General Cureton during the Sikh War. Our author has travelled widely in Asia as well as in Africa—sometimes as an engineer, sometimes as an explorer, and won a Fellowship of the Royal Geographical Society. He served his country worthily in the Great War. He informs us: "My larger life and activity is that of a professional writer who prefers to be to his public just Lloyd Morris."

Our author wields a trenchant pen. Some time ago he wrote about "The Occidental Martha," and considers Asia to be "too much Mary". He warns India, and the warning is worthy of very special heeding—Does India want Western crowns?

He asks India—"What is your address to the peoples of the setting sun?"

We repeat what we said last month—there is no other subject of so fundamental a value to the whole world as this of the cultural unity between East and West, and no other group of human beings has the grand opportunity that now comes the way of re nascent India—not only "can India give India freedom from India's self," but also she can "then come to teach the degraded better things".

—EDS.]

At the moment of its political emancipation, Asia approaches its greatest peril: peril that freedom be withheld; or limited; peril that it be yielded. No longer vassal to the West, Asia becomes subject to itself; dependent on its own sagacities; exposed to its own passions; unchecked to indulge extravagant follies; and undivided creditor of the meritorious. To the threatening hand of foreign rapacities it must oppose its own defences; for the convulsions of its own political integration, must find its own solution; and though the dominion of its conqueror relinquish to it political independence, its economic establishment is within no one's gift or grant, and must be achieved by its own hand and brain.

In what shape, what guise, Asia, do you come into the comity of nations? *You, India, in particular, rising now in the Orient; what is your address to the peoples of the setting sun?* Bound to alien tutelage, responsibility holds you unaccountable: free, you are not merely under necessity to vindicate your pretensions before Western civilization, but are on trial for your very life. And from Bering Sea to the Golden Horn millions of white faces are watching millions of faces that are not white.

Your independence does not imply that you are fitted for it: that you have to prove. And in the irony of History, not only you are on trial, but Britain, also, is at the bar; and you, India, are the

unwitting, unwilling, chief witness; whose testimony of achievement will show whether in yielding you liberty Britain is criminal to Occidental civilization, or a noble nation; whether her abdication is a gesture of greatness, or evidence of final declension.

What are you, India? a brown body in a loin cloth eating rice? a corpulent citizen with the flaccid mouth of an orator learned in the law? lordly states of inherited privilege? a clawing hand with a begging bowl? priestly fanatic? a great people with the heritage of noble spirituality? or twisted ascetic nourishing flies with the scabs and sores of a debased body? Are you political? Are you national? A political consciousness in a social state wherein millions of emotional human animals forming an overwhelming majority, are played upon by the apt skill of a highly organized minority intelligentsia directed to an invidious end? Or, are you a national consciousness cognizant of a national coherence and integrity; and animated by the deep sense of a destined people?

What forces, what capacities are in your mind and hand to resist the alien and establish the native? When the mailed stranger is assaulting your gates under sanction of the wolf and the lamb polity which the West has made peculiarly its own, what recourse will be yours to repel that which would violate? Will the tocsin of sacerdotal denunciation be invoked? What reason have you to suppose the servants of *Hari*

and *Hara* have power and immunity superior to the assembled Druids slaughtered twenty centuries ago on Mona's Isle? Will you point to your Treaties, to your Declarations of Independence? Have you not heard, nor read, or has none ever told you of the story of a scrap of paper, and its astonishing adventures against TNT, nickel steel and lethal gas? When the times of drought shall come, will your facile politicians go out from their cities and sternly reprimand with Asian oratory, Asian meteorology? sweetly request or strongly command the rain that it fall at the times and seasons politically appointed! or, notify the lordly sun that it must not at this or that time strike here or there, for we are independent now! Perchance if it be an English sun it will comply; but what if it be an Indian sun and answer?—I am an Indian orb and shall do as I please. When the floods come will you admonish them with the threat of an *hartal*? and at the time of plague will you present an Act of Congress to the *bacillus pestis*; and fulminate civil disobedience against the *vibro cholerae asiaticae*? When imports and exports exhibit the preposterous relationship of the precarious, will you seek to remedy present ills by reference to past wrongs; and so carry us all back to creation in the vehicle of accusation and rebuttal?

What is the self to which you must be subject? It is not the generous age of Asoka; for the word and deed of his time was

that you mix equally with the dreaded and despised; and even to the passing over of the "black water" you go teaching better things. It is not the golden time of Gupta; for then science and art were high and balanced; trade and commerce were a wide and gracious growth; and comely embassies sojourned with their culture in distant capitals of the world; and the voice of literature was *Sakuntala*. It is not the spacious wonder of Akbar's vanished day; for then there was neither Hindu nor Muslim; and the "guardian of mankind" knew not the tutelary deities of degraded cults. It is not the day of Babur; for the Tiger's brood knew not nor had tasted or become dependent upon the ameliorative inventions of a wizard mechanical age. Call not, then, upon the Past, India, lest it rise up in evidence against your present, should you claim that the wonder you were is your self to-day.

What is the Self to which you must be subject? It is an oriental soul that has lived beside occidental waters; been wayfarer along occidental highways; trencherman at occidental banquets of materialism; and having tasted the pragmatic can no more be wholly content with the rational; nor being basically transcendental can wholly be sufficed with the empirical. It is a spirituality mired with its own corruptions.

Over the habitable globe the question passes whether it be right or wrong that India shall be free. *Britain can yield you political freedom; but only India can give*

### *India freedom from India's Self.*

And nothing is wrong in eternity; nothing right: it is simply that the ends of destiny come to all; and now India takes its place in the centre of the Oriental Front; with Russia and China on each flank. You, India, have to make a nation of yourself; how is China doing it; how Russia?

Uneasy on their shoulders presently will stand native heads supported by, and supporting, vested interest, privilege, and contending faction. But to you into whose hands come the powers of life and death, come also the remembrance that *Thermidor* follows *Floreal*; and in the end comes 18th *Brumaire*.

Western crowns can only be obtained by western ways. The bastions of Verdun were not the product of sloth and speculation; suzerainty of the seas did not repose upon dirt and contemplation; the sky-line of lower Manhattan did not arise out of *Bhut*. A billionaire fiscal year will not accrue from a proletariat tributary to *gramadevati*; vaccines and prophylactics are not discovered by the exercise of revolting sacrifices to a nondescript pantheon; nor triumphs of engineering engendered by obscene propitiations on nights of *Kālī-pujā*; the accomplishments of physics will not be yielded up by *pradakshina* perambulation on the Ganges or Jumna; and immersion in their waters may bring soothing to the soul, but certainly not to the mind and body; neither knowledge of *atman*, ethic of *moksa*, nor jeal-

ous adornment of sectarian facial mark will serve as a compensatory recourse for a scientific ignorance unable to foil or ameliorate parasitic plant disease; and sanitary sewage disposal will not be evolved miraculously by a polytheistic fanfaronade.

Your perambulation of the rivers must be with an eye to their riparian industrial use, and their unsanitary misuses. Your sacrifice of blood offerings must be an efficient business enterprise in the abattoirs of meat-packing establishments. And in your religion, Asia, you must take example from Christendom. Twenty centuries ago you duffed aside and executed with every attendant circumstance of contemptuous hatred, the founder of Christendom. In that hour you cast away world-domination. If anything were wanting to display to your attention and convince your reason of the magnificence of the prize lost to your folly, the empery of Christendom, and the ache of your own servitude should serve as bitter precept for your future guidance.

Not in a night nor yet a day, India, must you anticipate to achieve parity of Western ideals and accomplishment. Consider the years that struggled upwards toward the Battle of The Somme, and the Harding Administration; and when discouragement visits you, reflect on the dark and joyless eras when no Congo atrocities, child labour, sweated industries, or American civic morality respited an uncivilised humanity. From the base of a hunger-bitten native

garrison donating their sole food to white comrades, your rise to the perfection of Putamayo or a negro lynching party of Southern ladies and gentlemen, is a passage not to be made without the meritorious exercise of many less picturesque, but equally forceful nobilities of Occidental accomplishment.

Time of earnest thought and prayerful effort must precede your ascension to the civilization of the Western hemisphere. Had it been otherwise, do you suppose the Anglican Litany through venerable seasons of plea and responsion, would have supplicated our Father that He give us peace in *our* time? Your harbours must resound to pneumatic rivetters busy in naval dockyards. Your strategically isolated sites must be preempted to the gainful use of explosive factories; and arsenals placed conveniently adjacent to the labour supply of your centres of population. Krishna must give place to the forbidding factory as the God of an industrial world of mean streets; and Rama dispossessed and shut inside a weekly pay envelope. Time and motion studies in workshops must take the place of contemplative craftsmanship. Muezzin and Priest shall be substituted by the factory whistle; and for Siva's hymn and Krishna's tales of love, whirring wheel and flying belt shall screech the Western pæan of praise; and from the land the cultivators shall come to tend the machine and support the "movie". For the purdah you must substitute public sexuality; and for polygamy, the promiscuous inter-



course of hazardous prostitution. Your bestially cruel Oriental practice of allowing wives to fulfil their procreative function of rearing a family, you will interdict in favour of frustrated coitus, abortion, or Caesarian removal ; which unnatural interference you will approve as scientific regulation and correction. Instead of taking wives ripened by the clime to womanhood at an age when equivalent western years are still immature, you will associate yourself with Western superiority of practice and rape children.

*If, then, you would have Western Crowns you must do as the West does : reform yourself from without ; and you will become even as Christendom. Is that what you want, Asia ? Is that what the world requires at this time or ever ? Look at Occidental Martha and read the answer.*

Is there nothing other than this ? nothing superior to the imputed regality of this civilization which the West has imposed upon the common habitation of Man ? In itself there is nothing ugly nor vile in the Material ; nothing for contempt or abhorrence. In itself it is a visible splendour draping a glory unrevealed. And if the Garbed be honourable the garment cannot be mean. But the West affects the habiliment and debases a seemly adornment with gross misuse. That is the way of the West.

Finite and infinite ; the impalpable and the visible symbols of infinity ; abstract and material must equally be accepted and nourished

if civilization is to move always onward to perfectibility of expression, and not be monstrously deformed. That is the other way.

The way of the West is a simple following ; but if you would tread the other way, then perilous is the way before you, Asia. You must stuff your transcendental soul into a pragmatic bottle ; and when the lid is removed what questionable *djinn* will emerge ? You must be of the world without being worldly ; acquire scholarship without losing wisdom ; learning with culture. Nourishing into flame the embers of your ancient transcendental philosophy, you must, also, adopt Western pragmatism : not as an end, but as a means. *Keeping your spirituality, you must embrace Western materialism : not as a God in the manner of the West, but as servant in the temple of God.* The arts and sciences of material life must be yours : not as masters in the fashion of the West, which is materialist for materialism's sake, but as agents to your spiritual needs of generation and regeneration. Exploiting to the fullest the utilitarian, you must still unalterably repose upon the discarnate : denying not nor scorning, but ardently pursuing to utmost physical advantage the wonders of material being ; making their happy enjoyment a worship of that whereof the material is only the blossom of greater beauty. Adhering not to the outworn and conventional ; nor neglecting the practical or immoderately tending the ideal ; but looking ever forward with glad acceptance of what is new and

revelatory; *turning back from the ugly, cast out the impure, and come again to the best in sweetness and endeavour of your ancient faiths.*

If you succeed you will accomplish something unknown in Time; something which shall be your glory as long as History is written. If you fail you will have freed yourself of a political yoke, only to take upon yourself the bonds of a new servitude; when you consent to a deluded acceptance of the immoral gyves of Christendom's materialism; which will crush you even as it has the West. Will you who have outlived Juggernaut make materialism your new Juggernaut?

Unique in Time; unbelievable in splendour is your opportunity, Asia; to send anew—not Scythian nor Hun; nor only matter of specie and merchandise; but once again, as often, a new regeneration to the West.

Are you prepared to this end, Asia? you who in the great division of Humanity are Oriental Mary. Not till you have sloughed the degraded and obscene; and banished engrafted externalism. Not till you have visioned and confess that Matter is the honourable mate of Mind; and, returning to your Self in its highest expression, carry the world back and away

from the gross dominion of Materialism to the right acceptance and usage of the Material; and the high beauty of purity in spiritual control. *The West is too much Martha; you are too much Mary.*

When you shall have done this then come to teach the degraded better things: come over the fords of Jhelum River; down the Khanah and Kaoshan Passes; from the Gangetic Delta across the black water; along the Baltic strand, and by the Aleutian Isles. But think not to have gracious welcome; all that is dark in human character will resist you—greed and hate; and the passions of vicious men; spiritual authorities whose hearts still would strew the earth with butchered dissidents; and rulers in all their degrees holding virtue for a farthing, and governship at the biddable value of corruption.

But should you come with the sword and only to add Materialism to the Material; then better that isostatic compensation of Himalaya's pyramid catastrophically should shatter, and all India perish from the face of earth; better the race of the Tartar the Turk and the Mongol should pass in cataclysm to the utterly forgotten.

LLOYD MORRIS

## THE APPEARANCE OF DOGMA

[J. D. Beresford presents an excellent analysis of what constitutes Dogma, and by its light examines the policy of this journal.

Rather than participate in the discussion we would like some of our readers and contributors to advance their opinions. We are content to append a few extracts to show what the real Theosophical position is.—EDS.]

“Dogma always gives birth to violent schism, whereas Truth is tolerant of variety.” The quotation is taken from a note by Mr. Richard Rees printed in the May number of *The Adelphi*, and concludes a comment in which he accuses the Editors of THE ARYAN PATH of too dogmatic an attitude in their expounding of the doctrines of Madame H. P. Blavatsky.

Now, to me, this question is one of the most vital interest. In my youth I reacted so violently against dogma that even now I find myself inclined to resent the appearance of it in any religious teaching. Yet the attitude that led to my turning away from a particular form of such teaching is one that, if I am to remain consistent in its practice, forbids me to condemn any dogma without examination, since by such a denial, I should be guilty of a similar arrogance in the assertion of opinion. Before, however, I attempt any personal answer to the specific charge made by Mr. Rees, it is necessary to examine, as briefly as possible, firstly, what is intended by my use of the word dogma in this connection, and, secondly, its application in particular instances.

The definition, as I see it, presents little difficulty. What I

recognise as dogma in its relation to religion is the formulation of statements that must be accepted by the disciple without examination. These statements are nearly always based on the pronouncements of earlier teachers and regarded as infallible by their later exponents; it may be in the Christian Church, on the reported sayings of Christ or—far more often—on the interpretation of them by the Early Fathers. In any case whatever may be the first authority, such pronouncements are delivered as assertions of absolute truth which must never in any circumstances be questioned. They constitute the unassailable premises of the religious argument, and upon them are based the deductions and, it may be added, practices, which in their turn come to be regarded as equally inspired and unquestionable.

Now let us examine the application of this method to particular instances. The argument for dogma, as expressed by a priest, might run somewhat as follows: The mass of people are ignorant and quite incapable of examining and, *a fortiori*, of judging, the foundations of belief. If we were to put my creed before them as a working hypothesis only, they

would have no confidence either in it or in us. They do not in this matter want to think for themselves; they need certainties; and the more positive our statements the greater comfort they derive from them, and the greater is the restraining effect upon their moral lives.

This represents, I admit, the pragmatic argument only, and does not touch upon the question of the ultimate Authority. But I put it in the forefront because I cannot deny its cogency. In my experience of life, I have realised that for people of the mentality assumed, such a principle as that adopted by the Roman Church, does serve not only a useful but, within limits, an ethical purpose; wherefore, had I the power to destroy the faith of one of these simple Christians, I might do more harm than good by the exercise of it.

Mr. Rees and myself appear to be of the same party, however, when we come to the consideration of preaching such a creed to those who do desire to think for themselves. In such a case the pragmatic test is of no value. It would have no ameliorating effect upon my, (I dare no longer continue to speak for Mr. Rees), moral life if I adopted the Christian religion. Indeed I would go further and say that by the weakening of my sense of personal responsibility, the effect would almost certainly be a harmful one. And since the pragmatic argument fails in such cases as this, we inevitably return to the question of Authority. It

is obvious that I cannot accept any deductions from premises that I am not ready to admit as proved.

Unfortunately it is impossible to enter here into any examination of a particular authority in this connection. I have somewhat tentatively set out my consideration of it in the three articles recently published in these pages under the heading "The Discovery of the Self". But that statement represented a personal confession rather than a logical argument; and all that I can do here is to suggest that authority is referable either to faith or to experience or to a combination of the two.

As an instance of the attribution to experience, the simplest example is the mathematical statement that  $2+2=4$ . This most primitive of all equations cannot be proved mathematically and its origin is unknown, but we accept it without question, and have based upon it a vast erection of mathematical practice simply because it is found to work in every case so long as we are content to regard "2" only as a quantitative and not a qualitative symbol. Nevertheless, however dogmatic may be our assertion of the truth of this primitive equation, it is not properly a dogma since the truth of it is solely applicable to particular and limited tests, and we can do no more than assert that our equation will be true—with all the deductions that arise from it—if we are prepared to make certain antecedent assumptions

with regard to the property and use of numbers. And this limitation applies to any claim for authority on the single ground of experience, since human experience is too brief and too restricted to furnish the data for universal truth.

For this reason all religious teaching must claim higher sanction for its authority than the effects of its practice or even than the power of its founder to transcend what we regard as the common limitations of natural law. (Christ, for example, continually deprecated the advertisement of his miracles as evidence for the truth of his gospel.) And this higher sanction commonly rests on the spiritual experience and knowledge of the original teacher (supported in some cases by those of his disciples), while the individual test for the truth of such experience and knowledge will be found in the power to recognise it, rather than by the observation of its effects.

This intuition of truth, coming it may be with astonishing suddenness, is the determining course of religious conversion. That such sudden conversions are usually associated with a particular creed is evidence only of the individual limitation. For the man or woman who leaps up at a Revival Meeting and shouts "Glory, Glory," has, indeed, had an intuition of truth. The effect may be, and generally is in these cases, of comparatively short duration. But at the critical moment such a convert is inspired by some reali-

sation of the eternal verities that lie behind the teaching of all religions.

From this somewhat vague indication of religious authority, let us return to the immediate question of dogma, concerning which I would now postulate that its use in some degree is unavoidable. For example, the religious convert of our instance coming back to the world of sensation, is filled in most cases with a passionate desire, —which in its origin represents a purely altruistic impulse—to pass on the joy of that sudden realisation of his own spirit to the world about him. And that cannot be done without some form of the dogmatic assertion "I know". What he truly knows, however, he cannot tell. Mystical experience must be translated into other terms before it can be explained to the world. And it is in the course of this translation, which necessarily disguises the spirit of the experience under the letter of language, that dogma comes into being. In its first and simplest form dogma represents nothing but this effort to translate mystical into common experience, the intuition of truth into a formula that can be understood by the mass of mankind.

And with this simplest form of dogma, no one can have any quarrel. It is against the elaborations and accretions of subsequent interpreters, whose claim for the task does not rest upon personal mystical experience, that the critic of religion rebels. He finds the simple truth of the first reve-

lation dispersed until it becomes unrecognisable, confined and disguised by rules and articles in which the spirit may finally be completely lost in the letter—as, in my opinion, has been the case with every form of the Christian religion and the common forms of Buddhism.

Moreover in its elaboration this accretion of dogma about the original articles of faith commonly takes three forms. The first, concerned solely with the origins and destiny of the immortal principle in man, comprises the cosmology and eschatology of the creed in question. The second deals with ethical practice, which is formalised into a code of rules dealing with personal conduct, rules that vary in detail from one sect to another. The third and most degraded form, treats of mechanical rites until at last we may come to such outrageous absurdities as some of those sacraments of the Christian Churches in which faith and conduct appear of less importance than the observance of some artificial ceremony,—even, in the case of infant baptism, in the penalising by eternal punishment of the child for the omission of its parents.

Now against this third form of dogma any thinking man or woman has a right to protest. I do not deny that a ceremony may be helpful to some people, but that it should be “essential to salvation” is childish nonsense. The second form is, also, open to criticism in so far as it deals with the minutiae of conduct; and as a matter

of fact the eleventh commandment of Christ “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” which is, also, the primary article of theosophical teaching, covers the whole ground of personal conduct. If anyone believes that and can practise it, he need have no fear of “falling into sin”. Wherefore it is the first form only, the gravamen of Mr. Rees’s charge against THE ARYAN PATH, that need be further discussed.

Briefly stated the passages in the March issue which more particularly induced the criticism represented a plea for greater precision of language in regard to the definition of Being. The difficulty in this connection is to be found in the fluidity of the medium. The meaning of a word, especially in any religious use, depends far more upon its associations than upon its definition or origin. To take the simplest possible example, the word God has a more sacred significance in Protestant than in Catholic countries, in which its obvious derivation in the romance languages from the Latin “deus” has preserved to some extent its pagan associations. Also for Western readers the nomenclature of the East has no associations whatever, and therefore, even when defined, little vital meaning. Finally, to put this difficulty on one side for present purposes, no language can describe the ultimate mysteries; the best that it can do is to awaken the responses of those who are ripe for the recognition of their own inner knowledge. Far

more often its effect is to crystallise and limit the conception it seeks to describe. And, ultimately we cannot doubt that spoken and written language will disappear. Its immediate use is that of a collection of symbols or metaphors which serve to concentrate the attention.

But, having granted that, we must recognise that however great the difficulty of conveying anything approaching the idea of mystical experience to those who have never known it, there are various concepts of the "Self" which may be indicated by material figures, such concepts as those now under discussion and set out in the March number of *THE ARYAN PATH*.

And speaking as an independent witness, for I am not a member of any Theosophical organisation, I would exempt the teachings of Madame Blavatsky from the charge of dogma. In her two most important works, *The Secret Doctrine* and *Isis Unveiled*, she appears as the exponent of the Ancient Wisdom-Religion and none of her teachings are at variance with it, either as revealed in the sacred books of the East or in the fundamental principles of the great world religions. She certainly clarified and documented their teachings more comprehensibly than any previous Initiate; and it is clear that her own comprehension of them was inspired and intuitive. But in *Isis Unveiled*, at least, her intuition of Truth was supported by abundant argument and a profound scholarship in these

matters. Her great work was the attempt to translate mystical experience—her own and that of her predecessors—into a form that could be understood, not it is true by the mass of mankind, but by those who have the beginnings of the power to recognise their own inner knowledge. And in this attempt she succeeded more nearly than any earlier teacher.

In conclusion, I would take one last step and defend the editors of *THE ARYAN PATH* against the charge of interpreting and expounding the teaching of Madame Blavatsky in such a way as to constitute a dogma in the manner of the Early Fathers of the Christian Church. I do not deny that, in the past, especially some twenty years ago, I have met professing Theosophists who have done this thing. It was this attitude of absolute certainty with regard to matters about which no man, not even the Initiate, can make such certain pronouncements, which made me sceptical at that time of Theosophical teaching. But after eighteen issues of *THE ARYAN PATH* (to seventeen of which I have been allowed to contribute, often stating opinions that were not in accord with those of the editors), I have not found there any sign of the formalising of doctrine and rigid adherence to the letter rather than to the spirit of Madame Blavatsky's teaching, which are the first indications of dogmatic formulae. And we must not forget that when an individual or a Society is deeply stirred by what I have referred to more than

once in this article, as an Intuition of Truth, it is incumbent upon him, her or them to do everything possible to spread the knowledge of that Truth. And in the doing

of that it is impossible to avoid the attitude of certainty in some relations. Those who passionately believe cannot express themselves in the language of doubt.

