

# AVAS

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

## THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. IX

OCTOBER 1938

No. 10

### SCIENCE ON THE DEFENSIVE

The Presidential Address of Lord Rayleigh at Cambridge, before the British Association for the Advancement of Science consists of two parts, the second of which is of supreme importance to the well-being of modern civilization. It is a reasoned defence of scientific researchers who are held responsible for aiding and abetting in producing horrors of war by allowing their knowledge to be exploited by their respective governments. Lord Rayleigh described the idea as a delusion and gave instances to show that scientists did not set out to discover dynamite and poison gas, but that these were the natural produce of their labours. While every impartial enquirer will readily concede to this proposition, the fact still remains that scientists have specialized in giving their governments the aid by which citizens of the enemy-state can be quickly destroyed. The volume of public opinion against scientists on this score has been steadily growing. The very fact that Lord Rayleigh has

to examine this view is the proof of that growth.

It is worth while to inquire what basis there is for this indictment, and whether, in fact, it is feasible for men of science to desist from labours which may have a disastrous outcome, or at any rate to help in guiding other men to use and not to abuse the fruits of those labours.

The Presidential Address is reasoned but not quite convincing as to the innocence of the defendant in the case. That some steps are being taken to remedy the evil indicate that scientists themselves recognize, if not their past guilt, at least their future responsibility. Very likely the fears expressed by Lord Rayleigh will prove true, but that, as Indian philosophers would say is the Karma of science :—

The world is ready to accept the gifts of science and use them for its own purpose. It is difficult to see any sign that it is ready to accept the advice of scientific men as to what the uses should be.

The American Association of Science was represented at Cam-

bridge by a strong delegation and, though Lord Rayleigh doubted "whether we can do much" he referred to a plan which has been discussed at Cambridge. It is reported that a world brain trust of scientists is to be created. A new division of the Association has been set up to co-ordinate scientific thought and activities throughout the world, and it will study the social significance of science.

But how will this trust gain co-operation from the scientists in Germany, Italy and Russia? And if the scientists of the totalitarian states allow themselves to be exploited in the name of patriotism, what answer can their confrères in Britain, France or the U.S.A. make to their respective governments? If the mellowing influence of literature does not succeed in creating a truly international body (recall the failure of Mr. H. G. Wells to persuade Russian *littérateurs* to join the P.E.N. Club); and if Hitler will not permit freedom of expression to poets and novelists, how can he be expected to listen to Nazi scientists, if there be any among them who hate war?

Some months ago the American Association for the Advancement of Science went on record with "a ringing statement of the ideals of science". One of these ideals is the right of the scientist to investigate in freedom and to express his views in liberty. As the *New York Times* said last May:—

If the state is to decide what a Newton, a Darwin, an Einstein shall think and say, science ceases to be a social influence.

Dr. L. L. Whyte, a mathematical physicist of the U.S.A. suggests a pledge to be taken by the scientists:—

I pledge myself to use every opportunity for action to uphold the great tradition of civilization, to protect all those who may suffer for its sake, and to pass it on to the coming generations. I recognize no loyalty greater than that to the task of preserving truth, toleration and justice in the coming world order.

Will German, Italian, Japanese and Russian men of science agree to taking such a pledge? Will British and French scientists suffer when their governments persecute them for not aiding their countries to resist foreign invasion? And yet, if the scientists of to-day do not organize and do not draw the world's attention to the cause of knowledge as superior to national patriotism and national trade, they will have participated in the ruin of the civilization which their predecessors helped in building up. Philanthropy and altruism have never been the guiding motive-power of the modern scientist; desire for knowledge manifesting in sincere curiosity has spurred on the scientist in his labours; perhaps the time has come when the motive-aspect will be given its due place of importance.

The aspiration to serve mankind morally and not only physically will lead the scientist, albeit unconsciously to himself, to be a real benefactor. Deliberate aspiration to serve the moral limb of the human race is a power which attracts to itself benediction from the world of immortal sages whose ally the modern scientists can become.

## THE MANDAEANS AND LIFE AFTER DEATH

[Mrs. E. M. Drower (E. S. Stevens), is author of *The Madaeans of Iraq and Iran, Their Cults, Customs, Magic Legends and Folklore* and of *Folk Tales of Iraq*. She also contributes articles on Oriental subjects to various periodicals. Most of her time is spent in the Near East.

It is interesting in view of this article to read what H. P. Blavatsky has to say about the "*Christians of St. John*". She hints very plainly that she considers this sect as an outcome of one of the Buddhist missions. In *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. II, p. 290) she writes :—

Driven from their native land, its members found refuge in Persia, and to-day the anxious traveller may converse with the direct descendants of the "Disciples of John", who listened, on the Jordan's shore, to the "man sent from God", and were baptized and believed. This curious people, numbering, 30,000 or more, are miscalled "Christians of St. John", but in fact should be known by their old name of Nazareans, or their new one of Mendæans.

To term them Christians, is wholly unwarranted. They neither believe in Jesus as Christ, nor accept his atonement, nor adhere to his Church, nor revere its "Holy Scriptures". Neither do they worship the Jehovah-God of the Jews and Christians, a circumstance which of course proves that their founder, John the Baptist, did not worship him either. And if not, what right has he to a place in the *Bible*, or in the portrait-gallery of Christian saints? Still further, if Ferho was his God, and he was "a man sent by God", he must have been sent by Lord Ferho, and in his name baptized and preached? Now, if Jesus was baptized by John, the inference is that he was baptized according to his own faith; therefore, Jesus too, was a believer in Ferho, or Faho, as they call him; a conclusion that seems the more warranted by his silence as to the name of his "Father". And why should the hypothesis that *Faho* is but one of the many corruptions of Fho or Fo, as the Thibetans and Chinese call Buddha, appear ridiculous? In the North of Nepaul, Buddha is more often called *Fo* than *Buddha*.]

The Madaeans are a small and vanishing people who are still found in the south of Iraq and Iran. Theirs is a form of gnosticism which shows strong traces of Mazdaean influences, although its roots go back into Babylonian times. They have been called "Christians of St. John", but St. John the Baptist is merely a figure in their later literature, and has nothing to do with their religion. Neither are they in any way Christian, and the rites which resemble those of Christianity are far nearer some Iranian prototype than those of the Christian churches to-day.

The Madaeans look upon the soul as an exile. When the body of man was formed, not by the all-highest spirits and the Great Life, but by means of beings half-way between the material and spiritual worlds, of whom the chief was *Pthahil*, it was an animal creation. It walked like a four-legged beast and had no human speech. The work of *Pthahil* was ended when he had completed this creature, and he saw that it was a poor thing, and that the purpose of the Great Life was not perfected in the achievement. The "House of Life" then sent the great

spirit of light called Hibil Ziwa—the "Light Giver", to bear a transforming principle into this creation which walked the earth. It was the soul. I will quote from the legend as related verbally by an old man of priestly caste.

When the soul was taken from Melka Ziwa (the Spirit of Light) and borne downward like a ball of light and beheld Adam she wept and cried, "Why do you bear me to the realms of darkness and why must I dwell in a house of uncleanness?"

To soften her exile, it was decreed that the things which gladden her, beauty, the greenness of trees, the scent and colour of flowers, the loveliness of pure running water and the breath of *ayar*—the pure ether which is rarer than air—should be found on earth. So, unwillingly, she began her exile in this world, which, according to them, is illusion, and a dark illusion full of mysteries of pain and evil, all foreign to the soul.

Death, then, is the opening of the door of a prison. This is an article of faith common to many religions, but in spite of it, death is usually looked upon as a disaster and a calamity. Not so with the Mandaeans. The women weep, it is true, but the unthinking creatures are reproved by their menfolk and reminded that tears form a river which the soul will find difficult to cross, and that the hair they tear out will form an entanglement about its feet. This attitude towards death is not merely theoretical. If, for example, a man dies at a time when the powers of life and light are especially active, such as the annual spring feast of Five Days, there are actually rejoicings. I met

an old man when I was in a Mandaean village at this season, and he stopped me with a face radiant with joy to tell me that his brother had died. I replied with foolish conventionality that I was sorry to hear it. He replied, "But we are glad! I have forbidden the women to weep: we had prayed that he might go at this time." Many sick and feeble persons choose to be carried to the priest and undergo immersion in the river knowing that it probably means death, but ready to set out on the journey to another world under the most favourable conditions, and death is often brought about in this way. In the case of dying persons, unable to do this, water is brought from the river and poured over them, and they are then clothed in a white religious dress symbolical of purity and consisting of five (or seven) pieces. Beneath the sacred turban on the head the priest places a myrtle wreath, for myrtle is symbolical of eternal life, being evergreen, and having a sweet scent. As shown in the story above, fragrance is looked upon as something belonging to the world of spirit rather than the world of matter, and it is customary for a Mandaean to murmur, as he inhales the scent of a flower, "The perfume of the Life is lovely, my Lord, Manda of Life." A few threads of silver and gold are sewn to the death garment over the left and right sides respectively. These represent the mysteries of being, the Mother and the Father.

As soon as death has taken place, the body is placed on a bier of woven reeds and borne by four men to the burial ground. I have no space to describe fully here the ceremonies, but

they include the solemn ritual of breaking bread and drinking water from a communal bowl, the bread being the symbol of life renewed and renewing, and water the symbol of Life. When the grave is filled in, the headman of the corpse-bearers, who must be married and the father of children, takes an iron knife, traces three circles round the grave, and then seals the mound on four sides with an iron seal-ring engraved with a serpent, a lion, a scorpion and a hornet. These are precautions taken to guard the body and soul of the dead, for they say that for three days the soul is attached to the body and can only free itself gradually from its wrappings of physical matter. During this interval the soul is helpless, weak and only half-conscious of its state. All the rites performed by the relatives and priests during these three days are intended to help the soul during this first stage of its release. Ritual foods are eaten in the name of the dead man and, as everything on the material plane has a sublimated counterpart, the soul is refreshed and strengthened by these ministrations and ceremonies. Everything used at the ritual meals speaks of life, fertility and resurrection, as for instance the "wine" drunk sacramentally at the *masiqta*. It is water fresh brought from the river or a spring, and into this the priest squeezes a few grapes or raisins and dates, mingling the fruit-juice with the water and saying, "Water into wine." In so doing, he recalls the fertilization of the dusty earth by living water, the leaf, flower and fruit, in short the cycle of life in seed, flower

and harvest.

At the end of the three days, the connection of the soul to its body is finally severed, and the sealings on the grave are rubbed away. No stone is set over the grave to mark it, and in time the untended mound sinks in and disappears. "There is nothing there", they have said to me with perfect logic. "We do nothing to the grave because the soul has gone."

I write "soul" but the Mandaean do not think of the non-material part of man as simply as that. The *nishimta*, which is the purely spiritual essence—the word means "breath"—is entirely of the light and life. The *ruha* (this word also means "breath" but refers to the part of man which desires and has emotions) is not of this eternal soul-stuff. The personified *Ruha* has a curiously contradictory position as in legend she often appears as a lovely and beneficent figure whereas in the priestly literature (most of it late) she is represented as the enemy of man, ensnaring him with delusions. In addition to these two there is the *dmutha*, literally, the "likeness". The *dmutha* does not inhabit the body of man at all but has links with the soul. It does not dwell in this physical world, but in a world called *Mshunia Kushta* which is midway between the worlds of spirit and matter. This "oversoul" acts as guardian angel to the human being, giving it intuition and even knowledge.

After the third day, the second stage after death is reached, the period of purification. These are in stages, and at each stage the process can be assisted by rites, purifications

and ritual meals, performed and eaten in the name of the deceased. If the person who has "left the body"—an expression which they prefer to "died"—did so with the proper ceremonies, described briefly above, his progress is facilitated, especially if death took place at an especially favoured time, such as the Five Days. I must confess that there is considerable vagueness about their conceptions of the form purification must take. The ignorant think of torture, the enlightened of spiritual ordeals. The *Diwan Abathur* describes these ordeals as taking place successively in various worlds, governed by planetary or spiritual beings. Other holy books content themselves with describing the helpful magic worked on the soul by the sacramental meals eaten in its name and the prayers said for its welfare.

When ye said *The Great Life spoke and opened its mouth* and ye unfastened your *pandamas*<sup>1</sup> and ate your *pihthas*<sup>2</sup> and drank your *mambuhas*<sup>3</sup> and ye consecrated the bread and water, ye gave wholesome fare as provision to the soul. And when ye placed incense on the fire and said *The Water of Life gleams in its Dwellings* and ye stood on your feet, the refreshment of the soul is made more potent, and she wakes, and gleams, and is satisfied and healed and praises the Life. When ye said *Lovely Perfume*, a garden of fragrances and delights is formed at the right hand of the soul.... (From "Alf Trisar Shiala")

The *Tafsir Paghra* draws a poetical picture of the joy of release after the forty-five days of purification—"forty-five" means of course merely "many". The imprisonment of

soul by its own deeds, good and evil, is likened to the cocoon woven by the silk-worm :—

Formed from a thread which issued from the mouth of the worm because the speech of the worm is of silk, while the speech of the soul is prayer and praise. Like the worm in the silk (cocoon), the soul is enclosed in a crystal called the Lofty Egg. Thus, they are two eggs (cocoon), the one of the silk which issued from the mouth (of the worm) and the other of the soul, which wept when she was cast into it, lamented and sobbed until her measure was full and the forty and five days of her going forth were accomplished. Then she burst forth by the mouth and issued and flew forth into the sublime ether, casting off the seed and mystery from which it came and by which it was surrounded on earth. Thus she mounts into the ether and none know whither she goeth - from the body she is freed and let out like the dove.

It is after this purification that *ruha* and *nishimta* come again together ; "the two are like one body ... and are, as it were, mingled together".

I must say something more about the Five Days' Festival which takes place every springtime and corresponds to the *Gâtha Gahambar* days of the Parsis. Both these must be related to the Assyro-Babylonian New Year's feast of *akitu*, which also fell in the spring in the month of Nisan. The Five Days are the five intercalary days, the Parsi and Mandaean year (like the Babylonian and ancient Egyptian year) being divided into twelve solar months of thirty days each. With the Parsis these *Gâtha* days now fall at the New Year which is at the beginning of an au-

<sup>1</sup> *Pandama* the ritual face-bandage which covers the lower half of the face during certain parts of the ritual.

<sup>2</sup> *Pihtha* the sacramental bread (wheaten and unleavened).

<sup>3</sup> *Mambuha* the sacramental water.

turnn month, but in the time of the Persian writer Al-Biruni (the tenth century A.D.) the feast of the intercalary days was "at the beginning of spring". This scholar describes the feast as observed in his day :—

During this time people put food in the halls of the dead and drink on the roofs of the houses, believing that the spirits of the dead during these days come out from the places of their reward or punishment, that they go to the dishes laid out for them, imbibe their strength and suck their taste. They fumigate their houses with juniper, that the dead may enjoy its smell. The spirits of the pious men dwell among their families, children and relations, and occupy themselves with their affairs, although invisible to them.

