

# 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

DECEMBER 1938

No. 12

---

### RELIGION IS SOUL-FREEDOM

In this issue we print several articles on the subject of Christianity appropriate to this month of December. The two contributions which immediately follow deal with the religion of Christ and the work of the churches in India, bringing out some important ideas which will interest Christians and Non-Christians alike. Both these articles are written by men who were born in Christian families.

The first is by Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa who belongs to a well-known Indian Christian family. He is a Bachelor of Divinity of the Hartford Theological Seminary of the U. S. A. and was at one time Professor of Philosophy at the Madras Christian College. He is the author of *The Hindu Conception of the Deity*. He writes out of intimate experience of organized Christianity and his article does not deal with the misdemeanours of the churches in India only, but shows how they represent

the anti-Christ everywhere. He refers to the real nature of prayer as inner communion, and condemns the mummery of ritualism and the work of proselytism, pointing out to the verity of inner conversion—the second birth.

The second article is by Jack Common who writes about the failure of Christians—*padres* and laymen alike in India. Is it a coincidence that while an Indian Christian like Bharatan Kumarappa has abandoned the missionaries to serve the down-trodden under the leadership of Gandhiji, an Englishman like Jack Common speaks of "decaying Christianity" and takes hope for its regeneration in the work of the same great "heathen"?

The doom of the churches has been pronounced long ago and a steady decline of organized orthodoxy has been taking place. Freedom of thought has been rising while this decline has been going on. Though political enslavement has occurred

in the totalitarian states, not for very long can the nationalistic dictators continue to occupy their place of power. Popes, and their confreres of other creeds, have exploited human ignorance and credulity about the other world. Since politics deal but with the problems of this world, human reason will revolt against political exploitation in a shorter time than has been possible for minds to free themselves from the religious instinct exploited by the fear of a menacing hereafter.

Be that as it may, men and women in their millions always require some satisfaction for their religious instinct; and those who now have freed, or are freeing, themselves from the thralldom of credal imposition will seek for some guidance for their mental contentment. The religious instinct refuses to be frustrated for very long, and mere denial of soul, spirit and the hereafter proves as unreasonable as the dogmatic assertion of eternal heaven for the believer and eternal hell for the infidel.

The main cause of the failure of organized religions, of which Christianity is but one, is absence of knowledge. Faith without knowledge very soon becomes blind belief. Knowledge of soul-science, without daily practice, recedes and is forgotten. To-day men and women desire to live intelligently and nobly but are lost in the jungle of secular ordinary knowledge, most of which has proven to be unreliable as it is constantly changing. Everywhere knowledge of soul-science is asked for, and it is now generally well recognized that between the prophets'

living message and the priests' dead and deadening words an unbridgeable gulf exists. Further, many people find it most difficult if not impossible to practise, from day to day, the truths of the Sermon on the Mount or the *Dhammapada*, the *Bhagavad-Gita* or *The Voice of the Silence*. The reason for this can be perceived right in our midst here in India, where large numbers of people desire to be real followers of Gandhiji but fail to carry out in life the basic and fundamental principles of his religion of Satyagraha—which are so similar to those advanced in the above-mentioned texts. Practice of truths without some apperception of their cosmic roots and their manifestation in Nature as Laws of Nature is not quite possible. The difference between the Inner God, the Human Conscience, and the Beast of Flesh and Blood must be learnt ere one can distinguish between them and be able to identify the voice which at any given moment is trying to impress his consciousness. Because of fine efforts in previous lives persons like Jesus or Gandhiji can act naturally and without endeavouring to acquire theoretical knowledge of the kind referred to. But ordinary folk, the man in his office or the woman in her home, cannot, however much they might ape or outwardly imitate the mystic.

Then there is the fact that such beings whose efforts of past incarnations bring them the privilege and the responsibility of preaching do their work from a high and pure plane of thought. Thus, for example, the Sermon on the Mount contains teachings which may correctly be

described as summation truths of soul life. To make our point clear let us give the example of the teaching embodied in the twelfth chapter of the *Gita*. There, with a really sweet reasonableness, Shri Krishna gives steps and stages—"If you are not able to do this, then do that ; and even if you are not able to practise that, do the other" ; and so on.

People of the twentieth century need a consistent body of knowledge which the mind can understand and which would lead to right practice and produce that contentment of the heart which accompanies soul-enlightenment. Such a body of knowledge has ever existed and exists in fair fullness to-day for any and all who aspire to the higher life.

## I.—JESUS VERSUS THE CHURCH

If we would focus on the essentially distinctive elements in the religion of Jesus, we should find that they gather round his conception of, and relationship with, the Deity. This is central in his religion. His life of service results logically from it as an outward expression of this inner relationship. He himself summed up the essence of true religion in the words : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength and with all thy mind and thy neighbour as thyself." It is here, then, we may look for the secret of Jesus's own religion.

I.—*Love of God* : Jesus conceived of God primarily as Father. Accordingly his relationship as well as the relationship of any human being to the Deity is one of Love. A King, a Lawgiver, a Judge or the Holy One—as God was primarily thought

of in Judaism—may evoke fear and awe in the mind of a human being who therefore will seek to approach Him through the mediation of a rite, a priest or a church. But a Father requires no such formality. Perfect love casteth out fear. Accordingly at one stroke the human soul is brought into immediate contact with the Deity.

II.—*Love of Man* : If God is Father, men are His children. Accordingly they are brothers and the only attitude possible between them is one of love and mutual helpfulness. And even as a weak or invalid member of a family receives the greatest attention and consideration from the rest of the family, so in ministering to the poor, the lame, the blind, the deaf, and in general the despised and rejected of men, Jesus spends his life. To those who came to him from John the Baptist en-

described as summation truths of soul life. To make our point clear let us give the example of the teaching embodied in the twelfth chapter of the *Gita*. There, with a really sweet reasonableness, Shri Krishna gives steps and stages—"If you are not able to do this, then do that ; and even if you are not able to practise that, do the other" ; and so on.

People of the twentieth century need a consistent body of knowledge which the mind can understand and which would lead to right practice and produce that contentment of the heart which accompanies soul-enlightenment. Such a body of knowledge has ever existed and exists in fair fullness to-day for any and all who aspire to the higher life.

## I.—JESUS VERSUS THE CHURCH

If we would focus on the essentially distinctive elements in the religion of Jesus, we should find that they gather round his conception of, and relationship with, the Deity. This is central in his religion. His life of service results logically from it as an outward expression of this inner relationship. He himself summed up the essence of true religion in the words : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength and with all thy mind and thy neighbour as thyself." It is here, then, we may look for the secret of Jesus's own religion.

I.—*Love of God* : Jesus conceived of God primarily as Father. Accordingly his relationship as well as the relationship of any human being to the Deity is one of Love. A King, a Lawgiver, a Judge or the Holy One—as God was primarily thought

of in Judaism—may evoke fear and awe in the mind of a human being who therefore will seek to approach Him through the mediation of a rite, a priest or a church. But a Father requires no such formality. Perfect love casteth out fear. Accordingly at one stroke the human soul is brought into immediate contact with the Deity.

II.—*Love of Man* : If God is Father, men are His children. Accordingly they are brothers and the only attitude possible between them is one of love and mutual helpfulness. And even as a weak or invalid member of a family receives the greatest attention and consideration from the rest of the family, so in ministering to the poor, the lame, the blind, the deaf, and in general the despised and rejected of men, Jesus spends his life. To those who came to him from John the Baptist en-

quiring for his credentials he said :—

Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard ; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached.

So deep is his concern for the weak and helpless that in regard to any one who causes injury to such he says : “ It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were cast into the sea than that he should offend one of these little ones.”

Supreme love for God and supreme love for man may therefore be regarded as constituting the essence of Jesus's life and teachings. Let us then see if Christianity as it finds expression in the Church of to-day approximates this standard.

I. *Love of God* : We noted that where the relation between the individual and the Deity is, as Jesus taught, the relation between a child and his father, the approach to the Deity is easy and natural. The soul communes direct with its Maker. “ When thou prayest enter into thy closet and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret.” Nothing can be more inward and personal than such prayer. Compare with this the set prayers recited in churches—the same prayers week in and week out, year in and year out, through the centuries. What can one say of the relationship of a child to its parent if whenever it comes to speak to him it recites a set formula ? The words may be beautiful, but how flat and hollow they must seem to the father who wants to hear the natural lisp of the

child as it gives expression to its own little joys and fears. Set prayers are, by contrast, soulless and are as Jesus scathingly described them, “ vain repetition”. They are unimaginably worse when they are in a dead language which the worshipper does not understand. Fancy an Indian child having to communicate its desires to its father in Latin which it does not know ! Can anything be more absurd ? Can the intimate relationship described by Jesus as love between the individual and the Deity spring up and continue under such a condition ?

Nor did Jesus require a set place for prayer. He himself retired to solitary places to pray, thus reflecting the deeply personal character of prayer as he understood and practised it. To fix a temple or a church as the house of prayer needlessly prevents prayer from being a natural communion with the Deity just when and where the individual feels like it. So Jesus says :—

Ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father... the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

This naturally means that Jesus had no exclusive ideas of worship. Any one may worship the Father in any place, provided he worships Him in all sincerity. The only thing that matters is communion of the soul with the Deity—time, place, form and language being of no consequence. Consequently Jesus made no attempt to convert a person from one religion to another. He regarded himself as having come merely to work amongst his own people, the Jews. Consistently with this, his com-

mission to his disciples was : " Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." If the emphasis is on love of God and love of man, there is no need of conversion, as each person can through the medium of his own religion seek to exercise that love, if necessary with suitable modifications in the tenets of his religion. Why cannot Hindus as Hindus practise love of God and of Man ? Even if Hinduism did not teach love of God or of man—a preposterous hypothesis in itself—what is to prevent it from doing so now ? Is it not likely that true love of God and of man is more apt to be practised by people if it is made a part of their own religion, than if they are required to change their religion ? The fact that the Church, on the other hand, insists on proselytism or a change of faith means that for it the details of creed are all-important. Accordingly the various denominations into which the Christian Church has split have vied with each other to propagate each its own particular shade of belief. Conformity to doctrine—a matter which does not appear to have troubled Jesus at all—determines membership in a church rather than love of God and man, which has paled into insignificance.

On the other hand, the only conversion Jesus preached and practised was a conversion from indifference to God and man to complete devotion to them, and such a conversion is necessary in every religion including Christianity. It is in this that the universality of the message of Jesus

consists and not in sameness of doctrine as the Church has unfortunately thought. This being so, the religion of Jesus is truly catholic in the sense that it embraces all religions, and his followers will be found in all religions. How much grander and vaster is this as compared with the cramped view of orthodoxy which would confine Jesus's followers to the four walls of the Church ? The provincialism of the Church in this respect is identical with the narrow intolerance of Judaism, concerning which Jesus said :—

I say unto you that many will come from the East and from the West and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven and the children of the kingdom shall be cast out.