J. D. BERESFORD

Let no man set up a popery instead of Theosophy, as this would be suicidal and has ever ended most fatally. We are all fellow-students, more or less advanced; but no one belonging to the Theosophical Society ought to count himself as more than at best, a pupil-teacher—one who has no right to dogmatize.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY. *Five Messages*. p. 4.

Dogma? Faith? These are the right and left pillars of every soul-crushing Theology. Theosophists have no dogmas, exact no blind faith. Theosophists are ever ready to abandon every idea that is proved erroneous upon strictly logical deductions; . . . Dogmas are the toys that amuse, and can satisfy but, unreasoning children. They are the offspring of human speculation and prejudiced fancy.

Realizing, as they do, the boundlessness of the absolute truth, Theosophists repudiate all claim to infallibility. The most cherished preconceptions, the most "pious hope," the strongest "master passion," they sweep aside like dust from their path, when their error is pointed out. Their highest hope is to approximate to the truth. . . .

If fact and logic were given the consideration they should have, there would be no more temples in this world for exoteric worship, whether Christian or heathen, and the *method* of the Theosophists would be welcomed as the only one insuring action and progress—a progress that cannot be arrested, since each advance shows yet greater advances to be made.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY. (*The Spiritualist*, 8th February 1878.)

Those who have spoken of dogmatism, have mistaken energy, force, personal conviction and loyalty to personal teachers and ideals for dogmatism. Such are not dogmatism. One has a perfect right to have a settled conviction, to present it forcibly, to sustain it with every argument, without being any the less a good member of the Society. Are we to be flabby because we are members of an unsectarian body, and are we to refuse to have convictions merely because no one in the Society may compel another to agree with him? Surely not. My friends, instead of being afraid of a future dogmatism of which there is no real sign now, we should fear that it may be produced by an unreasonable idea that the assertions of your own convictions may bring it about. I feel quite strongly that those who accuse us of dogmatism have no fixed ideal of their own.

—W. Q. JUDGE, Convention Speech, London 1893.

I cannot permit our sacred philosophy to be so disfigured. If they do not want the whole truth and nothing but the truth, they are welcome. But never will they find *us*—(at any rate)—compromising with, and pandering to public prejudices.

—MAHATMA K. H.



## THE NATURE OF CONTACT WITH GOD

[ **F. McEachran** is a keen student of modern languages. He graduated from Oxford with a First in the School of Modern and Medieval Languages; he also took his Diploma in Education. Since he left the university his studies have been mainly philosophical and he has contributed to many of the leading periodicals *e.g.* *The Times Literary Supplement* and *The Nineteenth Century* in England. Last year he published *The Civilised Man*, which is a treatise on the tragic view of life.

While we fully agree with our thoughtful writer in his diagnosis of the modern world's disease, and note that he advocates the Theosophic doctrine of a turning within, we think his three ways to attain Peace are artificial, and from the point of view of Asiatic Psychology superficial. The way of going out to perceive Beauty in Nature and in Culture is, more or less, the same process, in which the inner mind of man plays an important part; our author's third way brings vision splendid of the Beautiful but not without the aid of his first two. If we turn to the propositions of a thoroughly systematized psychology, like that of the *Gîtâ*, we find that the Path of the Human Soul to the Supreme Spirit is a very definite one, a map clearly marked with the bridges of obstacles to be crossed, the valleys of death to be passed through, and the heights of Vision to be attained. There is no better guide for the modern aspirant to Soul Peace than *The Voice of the Silence*.—EDS.]

The principal feature of the outlook of the present generation, whether in the West or in the East, in the Old World or the New, is a feeling of uncertainty and of psychological unrest, expressing itself in a spiritual malaise which is corroding the heart of the world. Behind us we look back to a century of high hopes, of liberal and scientific progress, of democratic and humanitarian ideals, before us we see a debris of shattered beliefs and an ever growing disillusionment, the chief element of which is a doubt as to the value of doing anything at all. *There is, indeed, no lack of doing, —the world hums with activity —but it is an activity without a purpose, an aimless piling of unit on unit, a summation to an infinity which never comes.* Most of all this is evident in the last en-

trenchment of the old ideals, the humanitarian outlook of the nineteenth century, which promised, by the amelioration of the lot of mankind in the mass, to create a veritable heaven upon earth. Now the means to erect this heaven are undoubtedly in our hands; we have the machines and the men who can work them. But somehow the promised heaven eludes us, and instead we are faced with nationalism, economic and racial, international suspicion, overproduction and under-consumption, and finally, a widespread and intense feeling of impotence in the face of unlimited power.

On one point, however, there is general agreement. What is wrong with modernity seems to be a certain flaw at the centre, in the organisation of man himself, and *this flaw, far from being elimi-*

*nated by the humanitarian process, is only aggravated by it.* It is agreed on all hands that salvation will come, not from laws imposed from above, but by a renewal of the life of the individual, by a self-improvement preceding the improvement of man in the mass. The individual must first find peace for himself, and then only, when he has found it, ask the masses to accept it from him. Weary of improving his fellow men, still more weary of being improved by them, disillusioned of the promises of material progress, *man returns to his inner self, there to build up the heaven which has failed without. There is no other road to salvation than this.*

We must return then to the man of history, believing firmly that, intrinsically, he does not change. This does not mean that we must turn our back on modernity—modernity is also part of history—but we must hold fast to the man of all ages, who does not alter or decay. We can accept democracy, liberalism, racialism, even evolution, provided only that by drawing the right distinctions we bear in mind that man stands over these things, not within them. Man has made evolution and progress, not they him. He is their creator, not a creature of their working. The true source of a theory of man is his two or three thousand years of history, not the product of yesterday with its bright illusions, nor all the baggage and paraphernalia of a science cut off from its roots. At

the centre of appearances stands man, ever thinking and devising things anew, and this centrality, this proud position, he must not surrender.

Now the reaction between man who does not change and the environment which is always changing is written down in the pages of history and is known as civilisation, a reaction which has, at times, reached a very high, perhaps even a supreme, level. It has brought into being the various cultures, of literature, of art, of philosophy and science, all of which embody, despite outward variations, not so much the changing, as the unchanging, ideals of men. Each of these ideals, whether in the form of the Greek city state, the cathedral of mediæval times, or the art of the Western Renaissance, represents a state of culture in which the flux of natural things has been stayed for a while and moulded, by the will, intellect and emotion of man, into a definite harmonious whole. Because this was done in these periods (examples could be drawn as easily from the East as from the West) life took on a meaning for the men of those times which it no longer has for us, and their activity, being directed to an end, brought them peace. Like ours this activity was immense, like ours it succeeded sometimes and sometimes it failed, but the difference, alike in failure or success, was this. These men found peace in their activities, and we find no peace at all.

The source of this peace, however, is not far to seek, since it lies precisely in the meaning which things attain when they are joined to an end. We know, of course, that the meaning of a thing derives not from itself but from what is beyond it, from something which sets an aim for it and acts as a kind of limit. "Animal," for example, attains "meaning" by virtue of the concept "man," which in turn is linked up with other concepts, the whole forming a certain order running through the world and leading, inevitably, to the conception of a final limit. The men of the past, beyond any doubt, felt the existence of such an order and end, and by shaping their activities to it, attained that harmony of culture and spiritual repose the loss of which we so deeply deplore. Because they felt it their activities ran together to a common end, achieving not quantity, nor the momentum which is another form of quantity, but quality in the highest sense, the sense which is of God. By such a name, moreover, we mean a supreme "end" which is both the end of the natural series and also an absolute end, in which, in brief, "activity" and its limit "repose" become one and the same event, the most rich and satisfying event in the world. It is an end which is both eternally the same and yet eternally inexhaustible, a definition seemingly paradoxical but which, none the less, is so apt to the facts that it reads like reason. Because of it, as Goethe said, "All things

transitory are but a symbol," and because of it the will of man, without ceasing to act, can find peace in the act itself.

To-day we have reversed this outlook and instead of subsuming quantity in quality, we have sought an end in quantity itself, surrendering, in consequence, the very meaning of "end". We add two and two together and they remain the same. We produce more food and men are still hungry, more clothes and they are not clad. We promise a Utopia to-morrow, and to-morrow never comes. We anchor idealism to better conditions, and conditions, however improved, give no satisfaction. The everlasting "more" cannot satiate, and the hunger, unsatisfied, remains. Man, in the terrible image of Hermann Hesse, is like a wolf roving in the desert of culture, howling for the eternity it has lost. Yet this eternity, in all its plenitude, was known to the men of the past, and history records their enjoyment of it. Confucius had more than a glimpse of it, Buddha tasted its sweetness, and Christ even, on the cross, felt its presence, under conditions admittedly far from good. To this feeling we must return, and the path to it is not barred even now.

There are in short, three ways to attain this peace and they may be summed up in nature, scripture, and man. One way is the way of the world, of the mountains, trees and flowers, in the power and beauty of which God dwells. Another is the way of scripture, including in its wider sense, the inspired

creations of human culture, art, literature, science, philosophy. There is finally the third road, perhaps the nearest of all, the inner mind of man. These ways are different, because men are different, but they lead all of them to the selfsame end. Some are higher and some are lower but the lower, though more remote, are not to be despised. So it is even true that the man who remoulds nature to serve material ends, like the humanitarian, may be serving Deity by his action, if only he keeps his eye on the final end.

But to keep our eye on the end, this is not easy. It is not enough to see the rose, if you do not see what is above it; you must see it with the light of God upon it, as Goethe would have you see it, or as Spinoza says, "under the aspect of eternity". The rose in itself has no "meaning"; remove it from its source in the Spirit and it turns to dust and ashes. So also the "great world itself wears out to nought," as Shakespeare teaches, but "in the great hand of God it stands for ever". Seen in this radiance the rose, like the world, is eternal, and there is no terror in mortality.

Now it is true, as the world prophets tell us, that ruin is of the fabric of things, and no passage of time can amend it: but once this is

granted, something else remains. Although we do not know what the future will bring us, whether world peace or world conflict, we do know one thing which is greater still and it is this. The men who will bring peace are not those who denounce conflict, or who place their ideal in to-morrow, but *the men who under stress of conflict remain peaceful in their minds*. They alone mean something for peace, and the world, seeking peace, must turn to them. Now the last question we ask is this: Did ever a man contemplate the crucifixion and imagine that this was the end? Did ever a man weep at the ruin of Lear, or of Oedipus, with the "lacrimae rerum," and not perceive that these are but symbols revealing, by the very intensity of pain, the peace which lies behind? Not one of the men we have quoted ever promised us anything better than this because—this itself is the best. The world is so; you must take it thus; even as God, in your name, takes it. *Jésus sera en agonie jusqu'à la fin du monde; il ne faut pas dormir pendant ce temps-là!*\* But remember, it is worth while, if only you turn to the end. Death has no meaning without life, nor life without eternity. This is the final promise, the impregnable eternity of God.

F. MCEACHRAN

\* Jesus will be in torture until the end of the world; you must not go to sleep during that time.

## PHILO AND THE THERAPEUTAE

[John Middleton Murry wrote about "Jesus and the Essenes" in our May number. He continues the study, which will be completed by his article on "Pythagoras".

The esoteric philosophy of the Wisdom-Religion regards the Therapeutae as the spiritual progeny of the Buddhist Theras. H. P. Blavatsky, whom our author quotes, has given a good deal of information on the subject in *Isis Unveiled*; some extracts are appended.—EDS.]

The historical origins of the Christian Church are lost in obscurity. There seems never to have been a time when they were not hidden. The first authentic Christian document we possess—Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians—reveals to us a Church already in being, but one established by a man who had not known Jesus of Nazareth after the flesh, and believing in doctrines different from those taught by Jesus himself. In twenty or thirty years a discredited and crucified prophet had become a deity; and of the process of that mighty transmutation we know almost nothing. The Fathers of the Church knew no more than we.

Accordingly, when in the third century Eusebius of Cæsarea, the first and greatest historian of the Christian Church, came across the treatise of Philo Judæus on *The Contemplative Life* which gave an obviously trustworthy account of a remarkable order of Greek-speaking Jews who early in the first century had separated themselves from the great world of Alexandria, divested themselves of their possessions, and lived a life of austerity and contemplation, he promptly and very naturally

decided that he had discovered some early Christians. And so for many centuries, indeed almost to within modern times, the Therapeutae of Lake Mareotis in Egypt were adopted into the Christian tradition.

They did not belong to it, any more than the Essenes belonged to it. Both were independent communities which were in existence before Jesus of Nazareth was born. What resemblances they had to the early Christians derived from the fact that their beliefs, like those of Jesus himself, were genuinely spiritual, and from the fact that the ostensible parent of the Therapeutae, the Essenes and the Christians alike was Judaism. But the Judaism from which the Therapeutae and the Essenes also were descended was a Judaism that had undergone contact not merely with Greek thought, but probably also with the wisdom of the East. It was specifically the Judaism of Alexandria, at once the great centre of Hellenistic civilisation and the chief gateway between the West and East. Of this symbolic Judaism Philo was, if not the master, the great apostle; and Philo profoundly admired the Therapeutae, who were if any-

thing a little nearer and dearer to him even than the Essenes, because they were a living example of the religion which he devotedly professed.

Essentially, this religion was a mystical Judaism liberated from literalness and local accident. It was, by intention and in fact (for there were moments when it seemed likely to become the creed of the élite of the Roman world) a universal religion. Philo, and the Alexandrian Jews of his persuasion, liberated themselves from the shackles of a literal interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures in precisely the same way as some of the greatest of Christian mystics were to liberate themselves in subsequent centuries, namely by the method of allegorical interpretation. This was the method of Paracelsus and Böhme and William Blake; and the tradition was maintained throughout the Middle Ages in Europe by the Kabbalists. And, provided that the method is never suffered to degenerate into a new formalism—a danger that can only be warded off by the reality of personal spiritual experience to vivify the symbols—it is a precious means to deeper understanding. Again, the Jews of Philo's persuasion liberated themselves by having received deep into their minds the fundamental mystical idea that all religions are one. This seemed to them to be corroborated even in detail by the correspondence between the Old Testament, allegorically interpreted, and the doctrines of Pytha-

goras and Plato. They had no doubt—and the most enlightened modern scholarship equally has no doubt—that the central doctrines of Platonism were derived from Pythagoras. The belief in a divine harmony of the universe, with which it was the duty of the individual man to become attuned by achieving a like harmony in himself, was confirmed for Pythagoras by his discovery of the relations between the sides of the perfect right-angled triangle. This "divine" correspondence, which is fundamental to the thought of Plato's *Timaeus*, was equally significant to the Therapeutae. Says Philo:—

They gather together every seven weeks, for they revere not only the simple week of seven days, but its power (*i. e.* its numerical square) as well. For they know it is holy and ever virgin. This is a preliminary to the greatest festival which falls to the fiftieth day, because fifty is the holiest and most natural of numbers, being composed of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the source of the birth of all things.

It is clear to me that Philo is not here giving his own symbolic interpretation of the chosen festival of the Therapeutae, but expounding their own teaching of its significance. It is a simple and striking example of the synthesis between Greek and Hebrew mystical symbolism which the Therapeutae had achieved. And indeed in the minds of those who attached importance to such things, such a synthesis imposed itself. The relation between the sacred Hebrew number seven and the

Pythagorean three and four was manifest. 50 was the sum of the squares of the sides of the Pythagorean triangle. Seven times seven is forty-nine. These correspondences may seem trivial to a modern mind. We need a certain power of imagination to transport ourselves to the time when the Pythagorean proposition, and the harmonies connected with it, seemed to afford a direct glimpse into the structure of the universe, and to be palpable evidence of a fundamental harmony in all things to which mortal men could penetrate in so far as they achieved a kindred harmony in themselves. To this noble and profound philosophy the Therapeutae, like the Pythagoreans, adhered.

They are rightly called Therapeutae, says Philo. The word in Greek has a twofold meaning. It means both "healer" and "god-worshipper". They are called by this name, says Philo, "either because they profess an art of medicine of a nobler kind than that now in vogue in great cities: there the doctors heal the body only, these the soul also. Or it is because they have been educated to worship Being itself, which is mightier than the Good, purer than the One, and older than the Monad." (The Monad, thus distinguished from the One, is the Platonic "idea" or "form" of unity: the "oneness" in which a multitude of single objects all participate.) In such a conception of the Godhead we have passed far away from the tribal deity of Israel. Yet wisely, like Philo himself, the Therapeutae

attached great importance to their own observation of the Jewish law; it was precious to them, because they knew its inward meaning:—

The whole body of the Law appears to these men to be like a living animal, whose body is the literal commands or precepts, and the unseen meaning lying within the words is the soul. And in the thinking of this very thought the reasonable soul of man begins particularly to contemplate what belongs properly to itself, beholding as in a mirror the surpassing beauties of the ideas contained in the words.

Like the Essenes, the Therapeutae possessed a body of esoteric doctrine, particularly in regard to the arcane meaning of the Old Testament, of which the Law is a part. "They have," says Philo, "writings of men of old time, who were the founders of the brotherhood and have left behind them many memorials of the real ideas wrapped up in these allegories." It seems probable, therefore, that some portion at least of the Kabbalistic wisdom derives from or through the Therapeutae.

Philo distinguishes between the Essenes and the Therapeutae in one cardinal respect: whereas the Essenes cultivated the practical life in all its aspects, the Therapeutae were completely given to the life of contemplation. And to this distinction corresponded a great difference in the recruiting of the two brotherhoods. The Essenes often adopted their novices as boys and were mainly a celibate community; the Therapeutae were composed entirely of men and women who had passed the prime

of life. They did not simply abandon their property; they made it over legally to their heirs: for which Philo approves them. "They make others happy by their generous liberality and themselves by their philosophy." Evidently, we are to regard them as a body of wealthy and highly civilized Greek Jews who, in middle age, withdrew themselves from life in one of the great cities of the world; and it is fairly clear that to be received as a member of the Therapeutae was itself no mean distinction. It meant that the elected member had proved himself worthy to lead the contemplative life; no romantic youthful impulse to withdrawal would suffice to secure admission. Philo, indeed, is intensely critical of premature vocation: "to pass one's days with evil is most harmful," he says of young men, "but to pass them with the perfect good (*i. e.* in the contemplative life) most deceptively dangerous."

Fifty, says, Philo, is the age for retirement. But the life of the Therapeutae was so austere that it would have been too hard for those who were not prepared for it. To be received into the order was evidently the culmination rather than the beginning of a spiritual life. Each member lived in a little hut, divided into two rooms, in one of which he lived, while the other served as a sanctuary "in which the mysteries of the holy life are performed by each in solitude". They ate neither food nor drink till sunset, when they partook of plain bread with salt or hyssop. They had no other

food than this at any time. For six days they remained solitary within their houses spending the whole time between their morning and evening prayer in the practice of their philosophy, that is, in silent meditation on the hidden meaning of the Scriptures, or in the composition of "lyric songs and hymns to God." On the seventh day they met together, and listened in silence to an address from "the oldest and most experienced in their doctrines". On every forty-ninth day they met with special solemnity as a preliminary to the great festival of the 50th day. After raising their eyes and hands to heaven, they reclined in the order of their election to the brotherhood, the men on the right, the women on the left, and partook of a solemn meal of bread and water served to them by the most recent members. Afterwards they sang an antiphon and danced a choric dance, based on the song of Miriam, commemorating the deliverance of Israel from Egypt by the passing of the Red Sea. Philo tells us elsewhere that this deliverance is symbolic of the liberation of the Soul from the bondage of worldly cares.

These are most of the facts concerning the Therapeutae recorded by Philo. He asserts that they are "part of a movement that is known outside Egypt"; and, apart from the fact that his own authority is of the best, it is intrinsically probable that a movement of this kind should have been widespread. The consolida-



tion of the Roman Empire, the complete establishment of the *pax Romana*, had made withdrawal from the shelter of great cities practically possible; while the astonishing speed with which Christianity permeated the Roman world shows that the moment was propitious for a new florescence of spiritual religion. There is a good deal of evidence to show that an enlightened Judaism had already gained many adherents in the pagan aristocracy. One must be wary of deducing too much from Philo's treatise. The connection between the Therapeutae and Pythagoreanism is evident; and possibly the Pythagorean influence is in itself enough to account for the markedly non-Jewish elements in the observances and doctrines of the Therapeutae. But Robertson-Smith, the great Biblical scholar, was convinced that there were signs of Buddhistic influence; and this is probable enough, seeing that Philo speaks elsewhere familiarly of the Indian "gymnosophoi" and gives the impression that he knew them more directly than by mere report. In any case, whether we hold the theory of direct influence or not, the resemblances between Pythagoreanism and Buddhism are striking and profound.

The significance of the Therapeutae is that, like the Essenes, they

represent a singularly lofty spiritual religion, much purer and more genuinely universal than primitive Christianity. Both alike reveal a freedom from fanaticism, and above all from that utterly unspiritual pre-occupation with a future life of rewards and punishments which bulks so large in early Christianity. Madame Blavatsky was eminently justified in stressing the importance of these orders in the history of true "theosophy"; for they show how near the Western world was at the time of the birth of Jesus to a religious synthesis, and how narrowly the great opportunity was missed. Beside the Pythagorean Judaism of Philo and the Essenes and the Therapeutae, the religion of Jesus himself shines with undiminished glory; but the religion of the early Christian *Church* makes a poor showing beside it. It marked not an advance, but a spiritual retrogression. For a time, indeed, the influence of the humane tradition seems to have persisted in Alexandrian Christianity. Clement of Alexandria, who owed much to Philo, was one of the most truly spiritual of the early Fathers. But the degradation was rapid. Alexandria became the chief home of Christian fanaticism: the cock-pit where Athanasians fought with Arians and Hypatia was murdered by a pious mob.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

After nineteen centuries of enforced eliminations from the canonical books of every sentence which might put the investigator on the true path, it has become very difficult to show, to the satisfaction of exact science, that the "Pagan" worshippers of Adonis, their neighbours, the Nazarenes, and the Pythagorean Essenes, the healing Therapeutes (Philo: "De Vita. Contemp."), the Ebionites, and other sects, were all, with very slight differences, followers of the ancient theurgic Mysteries. And yet by analogy and a close study of the *hidden* sense of their rites and customs, we can trace their kinship.

It was given to a contemporary of Jesus to become the means of pointing out to posterity, by his interpretation of the oldest literature of Israel, how deeply the kabalistic philosophy agreed in its esoterism with that of the profoundest Greek thinkers. This contemporary, an ardent disciple of Plato and Aristotle, was Philo Judæus. While explaining the Mosaic books according to a purely kabalistic method, he is the famous Hebrew writer whom Kingsley calls the Father of New Platonism.

It is evident that Philo's Therapeutes are a branch of the Essenes. Their name indicates it—Essaioi, *Asaya*, physician. Hence, the contradictions, forgeries, and other desperate expedients to reconcile the prophecies of the Jewish canon with the Galilean nativity and godship.