The feast is called *Panja* by the Mandaean, as it was by the ancient Persians. It takes place early in April, when the two great rivers of Iraq are in flood and the rice-fields are covered with the life-giving silt. Spring rains have fallen and the young corn stands already high and green. The powers of the Great Life worshipped by the Mandaean are at their zenith, while the powers of negation, death and darkness, are weak. Hence, it is a time when the Mandaean celebrate Life triumphant, Life unconquerable, Life supreme. They think that the barriers between the physical and spiritual worlds are easily surmounted during these five days, and ancestors who have passed through to perfection are able to approach them, helping and strengthening them and coming to the aid of those who have lately died, especially those who died in states of impurification, pollution and sin. The living link themselves by means of ceremonies and ritual meals

not only to those "out of the body" but to the great spirits of light and of life who are the ultimate ancestors of themselves and all that exists. All wear white garments and go barefoot, because the earth has become sacred ground for the time. Ritual immersions in the river which purify men for these communions with the other world go on from early morning till sunset, and are followed, not only by the ordinary sacraments of bread and water which are part of the baptismal rites, but also by communal meals eaten in the names of their beloved dead.

I have been asked whether there is, in the traditions of the Mandaean, any trace of a belief in reincarnation. There is no mention of such a belief in the holy books, and the priests deny it positively. I was told once, however, that a man who has died unmarried and childless must, after passing through the worlds of purification (the *mataratha*) and a sojourn in the world of light, return to the material world again to beget children, for Mandaean think celibacy a crime, and the handing on of the torch of Life to others a duty. A priest condemned the idea. If the man had died unmarried, he said, he returned to the ideal world which is a counterpart of our own—*Mshunia Kusha*, and there married with his partner, the double of the woman he should have married, and had children. I cannot find this idea corroborated elsewhere, but it has a poetic charm, characteristic of a people who love beauty and purity more than any of their neighbours.

E. S. DROWER

# FEDERALISM

[Below we print two articles on a subject of importance to Indians and Britishers and of interest to all.—Eds.]

## I.—IN THE UNITED STATES

[The status of James Truslow Adams of the U. S. A. as a historian is unique ; he won, so far back as 1922, the Pulitzer Prize for the text-book on American history that year. He is the author of numerous works, the importance and value of which are shown by the fact that their translation into French, German and Norwegian became necessary.

His previous contributions to our pages have revealed his intelligent sympathy with our Indian problems. In responding to our request for an article specifically on this subject he remarked that he "would write purely from the standpoint of American experience". The reader will note the significance of more than one statement in this article, and also of its conclusion. However indirectly, it gives the answer to the question so often propounded—what would happen if the British left India? Nothing different from what happened when they had to retire from America. "The difficulties seemed insurmountable." Yet they were overcome through ways similar to those which Indians would adopt. India, like the United States, would soon federate in a manner congruous with her own native genius. The religious differences between Hindus and Muslims are no greater than those between different church denominations or between Gentiles and Jews. The racial problem is not so formidable : Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Sikhs are all of one race, unlike the Negroes and the white people of the U. S. A. The riot in Harlem, New York in 1935 was more fierce than that of 1938 between Hindus and Muslims in Bombay—Eds.]

The student of forms of government has to recognize at the start that there is no perfect one nor is there one which may suit all peoples. Government is a way of doing certain things, and the way in which a people does anything at all will depend on character, history and contemporary conditions. Nevertheless, the study of government in one country may be extremely helpful or suggestive to those who have to establish or administer government in another, no matter how different. The history of Federalism in the United States is of especial utility for various reasons, among them being its vast scale and the fact that it is the oldest large-scale experiment in

Federal government.

Moreover, America has tried two experiments, one brief and unsuccessful but the faults of which afford us a lesson, as well does the success of the later one. The "Confederation", which lasted from 1781 to 1789, proved inadequate chiefly because it largely took the form of a league of sovereign states, and the central federal authority did not have sufficient power to compel obedience even in such matters as the raising of taxes. The union proved but a rope of sand, and, facing anarchy, the thirteen states had to try another form.

We may note some of the conditions. The states were all contiguous.

Their inhabitants, with the exception of some minor foreign groups, notably the Germans in Pennsylvania, were of the same general racial stock, and spoke the same language everywhere. They all had similar forms of democratic self-government. They were also all of one religion, the Christian, and were further faced by the common danger of falling separately into the hands of some foreign foe if they could not somehow combine their individual strengths and resources. On the other hand, for a century and a half, they had been so extremely jealous of one another that union, even temporary, in the face of danger had proved impossible until the war of Independence against Great Britain. Although of the same religion, there were many sects,—Puritan, Roman Catholic, Quaker, and others,—which created division. There were great economic and cultural differences, as between the small-farm and trading North and the slave plantation civilization of the South. Some states had large territory and populations, others very small. Until the war there had never been any cohesion or sense of nationality among them, other than that which came from all forming parts of the British Empire, and, after independence, that was gone. The difficulties seemed insurmountable.

It was clear, however, that only a Federal form of government would serve, and that such a government, in spite of jealousies, would have to possess far more power than the one which had been set up and failed. Some of the devices that were employed, and which, with one exception,

have lasted peacefully for a hundred and fifty years, are worth noting.

A mere league of states had been shown to be useless because of the inherent weakness of such a system already mentioned. Yet the states had to remain as sovereign entities. To solve the problem a then entirely new idea was hit upon, that of *dual citizenship*. Every American citizen is a citizen not only of his own state, New York, California or what-not, but also directly a citizen of the United States so that the power and control of the Federal Government reach down immediately, and not simply through a state government, to every citizen. For that reason we find in the Preamble to the Federal Constitution that it is "we, the people of the United States" who combine to "form a more perfect Union", and not that the states are combining. The change was momentous.

The central government, however, was made one of only limited powers. It can do only such things as are specifically granted to it in the Constitution, such as tax and borrow money for federal purposes, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, control foreign relations, the army and navy, currency and coinage, the postal service, and so on. Other than such specific powers granted, all powers remained with the states or with the people themselves. The Federal Government was also divided into the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches, with many checks on each other. The Constitution provided a Bill of Rights guaranteeing forever certain personal liberties such as freedom of religion, speech, press and

others. Without going into further detail we may ask what lessons or principles may have been learned in five generations from the actual working of such a form of government.

For one thing we have found in practice that the difference in size of the various states, so feared at first, has not caused any material disadvantage. Each state is represented by two Senators but its representation in the Lower House of Congress depends on population. Thus Rhode Island with only 1250 square miles has as many *Senators* as Texas with 266,000, but New York with a population of 12,750,000 has many times the number of *Representatives* that Delaware has with only 240,000. No harm has come from combining states differing enormously in size, population and wealth. Nor has any come from the type of boundary. We have many natural geographical boundaries but to a great extent state boundaries are merely straight lines on the map, yet states so delimited have developed as much local pride and character as others.

Another point we have learned is that it is not enough to give a Federal Government wide legislative powers unless the executive powers are commensurate. The failure of our first effort taught us that. The central government must be able to carry out its legislation directly and not by advising or requesting the states. This necessitates a large body of federal employees, and raises certain legal and political problems but our experience is that it cannot be avoided.

On the whole, the division of

powers between the central and state governments, as well as dual citizenship, has worked out well, although here again, legal questions can arise and have done so. For the first seventy years there was much dispute over the divided sovereignty, culminating in the bloody Civil War in 1861. That decided the question of whether or not a state could secede. Since then, none has tried to and it is doubtful if one ever will again. Economics, if not political theory and sentiment for the Union, have made it impossible. An interior state could not secede without being economically throttled, and a coast state would not be allowed to deprive the Union of its ports.

The question of States' Rights, however, is not dead, though it remains in a different form. From the adoption of the Constitution in 1789 there have always been *two schools of political thought*, one believing in increasing the powers and activities of the central government, the other in keeping them as low as possible in favour of the states. Once more, economic and other factors have proved of greater influence than political theory, and in the world of to-day it is clear that the activities of the Federal Government have to be constantly added to. Many problems of business, labour, communications etc., can no longer be handled by forty-eight separate states. *Our experience tells us that the power of the central government will steadily increase, and also its immediate and direct relations to individual citizens.* The central government is not remote from us but in ever increasing ways impinges on our daily lives,

through taxation and a vast mass of regulations of all sorts.

On the other hand, many of us believe that as this apparently necessary evolution takes place, the balance of powers between Federal and State governments should be maintained in every way possible. Take, for example, such a problem as the control of the waters of rivers or bays involving several states. The tendency of a Federal bureaucracy will be to grab the control, but we are proving in many cases that the group of states can themselves combine for the purpose in a more efficient and democratic way. Many of us are fighting for this method in preference to increasing centralization, yet there can be no question but that with closer communication, nation-wide business concerns and labour unions, nation-wide distribution of food products which have to be inspected, disease prevention, and many other things in our modern world, a Federal Government does tend to become a consolidated government, and to trespass on the powers of the states. This leads to the danger of totalitarianism and a dictatorship. Federalism does, however, offer a means of checking this process which a unitary state does not.

In view of such changing conditions, modification of a constitution becomes important. *It is my opinion, as a historian, that in spite of occasional lags and criticism, especially by those in a hurry to put some pet scheme into immediate operation, our two chief methods of altering or interpreting the constitution have worked better than any*

*others which could be devised for us in America.* We can amend the constitution, and although the method is slow when the people have not made up their minds, it is not slow when they have; and the amendment abolishing Prohibition, once the people believed it had been proved a failure, took only ten months. In the last thirty years we have had an amendment on the average of every three.

The Supreme Court also "interprets" the constitution, though it has no veto on the legislation of Congress. All it can do is to decide in some specific suit at law brought before it, whether the law involved is in accordance with the constitution which is the basic law of the nation. We have forty-nine legislatures, counting Congress, turning out thousands of laws annually, though few of these come before the Supreme Court. When they do, however, on a question of constitutionality, the Court has by a series of notable decisions done much to interpret the words of the constitution in such a way as to keep the document flexible for changing needs. The Court has also been a firm bulwark for the defence of the liberties in the Bill of Rights when infringed by legislation by Congress or any of the forty-eight states. Although an occasional decision has aroused angry criticism, the people have come to consider the Court as the corner-stone of their freedom, as was shown last year when the then immensely popular President Roosevelt tried to pack it to get quick action on popular measures, and failed because public resentment over his effort

became so great.

His second severe defeat came over a Bill in April of this year because the people felt that he had been steadily trying to upset the balance of powers in the Federal Government by attempting to make the Executive too strong at the expense of the Legislature. As the first defeat had revealed the belief of the people in the necessity for maintaining the Supreme Court intact, so the second showed their belief in the necessity for the separation and balance of powers.

On the whole, perhaps, the three principles which have taken deepest root in the public mind, after a century and a half of experimenting with Federalism, have been that there must be a supreme and wholly independent Court to maintain the constitution and our constitutional liberties; that the checks and balances of the three departments of the Federal Government must be maintained; and, lastly, that, in spite of the necessarily increasing power

of the Federal Government owing to modern conditions of life, the balance between that Government and the powers of the individual states must be maintained as far as possible.

In so brief an article on so great a topic it has been possible to touch upon only a few points, but I think those I have mentioned are the ones which have enabled Federalism in the United States to stand the test of a hundred and fifty years of colossal change in the world, as well as that of two wars of the first magnitude and many minor ones. We are a comparatively new and, now, a very mixed nation racially, yet I believe that a large part of the population would agree that the three principles mentioned in the preceding paragraph are those which we must cling to if we are to maintain our Federal and democratic way of government, and we cling to them not as the result of theorizing but as the result of generations of experience.

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

---

## II.—IN INDIA

[N. S. Subba Rao, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Mysore, attended the Round Table Conference of 1930 in an advisory capacity and served as Secretary of the Committee appointed by the Indian Princes' Delegation to examine the question of an All-India Federation in relation to the Indian States.—Eds.]

“Government”, writes Professor Adams, “is the way of doing certain things, and the way in which a people does anything at all will depend on character, history and contemporary conditions”. Governments in India

have been hitherto both unitary and despotic (or recently bureaucratic), and it is sought now to make the Government of India federal in character, and give to the Central Government as well as the Provincial

Governments a democratic character. The spirit of democracy is expected to alter also the despotic rule in the Indian States, the entrance of which into federation is contemplated by the Government of India Act of 1935.

Prof. Adams has said that "there is no perfect form of Government nor is there one which may suit all peoples". The numerous and vehement attacks on the Government of India Act make it evident that the constitution implemented by it is by no means perfect, but then all that framers of a constitution can hope to achieve is only some distant approximation to a perfect constitution, one that suits the people for whom it is intended. We may ask ourselves, is the proposed Indian Federation suited to the character, history and contemporary conditions of the people, and does it as a Federation achieve what is expected a Federation will achieve, *viz.*, bring about unity in diversity, and reconcile liberty with democracy, which, as Lord Acton has remarked, is one of the signal functions of the federal form of Government?

A federal form of Government of India may be looked upon as a retrograde step and as falling outside the line of historical development. On the other hand, it may also be considered to be the only way of achieving some measure of unity over an area where great diversity of interests and lack of political homogeneity prevail. Thus it may be argued that British India has been till recently a Unitary State, the Local Governments being merely agents of the Government of India. The proposal now is to convert these Local Gov-

ernments into Provinces with a character of federal "States". "We have to demolish the existing structure in part before we can build the new. Our business is one of devolution and drawing lines of demarcation and cutting longstanding ties. The Government of India must give, and the Provinces must receive. One must sedulously beware of the ready application of federal arguments or federal examples to a task which is the very reverse of that which confronted Alexander Hamilton and Sir John Macdonald." Thus the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. The Joint Parliamentary Committee are equally emphatic in their characterisation of the new constitution as an historical novelty: "Of course, in thus converting a Unitary State into a Federation, we should be taking a step for which there is no historical precedent. Federations have commonly resulted from an agreement between independent or at least autonomous governments surrendering a definite part of their sovereignty or autonomy to a new central organism. At the present moment, the British India Provinces are not even autonomous for they are subject to both the administrative and legislative control of the Government of India."