In a relationship of child to father, which is the analogy in terms of which Jesus liked to think of the relationship in which the individual stands to the Deity, there is no essential need for rites and ceremonies. So far as Jesus goes he does not condemn them as they make communion with the Deity easier for some. He condemns traditional observances only when they are given undue importance and elevated into ends in themselves as though they are to be observed at all costs even if they do not fulfil the purpose of serving human need. " The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath ", is the principle he lays down in this connection and it is in the light of this attitude of Jesus that his followers must view all rites and ceremonies, institutions, and religious organizations. They are there only as aids whether they be baptism,

holy communion or even the Church itself. What does it matter whether in baptism water is sprinkled on an individual or whether the individual is immersed in it bodily? This is to quarrel over a mere symbol and yet the Church has split into sects even over such triviality. To Jesus, who penetrated behind the symbol, it is the change in heart symbolised by baptism that matters, whether accompanied by the rite or not; and even as a symbol can exist without the reality, baptism may take place without the change of heart having occurred at all. Consequently baptism by itself indicates nothing. Similarly in regard to other rituals practised by the Church, Jesus's position is quite clear. All of them are valuable as means. The one standard is whether they serve the supreme purpose of producing devotion to God and man. If instead of this they cause hatred, strife, exclusiveness and division among men, as a glance at the history of the Church amply testifies, then it is better that they be done away with. Jesus is not amongst those who hesitate to use the surgeon's knife when anything comes into conflict with human welfare :-

If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

His condemnation of the Scribes and Pharisees is precisely that they observe merely the external form of the rite without entering into its spirit.

Ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin and have omitted the

weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy and faith. . . Ye blind guides which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

Can we be sure that the Church with its emphasis on set prayers and creeds, on its priestcraft, rites and ceremonies, does not come under this very severe condemnation of Jesus? If we are to answer this question we must see whether the religion of the Church fulfils the second requirement laid down by Jesus.

II. *Love of Man*: We have found that when through the right kind of worship the individual has come into a relationship of love with the Deity as between a child and its father, this love as seen in Jesus's own life and teaching inevitably expresses itself in service of the weak and helpless. The test of true worship is therefore service :

By their fruits ye shall know them.

Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

For I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me; I was in prison and ye came unto me.

Such service of those in need must characterise all who profess to be his followers, and not mere saying one's prayers, being baptised, partaking of holy communion or being a member of the Church.

Do we find the Church capable of meeting this test? Is the Church waging war for the rights of the oppressed or is it engaged in exploiting the ignorance and helplessness of the oppressed in order to make them fight in the interests of the rich and the powerful? During the last war,

Christian pulpits were turned into recruiting platforms and the Church actively helped in the work of butchering innocent young lives. To Jesus the worth of a single soul is greater than the gaining of the whole world, and yet the Church induced thousands to sacrifice their lives merely for a few millionaires obtaining or maintaining territory for purposes of commercial exploitation. Jesus said "Love your enemies." Bishops and others preached: "Die killing your enemies and you will go straight to Heaven." This is how the Church (barring one or two noble exceptions) allied itself with power and wealth and did not scruple to nail Jesus, the Prince of Peace, to the cross.

Nearer home, what part did the Church play in India when a non-Christian people struggling to be free used the method of Jesus, the method of non-violence, against a Christian power which kept them in bondage? To say the least, it kept severely aloof on the plea that the Church was a non-political organization and missionaries were pledged not to interfere in politics. But can the Church honestly restrict its adherence to the teachings of Jesus to a conveniently limited sphere and say, "Thus far and no farther"? Is it not too much like following Jesus only so long as doing so does not come into conflict with imperialism? If so, the ultimate authority the Church recognises is not Jesus but imperialistic power, not God but mammon and, as Jesus pointed out, one cannot serve both.

Even if the Church in India took

the position that though it sympathised with the desire of the nation to be free, still it could not support unconstitutional methods, what is one to say of the grim silence which it preserved over violent repression of a non-violent people? It does not require a Christian to say that violence perpetrated on one who refuses to resort to violence is sheer brutality. Common humanity will cry out against such barbarism, and yet the Church as an organized body did not raise a finger in protest. Jesus might have been amongst those who bared their heads to receive the blows from the police, while the Church merely looked on and passed by on the other side. Instead of the Church teaching non-Christians the method of non-violence, the non-Christians proved themselves by far the truer followers of Jesus.

Or consider religious leadership. Jesus as a religious leader identified himself with the poor and had not where to lay his head. When he sent out his disciples, his instruction was: "Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purse, neither scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes nor yet staves, for the workman is worthy of his meat." This is quite ordinarily practised by the religious men of our country and it is entirely in line with our religious traditions. Christian missionaries, on the other hand, have adopted other standards on the ground of efficiency. They must have bungalows, wardrobes, electric fans and motor cars. Would not Jesus have had a readier following in India had it not been for the utterly false standards thus set up? Jesus who wan-



dered from house to house and ate what was given him can be immediately understood by our people but not a Christian missionary on tour in a car with servants and baskets of provisions and camping at comfortable rest-houses built for Government officers. The missionary is too much like the high and mighty bureaucrat to speak to the people of the loving Galilean who identified himself with the poor and the down-trodden.

Or take the question of race. Has the Church which professes allegiance to one who regarded all men as children of the one Father contributed anything to overcoming friction between races? On the other hand, in America and South Africa and to a lesser extent in the East, has not race crept into the Church itself, so that separate churches are built for the "blacks" lest they should otherwise presume to kneel alongside of the "whites" in worship of the Father? Jesus said: "Him that cometh to me I shall in no wise cast out." The Church, on the other hand, which shuts its doors against non-whites proclaims itself in that very fact not to be a Church of Jesus at all.

Jesus took on himself the poverty of the people. In India one of the chief ways in which to identify oneself with the poor and at the same time to relieve their poverty is to provide them with employment by using articles produced by them. Leadership in this regard should have come from the Church if it troubled itself with the problems of the poor as Jesus did. Even, failing this, when non-Christians have

showed the way, has the Church fallen in line? No, Indian Christians and missionaries must have fineries from the West, even if thereby they make the poor in this country poorer. Khadi—cloth hand-woven and hand-spun by the poorest in the land—is conspicuous by its absence in Church congregations and amongst the clergy. Jesus came to seek and to save that which was lost. The Church on the other hand appears in this regard to be unmindful of the lost and to be interested merely in saving its own soul. Non-Christians in India have shown a greater capacity for putting into practice the teachings of Jesus in this respect than Christians; and who can say that if the Western Church had not set foot on India and India had merely read the gospels with their portrayal of the life and teachings of Jesus, Jesus would not have had a much wider and deeper sway in India than at present?

India knows of devotion to God such as is rare in the history of the Church and of unstinting love and service not only of man but of all living beings emanated by God. To it therefore the religion of Jesus comes as a natural consummation, its very crown. Not so, however, the Church with its prayers, its creed, its priestcraft, its ceremonies and worse still, its alliance with imperialism, wealth and power. Till it leaves these and follows Jesus it can have but little influence in this land. "He that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me."

BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

## II.—CHRIST IN INDIA

The evolution of religions is a curious study. For a religion is a sort of vital breath which at first sweetens and purifies the life of a whole community, then runs stale and sickly to end perhaps in the arteriosclerosis of moribund churches and temples overlarge and empty. Often this rhythm will be reproduced many times before some especially drastic restatement causes us to say that a new cycle has begun and to forget the old. It is easy to trace these motions of the human spirit in the remains they leave. We learn of the existence of ancient animals by their shells and fossils, and of the old gods by the half-fallen stones of their houses. And this breeds a habit in us of counting in stones instead of watching for the genuine life-motion. Thus we think the old Mayan religion is dead in Central America because its temples are fallen; we call the huge lands of Brazil and the Argentine, Roman Catholic because mass is celebrated there; and the American Negro, of course, is a Christian because he makes curious hymns about the Old Testament heroes.

This classification will do for history-writing, perhaps, since in that sphere it is hard to have any better. But for the study of the present it is almost useless. A people may be in a high state of religious ferment, at that early vital disorder when the new stir is beginning, and yet build no churches. By our methods, we should not know of it. What for

instance, is the present religious condition of China, of India, of Russia? China has its New Life Movement, but how deep does it go? We cannot guess what Russia's phase of atheistic denial really hides. As for India, that huge population is officially Hindu and Moslem, governed by a minority of Christians. Officially.

When the British came to India, Christianity was instantly faced with an enormous challenge. A small Christian nation was destined to control this huge continent of ancient civilisations. There had never been anything quite like that in Western history before. True, Catholicism had a huge enough task when it took on the transformation of the Americas, but still not as great as this which Protestantism in its maturity was met with. No people can take root in a country unless their religion is rooted there. So the first step of the newcomers should have been to establish missionaries and proclaim the goodness of their essential faith.

The missionary is in some ways one of the most mysterious of the human types. When most typical and in purity he is the man blinded to all save his inward revelation, a custodian of impalpables travelling a non-terrestrial cargo to remote places, the opener of ghostly gates. But to be right, he must be lonely, with no visible means of support. This was what the Gregorian missionaries were, the Buddhist, and those

of the early Keltic church. He should be the wandering star from another cosmos sustained by its fire and ready to communicate to all who will take the touch. He comes to be ill-treated as an alien, or nourished as a guest, but never in the guise of the man of earthly power. That defeats his message.

Now the curse of all religions is that they tend to develop organisations of temporal power, churches, which because they have temporal power, become allied in its defence with the State. Thus in the Catholic conquest of South and Central America the Jesuits often succeeded in giving their message in the true creative way and rather fine communities sprang up where they came. But elsewhere the missionary betrayed his charges to the Church and the Church betrayed them to the State. Protestantism, too, has had its true messengers. Yet in the late nineteenth century and now it could degenerate in its missionary enterprises to a disgraceful scramble for power and rivalry such as is its story among the people of Polynesia. The germ of the decay is always there.

In India it was manifest from the start. Something about India seems to have daunted Western enterprise. It tried to handle this great land through the East India Company, that is, privately, without becoming really responsible for the place or its people. Exploitation at the hands of private traders, that was how the problem was to be solved. Missionaries, of course, but the missionary would be firstly the representative of the Church which sent him out, and

secondly the ally of the traders to whose guns he must look for protection. Who was to protect this kind of missionary and his message from the traders? Had he been genuine of his sort, the Indians themselves would have protected him, as they have protected countless holy men of other creeds throughout the ages. That is the only protection the real man of revelation needs, or can honestly take, this of the people who have listened to his news of another God, and are sufficiently struck by it to want him to keep on repeating it.