Luke, who was a physician, is designated in the Syriac texts as *Asaia*, the Essaian or Essene. Josephus and Philo Judæus have sufficiently described this sect to leave no doubt in our mind that the Nazarene Reformer, after having received his education in their dwellings in the desert, and been duly initiated in the Mysteries, preferred the free and independent life of a wandering *Nazaria*, and so separated or *inazarenized* himself from them, thus becoming a travelling Therapeute a *Nazaria*, a healer. Every Therapeute, before quitting his community, had to do the same. Both Jesus and St. John the Baptist preached the end of the Age;—the real meaning of the division into *ages* is esoteric and Buddhistic. So little did the uninitiated Christians understand it that they accepted the words of Jesus *literally* and firmly believed that he meant the end of the world—which proves their knowledge of the secret computation of the priests and kabalists, who with the chiefs of the Essene communities alone had the secret of the duration of the cycles. The latter were kabalists and theurgists.—H. P. Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled*, II, 143-144.

**THERAPEUTÆ (Gr.) or Therapeutes.** A school of Esotericists, which was an inner group within Alexandrian Judaism and not, as generally believed, a "sect". They were "healers" in the sense that some "Christian" and "Mental" Scientists, members of the T.S., are healers, while they are at the same time good Theosophists and students of the esoteric sciences. Philo Judæus calls them "servants of god". As justly shown in *A Dictionary of . . . Literature, Sects, and Doctrines* (Vol. IV., art. "Philo Judæus") in mentioning the Therapeutes—"There appears no reason to think of a special 'sect,' but rather of an esoteric circle of *illuminati*, of 'wise men' . . . . They were contemplative Hellenistic Jews."

H. P. BLAVATSKY. *Theosophical Glossary.*

## RENAISSANCE IN ART SPIRITUAL AND SYMBOLIC

[M. Jean Buhot is the well-known Editor of *Revue des Arts Asiatiques* and an acknowledged authority on the subject. There are numerous thoughts in this vigorous article to which the attention of Indians interested in the revival of Art in their ancient home must be drawn. All lovers of art culture must look out for a remarkable pronouncement from him in a subsequent issue on "Eastern Art and the Occident".—EDS.]

Femme je suis povrette et ancienne  
Qui rien ne scay, oncque lettre ne lus.  
Au moustier voy dont suis paroissienne  
Paradis paint où sont harpes et lus,  
Et ung enfer où dampnez sont boullus,  
L'ung me fait paour, l'autre joie et liesse.

FRANCOIS VILLON (ob. 1463)

From the ballad he wrote at the request of his mother as a prayer to OUR LADY.

If we consider broadly the evolution of art from prehistoric times down to the Renaissance, we generally find at the back of it some compelling occasion, some inspiring outlook which seems to direct the creation of the artist and bring it into harmony with the highest human activities of the period. It may be magic as in the stone age (and also in much later ages); a religious cult together with the care of the dead, as among the Egyptians or the ancient Chinese; the power of the monarch as in Assyria; the glory of the city as in Greece; or the background may be a purely religious one (symbolism perhaps in the earliest stage, edification in the next, worship in the last—such, at least, was the development of Buddhist and of Christian art). And these traditions are often carried on for a century or two after the impetus has died out. Now many thinkers are con-

cerned to find that in our present age art seems to possess no such source of inspiration; it is, so to speak, cut adrift, it is no longer the expression of any collective spirit, but the seemingly haphazard and often uncalled-for manifestation of an individual.

*No one can deny that humanity as a whole is now rushing headlong into the pit of materialism at such a rate that the bottom must soon be reached.* Some seem to think a great upheaval must follow thereupon—our civilization perhaps be completely destroyed; others believe a new equilibrium will then prevail, and mankind live on happily ever after; whilst a third opinion, for which the ground has been prepared by the gradual spread of Eastern conceptions, holds that according to a general law, a movement in the opposite direction *i.e.*, towards spirituality, must set in at no very remote date, perhaps even in our lifetime.

Many people in every country would be the forerunners of this new ideal, even while the ebb of materialism is still running strong. To confine ourselves to artistic questions, it may be of interest to examine briefly what the prospects are of a renaissance of spiritual and symbolic art.

The subject is an intricate one, because, as a matter of fact, art was never one and single, even in ancient times. Professor Strzygowski has repeatedly pointed out the interaction of popular art on the one hand and the art of the mighty lords of the earth (*Machtkunst*) on the other. As examples of the latter, the reader will at once call to mind the reliefs of Assyrian kings, or the palaces, pictures, statues, operas, etc. of Louis Quatorze. And what we now call "Art" for short is really *la monnaie*, the "small change" for this kingly art alone. From the aristocracy it was handed down to the *bourgeoisie*, and it is now the privilege of a cultured minority.

In the meanwhile what has become of popular art? It has been completely transformed by scientific and mechanical invention; practically annihilated as far as "arts and crafts" are concerned, and utterly upset and transposed in its major aspects: painting, sculpture, music, the stage, etc. When they want their portrait taken, the people go to the photographers instead of calling into their homes the itinerant painter, who could also execute signboards and votive pictures. Churches no

longer provide for them the emotions of colour and form. Shop-fronts, posters, cheap illustrated papers, postcards, etc., now satisfy the craving for superfluous beauty (but though enjoyed by the people, they are not the people's creation). Music-machines, gramophones, and, in some countries, the more hopeful broadcasts represent music. The detestable "movies"—also called in slang "pictures"—a sign of the times—stand both for the dramatic and the pictorial arts. Popular art is perhaps not dead—how could it die?—but we cannot recognize it in this new *avatāra*, where it shows as yet to no great advantage. Masses are swayed by the snapshots and articles of ignorant journalists, or by the production of cinema authors and cinema actors who do not seem to feel the want of knowledge, culture, and ideals before they start to cater for the millions. Vulgarity reigns supreme. Whether popular art, such as it is, can, or is likely to, undergo a change towards spirituality, is a question we will not discuss to-day. We must return to its twin-brother, which alone is meant when people say they are "fond of art"—it is after all the art of an *élite* (the *élite* of culture, of course, not of wealth).

Individualism, which is so striking a feature in modern Western art, is evidently a consequence of certain historical events; the Protestant Reform for one, the French—or rather universal—Revolution for another. In France and elsewhere the State makes a pretence

of patronizing the arts, as the kings were wont to do; as a lamentable result of this *mésalliance*, most countries are burdened with an official and academic art, a stillborn, cumbersome, mischievous institution. Against a dozen mural paintings by Puvis de Chavannes, which are the pride of our public buildings of the late nineteenth century, and a credit to the public authorities who commissioned them (not without reluctance it is said), how many silly, inexpressive statues block our streets, how many thousands of bad pictures encumber our universities, town-halls, and provincial museums, the better to distort and corrupt the taste of the people! They are bad technically, they are bad intellectually, because the essence of art is misunderstood, and we must not be surprised if foreigners with purer traditions, and especially Orientals, consider them bad morally. The artists were dull and often low-minded men who thought they could make their career with academic honours and Government commissions.

We must say this official art is now on the wane. Even in South America there is no longer any market for these senseless, but sensuous, nudes, or those emotional anecdotes. Both the artists and their patrons are impecunious; only small pictures are painted and get bought, even by the State. Artists are allowed to work more spontaneously; they can paint a landscape, a corner of their room, a bunch of flowers, anything in

fact which has aroused their artistic emotion, and—what they could not have done fifty years ago—they can readily show and sell pictures which, after all, are mere sketches. Thus their art is more genuine and direct. This is an important development, for true artistic emotion is never impure or debased. The subject has nothing to do with it. A still-life or a nude may be imbued with a far loftier spirit than, say, a Ming Bodhisattva or an eighteenth century Madonna.

I will not deny that the general attitude of artists, as also of their public, is an epicurean and materialistic one. Religion has but little sway in the modern Occident; personally *I cannot wish for a revival of Christianity, considering the poor account the different Christian churches gave of themselves during the war*; I honestly believe they were abettors of the crime! Most yearly exhibitions hold a section of religious art, but I could scarcely name any outstanding production. *There is far more life, more spirit, even more spirituality, in the non-religious art of the present day.*

Certainly it does not aim at symbolism. If the artists of the present generation love to paint youth and sunshine and the joy of life, let not Puritans frown on them, for they have seen death at close quarters.

And now let us turn to symbolism.

In the early nineties of the last century, some merriment was caused in Paris when a writer named Peladan, whose theories

were but the quintessence and exaggeration of the ideas then prevalent in the "Symbolist" school, founded a society with a view to putting them into effect. I have before me the illustrated catalogue of his second "Salon de la Rose Croix" (1892), from the curious regulations of which we translate a few excerpts.

The following subjects are banned, even if perfectly executed :

- (1) historical paintings in the matter-of-fact illustrative style ;
- (2) patriotic and military pictures ;
- (3) representations of contemporary public or private life ;
- (4) portraits "except as an iconic honour" ;
- (5) rustic scenes ;
- (6) landscapes of any sort, "except *à la* Poussin" ;
- (7) seascapes and seafaring people ;
- (8) humorous subjects ;
- (9) Orientalism from the picturesque side ;
- (10) domestic animals, or animals connected with sports ;
- (11) flowers, fruit, and all the still-life properties which painters are insolent enough to place on show.

Received with favour, on the contrary, are the Catholic ideal and mysticism : legend myths, allegories, dreamland, the paraphrase of great poems, in short, lyricism of any sort ; nudes of a sublimated and stylized kind, *à la* Primaticcio, *à la* Corregio (!) ; or heads "of a noble expression, *à la* Leonardo, *à la* Michelangelo'".

This programme contains, no doubt, many good features, though not happily formulated nor resting on a sound basis ; for it is clear that art cannot be regulated by precedents, and what is admirably expressive in one period becomes an empty shell if you attempt to repeat it in the next. Of the 63 painters who exhibited that year, not more than five or six are known to the present generation, and only one, perhaps, outside France (M. Aman-Jean). As a matter of fact, the prominent men of the Symbolist school

were never among the faddists ; they differ widely from each other, such as the very great poets Verlaine and Mallarmé, the painters Puvis de Chavannes, Odilon Redon, Maurice Denis (then a very young man) and others. Carrière, the painter, and Rodin, the sculptor, were also, though somewhat later, connected with the Symbolist movement, more perhaps by the activities of their literary entourage than by their own sympathies.

One of the purest and worthiest exponents of the Symbolist ideals was a little-known artist whom I had the privilege of knowing in my childhood ; a premature death cut short his difficult and noble career. Maurice Dumont's etchings, woodcuts, etc., expressing as they do a sensitive and refined personality, remain things of living beauty even to this day, while Ibsen's and Maeterlinck's dramas, which they sometimes illustrate, seem to belong to a remote generation. Phantom figures in flowing, simplified outlines are seen wandering, or rather floating through dream-landscapes, along the shores of a tranquil lake or round the suburbs of a grimy city. There is neither a line nor a tone but concurs in the expression of the idea. None of that extraneous botany or zoology to which Ruskin had subjected his disciples, the painters of the so-called Pre-Raphaelite school. The pleasing division of the surface, the happy distribution of a few flat tones, the delicate drawing ; such are the reasons of their artistic charm.

In some respects the same conception of art was to be advocated by the Cubists some fifteen years later, though they would have repudiated the Symbolist confusion of painting and literature. The following extracts from their famous manifesto of 1912 (Albert Gleizes et Jean Metzinger, *Du "Cubisme"*) illustrate this new attitude :

Let no one be misled by the seeming objectiveness with which many an imprudent artist seeks to adorn his paintings. Imagine a landscape; the width of the river, the thickness of the foliage, the height of the hills, the size and proportion of each object give us a security. But if we find them faithfully reproduced on canvas, we shall be none the wiser as to the artist's talent or genius . . . . We visit an exhibition in order to see the pictures and to enjoy them, not to display our geographical or anatomical science.

Then follows an interesting disquisition on Space and Light as conceived by the Cubists, and a eulogy of the painter's art.

Without any literary, allegorical or symbolical device, and by the sole inflections of lines and colours, a painter can show on the same picture a town in China and a French town, seas, beasts and trees, even peoples with their histories and yearnings, in short all things which, in their real existence, must remain separated. Distance and time, actual objects or pure conceptions, all things can be expressed in the painter's speech, just as well as in the language of poets, composers, or men of science . . .

The ultimate end of painting, we grant you, is to touch the multitude, but the painter should address it not in the language of the multitude but in his own language, in order to move, control and direct their hearts, not with a view to be comprehended. Religions and philosophies proceed thus. . . . The artist who keeps aloof from any concessions, *who cares not to be understood, and who has no story to tell*, will accumulate an interior force such as must illuminate all around him.

As has been said in a former article,\* Cubism is no longer in its zenith; its formulas are vulgarized; they are the toys of the multitude. But its main ideas have exercised a deep influence over the painters of the present generation. Thus their art does aim at a certain purity of (æsthetic) feeling, which excludes philosophical or literary allusions on the one hand, but also the taint of the low passions on the other. Whether the pendulum may swing back towards a new symbolism, no one can say. It can hardly do so until a new spirituality of some sort inspires the world, and of this we have as yet no inkling. Many people in the West fancy that something of the kind might be brought about through an intellectual *rapprochement* with the Orient. This question, considered mainly in connection with art, we hope to discuss in our next paper.

JEAN BUHOT

\* THE ARYAN PATH, March, 1930.

## RENASCENT INDIA

### INDIAN WOMEN: THE OLD RÔLE IN A NEW WORLD

[Dr. N. B. Parulekar continues his study of the living problems of India. He has already evaluated "the educated who exploit and the illiterate who build"; he has shown the cross-roads India has reached compelling her to choose between what is secular and what is spiritual; he has traced the cause of communal riots to the underworld; last month he wrote on "India Where the West Meets East." Next month he will describe "Benares—Old and New".

In the following article Dr. Parulekar may seem one-sided—a knight who champions the fair, sees no weakness, no danger, in the position of the up-to-date women of India. While all must recognize the general truth of his statements, it yet remains for someone who has observed and reflected to tell our readers if among the Indian women politicians and reformers there is not any element of anarchy and materialism present. Are all Indian women true to the ideals of ancient Aryavarta? Do they all recognize and try to formulate those ideals, so as to live by their light? —EDS.]

Books giving the impression that in India women are regarded as mere chattels to be used in the service of men and as sacrifice to gods are popular in the West. What talk is this of women's rôle in society where men look upon women as mere possessions? This is the note, in particular, in the writings of most Christian Missionaries.

No social evil should be defended. But I wish to point out that in spite of child marriages (a recent enactment penalises these) and child widows, the majority of women in India are neither children nor widows. And all of them are human souls. So why hide their virtues? Why make propaganda to extinguish the light of their spiritual fervour? The impress of Indian womanhood is found everywhere in society. Talk casually to school boys, chat with business men, ask people in random groups,—one hears nothing but

praise for woman's contribution to Indian society. Gratitude is given.

When one thinks of a country immersed in illiteracy, parcelled into thousands of villages, devoid of any educational influence, the question arises: Who looks after the character and education of the young and the growing? In many of these villages people do not recall a criminal case in their lifetime; marital relations are on the whole smooth; harmony prevails in spite of poverty and mass ignorance; what share of it all is to be attributed to feminine tact and understanding? Women in the country act as juvenile courts, traditionally trained doctors, counsellors in family and neighbourly relations. Why do people assuming to interpret India to the West fail to mention all this? Why go on calumniating the fair name of Indian womanhood?

The present upheaval in India has done great service in exploding



many propaganda stories against Indian women. Articles have begun to appear about the swift footed Indian women moving in market places, directing political meetings, boycotting British goods, dictating traders what to sell and what not. The British shopkeepers here felt paralysed as the blow came swift and strong and from the least expected quarter. Their knowledge of Indian women was gained not from everyday contacts with facts but from mission literature and club talk. Their belief in the fixity of purdah was so strong that they used to set aside special "Zenana Days," exclusively for women, a practice of segregation not observed by Indian shopkeepers themselves. But when picketing organisations of women laid a complete blockade around British business, the same shopkeepers were seen restlessly pacing back and forth on the floor of their stores, anxiously looking out for customers and wondering how it all happened over night. Some of them had lived over twenty or thirty years in the country! I had many opportunities of watching closely how women worked during the stirring times. Their headquarters had to be shifted from place to place; their papers were frequently confiscated, offices were broken into, leaders jailed, and their movements prevented by police. Yet they were surprisingly effective. So much ruin of British business compelled the world to sit up and take notice of the Indian women.

Just as the present Indian revolu-

tion has attracted the world's attention to women, it has also created new problems in the country. As the social structure of centuries began disintegrating, the span of social contacts has widened. In the case of woman the change is specially great. So great that it is agitating people's minds: what is her attitude going to be towards men and the ancient culture of the country? The answer is given in two ways: The orthodox fundamentalist is dying if not dead; but his place is fast taken by a new opportunist whose religion is on a par with the patriotic professions of the money maker. His first care is to ensure profit not assure himself of principles, and to speculate in real estate rather than on religion. But with the assurance of coming settlement, his mind moves in the direction of reviving the old order. At the moment such men are giving women a sufficiently long rope in politics and in movements preliminary to political freedom. But after Swaraj, is attained they would like to see women return to the house-keeping business. In their hearts they believe (though they dare not say so) that the only way to save the home is to speak of it as the glorious preserve of the women in which domain men are too incompetent to interfere! On the other hand there are the extreme socialists whose opinions vary from the philosophic collectivism of Plato to the materialistic communism of Marx; these are the raw product of the new age, ideas, and ambitions. According to them the

ideal state and factory are bound to make home and family superfluous. Their goal is to raze home and education, prince and priest, capitalist as well as bourgeois culture in order to make workers feel less inferior in status. Between these two types of thinkers, the orthodox and the modernist, wait the majority of the people, who wonder how woman is going to fare in future, and how she is going to behave.

The problem before Indian women is, in substance, the problem before Indian civilisation itself which, contrary to current notions, is shaped more by women than by men.

As I look around for a clue to the happiness in Indian homes, and the loving hospitality present everywhere in the country, lives of self-effacing women stand out before me. In most cases the country houses are but mud walls thatched with straw on top, and one is struck with the capacity of Indian women to preserve a kindly temper in the midst of general poverty. In villages as in cities what impresses one as almost their universal trait is the merging of their self in the service of those around; their personal affairs are managed without the least inconvenience to the family. The Indian household does not have the trim appearance of an American home; it is a medley of different ages, different temperaments, different tastes in food, clothes, and often it is composed of many distant as well as near relations. In addition, there is a

constant flow of guests, and often perfect strangers are taken in for temporary shelter. A guest may not be a close friend nor a family relation; more often he is an acquaintance of an acquaintance, a man with a note from a friend of a friend, stopping for a few days on business or sight-seeing. I have no doubt that India might have had more hotels than America and more tourist traffic than France, if all the flow of human beings had been turned on the streets to shift for themselves. In the midst of such life fewer headaches are reported from women than men, fewer irregularities and practically no personal preferences pertaining to food or rest. Women have their pains and pleasures, but all these pass generally unnoticed being subordinated to the welfare of the family as a whole. It is no wonder, therefore, that among all the aspects of human relations, the mother is the most exalted in India. For an Indian it is almost as impossible to go against his mother, as it is to go against his religion. From early childhood he observes the mother showing greater discretion, self-denial and spirit of service than the father. She is the first to give up a dividing point, the first to forgive and forget, the first to regain calmness. Her life is an education to her children in patience, sacrifice, and the capacity to accommodate even the most diverse and distant interests of others. As mother, home-maker, hostess, and sacrificing companion to men, woman is the heart of Indian civilization.

Indian women have played an important part in philosophy and religious literature, which are as much revered in India as banking and business in the West. But it is through sacrificial service and self-denial in everyday life that women have elevated society most. I believe women illustrate more fully than men the basic principle in the Hindu view of life that sacrifice is the foundation of this world. Consequently obligations are emphasised before interests, duties before rights, and respect is shown to those who renounce rather than to those who accumulate. Hidden in the intricacies of life operates the law of Karma or of Compensation, according to which those who give do receive in another sense. But since the fruits of Karma often transcend our ordinary concepts of time and space and ripen in inconceivable ways, the majority of people, having neither insight nor patience, seek satisfaction in terms of their unimaginative egotism which creates individualism, social friction and the multitude of sorrows in life. Persistently the Indian woman has stood against individualism of every kind and wherever necessary suffered in overcoming it. Through self-elimination and continued care for others she attains power and authority in the family and tries to fit each fresh generation for the task of mutual helpfulness.

If in the past Indian women have served as solvents against individualism, their rôle in recent times has been equally great.

After conquering the East the egoistic and self-possessed nineteenth century Europe elevated in the Orient a large-scale commercial and political individualism. John Stuart Mill was trying to subdue it at home and Carlyle condemned it as downright degradation. During the last few generations the struggle between the principle of sacrifice and self-assertion has grown keener. Within a short space of time the western nations cut deep into Hindu society, swept men off their feet, and forced women to fight alone and even against men. Elated with a sense of fresh power the Indian in Civil Service, the newly raised Government officer, the so-called social reformer and the English educated in general—the first offspring of West in the East—brought on the womanhood of India more tears and unheard sobs than all the suteses put together. They wanted to be Sahibs; a good many organised club life in imitation of British bachelors, took to drinking alcohol and eating meat just to spite religious susceptibilities of older generations, and adopted all sorts of reforms in clothes, mannerisms and superficial tastes. If the cow was sacred to woman, to man it was so much beef; woman's religious worship, her devotional performances, her ways of charity and social service were at variance with the ideas of the newly educated, who regarded them as medievalism, superstition and perpetuating ignorance in the family. His ideal was sanitation, hers—saintliness; he

believed in happiness through the conquest of dirt without while she prayed for contentment within; one challenged god when the other fell prostrate before It. It was a conflict between alien ideas and a truly indigenous way of life.

Where would society be to-day had women given in and followed the lead of men? Supposing they had decided to wear gowns in place of saris, deserted temples to form clubs. The West which had enamoured the younger generation of the East was not the truly representative humanitarian West, rebellious against every kind of injustice, but a type of life which sailors, soldiers, unscrupulous salesmen, highbrow officials, and upstart adventurers had brought to the shores of India. Had the Indian woman then decided to drift with the new tide, the task of reconstruction would have been doubly difficult to-day. The path of women was the more difficult, for it lay between orthodox egoists armed with the weight of custom, and the extreme individualist who wanted to knock everything old on the head; the choice seemed to lie between slavery and self-abandonment. But by suffering and silent service Indian woman helped to stabilise Indian society, save its qualities of other-worldliness and instil faith in succeeding generations about the values of their own civilization.

It is probably the most redeeming feature of contemporary Indian society that when a new crisis has arisen and the nation is in need of the maximum spiritual re-

sources, the women of India have chosen to walk farther from traditional limits and gone into politics, industrial problems, race and social relations. *Political liberty is only a beginning of the larger problem confronting India.* It releases fresh energies and desire for power in men, and encourages a new kind of individualism more indigenous and more virulent than what the West had brought at the beginning of the nineteenth century and which women had to face and fight alone. Old bonds are breaking and newer social ideals and controls must be raised to restrain self-seeking elements from trying to profit by social weaknesses.