It is true that the Government of India was unitary in character, and exercised control over the Governments in the Provinces. But this meant that the range of central control was limited to certain essential matters like military affairs, currency, customs and communications. In many respects the Governments in the Provinces had great powers delegated to them, because no single

administration could support the Atlantean load; not a matter for wonder. We may recall the fact that India is nearly as large as Europe without Russia, so that it would be impossible, even with the assistance of the latest improvements in communication to govern such a vast country from one centre without clogging the machinery of government. That is also one reason why the Government of India has been out of the main current of change in respect of the extension of the functions of government which has been such a marked feature in Europe and America. If the State was to perform the more numerous and socially beneficial duties which are expected of it elsewhere, some large and effective measure of decentralisation was necessary, and federalisation was the obvious way of effecting the change.

It might also be said that Federation is the only way in which effective unity can be given to the political structure of the country. For, outside British India lie the numerous Indian States running into hundreds in number, some large and numerous ones ridiculously small, but all of them claiming sovereign rights in varying measure. Here again the Government of India has served to give a measure of unity which the independence of the States would not permit, and there is some measure of unity in diversity.

Thus British India needed federal devolution of functions from the Government of India to the Provinces, if a nominal unity was to be made real, and if Government in India was to perform all the duties people might

legitimately require of it under modern conditions. When we look beyond British India and consider India as one whole including British India as well as the States, it is only by some form of federation that the country could be brought under one common rule in which diversity would have play without injuring the political life of the people. The rulers of the Indian States who were chafing under the control of the Political Department of the Government of India, and the peoples in the States themselves were both anxious, although for different reasons, to enter the larger unity.

Thus the Government of India Act may be considered to be in the full stream of political development in India, and to answer, whatever might be the defects of detail, the political needs of the country.

We may enquire how far the proposed federation will give India what it needs in the way of strong government, good government, and self-government. Students of political development know that federalism means weakness. A federal constitution is a compromise between two opposing forces, and in all federal constitutions, the Central Government is generally weak, and this weakness is maintained by the jealousy of the States making up the federation. As Prof. Adams points out, there are "two schools of political thought, one believing in increasing the powers and activities of the Central Government, the other in keeping them as low as possible in favour of the States". But as he points out further, American experience "tells us that the power of the Central Government will

steadily increase, and also its immediate and direct relations to individual citizens. The Central Government is not remote from us but in ever increasing ways impinges on our daily lives, through taxation and a vast mass of regulations of all sorts." There is no doubt that a similar development will take place in India in spite of the careful and elaborate distribution of functions between the Central Government and the Provincial Governments.

In this connection it would have been interesting if Prof. Adams had given us his views on the allocation of residuary powers. In the U. S. A. these powers are vested in the State Governments, and there is no doubt that it works in support of the position that "the balance of powers between federal and State governments should be maintained in every way possible", by acting as a check against every intrusion of the Central Government into the field of the State Governments. In some other federations, these residuary powers have been vested in the Central Government with the result that the tendency of the Central Government to become strong receives a stimulus. When the Indian constitution was under discussion, the question of the allocation of these residuary powers naturally came up for discussion, but it became mixed up with the communal conflict which was such an unsavoury and disheartening feature of discussions at the Round Table Conference. As Sir Samuel Hoare pointed out, "Indian opinion was very definitely divided between, speaking briefly, the Hindus who wished to keep the predominant pow-

er in the centre and Mussalmans who wished to keep the predominant power in the Provinces. The extent of that feeling made each of these communities look with the greatest suspicion at the residuary field, the Hindus demanding that the residuary field should remain with the centre and the Mussalmans equally strongly demanding that the residuary field should remain with the Provinces." The result was that elaborate lists of the functions assigned to the Provinces and the Central Government were prepared, and it has been left to the Governor General in his discretion to empower either the federal legislature or the provincial legislature to enact on subject-matter not enumerated in any of the lists or to impose taxes not mentioned in them. In the case of the Indian States, the matters in respect of which they may join the federation is subject to individual negotiation, the residuary powers which in this case are very large, resting entirely with the States.

There is reason to fear therefore that the Government of India will start with considerable weakness, and the process of centralisation will be much impeded by the vesting of residuary powers in the States. It is true that there are devices by which the power of the Government of India is maintained over the country as a whole, but these could hardly be called constitutional, although they are embodied in the Government of India Act.

How far does the new constitution promise the country good government? The very size of India makes it impossible for centralised rule and administration to be effective except

in a few essential matters where uniformity is required. The province of the State has extended beyond all recognition in the West since the century began, and our hope is that there will be a similar expansion in India particularly in matters relating to the health, wealth, and well-being of the citizens. This expansion will lie mainly in the hands of the Provincial Governments, but the scope for expansion is limited by finance. Here the fault is not so much the fault of the federation as of the fact that certain powers of Government are segregated from the control of the Central Legislature. Thus a Ministry at the centre may decide to reduce military expenditure and the salaries of the Government officers in order to find money for social reform. In both these directions the powers of the Federal Government are strictly limited with the result that the financial assistance which might have been given to Provincial Governments is not available. It is true that the world situation and the race of armaments at the present time and the danger of war on the horizon make it extremely improbable that India whether in the British Commonwealth or outside it can succeed in reducing her military budget appreciably. Therefore, if the wealth and the economic conditions of our people are to improve, the only hope lies in a general improvement of the world situation which will strengthen the economic position of India. There is not the slightest doubt that the worthwhileness of the new constitution will be tested on this ground,

namely, its ability to ameliorate the lot of the worker. This of course is not the effect of Federation as such, but the form of federal government envisaged by the Government of India Act of 1935 does affect the position.

What of self-government under the new constitution? This is the cardinal issue, and the critics of the proposed Indian Federation object to it not because of their reluctance to accept the federal principle but because under the federal form, the old subjection to external control continues. The numerous safeguards and the special powers of the Governor General both are prominent factors in the situation. The people further want the constitution of the Central Government to be democratic and representative of the people, but indirect elections to the Federal Assembly and the system of nomination of their representatives by the Rulers of the Indian States both detract from the representative character of the Federal Assembly. It is only by enlarging the field of popular control at the centre and by making the Federal Legislature more decisively representative of the people that the new constitution can be made acceptable to the country. These, however, are considerations not of direct relevance when we are discussing the federal principle, but they are of vital importance if we are discussing the operation of the Federal Constitution as contemplated by the Government of India Act of 1935.

N. S. SUBBA RAO

# THE SUPREME STATE

## A PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPT

[John A. Osoinach offers a basic spiritual concept whose distorted and ugly shadows are the totalitarian states. He would give human history a new meaning by the light of Spengler and interpret national, racial and world events differently. But the light of Spengler is neither new nor complete; the Law of Cycles and Nemesis, of *Chakras* and *Karma* are fundamental teachings of the ancient Esoteric Philosophy.

The practical question is how to purify the totalitarian autocracies as also materialistic democracies. Legislatures cannot create pure Spiritual Democracy.

The state, like a human being, has its Spiritual Soul and its Egotistic Self—Atmic or Altruistic and Ahankaric or Self-seeking natures. Which predominates? that which predominates in the majority of its citizens. To allow the ruler, be he king or president or called by any other name to rule in terms of the lower personal self is to create autocracy and dictatorship. On the other hand to permit the citizen to exercise his freedom in terms of that self is to usher in anarchy. The human aspect of this problem is discussed in the following article.—Eds.]

The world has heard much of the supreme state. Of course, the idea has always been popular with certain types of rulers and ruling classes. The divine right of kings seemed to justify despotism in its own doings. But the supreme state has a wide appeal among the people of many nations to-day, no doubt because it seems to hold out hope that all men may be better off materially by becoming subservient to the economic and political domination of a few supposed supermen.

This is a simple idea. If it means anything, it means only that the state is everything, the individual nothing; that as the state prospers, good filters down to the least of its subjects. Patriotism is its spur, prosperity its bait, and the loss of liberty its price. It is rooted in economic materialism; its exponents have given no thought as to whether it has, or even needs, any philosophical defence.

Certainly, I am not prepared to

argue the thesis that the supreme state as the world has known it—the military autocracies of the past, the medieval monarchies with their divine right of kings, or even the totalitarian states of to-day—can be defended as a philosophical concept of an ideal type of government. And yet, the query recurs, may there be a sense in which the supreme state, as a philosophical concept, can be justified?

Nietzsche presented the idea, but it remained for Spengler to lay the groundwork upon which, if at all, a serious argument may be predicated in behalf of a supreme state, at least under certain imaginable conditions, as an instrumentality of idealism.

When I first encountered the idea, in *The Decline of the West*, that history should not be regarded as a linear progression, it seemed more or less meaningless. It dawned upon me only gradually that what Spengler must mean is that to get a true conception of history, we must turn

our attention in a new direction, inwardly into consciousness—not a direction parallel to any with which we have been familiar in our previous perspective of length and breadth and our concept of a third dimension which we call depth, but truly a fourth dimension, an inner and a spiritual depth. *History, then, is not an unfolding panorama of people and events proceeding from past to present and from present to future. It is, rather, the realization by a people of the totality of their spiritual possibilities, or, in other words, the fulfilment of their destiny. That destiny is no part of a chronological pageant. It is something peculiar to the people, the culture, that experiences it, an achievement born of some obscure impulsion from within the organism itself, some inner spiritual necessity whose origin is shrouded in the mist of its mind.*

Ouspensky has somewhere advanced the idea that the concept *man* includes all of the individual's life or possibly lives—stretching from the dawn of antiquity to the remotest reaches of time. Re-orienting this thought in the light of Spengler's doctrine to interpret the concept *man* to include the infinite expression of life by all the men and women forming the body of a culture or a civilization, we get some comprehension of the vastness of this organism which Deity may consider as *man*, and through which It may be working out the divine purpose of Manifestation.

If such be the case, and if, as Spengler suggests, history is not the running record of individuals, or even of nations, but rather consists

of the destiny-patterns of spiritually unrelated cultures which appear upon the world's stage from era to era for no other reason than to achieve and express their own spiritual destinies, then the task of the historian is to try to fathom what were the destinies and what the spiritual objectives of these cultures, and to what extent they fulfilled or attained them.

Thus Spengler comes with a doctrine which suggests as a necessary corollary that the supreme state does not exist for its own sake nor for the benefit of its privileged classes, but because the four-dimensional organism *man*, embodied in a complete culture, is the most significant reality of history. The supreme state seems to be a necessary corollary of this doctrine because the shaping of such a culture usually requires the firm though plastic hands of one or more dominant nations. If, then, such an organism is the necessary material out of which these four-dimensional destiny-patterns must be woven, and if a dominant nation is required to give the culture its impetus and direction, may there not be some concrete philosophical justification for a supreme state?

That, of course, amounts to a substitution of the concept, *a culture*, for the concept, *the state*, as a historical reality so completely dwarfing the importance of individual man that his little destiny can afford to be merged into this transcendental creation. It means that the supreme state is not an end in itself but only the medium of helping the culture to arrive at its zenith. Are we, then, justified in assum-

ing that the state—or, at any rate, the culture—is everything and that individual man has no significance except as he fits into and becomes a worthy part of the larger whole?

All my life I have believed in the maximum possible amount of local self-government. Hence, I do not come to this subject with any prepossessions in favour of the doctrine of the supremacy of the state or even of strongly centralized authority. I am only examining the subject as a philosophical concept in the light of what seem to me new implications growing out of Spengler's challenging idea.

It seems that philosophically the idea may have something to commend it. Viewed in another light, it is not greatly different from the widely accepted belief that man exists only to fulfil God's will—that his own will is nothing. Jesus himself taught us as much in Gethsemane. But, of course, acceptance of the idea presupposes acceptance of the hypothesis that God's will is expressed through these four-dimensional organisms directly, and only indirectly through individual man as he contributes to the culture as a whole in expressing its larger destiny.

It would appear that one may accept the hypothesis without accepting the historical interpretation of the supreme state—that instrument of tyranny which has so often been the creation of selfish men for their own aggrandizement. And, of course, there is always the danger that any supreme state may develop into tyrannical autocracy—a danger so great that idealistic men probably

will always fear and seek to avoid this form of political expression.

Of course, all of this is postulated upon the acceptance of Deity, the existence of the Supreme Being; and with that Being, Its purpose. However, unless we are careful to avoid the traditional idea of a personal God, full of whims and caprices, this will not throw any further light upon Spengler's recondite idea of a new approach to the interpretation of history. Such a God is a God of notions rather than a God of principle. He is a God of favouritism and vindictiveness, full of unearned rewards and unmerited vengeance. He is the archetype of the despot who fashions tyrannical autocracies. His creativeness would make the state as well as the universe almost lawless institutions.

If we hope to gain any light on the nature and meaning of history by associating it with the plan and purpose of the supreme creative intelligence, we must think of It as the God of Law. The unfoldment of Its manifestation must be in accord with law—spiritual law that is eternal, immutable and impersonal. *History will be man's actualization of his own experience potentials—not events arbitrarily dictated by God, with man a helpless automaton in the toils of such a protean fate.* An understanding of that fact will save us from the blasphemy of thinking of God as the author of the horrors of human history. God is bound to be a God of principle, a God of spiritual law. Man reaches the pinnacle of true achievement only as he brings his being and his activities into line with this changeless, impersonal,

universal God and seeks to fashion his material world after the laws which control the spiritual or real world.

It seems useless for man to try to understand Deity. It is hard enough to understand some very superior human intelligence. For example, let us suppose that I wish to approach some intelligence which I know exists in my three-dimensional world, but which is so vastly superior to my own that I cannot hope to grasp its concept of cosmic things. Suppose we take Einstein as such an intelligence. Consider that I have asked him to explain to me his Special and General Theories of Relativity. No matter how great his willingness, he could not: not because he himself does not understand them, but because I am incapable of understanding his mathematical language and formulæ, the only idiom in which they can be adequately expressed. I might, and probably would, glean from him something of the impermeable essence that is his personality, his soul, his being. I would realize that I was witnessing the functioning of a vastly superior intelligence, but I would gain no adequate understanding of the Special and General Theories of Relativity.

And so it must be, only in an infinitely greater degree, with any human intelligence that tries to understand Deity. Every creator must yearn for understanding of himself and his work. The Supreme Creator must intend that some time we shall understand Its manifestation. The fault for our failure to understand it now does not lie in It.

Explanations lie all around us—in the starlit skies, the waving meadows, the shining seas, the very mind that animates us—but we, in our beclouded state, are incapable of understanding the only idiom in which things infinite and eternal can be expressed.

Thus we must rather search for some principle that expresses the nature of Deity, some law that is universal and impersonal. A deity finding expression through laws that are universal and impersonal is concerned with principles rather than principalities.

Where, then, shall we look for the universal law that may afford a clew to our inquiry? Is it not to be found in the Eastern concept of Karma, the Law of Action? This must not be confused with fatalism. The Law of Karma is impersonal; it touches all men with the necessity and incentive for action; it is the law of retribution and reward. But it is not God who metes out punishment and reward: it is we ourselves. We ourselves create our karma. We are our own judges, the makers of our own destinies, for good or ill as we fulfil the Law or transgress it.