These servants of the Churches did not have such a thing, and did not deserve it. If they saw that the traders were behaving in a way that could not be called Christian, their remonstrance was practically limited to writing home to their leaders. And that was ineffective, for what had they achieved in India? Where was the new Indian Christianity that should have resulted from their efforts? It did not exist. Probably the evil was done in these early days, or at any rate a harmful tradition established by the time the Crown became responsible for its Eastern Empire.

This is a thing always to remember: practically the British in India have been without spiritual guidance. They live there after the manner of an army of occupation, carrying on the business of day-to-day government, and keeping a certain order. There appears among them sometimes a little crude idealism, but never the real creative gesture of co-operation which would transform them into bearers of a culture. Now

such men can do no more than that, without help. And other types will not choose a field so limited to work in. Therefore British India tends to be recruited monotonously from the same kind of people, those of the Anglican squirearchy at home, the sort who actually enjoy living to themselves at some little eminence from their fellows of the streets, and are too stupid to mind the sterility that entails. Never mind whether they go out under the orders of some Church, as soldiers, or for trade; there is a similarity about them. That cannot be helped: it lies in the nature of the job they do, which is narrow, stifling and uninspired.

The work of ruling men is always a soul-deadening one unless it is enlightened by some high aim. The man who is seeking a new way of emphasising the fact of human brotherhood may do the dullest work and be ennobled in it. But not all men are able to find that truth for themselves. They need the help of religious visionaries. Imperial Britain has never had that help from its own missionaries, and therefore its rule of India is a mere stopgap, a bridging of an evolutionary pause. At the end of many years of it there is still no Indo-Anglican community nourished from the actual soil.

The effect of this queer rule upon the Indian people was originally quite negative. The people of many civilisations found themselves at last having a curious kind of membership of one that apparently had no use for them. The British Commonwealth of Nations is unable to use Indian talents. It is content to see India as an appendage of the Empire,

to leave it to be run by "Colonial" methods, that is, in a rough and ready way which forbids partnership. England itself could never have become anything had it had no more than that to inspire it. The whole force of England derives from the waves of Christian feeling which established a liberalism and a free citizenry at a time when other nations were still struggling with feudal repressions. Thus, which was the essence of things at home, we did not seriously try to export to India. Yet India perhaps, is the ideal climate for the kind of spiritual commonwealth which the old Puritans hoped to make out of their understanding of the word of Christ. At home, the fine ambition got mixed up with a good deal of unsavoury mercantilism. In India, we might have escaped that. Had we sent out real missionaries, untainted by the ties of Church and unholy alliances, then the teaching of Christ, coming into lucky conjunction with the fine spiritual aptitude of a great people, would have blossomed creatively and given to the world a new pattern of social behaviour.

The chance was missed. So for a long time intelligent Indians were bewildered and unable to find any way of co-operating with the administrators Britain sent to them. It was a condition of sterility on all sides. But in the end such chances never really slip away. The British failure was a failure to follow the injunctions of their own religion. But religions, though they have particular names and seem to belong to certain peoples and organisations, are living experiences which may come to any

men. The Law of Jesus is a universal which is applicable to situations very remote in time or place. When the British came to India they made a situation which could only be solved by direct reference to the Christian teaching. The British lagged and marked time, forgot their own creed while manufacturing governmental makeshifts. So it has been left to India to make the creative effort which would break the awful sterile pause.

With the appearance of Mr. Gandhi and his movement, one could say for the first time that Christianity began to exist in this great land. Not the Christianity of the churches, perhaps, but the true gesture, so fine its patient yielding unyielding, that was characteristic of the early Christians and of their several incarnations as Hussites, Huguenots, Quakers and the like. This movement proposes no rivalry, does not challenge authority, yet it makes many rivalries unnecessary and dissolves foolish authority out of the fear that initially took away its wits. The same quiet strength, you see, that once survived Rome and grew out of the feudal shell into many flowerings of free communities. This, and not the name or the exercise, always dis-

tinguishes the right application of the Jesus-wisdom. One can therefore prophesy victory for it. Not yet, on no certain to-morrow. That doesn't matter so long as the thing is started.

What is of chief importance is that the old law should be renewed somewhere in the world. For in the West Christianity is decaying, held too fast in dying churches that have long forgotten the simplicity and imperativeness of the creed they hold in closed fists. Europe does not know how to co-operate any longer; it divides into armouring imperialisms or would-be imperialisms, none of which show any signs of knowing how to govern their enemies should they be successful in war. It has lost the secret of brotherhood, the immortal gesture by which man proclaims his unity with man. It lost it first in colonial adventures, in the Congo, in Mexico, in India. And now everywhere.

But, of course, the loss cannot be permanent. We'll have to learn to unite again, to make the peace on earth of the comers to the Kingdom. For Britain that lesson may well be learnt where she has never been able to teach it, in India, at the feet of Mr. Gandhi.

JACK COMMON

# CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

[Below we print two articles, the first of which shows that religion of service in the streets is superior to that of prayers in the churches ; the second brings out the necessity of true knowledge in the performance of good works.—Eds.]

## I.—FOUND : SERMONS IN SERVICE

[May Perry narrates the true story of one who has been both a Protestant and a Roman Catholic and tells how she came to stop looking for God in a stained glass window and began looking for Him in the street. Her article answers the question, "Do church representatives represent?"—Eds.]

To the Occidental, the obvious place to satisfy one's hunger for food appears to be a public eating-house or a private home. So did the Christian Church appear to be the obvious place to satisfy my hunger "after righteousness".

I went to the Protestant Orthodox church and to the Roman Catholic ; became, at different times, a member of both, yet to-day I am a church member without a church.

Born of deeply religious parents I was practically raised in the Methodist Church until a few years prior to my marriage. When the one and only man in my studious and dreamful, though withal laborious life, proved to be of Catholic upbringing, the fact seemed of no importance to me. My having been raised a Protestant was a matter of equal indifference to him. Perhaps because at that time neither of us had been inside of any church for a few years. Then, too, never having known religious prejudice in a personal sense, we had none to overcome.

After marriage however, when we stopped thinking wholly in the present tense and began to think seriously in terms of home ownership,

the ballot box, the probability of our becoming parents, etc., in other words when we began to come to ourselves, we began to come to "God", or rather to the concept our theological training had given us of God.

Growing daily more wholeheartedly in love with each other we decided that what we wanted more than either of us had ever wanted anything before, was to *make* the beautiful thing that was our marriage, last. "To make it outlive—life!" was how we expressed it. This would mean careful building!

Mutual interests and ideals, and the concentrated power of our combined will, would accomplish wonders. But building roofs without foundations would not prove lasting enough. So we sought the spiritual counsel, the mental stimulus and the physical help of the world's most noted Carpenter. As children we had made His acquaintance within the walls of a Church. So it was there that we sought Him now, convinced that a personal church home was a necessary brick in building the lasting kind of foundation we wanted for our marriage.

The creed did not matter. What we wanted was to let "God" control our present so that we could be better able to control our future. The constant consciousness we sought of a personal "God", an intimate family friend, plus the personal right to a Sanctuary where we could retreat, tired of spirit, unsure of mind, and come forth stabilized—might come through any denomination.

We tried several. But to my husband, every sermon we heard, whatever the church, was just another "lecture". He enjoyed them all, but as—lectures!

"It is in the Roman Catholic Church that one feels God really close", he said after a few weeks. That was all, but how could I, being equally sincere in my altruistic quest for a church home, fail to hear—and hearing, heed?

The next Sunday we attended our first Mass together.

"If there is such a thing as only one true church, then the Catholic Church is that one", he commented when we stood once more on the pavement and looked back. "To me, the best of the rest can't ever be more than a kind of meeting-house where good people gather to hear worthwhile talks and sing nice songs. Although I didn't realize I felt this way until this morning", he added, plainly puzzled at the tardiness of his decision.

If I was a little stunned at this unforeseen turn of events I did not show it, and less than two weeks from that Sunday something happened, which, by putting the immediate decision of a church home abruptly

and solely into my hands, actually took it out of them, or so it appeared at the time. A physical condition from which I had suffered over a long period, suddenly became acute. I was ordered to the hospital and told frankly that due to a heart ailment my chances for recovery were slight.

If, in leaving this earth, I had to leave for a time the man who had become Life itself to me, then I naturally wanted to leave him in the church that brought "God" closest to him. Would not such an arrangement better insure our reunion in the next world? And there had to be a reunion. There *had* to be!

But would he *stay* in the church? He had not done so before. There was one way I could be sure. If it was *my* church *too*.

So, in recognition of the Oneness we professed, I voluntarily made the suggestion that we contact a Priest in regard to my becoming a Roman Catholic. The Priest talked with me for several hours. He was one of those rare Christian souls who believe that in many instances the spirit of the rule is more important than the letter. Because it was necessary that I leave for the hospital at once, and because of the grave doubts expressed by the doctors, this good Priest accepted me into the Catholic Church minus the customary procedure of "Instructions".

I was asked, comparatively recently, if it would be possible for me to write an essay on what the Blessed Sacrament meant to me before and after my "conversion" to the Catholic Faith. Whether it had any distinct influence on my conversion.

Yes, I could write on what the Blessed Sacrament means to me but I could never hope to have it accepted by a Catholic periodical for publication. Reason: it would not be considered adequate.

Receiving the Blessed Sacrament means to me a glorious consciousness of *everlasting* Oneness between "God" (or Life), my husband and myself. Of all the high moments that make life great, none for me is so beautifully complete as that moment when we kneel at the communion rail together. Perhaps because I know that we are *sharing* an experience that means much to him. To kneel there alone ought to mean equally as much to me. *Only it doesn't.*

Then how can I, who, up until a few months ago, was a frequent partaker of Holy Communion, be said to be without a church home?

Because in the Faith of my adoption a church home is not a matter of personal choice, but a matter of where one happens to reside. The fact that both my husband and myself are antagonized by a Priest who not only pauses in his sermons publicly to reprimand late-comers, but has ushers stand in the doorway to collect ten cents in advance for seats (as though it were a cinema we were attending) makes no difference. We are supposed to attend our own parish church, regardless.

Actually, we have regularly attended Mass in almost every parish but our own. But that is because, while we have been Catholic enough to recognize the sanctity of the Roman Church, we have also been individual enough to recognize the sanctity of

personality.

One Sunday from the pulpit of an outside parish church a public request was made for volunteer workers on a proposed new schoolhouse. As a result, my husband contributed over a hundred dollars worth of hard labour. Yet later, in a chance encounter with the Pastor, we were informed that in case of the sudden illness or the expected death of either of us it would do us no good to call other than our own parish priest to administer Extreme Unction.