It is therefore no accident that women should support non-violence as the basis of reorganisation in India. *This country needs, and will need, it more in future.* The extent of armaments can be computed with mathematical exactitude; but the explosives here are covered under issues of religion, caste interests, colour prejudice, mistaken ideas of superiority. These are imperceptible and hidden. In reorganising society men are likely to be harsh against men, range caste against caste, sect against sect, and fight for personal vanity instead of reasonable settlement. If India is not to repeat the mass violence of other nations and the massacres of its own history, it is necessary that the forces of non-violence must be focused, and I see no other single agency to do it than the peace-loving women of India. Already

they have been instrumental in infusing the spirit of non-violence into the political movement. I have seen how in their presence hotheaded young men feel restrained. Women undertook to picket places where it was easy to provoke men and make them fight. "What impelled you in this movement?" was my question to many of them and the answer was, "The call of the country and of Gandhi's non-violence, which came to us as a call from home."

Still another field is ahead of Indian women: In spite of Gandhi's insistence on the spinning wheel, machines are multiplying and the country is being rapidly transformed into an up-to-date mechanised nation. Before the incoming civilization brackets men in mutually exclusive economic and political groupings, it is necessary that some agency must be set to work in breaking up new-formed barriers and provide continuously fresh points of view, fresh attitudes, and fresh motives. The craving of men and women in more industrialised parts of the world to seek satisfaction in week-ends rather than in week-days, to hunger for the odd and abnormal, to feel thrilled with tabloid and "true story" magazines, to keep in imaginative intimacy with the underworld rather than with the inner world, is an outstanding weakness in the West. It promotes mutually abstracted behaviour among men so that in times of crisis faith shrinks, fears are enlarged and greed deflects men's judgment of one another. I

do not feel that the world is going to be a satisfactory place even when adequate material comforts are provided for all. It needs constantly a place more intimate than factories, sports clubs, professional conferences, trade union meetings, etc., where men may have the opportunity to deal with one another intimately, charitably, and with domestic affection. Home is a laboratory where people learn to live in mutual confidence, and in security seasoned with love. *Far from abolishing homes, India will need them the more*, the more she progresses along industrial lines. It is a very difficult problem and very urgent in our times to translate in social conduct such judgment, mutual understanding, give and take, or rather give without take if necessary, as prevail in a happy family. The spiritual qualities which the Indian woman has developed in homes are needed by society at large. Hampered with caste limitations and do-not-do-this taboos she has had few opportunities to try out her "home-made" methods on society on any large scale. Now that she is free and her activity is widening beyond the traditional limits, the task ahead of her is to build a passage between home and society, so that the virtues of the one may be passed on to the other and society may rise to the consciousness of one family. The sacrifices of Indian womanhood may then help to build a civilization large enough to house a happy India in the midst of a peace-loving world.

N. B. PARULEKAR

## JABIR

### THE SHAIKH WHO INTRODUCED EUROPE TO ALCHEMY

[Dr. E. J. Holmyard, M.A., M. Sc., D. Litt., is one of the best and greatest authorities on Alchemy. He has written and edited numerous volumes and is much interested in the study of Islamic Chemistry.]

Below we print a life sketch of one who forged a link between the learning of East and West in an age when scholarship in science was very rare. In a subsequent issue will be published similar sketches by the same authority on Helvetius and Flamel.—EDS.]

If we take as our standard of greatness the fame which they enjoyed among their brethren in the Art, few alchemists can compare with the Arab shaikh, Jabir ibn Hayyan. Not only was he universally acclaimed as the supreme Master by his fellow-countrymen and co-religionists of Islam, but European scholars of the highest rank, such as Gerard of Cremona, translated his works into Latin; with the result that Geber, the Westernized form of Jabir, pervades medieval Latin alchemy to a degree that finds no parallel.

Until quite recently, very little was definitely known of Jabir's life and accomplishments, and a tendency had arisen to regard him as one of those legendary figures in which alchemical literature is so rich. Within the last few years, however, investigation of Arabic sources has revealed him as a perfectly authentic historical character, and has helped to explain the admiration and reverence expressed for him by all later alchemists.

According to the most probable interpretation of the facts at our

disposal, Jabir's father, Hayyan, was an Arab druggist in the town of Kufa (Iraq) towards the end of the seventh century A. D. At the end of the second decade of the succeeding century he was sent to Persia on a political mission on behalf of the Abbasid family, who were at that time conspiring to overthrow the Umayyad dynasty. It was while he was at Tus (near the modern Meshed), then the capital of Khorasan, that his son Jabir was born, probably in the year A. D. 721 or 722. Hayyan was shortly afterwards arrested by Umayyad agents, and was subsequently executed.

The infant Jabir was sent to Arabia, possibly to his kinsmen of the celebrated South Arabian tribe Azd, to be cared for till he was old enough to fend for himself. As a boy, he studied the Qur'an, the Traditions and other subjects under a scholar named Harbial-Himyari; judging by his achievements in after life he must have been an apt pupil, with an insatiable appetite for all kinds of learning. While still in Arabia, he seems to have won the

friendship of the Sixth Shi'ite Imam, Ja'far al-Sadiq, probably at Medina. This friendship was destined to have important consequences, for it was doubtless the cause of Jabir's interest in mysticism and occultism and of his ultimate preferment to the Court in later years.

Meanwhile, the Abbasid propaganda had prospered, and in 749 the Caliphate was wrested from the house of Umayya. When conditions became more settled again, Jabir migrated to Baghdad, the Abbasid capital; and after the accession of Harun al-Rashid we find him on terms of some intimacy with the Caliph's powerful ministers, the Barmecides, for whom, indeed, he sometimes acted as household physician. His association with this remarkable family lasted for many years, and was only brought to an end in 803, when Harun al-Rashid extirpated them. From what we know of the Barmecides, we can safely conclude that Jabir must have been highly esteemed by his contemporaries, for his patrons were notoriously shrewd judges of men.

Recent researches have, indeed, decisively shown that Jabir was one of the most accomplished men of his time. The greatest of early chemists, he was also an able pharmacist and physician, a keen student of Greek philosophy (which he was probably able to read in the original), a mathematician and astronomer (he wrote a Commentary on Euclid and a Book of Astronomical Tables), a logician—and a mili-

tary strategist! His book on poisons, described a short time ago by Prof. Ruska, of Berlin, shows "complete independence of form and choice of subject matter," and in its wealth of accurate detail arouses admiration for its gifted and versatile author.

In addition to his other activities, Jabir found time to interest himself in theological subjects, more particularly the newly-founded system of Sufi-ism. This leaning towards mysticism, so frequently to be observed among the alchemists, was especially marked in the latter stages of Islamic alchemy; Jabir himself though he was evidently well acquainted with esoteric doctrine—chiefly in its Persian dress—was also a practised chemist, proficient in laboratory technique. It is, indeed, not the least arresting fact about this Muslim genius, that he realized the vital importance of experiment in the study of natural phenomena and himself made many notable discoveries.

It is to Jabir, too, that we owe a theory of the constitution of metals, a theory which was developed from the Aristotelian theory of "exhalations" and which later became modified into the celebrated phlogiston theory of Beccher and Stahl. He describes also, and attempts to explain, the principal operations of chemistry, such as calcination, reduction, solution and crystallization, while the technical applications of chemistry were not forgotten.

What were the sources of Jabir's learning? Such a question can

be more easily asked than answered, but we may reasonably assume that much of that amazing lore came from his native province of Khurasan, then a storehouse of accumulated Greek and oriental knowledge. The Syrian legacy from Greece was possibly beyond his reach, but in the *Book of Seventy* he refers to the Indian cipher or zero as though it were quite well known, and there are various other indications that he was in touch with the wisdom of India and the Far East.

Jabir was an extremely industrious writer, and there are nearly a hundred of his works still in existence. Up to the present, very few of them have been studied, so that it is not yet possible to form an accurate estimate of the place

which their author must occupy in the history of intellectual development. Sufficient is known about him, however, to afford ample justification of Ruska's contention that "all fields of the history of Arabic science will have to be fundamentally re-learned, in order that the facts revealed in Jabir's writings may be included in any future history of the Sassanian kingdom and of the development of Oriental Hellenism". There is, indeed, every reason to believe that modern Western natural science derives immediately from the mystico-scientific system of Islam rather than from Greek wisdom, and chemistry in particular owes its effective origin to the genius of Jabir ibn Hayyan.

E. J. HOLMYARD

Civilization is an inheritance, a patrimony that passes from race to race along the ascending and descending paths of cycles. During the minority of a sub-race, it is preserved for it by its predecessor, which disappears, dies out generally, when the former "comes to age". At first, most of them squander and mismanage their property, or leave it untouched in the ancestral coffers. They reject contemptuously the advices of their elders and prefer, boy-like, playing in the streets to studying and making the most of the untouched wealth stored up for them in the records of the Past. Thus during your transition period—the middle ages—Europe rejected the testimony of Antiquity, calling such sages as Herodotus and other learned Greeks—the Father of Lies, until she knew better and changed the appellation into that of "Father of History". Instead of neglecting, you now accumulate and add to your wealth. As every other race you had your ups and downs, your periods of honour and dishonour, your dark midnight and—you are now approaching your brilliant noon. The youngest of the fifth race family you were for long ages the unloved and the uncared for, the Cendrillon in your home. And now, when so many of your sisters have died; and others still are dying, while the few of the old survivors, now in their second infancy, wait but for their Messiah—the sixth race—to resurrect to a new life and start anew with the coming stronger along the path of a new cycle—now that the Western Cendrillon has suddenly developed into a proud wealthy Princess, the *beauty* we all see and admire—how does she act? Less kind hearted than the Princess in the tale, instead of offering to her elder and less favoured sister, the oldest now, in fact since she is nearly "a million years old" and the *only* one who has never treated her unkindly, though she may have ignored her,—instead of offering her, I say, the "Kiss of peace" she applies to her the *lex talionis* with a vengeance that does not enhance her natural beauty. This, my good friend, and brother, is not a far stretched allegory but—*history*.

—MAHATMA K. H.



## EDUCATING THE WHOLE CHILD

[Dr. Hughes Mearns is the head of the Department of Creative Education in New York University. His two books *Creative Youth* and *Creative Power* are famous. He has already contributed substantially towards the making of the history of educational reform.

Though rapid strides have been made in this direction, wrong philosophical and psychological views are leading many educational reformers astray. Experimenting with young human beings is worse than vivisection; though the cruelty is absent, the moral irresponsibility is greater. If it is true that the medical profession are learning at the cost of the health, even the lives, of their patients, it is also a fact, albeit a ghastly one, that lack of real knowledge of the human constitution, of psyche and nous, of soul and spirit, on the part of educationalists, proves fatal for battalions of boys and girls. We draw our readers' attention to her *Key to Theosophy* (Indian Ed. pp. 220-226, American Ed. pp. 263-271) in which H. P. Blavatsky wrote frankly because she felt strongly on the subject of the education of the young in her day, and Theosophists will rejoice to see some at least of the ideas put forward by her have been practically worked upon by reformers of the type of Mr. Mearns.—EDS.]

About twenty years ago I gathered with a small group of parents to discuss the question of the education of our children. Most of us had youngsters approaching school age. The public school did not satisfy us at all, then a highly mechanized rote-mill backed up by a discipline outwardly whitened but inwardly immoral, for it encouraged all the vices of deception and concealment. The private schools were either avowed cramming places for prep-school and college examinations or they were institutions for turning nice little children of the rich into a comically out-of-date little lady and little gentleman.

We would have neither of these for our children, for we had ideals of our own of what should constitute the healthy school environment of growing youngsters. So we took over an old house in the country, gathered together a small

staff of teachers who felt, or said they felt, the same way about young life as we did, and let loose our offspring in a school of our very own. That was the beginning of the Shady Hill School in Philadelphia.

Dewey's important little book *School and Society* was the main basis of our faith. We knew, of course, the writings of President Eliot and Colonel Parker; some of us were familiar with the long struggle for a commonsense education of youth as depicted by educational leaders for a century or more; and one of the parents, Mrs. Charles Frazier, had visited Bedales and other experimental ventures in Europe as a preparation for organizing the kind of school we desired for our children. We were aware, too, that the public schools had been making commendable strides toward the ideals of Dewey, Eliot and their group, but we could not wait for

the advance of those great but necessarily slow-moving institutions.

Other parents, we soon discovered, had had similar notions. Here and there all over the country a new kind of school was being started by mothers and fathers who could not wait. Within the past score of years, indeed, parents have quietly organized such schools at a cost to them, in initial equipment alone, of over ten million dollars. These are not schools of the rich, remember, but rather schools of the intelligent, to whom the tuition fees mean often a distinct sacrifice.

The Progressive Education Association, with offices at 10 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., has become the clearing house for this liberal wing of education; in publication, conference, and in national and international conventions, it binds together those teachers, parents and leaders of educational thinking who believe that youth is worthy of a better education than that commonly offered. Its "Directory of Privately Supported Schools Applying the Principles of Progressive Education" now lists nearly two hundred schools in twenty-five states. The actual number, of course, is much greater than this; and it is growing rapidly larger.

Through this loose central organization it has been possible for these varied progressive ventures to set up the goals toward which the new education is tending. It is safe to say that no school has attained them all, nor are they

put forth as the specific aim of any one group or organization. Rather they are a general summing up of such characteristics as find expression in some part throughout all forward looking education. Here are some of these goals:

First, of course, is health. Then follows "opportunity for initiative and self-expression, the free use of which will release the creative energies of the child". Interest, they claim, should be the motive of all work and should be developed through daily contact with the world and its activities; and always there should be a steady consciousness, not of failure, but of successful achievement.

At the start, one sees, there is an attitude toward child education in direct contrast with the traditional view which considers education as something out of books, difficult rather than interesting, something "learned" rather than something created out of life-experiences.

The international organization of those who believe in the paramount importance of developing the innate powers of childhood are banded together in The New Education Fellowship with central offices at 11 Tavistock Square, London. Their magazine, in English *The New Era*, is published simultaneously in a half dozen European languages. They also emphasize that "all education should give fresh rein to the innate interests of the child" and that the school curriculum should fur-

nish a continuous outlet for those interests "to the end that these our children may grow to be men and women conscious of their own dignity as human beings and recognizing that dignity in everyone else".

The main interest has shifted from the memorization of "information" to the child himself. The new schools are "child-centred," to use Dr. Harold Rugg's fine word. One should read, by the way, his exciting story of the new movement, *The Child-Centered School*. The primary question is: What is important to the spiritual and physical growth of this child?—not, What must this child learn? "Subjects," therefore, almost disappear, or combine with other subjects; "lessons" and "recitations" have almost no place, or are so lost in larger goals as not to be recognized as such. Gone is the old "drive" which made the pedagogue and the schoolma'am a person to be dreaded and avoided. Vanished, too, are the rigidity of posture and that equally unhealthy and most unnatural silence. Fear as a motive force has disappeared along with that fierce and selfish competition for "marks" which gave all the glory to copiers with merely facile memories.

The outcomes, nevertheless, have brought into the schoolroom more "information" than the traditional school had ever been able to furnish even to its so-called "bright" pupils. It is not, to be sure, so unprofitable to child life—or to any life!—as a memoriza-

tion of apothecaries' weight, the surveyor's table, the definition of metonymy and synechdoche, the exact order in authorship of Shakespeare's plays (which nobody really knows, by the way) or the precise reason, say, why personal pronouns are called personal (which nobody but a certain type of grammar teacher ever can remember for a week at a time).

The new "information," dug with almost feverish interest by the children themselves out of daily experiences which the school is wise enough to furnish, is drawn from most erudite sources, from astronomy, anthropology, sociology, history, physics, geology, aeronautics, and it is always compellingly alive. This is genuine learning, I often think, as I watch third grade children, for example, search magazines, books, museums, catalogues, government bulletins; as they write letters all over the world to places that are likely to satisfy their hunger for knowledge; as they ply their family and their grown-up friends in the search of ever fascinating truth.

As a parent interested in having his child "learn something," as the phrase is, one need have no fears about the new education. Enough time has elapsed to prove the success of the education which treats the child as an individual, which removes fear from the schoolroom, which abolishes the selfish competition of child against child, which substitutes live learning for dead "information," which every hour of the day uses the enormous energies of youth—an

education, which, in short, believes that youth is naturally worthy, decent, and able, rather than indolent, bad, and inept.

These newer educated children, brought up to believe in their own illimitable powers, have gone on to college and out into the world. Wherever they go they are natural leaders. In college they surpass their coerced brethren and sisters, winning high scholastic distinctions and, perhaps more significant, receiving coveted honours in the gift of their own mates. Even when they go from a progressive elementary school to a traditional high school, we have the proof that they rise slowly but surely to places of distinction; their practised resourcefulness marks them as inevitable leaders.

An illustration from a second grade class will show what happens when coercion is replaced by wisely guided freedom. In a school where modern procedures are used most intelligently a classroom theatre was made the centre of a year's work. Through a wise manipulation of the natural interests of little children in make-believe, these youngsters made surprising headway in academic accomplishment. In addition to important outcomes in character, personality, and in the discovery of individual gifts, these children, measured by the Stanford Achievement Tests, showed results in

arithmetic, reading and spelling which amounted at the end of six months to an average growth of eleven months! The lowest growth record was five months, and the highest was twenty-one months! And there was not a single old-style "lesson" during the whole period. And, more important, during all that time there were no mentally depressed children bewildered by the impossibility of keeping up with the exactions of fact-driving adults.

This is a brief picture of a world-movement to free the child from a traditional slavery to memorization and self-suppression. The whole nature of the child is being educated and not his mind alone; and as a result his mind has leaped to achievements of surpassing beauty and power.

In my two books *Creative Youth* and *Creative Power* I have tried to tell the story in more detail and with the exhibition of the convincing results; but it is a longer story and of greater importance to civilization than a mere two volumes could contain. To teach youth to know is one thing, and a good thing; but to give him intelligent guidance in the cultivation of taste, judgment, self-reliance, resourcefulness, tolerance, vision, individual power, that were, if practised generally, to make a new and beneficent race among the human kind.

HUGHES MEARNS

## THE OCCULT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE

[C. J. S. Thompson, M. B. E., Ph. D., has an assured reputation as historian in the fields of magic, astrology and pharmacy, his researches now having been continued over a period of thirty years. He is the author of books with such fascinating titles as *Mystery and Romance of Alchemy and Pharmacy*, *Mystery and Lure of Perfume*, *Mysteries and Secrets of Magic*, and *Mystery and Art of the Apothecary*. His *Mystery and Romance of Astrology* has been widely and favourably reviewed by the English critics. Formerly the Curator of the Historical Medical Museum, London, from the date of its foundation in 1913, he is now Honorary Curator of the Historical Section of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons of England.

In more than one of its branches modern science is nearing the invisible and the super-normal. The cure of bodily diseases, and especially of disorders of the nervous system, is compelling the modern medical man to admit that there may be something in some of the magical practices of his old-world co-professionals. Some bold enthusiasts have already begun to dabble in astrology, magnetism, etc., to bring relief to their patients. We know of several American Psychoanalysts who seem convinced that the "complexes of our science are the obsessing devils of the Vedic science". The whole subject is full of grave dangers and Theosophy recommends a very careful theoretical study of Occult Sciences *before* the undertaking of any practice—especially upon the sick bodies and brains of others.

Dr. Thompson deals with exorcism and astrology. We append some thought-provoking statements culled from reliable sources to which we draw the attention of all our readers, and especially of those medical practitioners who are eager "to perform magic".—EDS.]

There is evidence that the occult has played a prominent part in the history of medicine from the earliest times of which we have record. Even in the prehistoric period, primitive man instinctively recognised that there was some unseen power which it was necessary to invoke for the healing of bodily ills. As time went on, the aid of the deities was sought, and we find magic, religion and philosophy spread over the whole ancient world. Some insight into the earliest ideas of the origin of disease is given by the records of the Babylonians that date from about 2500 years before the Christian era.

The general belief among an-

cient peoples appears to have been that sickness was caused by the entrance of some evil spirit or demon into man's body, or by some agent not human. To rid him of the intruder, resort was made to incantations or the invocation of the unseen power whose influence was greater than the evil one's. This idea was held practically by all the civilised communities; in Babylonia, Egypt and India and even in the New World, we find the same belief as to the cause of disease.

In Babylonia and Assyria, the priest-magician was called in to exorcise the evil spirits and counteract their malign influence by prayers, spells and incantations,

with the aid of various substances which had a ceremonial importance. Water was sometimes sprinkled over the head of the sick person at the conclusion of an incantation, with the double object of cleansing the patient from the spell and the presence of their deity Ea, whose emanation was believed to remain always in water.

An instance of this treatment is recorded on an Assyrian clay tablet which dates from about 2500 B. C.

I am the sorcerer priest of (Ea)  
I am the magician of Eridu  
When I sprinkle the water of Ea on the sick man,  
When I subdue the sick man.

Among the ancient races of India the same ideas of the causation of disease prevailed, and the evil influence was ejected from the body by rites of exorcism. In the Vedas are the earliest records known of the art of healing in the far East and some of the clinical descriptions given are remarkable. In the Atharva-veda there are hymns to be used as charms or amulets, prayers to plants and other substances to be used to restore the sick to health, as instanced in the following :

The fever that comes on every day, third day, that intermits on every third day, that comes continuously and that comes in autumn, fever that is cold and hot and that comes in summer, Destroy him O plant !—

O,—relieve this man from the demons and Grahās, who have held him by the joints. O plant take him to the world of the living.

In ancient Egypt, magic and medicine were intimately connect-

ed, and incantations as well as material remedies were employed in the healing of disease. According to the Papyrus Ebers, the most important record extant on ancient Egyptian medicine, which was written about 1550 B. C., the incantations were composed by the gods,—Thoth, in particular, being regarded as the author of those employed by the physicians and magicians. "Incantations are excellent for remedies and remedies are good for incantations," was one of his precepts.

Incantations were used in conjunction with drugs for internal or external purposes, as instanced in the following text to be repeated when an emetic was to be taken.

O demon who art within the abdomen of —  
Son of — O thou whose father is surnamed —  
He who causes heads to fall, whose name is death,  
Whose name is the male of death,  
Whose name is accursed to Eternity.

The North American Indians ascribe sickness to the action of ghosts, who act either on account of a natural malevolence or because they have been offended by some lapse on the part of the victim. The "shaman" or medicine-man is called in to frighten them away by the exercise of his magical arts.

Next to magic, astrology may be said to have influenced medicine in early times more than any other of the occult sciences.

The Sumerians who dwelt on the banks of the Euphrates were probably the first to associate the heavenly bodies with the destiny of man. From the sun, moon and planets, a mysterious influence was believed to emanate

which affected human beings in health and disease, for the stars were considered to be the abodes of the gods. The signs of the Zodiac also were thought to exercise a considerable influence over the various parts and internal organs of man's body; their study, therefore, was considered of the greatest importance to those who practised the art of healing.