Speaking of the Law of Karma, H. P. Blavatsky says in *The Secret Doctrine* that "There is no return from the paths she [Karma-Nemesis] cycles over; yet those paths are of our own making, for it is we, collectively or individually, who prepare them." And again, in the same chapter, she speaks of *racial Karma* leading a continent to cataclysm, and refers to "'Deity' manifesting co-ordinately with, and only through Karma."

Is there any reason why the karmic

law should not apply to these cultures, these four-dimensional organisms, the same as to individuals? It would not seem so. This may shed much light on the triumphs and tragedies of history which appear to us to be so inscrutable, and the application of this idea of the Law of Karma may point the way whereby these cultures, in the fluid environment of their four-dimensional unfoldment, may fashion for themselves the architectonic of a spiritual destiny which idealists cannot help but

believe is their objective.

And so it seems that there is a sense in which a supreme state may be an instrumentality of the divine purpose—*not a supreme state bent on war and conquest, but one in which the statesmen at its head would be "philosophers as well as kings"*. In this sense, and in this sense only, such a state, freed of selfishness and aggrandizement, might find justification as a truly philosophical concept.

JOHN A. OSOINACH

---

"The purpose of all evolution, according to Theosophy, is to bring man to the realisation of his divinity, not merely latent, but divinity which has become fully patent. Man, by and through the help of evolution, becomes God, knows Himself and His universe, can and does use the Power of His Will, can and does create a universe all His own, which He fills with His Love and guides with His Wisdom. In other words, the purpose of evolution is the unfoldment of man, through the stages of Superman, to that Perfection which is embodied in the *shāstric* conception of the Supreme Purusha. Man is striving to become a Perfect Individual—free in mind, morals and activities. The purpose of all evolution is to enable him to attain to that exalted status. The various branches of the tree of evolution serve the one purpose to give man the necessary shelter while he is engaged in the Herculean labour of growth unto a Perfect Individuality.

The aim of political evolution, on our globe is the production of the Free Man, who will live and love and labour among Free Men, uninterfered with by State-laws of any kind or description. Our emancipated Free Man has unfolded his divinity to the extent which enables him to understand and apply the laws of his being to his own good, and without injury to anyone else. He does not require the aid of any set of rules or regulations, laws or enactments, made by others; further, the laws of his life, which are the outcome and the manifestation of his unfoldment, however different from those of his neighbour, do not interfere with the latter's existence; our Free Men have different outlooks on life and the world, but each of them, in his individual freedom, living according to his own enlightened conscience and the set of laws and rules which he has made for himself, lives without interfering with or harming his fellow Free Men, whose enlightened consciences have given them their points of view and their outlooks, and who have made for themselves their own sets of rules of conduct and laws of life."

# THE ARCHETYPAL STRUGGLE

## EURIPIDES INTERPRETED

[G. H. Poole is one of those very few Englishmen to whom India's spiritual atmosphere makes a deep heart appeal. Like his friend Shri Krishna Prem he lives in a Himalayan retreat, a devotee of Wisdom. His interpretation of the great drama of Euripides will interest all students of Asiatic psychology. Non-recognition of Buddhi-Manas produces Kama's chaos and its progeny, suffering. Recognition of the Divine makes for peace and harmony and leads to an intelligent co-operation of man with Nature. —Eds.]

All readers acknowledge the intense poetry and dramatic power of the *Bacchæ*; but many, instead of seeking the meaning of the play in the only way in which, I believe, it can be discovered, stray from the main question into bypaths and waste time and effort in futile endeavours to explain, not the meaning of the play itself, but why Euripides "the rationalist", as he is called, in this, his last play, should exhibit such an apparent change of front and come down this time so decisively on the side of religion.

Now leaving these bypaths of scholarly criticism severely alone, let us consider the play simply as the work of a great artist, who, from the depths of his own being, has here expressed under the form of symbols truth about the conflict of forces within the human psyche. I shall not argue, but state as simply as I can what seems to me to be the significance of the play, and leave it to my readers to agree or disagree as they will. First, a short summary of the drama:—

The story of the *Bacchæ* is of the return of Dionysus to Thebes, his birth-place, from his wanderings in the East, accompanied by a train of Asiatic women, his worshippers, who form the

chorus of the play. He was the son of Zeus and Semele, a daughter of Cadmus, but his divine origin was disbelieved at his home where it was thought that he was but the child of his mother by an unlawful union. He comes to Thebes to establish his divinity by introducing his own worship into the state, in which he is opposed by Pentheus, son of Agave, his mother's sister, in whose favour Cadmus had retired from the throne of Thebes. Inspired by Dionysus, the women of Thebes with Agave as their leader fly away to the mount Cithæron to perform his rites. Pentheus resolves to stop these celebrations, if necessary by force, and as a first step he imprisons Dionysus, who appears in the form of a wandering and effeminate Asiatic stranger. Dionysus escapes from his bonds and reappears before Pentheus, just as a messenger arrives and announces to the king that he has seen the women of Thebes on Mount Cithæron, not given over to licence and debauchery as Pentheus had thought would be the case, but in various ways under the mysterious power of the god. At first he found them sleeping peacefully; but as soon as they heard the low of his cattle, they rose up and donning their spotted fawn-skins, some began to draw forth milk and wine by touching the earth, while others drew honey from the ends of their *thyrsi*; and those who were nursing mothers, gave their milk fearlessly to the young of wild animals who came to them. All was peace and harmony while nature yielded herself to the power of the god.

Pentheus himself now beginning to fall

under the divine influence, desires to see his mother and the maenads, a sight forbidden to any man. Dionysus bids him array himself in female attire as a maenad, leads him to Mount Cithæron and, placing him on the top of a tall pine tree, himself disappears. The maenads hear a divine voice bidding them seize the intruder, and Pentheus is torn to pieces by his own mother and the rest. Agave returns to Thebes carrying the head of her dismembered son, which she mistakes in Bacchic frenzy for that of a lion.

Cadmus and the seer, Teiresias, alone among the men of Thebes, have resolved to reverence the god. But the former has discovered the other remains of his grandson and comforts his daughter Agave, who at length recovers from her trance and, recognizing her son's head in her hand, realizes that she has become his murderess, unknown to herself. For her the chorus of Asiatic Bacchantes have some pity, but for Pentheus none. Dionysus pronounces the doom of Agave and her companions to be expelled from the city, and of Cadmus and his wife, Harmonia, daughter of Ares and Aphrodite, to be changed into the form of snakes. Cadmus as leader of a barbarian host, after many wanderings ending with the sack of Delphi, will be delivered by Ares and transported with his divine spouse to the land of the blessed. All this tragedy, Dionysus declares, has been caused by their failure willingly to honour him as a god, the son of Zeus.

The key to the play is to be found at the end in the speech of Dionysus when he pronounces the doom of the chief actors in the tragedy :—

If ye had known restraint when ye  
would not,  
Ye would be happy with the son of  
Zeus as your friend.<sup>1</sup>

The failure of Pentheus, and indeed of all of them, to recognize the divine nature of Dionysus led to the terrible clash between opposing

forces which might have been avoided. Harmony would have been the result, not conflict and tragedy. Dionysus and Pentheus represent forces which may either clash in disastrous opposition, or be resolved into a harmony, in which the Dionysiac inspiration becomes the complement, instead of the enemy, of the negative and critical Pentheusian function.

I have already said that what Euripides really does in this play is to exhibit under the form of symbols the conflict of the opposing forces within the human psyche. Of these Dionysus is the one and Pentheus the other. Whether Euripides consciously intended the play to be understood thus or not is to me beside the point, as I believe that the source whence a great work of art springs into being lies altogether deeper than the conscious mind of the artist, and the degree in which artists themselves can consciously know and explain the significance of their own work differs in every individual case.

Dionysus, at once "a most dread divinity and most gentle to mortals", lies deep and hidden in the psyche beyond the conscious mind. He is that creative power which is beyond the antinomies of the conscious order : not a power which conflicts with the moral law, as the Pentheusian self-conscious mind supposes, but a stainless force by which the creative faculties of the psyche are energised. Without him man nothing can : with him the forces of nature herself blend in one terrific harmony with the undiscovered potencies of the psyche. Under his in-

<sup>1</sup> Translated from Sandys's text.

fluence men are led to self-realization or self-destruction according to the purity or impurity of their natures.

It would be wrong to suppose, however, that Pentheus is the only culprit and that everything would have gone smoothly if he had not been there. He is not the only one to blame. In varying degrees all are responsible for the catastrophe. Dionysus declares that Pentheus suffered the just penalty of his error, and then goes on to pronounce the doom of Agave, Cadmus and Harmonia. None of them had fully recognized the divine power for what it was, so all became involved in the clash of opposing forces. Agave and the other sisters of Semele had joined with their father and mother in casting a slur upon his birth, wherefore he cast his power upon them, which even then would have filled them with divine ecstasy had not Pentheus changed it into a curse. Pentheus, the King, vested with the divine authority of ancient kings, is the governing principle of the psyche without which the Dionysiac power produces only a fruitless ecstasy. Had Pentheus acknowledged the god, then, under his guidance and authority as the King, the inspiration brought by Dionysus would have been directed to enhance the life of all in a beneficent and rhythmic harmony. Dionysus would have shown his other side, and instead of being the most dread god, bringing frenzied destruction in his train, would have been his other self, still powerful, but "most gentle, most benign to men".

Dionysiac inspiration cannot create by itself. To this end it must be held

and channelled by the sovran mind. Form as well as force is necessary to the creation of beautiful things; but bereft of force form becomes sterile. The process of creation, however, is not merely orgiastic, and the ecstasy will be vain unless the mind is set in movement by it to accomplish some beautiful things. So the Greeks thought that the principles of beauty were limit and proportion. But the tragedy of the *Bacchae* is re-enacted whenever the mind, instead of receiving and taking up the ecstasy and power, repudiates them through egoism and fear, which is what Pentheus did. He failed to fulfil the function of sovran mind because of his own mental squalor. The struggle within him reflected itself without in his mistaken judgment and his expectation that the Bacchantes on Mount Citharon had surely fallen victims to those desires which secretly waged war within himself. Unharmonized, bitter and egoistic, he blindly opposed the creative power when it came and so wrought chaos and destruction for himself and all the rest. Thus we see the meaning of the strange and paradoxical words of Dionysus, that the house of Cadmus by reason of a failure in sophrosyne, self-governance, had been unprepared to recognize him for what he was, a pure and stainless god.

Earlier in the play (II, 882-96) the chorus set forth what from their point of view is the right attitude towards the divine power. It is a conservative one. Institutions such as laws and religious rites which have the sanction of time and antiquity should be accepted as binding and not questioned by men with their fallible opinions.

There is a superficial inconsistency here, as the worship of Dionysus is not something handed down from ancient times in Thebes, but an innovation. Teiresias, however, who represents with Cadmus the old order at Thebes, has already recommended Pentheus to accept the god and refused for himself to join the fight against divinity. Acceptance of the new cult was in accordance with the old outlook by which the new and striking phenomena were attributed to divine agency.

This conservative attitude of Teiresias and the chorus is what makes the critics concern themselves with the play as a recantation by Euripides of his former rationalistic views. I am not here concerned, however, to discuss the play in connection with what may or may not have been the "views" of the poet. An artist like everybody else, has his views, but to ascertain what these views were, is not necessarily the surest way to find out the significance of his work. For instance the real meaning of Shelley's poetry is not revealed by the obvious fact that he was a democrat and hated all aristocratic and hierarchical in-

stitutions. A man's opinions are symptoms of his habits of mind and are not causes but effects of his psychic nature. Opinions never produce real poetry or any other kind of art, though they may colour the form of its expression. Whether Euripides' views on the subject of religion underwent a change just before he wrote the *Bacchae*, is a question which I leave to those to answer for whom it is of primary interest.

The protest of Teiresias and the chorus against the refusal of Pentheus to recognize Dionysus does not contain an intellectual judgment in favour of the claims of religion. Under the form of a recall to the old spirit of awe and humility their words really express a recognition of that moderation of mind whereby the claims of inspiration are accepted, so that the mind instead of repudiating the creative energy may use it and work it harmoniously with the whole power of the psyche. With the passional nature purified, the mind of man becomes free from egoism and suspicion, and of such a man Dionysus becomes, not the enemy, but the friend.

G. H. POOLE

---

To seek to achieve political reforms before we have effected a reform in human nature is like putting new wine into old bottles.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

## KSHATRIYA CHIVALRY

[It is a commentary on the low moral state of this civilization that while war is so noisily glorified by some leaders directly and openly and stealthily or cunningly by others, the Knight of Chivalry is dumb, if he exists. The first article contains some old Indian points of view about chivalry in war. But it is not only a martial quality. In home life and social relationships the virtue should be cultivated; and the second article pleads for it. Chivalry can contribute towards the maintenance of peace in the international world and when war becomes inevitable will make its carnage less mean and less revengeful.—EDS.]

### I.—WARFARE IN ANCIENT INDIA

[Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri's article shows that Non-Violence was not always the rule of government in India. But as he well points out even when war was waged as a last resort, the rules of Kshatriya chivalry robbed it of the ugliness and wholesale butchery of modern times.—EDS.]

The modern Western mind is still hugging the delusion that war is inevitable and even ennobling. Mussolini says :—

War alone carries all human energies to the maximum of tension and sets the seal of nobility on the peoples who have the courage to face it.

As an institution, war has nothing but its venerable age in its favour. Mr. C. Delisle Burns says that "the morality of civilized life binds the practices of war in three chief aspects : (1) The treatment of non-combatants, (2) the treatment of wounded captured soldiers and (3) the avoidance of certain weapons and certain methods of slaughter". Yet where had this morality gone in the recent aggressions of Italy and Japan ?

Had ancient India anything which can give vainglorious boastful modern humanity a lead out of the labyrinth ?

The classical instance of the fervour of righteous war throbbing in exalted literary expression is found in the *Bhagavad-Gita* (II, 31-32). Sri

Krishna says :

Do not feel any tremor in the face of your duty. To a Kshatriya there is no higher auspiciousness than a righteous war. To you the door of heaven is accidentally open. Only happy Kshatriyas get such a war as this.

In the *Yoga Vasishtha* it is said :—

Those who die in support of a king who protects his State will attain *Veera loka*. But those who die in support of a king who oppresses his people go to hell.

In the *Agni Purāna* (232, 52-56), it is said that a soldier who dies in battle acquires the merit of a thousand *asvamedha* (horse sacrifices). Nay, it is pointed out even in *Dharma Sāstras* that *Ātatāyins*—enemies that seek to slay us by foul means such as poison or to dishonour women—may be slain out of hand.