He told us frankly that he would not be permitted by his bishop to respond to our need, we having a parish priest of our own to call. Yet the fact of that not being our parish had not kept my husband from responding generously to its need! Nor had it kept the Priest from accepting outside help!

However, it was not this incident that sent me back to the Protestant Church as an occasional Sunday evening visitor. It was the first anniversary of my mother's death. I longed to feel closer to her. So, with the man who will always be able to enjoy "a good lecture", and whose pleasure has remained my pleasure, even as mine will always remain his, we again attended the Methodist Church.

This one, big, prominent, rich, with its brilliant Expounder of the social gospel, its famous choir, its Kappa Beta Society and its repeated mention of the word "Culture" was little like the small Methodist Church of my childhood. Yet I felt strangely at home there, until at the close of the service when the minister said, "If there are any here who



would care to unite with the  
 and on . . . ."

It was then I realized that I was indeed a church member without a church.

The next afternoon, still feeling rather lost, I sought the quiet stillness of the church of my adoption. Its Beauty warmed my heart. Its Endurableness assured my mind. Its Sacredness led my soul.

Then suddenly I realized that it only did these things for me when empty of its representatives. Which raised the question: Do the representatives of either the Protestant or the Catholic Faith, really represent?

Communicants who distract with loud-voiced prayers and clicking beads, who make the sign of the cross as though brushing away flies; then, Mass being over, push rudely out to buy a Sunday paper before the screaming newsboy on the church-steps is sold out--do they represent?

Women who cheat at public card-parties on Thursdays in the parish where they attend Mass on Sundays--men who blaspheme on weekdays with the same lips they use later to chant prayers.

Priests in the Confessional who ignore the penitent's mention of such sins as Lying, Deceiving, etc., but dignify with quick recognition the breaking of any church rule: Missing Mass, Failure to observe Holy Days, Eating meat on Fridays, Going to a "Fortune Teller".

Protestant Preachers whose gifted tongues drip acid against creeds not their own.

"Saved" revival addicts, who, suddenly falling upon their knees expose their souls more publicly than

their despised "weaker" sisters expose their bodies.

Business men who join a Christian church as they might a iraternity, for the "connections" they hope to make.

*Do these representatives represent?*

Yesterday the question seemed of vital importance. I felt I had to comprehend. To-day it is enough that I apprehend.

Had my impassioned quest for Truth kept me on the confusedly sign-posted road of yesterday, I would not be endeavouring now, as I humbly am, to stand at "tip-toe height" with those whom THE ARYAN PATH refers to as having "freed themselves from the shackles of orthodoxy and dogmatism".

To-day I realize that the basic premise which Aristotle laid down, that all governments tend to perish from excess of their basic principle, applies to theologians as well as to governments.

I had a hunger for "God". Orthodoxy and Dogmatism, through "revealed" scripture, gave me in abundance all they had to give. But before I perished from the excess of that giving I finally ceased looking for "God" in the printed page, the stained glass window, or in the obedient servant.

I began looking for Him here in this very life. In ME, and in every opportunity that comes to me for unselfish SERVICE.

I ceased trying to grasp intellectually that which can only be sensed spiritually.

My outward sight is still much dimmed by matter, but this much has the awakening of the inward

vision shown to me : That "God"-Membership is not dependent upon Church-Membership. And that the churches do not have a monopoly of Truth.

HERE is where God is. And "Here" is bounded neither by the covers of a book nor by the walls of a church.

MAY PERRY

## II.—THE SOCIAL APPLICATION OF WISDOM

[F. H. Hill calls the following "a note" but the reader will find it suggestive of more than one basic principle necessary as guides to personal living and social service.—Eds.]

Our era in the West is remarkable in that whole continents are living in entire independence of any commonly accepted body of spiritual values. The Holy See continues to influence politics, but the Christian Churches have lost finally their influence over the conduct of men. The primary concern of religion, the emancipation of the individual from evil, is submerged in political manoeuvring. The Church of England has candidly epitomized her failure in the Report on Doctrine. There is much speculation but no longer any pretence of spiritual guidance.

To people in such conditions the most profound wisdom ceases to convey any living significance ; particularly while they retain comfort and security sufficient for temporal happiness. Ancient teaching seems a merely academic preservation of aphorisms irrelevant to contemporary ambitions.

The "ancient teaching", that interpretation of life preached by the great Teachers of mankind, before its invariable modification by the theologians of all ages, can be traced from the early Egyptian priesthood to the ministry of Jesus, though after the

Council of Constantinople its exposition became dangerous.

The life of man was revealed as a stage on his journey towards a spiritual goal. Spirit grows by experience, through the universal law of cause and effect, of exact adjustment and retribution. The goal is union with the Supreme, as the source of life and of consciousness. Thus arose the symbolism of the "Mysteries", whose aim was to increase man's realization of the purpose of life. In history we may study the results that have followed the degeneration of a living symbolism into empty ritual and baseless dogma.

The process of mental obscuration in relation to man's destiny reached its climax in the prosperous half of the nineteenth century. Every new mechanical invention was hailed as a promise of eternal bliss. Materialism, for one mad moment, had become completely satisfying, because men felt that the Kingdom was about to be constituted on earth.

But in times of stress and uncertainty, of tottering faith in social progress, numbers turn to the ancient teaching, to discover again its secret and its power. Since the war, though nations still trust in diplomacy to

save the world from a repetition of horrors, individuals have felt a growing need of a philosophy offering a solution of their problems on a higher plane of being; the need for a permanent background against which passing events cast but unsubstantial shadows. These have seen that in non-attachment to the immediate circumstances lies man's hope of peace. Those alone, I think, will be saved from despair in the coming days, who are able to appreciate the relevancy of the ancient teaching to the problems involved in the disintegration of our civilisation.

But they delude themselves who look for swift and widespread enlightenment. Proper recognition of self-seeking desire as the cause of all sorrow cannot be expected of a society believing permanent material prosperity to be always "just round the corner". The difficulty is not so much to win agreement to the proposition that the root cause of strife and suffering is desire to obtain, or fear of being deprived of power based upon material wealth, as to persuade a people bred in the tradition of social success that to surrender their ambitions is not tantamount to forsaking life itself. Many, no doubt, will acquiesce, but without appreciating the magnitude of the issues presented. "There is", said Lao-Tse, "no calamity greater than the wish to acquire".

Inattention to fundamental causes has given rise to pseudo-religious movements and universal panaceas, including the fashionable political creeds whose remedy consists in changing the organization of society. The great religious teachers of man-

kind have never taught the perfectibility of society as such, but that the only real progress is the evolution of the individual soul. Implicit in the teaching of Buddha, of Jesus, of Lao-Tse and of Krishna is rejection of the social character of evil. The primary social problem is not that some men live by privileges not available to all, but that nearly all men *want* to do so—a desire that cannot be legislated out of existence. Aldous Huxley says: "Large scale manipulations of the social structure do not abolish evil; they merely deflect it into other channels."

A community's foremost requirement is not redistribution of possessions, with more and more emphasis on their desirability, but a heightened consciousness of the worthlessness of material wealth and power as ends in themselves. The modern reform movements fail to perceive, as Keyserling has said, that we do not by making good institutions make good men, but that good men alone make good institutions.

The great movement for social reform in the last century was not lacking in good-will, in "right feeling". But it denied the possibility of "right knowledge". To the reformers the relativities of history were of supreme moment, their attachment to the immediate consistently unashamed. Into philosophy they introduced a dreary pragmatism, and into history the brutal secular religions of to-day, Fascism, Nazism, Sovietism.

Inevitably this shifting of emphasis from the Spiritual to the material, has resulted in a great increase of mental stress and anxiety. We are

warned that unless we achieve this or that in the political or the international sphere all that we value most in our civilisation will be obliterated; or that humanity will "perish". We are warned that a world war will sweep away all the achievements of mankind.

But the innermost being of every man is subject only to his own determination. Nothing that a man has truly "built into spirit" can ever be taken from him, though karma may temporarily prevent its manifesta-

tion. Our civilization, as such, is passing into outer darkness, but the spiritual growth of any given individual will not necessarily be hindered in the process. There is increasing inner tension, but tension is the necessary prelude to advancement. Without suffering and difficulty evolution is inconceivable. Therefore let us take the next step into the future, not indifferent to the problems of earth, but without undue perturbation concerning the future of nations.

F. H. HILL

---

He who would be an occultist must not separate either himself or anything else from the rest of creation or *non-creation*. For, the moment he distinguishes himself from even a vessel of dishonour, he will not be able to join himself to any vessel of honour. He must think of himself as an infinitesimal something, not even as an individual atom, but as a part of the world-atoms as a whole, or become an illusion, a nobody, and vanish like a breath leaving no trace behind. As illusions, we are separate distinct bodies, living in masks furnished by Maya. Can we claim one single atom in our body as distinctly our own? Everything, from spirit to the tiniest particle, is part of the whole, at best a link. Break a single link and all passes into annihilation; but this is impossible.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in 1889

## THE STAR OF BETHLEHEM

[Keith Percy recognizes the legendary character of the Star of Bethlehem and he points to a profound truth when he suggests that "behind all these old-world legends there lie intimations of the Gnosis". As Madame Blavatsky wrote: "No mythological story, no traditional event in the folk-lore of a people has ever been, at any time, pure fiction". It is vain, however, to seek a basis for this legend in the disposition of the heavenly bodies just prior to the beginning of the so-called Christian era. History is silent as to the very existence of Jesus, while the records of the ancient East which preserve the account of his mission tell a strange story. The story of the "star in the east", like many of the events narrated of the Christian Saviour, is akin to those related of other Saviours, as Mr. Percy brings out. Convincing evidence is brought together in Madame Blavatsky's books and articles of the great extent to which the Gospel setting of the teachings of Jesus, as well as the forms of the later Christian Church, is indebted to the older religions of the pagan world.—Eds.]

On the 6th of January of each year the Church celebrates the feast of the Epiphany to commemorate the visit of the Wise Men to the cradle of the infant Saviour at Bethlehem.

The Gospel story, related only by St. Matthew, does not record the number of the Wise Men, but an old legend states that there were three: Melchior, King of Nubia; Balthasar, King of Chaldæa; and Gaspar, King of Tarshish. The bodies of these three royal pilgrims are alleged to be interred in the cathedral of Cologne.

Of course there is no foundation whatsoever for the supposed kingship of the Wise Men, and the legend of their royalty is probably the outcome of an attempt by the early Church to find a literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah, who spoke of a time when remote peoples and kings would gather at Jerusalem to worship and to offer gifts of incense and gold.