In Babylonia, Egypt, India and Greece, medical astrology later assumed a definite position and began to form one of the chief methods of diagnosing disease. To the influence of the stars also was attributed the potency of the herbs and plants employed as remedies. The ancient Aryans studied astrology. To them the astral influence meant the "flowing forth" of an ethereal fluid from the planets to the earth. The Sun and the Moon were considered especially important to the welfare of mankind; from the influence of the Moon and Venus, all plants were supposed to come into existence and the minerals were attributed to the agencies of Mars and Saturn.

According to the Rig-veda, astrology is the "Eye of Brahma. Death is from the Moon. The Moon gives coldness and when man becomes abnormally cold he dies".

In the Alexandrian School of Medicine, astrological prognosis and diagnosis were recognised and practised. Diseases of the more important bodily organs were diagnosed according to the influence of the signs of the Zodiac ruling at the time, and remedies

were administered according to the position of the stars. Plants, herbs and mineral substances were also appropriated to the planets and so assigned for the cure of disease. Such remedies were only to be given at certain times when the planets and stars were in certain positions.

In Europe, the operation of bleeding was considered safe only when the stars were in favourable aspects and at certain times of the year. According to a sixteenth century work on medicine:

The end of the physician's employment is the cure of the patient, and that he may accomplish this desirable end with more certainty and facility, astrology is very necessary as the handmaid to attend his physical sciences.

First, for the knowledge of what part the disease is in and which causes it to come; the physician is to remember what parts of man's body are signified by the twelve houses and signs of heaven, by the planets, by the position of the planets which are the significators in any houses of the signs.

The first house signified the head, face, ears, eyes and mouth; and so on up to the twelfth.

In order to discover the disease from which the sick person was suffering, the physician had to note in what sign the Moon was when he first took to his bed, and by what planets the Moon was afflicted; then according to the rules under the planets he was able to name the disease. Thus for example, if the Moon was in Capricorn and afflicted by Saturn the chest and stomach would be affected, the lungs might be oppressed and he would have shortness of breath and cough.

Another method was to observe the signs of the twelve houses, and then to give judgment according to which of the twelve signs the Moon was in and by the infirmities afflicted. By astrological rules, the physician also claimed to be able to discover whether the sick person would recover from the disease or die, and if likely to live, how long it would be before he would recover. Signs of recovery were foretold if a benevolent planet were stronger in the ascendant than the afflicting one. The task of the physician in the sixteenth century, when first called to attend a sick person, was by no means an easy one.

The surgeon also was guided in his operations by astrological rules. Ptolemy, for instance, issued a warning to surgeons not to operate when the Moon was in the sign governing the affected part of the body. "Pierce not with iron," he writes, "that part of the body which may be governed by the sign actually occupied by the Moon."

Another matter of great importance in which the Moon had to be taken into account by the physician treating certain diseases was the determination of crises. A writer of the fifteenth century says:—

From ancient times Physicians have

found out the changes and terminations of diseases by the course of the Moon. Wherefore the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-th, twenty-first, twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth<sup>d</sup> days of sicknesses are called critical days. Know then, that the crises, viz. upon a critical day, the Moon being well-aspected by good planets, it goes well with the sick; if to ill-planets, it goes ill.

Modern investigators regard the ancient tradition associating the Moon with lunacy, and the belief that its influence affected the insane, as a myth.

Astrology brought to its aid the use of charms, amulets and talismans. Many of the latter, engraved with the symbols of the planetary signs, were in general use down to the end of the sixteenth century as preventives of disease. Space will not permit us more than to mention the other branches of the occult sciences, such as divination, auguries and oracles, which played a part in the history of medicine in ancient times. All of these offer studies of profound human interest and are worthy of careful investigation.

Let us hope that through the medium of THE ARYAN PATH some further knowledge of the wisdom of the great philosophers of ancient times, much of which is to be found in the East, may be crystallised for the benefit of posterity.

C. J. S. THOMPSON



“Elementary spirits,” whether they belong to “earth, water, air or fire,” are spirits not yet human, but attracted to the human by certain congenialities. As many physical diseases are due to the presence of parasites, attracted or produced by uncleanness and other causes, so parasitic spirits are attracted by immorality or spiritual uncleanness, thereby inducing spiritual diseases and consequent physical ailments. They who live on the animal plane must attract spirits of that plane, who seek for embodiments where the most congeniality exists in the highest form.

Thus the ancient doctrine of obsession challenges recognition, and the exorcism of devils is as legitimate as the expelling of a tape-worm, or the curing of the itch. It was also believed that these spiritual beings sustained their spiritual existence by certain emanations from physical bodies, especially when newly slain; thus in sacrificial offerings the priests received the physical part, and the Gods the spiritual, they being content with a “sweet-smelling savour.” It was further thought that wars were instigated by these demons, so that they might feast on the slain.

But vegetable food also held a place in spiritual estimation, for incense and fumigations were powerful instruments in the hands of the expert magician.—  
BUDDHA OF CALIFORNIA (*The Spiritual Scientist*, 1875)

Above the elementary spheres were the seven planetary spheres, and as the elementary spheres were the means of progress for the lower animals, so were the planetary spheres the means of progress for spirits advanced from the elementary—for human spirits. The human spirit at death went to its associative star, till ready for a new incarnation, and its birth partook of the nature of the planet whence it came, and whose rays illumined the ascendant—the central idea of astrology.—  
BUDDHA OF CALIFORNIA (*The Spiritual Scientist*, 1875)

The Secret Doctrine teaches that every event of universal importance, such as geological cataclysms at the end of one race and the beginning of a new one, involving a great change each time in mankind, spiritual, moral and physical—is pre-cogitated and preconcerted, so to say, in the sidereal regions of our planetary system. Astrology is built wholly upon this mystic and intimate connection between the heavenly bodies and mankind; and it is one of the great secrets of Initiation and Occult mysteries.—H. P. BLAVATSKY (*The Secret Doctrine*, II. 500)

Unfortunately the key to the final door of Astrology or Astronomy is lost by the modern Astrologer; and without it, how can he ever be able to answer the pertinent remark made by the author of *Mazzaroth*, who writes: “people are said to be born under one sign, while in reality they are born under another, because *the sun is now seen among different stars at the equinox*”?—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Theosophical Glossary* “Astronomos.”

## IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS

### SPIRITUAL PSYCHOLOGY

[Hugh I'A. Fausset is a well-known literary critic whose recent volumes show Theosophic insight. In our April number we published his article on "Self-Realization," in which he pleaded for the living of the Higher Life.

*The Dream of Ravan* is a book with a Message, and one with which every genuine student of Theosophy is familiar, or should be. It was written in 1853-54 and marks a very early noble effort to interpret the Wisdom of the East to the West.—EDS.]

The necessity of becoming "whole," of recovering a lost unity of being, is more and more engaging the attention of poets, philosophers, sociologists, and teachers in the West. The reason is obvious. The European War exposed with appalling clarity the abyss of sin, of division, into which we had fallen. The immediate reaction amongst the most sensitive spirits was one of bitter disillusion and scepticism. But that is passing. For, as Mr. Lawrence Hyde has written in his striking book *The Prospects of Humanism*, "to doubt sincerely and consistently is to be in Hell. And this is insupportable. If the suspension of belief is honest, the outcome must either be a paralysing despair or a birth into a new mode of consciousness". It would be too much, perhaps, to say that such a *new mode of consciousness* is already born, but there are many signs that it is coming to life, and the marked preoccupation by leading thinkers of different schools with the problem of "wholeness" is perhaps the most hopeful of them. For it shows that we are beginning to realise that the external methods of science and ra-

tional manipulation, necessary as they are in their place, are not enough, that the problem is essentially a moral one, and that the creative harmony which we seek to establish in the world depends ultimately upon each individual's effort to integrate himself.

But if we are increasingly realising this truth to-day, we are still, it must be admitted, very far from having a clear conception of what the effort of self-integration involves.

The advice offered to us is very various and each teacher tends to stress one aspect of the problem to the exclusion of all others or to proclaim a manifestly partial way of salvation. And this is because even those teachers who announce most emphatically that they have unified themselves, are in fact still inwardly divided men. They seek to relieve their own sickness by prescribing for the health of others. They forget that all the great spiritual teachers of the world have painfully established their own integrity before offering a gospel to others. They are in fact in the line, not of the true seers, but of Rousseau. For Rousseau

was the first and the most influential of the modern evangelists. And all his life he was a sick man in search of a cure. His sickness was our sickness, the malady of a divided being in which heart and head, the senses and the intelligence, were at war with one another instead of being actively reconciled in the spirit. And the solution which he preached was also characteristic. It was a return to a "state of nature". There is a sense in which the spiritual man is indeed the natural man, and the false moralists who have insisted upon a final opposition between the natural and the spiritual betray the same inward division and self-enslavement as the false romantics who confuse the sensational with the spiritual. But because Rousseau was guilty of this confusion his "state of nature" has proved perhaps the most delusive Eden to which a sick world has ever been invited to return. Yet his influence has persisted, and this has been due not only to the seductive charm of his writing, but to the fact that no other man has so eloquently and sensitively expressed the disease which has been sapping the virtue of the Western world for two hundred years, and that his gospel has had all the fatal attractiveness of a half-truth. For Rousseau was right in his claim that Western civilisation had become morbid through rationalising self-interest at the expense of the instincts and the feelings. But he failed to realise that self-interest was itself an instinct with as deep biological

roots as self-surrender, and so by inviting men to abandon thought for feeling he was merely transferring the principle of selfishness from the plane of intellect to that of the senses. And very many of our modern teachers are guilty of the same error. Their gospels are disguised naturalism, whether they deny the tyranny of the intellect, like the late D. H. Lawrence, or find salvation in rationalism like Bertrand Russell. At bottom their error is due to faulty psychology, and even our modern psychological specialists, the psycho-analysts, reveal the same deficiency. Their life-wisdom is inadequate, because their self-knowledge is. For true self-knowledge is only possible to those who have died to the personal self and through a consequent regeneration experienced the deeper mysteries of the soul. And *for the most part our modern teachers, whether they be humanists, primitivists, rationalists, moralists, or psycho-analysts are imprisoned within the personal self.* Their knowledge is therefore external, because whether they emphasise the part to be played by the body, the mind, or the will in the "whole" man of whom they dream, they are ignorant of the spiritual principle in relation to which alone can the divided human faculties be unified and which is in truth the very reason of our being.

In short without spiritual insight the problem of human nature cannot be truly solved even if much useful knowledge can be acquired concerning its physical and mental

aspects. The Western investigator has in fact only reached and begun to analyse the external phenomena of a mystery which the spiritual teachers of the East have long ago inwardly divined. And the truth of this was recently brought forcibly home to me when I read in succession D. H. Lawrence's *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and a book by an unknown author, entitled *The Dream of Ravan*. Lawrence was perhaps more truly possessed by the spirit of life than any creative writer of his generation, and consequently his book is full of dynamic insight. Yet it is violent and one-sided because it lacks just that spiritual wisdom which shines through the exposition of Hindu psychology to be found in *The Dream of Ravan*. This book appeared originally in a series of articles in *The Dublin University Magazine* of 1853, 1854. Its author was therefore presumably a Westerner, but one who was profoundly intimate with Eastern literature, and in particular with the *Ramayana*, out of which *The Dream of Ravan* develops. Much of the dream is told in verse that has qualities of vision and melody which recall at times both Shelley and Poe. Like the religious oratorios of the Haridasas or Ramadasas, it blends "moral and religious instruction with music, lyric poetry, mythical narrative, and a dash, now and then, of proverbial wisdom, or amusing anecdote". For, significantly enough, while D. H. Lawrence was always humourless, the true spiritual teacher being self-

emancipated and so inwardly at ease does not feel an innocent gaiety to be incongruous to a setting forth of spiritual truths and allegories that are eternally true to the human soul. *The Dream of Ravan*, then, breathes throughout a charming temper, the temper of a poet who is also a mystic, who is not only versed in Vedântic psychology but has proved upon his pulses the truths of this ancient Science of Being. And it is in the prose interpretations of the dream that the reader will find the richest spiritual wisdom. And perhaps the most significant of these is that which defines the three "states" of consciousness through which the individual should grow to completeness. This is a subject upon which Western minds have been increasingly concentrating, and it is treated here with a luminous clarity which is in striking contrast to the volcanic flashes and dark convulsions of such a disintegrated searcher after life-wisdom as Lawrence.

The three radical, prismatic qualities into which the primordial and eternal unity is described as dividing itself, when reflected in time and of which every soul born into natural life partakes in greater or less degree, will be familiar to all students of the *Gita*. They are *Tamas*, *Rajas*, and *Satva*, representing respectively Darkness, Passion, and that Being, of which Truth and Goodness are the expression. But it is in his interpretation of these three qualities or "states" that the author of *The Dream of Ravan* reveals himself

as a master of knowledge. *Tamas*, as he shows, is negativity.

It is the absence of all knowledge, feeling, motion, penetrability, transparency. It is, in fact, what may appear a strange expression, the moral basis of matter; or, in other words, that stolid state or form of spirit, which causes it to appear and be what we call matter.

Its highest form of organic development, therefore, does not go beyond the mere animal life and the region of sense.

The *Rajas*, on the other hand, is the characteristic of moral life or soul; the dark opacity is penetrated with a fiery and turbid glare, but not yet rendered purely transparent; the cold obstruction and insensibility are awakened into pangs of painful movement.

This is, in short, that state of warring passion and moral division into which every sensitive individual falls when self-consciousness shatters his primitive unity. And finally *Satva* is the characteristic of Spirit, which though bright, luminous, and glorious in itself still partakes of distinction, being bound in the chains of individuality and limitation.

The feeling soul compelled by suffering into a profounder self-consciousness and reflection, passion has risen into reason and knowledge. Self-knowledge, reasoning outward, progresses into universal sympathy. The life of emotion reaches its consummation, and all other passions expire in giving birth to an eternal sentiment of justice and love, which are ultimately one.

Where this scheme of life so convincingly differs from the partial gospels of the modern West is both in its inclusiveness of all the vital factors and its avoidance of those false oppositions between

reason and instinct, flesh and spirit which show that the teacher has not himself really outgrown the *Rajas* state. It is in short an exposition of soul-unfoldment by one who has himself realised the state of *Satva*, "when the plastic, and the emotional, and the ideal, become absolutely one, and there is, properly speaking, neither matter, nor soul, nor spirit, but something which is all and yet none of these—call it Bramh. . . or SOLIDARITY OF BEING, THOUGHT AND JOY."

And the important point to emphasise is that the man who has thus achieved reunion with the divine no longer cherishes enmity against either his animal or his intellectual being. He knows that even the *Tamas* "partakes of good: it contains within itself potentially both the *Rajas* and the *Satva*, which only require to be evolved from it"; while "in proportion to the large basis of the *Tamas* quality is the intensity and power of that *Rajas* fire and *Satva* light, which movement can evolve." And again, if the Spiritual seeks to stand alone, denying its humbler faculties, "it becometh in its proud isolation, a deadly venomous yellow, the colour of serpents, and dragons, and irredeemable Bramha-Rakshasas".

In many recent Western championings of the life of instinct against sterile intellectualism we have partial reflections of this truth, partial because lacking the spiritual vision which reconciles and redeems both reason and instinct in itself. But the author of

*The Dream of Ravan* not only defines the states through which the soul must go. He reveals too the essential condition of growth. He wrote:—

The problem to be solved in the case of Titanic Ravan—and in greater or less degree of every human soul, in proportion as it partakes of the Titanic nature, as all in their emerging must in some measure—is, how shall the *Tamas* be changed into the *Satva*, or penetrated and ruled by it?—how shall matter reascend and become spirit?—the gross darkness and stolid stupidity . . . . be illumined into self-consciousness, reflection, reason, knowledge?—the brute self-concentration be kindled into universal sympathy and love?—the blind instinct of coarse desires . . . . be sublimed into the eternal conscious principles, self-renunciation, and pure ideality of the divine life?"

And he answers,—

This can only be accomplished in one way, and that way lies through the *Rajas*—the life of passion—the life of suffering. The result of every passion of our nature, even love, nay, of love more than of all others, is suffering and sorrow. The first awakening of unconscious matter into the consciousness of mere animal life is through physical pain; and the process is carried still further by the mental suffering which is the very nature of the soul's emotional life . . . . . Brute appetite and blind impulse are first superseded by passion; and passion working, through sorrow and the reflexion and sympathy which sorrow generates, begets its own extinction, and finally merges in and is swallowed up in love and absolute resignation. This philosophy seems to rest on a basis of unquestionable truth. For, understood in all its depth, it is identical, in ultimate results, with the way of the Cross."

Such suffering is, indeed, essential to all true growth and deep experience, and the knowledge of

our modern rationalists is superficial because they have not really suffered, have not accepted the creative agony, the infinite travail of love. For real suffering is not the negative endurance, the self-bound and resentful distress, with which the word is commonly associated. It is, as our author emphasises, a positive and passionate giving of the self to life and receiving of life into the self on progressively higher and deeper levels until the personal will is at last wholly identified with the Creative Will, and self-consciousness is completed in the divine consciousness. In such a scheme of Spiritual evolution we find that true marriage of the active and passive, the masculine and feminine principles, which is everywhere seen to govern creation on the lower level of physical life. It is often said with justice that the East has overemphasised feminine self-surrender in its way of life, the West masculine self-assertion. But the author of *The Dream of Ravan* makes it clear that in the purest mystical doctrine of the East activity and passivity were creatively reconciled, that natural life with its faculties of reason and sense was not denied but fulfilled in the spirit, and that the human was conceived of as realising its essential divinity by a kindred process to that by which the seed dies that it may live, the plant is receptive to the wind and rain, and the flower both lifts its face to the sun and draws its beauty and vitality from roots deep in the soil. Thus

it is only when all isolation and all inward division are renounced that the *Satva* may re-enter predominant into the *Rajas* and *Tamas*, may penetrate them with its influence and "all three isolated prismatic rays coalesce into pure universal light and a consciousness of divine reunion".

And later in the book we find the distinction between a perverse and a true spirituality emphasised in the contrasted characters of the two sages Maricha and Ananta. Both have trodden the path of self-renunciation, but while Maricha, as a result of his excessive and grotesque penitential austerities, is a skeleton and a scarecrow, Ananta, though advanced in years, has "a fresh and almost roseate look. His features, naturally handsome, wore the impress of a loving as well as a reverential nature, and the holy calm of a spirit at peace crowned their blended expression of dignity and sweetness". Similarly Ananta avoids "the pursuit of the Siddhis, or miraculous faculties" to which Maricha devotes himself, "pronouncing it a road beset with dangers, and often leading to the profoundest darkness". Being in short a truly liberated being, he is not inhuman, but completely human and so divine. Maricha terrifies all who come into contact with him. Ananta draws his fellow-men towards him by the magnetism of his love. By such practices as standing on his head for a series of years Maricha has acquired strange powers and experienced wild visions. But the spiritual

pride which dictated such fanatical penances has not been mortified by them. He has not in short truly suffered as Ananta has done who has been content "with the humbler exercise of fixing the contemplations of his spirit on the infinite moral beauty and goodness of the Divine nature, and endeavouring, by contemplation, to transform himself to some likeness of the eternal love," and who in consequence feels a glad sympathy with all living creatures and evokes it too.

In these two characters, then, we are shown the difference between the magical and the mystical, the divided self which exploits spiritual forces, and the completed self which expresses the divine. There is much else in *The Dream of Ravan* which throws light on the nature of the true mystic and the conditions governing his development, much esoteric lore, too, such as the remarkable catalogue of soul-powers, which will be of deep interest to initiates. But the whole is written with such simplicity and charm that the reader needs to be no student of Yoga or occult practices to receive the deep life-wisdom which it breathes.

We are beginning to realise in the West that the most practical psychology is also the most spiritual, that the analysis of the scientist, although helpful up to a point, is inevitably superficial through the limited and specialised quality of his perceptions. Intellectual analysis is in fact only of value if it is grounded in and

quicken by spiritual insight. And we have only to compare the understanding of a true poet or seer with that even of such an eminent analyst as Adler, for example, to see how much deeper and more sensitive is their contact with reality. *The Dream of Ravan* is the work of both a poet and a seer. There are elements in it of playful phantasy and caprice. But even its phantasy is a veil behind which true vision may be found. And all who are concerned to bring to birth that new consciousness and new man upon whom the future of the

world depends should read it. For here that path to wholeness, that growth from unconsciousness, through self-consciousness, to pure being, which is becoming increasingly the concern of the most sensitive spirits in the West, is revealed by one who was himself whole, whose vision, therefore, was not convulsed and demiurgic but serenely sabbatical, and who by the light that shone in himself and his Eastern Forerunners could reveal how man might throw off the darkness clouding his spirit and resume his native brightness.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

*Sakya, or Buddhist Origins.* MRS. RHYS DAVIDS. (Kegan Paul. London 12s. 6d.)

When one of the greatest living authorities on any subject takes the trouble to embody in a series of volumes the fruits of her carefully collated researches, all who with the same enthusiasm are engaged in studying that subject would do well to examine these results with care, all the more so when the considered opinion of the writer is utterly at variance with generally accepted views. That Mrs. Rhys Davids, one of the greatest living authorities on Pali Buddhism, is entitled to a careful hearing in all that she has to say will not be questioned, and it remains to be considered what she has to say. Her aim, as stated on the wrappers of the book, is "to restate the original message of Sakya-muni, to clear away the overgrowth of ideas and doctrines with which later theologians deformed and almost smothered it . . . and to discover how there developed a body of doctrine extraneous to this central message, even antagonistic to it, which grew into what is now called Buddhism". To distinguish what she claims to be true Buddhism from its

modern corrupted form the Author calls the former "Sakya".

Mrs. Rhys Davids is not a Buddhist, and writes as a student of the Pali Scriptures rather than as an exponent of that form of the religious life now known as Buddhism, and it may be that this is the explanation of her tacit assumption, common to critics of the Dhamma but utterly unknown to Buddhists, that the Buddha was not what in fact he definitely claimed to be, the BUDDHA, the ALL-Enlightened One. Was he, as the Author seems to assume, merely a "thoroughly good and lovely man," a "psychic medium," who happened to develop ideas of his own on the best way to arrive at Truth, and who taught, in spite of imperfect understanding, doubts, misgivings and mistakes, a body of doctrine which has proved acceptable to untold millions, or was he in fact, as countless generations have accepted him to be, the BUDDHA, the latest of his line as such, the Fully-Enlightened One? Here is no equivocal phrasing such as is found in the New Testament, no cryptic self-descriptions as "the Son of God". The Buddha in terms, if we may accept at least these



portions of the Pali Canon, proclaimed the nature of the Office which he held, and none who knew him, having tested him with all the agony of doubt with which each seeker of his day would test each claimant to the common Goal, was found to say him nay.