It was realised that *ahimsa* is the nobler attitude but, if war is inevitable to defend the national territory and the national honour, we should never shrink from it. In the seventh book in Kautilya's *Artha Sāstra* it is said :—

When the advantages derivable from peace and war are equal, one should prefer peace; for disadvantages, such as loss of power and wealth as well as wandering and sinfulness, result from war. Out of the four means (*upāyas*), viz., *sama*, *dana*, *bheda*, *danda*, (peace, winning by gifts, fomenting quarrels and war,) *danda* (war) should be resorted to only as a last resort.

It is as necessary to remember the Indian attitude towards the æsthetic aspects of war as towards its ethical aspects. Æsthetics has had a subtler elaboration in India than anywhere else in the world. The *Veera Rasa* (Emotion of Heroism) was given as exalted a place as *Sringāra Rasa* (the Emotion of Love), *Sānti Rasa* (Peace) or *Bhakti Rasa* (Godward Love). But the heroism prized was not the heroism of aggression or slaughter. The poet says :—"One murder makes a villain; a million make a hero." That applies to modern Western heroes but not to the noble and beautiful emotion of heroism as understood in India. The heroic spirit in India is the heroism of *ahimsa*, of protection of the Motherland, of the weak and the oppressed and of women. It was later expanded into the *Dāna Veera*, the *Dayā Veera*, etc., (the heroism of munificence, the heroism of compassion, etc.). War on a colossal scale or during a national frenzy can never rise to such an emotional height.

The famous *Artha Sāstra* lays down the six aspects of the foreign policy of a state :—peace (*sandhi*), war (*vigraha*), observance of neutrality (*āsana*), military march (*yāna*), alliance (*samsraya*), and making peace with one state and waging war with another (*dwaidhībhāva*).

When a king has two enemies, he must attack the stronger first. Of two enemies, whose subjects are, respectively, impoverished and oppressed, Kautilya's advice is to attack the latter first. He advises that no king should allow what would cause impoverishment, greed, or disaffection among his subjects. In regard to an invasion he says that the king should leave one-third or one-fourth of his army to protect his base of operations and should march during the month of *Mārgasira* (December) or March or May-June, taking with him a sufficient army and enough treasure. The time of march will depend on his intention and on the enemy's equipment and provisions. He describes the mechanical and other equipment needed as well as the battle array. These rules helped to keep a balance of power among the many states—a balance often upset except in those rare eras when a great suzerain dominated India.

The *Sukraniti* refers to the big *Nāleeka* and the small *Nāleeka* (cannon and gun) as well as to gunpowder, which it says should consist of five parts of nitre, one of sulphur and one of charcoal. It describes iron cannon balls with smaller shot, etc., inside, which seems to show that ancient India knew something about shells and other explosives. It refers to other lethal weapons (*sasthras*) such as bows and arrows, swords, maces, lances, spears, battle axes and daggers, and especially to *asthras* or destructive weapons whose superior potency is due to *mantras*. It refers to metal armour for soldiers and leather armour for horses and elephants.

The Indians were aware of military machines of various kinds, including flying machines. Not only does the *Rāmāyana* refer to the *Pushpaka Vimāna*; *Jeevaka Chintamani* (one of the great Tamil classical epics) refers to a flying-machine. Apart from these poems, such a serious scientific work as King Bhoja's *Samarānganasūtradhāra* contains descriptions of the elephant machine (*Gajayantra*), the bird-like machine made of wood and capable of flying through the air (*Vyōjomachari-vihanga yantra*), the wooden *vimāna* capable of aerial flight (*Akāsagāmi-dārumaya vimāna yantra*), the machine which can protect the entrance from attack (*Dvārapāla yantra*), the machine which can raise water and let it fall as and when needed, etc. In a noteworthy passage he explains how a huge mechanical bird could be constructed and a *Rasayantra* placed in its centre with a lighted lamp beneath, and how such a bird can be mounted and controlled and made to fly by beating the air with its wing-like blades. Another mechanical contrivance which he describes could operate bows, *sataghnis* (hundred-killers, *i.e.*, cannon), etc. *Sataghnis* are referred to in Valmiki's *Rāmāyana* and *Sukranīti* also.

It was always recognized in India that vast wealth is required for the successful prosecution of war. Forts were regarded as indispensable. But it is pertinently stated in *Sukranīti* that a fort is useless unless well equipped with soldiers, military machines and food supplies.

But the most important element in war is the army. The *Kamandakiya Nīti* states that the hereditary army

is better than mercenaries; that the latter are better than the *sreni* or the people called up and trained— but not well-trained—for war; and that these are better than the armies of allies which, however, are better than wearied enemy armies and hill-tribes. In regard to the relative proportions of elephants, cars, horses and foot-soldiers, there are various rules. According to the *Sukranīti* the infantry should number four times the cavalry. Amara Simha says that an *Akshauhini* consists of 21,870 elephants, 21,870 cars, 65,610 horses and 109,350 foot-soldiers, the ratio being 1 : 1 : 3 : 5. It is laid down that cars and cavalry can be used in summer and in winter, infantry and elephants in the rainy season, and all four in autumn and in spring. The king should take along physicians to treat the sick and to dress and nurse the wounded. In actual battle much will depend on the disposition (*vyūha*) of the forces. The flower of the army must be in front of the battle array but the rear also must be guarded. The flag must be defended at all costs.

In ancient India fighting was allocated to the Kshatriya caste. It was reserved for modernity to conscript whole nations and hurl them against one another. It is often said that the armies in India would fiercely decimate each other while the agriculturists pursued their calling unmolested. The *Agni Purana* states that the civil population must not be harmed. Thus war never brought on in India the dire slaughter of unarmed citizens, including women and children, or the destruction of works of art—an evil which we find

inseparably associated with modern warfare.

A noble feature of ancient warfare was the concept of *Dharma Yuddha* (righteous warfare) as opposed to *Koota Yuddha*. The most famous instance is that of Sri Rama who, when he had deprived Rāvana of all his weapons and his armies and had made him giddy with fatigue, asked him to go to his palace and to return next day refreshed for the fight. The *Rāmāyana*, *Mahābhārata*, *Sukraniti* and other works contain elaborate rules which forbid attacking one who is in fear and stands with folded arms or runs away from the battle field, or a eunuch ; one without armour or a mere onlooker, or who is eating food or drinking water. Women, children and old men should never be attacked. If two warriors are fighting with each other, a third should not interfere. *Kāmandaka Niti* seems to give greater scope to unrighteous warfare. But modern atrocities, such as poison gas and liquid fire, would not have been permissible or even imaginable in ancient India. In fact the use of poisoned darts is expressly forbidden.

The rules of warfare ordain that prisoners of war should be courteously treated, that a wounded foe must be treated by surgeons, and that a maiden who is taken as a prisoner of war should be treated with honour and helped to go back to her country if she desires to do so. When a city is captured the victors should not molest the sick, artists or ascetics.

Many Tamil works give insight into the ethical aspect of warfare in

South India. Among them may be mentioned the great *Tirukural* of Tiruvalluvar, the ancient poems of *Ettutogai* and *Pattupātu*, the epics *Silappadhikāram* and *Manimekhalai*, and *Kambaramayana*, *Purapporul*, *Venbamālai*, etc. Wars were waged to win cattle, lands or maidens or to enforce payment of tribute or acknowledgment of suzerainty.

The *Tirukural* refers, like the Sanskrit *Artha Sastras*, to the *Saptānga* of the kingdom, viz., king, minister, people, treasury, army, fort and allies. It emphasises the importance of a strong army and says that an ocean of rats is of no use and will perish at the mere breath of a cobra ; and that that is a real army which is loyal and valorous, capable of offering a united front even if the God of Death comes to attack it. If a hero can die in such a way as to fill the eyes of his king with tears, such a death should be wished for. It says further that valour, a high sense of chivalry and honour, high military traditions, reliability and trustworthiness are the four safeguards of an army.

The famous author of the *Kural* teaches that, though the learned say that fierceness in fighting is noble and admirable, it is more noble and admirable to become the benefactor of the enemy when he is injured or conquered.

The descriptions of embattled armies in Tamil poetry are vigorous and full of the zest of battle, and show that the Tamils were not only experts in the fine arts and skilled colonisers but were also a martial people.

The paraphernalia of war in ancient Tamil India, as elsewhere, consisted of forts and trenches for purposes of defence and of arms and accoutrements for purposes of offence. On the fort walls were mounted mechanical contrivances for hurling stones, burning oil and molten metal. But invading armies used to fill up the ditches and moats and scale the fort walls with the help of ladders. Sometimes the gates were battered down by elephants, their heads being protected by armour-plates.

The ancient anthology of Tamil poems, *Padirrupattu*, which is attributed to the third Sangham, contains interesting descriptions of the war mentality of the Tamil race. Its eight books, which alone are now extant, consist of poems by eight authors in praise of the military greatness and the munificence of the Chera Kings. One poem relates to the customs and manners of the western Tamils, from whom the modern Malayalis have sprung. It seems to belong to the second and third centuries of the Christian era. One *Padirrupattu* poem says that, when a fort was besieged by an enemy, the defenders used to engrave on the fort walls the number of days passed without food. It is said also that the forts contained anklets and wreaths of leaves, the former for warriors who displayed heroism in battle and the latter for distribution among cowardly soldiers as marks of ignominy.

The army generally set out on its expedition in the cold season after the rains were over, on an auspicious day fixed by the king's astrologer and after offering worship in the

temples and praying for victory. The soldiers used to be fed well, and there were music and dance to beguile the weariness of military marches and to sweeten the strenuousness of the battle. The ancient Tamils used to propitiate the goddess *Korravai* (*Durga*) as the presiding deity of battles. The women also had a high martial spirit. It is said that when a mother heard about the death of her only son on the field of battle, she went there to see whether he died from a wound in his breast or in his back.

One of the Tamil poems (*Puram*) says that non-combatants, women, diseased, aged, sonless men, and the sacred animals used to be warned to seek the protection of a fort lest they should be injured in battle. The commentator *Nachinarkiniyar* says in his commentary on the *Tolkappiam* that the sonless person, the defenceless man and the retreating soldier should not be slain in battle.

The kingdoms abounded also with spies who informed the king about rebels and miscreants at home and about the designs of rival kings. The kings used to send also a nobler type of persons as their ambassadors to other potentates. Both the *Manu Dharma Sastra* and the *Tirukkural* say that such ambassadors should have a noble and lovable character, and must belong to a noble family, have profound loyalty to their king, deep sagacity and persuasive tongues, and be well-versed in religious and secular lore. A king might kill spies (*chāras*) from another kingdom prowling in his state but should treat ambassadors (*dutas*) with respect.

It is thus clear that ancient India, besides her achievements in literature and art, philosophy and religion, introduced noble elements of righteousness even into the pugnacities and hatreds of men. She not only held aloft the banner of

*ahimsa* but also controlled and regulated *himsa* in such a manner that war was robbed of half its terrors and all its coarseness and stands as a guide and a model to the vainglorious modern world.

K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI

## II.—A PLEA FOR CHIVALRY

[Cecil Palmer, the author of *Truth About Writing* pleads for the practice of chivalry in modern life.—Ebs.]

I do not entirely agree with the critics who claim that this is an uncourtly age. It strikes me as being one of those sweeping generalisations that are made by over-particular people who jump to conclusions but rarely alight upon them.

Every age has had its share of bad manners, lack of gallantry and wanton disregard of chivalry. But every age has also had a goodly measure of the glittering beauty implied in the noble word "Knight". I am not ashamed to admit that the very word itself has always enthralled me. It, and the blessed word Crusader, have spiritual as well as temporal significances—significances and implications that have their roots in the stuff that dreams are made of. It is a poor heart indeed that cannot evoke a responsive throb to the compelling music of marching Knights journeying in holy crusade.

My dictionary's definitions of chivalry are almost bewilderingly composite in the sense that they embrace nearly all the attributes of human grace and graciousness. But I like best among them those that re-

mind us of "the ideal knight's characteristics, and of devotion to the service of women, and an inclination to defend the weaker party"—to be, in short, gallant, honourable, courteous, disinterested and quixotic.

In this present-day world of whirl what surprises me is not that there appear to be so few knights abroad, but that there are any at all. The fact is, of course, that knightly chivalry is all around us, but our dim eyes are, alas! unaccustomed to the lily beauty of eternity. By which I mean just this. Chivalry is not the prerogative of any one class in society. It thrives in unexpected places. It withers in the presence of any manifestation of social or intellectual snobbery. For that which the eyes oftentimes cannot see, vision sometimes reveals.

It is not possible for any thinking man of mature age to have many pleasant recollections of the Great War. Among them, the one that stands out with the vividness of a searchlight sweeping the seas, is surely the chivalry of man that refused to be suppressed even when

man's inhumanity to man was the very life's blood of those who were, minute by minute, facing death. A glorious, if terrible, paradox that men should be gentlemen when fighting like beasts! But it was so.

Whenever I despair of human nature I am revived by contemplation of those countless gentlemen who so steadfastly believed that civilisation was being challenged and who now sleep peacefully with yesterday's seven thousand years. There should be no need to remind ourselves of the splendour of Youth in Armageddon when schoolboys became knights in a single night. Youth, then, was indispensable. Then scatter to the winds all the highfaluting nonsense about modern Youth being intolerable now. Even if it is true that Youth is sometimes inclined to go off the deep end, it is also profoundly comforting to temper our judgment with the knowledge that Youth can swim. Chivalry flourished in those mad, bad years of War. *I, for one, cannot believe it has died with the dead.*

There is, it must be admitted, evidence that men and women and our youth are sometimes guilty of transgressing the canons of good taste. It indeed is a startling symptom of human deterioration when rudeness can be indulged in without comment or *apparent consciousness*. The fact that many people behave rudely fifty times a day without knowing it is partly explicable. It is much more difficult to understand the equally depressing fact that rudeness does not always awaken resentment in those who suffer its stings. Apparently, we are in some danger

of becoming more sensible at the costly price of becoming less sensitive.

I think it is true to say that bad manners are as much a danger nationally as personally. The travelling Englishman is notoriously insensitive to the feelings of nationals in whose countries he is temporarily domiciled. It is a strange reflection on English gentility that it is so inclined to reserve all expression of it for home consumption.

I dare to believe that the cultivation of chivalry in an international sense is a problem of urgent necessity in these post-war years when civilisation itself is threatened with virtual extinction.

Courtesy of speech and courtliness of bearing are possibly less conspicuous to-day than they were in the "good old days". The *tempo* of the age in which we live is perhaps too syncopated and swift for the leisured strides of culture and chivalry. I am afraid it is true to say that in our hectic desire for freedom and equality we have sadly overlooked the fact that neither the one nor the other is worth having if it involves the sacrifice of those qualities that make freedom and equality socially bearable. For, in our saner and humbler moments, we are bound to admit that a healthy discipline of the mind is an essential factor in all human development and achievement. If freedom gives us the right to be proud, it does not relieve us of the necessity to temper our pride with spiritual humility. And he who thinks that spiritual equality is of the same pattern as the economic claim that all men are equal is sadly

lacking in both philosophy and humour.