Possibly, too, the story may have been suggested by the visit of Tiridates, the King of Parthia, to the Emperor Nero in A.D. 66. This Oriental potentate was accompanied by

three Magi laden with gifts for the Emperor, whom they flattered by worshipping him as an incarnation of the Sun-God, Mithras. Nero was the Anti-Christ of the early Christians, and if he could receive the homage of these Magi, surely the Christ Himself, when He was visited by the Wise Men, received the adoration of at least an equal number of worshippers, each equal in magnificence to, if not exceeding, the ostentation of the King of Parthia!

As a further embellishment it used to be related that there were four Wise Men, but that one of these had forfeited his life on the journey in the performance of an act of kindness. Although he did not reach his destination, the story runs, he was rewarded with a vision of the Christ Child while he was dying.

If they were not legendary characters, who were these Wise Men, or Magi, to give them their correct designation? What induced them, although they were pagans, to make a pilgrimage to the little town of Bethlehem and offer to the young Child those mystic gifts of gold, frankin-

cense, and myrrh? What was the Star they had seen in the east, and which guided their footsteps till it stood over the house, or perhaps the cave, wherein the Child lay?

History tells us that the Magi were a priestly caste of the ancient Medes and Persians. They were credited with the possession of supernatural powers, and were said to have secret knowledge, whereby they were able to perform signs and wonders. Their reputation in antiquity was so great that the sect has provided us with the origin of the word "magic". They were sun-worshippers and astrologers, and practised the art of oneiromancy, or divination by dreams.

St. Matthew, or whoever it was who wrote the Gospel attributed to him, shows his acquaintance with Magian beliefs and ideas when he speaks of the Wise Men being "warned in a dream", and his use of the phrase "his Star" is peculiarly Magian, as these people believed that every good man has a *fravashi* or stellar counterpart, which shares in his spiritual development during life, and is ultimately united to him at death. Hence the appearance of any new star would be taken as a sign of the birth of some remarkable personage.

The astronomer Kepler, who was unacquainted with the religion of ancient Persia, but who believed in astrology, thought that the Star of Bethlehem was a close conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation of Pisces, which "rules" Judæa. He discovered that such a conjunction had occurred no fewer than three times in the same constellation in the year B.C. 7, shortly before the birth of Christ in B.C. 4, the

date accepted by scholars. A repetition of a conjunction often happens in this way owing to the retrograde movement of the planets.

More careful calculations than Kepler's have shown that the conjunctions were by no means so close as to present the appearance of a single star as Kepler imagined. They must have appeared to be separated by a distance of at least two or three times the diameter of the moon. In this connection it is amusing to read that Dr. Ideler, who corrected Kepler's researches, and who ascertained that the conjunctions were not close, supposed that the Magi may have been old men and have had weak sight so that to their hazy vision the conjoined planets appeared as a single luminary!

As the Magi were astrologers they would undoubtedly attach importance to the repeated conjunction in Pisces, particularly as Jupiter and Saturn were subsequently joined by Mars; but in no case could they have possibly alluded to the phenomenon as a "Star". Moreover the astronomical investigations of Professor Pritchard have shown that there was an even closer conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in B.C. 65, and if the Magi had regarded the conjunction of the planets as "the star in the east" surely they would have visited Judæa earlier than they did!

A conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces happens once in every eight hundred years, and according to the fifteenth century Rabbi Abarbanel there was such a conjunction three years before the birth of Moses. The portent of a luminous star in the east before the advent of

the Messiah is a very old Jewish tradition, and probably owes its origin to the prophecy of the ancient Magus Balaam : " A Star shall arise out of Jacob ". In the reign of the Emperor Hadrian advantage was taken of this hoary prophecy by a pseudo-Messiah who assumed the name of Barchochba (Son of the Star) in order to win the people to his cause.

Some writers have attempted to show that the mysterious stellar apparition which guided the Wise Men was a comet. Unfortunately for this theory comets (and stars, for that matter) do not pause in their flight round the sun, and there is no record in history of the appearance of any such uncommon celestial phenomenon at the birth of Christ.

There is, however, mention in ancient Chinese annals of the appearance of a new star somewhere about the year B.C. 7, and this *may* have been the one observed by the Magi. Such new stars or *novæ*, as they are known to astronomers, are not uncommon, but the bright ones are rare. A brilliant *nova* appeared in 1918 and was known to many as the " Peace Star". It is thought that these *novæ* are originated by the clash of two dead suns in some distant region of space, the force of the impact generating the heat which makes an incandescent mass at the point of collision. Or they may be caused by the passage of a star through a dark nebula with momentary illumination of the hitherto non-radiant matter. A *nova* seems to be an explosion of some sort, as these new stars suddenly increase in luminosity and gradually dwindle into insignificance.

Such a new star, along with the significance of the repeated conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces, may have led the Magi to infer that a Prince or Deliverer had been born in Judæa, and many of them must have been familiar with the Magian prediction of Balaam, since, according to Josephus, there were very many Jewish colonists in Mesopotamia and Persia at this time.

But how could the Star have moved on before the Wise Men, it will be asked, and how could it stand still over any place? That we do not know, but St. Matthew's account may have been influenced by similar statements regarding guiding stars which were common in those days. Thus Virgil relates that Æneas was directed by a star from the coast of Troy. Thrasybulus and Timoleon were similarly guided, and an old rabbinical legend states that Abraham was shown the way to Mount Moriah by some such astral phenomenon.

An old tradition recounts that the Wise Men lost sight of the Star in Jerusalem, but saw it again reflected in the depths of a well at Bethlehem, from which they inferred that it was over their heads, and that their quest was ended. Perhaps this story may explain why Gregory of Tours in the sixth century alleged that the beams of the Star were to be seen glinting in the water of a well at Bethlehem in his day.

However that may be explained, and we must remember that Gregory wrote his treatise on miracles in an age of faith, there is no doubt that the well story helps to make the Gospel narrative more credible, if we want to make it so.

It should not be forgotten that practically similar stories are related of the infancy of other World Teachers. The birth of Buddha was announced to certain *Rishis* by the appearance of an asterism on the eastern horizon. A star is said to have figured at the birth of the Chinese sage Lao-tze, the founder of Taoism. The various *avatars* of Vishnu were foretold by celestial signs, and it is recorded that a supernatural light was seen in the heavens at the birth of Ali, Mohammad's great disciple. Nor were these sidereal manifestations confined to the East. Even in the New World we find that the symbol of the virgin-born Saviour, Quetzalcoatl, is the radiant "Morning Star".

Such myths were common in an

age when the belief in astrology was widespread, and when there was a general tendency to weave legends of a supernatural character around the cradles of heroes. The story of the Star of Bethlehem and the Adoration of the Magi belongs to the same category.

Yet, although the legend may have no historical foundation as such, its sublime poetry will continue to appeal to all lovers of mystical beauty. It will also continue to convey a spiritual message to those who believe that behind all these old-world legends there lie intimations of the Gnosis and of that closer communion of God and Man which the world once had, but of which the hard, formal, exoteric religions of to-day have lost the secret.

KEITH PERCY

---

Fix thy Soul's gaze upon the star whose ray thou art, the flaming star that shines within the lightless depths of ever-being, the boundless fields of the Unknown. (Every spiritual Ego is a ray of a "Planetary Spirit", according to Esoteric teaching.)

—*The Voice of the Silence*



# THE FUTURE OF RELIGION

## II.—THE COMING OF THE FORERUNNERS

[J. D. Beresford concludes his study of the Religion of the Future, enumerating the powers and qualities of those who are the silent pioneers of the Cycle which will open in the last quarter of this century.—Eds.]

It has been foreshadowed by adepts that the new Spiritual Teacher will be manifested in the last quarter of the present century.\* Let us then, in the first place, assume that as a certainty and examine the influence he would be likely to exert on a people differing in few essentials from those of the present day. For the moment we need not consider the nature of his teaching and the differences it would exhibit from all orthodox religions. We shall come to that later. What concerns us is a forecast of the immediate effects of his coming.

We can assume that he would find disciples, and a following, among those who had reached a stage of spiritual development that enabled them to understand him. But let us at once abandon any hope that he would be able to "convert" the world in, say, the course of a generation. Such an outcome is not in the nature of things. It would directly negate the law of Karma which teaches that each individual has to work out his own salvation through suffering, since every thought and act

produce their inevitable consequences. The new Teacher will be no more capable of "converting" those who are in the early stages of spiritual development, than Christ was capable of "converting" the Pharisees. (It is a significant fact that He never even attempted to do that.) There are occasional instances of spiritual law superseding and apparently contradicting the "natural laws" of human experience, and we speak of them as "miracles". But the law of Karma is a spiritual law, and can be neither superseded nor suspended.

Moreover the essential truths cannot be taught to those who are not ready to receive them. They may be accepted by the intelligence and adopted as an article of belief. They may perform the function of all religions by enforcing standards of morality and humaneness. But so long as they remain articles of belief held only by the intelligence they have no more living value than any other rules of life, religious and social. It is not until these truths are found in the self that they become the

\*H. P. Blavatsky wrote in 1889 in her *Key to Theosophy* :-

"During the last quarter of every hundred years an attempt is made by those 'Masters', of whom I have spoken, to help on the spiritual progress of Humanity in a marked and definite way. Towards the close of each century you will invariably find that an outpouring or upheaval of spirituality—or call it mysticism if you prefer—has taken place. Some one or more persons have appeared in the world as their agents, and a greater or less amount of occult knowledge and teaching has been given out. If you care to do so, you can trace these movements back, century by century, as far as our detailed historical records extend."—Eds.

means of spiritual development.

And this applies even to those truths which, as I said in my first article, come as near to absolute as it is possible to come in the phenomenal world. Indeed these truths or at least some aspect of them, have been recognised throughout that period of ten thousand years assumed as covering the historical period of the present cycle. They were taught by Gautama and by Jesus. They have been expounded for the last sixty-three years by Theosophists who faithfully repeat the doctrines of their Teacher, H. P. Blavatsky.

We have but to look at the religious and moral decadence of the world at the present hour to realise that these fundamental truths cannot be appreciated, far less understood, by those who have not reached that stage of development at which they can be found in the self. We may find them there without any outside teaching whatsoever and, as has been said, the approach to them will be made by any informed mind that can hold itself free from prejudice. But no teaching can bring sight to the spiritually blind. If that miracle were possible the law of Karma would become meaningless.

I have insisted upon this aspect of what may be expected from the effects to be produced by the gospel of another Teacher, because it has been the chief weakness of orthodox religions to pose the figure of the Teacher as coming "to save the world", a misunderstanding that is deeply rooted in the world-mind. And when it has become evident that the world has not been "saved", the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice serves

to maintain the illusion. The world, we are told, has been "saved" by Christ's death on the cross, and we have only to believe that in order to attain perfection. It is certain that the next Teacher will make no claim to "saving the world" in this sense—no real Teacher ever has.