Only a Pali scholar is perhaps entitled to join issue with the writer on her detailed criticism of a hundred passages in the Scriptures, but here again the writer's attitude is strangely contradictory. Scriptures must either be taken as inspired *in toto* and above all criticism, or else, and such is the Western method now in vogue, as the records of past centuries, handed down by generations of custodians as the *ipsissima verba* of the Master but bearing on their face the record of interpolation, alteration, excision and addition which, it is sad to say, is apt to be the price of copying. Had all the collected sayings of the Buddha been engraved, as were the Edicts of Asoka, on timeless pillars of stone our doubts would be at rest. They were not, and to-day the world is at the mercy of human argument on what was said by the greatest of the sons of men. But if these records be so inaccurate, as the Author here suggests, of what avail to erect upon them elaborate theories on the use of this word or of that, or on the mention or absence of mention in some particular Scripture of some doctrine which the writer claims to have been later superimposed? The Author herself remarks, "how hard it is to get at the true residuum in these ancient records," yet on them proceeds to build up theories antagonistic to the doctrines they express.

"Antagonistic" is the perfect word, for almost each and every doctrine found in Pali Buddhism is here ascribed to "monkish invention" at a later date, while the insistence on suffering, so plain to the thoughtful man who is free from the twin forms of mental bias known as pessimism and optimism, is held to be a perversion of the truth. If the writer's theme be merely to point out, as others, notably Mr. Edmond Holmes in *The*

*Creed of Buddha*, have also pointed out, that the negative aspect of Buddhist doctrine would be more acceptable to the Western mind if positively expressed, she will have many to agree with her, but to say that the accepted method of presentation is not Buddhism is surely going too far. Mrs. Rhys Davids is entitled to claim that "Buddhism" to-day is static, negative and stiffened into an objective code, whereas the Buddha's Teaching was dynamic, positive, a clarion call to humanity to become spiritually "more," to tread that inner Path which leads to spiritual health and "wholeness" where the pilgrim of "becoming" has become what he inherently and ever is; that "moreness" which is Most. But the Self was ever accepted by the Buddha's audience and his aim was to arouse in them the desire to make the potential actual without delay by treading the Wheel, which, as the Author rightly emphasises, is no circle but an ascending spiral to perfection in the death of the separative self. What then remains but a matter of relative emphasis? We should concentrate, according to the writer, on Sukha, not on Dukkha, on Self, not on the not-Self, on movement forward rather than on standing still, and we should refuse to allow the "lion-roar" of truth to be crushed into the mould of phrase and formula. Sakya, in fact, is no analysis of Ill but a showing of the Way to Well, a Way which has a Goal but no apparent end. But if this be her contention, and the thought is an inspiring one, what need for all this effort at destruction before the constructive effort is made clear? The latter alone, bereft of the tool-marks of her erudition, would be a call to action to the all too stagnant Sangha of to-day, a call to forsake the paths of unproductive study for the Way of Life, of precept and example, until each wearer of the Robe was worthy of the noble title, Follower of the All-Enlightened One.

The book is beautifully printed and produced and is cheaper than one would expect from its considerable size.

*The Prospects of Humanism.* By LAWRENCE HYDE (Gerald Howe, Ltd., London.)

Religion has been one of the most powerful forces in socializing man through the ages, and it has entered into the warp and woof of every civilization that the world has known. Though religion has been so essential a factor in the upward struggle of man, yet it must be admitted that at the present time it is confronted by a crisis,—one which has been brought about by the growth of institutionalism in religion. By overshadowing more or less the spirit of religion, formalism has led to the weakening of the grip religion has had on mankind. Consequently, we are now facing serious instability in the life of the individual and profound disturbances in the life of modern society. People's beliefs, even in the things which were accepted as axiomatic, have been rudely shaken. During the last quarter of a century our whole life has been a scene of confused values and conflicting ideals. Nevertheless, there is no cause for despair as the uncertainty which pervades our world of religious beliefs is not an isolated phenomenon. It is only one manifestation of the general confusion which exists in the whole of the modern world as regards the values and standards of human living. In fact, all our institutions may be said to be at the present time in the melting pot, being tested in the crucible of fiery criticism.

Such confusion as we are now living in is to be expected in all ages of transition. But what we must guard against is the reversions to lower planes which often take place during such periods. And reversions are an ever present danger in our religious and moral life as well as in other phases of our social life. Even to-day various kinds of substitutes for religion are being offered to the intellectuals of the modern world. Religion has been a real power in human society, and it cannot be easily dispensed with in the more complex stages of social evolution. If it is so vital an element in civilization, then the attainment of a rational and ethical religion is one of the greatest

and most fundamental of our social needs, and nothing could be more shortsighted than an irrational attitude toward religion. The present situation is a challenge to thoughtful men and they are rightly concerned as to whether these substitutes could adequately fill the place of religion in society and satisfy the inner longings of the vast mass of mankind. One among the few who are seriously thinking about human progress and the future of religion in the modern world is Mr. Lawrence Hyde.

In his thought provoking volume Mr. Hyde does not attempt to reconstruct religion or present a new religion, except by implication, to meet the demands of modern men and women and provide them with a proper framework for their lives. His purpose is to examine critically the wider literary-artist movement which professes to emphasize the supreme need of re-integrating and re-creating the individual by a harmonious and self-sufficing development of the rational, the ethical and the aesthetic aspects of his existence, and to show to what extent these substitutes for religion provide no secure spiritual foundation for their lives. Giving the general title of "humanism" to these substitutes, Mr. Hyde surveys under it such different creeds as the "New Humanism" of Mr. Irving Babbitt, Walter Lippman and others, the Pagan faith of sensationalism of Mr. J. C. Powys and Mr. Clive Bell, the classicism of Mr. T. S. Eliot and the neo-romanticism of Mr. Middleton Murry. Besides these, he brings under his critical survey the academic thinker and philosopher and the "high-brow" intellectual as types lacking a firm spiritual foundation.

The humanists put their entire faith in man's native powers, rejecting the idea of God. They conceive of man as capable of ordering his affairs without consciously looking upward to a supreme region of being for inspiration. Hence humanism entails a reliance upon the operation of three cultural agencies: rational, ethical and aesthetic. If somehow or other people can be induced to exercise their reason in a proper way, to respect

the moral law, and to respond to the ennobling influence of art, it is believed that we may one day enjoy the privilege of living in a harmonious and stable type of society. Mr. Hyde devotes a portion of this volume to a criticism of the above view. In fact, the first three chapters are more or less introductory in which the author stresses for solving life's problems the necessity of achieving a "unified consciousness," which he describes as that "polarization of the heart and head which only the mature artist and the enlightened mystic can be said to achieve with any degree of completeness". In the fifth chapter Mr. Hyde discourses on the dangers attending upon an over-emphasis on the value of culture as a spiritualizing agency. The main interest of the work, however, centres in the fourth and sixth chapters which are devoted to a critical examination of classical and romantic humanism represented by Irving Babbitt of America and Middleton Murry of England respectively.

The implied object of this volume being the advancement of a plea for a new or more rational religion, he tries to show how the humanistic attitude to the world breaks down at every crucial encounter in life, and how in so breaking down it points beyond itself to the superior validity of religious experience. And yet in spite of his partiality for religion, Mr. Hyde is absolutely unprejudiced in his analysis, and throws out in bold relief not only the defects but also the excellences of every system he examines.

Classical humanism rightly insists upon the development of man's ethical nature, resulting in moderation and sobriety, balance and proportion, but it misses the cream of life in excluding all spontaneity, poetic emotions and artistic creativeness. The unabashed naturalism and atheism of the neo-romanticist; his insistence upon the divorce between our moral impulse to action and our poetic apprehension of the spiritual; his emphasis upon the poetic experience as being the

perfection of religious experience; his assertion that art can embody truth better than life, these and many other such tenets of modern art-literature preclude us from optimistically assuming that neo-romanticism is an effective substitute for good old religion. Though Mr. Hyde rightly and convincingly fights the neo-romantic view that religion ought to be dissociated from morality, yet he does not seem to realize that for the true mystic morality as such,—as involving a conflict between rival impulses,—ceases to exist, for, as the embodiment of perfection, he is automatically moral and virtuous. Else, what exactly is the significance of the "transcendence of morality" which Mr. Hyde admits is effected by religious illumination? Again in regard to the problem of evil, it seems to me that no religion or system of philosophy can satisfactorily solve it which is ready to adore God as the Benign but refuses flatly to adore him as God the Terrible.

In a work of this kind, of course, there are bound to be some differences of opinion. Nevertheless, as a defence of the validity and ultimacy of religious experience, the book is a welcome contribution. One cannot but heartily endorse the author's conclusion that man must cease to be merely "human" and rise to the full stature of the divine latent in him, that art and morality must both be illumined by the glow of religious faith consequent upon a long process of spiritual discipline. Indeed, the high value of being a man is not really attainable without religion, and any system that wants to influence human beings must needs reach out into the infinite. It cannot be egocentric and homocentric; for humanism without God lacks on its ethical side the authority and appeal to the imagination of the vast mass of mankind. Hence, humanism cannot get on without religion, though religion can get along without humanism. While the humanist puts his faith in Man as merely Man, Mr. Hyde would have us put our trust in Man in union with God.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

*Vinavasavadattam*. Edited By S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI (Published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras. As. 8 or 1s.)

This publication is valuable as a document adding to the data of the Bhasa controversy. Ganapati Sastri of Trivendrum created a sensation in the world of oriental scholarship by his important discovery of thirteen old Sanskrit plays which he ascribed to Bhasa, a well-known ancient playwright. Some scholars, however, did not feel so certain as regards this authorship, though the discovery of the wonderful texts was a happy surprise to them. Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri, who has edited the play under review, ascribes three of the thirteen so-called Bhasa plays to Shaktibhadra. The word, *Vinavasavadattam*, was written on a card attached to the original text, but there is no internal evidence

to prove its correctness. Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri feels inclined to identify this play with *Unmadavasavadatta* of Shaktibhadra. The play has, however, important affinities with *Pratijnya-yaugandharayana*, one of the thirteen Bhasa plays and it also contains a number of so-called Bhasa features. The "Sthapana" or the introductory part of the play is brief and is more after the manner of Bhasa than of Shaktibhadra, whose "Sthapana" as we have it in his *Chudamani* is more like the lengthy prologues of Bhavabhuti and Shriharsha. These points seem suggestive of Bhasa's authorship.

This critical edition of the play is sure to prove of immense help in solving some of the difficulties of the Bhasa hypothesis. Undoubtedly the play is one of the many missing links.

D. G. V.

*H. G. Wells: A Sketch for a Portrait*. By GEOFFREY WEST. (Gerald Howe, Ltd., London. 10s. 6d.)

A really good biography presents a double character study—the study of the subject of the biography and the study of the biographer himself. This is the case with Geoffrey West's *H. G. Wells: A Sketch for a Portrait*. In it we find analysis wrought with insight—as also Mr. West's complete immersion in his subject. Yet he succeeds in attaining the aloofness necessary for his survey in the masterly last chapter.

In many of Mr. Wells's novels one gets the idea of a photograph, with its close attention to detail, rather than that of a painting; none the less there is genius. The light that never was on land and sea sends forth a first tiny ray when, as a boy, Mr. Wells read at Uppark, Plato's *Republic* "with an intimation of purposes and horizons wider than any he had glimpsed before". The light brightens in *The History of Mr. Polly* wherein we find expressed the truth that man is the maker of his

destiny—"If the world does not please you, you can change it. Determine to alter it at any price, and you can change it altogether." In *Tono-Bungay* the light shines forth with fulness in the realization that "there is something finer, to put away one's self in the service of mankind," working for the dream of a great World State and the "consciousness of something greater than ourselves, the immortal soul of the race . . . ."

When we turn to the biographer, do we not find that he reveals himself in his selections of episodes from Wells's exuberant life and quotations from his voluminous output? Let us take an instance: the story of the charade, in which Wells "adorned with a long tow beard and enhaloed by a dinner table mat" circled "slowly in strange gyrations across the room in illustration of a familiar quotation, presently explained as 'God moves in a mysterious way'." The relation of this anecdote clearly reveals the biographer's attitude to such an unphilosophical belief.

M. T.

*O World Invisible. An Anthology of Religious Poetry.* Compiled by EDWARD THOMPSON. (Ernest Benn, Ltd., London. 6s.)

No anthology can hope to satisfy everyone, but there is a very pleasing feature in the book before us, and that is its catholicity. It is not only an anthology of English religious poetry, but the author has also drawn from the literary treasures of India, Persia, Judæa, Greece and Rome. All these passages are very well chosen. The selection from English writers is good also, but we find it difficult to understand why, when there is only one example of Cardinal Newman, his "Lead Kindly Light" should have been omitted in favour of his much more doctrinal verses on "Candlemas". A serious defect of the book in our opinion is the total omission of any passage from the Buddhist scrip-

tures. A few verses of the Dhammapada at least should have been selected. Still, as said at the beginning, no anthology can please everyone.

Mr. Thompson is very rash in altering the accepted translation of Psalm cxxi, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills," into the interrogative form "Shall I lift up mine eyes unto the hills? From whence cometh my help?" He explains the alteration in a note:

The writer is rejecting, after challenge, the common belief that high places are sacred: he has passed away from trust in local deities to confidence in One above all creation.

Possibly, however, the author of the Psalm under discussion, meant what he said when he wrote "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills". It seems strange that a writer who is reputedly in sympathy with eastern thought, should remain blind to a very obvious interpretation of this text.

T. L. C.

*Synthetic Biology and the Moral Universe.* By H. REINHEIMER. (Rider & Co., London.)

A materialistic tendency resulting in a sclerosis of physical, mental and spiritual principles, still prevails among scientists owing chiefly to their continued belittling of ethics which they regard as "matter unknowledgeable in scientific sense." Their notion of metaphysics as "something which makes it a topic which it is desirable to avoid" has led them to ignore the fact that "esoteric philosophy teaches us that everything lives and is conscious, but not that all life and consciousness are similar to those of human or even animal beings. . . The idea of universal life is one of those ancient conceptions. . . it hardly seems possible that science can disguise from itself much longer, by the mere use of terms such as 'force' and 'energy', the fact that things that have life are living things, whether they be atoms or planets." (*Secret Doctrine*, Vol. 1., p. 49.) Due to their over-specialisation and their avidity for piling up hypothesis on hypothesis,

modern scientists have lost the sight of the wood for the trees. Our author discusses in an interesting and topical way these three main shortcomings of biology and with apt selections from the works of Robert Bridges, Emerson, Goethe and Dr. Whitehead, shows the necessity and recognition of the practice of ethics. In this connection students of Theosophy will recall to mind H. P. Blavatsky's message to the American Theosophists that "the ethics of Theosophy are more important than any divulgement of psychic laws and facts". (*Five Messages*, p. 26.) This is pertinently applicable to the pursuit of modern science. After a careful scrutiny of biological tendencies which are, at best, "a medley of ad hoc hypotheses," Mr. Reinheimer shows the necessity of the reconciliation of biology with philosophy and the re-interpretation of biological concepts. He rightly points out that biology will make no advance until "symbiosis, reciprocity or interdependence" is fully recognised.

B. Sc.

*A Contributive Society.* By J. R. BELLERBY. (Education Services, London. 7s. 6d. net)

In these days of enlightened finance ideals and ideas are unusual in a book on economics but Mr. Bellerby who would bring about Utopia introduces us to both, which is refreshing. His indictment of our system is shrewd and sound, its fundamental weaknesses are traced to their psychological basis of *self-interest*. As he rightly stresses, it is the character of the people which determines the nature of the economic system. Obviously, then, the world has what it deserves in its present economic disease. He holds that what is needed is the voluntary surrender by employers of a part of their specially protected incomes and the general curbing of self-

interest. Begin with the child, he says in effect, and educate the motive so that the result will be a Society contributing to the whole.

Grateful as many readers will be to Mr. Bellerby, some no doubt will close his book questioningly. Here are ideals, but we look in vain for the knowledge which will make man pursue in fact the ethics to realize those ideals. Theosophy teaches that without a recognition of the Law of Ethical Causation or Karma the true basis for any "voluntary surrender" is impossible. Unless a man learns by such economic disease as the present, to say nothing of other suffering, that he takes from himself when he deprives others of aught and that only what he gives away is ever his, there is little hope for him and his civilization.

M. T.

*Immortality in the Poets of To-day.* By G. H. WRIGHT, M.A., D. Litt. (Independent Press Ltd., London. 1s. 6d.)

Unfortunately the author is divided in mind between the plan of merely noting the tendencies of modern poets and the wish to draw conclusions or expound dogma. Only in the last chapter is he clear and sincere in expressing his own Christian faith.

Beginning with the tendency of the moderns (notably Housman) to be depressed by inevitable death as the end of all things, he shows how Monro (among others) swings between this conception (p. 30) and the thought of survival as part of the Whole ("The Last Abbot", p. 32). This same thought comes from Rupert Brooke in the phrase, "a pulse in the Eternal Mind" while the thought of personal survival is suggested by the same poet's "fifth-rate business man—splendid and immortal and desira-

ble". The author admits that one cannot know what Brooke's ultimate views were, but contends that none of the poets of to-day have the "compelling certainty" of Emily Brontë (p. 53). Masefield's early poem "A Creed" proclaimed re-incarnation but now he is still asking: "Do we come like candles in the dark?" Robert Bridges feels that "This mind perisheth with this body, unless the personal co-ordination of its desires have won to being higher than animal life," and John Drinkwater agrees that actions "mould the spirit of man immortally to live". Dr. Wright himself objects that "our hearts do not burn within us if the invisible world contains only some bleak Absolute," and declares that "along the roads of goodness, truth and beauty and through the syntheses of these in listening to the universal harmonies which the poets give us, we may surely vision God and this vision will affirm our eternal worth".

EUPHEMIA TORRY

*The Religion of Man.* By RABINDRA-NATH TAGORE. (Allen & Unwin, London. 7s. 6d.)

It is always difficult for a Western mind to appreciate or even to understand the pronouncements of an Eastern sage. Trained in logical methods of thought, dominated by the outlook of science, the Westerner cannot but notice, and noticing cannot but censure, a certain lack of definiteness and precision in Oriental philosophy. The same words are used in different senses, different words are used to describe the same thing—I have counted six different expressions in the present volume, each of which, so far as I can see, is intended to denote the same concept usually expressed by the term "Eternal Man"—and there is a general cloudiness and obscurity of utterance which, one is inclined to suspect, reflect similar qualities in the thought. Above all, propositions are asserted without being supported, with the result that much Eastern philosophy seems to consist of a series of assertions which no reasons are given for thinking to be true. I am not suggesting that they are not true; I am not even suggesting that good arguments cannot be found for them; I merely point out that no arguments are given so that their truth has to be apprehended by the eye of faith, or taken on trust on the authority of the sage.

All these points are exemplified by Rabindranath Tagore's book *The Religion of Man*, or rather by the instinctive reaction of my own mind, an incurably Western one, towards it. I am not defending this attitude; I am merely stating that it is my attitude, that it is one which I believe myself to share with many other Western philosophers, that it goes far to explain the lack of contact and understanding between Western and Eastern thinkers, and that it must be my excuse for summarising what I conceive Dr. Tagore to be saying in the only way in which I can make it clear to myself, that is in a series of propositions.

First, then, the supreme object of religion is union, the union of the individual soul with the divine. This union

so far from being assisted is impeded by mind, in so far as mind develops along purely intellectual lines. Mind is a limiting and dividing element; evolved biologically to advance and protect the "economy in the human organism, it carefully husbands our consciousness, for its own range of reason, within which to permit our relationship with the phenomenal world". If mind emphasizes divisions and introduces separation, it is by some other faculty that Yoga or union with the divine, also called "the Supreme Reality of Man," is to be achieved.

Secondly, this divine element is nevertheless already within us. It is "the divine being, the world worker, who is the Great Soul ever dwelling inherent in the hearts of all people. . . . Those who realize Him transcend the limits of mortality". To effect this realisation, therefore, it is necessary merely to develop this indwelling element in one's own nature. By so doing one achieves immortality; "one may die, but will not perish, achieving life everlasting".

Thirdly, the divine element is not only in ourselves but in our fellow men. To realize it, therefore, one must mingle with one's fellows and cultivate "the greatness of soul which identifies itself with the soul of all peoples and not merely with that of one's own". Hence arises an ethic, the ethic of sympathy, love and understanding of others; and a duty, the duty of being actively charitable and loving towards one's fellow men.

In pursuance of this duty Dr. Tagore recounts how he felt impelled to relinquish the life of the literary recluse and, abandoning the study of texts, to devote himself to the service of man. "I felt," he says, "that my need was spiritual self-realization in the life of Man through some disinterested service."

Fourthly, since the divine element is present both in us and in all, it must have meaning in terms of human values such as goodness and love. Thus the divine element is frequently spoken of as "the Supreme Man". It follows that the practice of human virtue assists the realization of the infinite in man, just in so

far as the infinite includes human virtue. "By being charitable, good and loving you do not realize the infinite in the stars and rocks, but the infinite revealed in Man."

Of the many points upon which comment may be offered I select two. First, there is an extraordinarily interesting application of the doctrine of the intellect as that which divides to the characteristic features of Western civilisation. Western civilisation is dominated by the desire for possession; it is also in a quite peculiar degree a structure built by the intellect. Now possessions divide; as Plato pointed out in the *Republic*, if I own a thing, you cannot. Hence the difference between *meum* and *tuum* is a source of division in the state.

Again, machines are a dominating feature of Western civilisation; machines exist to make things; they increase the sum of available possessions. Therefore they, too, constitute a factor making for division. Gradually Dr. Tagore builds up a conception of Western civilisation, the civilisation of intellect, of possessions and of machines as the great divider, and suggests that in placing a premium upon division and a penalty upon unity it advances along the wrong lines. For in civilisations, as in human beings, the divine element is present; they too must seek to realize it by their evolution, and in them, as in human beings, its realisation is assisted by love and unity. What are the most characteristic expressions of a people? Its arts and its literature, its morals and its manners, in a word its civilisation. Yet art and literature are nothing but the offsprings of its members' impulse "to give expression to Universal Man," civilisation nothing but the unfolding expression of its *dharma*, that is the spirit of the divine, which animates its members.

Dr. Tagore sees the civilisations of the East preoccupied with literature and the arts, increasingly swamped by the new and soulless civilisation from the West. He sees, for example, a group of Indian children contentedly playing a game, expressing their natures in creative harmony; one returns from the market with

an expensive and very perfect European mechanical toy. The temptation to possess the toy, provoking possessiveness in him who has it and envy in those who have not, destroys the game. Even in the possessor value has been destroyed.

The toy merely expressed his wealth but not himself, not the child's creative spirit, not the child's generous joy in his play, his identification of himself with others who were his companions is his playworld.

In an admirable survey of the effect of modern civilisation upon Japan the author makes the same point.

On the one hand we can look upon the modern factories in Japan with their numerous mechanical organisations and engines of production and destruction of the latest type. On the other hand, against them we may see some fragile vase, some small piece of silk, some architecture of sublime simplicity, some perfect lyric of bodily movement.

The former are characteristic not of Japan but of the whole of Western civilisation; the latter were the expressions of the individual *dharma* of the Japanese. "They had those large tracts of leisure in them which are necessary for the blossoming of Life's beauty and the ripening of her wisdom."