I have said that chivalry is to be found in all walks of life. If the Great War taught us nothing else, it taught us this. Chivalry, like gentlemanliness, is not dependent on what you were, but on what you are. It is one of the most precious jewels in our culture ; a jewel to be worn by the brave of spirit and meek of heart.

I sincerely think the pessimists are quite wrong in believing in the decline of chivalry. I believe it exists in men and women now, as healthily and vigorously as ever before. The morbid theory that chivalry no longer exists to beautify and to fortify human life is contradicted in numberless ways numberless times a day. The outward and visible signs of chivalry have changed with the

ever-changing years. The inward and spiritual graces of chivalry are indestructible and incorruptible.

I will believe the pessimists when I see the evidence that men and women, and particularly young men and young women, are becoming insensible to beauty and unresponsive to truth. Surely the exact contrary is verity of verities. The veneer of chivalry has, perhaps, worn away, but the thing itself is firmly rooted in our social and religious life. For if it be true that the post-war world is menaced on all sides by dragons, it is no less certain, and greatly comforting, that within the ranks of lovely Youth are eager, willing St. Georges who have not lost the capacity to slay in a righteous cause. And noble chivalry has consecrated their dazzling swords.

CECIL PALMER

---

Formerly, when people wanted to fight with one another, they measured between them their bodily strength ; now it is possible to take away thousands of lives by one man working behind a gun from a hill.—GANDHIJI

# ADVERTISING AND PROPAGANDA

## TWIN CURSES OF THE AGE

[Miller Watson sounds a necessary and timely note of warning against the method of "psychologising" the minds of others which now prevails in many fields. H. P. Blavatsky explained the dangers of all such processes which interfere with the free mental action of others and condemned them as unconscious Black Magic. Aldous Huxley describes in *Ends and Means* how to build a habit of resistance to suggestion without which "the men and women of the next generation will be at the mercy of any skilful propagandist who contrives to seize the instruments of information and persuasion". It is time that people learn to rely on their inner resources, and not allow their thinking to be done by proxy.-Eds.]

If some future historian traces the origin of dictatorships to commercial advertising he will have sufficient support for his arguments. While many people will agree that modern dictators have made of propaganda their most effective weapon, most will also affirm that there is a vast difference between commercial advertising and political propaganda. There may be a difference in aims, but the methods are largely similar and I have no doubt that widespread commercial advertising opened the way for political propaganda.

Let us study a daily newspaper or one of the more popular periodicals. The first thing which will be noticed is that about half (and sometimes more) of the printed space is taken up by advertisements. That particular paper or periodical depends on its advertisers for its profits.

At one time I was an advertising agent and I learned some interesting facts while I was in that profession. For instance I knew of one paper which maintained a certain policy. One of my clients, a great business concern known all over the world, was at the time the biggest advertiser

in that town. The advertising manager of the paper called on me and asked for advertisements from my client. He was informed, through me, that the concern could not advertise in his paper because the paper advocated a certain policy. Some time after, the paper modified its views and the business firm granted it advertisements. Here was one definite case of a business concern using its influence to alter the expressed opinion of a daily newspaper. I know of other instances, but there are other aspects of advertising.

In a certain town a Beauty Competition was being held. Pretty damsels from all over the world were taking part. One of my clients, a manufacturer of products not unrelated to supposed beauty production, propounded a scheme. The young ladies would give testimonials to the excellency of his products in return for a consideration. His scheme was successful and for months photographs of the young ladies were published in the press accompanied by signed testimonials. I know it to be true that most of these young ladies had never heard of the product before the man-

ufacturer propounded his scheme. Every one of the advertisements was a false testimonial obtained by bribery.

Let us look again at our daily paper. We find an advertisement illustrated by a drawing or photograph of an unclad female. The advertisement, however, has nothing to do with a course of physical training or with a product for producing bodily beauty. No, it advertises household furniture. I have tried hard to find an excuse for the naked lady's presence, but I have failed. The advertisement is as pornographic as the law will permit. Another advertisement tells us that so-and-so's bath salts "are prepared from the famous Sesame flowers". As every one with a slight knowledge of chemistry knows, the bath salts are prepared from washing-soda. Of course "Sesame flowers" sounds so much better—and probably justifies the increased cost of washing-soda.

These are all comparatively small things, you may say, and affect only the perpetrators of the falsehoods. Unfortunately that is not true. Our press is so full of untruthful, immoral and senseless advertisements that the public which accepts them is becoming incapable of thinking. Is it not a sign of the times that the public of Britain has accepted an advertising campaign which consists of nothing but the often repeated slogan—"Beer is best!"? A slogan which from a grammatical point of view means nothing, and from any other point of view is an unqualified statement of dubious significance. If the public of Britain were not already stupefied by senseless and ridiculous advertising, such nonsense could not

be printed in any paper. As things stand to-day no ordinary paper can refuse such absurd advertisements because it depends on the advertiser's money for its existence.

If any one doubts the effects of such advertising and thinks the public does not take it seriously, the following facts may prove interesting. A certain manufacturer of soap advertised the unique colour of his product as having special virtues. Some time later a market investigation was held. Investigators called at private houses and asked details about soap. A large proportion of the people visited said that they liked soap of that particular colour because it had certain virtues! They gave the same explanation as was originally published in the advertisement. In other words, the public does take advertising seriously.

Some years ago I was advertising agent for a patent-medicine manufacturer. I was amazed at the sums of money spent on advertising and one day I told the manager I was surprised to find there were so many sick people in the world. His reply was that there are many people who *think* they are ill! He added that you can convince any one of anything if you advertise enough. Incidentally I discovered that the cost of production and advertising of that product were in this proportion: Cost of goods—unit; cost of advertising—ten units.

When commercial firms had carried advertising to the point where the public was stupefied, hypnotised or otherwise reduced to believing anything, ambitious politicians learned the same lesson. The dictator found

propaganda a most useful tool. Mussolini and Hitler have both made more use of propaganda than of any other weapon. With propaganda in one hand and terror in the other, one man can rule the minds of millions.

In Britain to-day, the general public does not realise how well it has been prepared for dictatorship. Commercial advertising over a period of many years has sapped the critical capacities of the public's mind. Great press lords have played a hypnotic tune which has changed the thoughts of millions. To-day, in Britain, you can usually tell what paper a man reads from the opinions he retails. Few, very few, think, or are capable of thinking, for themselves. They are reduced to that state of mental softness and malleability beloved of dictators and aspiring dictators.

How many Britons realise one aspect of the abdication crisis? In an event of national importance they were content to leave the matter in the hands of a single leader. During the abdication crisis Stanley Baldwin was virtually dictator of Britain.

In the more recent crisis over relations with Italy the propaganda and advertisement-drugged mind of the public has been incapable of asserting itself. In direct opposition to democratic beliefs and democratic custom, one man is to decide the country's destiny without even the ceremony of explaining his intentions. Unless the British people can shake off the yoke of propaganda and advertisement they are doomed, sooner or later, to dictatorship. Free, healthy thinking minds would not accept the ridiculous advertisements or the illogical opinions expressed in the newspapers and periodicals of to-day.

It used to be said you could tell a man's character from his friends. To-day I think it is true that you can predict a nation's fate from the advertisements in its papers. A well-known publicity man said to me only a short time ago: "The formula of modern publicity is—fifty per cent insinuation, forty-nine point nine pure lies, and traces of truth." I am willing to admit he was probably exaggerating.

MILLER WATSON

---

People are not aware that they act almost entirely under suggestion. From our birth we are surrounded by those who suggest certain ideas to us as true, and we follow these suggested ideas. There is very little *original* thought anywhere, and particularly is this true in those lines to which the public pays the most attention—that is, politics, religion, science. Whatever system of thought is presented to us, that we adopt. We follow the suggestion given, with no attempt to reach to the basis of that which is suggested. The foundation upon which the suggestion rests is taken for granted, even in the most important things in life.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

## NEW BOOKS AND OLD

### PHYSICS DEMATERIALIZED<sup>1</sup>

[Philip Chapin Jones is a scientific researcher whose sincere interest in Theosophical philosophy extends over a long period of years.—Eds.]

In all fields of science, the gap between the professional and the layman is constantly tending to widen. This is to be expected in a period of rapid accumulation of fact, and has undoubtedly occurred before. With the eager seeking for classical knowledge during the Renaissance, a similar situation unquestionably arose, and endured for an extended period. In present physical science, however, the widening gap is caused by more than a simple accretion of factual knowledge, and is rapidly growing impassable, which no differential in facts known could ever become. The explanation is that physics proper has assimilated, and actually become, philosophy and mathematics as well as physics, and both of these added subjects have always been as unknown languages to the greater part of mankind.

This is an unfortunate situation, because physics, in absorbing mathematics and philosophy, has taken on considerable added significance, and it is important that the conclusions it is reaching regarding the nature of the universe should be more generally understood. In attempting to make them so, however, a natural dilemma is encountered. The more needful it becomes that the findings and theories of physics be disseminated to a larger public, because of their greater significance, the more difficult it is to impart them because of the greater difficulty in leaping the barrier of abstruse mathematics that, while yearly growing more difficult, seemingly alone is capable of expressing them.

A serious effort to cross this barrier is a notable event, and the recent publication of *The Evolution of Physics*, by

Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, certainly deserves such a characterization. The book starts with the physics of the late seventeenth century, traces its rise to the end of the nineteenth, and then shows its transformation into something distinctly different. Newton's formulation of the laws of gravity and moving bodies placed mechanics on a substantial foundation, and the physics of the following generations was based almost entirely upon it. Matter and motion were made the basis of all phenomena, and gave rise to the "mechanical view", the development of which is the subject of the first section of the Einstein-Infeld exposition.

During this period of physics there was no serious obstacle to the wide dissemination of physical knowledge. A system composed of moving, physical masses could be, at least approximately, understood, and the mechanical explanation had the additional advantage of being intuitively perceptible. We could readily picture the sort of motions and interactions that were going on, whether we considered the solar system, with planets rotating around a central sun, or an atomic system with small electrons rotating around an internal nucleus. As time went on, however, it was found that this mechanical view, which had at first seemed so satisfactory, could no longer be made to fit all the known facts. It slowly went into a decline, and the second section of the four into which the book is divided traces the growing inadequacy of the mechanical view, and discusses the reasons for it.

To account for the phenomena of electricity and magnetism, it became neces-

<sup>1</sup> *The Evolution of Physics*. By ALBERT EINSTEIN and LEOPOLD INFELD. (Cambridge University Press, London, 8s. 6d., and Simon and Schuster, New York, \$2.50.)

sary to develop the concept of a "field", a region in space permeated by a force that at every point has two characteristics—a magnitude and a direction of action. Although the authors imply a well-marked distinction between the mechanical and the field theories, they fail to establish it very satisfactorily. In fact the field concept would seem to date at least from Newton, since gravitational force certainly constitutes a field as much as does electric or magnetic force. The field concept, however, undoubtedly grew, and it is used by the authors primarily to lead into relativity, with which the third section closes. The concluding picture of this section is of the universe as a field of energy, with the regions of greatest concentration corresponding to what we had heretofore called matter. According to the mechanical view there was matter, on the one hand, and force on the other, two separate and distinct things—one leaving off where the other began. According to the field theory there is only one basic reality; differentiation is merely a matter of structure.

In the earlier sections, energy transmission by waves is discussed, and a contrast drawn between the energy of waves and the energy of particles. This contrast was first met in attempting to account for light. It was initially thought that light was caused by minute particles shooting off from the luminous body and striking the eye. Although this theory satisfactorily explained most of the behaviour of light, it encountered difficulties with diffraction, which the wave theory—proposed as an alternative—easily accounted for. To explain the photo-electric effect, however, even the wave theory proved inadequate. Only some sort of a particle theory seemed capable of this. Physics was facing one of the most serious contradictions of its career, and the final section of the book discusses these difficulties under the heading of Quanta. This dualism of wave and particle has been found to be universally present, and is undoubtedly one of the most difficult parts of physics

to clarify without the aid of involved mathematics.

A popular work on physics is difficult to appraise because to a greater extent than almost any other written work its success in attaining its objective depends on the extent of the reader's knowledge. The authors were fully cognizant of this difficulty, and devote the preface to its discussion. "Whilst writing the book", they say, "we had long discussions as to the characteristics of our idealized reader and worried a good deal about him." How well they succeeded in estimating the intellectual background of their average reader, and how successful they were in making their text meet his abilities and limitations, it is impossible to estimate. The work is distinctly an achievement, however, in completely avoiding mathematics. Not an equation appears from the opening line of the preface to the last line of page 313 that closes the final section.

It is difficult to believe that one who would be deterred by even the simpler forms of mathematics can yet read this book with complete comprehension. Modern physics, as has already been remarked, is mathematics, and it would seem that space could have been well employed in clarifying the meaning of certain of the basic mathematical conceptions and expressions that serve as the very foundation stones for the new physics. Whether or not this is so, the authors have written an interesting book; one that even if only partly understood will give something of the change that has been completely transforming physics since the closing years of the last century.

There are those, of course, who are disinclined to accept much of the new physics. I am reminded of a recent article in *Nature*<sup>1</sup> on "The Pragmatic and Dogmatic Spirit in Physics" by Prof. J. Stark. He deplors the emphasis on purely theoretic structures which are characteristic of the "Dogmatic Spirit". Undoubtedly there is but a very small minority who would

<sup>1</sup> April 30, 1938.

stand by his extreme position, but an appreciably greater number still question many of the newer theoretical creations, and even are sceptical of some of the underlying postulates of relativity itself. It is for this reason that a wider dissemination of physical philosophy is desirable, and that more effort should be made to elucidate the meaning and philosophical implications of the many striking concepts that support contemporary physics.

Regardless of the exact position one takes, there is no doubt that physics has run into very real difficulties since the tangible satisfactoriness of the days, say of Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences*. These difficulties, moreover, are of particular interest to Theosophy. H. P. Blavatsky published her great works while the particle-mechanical

physics was at its height. She did not share the general enthusiasm, however. While recognizing the true scientific spirit in which most of the physical research was carried on, and granting a large proportion of the facts, she yet differed radically as to the underlying nature of the phenomena. Against discrete, more or less unrelated units, she posited a basic unity, both of substance and law. It is interesting to note, therefore, that it is toward exactly such a unity that continued study and research is inevitably leading. Physics of the period with which this book starts was purely material; it dealt with matter and motion. At the present time the motion still remains, but the matter has dissolved into what in another age no better word could have been found than spirit.