Having stated this conclusion, I will return in thought to the present day in order to attempt a forecast of the probable steps in world evolution that will prepare the way for the coming of the World-Religion that will be the new Gospel of mankind. And I will begin with the prophecy that within those fifty years, there will be increasing evidence of a new type, the coming type, of humanity.

The human body, which is the temple of the Spirit, holds immense potentialities for development, instances of which appear sporadically now and again, to be accepted as a portent by the few and discredited or disregarded by the many. One, and perhaps the simplest, of these as yet undeveloped powers is what we know as "telepathy". There are few people who have not, intermittently, been aware of possessing this undeveloped power; and quite recently certain well-organised experiments in America have produced results that can be explained only by the theory that, in certain conditions, a thought may be communicated from one mind to another by some extra-sensory means. I need not, however, labour the evidence for this particular phenomenon. The plain deduction is that the human vehicle is capable of receiving and transmitting thoughts across any distance, but not, as yet,

of controlling that power.

My first prophecy, then, is that this potentiality will be greatly developed in the course of the next two generations, and that the more highly developed individuals of the new race will be able to communicate with one another at will, although they be separated by the width of the earth.

The next potentiality, at present very weakly exercised and misunderstood, is our power over the physical body. We find examples of this in the occasional "miracles" of "spiritual healing". These rare but well-authenticated effects of the power to create, dissipate or rearrange the physical cells of the body, almost instantaneously, are so astoundingly contradictory to what we have come to regard as "natural law", that the word "miracle" appears to the average mind to be fully justified. They are, in fact, evidence of the over-riding spiritual "law", of which these exceptions to "natural law" which so confound the materialist are occasional manifestations.

The new race will be increasingly able to control this power over the physical body. The members of it will be born with a distaste for all those stimulants and soporifics upon which our artificial civilisation is so dependent; and from childhood their bodies will thus become more sensitive instruments of the Spirit. This is not to say that our misused bodies of the present day cannot be made the instruments of the Spirit. The Spirit is all-powerful and may now and again manifest itself through the most

reluctant material. But the bodies of the new race will be more fluid, far more sensitive to the suggestion of the self than ours.\*

This power over the cells of the body will be further increased by a third potentiality we possess but do not know how to develop, generally spoken of as "the extension of consciousness". At present many of the ills of the body are due to the unrecognised, generally thwarted, desires of what we call the unconscious, or subconscious, mind. Psycho-analysis has made a few tentative efforts to develop a technique by which those desires may be brought into consciousness. The next race will not need the interference of an analyst. Its members will develop a consciousness that will include many of those unrealised thought-processes of which we are now only made aware through their more or less disguised manifestations in our restricted minds. Compared with ourselves, all such highly developed beings will deserve the title of genius.

A fourth potentiality is allied to our gift of sight, which is far less a physical endowment confined to the organ of the eye, than is generally recognised. There are people, outside the class of adepts, who have what we regard as strange powers of this kind, people who can see radiations, auras, thought-images and what we call spirit-forms. There are others who can "see" when their eyes are so closely bandaged as to exclude the passage of all those light-vibrations that make up the spectroscopic colour scale. For ultimately

\* I have written "self" and not "mind" in the last sentence, because the mind not less than the body is a servant and not the principal.

sight, like all our senses, is psychical rather than physical, and when the body becomes the sensitive instrument of the self, it is able to record vibrations beyond the range of visibility common to our present undeveloped powers.

There are in the human instrument of the physical body, other and still stranger abilities—all of them manifested in the past by a few adepts—but enough has been said to suggest the possibilities of evolution in the coming race. The change will, of course, be gradual, and the types that exhibit these new powers will be comparatively few and diverse for, perhaps, many generations to come. But before the coming of the next Teacher, some of the abilities that are now regarded as miraculous, will be accepted by the majority of humanity without question.

There is just one more point before I come to the nature of the religious development which must emerge before the end of the century. This point is the high probability that the present worship of machinery and high-speed travel will not survive the collapse of our civilisation. During the past fifty years, the development of machinery—using that term to include every physical device—has progressed so astoundingly that what seem commonplaces to the present generation would have appeared as miraculous to even the intelligent minds of the last century. But by far the greater number of these inventions will serve no purpose in the coming spiritual evolution of man, and will gradually disappear.

We come now to our final consideration in an attempt to answer this

question: "What will be the nature of the religion that will be first prepared for and then confirmed by the coming of the next Teacher?"

I begin by the firm assertion that the forerunners, those who, endowed with spiritual insight, will prepare the way for the understanding of the ancient wisdom, will preach no gospel, make no profession of inspired virtue, be bound by no ritual. Their religion will be expressed solely in action. They will wear no uniform, such as the habit of the monk, and they will live among the people, ministering to the needs of those who require their assistance. In this they will exercise no discrimination between the social or spiritual worth of those they serve. They will help so far as they are able rich and poor, weak and powerful. They will recognise one another when they meet, but they will not band themselves into communities or seek by congregating to reinforce their faith. Inevitably they will attract disciples, choosing from among them only those whose spiritual development has reached the point at which they will be ready to abandon all worldly desire and become in turn the ministers of humanity.

Nevertheless, although these forerunners will preach no creed to the people, other than that creed of loving service which they will teach by their example, they will hold certain beliefs that can be expressed in language. The principal of these was stated by Christ but has become emasculated and diverted by false theological interpretations. The Biblical version is: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteous-

ness ; and all these things shall be added unto you." And since Christ said elsewhere, " The kingdom of God is within you ", the passage may be rendered in unpoetical terms : Seek God in the self through right thinking and the exercise of virtue. Of the things that shall be added to those who find what they seek, the first is that universal charity which is, also, the first of the seven golden keys of *The Voice of the Silence*.

Beyond that we need not look for the present. This all-embracing charity which is of the spirit and not of the mind, though it may be but a preliminary step on the road to the End of Desire, will be sufficient for those forerunners of whom I am speaking. Through that attainment they will achieve and manifest those powers we now regard as supernatural, but which are in fact the expressions of the prevailing spiritual law of which all so-called natural laws are but obscure and imperfect reflections.

But through their example, our forerunners will demonstrate certain truths that have been concealed by the organised religions of the past two thousand years. One of these is that every human being is the sum of all his or her past. No sin can be expunged by repentance, though in some cases what we call " repentance " may be a sign of spiritual growth. Thus it serves no purpose whatever to attempt compensation for evil done in the past by protestations and vows laid before " God and His priests ", nor to castigate ourselves in the same cause. It is what we are that matters, not what we

have thought and done in the past, the whole of which is present with us at every moment.

Another truth, implicit in what has just been said, is that every human being is solely responsible for his own development. No outside help can alter that sum of our past which is what we are at the present moment. But although a sensual and self-seeking life imposes an ever thickening barrier between a man and the guidance of the inner Spirit, and although he must inevitably suffer somewhere, at some time, for this misuse of the temporary vehicle, he may come to know his own spirituality in a moment of self-realisation, and appear to the world thereafter as a changed being. This is what is known to the orthodox religions as " sudden conversion ". The man has neither changed nor been converted. That is but the appearance his altered conduct bears to the world.

All these and many other truths which cannot be stated in this place, will be the foundation of the religion, as such, practised by the forerunners of whom I am speaking. And by degrees a recognition of them will slowly permeate the thought of the world. The present religions will persist little altered among a diminishing number of people up to and beyond the coming of the next great Teacher, whose message, will, perhaps, do little more than corroborate the truths that will by then have begun to influence the minds of the people.

By way of summary, I would insist primarily on the essential that these forerunners will abandon pre-

cept, in favour of practice. They will teach no doctrine of final judgments, lay down no strict rules of conduct, elaborate no theory of being. The influence they will exert—and that influence shall be as the leaven of righteousness—will be by the shining examples of their simple lives. They will exercise their spiritual powers only for good, for healing and for helping the distressed. They will seek no reward, not even the reward of love and gratitude ; but will give

themselves freely by virtue of that universal love which illuminates them. And their disciples and the slowly increasing crowd of their followers will attempt the same path so far as they are able. It is by these means that the way will be prepared for the new era of world civilisation, an era that will differ almost inconceivably from our own. But before that comes the world has to pass through the pit of darkness.

J. D. BERESFORD

---

It is from this WISDOM-RELIGION that all the various individual " Religions " (erroneously so called) have sprung, forming in their turn offshoots and branches, and also all the minor creeds, based upon and always originated through some personal experience in psychology. Every such religion, or religious offshoot, be it considered orthodox or heretical, wise or foolish, started originally as a clear and unadulterated stream from the Mother-Source. The fact that each became in time polluted with purely human speculations and even inventions, due to interested motives, does not prevent any from having been pure in its early beginnings. There are those creeds—we shall not call them religions—which have now been overlaid with the human element out of all recognition ; others just showing signs of early decay ; not one that escaped the hand of time. But each and all are of divine, because natural and true origin ; aye—Mazdeism, Brahmanism, Buddhism as much as Christianity. It is the dogmas and human element in the latter which led directly to modern Spiritualism.

H. P. BLAVATSKY—U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 1.

# OUR COMMON HUMANITY

## BARRIERS TO ITS REALIZATION

[Professor N. K. Bhagwat is a Pali scholar, well-known for his zeal in spreading far and wide the peace-giving, illuminating teachings of Buddhism. Below we print a paper presented by him at the All-Faiths Conference held in April 1938, at Indore.—Eds.]

The noble task undertaken by this Conference representing different religions and faiths is "to bring together persons believing in the essential unity of the Human Family and in the unity behind all Faiths". How very urgently this work is required in the light of recent communal tension and strife! I come from Bombay, where Hindus and Muslims, instead of working to bring about union and a harmony of interests, have been flying at each other's throats. Other nations justly point the finger of scorn at our display of the brutal instincts of vindictiveness and lust, at our superiority complex, at our lack of fellow-feeling and at our negation of the splendid and the beautiful in Man. Why should not these two major communities of India join hands as brothers and set a noble example to all other communities? The prosperity and the advance of this land depends on the realization of this ideal.