Secondly, perhaps the most distinctive feature of the philosophy expounded is the conception of the divine as the Supreme Man, who is also the indwelling Man. Briefly stated the view seems to be that every individual is really two men. There is the brute man concerned merely to satisfy his personal biological needs; and there is an Eternal Man who, so far from harmonising with the brute man, frequently insists on running counter to his biological needs. This element is the "Truth of Man" or "The Indwelling Man"; it is the same in all individuals, and it is the object of religion to cultivate and express the latter at the expense of the former. Hence religion may be regarded as the unfolding of man's nature, in the sense in which man's "nature" is man's higher nature.

What is distinctive about this conception is not so much the belief that there is one common indwelling spirit in all men, which struggles for expression, as



the view of this common element as itself human in character, as being in fact an *Eternal Man*. Upon this conception I venture to offer three brief comments.

First, it is not clear whether the Indwelling Man is really a separate, individual person existing in precisely the same sense as that in which ordinary men and women exist, or whether He is merely the sum total of the higher elements or natures common to all men and women. On the whole I think that the former is Dr. Tagore's view, but he frequently writes as if he had in mind merely "the bond of unity running through individuals".

Secondly, is the "Indwelling Man" something or somebody whom individual men and women bring into being by their own efforts? He is frequently spoken of as "the eternal" in human personality, from which it would seem to follow that He is static and changeless. On the other hand there is much to suggest that His very being depends upon the extent to which men succeed in realizing Him in their own natures. In other words, He would seem to grow, as human beings develop in respect of unity and virtue. I feel pretty sure that the author does not mean this, but the confusion is, perhaps, a necessary consequence of making the perfect and permanent element the essential core of the being of the imperfect and changing.

Thirdly, it is difficult to defend the conception from the charge of anthropomorphism. Our species, biology has shown, has been only lately evolved: it is a makeshift production, the continuation of a long line of early experiments, improved by haphazard adaptations. Also it is transitory; it is impossible to believe, in the light of the history of evolution, that it will not be superseded as completely as the mammoth and the dinosaur. Are we, therefore, entitled when seeking for a model after which to conceive the permanent and perfect element in the universe, to find it in ourselves?

C. E. M. JOAD

[PROF. JOAD has a recognized place among modern philosophers. In his closing para-

graphs he raises vital questions to which adequate answers can be found in the philosophy of ancient India. Dr. Tagore writes as a poet and a humanitarian and the Volume under review eschews metaphysics. The answers of the ancient philosophy have been re-presented in *The Secret Doctrine* of H. P. Blavatsky. We append a carefully prepared article which advances the theosophical view. We print this not as a final solution, but that study and discussion may take place.—EDS.]

## THE ETERNAL VERITIES

### I.—THE OMNIPRESENT SELF

I. "ALL IS LIFE."

II. "*The Universe is worked and guided from within outwards.*"

III. "Each of these Beings either *was*, or prepares to become, a man, if not in the present, then in a past or a coming cycle (Manvantara)."

These words, from H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, embody the fundamental conceptions of theosophy as taught by her. All her voluminous writings, as all her life-labours in every direction, were for the one purpose of imparting these truths to all who might be wrestling with the great Mysteries with which Humanity is encompassed to-day as much as, if not more than, in former times. The same great ideas are repeated by her in a thousand forms of speech, and for every statement of them she supplies fresh evidences of their underlying and pervading actuality. Behind all evidence and testimony to any fact, physical, metaphysical, or spiritual, lies the fact itself. Above and beyond any and all facts lies the apprehension or comprehension of their *meaning*, *i.e.*, the relation subsisting and persisting between and among facts. Antedating and succeeding any and all experience or understanding is the Intelligence, or Being, to whom alone the facts possess either actuality or meaning. As every being is a form of Life, physical, metaphysical, spiritual, capable of experiencing facts, *i.e.*, *relations* with other beings, capable of varying those relations, it follows that all experience and understanding begin and end with Beings. But, since no being is capable of independent, *i.e.*, *unrelated*, existence, it necessarily follows "there is THAT, which upon the dissolution of

all things else is not destroyed," in which all Being must arise, in which all Being must exist, and which must be the Reality within and without all beings—THAT of which any and all things can only be conditioned reflections, expressions, manifestations, *embodiments*.

It is easily possible for any man to think there was a time when he did not exist, a time when he shall cease to be; exactly as it is possible for him to imagine, "never was time when I was not, nor shall I ever hereafter cease to be". As these fundamentally diametrically opposed ideas *are*, as a matter of fact, metaphysical, held by different men at the same time, and by the same man at different times, it is self-evident that neither view has any but a relative validity: either merely represents the particular *idea* of Self entertained, and in itself has neither validity nor non-validity; can be but partial, since either view necessarily excludes the other, and depends for its verisimilitude upon the man himself. The man, not the idea, is the *finality*, and this whether as to the facts of experience, of understanding, or of Self.

*Fundamental* Truth, therefore, can never be found in any accumulation of facts or experiences; in any aggregation or aggregate of ideas; in any relation of the one to the other; but must be sought for in the man himself—if it is to be found in fact spiritual, *i.e.*, *realised*. It must be *self-sought*, *self-found*, *self-perceived*, *self-realised*. The search for Truth must never prove barren for any being so long as he partitions experiences, accepting some, rejecting others; for pain is as much a fact of experience as pleasure. Nor can Truth be found by him who seeks the good and rejects the evil, for both evil and good are *factors*, as pleasure and pain are *facts*, in the life-experiences of every being. Nor can Truth be perceived at second-hand, *i.e.*, by means of either the evidence of others, or of inferences derived whether from our own experiences or those testified to by others. Truth verily is in all experiences whether these be pleasant or painful; in evil as in good; in the life-

experiences of others as well as our own: Truth exists in them, but they do not exist in Truth. "He who, by the *similitude found in himself*, seeth but One Essence in all things, whether *they* be good or evil"—he only is capable of perceiving Truth, because he has seen the common nature of all facts of experience, the common reactions to them, the common actions springing from experience and ideation, the underlying similitude in all that is. This common similitude is the Truth in regard to all that hath been, all that is, and all that shall hereafter be. "*Realisation* comes from *dwelling on* that which is to be realised." That which is common to all is experience, is our reaction to it, is our action based upon it. This communal nature can mean but one thing: the One Identity, in all, as well as antedating all, surviving all manifested things and beings. "THAT thou art, O little man: thou art This, and thou realisest It not."

Because man is a finite being, whether regarded physically, metaphysically or spiritually, and because the human being represents in himself the three aspects of the Supreme Self, H. P. Blavatsky, as all her great Predecessors in all time, presents the One Identity for our apprehension as the Reality which can be sought for, found, perceived, realised, by dwelling upon the three-fold Eternal Verity, not "as present, as contiguous, as perhaps part-tenant," but as one's Self, as "the Knower in every mortal body".

Theosophy, or the Wisdom-Religion, comes from "Knowers of the SELF" who have realised that perfection for which we are still striving—from the Mahatmas of our Manvantara. Can these Mahatmas be found by the man of to-day, regardless of race, creed, caste, sex, nationality, or other human distinctions and differences? They can be found only by disregarding all these *differences* as finalities and by "doing service, by strong search, by questions and by humility"—by Universal Brotherhood as the basis of conduct and relation with our other Selves.

## II.—THE SELF AS SEEN

Since "All is Life," it must be that every part of Life is identical fundamentally with every other part, and with the whole: "There is no separateness at all"—in Reality. But the very expression evidences the triune nature of Life, of Man, of everything that is—that is to say, of everything that is manifested, or *seen* in any sense. That Unity lies undisturbed within and without all change, is easily perceived: the Intelligence is incapable of imagining anything short of Unity as the sufficient Source and Destination of "all this vast diversity".

As fact, it is unmistakably and unavoidably seen that this is a universe of action, of change, of diversity and multiplicity—in short the universe of *Karma*, not of "matter," as Westerners imagine to be the "finality" of all things. And what is *matter*? Even "Matter" is a unitary concept of the Seer in the philosophy of the Wisdom-Religion, or Theosophy: the word is used to indicate anything whatever that can be perceived in any way whatever. "Matter" is the opposite pole of Life to the Seer: it is "the aggregate of objects of possible perception"; it is, to the *true* Seer, the Occultist, "that *totality* of existences (or beings) in the Kosmos, which falls within any of the planes of possible perception." Like its *metaphysical* counterpart, "Time," it is nothing else than the sequence of our own states of consciousness. Nothing—absolutely nothing—exists to us except as it is "seen" in some sense. If not *present* in our consciousness it is non-existent—to us. But its existence to *itself* no more depends on us than our existence to *ourselves* depends on it. It *is*, whether present to our consciousness or absent from it; we *are*, whether present or absent to it. What is eternally present and never absent is SELF. Subject, and Object, Seer and Seen, "Spirit" and "Matter," have each a *relative* existence only—the *being*, that which is Absolute in both, is SELF. "Spirit" apart from "Matter," subject apart from object, Seer

apart from the seen, is in sober truth as impossible of imagination as it is impossible to conceive of Space independently of any object in it; of Motion existing in and of itself, with no field of change (space in which to move) and no object to alter in its relation, whether to its own constituent elements or to other objects. Everything that *is*, is *both* Seer and Seen, both Spirit and Matter, both subject and object, but *in itself* is neither the one nor the other—it is THAT which ever is. The *metaphysical* Universe is therefore of necessity dual, as the spiritual Universe is of the same necessity a unity. Equally, the physical or "objective" Universe is a trinity—for it is impossible to imagine change without action, or action except upon the *principle* of the lever. Spiritually seen, Karma is the Principle of action, that which eternally *is* in all life, the One Element common to all change, or manifestation of Life, its Creator, its Preserver, its Destroyer, its Regenerator. Whether we call this *principle* by one name or another, as "deity," or "law," or "energy," or "*Fohat*," it is the connecting link between the Unmanifested and the Manifested LIFE. *Internal differentiation*, the subjective or metaphysical Universe, is, in relation to the external, or manifested, world as the foetus is to the babe—it is a precedent, gestatory stage of a *continuous process*. Metaphysical existence precedes, dwells in, and survives, manifested existence. As says *The Secret Doctrine* ( I. 238 ) :

The reincarnationists and believers in Karma alone *dimly perceive* that the *whole secret of Life* is in the *unbroken series* of its manifestations.

The "Wheel of the Good Law" is a graphic symbol of this eternal precession of the Equinox: as each being moves *forward* in the path of the Seer, the "Eternal Pilgrim," the Universe of the Seen appears to move *backwards*, the bottom moving to the top, the top of the wheel moving to the bottom. Both "top" and "bottom," both Seer and Seen, are *Maya*, an "illusion"—if taken to be other than they are, a *continuous change of relation*. Unless both birth and death

are seen as the *continuous* and *coincident* progression of Life from the Spiritual, through the Metaphysical, through the Physical, "downwards"; from the Physical, through the Metaphysical, to the Spiritual, "upward"; unless "spiritual," "metaphysical," "physical," are seen for what they are—states of consciousness and no more—the Seer will of necessity regard whichever one he may be in, and see it at the moment as the "real". If he is in "Nirvana," that state will seem to him the reality; if in the metaphysical "*lokas*" or "*talas*," these will be real—to him, the victim of his own ignorance, spiritually and psychically; if in the objective or physical phase of his cycle—grossest delusion of all—he will become that strangest of all the phenomena in manifested Life: a Seer who is convinced that his identity and continuity depend upon an ever-changing body that can be "seen" with the five senses. In all this, in each man, is the faithful mirror of eternal, of cosmic, of universal processes—the *Manvantaras* and *Pralayas* of "this whole assemblage of beings" called the Kosmos. Who pauses to reflect that each minutest change of relation between the Seer and the Seen involves and duplicates the whole vast majestic panorama of "the Day and the Night of Brahma"? That each human day is their incessant repetition, metaphysically, as each human life is their repetition physically? That each cycle of incarnations is the spiritual repetition by the Individual Life, the Self each one in Reality *is*, of the procession and precession of that collectivity of Souls called the Universe?

Yet all this may be *seen* by him who begins to look "with the subtle sight of the subtle-sighted"—with the Eye of SELF.

### III.—THE SELF AS SEER

"The Soul is the Perceiver; is assuredly Vision itself, pure and simple; unmodified; and It looks *directly* upon Ideas."

Here we have the mysterious response which the Seers of all time have set themselves to repeat and record, as the

only possible answer that can be made to the impossible prayer of ignorant mankind, blinded by its suffering and its sins: "Lord, that we may see without eyes, hear without ears, feel without pain, act without responsibility, and learn without understanding." H. P. Blavatsky expressed the same spiritual Reality, the same metaphysical Truth, the same physical Fact, in her *Key To Theosophy*:

To the mentally lazy or obtuse, Theosophy must remain a riddle; for in the world mental as in the world spiritual each man must progress by his own efforts. The writer cannot do the reader's thinking for him nor would the latter be any the better off if such vicarious thought were possible.

The whole Physical universe, visible and invisible, is but "world food"—food for sensation, in the lowest as in the highest being; the whole world of sensation is but food for the Metaphysical universe, whose forms are what we call Ideas, as we name the forms of the physical world, Bodies; the whole ideative world is but a Spectacle for the Soul the Perceiver—for the Seer is Self-existent: when he ceases to look, for *him* "the manifested Universe has ceased to be," even though it has not ceased for those Souls still in the bonds of flesh, or imprisoned in intangible forms of thought. Does the Seer cease when he turns aside from the world of external and from the world of internal forms? "At the time of concentration, the Soul is in the state of a Spectator without a Spectacle."

What is that state? It is as if one engulfed in the world Babel of sensation overwhelmed by *his own* Babel of mind cried out without surcease, "What is silence?" More anyone—even a Sage—speaks of Silence, more it recedes; more one considers the discordant ideas of Soul pictured in creeds, philosophies and other systems of thoughts, the further he from Divine Image as *reflecting* all forms; more one "meditates" on his own Soul as separate from all other Souls, more is he an exile from the World of Souls, the "Divine Form as including all Forms". "Meditation," to-day as ever, "is but a name to the bewildered".

Pushed to its "perfection," *insanity*, it becomes "meditation with a seed"—and that seed is self, the Self of Egoism or Matter, the *Ahankara* of *Bhagavad-Gita*. Every great Founder of a religious sect, every self-deluded Saviour of others, every self-appointed *Guru* or Priest, from him whom millions worship for long centuries, to the wandering "Ascetic" with his handful of reverent adorers who sincerely imagine the "Master" is "out of his body," when in sober fact he is merely *out of his head*—every such Idolater is lost to the possibility of *Spiritual* evolution. He has mistaken the Self that is seen for the Self that sees—and this is *Egotism*, both in Patanjali's definition, and in the common-sense of mankind. He has fallen into that "current of efflux"—the Law of Retardation—which in the end, if unchecked, will bear him back to the Source in complete unconsciousness of Soul; as, if seen for what it is, the *reverse* of the current of progression, he will as surely land "on the other shore" in full Consciousness—the "Spectator without a Spectacle," save such as he *wills*. The one is the apotheosis of self, as the other is identification *with* SELF. As says *The Voice of the Silence*: "The Self of Matter and the SELF of Spirit can never meet. One of the twain must disappear; there is no room for both", and so "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

The genuinely religious Soul and the sincerely materialistic Soul are on one and the same current, though *faced* in opposite directions. Each "goes by what he sees"—by what is *seen*, experienced—externally and internally. Each is convinced beyond recall that *what he sees* is the reality and finality. Yet he *is* Soul, though he knows it not, though in fact he is concentrated in Matter, not in Spirit; though he is convinced that "the non-eternal, the impure, the evil, and that which is not Soul, are, severally, eternal, pure, good, and Soul." He is veritably *himself* the "producer of this production" which he takes to be Reality because it is *seen*. What else can he do than regard himself as the *creature* of this creation, if he

does not know himself as its Creator?

SELF is not personal; Law is not personal; action is not personal; nature is not personal; only *human* nature is personal. This is so because only in mankind is the three-fold evolution, Spiritual, Intellectual, Physical, conjoined, albeit not yet *identified* as one and the same SELF in all. SELF is *impersonal* in every man, as in all Nature. Every "God" of every religion is a Personal god; every Priest of every sect is a Personal saviour to his followers; every idea and ideal of the Materialist is a Personal power over the only Nature he knows or cares to know. The "Knowers of the SELF" are "Beneficent, Intelligent FORCES," whether in bodies, or out of bodies, whether working in the world physical or the world mental. *They* "know" what Concentration is for *They are THAT*, self-sought, self-found, self-perceived, self-realised.

"*What is concentration?*" It is Impersonality—"the *attitude of the Perceiver continuously maintained*" in no matter what form or world or relation. The *Mahatmas* are neither leaders nor followers, neither saviours nor saved, neither Gods nor men. They are, on earth, the Incarnation of Universal Brotherhood; they are Teachers to those who would learn the meaning of their *mantram* to all Disciples of Their Wisdom, the *mantram* which it was the supreme object of H. P. Blavatsky's life to set resounding in the lives of all Theosophists as *their* First Object: To form the nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour. "There is nothing but the SELF; the Self acts only through the creatures: *act* for and as the Self." Brotherhood *in actu* leads to brotherhood in thought; brotherhood of thought leads to brotherhood of Souls; brotherhood of Souls leads to Universal Brotherhood; Universal Brotherhood leads to the realisation of the SELF. In Mr. Judge's "sacramental phrase":

Through the spreading of the idea of Universal Brotherhood, *the Truth in all things may be ascertained.*

## CORRESPONDENCE

### RELIGION AND DRAMA

[ Dr. Fred Eastman is Professor of Religious Literature and Drama at the Chicago Theological Seminary, and is one of the leaders of the Church and Drama Leagues in America. The value of Drama in religious life is again beginning to be realised by the churches. The Ancient Mysteries of Egypt and Greece were the nourishers of true religion and basic truths were taught to genuine seekers. This was done "by dramatic representation of the origin of things, the nature of the human spirit, its relation to the body, and the method of its purification and restoration to a higher life". (*Isis Unveiled*, I. xliii.)

Lord Irwin recently gave three causes why the West had lost prestige in the eyes of the East; the third, on which he laid special stress, was the Movies. Dr. Eastman truly says that in very many cases they "are false interpreters of life". But he tells us earlier how missionaries on furlough from China, India and Turkey are studying the craftsmanship of the drama to use it "not for propaganda purposes merely but to deepen their power to understand and to portray the conflicts in the human soul". That way also a danger lies—for human nature being what it is, it is likely that missionary propaganda purposes will outweigh all other considerations, and the *sectarian* religious drama become a more real spiritual danger to humanity than even the condemned Movies. —EDS.]

Exciting struggles are taking place these days in that zone of the spiritual life where religion and drama overlap. In Russia drama and religion are pitted against each other in this struggle, and the State is using drama in an effort to get rid of religion. In England and America drama and religion are emerging from a period of mutual antagonism to one of co-operation. The theatres are beginning to produce such spiritually powerful plays as *Journey's End* and *Wings Over Europe* and *The Infinite Shoeblick*, while literally thousands of churches are introducing pageantry and religious dramas into their ministry. In my drama classes at The Chicago Theological Seminary there are a number of missionaries on furlough from China, India, and Turkey, studying the craftsmanship of the drama in order to use this art in those countries, not for propaganda purposes merely, but to deepen

their power to understand and to portray the conflicts in the human soul. On the other hand there are certain sections of the United States and probably of other nations where the churches are at war with the theatres and will not be content until they have driven them out. And from East and West, the world around, are coming protests—well-justified protests—in the name of religion against the American movie as a destroyer of the character of children and a menace to international good-will.

Are all such phenomena just evidences of the confusion of modern life? Or are they signs of the times? I believe that they are the latter and that they are pregnant with prophecy to those who will take the time and thought to understand them. The basis of that understanding must lie in whatever insight we can bring to bear upon the nature of religion and the nature of drama.

Roughly speaking, all religion can be divided into two classes: that which seeks to escape from life and that which seeks to interpret life. All drama can be divided into the same two classes. It is altogether natural, therefore, that when we find in any country sincere attempts on the part of both religion and drama to interpret life we find them not quarrelling but co-operating. Religion calls to its aid drama as the art which best portrays the emotional struggles of life. Drama, in turn, looks to religion for the solution of the emotional crises of its characters. It is equally natural that we find drama and religion quarrelling when either one or both of them seek to escape from life. For when religion seeks to escape from life it seeks that escape by some magical way to heaven. But when the drama seeks to escape, it more often takes a primrose path to hell. Going in different directions they pull against each other.

With this very simple but, I think, dependable classification of the essential characteristics of religion and drama in mind, let us look again at the signs of

our times. Why this increasing volume of protest against American movies? Is the basis of it just economic jealousy, as the movie producers claim? That may account for a little of it. But the bulk of it seems to come from religious or at least socially minded persons who have no financial stake in the movies. And the gist of their protest is that the movies are false interpreters of life. They pretend to picture life as it is, but in reality misrepresent it. They escape from life by a well-worn ladder of sentimentality, gun-play, and happy endings. It is worth noting that there is no protest against the out-and-out escape type plays such as those rollicking farces of Harry Langdon and Harold Lloyd and Charlie Chaplin. Everyone appreciates the wholesome quality of such clean fun. The entire volume of protest is against the escape pictures which pose as interpretations of life as it is. Until the movies are taken out of the hands of the commercial crowd that now controls them and put into the hands of men who have reverence for something besides box-office receipts we shall continue to find religion—all religion—quarrelling with this type of drama.

Why is the drama in Russia quarrelling with religion there? Because the Soviet leaders who control the theatre wish to abolish religion. And why? Because they say that religion does not help to solve the problems of life but only to escape from them. That there has been much in the past history of the Russian church to justify this claim no one can deny. If the Soviet leaders limited their opposition to the escape type of religion they might find more sympathy among religious people. But when they go further and seek to abolish the most thoughtful and devout religionists along with the others we begin to suspect that they themselves have espoused an escape theory of their own that cannot bear the criticism of thoughtful religion, and our suspicions are strengthened when we find that they have taken a cowardly refuge behind the bulwarks of a military despotism.

Why have church leaders joined with

drama leaders in America to establish the Church and Drama League? Simply because each group has come to the point where it realizes its need of the other for a fuller interpretation of life. During the last two decades the liberal churchmen of America have been doing what they could to rescue religion from dogmatism and institutionalism and to let it shine forth as an interpreter of the way of life for those who would "do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with God". These men have recognised the drama in human life. The theatrical men and women who joined in the founding of the league were the minority who have been trying to rescue the American theatre from the hands of these who produce drama for revenue only. The latter have been debauching the stage with all sorts of dirty and inane plays. What could have been more inevitable than that the liberal churchmen and the sincere dramatists and managers should come together or that they should state in their constitution:

Recognizing the power of drama to influence human ideals and conduct, we believe it to be not only our obligation but our privilege to work for a wider appreciation and support of dramatic art as a creative force and to seek its employment for educational ends and the pursuit of social and spiritual culture.

Why have the churches of England and America gone in so extensively for the production of religious plays and pageants? If our hypothesis is right it is no fad. It is because these churches are seeking to interpret life rather than to escape from it and have adopted the plan of Hamlet whose words are so often misquoted by being only half-quoted:

The play's the thing  
Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king.

Good dramas have already caught the conscience of kings and of their people.