PHILIP CHAPIN JONES

## THE VISION OF KAHLIL GIBRAN

[J. Vijaya-Tunga is a Singhalese now resident in London. He writes about Gibran, a great Oriental whose influence is widespread in the Western world. Such a mature mind as that of A. E., the Irish literary statesman, was impressed by Gibran as is the young heart of Laila Neffa in far away Uruguay, as the review which follows this article shows.—EDS.]

In the Arabic world, where from the earliest times the poet was sought out by the king, Kahlil Gibran is well known and honoured. He has a considerable following in America. Indeed his most ardent biographer and follower to-day is the American poet, Barbara Young. But I fear that his name is not so well known in Europe, not in England, at any rate, and certainly not well enough in India.

By a great misfortune, the meeting with him that a mutual acquaintance had arranged for me was postponed, and I did not seek it again, to my great loss. But I have been in at least one company of normal, educated American men and women, a company where youth predominated, which listened for more than an hour to one of their number reading Kahlil Gibran's *Jesús, the Son of Man*.

Every event of Kahlil Gibran's life belongs to the realm of greatness. His birthplace in a romantic valley in the hallowed land of Lebanon; his ancestors, cultured men, priests, scholars, and gentlemen-farmers; his mother, Kamila, of whom he said after her death: "My life was shrouded, not because Kamila Rahmi was my mother, but because she was my friend"; and who said of her son: "My son is outside of psychology"; his childhood in the four-thousand-year-old vilayet of Becharre; his education in French, English and Arabic, at Beirut; the emigration of the mother with her four children, Kahlil being then eleven, to Boston; his Parisian sojourn; and his life and work and death in New York, far from the Syria for which he had so great a yearning.

Those of us who cannot read his many volumes in the original Arabic must be content with his books in English. These were *The Madman* (1918), *Twenty Drawings* (1919), *The Forerunner* (1920), *The Prophet* (1923), *Sand and Foam* (1926), *Jesus, the Son of Man* (1928) and *The Garden of the Prophet* (1935).

In these, however, is revealed to us sufficiently the measure of a man not too common in this modern world of compromise and complacency. Kahlil Gibran has converted many a life into a more abundant one by the spoken word and by his presence but he was for ever reminding his listeners, "I am not a philosopher, I am not a poet, nor a painter - I do not wish to be any of these things. I wish only to share life. The hours spent as brother, friend, lover—these are hours of fulfilment, only these."

He was, of course, all those things and in the highest sense of the word. As lover, in *The Prophet* he wrote :—

Then said Almitra, speak to us of love.  
And he raised his head and looked upon  
the people, and there fell a great  
stillness upon them.  
And with a great voice he said :  
"When love beckons to you, follow him,  
though his ways are hard and steep.  
And when his wings enfold you, yield to  
him, though the sword hidden among  
his pinions may wound you.  
And when he speaks to you believe in him,  
though his voice may shatter your  
dreams as the North wind lays waste the  
garden.  
For even as love crowns you so shall he  
crucify you. Even as he is for your  
growth so he is for your pruning.  
Even as he ascends to your height and  
caresses your tenderest branches that  
quiver in the sun,  
So shall he descend to your roots and  
shake them in their clinging to the  
earth.

His words are allegorical and his meaning prophetic, as they were, and are, on the lips of the mystic poets of India and of Persia. In *Jesus, the Son of Man*, he puts these words into the mouth of John :—

I would tell you more of Him, but how  
shall I ?  
When love becomes vast love becomes  
wordless.

The greater the mind, the more eloquent its silence. In *The Prophet* Kahlil Gibran sings :—

A seeker of silences am I, and what treasure  
have  
I found in silences that I may dispense  
with confidence ?

And in *Jesus, the Son of Man* he makes Zacchæus defend Jesus thus :—

You believe in what you hear said.  
Believe in the unsaid, for the silence of men  
is nearer than their words.

And, poet that he was, every truth he realised in his silences, he clothed in Beauty. Barbara Young quotes an illuminating story :—

At six he was given a volume of Leonardo reproductions to look at, and after turning a few pages, burst into wild weeping and ran away to be alone. His passion for Da Vinci possessed him from that hour, so much so, indeed, that one day, when his father rebuked him, for some childish misdemeanour, the boy flew into a rage and shouted, "What have you to do with me anyway ? I am an Italian." How reminiscent of those other words, "Woman, what have I to do with thee ?"

On another occasion he argued with his mother on the proper spelling of "Kahlil", changing it from the more usual Arabic Khalil. "Can't you see", he asked her, "the form is more beautiful this way ?"

"Do whatever you will, so long as you do it beautifully", was his rule of conduct. If we translate this dictum in a spirit of reverence and not of half-cynicism we shall get a rule of conduct that is at all times dependable. For is it not exactly what was meant by those too often and too glibly quoted lines of Keats ?

Kahlil Gibran was both as a painter and a poet greater than Blake. This is not meant as a reflection on the latter for if one considers the hostility of environment and tradition against which Blake had to develop his mysticism his was the more remarkable achievement. Kahlil Gibran was indeed fortunate in that respect.

Of his draughtsmanship and genius as an artist there is not the slightest doubt. If anything has eclipsed his fame as an artist it is only his greatness as a philos-

opher and a mystic. While India's ancient art is full of examples for its artists of to-day no Indian artist, or for that matter no Oriental artist, can but be inspired to greater heights by a study of Kahlil Gibran's symbolic drawings and paintings.

Nurtured as he was in an atmosphere of beauty, love and understanding—though his father tried his best to make his son a lawyer instead of a poet—it was no wonder that Kahlil Gibran should have sought his greatest inspiration in the unorthodox but truer and nobler life and death of Jesus.

Numerous as are the portraits of Jesus that the devout, the inspired and the learned have created in his name, there is no single portrait or book in which you get a portrait of Jesus so vivid, so understandable and so akin to reality (from the Oriental point of view at least) as in Kahlil Gibran's *Jesus, the Son of Man*.

From the mouths of seventy-nine characters—as vastly divergent as possible—we get a very vivid picture of the inspired child Jesus growing up to youth and manhood and fulfilment. Here, for example, is Annas, the High Priest, defending the persecution of Jesus :—

He made sport of us and our laws ; He mocked at our honour and jeered at our dignity. He even said He would destroy the Temple and desecrate the holy places. He was shameless, and for this He had to die.

And this is how Ahaz, the keeper of the inn where Jesus had his Last Supper, remembered Him :—

Then He put the two pieces (of silver) into my hand, and said, " With these buy a silken girdle for your daughter, and bid her wear it on the day of the passover in remembrance of me."

*Voces de Oriente (Voices of the Orient)*. By LAILA NEFFA. (Published by the Author, Montevideo, Uruguay, South America.)

This beautifully printed and illustrated book contains translations in Spanish from the Arabic writings of Kahlil Gibran, Maric Ziade, and other Arabic

And this was how Zachæus answered questioners :—

You ask if Jesus could have escaped His shameful death and saved His followers from persecution....

Aye, He could have said, " Go back to your kin. The world is not ready for me. I shall return a thousand years hence. Teach your children to await my return."

He could have done this had he so chosen....

Neither the Romans slew Him, nor the Priests.

The whole world stood to honour Him upon that hill.

And Mary, His Mother :—

Woman shall be forever the womb and the cradle but never the tomb. We die that we may give life unto life even as our fingers spin the thread for the raiment that we shall never wear.

Idealist though he was Kahlil Gibran was equally concerned with the ordinary lives and activities of his fellow-men. The only people he had no use for were the merely clever. In *The Garden of the Prophet* he wrote :—

The angels are tired of the clever. And it was but yesterday that an angel said to me : " We created hell for those who glitter. What else but fire can erase a shiny surface and melt a thing to its core ?"

He was ever thinking out for his beloved Syria " a system of forestation and agriculture, and the solution of economic and political problems". And he exhorted " Young Americans of Syrian origin" in these words :—

Stand before the towers of New York and Washington, Chicago and San Francisco saying in your heart, " I am the descendant of a people that builded Damascus and Byblus, and Tyre and Sidon and Antioch, and now I am here to build with you, and with a will !"

J. VIJAYA-TUNGA

authors. The translator tells us in her biographical note on Gibran that she was attracted to the original works of this " greatest poet of the Near East" whom she also regards as the " poet-messiah" because in his writings are focussed the voice and the genius of the Arabic people. She promises to continue

to give to the Spanish-speaking world the message of living Arabian culture. Delightful is her rendering but her power to charm the reader increases from the fact that she completed this first book before the age of fourteen, making of it, she tells us "a sweet remembrance of my childhood". Born of Arab parents in Montevideo, she has perfect

command over both languages, the Arabic and the Spanish; and it is evident from her book that she too, unites within herself the East and the West, and will soften, to quote her own words about Gibran, with her *Oriental Soul* the materialistic exaggeration of the civilization of the Occident.

*Symbolism and Belief.* By EDWYN BEVAN. (George Allen and Unwin. 15s.)

One's reaction to this book will be chiefly conditioned by the expectations created by the title. At the outset, Dr. Bevan quotes Professor Whitehead's definition of Symbolism:—

The human mind is functioning symbolically when some components of its experience elicit consciousness, beliefs, emotions, and usages, respecting other components of its experience.

Dr. Bevan, having told us that he thinks a symbol certainly "means something presented to the senses or the imagination—usually to the senses—which stands for something else", accepts Professor Whitehead's definition, qualifying it by making a distinction between symbols which give no information about the thing symbolised and those which do.

Then follow long learned chapters detailing anthropological and literary evidence relating to the symbols of Height, Time, Light, Spirit, Wrath, and so on. There is no doubt about the erudition—possibly some readers will feel bombarded by it—but whether or not, when you close the book, anything essential will have been added to your knowledge of symbolism is an open question.

For instance, to be told that the tendency of primitive man to regard the sky as the home of God was "a singularly apt anticipation of the truth" may, or may not, shed light on the symbolic significance of Height. In the same way, our apprehension of the value of Light as a symbol may, or may not, be deep-

ened by the announcement that it is especially intended to give "the sense of glory".

That, however, is a matter for the individual reader. What, surely, will affect the majority is the number of sentences which jar, although their meaning is clear enough. There is space for only two examples. Here is the first:

Since no phrase you can use about the Supreme is adequate to the Reality, all you can do is to throw out your phrase at it and then deny that the phrase is true.

And this is the second:

The crucial question . . . is, *What has happened to Jesus since?* [his death] Has he ceased now to exist, just as much as the old horse we may have seen last year in a neighbouring field?

It is difficult too, not to be irritated by Dr. Bevan's profound conviction that the Hebraic group of religions is right and that the Indian group is fundamentally wrong. And isn't there something pompous and patronising in this reference to Indian mysticism? "If we leave out of account the peculiar development of pantheistic mysticism in India, seen already in the Upanishads. . . ."

Doubtless Blake, Swedenborg, and Boehme are considered madmen by the right people; nevertheless, those who find the definition of symbolism, quoted at the beginning of this review, totally inadequate, might study their works before abandoning the whole subject. And they might just glance at the Upanishads. They seem to have lasted for about 2,800 years, if not more.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

*Shamanism in Western North America*—A Study in Cultural Relationship. By WILLARD Z. PARK. (North-western University, Evanston and Chicago. \$2.25.)

Anthropological studies have grown in variety and volume. It is amusing that scholars with modernest outlook who accept nothing which does not admit of laboratory verification are somehow fascinated by the odd, strange, religious beliefs and practices of primitive sections of humanity.

Dr. Park chose Shamanism as his subject for a dissertation presented for the Doctor's Degree in Philosophy of the Yale University. The work under notice is a revised presentation of that thesis. What is "Shamanism"?

All the practices by which supernatural power may be acquired by mortals, the exercise of that power for good or evil, and all the concepts and beliefs associated with these practices.

The beliefs and practices are recorded in detail in the chapter entitled "Pavlotso Shamanism". In the following chapter inter-relations, reciprocities, readjustments, etc., found in "Shamanism" as practised by different primitive tribes in different geographical distributions are set forth with a wealth of detail that does credit to the

industry and critical perception of Dr. Park. The results obtained are brought together in the concluding chapter.

The American "Shaman" may be compared to the Hindu *Mantra-Vadi* or *Mantrika*. Ancient Hindu religious practices intended to enable individuals to acquire some specific power for good or evil over their fellow men have round them a vast mass of literature that is yet to be systematically investigated. Arthur Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe) has done his best in placing before English audiences the contents of some of the leading works on "Mantra-Sastra". But the Vedanta counsels a stern and stiff attitude of renunciation of desire to acquire such power. Even the extraordinary power associated with the Yoga-Siddhis is not to be desired. The power, if and when successfully acquired, is to be used always for the good of the people. But then, human nature and mentality being what they are, temptations are sure to deflect one from the path of rectitude, and urge him on to the use of these powers for self-aggrandisement, for exploitation, for evil. It is thus, best not to have anything to do with such powers. That, I would like to emphasize, is the ideal of the Vedanta.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA

*Liberality and Civilization*. By GILBERT MURRAY. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d.)

From Gilbert Murray one expects a noble statement of the "Liberal" faith; and in these two lectures he gives us such a statement. It is significant, however, that he feels the necessity of substituting the word "liberality" for "liberalism": for that is a tacit acknowledgment that "liberalism" is discredited. What Gilbert Murray means by "liberality" is what Matthew Arnold meant by "culture".

Liberality is not a doctrine; it is a spirit or attitude of mind, constantly changing in its outer manifestation according to the circumstances it has to meet, but always essentially the same in itself, an effort to get rid of prejudice so as to see the truth, to get

rid of selfish passions so as to do the right. It is not a popular attitude.

How then does Gilbert Murray persuade himself that it can prevail? The modern world, he says truly, is dominated by fear. It is inevitable that it should be. Nations are equipped with an incomparable power of destruction, and they know in their hearts that they are no better than their fathers—no fitter to wield such superhuman powers.

As we know, Gilbert Murray still "believes in" the League of Nations. I do not criticise him for that, for assuredly he worked as hard as any Englishman to make it a reality. But it seems to me that at the crucial moment he turns a blind eye to the realities which, at other

times, he sees so clearly. He gives an exaggerated account of the complete repudiation of "liberality" by the totalitarian nations, and concludes :—

Neither can we fly for refuge to pure pacifism. If we believe that sacrifice is good, let us sacrifice ourselves, not our neighbours. To undertake solemnly, and with an air of religious duty never to defend your brother against wrong if the wrong-doer uses armed force seems to me a denial not only of liberality but of civilization itself. No. The only safe road is a straight road. The nations that for the sake of peace are ready to live according to law and accord justice to one another are a vast majority. They have vast economic and military strength. Their united will would be, I think, irresistible so long as it operates along peaceful channels for liberal and lawful ends. But they are not united.