We, the votaries of different religions and faiths, are ultimately *one* in the fundamentals of our religious teachings. Let us, without belittling the importance of others' views and without unduly elevating our own faith, sit down together and try to understand one another. What is our ultimate aim? Restraint and Purity of Heart. Is there a single religion

which does not aim at both of these two fundamentals? Let us, therefore, tolerate the presence of others, treat others with consideration and with appreciation and find out whether in essentials they are not, in fact, at one with ourselves. "Being *one*, wise persons call It by different Names." When we recover this vision, when this wide and catholic realization finds a place in our hearts, our work nears completion and is bound to be crowned with success. Let us draw nearer together, give each other a hearing, cogitate upon each other's point of view and try to understand and appreciate it, and to find out the points of agreement between us. This attitude is a consummation devoutly to be desired. But such is the irony of Fate, the more we pursue this ideal, the farther it seems to retreat before us! Why? Why do we not realize the essential unity and community of the Human Family? This paper attempts to answer that question.

When we observe the phenomena in the plant kingdom, the animal kingdom and the human kingdom we find, on the face of things, abundant diversity, great disparity in constitution, general appearance and structure, in the working of the life energy, in the processes of the mind. This vast apparent disparity, this great variety

persuades us that to seek unity in this ocean of diversity is to follow a mirage. But water, whether hot or cold, whether calm or turbulent, is resolvable into H<sub>2</sub>O. Animals like lions and tigers, which are endowed with great physical strength, lead a lonely and solitary existence, while elephants, horses and sheep seek a gregarious life. Among humankind there arises first the desire to segregate oneself from others and from society, to lead a life of towering personality; individuals, groups or classes try to domineer over the masses. This habit of domineering over others, when permanently ingrained, becomes a powerful weapon for tyrannizing over the masses who are sunk in ignorance. Thus diversity becomes more and more accentuated; it becomes apparently an essential attribute, a characteristic feature. The individual versus the community is the first stage and the strong desire to perpetuate power and privileges acquired causes perpetual struggle. There is no effective attempt to put a stop to this and to weld all of these jarring elements into one composite whole. According to some, this has become an impossible proposition in practical life. Suffering heaped on suffering, oppression heaped on oppression, lust heaped on lust—these have driven away every concept of unity of life and of the human race. There is physical suffering, moral suffering, economic suffering, social suffering, communal suffering, sectarian suffering and the result is a chaos, a pandemonium, without hope of redemption.

Says the Buddha :—

“ When, Oh Bhikkhus, I saw the

world in its jarring elements, fighting and trembling, a great shock overcame me... Whence can there be laughter whence can there be any jubilation, when the whole is burning? When you are all enveloped in a thick coating of darkness, why not seek for light?

It is thus that the absence of the true light of reason throws the world into diversity, confusion, turmoil, and when this is the case, whence can you obtain the consciousness of a common Humanity and a common Life? Grasping desire, ignorance of the truth and perverted vision, these produce the brute in man, which manifests in three forms: (1) Passion or lust, (2) Ill will or malevolence and (3) Infatuation or madness, clouding of the understanding. Passion or lust may manifest as a passion for disregarding everything else before the one consideration of safeguarding vested interests; these may have been ill-gotten, they may be unjust and inequitable, and yet they must be safeguarded and perpetuated. Man becomes obstinate and impervious to noble and universal feelings and the brute in man, filled with lust, displays egotism, rapacity, and utter disregard of the dignity and the sanctity of life. Cupidity becomes the ruling passion; the demand for territorial aggrandizement is its expression on a national scale. The second form of manifestation of the brute in man is ill will, the positive aspect of absence of love towards others. Vanity, dogmatism, obstinacy, denial of the possibilities of co-operation, jealousy, vengeance—these bring about in man or nation some of the worst expressions of brute instincts. Equanimity, the sense of brotherhood and fellow-feeling, love and compassion



are conspicuous by their absence. Ill-will or malevolence forms the greatest obstacle to the consciousness of the oneness of humanity and the kinship of all life. The third manifestation of the brute in man is the clouding of understanding. The reason, the power to distinguish right from wrong, the power to sift and to weigh dispassionately disappear, and clamorishness, partisanship and blind adherence to a cause follow as a matter of course.

These three manifestations of the brute in man creep into almost every faith and religion, recognized or unrecognized, and then the pure, simple, unsophisticated and unitary form of that religion or of that faith is lost. Then the savant, the teacher, the custodian of that religion forget their high and noble mission as ministers of truth and mistake sham for substance, non-essentials for essentials, means for end, and sophistry reigns supreme. The brute in man comes forth in its naked ugliness. Do you expect in those circumstances restraint and purity of heart? Do you dream of unity and consonance, of concord and harmony, of brotherhood and love? All that is holy is trampled under foot; when the brute in man is transcendent the Inner Ego forgets his essential attributes. The brute in man laughs everything to scorn. He jests and scoffs and life to him is a huge joke, without implications, without meaning, without purpose, without unity.

How can these obstructions be removed? Freedom from selfish cupidity, freedom from ill will or malevolence and freedom from the utter darkness of infatuation produce in

man a spirit of disinterestedness and of love. Rejoicing in the interest of all, even at the cost of self, man finds in himself a glowing, ever-shining lamp of light, of knowledge based upon an *universal* outlook. He effaces his sense of pride and for him the Ego becomes universalized. He sees it in *all*. He has surrendered self; he has dedicated himself on the altar of Humanity. To him Humanity is God, the supreme Divinity. Brahma sacrificed Himself before starting the work of creation. All great teachers and prophets have sacrificed self in the service of humanity, in the interest of all, out of love for all. Their crucifixion is the symbol of their self-effacement. Consider Janaka and Yajnyavalkya, Krishna and the Buddha, Mahavira and Makkhala Gosala, Zoroaster and Muhammad, Moses and the Christ, Guru Nanak and Swami Dayanand, Ramatirtha and Ramakrishna, Vivekananda and Rammohan Roy, Madame Blavatsky the great Theosophist, and other redeemers of the human race. They found and developed the consciousness of the one life, the one humanity, the one universe, and to this they sacrificed self. This is not the suicide of a desperate man, of a blind fanatic or of a narrow-minded bigot; it is a fully self-conscious act of homage, devotion, worship. They surrendered self, they sacrificed self and yet they live in perpetuity. They found that sacrifice the only way of realizing the oneness of the human family and of serving that family. They sang :—

Let us then, free from hate, live happily amongst those who hate; among men filled with hatred, let us dwell free

from hatred.

Let us then, free from ailments, live happily among those who are ailing ; among men afflicted with ailments, let us dwell free from ailments.

Let us then, free from lust, live happily among those who are filled with lust ; among the lustful, let us dwell free from lust.

Let us then live happily who own nothing, can call nothing our own ; let us be like the shining ones who are nourished on love.

With these ideals, the noble self-effacing Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis wandered over the earth in the interest of the masses whom they taught to live as human beings. The Emperor Asoka will ever stand in history as a follower of the noble and universal teachings of Bhagavan Buddha.

It is only meet that we who are

actuated by a genuine desire to bring home to all this lesson of the unity behind all faiths and of the unity of the whole human family should show forth more of the spirit of doing real service to all, irrespective of caste, sex, religion, in a spirit of selflessness like that of the great prophets of old. We must teach these lessons through Shastris and Pandits, through Maulanas and Maulavis, through Missionaries and Mobeds, so that they may reach even the lowest strata of society.

Let us leave aside self and be selfless, and we shall overcome Evil with Truth and Ahimsā.

“Let us all be of one mind, of happy mind, and let us realize humanity as one.”

N. K. BHAGWAT

---

*The religion of the ancients is the religion of the future. A few centuries more, and there will linger no sectarian beliefs in either of the great religions of humanity. Brahmanism and Buddhism, Christianity and Mahometanism will all disappear before the mighty rush of facts. “I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh”, writes the prophet Joel. “Verily I say unto you...greater works than these shall you do”, promises Jesus. But this can only come to pass when the world returns to the grand religion of the past ; the knowledge of those majestic systems which preceded, by far, Brahmanism, and even the primitive monotheism of the ancient Chaldeans. Meanwhile, we must remember the direct effects of the revealed mystery. The only means by which the wise priests of old could impress upon the grosser senses of the multitudes the idea of the Omnipotency of the Creative will or FIRST CAUSE ; namely, the divine animation of inert matter, the soul infused into it by the potential will of man, the microcosmic image of the great Architect, and the transportation of ponderous objects through space and material obstacles.*

—H. P. BLAVATSKY in 1877

## VARIETY IN MYSTICISM

[These two articles deal with the attainment of Divine Realization but neither of the methods emphasised will achieve that aim in final completeness. However varied the forms of mystical exercise they all recommend the endeavour to "give up thy life if thou would'st live", i.e., as H. P. Blavatsky explains that verse in *The Voice of the Silence*—"Give up the life of physical personality, if you would live in spirit".—Eds.]

### I.—VAISHNAVA MYSTICISM

[Matilal Das outlines attainment through the Way of Love, *Bhakti*, and favours it as easier of access than the Way of Knowledge or that of Works. The psychic dangers of false or lower types of devotion are overlooked. High is the power of devotion but it must be fortified by knowledge and expressed in works of service; self-realization is the fruit born of the beautiful flower of *Bhakti*, which grows on the Tree whose roots are *Gnyana* and whose branches and leaves, *nishkama Karma*. Therefore *Light on the Path* explains :—

"Seek it [the Way] not by any one road. To each temperament there is one road which seems the most desirable. But the way is not found by devotion alone, by religious contemplation alone, by ardent progress, by self-sacrificing labour, by studious observation of life. None alone can take the disciple more than one step onwards. All steps are necessary to make up the ladder."

—Eds.]

Mysticism is an approach to Truth through intuition. Intellect cannot take us far; its progress has limits. The higher truths of life, the finer meaning and significance of the world, can be had only by immediate awareness. The mystic's revelations have value and no man with broad outlook can ignore them.

Vaishnavism delights in mystic experiences of the soul. It stresses emotional ardour through which the receptive soul can have direct communion with ultimate Truth. It believes that spiritual realisation is a matter not of logical thinking but of intuitive experience received as inspiration. The highest fulfilment of life is enjoyment of the divine delight that comes from the spiritual marriage of the soul with the centre of life.

Vaishnavism is essentially theistic. It is at war with the subtle intellectuality of Sankara, who holds that there is not the least difference between man and God, that there is complete and essential identity between the human and the Divine. In his heart of hearts man is at one with God. There is an eternal urge in man to break down the apparent divergence from infinitude. The soul hungers because it has lost touch with its inherent infinitude. Peace and plenitude can come only when this isolation is broken in mystic illumination. The direct awareness of reality is to be had, according to the Vedantists, by knowledge, and knowledge alone, of our oneness with the Supreme. This highest wisdom that gives identity is the quest of life; it does not come through grace

but by inner discipline.