Our hypothesis is confirmed by careful studies of the churches producing dramas. For example, in Chicago last winter, these studies showed that 56 of the 65 leading churches were producing dramas. They produced about 200 plays and pageants during the year. In answer

to the question, "Why are you producing these plays?" they replied practically unanimously that it was for the purpose of inspiring the audiences and educating the young Christians who were the players. Some churches supplemented this answer with statements to the effect that they felt the need of their people for an emotional and æsthetic ministry to counteract the effect of the rush and roar of modern industrial life.

And so we might go on citing illustrations from modern countries and from ancient civilizations. They would all bear out the truth of our hypothesis for religion at its best is engaged in a dramatic struggle to transform human life; and drama at its best is a mirror reflecting the struggles of the soul. At their best, they work together as friends. It is only when one or the other of them fails in its mission to the human spirit that they quarrel. A considerable portion of the spiritual history of this century will be determined by the extent to which drama and religion work together in the effort to interpret and transform human life.

*Chicago.*

FRED EASTMAN

---

#### ECONOMIC CRASH AND ITS MORAL

The bark of our Machine Age, with all sails set for production and ever more production, has stranded into a sand-bank. We have reached an impasse in our economic advance which bade fair to go evenly on to ever greater triumphs; and to find the way out is the great problem facing the man out of a job no less than the leaders of thought throughout the world. There is general feverish search for a formula for the world's ills; but the point is overlooked that it was following a formula blindly to its logical conclusion that brought us to this state. The way out must lie in analysis of our course so far, and not in seeking Shibboleths, the quick recourse of adolescent minds.

I distinctly recall my sense of relief when, as a child, I first grasped the concept of law-making bodies. The inequalities of life had oppressed me

heavily. Why did I live in such comfortable surroundings while a school-mate with gentle voice and deprecating manner lived in Cedar Street, a euphemism for a near-by treeless alley? Why were there beggars, why drunkards, and why, oh! why, the "striped men," the sad chain-gang in their broad-striped suits, driven past to their work on the roads? But when I learned of legislatures the problem was all but solved. Remained only to frame a law and get it introduced and passed—and the difficulties of the latter process loomed greater on my young horizon than the formulation of the bill that should untangle the snarled skein of human affairs. True, I did not then know just what to put in it, but I had no doubt I should when I grew up and had studied the vaguely imagined field I could not label "economics". There must be a solution; I would find it and get it made a law. Then there would be no Cedar Streets any more, and everyone would be happy and good. It looked as simple as that.

The recognition of the deplorable pass to which our civilisation has come has deepened with the years; the will to find the solution is no less strong; but the thread out of the labyrinth is not legislation.

Inequalities, I have come to see, are inevitable. They are inherent in the very law of our life and development, though how to minimize their pressure on the underprivileged must be the constant study of him who loves his fellow-men. Russia is trying on a gigantic scale to level down the inequalities of wealth and social station, but in the deadest level of democracy there still are wise and foolish, well and sick, happy and wretched men. Perhaps we find democracy at its modern best under frontier conditions such as prevail on the fringes of civilization, but even there the natural leaders tower head and shoulders above the mass of men around them.

The United States staged an experiment in levelling up that for a long time seemed to promise well. High wages made possible a general rising standard of material living; whetted demand re-



acted on supply, and factory wheels turned merrily. Other industrial countries saw the apparent success of the method and set themselves to copy it. Not satisfied with modest profits, capital redoubled its exertions and turned out goods in an ever-swelling stream until at last supply choked the channels of demand, artificially deepened though they had been by the millions spent on advertising, and the backing up of the unwanted goods brought swift catastrophe. There was a sharply realized plethora of automobiles and silk shirts. The resulting depression, with its attendant unemployment, misery, and suffering, is affecting practically the entire world. The question, "Why?" is raised on every side.

The answer is obvious to the philosopher, less so to the capitalist-manufacturer, who will not accept the evident implication of the collapse of his system. The solution, he will tell you gravely, lies in widening your markets. Raise the standard of living of the millions of India and China; increase their demand for comforts and luxuries, and the wheels of our factories will turn again and the unemployed will swarm back to their jobs. And then? Is it not apparent that the saturation point will be reached again, soon or late, and that ultimately the solution of the problem must be faced, perhaps in an even more acute form?

Overproduction is the world's disease. That is plain to all. The cause of that overproduction was partly competition of producers and partly artificial stimulation of demand by whetting desires all along the line by every device known to advertising and sales managers. It has been demonstrated quite conclusively to many thoughtful people that increasing physical wants is effective in advancing material civilization only up to a certain point. The inevitable reaction comes in such a period of general misery as we are living through.

There are two ways open to the man who seeks happiness. He may set to work to increase the number of his satisfactions—which has been the method of the world, or he may devote his effort

to decreasing the number of things necessary to his happiness, which has been the mode of the Sages of every land. Personal desires are, in the last analysis, a source of pain—unhappiness in their frustration or satiety in their gratification. Is not their multiplication folly? The illusory character of material satisfactions has been grasped by isolated thinkers in all ages and in every land, but by none more clearly than in ancient India.

Golden gift, serene Contentment! have thou  
that, and all is had;  
Thrust thy slipper on, and think thee that the  
earth is leather-clad.

Human nature has been in the process of perfecting itself these many million years. It has still far to go. I have no expectation that mankind in the mass will grasp these truths and act on them for millennia more.

We have to help on by all means in our power every wise and well-considered effort which aims at ameliorating conditions or promoting true brotherhood, but I am increasingly convinced that the great Spiritual Teachers of the race were the most practical economists in directing their propaganda to the individual instead of using their energy to get laws passed and enforced.

There is no mass solution. The more individuals who grasp the idea of themselves as immortal beings, concerned only temporarily and incidentally with the things of the world, surely the sooner we may hope for better things where wants will be simple and desires restrained; where there will be work for all and grinding toil for none; and where all will have full opportunity to develop the higher tastes and aptitudes, and the nobler qualities on which true and lasting progress alone depends.

CHARLES DERNIER

Petersburg, U.S.A.

---

## TWO CENTRES OF BROTHERHOOD

## I. THE MOST FASCINATING MUSEUM

The Palais Mondial or World Palace is housed at present in the Parc of the Cinquanteenaire at Brussels. The head quarters of the Union of International Associations, it is much more than a museum of internationalism: it is a dynamic force working towards the unity of the world, a seed of the greatness of the future.

Entering by the main door, we come at once into a semicircular hall containing in the centre a globe and a large plan of the palace from which it is easy to find any particular section. On the walls hang two tremendous charts, one illustrating the extent and influence of the Union of International Associations, the other demonstrating the "Tree of the Centuries" and the unfolding of man's life and genius. Three doors lead from this hall, labelled "Time," "Knowledge," and "Space".

If we take these in order, turning first to the left, we pass through a series of rooms in which the history of our earth, of man, and of civilisation is unrolled in unbelievably vivid pageant. Such a wealth of scientifically ascertained detail has been poured with patient labour into these pictures and models, such creative imagination has controlled the work, that the whole of the known past of mankind lives for us again, and visions of its unity and its future hover continually around us. Each room affords abounding delight and in each we would gladly linger.

We move on, however, to the complementary section on "Space," and here we pass through a similar series of rooms in each of which a national civilisation is graphically set before us. The British Isles, France, Germany, the United States, India, and so on—every country shows what it can contribute to the sum of human achievement and happiness.

The section labelled "Knowledge" is divided into two parts, "Arts" and "Sciences". A beautiful art gallery contains, besides some fine original paintings and sculptures and excellent reproduc-

tions of the best and most typical works of art, also many portraits of musicians, architects, and other artists, with details of the history of their arts. In the scientific part, there is a room for each of the sciences, showing its history and the stage to which it has arrived.

The religions of mankind are not forgotten and in the section devoted to them are some of the most striking illustrations. Here, more convincingly perhaps than anywhere, we are made to understand the differences between man and man, and the fundamental unity of the race.

The means of spreading knowledge and promoting unity are accorded special attention; book production, photography, wireless, and all methods of communication are abundantly illustrated. And here we come upon one of the most stupendous tasks ever undertaken by the co-ordinating mind of man: the World Bibliography; no less than an index to all the books in the world! Already it includes about 20,000,000 easily accessible references.

Those pacifists who are apt to talk glibly of the horrors of war and to ignore its real problems would do well to visit the Palais Mondial. The Great War was important enough to have a section devoted to it. The glorious patriots of the various nations confront each other, more pitiful in their idealism than in the ghastliness of the battlefields. Enough is revealed of the economics and psychology of war to persuade us that the problems of peace will not be solved without sweat and agony.

Yet everywhere as we pass with increasing amazement and enchantment from room to room we are arrested by some profound thought or some startling vision of the ultimate harmony of mankind. Optimism prevails and the ideal "*per orbem terrarum humanitas unita*" is never lost sight of. Directing our forward-darting glances to the future is the magnificent allegorical model of the "MUNDANEUM," the Palais Mondial raised to its perfection and universally accepted as the intellectual centre of the world. At sight of it we pause in wonder

and admiration, while the face of our genial guide, Monsieur Paul Otlet, founder and inspirer of the Palais Mondial, lights up with the purest and most vital idealism, as he utters his belief in man.

He is over eighty years old, of commanding stature, with massive domed forehead, thin snowy hair, twinkling blue eyes, and the tender complexion and innocent loving expression of a babe. He has seen much of the world and of men, known the profoundest adversity and bitterness and sorrow; yet with unflagging energy, keenest intellect, and unsubdued faith he pursues the ideal. Who dares to say he is wrong?

## II. THE WORLD UNIVERSITY

Where the great highways from west to east and from north to south of Europe intersect, stands one of the most beautiful and romantic cities of the world and one which, having played a great part in the history of man, may be destined to exert a still greater influence. Cosmopolitan through the necessities of trade, Vienna is also the meeting-place of mighty civilisations and the natural centre of the world.

To the north and west of it lie the conglomerated towns of the industrial colonising nations, France, Germany, Britain. Their wealth is the machine and the organising brain; the citizens move with hasty steps and their minds are restless as their feet: their god is progress.

Soon after leaving Vienna (which is as modern as western clocks can make it) any observant traveller going eastwards to Budapest is struck by the huge extent of the plain. It is all cultivated but there are no hedges and few trees, only the unending furrows or the illimitable ocean of corn. Hungary, Besarabia, Ukraine, Russia, Siberia—in such countries men love the soil more intensely than Gabriel Oak loved it, after the manner of beasts who know nothing else. Time is measured by the slow cycle of the seasons which care nought for progress.

And southwards? Here are the gay

artistic Italians, who will make the most daring machine or cultivate the most placid olive groves, so that it all be done gracefully; here are fierce Turks and Persians who swear by the prophet and will sacrifice all else for Islam; nomadic Arabs who, gazing on the stars as they ride, have thought profoundly until their philosophy is more concrete to them than the earth is to a Russian peasant.

Such vistas of the predominantly commercial, agricultural, and spiritual civilisations are to be seen from the gates of Vienna; wherefore Doctor Erwin Hanslik, Professor of Geography at Berlin, moved to Vienna and founded the World University which was to study, focus, and eventually fuse the three in one universal civilisation. In the Aeusseres Burgtor am Burgring, these theories can be seen demonstrated in pictures, maps and diagrams, but most marvellously in films. There is no room for an exhibition on the scale of the Palais Mondial at Brussels, for the World University consists at present only of a large lecture-hall, a smaller hall for temporary exhibitions, and a few small work-rooms. But the films amply compensate the lack of space: they are among the most extraordinary and, educationally, the most valuable in the world. In a few hours the magnificent panorama of the whole past of mankind unrolls itself vividly alive before our eyes; we learn of distant times and places as though they were here and now, and from it all we get the same real sense of the ultimate unity of mankind which we experience in the Palais Mondial.

One of the greatest obstacles to the achievement of this unity is the economic chaos at present prevailing. For blind competition and clash with the untold waste and misery which they entail, co-operation, co-ordination and ordered security must be substituted and Dr. Hanslik proposes the creation of a World Bank to control the whole of the world's economic affairs, under the direction of the World Parliament and World Government. And lest it be thought that these schemes be too wildly Utopian to deserve consideration, let it be added that the members of

the World University, scattered in a number of countries, include scientists, artists, politicians, big business men, and at least two bankers of world-wide fame.

The sceptic and the cynic shake their heads and murmur, "But human nature..." There is neither need nor space here to enter into a disquisition on that much discussed term or to prove the mutability of man. Suffice it that although Professor Hanslik believes in the Greek proverb which says "Who sees the best must needs pursue it," he realises, like Plato, that a long and arduous training is essential for him who would "see the best". Each man must have some inkling of his position in the world and of the contribution he can make to the universal civilisation and must learn to unite all his conscious and unconscious efforts in the one direction. A perfect world implies perfect individuals. In the World University's Institute for Physical and Moral Culture, the courses include not only physical training in the ordinary sense, with dieting and hygiene, but also exercises for the emotions and the will and in meditation, according to the wisest practices of the east.

Around Professor Hanslik is gathered a band of devoted workers who are incapable of thinking in terms of petty national or local rivalry: the universe is the realm of their thought and mankind its object. It is sought to build up gradually an Academy of such people, the greatest creative personalities, who would be able to direct the growth and organisation of the world as a whole. Under their guidance will be taken a great practical step towards the realisation of the age-long ideal of the "Brotherhood of Man".

S. H. FOMISON.

[S. H. FOMISON is an honours graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, who has spent considerable time touring Germany and Austria, in intimate touch with local people and conditions. A school master in the north of England, he took a party of sixty boys from Hamburg through Leipzig, Passau, down the Danube to Vienna and back via Salzburg, Munchen and Hamburg.—EDS.]

#### TWO EXTRACTS

The following two extracts, the first from a letter from one of the Theosophical Mahatmas, written in 1882, and the second from *The Mysterious Universe* by Sir James Jeans, may interest readers of THE ARYAN PATH. Let it be borne in mind that there is a lapse of nearly fifty years between the writing of the two extracts, and further comment is unnecessary.

We know of no phenomenon in Nature entirely unconnected with either magnetism or electricity—since, where there are motion, heat, friction, light, there magnetism and its *alter ego* (according to *our* humble opinion) electricity will always appear, as either cause or effect—or rather both if we but fathom the manifestation to its origin.

—MAHATMA K. H. (1882)

Thanks mainly to the researches of Sir E. Rutherford, it has now been established that every atom is built up entirely of negatively charged electrons and of positively charged particles called "protons"; matter proves to be nothing but a collection of particles charged with electricity. With one turn of the Kaleidoscope all the sciences which deal with the properties and structure of matter have become ramifications of the single science of electricity. Before this, Faraday and Maxwell had shewn that all radiation was electrical in its nature, so that the whole of physical science is now comprised within the single science of electricity.

—SIR JAMES JEANS

M. R.

## ECHOES OF THEOSOPHY

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

---

The greatest independence in the world comes not from the possession of money but in freedom from wanting to possess it.—MAUDE PARKER (*Saturday Evening Post*, Philadelphia)

The more India knows of Christ, the less is it inclined to appreciate the work of proselytising missions. It is really a question of, Nearer to Christ, the father from Missions. . . . What India cannot tolerate is the driving of ignorant men, women, and children pell-mell into the mission compound, as one sees sheep and goats driven into the Bandra Slaughter House premises every day.—(*Indian Social Reformer*, Bombay)

I confess that when I was younger I thought that we could compel people to be better by Acts of Parliament and Regulations ; but as I grow older I believe in that less and less. "Thou shalt not" was not so good a law as "thou shalt." I would rather prefer the people to choose for themselves what they should eat and drink. I am a teetotaller, but I do not think I am better than the people who drink. . . . Distortion and misrepresentation are probably greater evils.—GERGE LANSBURY

Deal with crime in its formative period, and with criminals not as debtors who must pay for misdeeds or as a group of men and women to be segregated and rendered impotent in mind and body, but as stupid sons or daughters, brothers or sisters who need guidance and strict supervision in normal, wholesome environment.—L. E. LAWES, Warden of Sing Sing (*N. Y. Times Magazine*)

We need discipline, certainly, but I want to see it spontaneous rather than enforced, and motivated by a clearer vision than we now have of a life worth living. . . . The road we have to find is the road of co-operation, the most difficult and beautiful art in the world. . . . The individual must cheerfully consent to some degree of discipline for the common good.—L. P. JACKS (*The Observer*, London)

We are gradually developing towards a literature of spiritual belief. Perhaps it would be better to say *philosophical* belief. Some people might misunderstand my use of the word *spiritual*. There is an inexhaustible mass of philosophical material from the past that is deeply imbedded in us emotionally, an incredible accumulation of material about nature and the supernatural that has as deep associations emotionally as the spade or any other ancient symbol. Some of it is Paganic, and some of it is older than Plato, going as far back as the Vedas. I think there will be a revival of that kind of philosophy. It will become vital again. We shall have next a literature of spiritual conviction.—W. B. YERS (*Everyman*, London)

---

## ENDS AND SAYINGS

“—————ends of verse  
And sayings of philosophers.”

HUDIBRAS.

In the noise of political conflict Gandhiji's virtue enables him not only to hold his balance but at times even to become spiritually creative. His mystic outlook takes practical shape in schemes for his country's uplift, and incidentally for that of humanity. In his *Young India* of July 30th he explains and justifies the resolution adopted by his political party limiting the highest salary of Government servants under Swaraj or Native Home Rule to Rs. 500 (£35½ or \$177) per month or Rs. 6000 (£426 or \$2124) per year. This resolution has been adversely criticised in several quarters and in answer Gandhiji says:—

The mode of life is not an abstract term. It is relative, and a man, who has surrounded himself with artificial wants and created conditions out of all proportion to the natural surroundings in which the people of his country live, can claim no exceptional consideration because of his artificial mode of life. Such people unfortunately we have in our midst. They will naturally feel the pinch during the transition stage, but they will soon accommodate themselves to the new and natural condition when the maximum of Rs. 500 per month will cease to appear ludicrous as it does to-day.

Leaving the detail of the actual figure of Rs. 500, we turn to the problem of the general standard of life for all which naturally arises: Are Government servants

to adopt a mode and standard of life different from others? Are they alone to set an example in thrift? Are not all called upon to simplify life? As the earning capacity of professional and business men cannot be artificially limited by legislation, how are they to be brought round to contribute their share towards the re-shaping of society when India attains self-rule? Gandhiji makes an appeal to

the businessmen and professional classes, that they should anticipate the future and remodel their lives so as to make it easy for all, when the burden of administration is taken over by the people, to *take to the new life*. It would be wrong to entertain the idea, that whilst the public services would be paid in accordance with the natural condition of the country, professional and businessmen would continue a mode of life out of all correspondence with their surroundings. *They must voluntarily lead the way and set the example.*—(Italics ours—EDS.)

This is a very Theosophical view. Those who at present, under stress of circumstances and pressure of habit and custom are living according to a standard not quite natural to the country must train themselves “to take to the new life”. It is the way of evolution which will prevent the upheavals of revolution. For example, if the Russia of the Czars had brought about a changed mentality in the

rich classes so that they sacrificed intelligently on all planes by an adequate re-shaping of life "in accordance with the natural condition of the country," there would have been no revolution. Unless the monied classes are educated and made to realize the truth of Gandhiji's statement his noble scheme to benefit the starving millions of India cannot succeed. If the Congress resolution is legislated upon, without the rich undertaking the necessary discipline, the ranks of the Government servants will be full of third-rate intellects and poor characters. Gods sacrifice for men, teaches the *Gita*, and following their example more evolved intelligences of the human kingdom must sacrifice for the betterment of the less evolved; all those who have earned or inherited wealth must recognize their obligation to the masses of the starving poor. The educated classes must serve the large masses by freeing themselves from the bondage of the glamour of sense-life. They must enrich life by raising their own *mental* standards and by adopting frugal ways in daily living. They must plan and attempt not to lower their own mode of life—the prevailing cheap Western imitative one is not the proper standard, by any means—but to raise that of the peasant and the villager, so that India may set an example to other countries in right living.

The best way to understand world progress is to regard it as spiral forward movement. One

great paradox of modern civilization is that while it has tended to make men self-centred and materialistic, it has also made possible a greater unity through international exchange by means of Leagues, Conferences and Commissions. This is being taken advantage of, and an "Inter-Religious League" is being formed with the design of bringing together people belonging to various religions from different parts of the world in order to understand one another and so create a fundamental basis for that "fellowship of man" which politicians so often glibly talk of and as often frustrate. In the July number of the *Hibbert Journal* there appears a very interesting article on this subject by Professor Rudolf Otto who is in charge of the subject of Theology in the University of Marburg. The present condition of the world cries out for co-operation, and such a League has been sought to be formed from the recognition of the necessity of enabling men to have "a common responsibility which arises from the very heart of religion, and a common fulfilment of such duty". At the very outset Professor Otto states what may be taken to be the millet-seed of this idea: "Every year in India a circle of men and women of various religious faiths spends several days in conference together either in Gandhi's Ashram at Ahmedabad or elsewhere. . . ." These are not people who have lost their faith in any one religion but rather those who are impelled by a religious conviction to consi-

der the things which religions have in common and the things which divide them, and so seek a "possible settlement of the differences which still to-day on occasion lead to enmity and bloodshed". The meaning and purpose of the League is thus to "create an authoritative world-conscience" and to carry out, through closely knit co-operation, the "great collective moral tasks facing cultured humanity." Men of all creeds are welcome. But they must be enthusiasts prepared to work for the League whose "ideal must be to transcend mere individual ethics and to influence and fashion anew the social, national and international life of men".

What bond will hold these people together? What is it that they have in common except a decent standard of ethics and a dimly formed, albeit a grand, ideal which may be lowered as soon as certain tenets of their respective creeds come into clash? Prof. Otto thinks:

Despite the great variety that exists amongst religions one thing binds them together: the religious character and impulse as such, and a common antagonism to materialism and irreligion. . . . We would rely upon such an ultimate unity—however difficult to define—as a basis to take action against the evil of the world.

A common antagonism! Prof. Otto characterises as a "tremendous error" such arguments as "Religion is fundamentally everywhere one and the same," and "Behind the differing masks of manifold religious faiths the same face is hidden". He says:

On the contrary: through powerful movements of inward reform and new creative activity the impulse is apparent afresh on every side to reinforce the particular foundation and the inner content of each faith in its distinct individuality, and to come to a new realisation of its own peculiar essence. Not a general levelling down of all religions, but an unprecedented strife between them as mightily renewed spiritual forces is already arising to startle those who follow the way of the "common denominator".

It seems strange that a man of the Professor's insight should at one moment seem to grasp the inner unity of religions and then at the next emphasise their differences. The Spirit is one and indivisible; the Knowledge is one and indivisible; the Teachers, as Custodians of that Knowledge, are one and indivisible. It is only the method of presentation of the Knowledge that has varied. If we but pierce the outer shell of each faith, having first cleaned it of the accretions that priestcraft has laid upon it, we shall reach the Heart (of which the Professor has spoken) and that Heart is one and indivisible. This is what Theosophy strives to do. It teaches (*Isis Unveiled* II. 586; 635)

If both Church and priest could but pass out of the sight of the world as easily as their names do now from the eye of our reader, it would be a happy day for humanity.

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