How, then, is this a straight road, seeing that its foundations do not exist? I am not concerned to dispute with Gilbert Murray, whom I respect, about the nature of pacifism, which I think he caricatures. But I seek in vain to discover what basis in fact he has for his faith that the "liberal" nations of the world will combine in a selfless league to resist, or at least to isolate, the Fascist nations. He himself has made the admission that "liberality", which is the attitude of

mind on which such a league depends, is not a popular attitude. How does he persuade himself that it will become popular? Or that the "liberal" nations which do not trust one another will trust one another?

In my judgment, Gilbert Murray's analysis, though profound, is not profound enough. It is the analysis of a Greek mind seeking to order the world according to rational principles. Men in the mass are not governed by their reason; they are governed by appetite or religion. And those for whom "liberality" is a religion, as it is for Gilbert Murray, are very few. But even they, it seems to me, would be more effective if they realized that they are in fact in the position of a tiny minority, whose alliance with the hosts of well-meaning and self-deceived Liberals is really superficial. Finally, I cannot understand how Gilbert Murray reconciles his attitude of "liberality", which I know to be sincere and from which as a student I received an abiding impression, with the abomination of modern mechanised war, which is the same whether the war be defensive or offensive.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

*Essentialism: To Defend Truth.*  
(Pollen House, London. 5s.)

The anonymous author claims to present a new conception of Christianity and of world religions acceptable to this new age. We find, however, no dissertation on world religions; the whole book is exhausted in expounding Christianity as the dynamic philosophy of life.

The language is more fresh and arresting than the ideas. Essentialism is defined as the acknowledgment of the Eternal Verity within the individual as well as the mass-heart of humanity and its purpose is to bring out the deeper meaning of the Delphic oracle: "Know Thyself." The true significance of this cryptic utterance is to be found in the Eastern Wisdom, without which any conception of Christianity must remain incomplete. Essentialism teaches the

Law of Cause and Effect, considers Heaven and Hell as conditions existing individually in each man, and recognizes previous incarnations "not necessarily of the earth". Since Essentialism admits the common characteristics of World-Saviours who inspire men to attain the Absolute Good which they have reached, why does it allot first place to Christ?

The book, ultra-modern in *format*, includes propaganda for a British American alliance and an economic panacea as well. The author has a visionary ideal of reforming humanity and uniting mankind; he appeals to all to adopt his doctrine and to organise a band of Essentialists pledged to practise its cardinal affirmation:—"I am the Supreme Consciousness...and Truth Everlasting...I abominate self-interest and dominate Evil."

SWAMI JAGADISWARANANDA

*Village Theatres.* The Foundations of the Indian National Theatre. By TANDRA DEVI. With a Foreword by NANDALAL BOSE. (Tandra Devi Publications, Shrinagar, Kashmir. As. 10.)

In this booklet of hardly 20 pages Tandra Devi (Mrs. Foulds) makes a passionate plea for the revival of puppet or marionette shows in our villages. The village to-day is a drab place steeped in despair, inertia and apathy. One of the ways of putting new life and joy into our village people is to give them some potent means of self-expression or creative activity. And here is a method that Tandra Devi points out which while being well within the means of village people will give ample opportunity for local skill and ingenuity to express itself in the way of dramatic imagination, poetry, music, colour and move-

ment. In Czechoslovakia puppet shows are used not only for entertainment but also as an important means for formation of character and dissemination of knowledge regarding practical subjects such as public hygiene, domestic science and the like. A whole world of beauty, joy and creative energy will be opened up for our village people if the educated unemployed will turn to puppet shows and travel from village to village conducting such shows till villagers learn to do it for themselves. Puppet shows should also be a means of developing the inborn talents of children when introduced in schools. They have great possibilities.

The author gives names of useful literature on the subject and the booklet is enlivened by beautiful pictures and designs.

BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

*Legends of the Longhouse.* By JESSE J. CORNPLANTER of the Senecas. (J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia. \$2.00)

These racy tales "told to Sah-Nee-Weh, the White Sister" are reproduced in the narrator's idiom, as piquant as his pen-and-ink sketches which illustrate them. The student of comparative thought will value them as additions to the literature of legend, for there is truth in the opinion of the author's father, whom he quotes, "that most all legends nowadays were in the olden time a reality". Madame Blavatsky, who had devoted many years to studying legendary lore of various races, declared her conviction that "no mythological story, no traditional event in the folk-lore of a people has ever been, at any time, pure fiction" and that "Popular folk-lore and traditions, however fanciful at times, when sifted may lead to the discovery of long-lost, but important, secrets of nature."

These legends tell of giants and of witches and of the "Little People", some of whom live beneath the rocks and caverns, others along the streams, while still another group "wakes up the plants

and causes them to grow in the spring-time; they make the flowers blossom in their time, also paints the fruit red when it ripens".

In THE ARYAN PATH (September 1937), Mr. James Truslow Adams under the title, "The Long House" described the remarkable League of the Iroquois Indians of New York State, of which the Senecas were members, with four other tribes—a League of Nations which worked, maintaining peace among its savage members. One legend in this book, "The Naked Bear", seems to be an echo of the setting up of that League, recounting the public burial of all weapons of war and, with it, the disavowal of hatred and desire for revenge upon former enemies. The old Chief adjures the people of his own village and of another in words that have a message for our modern strife-torn world :—

Let no one ever mention about the past. We all have lost some one; so let us not bring back the things that hurt us. . . . Beginning to-day, we find we are one people only that we live apart in different villages, but let us keep up that relationship alive within us.

PH. D.

# CORRESPONDENCE

## CONTROVERTIBLE PSYCHOLOGY

Professor Woodworth, of Columbia University, in a chapter of his text-book, which is studied in British Universities, has expounded his Western view of the 'Aim of Psychology'.

Any English dictionary will be found to define 'Psychology' as 'that branch of knowledge which deals with the Mind or Soul'. This definition may be considered defective in that many people draw a psychological distinction between the Mind and the Soul. Mind is defined in English dictionaries as the 'Thinking Principle'; a subtle abstraction. Soul is defined as the 'Spiritual Principle in man'; which is yet another subtle abstraction.

Professor Woodworth states that Psychology is the study of the human individual. Individual is defined as the essentially 'One'.

The human individual has existed, and exists, in countless numbers, and cannot be studied as the essentially 'One', for all human individuals exhibit inherent differences.

The Professor also states that during his lifetime the individual remains the same individual in spite of many changes. As a contradiction in terms, and verbal jugglery, this statement takes a lot of beating.

Professor Woodworth states that in defining Psychology as the science of the individual's activities he does not mean that the individual should be studied apart from his environment.

As it is impossible in fact to separate any human individual from his environment this statement seems superfluous. He speaks of 'the cognitive activity of the individual' but would be hard put to suggest from what origin springs that cognitive activity. He states that different individuals respond differently to the same stimulus.

What he does not seem to realize is that material stimuli originate from psychic stimuli.

He postulates 'O' as his symbol for the organism or the individual. Actually, he uses 'O' as his symbol for both the organism and the individual. Individuals are made up of organisms, *inter alia*, and both organisms and individuals vary, so that the professor is up against the Infinity of variety in fact. Professor Woodworth insists that we must know our 'O'. Such a categorical imperative is *prima facie* absurd, in all our circumstances.

He also points out that individuals vary in condition. The more psychic and material

conditions vary, the greater grow the difficulties for such psychologists as himself.

Professor Woodworth enumerates and lays down the following as the General Principles of Psychology :-

1. The individual is a unit. It may truly be said that many a mickle individual makes so much more the muckle trouble for his psychology.

2. The organism is not simply 'one'. Yet we see that the individual, made up of organisms, and the organism alike are both 'O' in Professor Woodworth's formula.

3. The organism participates in environmental processes while still maintaining its individuality. Here he identifies the organism with the individual, and we so often find that a distinction between the individual organism and the individual must, for reason's very sake, be drawn.

4. Participation takes place only by means of stimuli and muscular and glandular responses. These responses we hazard are the result of primal psychic stimuli.

5. The organism becomes set or adjusted for situations or goals. In an infinite variety of ways, yes. All that makes the puzzle more complicated than ever.

6. One individual differs from another. Can he then hope to psychologize countless differing individuals?

7. The same individual displays a variety of activities. Added to his previous difficulties, this fresh variant should indeed render the aim of the Professor's psychology a superhuman task.

8. The individual changes in time, growing, learning, declining. Some grow little, some learn little, while all decline in the end; it is of course a lamentable fact that all 'individuals' change in time. Lamentable, that is, for the study of 'psychology'.

9. The individual has needs, desires and goals. Necessity is the mother of everything, including change.

10. Many individual activities are synthetic. Among these we must include professor Woodworth's '*Aim of Psychology*'?

My many Eastern friends will, I believe, agree with me that their language, be it Sanskrit or Arabic, is better organized and adapted than is the English, or American, language to express psychological concepts. If they are in doubt about this, they might satisfy themselves by perusal of Professor Woodworth's best-seller text-book on Psychology.

T. H. WORGAN

## ENDS AND SAYINGS

In our civilization suicide is on the increase : the majority of suicides occur in lands where the mechanical forces of civilization are focussed in abundance ; again, there are more suicides in towns than in the country. Many are the reasons advanced for this evil, while not a negligible group of logical cerebrators go so far as to justify the act of self-murder. Modern knowledge as popularized certainly aids a logical person to conclude that suicide is justifiable : if man is a fortuitous concrescence of atoms and if his self-consciousness is born of his body ; if his blood is the mother of his emotions and his nerves the father of his thoughts ; if, like the flame of a candle, man gets extinguished when the body dies—then it is logical and right that he should commit suicide when pain and disease assail him ; when heart feelings depress him ; when starvation faces him ; when his mind is full of confusion. False philosophy is at the root of every trouble our civilization is heir to. The ghastly evil of suicide is not understood because the available knowledge of the psychic and occult conditions which surround man is not studied. An important publication on the subject is *Suicide* by Romilly Fedden (Peter Davies, London, 12s. 6d.), and we print here a review of it prepared for us by Miss Winifred Whiteman :—

At first one wonders why the subject should have been chosen. To fill the mind and stimulate the emotions with images of evils and disasters is the best way to reproduce them. There are images enough of self-destruction in the

picture galleries of the Astral Light, that imponderable, invisible medium interpenetrating the earth's atmosphere, which retains the record of earthly thoughts and events, to reflect them back again on unconscious men and women, "suggesting" to them their repetition. The view that suicide is no evil (and the author's sympathies incline towards it) arises from a wrong philosophical basis.

Nevertheless the book provides data of value, when properly sifted and understood, though it would have been more useful for reference had there been an index. It deals with ritualistic, epidemical and personal suicide, and with the variations in the public attitude towards the act, from classical times down to the present day, and concludes with suggested explanatory theories and modern statistics.

It states that, broadly speaking, the incidence of suicide varies with the degree of individual self-consciousness and responsibility among the units of society. In periods when custom and authority dominate, suicide is rare, for men do not have to face life on their own feet, and may even be deprived, by the inertia of this social dependence, of their very birth-right as thinking responsible beings. In transition periods when the old social systems break up, and when individualism forms the key-note of men's faith, suicide increases. Men are overwhelmed by the problem of thinking for themselves. Actually the explanation should be taken further. When the awakening self-consciousness identifies itself with the lower personal nature alone, then it does become despairingly aware of its own insufficiency to deal with life. The sufficing power resides in man's higher, divine nature, which in materialistic ages is ignored or denied, but through which alone he experiences the strength that comes from his spiritual unity with his fellow beings and all nature.

The second theory put forward is

Freud's tentative postulate that the instinct for death is even more basic than the instinct for preservation. All animate things are said thus to strive, not towards some evolutionary progress, but back towards the source from which they came, the complete peace and equilibrium of the inanimate. The author of this book, as said, appears favourably inclined towards the assertion of the right to die at choice. In fact he suggests a similarity between the mystic who attains through the path of "inaction" the timeless oblivion of Nirvana, and the man who ends the activities of bodily existence by seeking refuge in the quiet of death.

Ye gods! If it were only possible to break these distorting mirrors of men's minds that twist truth into error, whose crooked philosophy breeds crooked motives, crooked tragic acts! Small wonder that the old Kabalists said "Demon est Deus inversus"! This book shows well, if unintentionally, how this "philosophical" concept of suicide is the blackened, distorted shadow, at second remove, of the true conception of Nirvana, both states producing extinction of life as commonly understood.

Evil comes from a blind application of the materialistic dead-letter of spiritual truths, inverting the divine into the infernal. Ritualistic suicide and the foul horrors called religious sacrifices, spring from a distortion of "atonement" and other theological doctrines; the gross debauchery of phallic rites is a degraded representation of the fundamental abstract duality of life, while the viewing of suicide as the gate to freedom, which may be opened at wish, is a perversion of the spiritual paradox, "Give up thy life if thou would'st live." The personal consciousness has to be "killed out" if the divine universal consciousness is to become manifest in the human being. In this connection we suspect that in dealing with ancient writers such as Diogenes Laertes, Mr. Romilly Fedden has attributed to bodily suicide what really described the "killing out" of the personal separative consciousness.

Even the goal of the mystic as he con-

ceives it is actually "suicide", soul-suicide, more deadly than the other, for it is quietism, the utter paralysis of the soul. It is not too difficult to recognize when physical suicide is "escapism", however high-sounding the terms that describe it. Yet the "Path of Liberation", the merging of the individual in the "Undifferentiated"—the *Aryaklam* of Sankya philosophy—is spiritual escapism, though too often falsely exalted by the religious as the supreme goal of existence. Some of those who obliterate themselves in the blissful unity of Nirvana, unconcerned about their duty to their fellow units, are called the Buddhas of Selfishness. Yet even they cannot lose themselves for sempiternity. For actually the best argument against spiritual or material suicide is one the author does not appear to have met. *It is impossible to kill oneself*. The destruction of the physical body still leaves the person alive, and if self-centred, far more at the mercy of his chaotic thoughts and intensified desires, that function even more actively without the friction of the physical frame to act as a brake. He may go over and over again the thoughts and events that led up to the point of suicide, while the pent-up force can find no relief in physical action. The violence of the images thus created on the astral plane, reflecting themselves in minds whose resistance is low, explains the contagious, epidemical aspect of suicide, murder and such acts.

Some, at least, of our social problems would be cleared up, if the public mind grasped the fact that suicide or euthanasia does not mean a release from troubles and pains, as death does, *when it comes at its normal, proper time*. Collating the data available will enable those postulates to be checked up and verified. In this way it should be possible to build the accumulative work already done in the present volume into something constructive, by the help of which those who feel the need of it will be able to distinguish between the true and the false "way out".