To the Vaishnava the Eternal is a personality, a reverent attitude of worship of and of love for whom is the essence of his religion. The Cosmic Being is not a bare identity, but a personal being with whom there can be real fellowship in faith and love. The Nirguna Brahman of Sankara is a blank transcendence which cannot attract the selfless feeling of the devotee. God is a perfect personality called Krishna, the charmer of the soul. Chaitanya, the founder of Gauriya Vaishnavism, explained to Sanatana in a beautiful dialogue the nature of Krishna. He is the darling of Braja's lord—the one without a second, the one whose only form is consciousness, the source of infinite Bliss. He is the material and the efficient cause of the universe, the source and the support of the world. He is the embodiment of *chit* and *ananda*—life and bliss. This supreme Godhead in its aspect of delight and bliss is the highest reality and the Vaishnavas long for an eternal experience of love with this God of Love.

The individual soul is both different and non-different from the central Soul. The Lord is infinite while the human soul is finite. There is unity in the sense that the individual is an effect which has no reality apart from God, just as sparks have no reality apart from the fire. There is duality in the sense that the soul possesses attributes different from those of God. The burden of sorrow and suffering overcomes man but God is ever free. Man is controlled by the *maya* of God while God rules through *maya*. Man is the eternal

servant of God and a life of joy and glory is his birthright, but forgetting this noble heritage man becomes the slave of the world through the power of *maya*. This *maya* is a different conception from that of Sankara. Infinite is the nature of Krishna, infinite are His powers but His chief qualities are three : *chit*, *maya* and *jiva*. The *chit* power has again three aspects :—it becomes *haldini* in the aspect of bliss ; *sandhini* in the aspect of existence, and *samhit* in the aspect of consciousness. These three-fold powers are also called *Swarupa-saktis*, because they constitute the very self of God. By the *chit*-power God maintains His nature as intelligence and will ; by the power of His *maya* the world is evolved and by *jivasakti* the souls are produced. *Maya* and *prakriti* are the same, the energy of God, through which comes this manifold universe and the fetters that bind souls to the misery and pain of the world.

But the highest power of God is the power of delight. Radha is the embodiment of this delight-giving power. Through *bhakti* (love) we may be in touch with this universal joy. This ascent through love is a mystic process. The greatest attraction of Vaishnavism lies in its promise of spiritual love to all its followers. Its essence lies in the luminous experiences of the divine love. The initiate tastes it more and more as his realisation becomes deeper and there is no satiety, for the source is eternal and has infinite shades and phases.

Vaishnavism adopts the language of high imagery to express the longing of the soul for God. Vaishnavism

stresses *bhakti*. It is the supreme sublime attachment to the Lord due to intense love, a love that seeks no other reward as its goal. This exclusive love and devotion is its own fruition. It must be spontaneous and free, not dictated by fear nor by expectation of rewards. It must proceed from the hidden nature of the soul which feels deeply the genial attraction of the infinite Life. It must be so intense as to absorb the entire soul, which must resist all other attractions and tendencies.

But even this deep attachment is regarded as a very low step in the path of realisation of the deep ecstasies of spiritual love. The aim of Vaishnavism is to bind the soul to its lost source, the God of love and of joy. A devotion that has its origin in the injunctions of the sastras is lower than the passionate attachment which flows spontaneously and which is called *Raganuga Bhakti*.

A life of law is necessary when a man devotes himself to religion by a rigid spiritual discipline, but the life of love requires nothing but loving service and worship of God. The life of love is a life of personal relationship between man and God. Such a devotee does not meditate on the glory and power of God but on His charm and grace.

Vaishnavism does not advocate asceticism. It asks us to find the blessed joy of our hearts' desire by sublimation of our natural feelings and emotions. There are four stages in the life of love :—love of a servant for the master ; love of a friend for his comrade ; love of a mother for her child ; the burning passion of the lover for his beloved.

God is infinite love and infinite are the ways of approach to Him. We are to look upon Him either as master or friend, as mother or lover, and by constant contemplation and deep meditation we shall transform the natural feelings of our heart into divine feelings.

The last method is deemed the best. God is sublime love and is won by the deep love of a passionate soul. Words fail to describe this spiritual relationship, so the yearning of the woman for her beloved is taken as its symbol. But we are to bear in mind that things of the spirit are different from things of the world. This mystic experience of the supersensual world is subtle and fine ; it is not polluted by being described in terms of sensuous joy and delight. This spiritual love is surrender, body and soul to God in the manner of the Gopis, the milkmaids of Brindaban, whose selfless passionate devotion to Krishna exemplifies the ideal of this love. And the greatest of all the Gopis was Radha whose essential nature was love, who lived not for herself but for Krishna.

Chaitanya, it is said, incarnated in order to taste the passions and emotions of Radha. His life exemplifies the mystic union of God and man. His *sadhana* is the embodiment of this relation. It is a spiritual tie of sweetness inexpressible in human words. Chaitanya shows how the bride, the soul, can be united with her divine consort in His all-absorbing embrace. The love between bride and bridegroom on earth is but a limited reflection of the divine love, which awakens our souls to all their powers and activities.

Vaishnava mysticism is an appeal for such a God-imbued life. The object of consciousness is the Lord of Bliss and of Joy, whom the soul wants to enjoy through love and faith. There is eternal duality and to the Vaishnava mystic this is necessary, for to him the goal is not the attainment of unity but the eternal enjoyment of love.

Vaishnava mysticism has an universal appeal, for love is ingrained in us and flows directly to the object of love. But our attachment to and fondness for material things of beauty or finite beings cannot satisfy our cravings. The Vaishnava mystic asks us to go to the source of beauty and of loveliness, for the earthly attraction is an indication of the call of our heavenly bridegroom. Love allures us, beauty attracts us and sweetness charms us, for Krishna, the divine tempter, wants to draw us to Himself, with His enchanting flute.

The paths of work and of knowledge are difficult to tread ; they demand rigid discipline and require the follower to go against the normal bent of his mind. But Vaishnavism is a gradual journey to the finest expression of life, and as the *sadhaka* is able to free himself from earthly ties and tendencies by the unceasing inflow of the spiritual synthesis, there is progressive unfoldment of harmony.

Vaishnavism therefore has for its ideal the complete saturation of our being with the Divine, and the complete spiritualization of human values. With this transfiguration, the contraries of life and death, joy and sorrow, vanish and the soul can take part in the transcendent play of God.

Life to the Vaishnava is the *Lila* of the Lord—we are outside it because we are hedged round by our shortcomings and limitations.

But when life is completely spiritualised, the gate to the palace of love and beauty and harmony is thrown wide for us. Illumined by the ray of divine light and inspired by the force of divine life we take part in the *Rasa* dance of Krishna which is movement from abiding *ananda* to *ananda* at the centre of the divine play of love. For God moves in *ananda* (bliss).

Vaishnavism has an indefinable charm and attraction for the lovers of mysticism. Its appeal is to the culture of the soul, which provides gradual extinction of egoism and gradual elevation to God-consciousness. This appeal is irresistible. It calls also for absolute surrender of self to God and for perfect identification with the divine will through love. There can never be full realisation for life is infinite progress and religion a ceaseless growth. But the growth through love is preferable to any other form of development and love alone has power to give us the surest and sweetest experience of Deity. It may be after all an approximation to the goal but still it is the most perfect realisation possible within the limits of human life. And it is not a mere dream. It has been realised by a long line of devotees and their life and *sadhana* are the strongest assurance to our oscillating faith.

The seers of the *Upanishads* felt that *Ananda* or Bliss is the Absolute, for from *Ananda* these beings are born, by *Ananda*, when born, they live and into *Ananda* they enter at

their death. Vaishnavism invites us to participate in this bliss to have direct and immediate experience of this *ananda*.

If we follow the path shown by a host of teachers and seers, the ultimate peace that transcends all is promised to us. We shall have direct communion with the heart of things and the consequent spiritual splen-

dour will enable us to grasp the unity of the whole that lies beyond the conflict and unrest of life.

This intuitional experience is the crowning glory of human life. When we are lighted up by the fire of love, we are fused with the spirit of God's nature which is bliss. Herein lies the highest consecration of life and the greatest fulfilment of life's struggle.

MATILAL DAS

## II.—MYSTICISM IN HUMAN RELATIONS

[Dr. Radhakamal Mukerjee, Head of the Department of Economics and Sociology of the University of Lucknow, is the author of *The Theory and Art of Mysticism*. Below we print the summary of an address he delivered last autumn in the chapel of the University of Chicago. In this paper Dr. Mukerjee surveys the mystical outlook rooted in earthly conditions and relationships and shows how the natural human ties can be used as stepping-stones to spiritual exercise and realization. A truer and more philosophical method would be to see human institutions and historical events as projections from the inner psycho-spiritual world—for after all matter is but the concrete copy of the abstract idea. Thus could be avoided the many types of mischief caused by many schools of pseudo-mysticism. Man being a compound of animal, human and divine tendencies acts like a beast, a man, or a god, and any deification of his animal nature proves one of the gravest dangers to the higher life.—Eds.]

A sense of detachment is not the *sine qua non* of mysticism. The mystical consciousness is not divorced from social experience and the social ideal. On the contrary, the highest stage of the mystical life is one of active participation in the daily round of individual and social duties. In the normal give-and-take between the individual and society, certain permanent relations develop which can be the seat of the highest aspirations, and these are always seized upon by the mystic for his own purposes. Relationships within the family cannot be adequately interpreted in terms of contract or by

a calculation of efforts and satisfactions. The matrimonial relationship extends beyond the interests of the partners in marriage; its ends can be revealed neither by the particular means and ends of the partners, nor by their reciprocal pledges, but these surround, interpenetrate and overreach their lives. A complex of satisfactions and feelings arising in family relationships are projected to each partner, and these are described as love, fidelity and devotion, which have a kinship to the ultimate-common-value attitudes that art and religion express. In the organic GE-MEINSCHAFT relationships, as these

are described by modern sociology, which are simply taken for granted as a natural and an inevitable way of living, we have a most important element of social life, in fact, an absolutely fundamental one which cannot, at best, in the majority of cases be thought of as a whole in terms of a rationalized course of action directed toward specific rationally formulated ends. Such relationships are as intimately bound up with value-elements as anything in our lives ; but it is in the form of the more diffuse value attitudes, rather than the more specific ultimate ends, that they can best be brought in.

*Gemeinschaft*, observes Alfred Vierkandt, means surrender to a whole, to something of greater value than oneself, which carries with it "the entrancing feeling of the widening of the ego". The permanent social relationships which man has envisaged do not express certain specific, rationally formulated ends but symbolise the same imponderable ultimate values which art and the mystical consciousness reveal. On the other hand, it is the importation of the ultimate values into contractual relationships and specific mechanical behaviour that elevates these, and contributes towards social harmony and the enrichment of personality. The search by individuals for the highest values thus resolves all conflicts of impulses and interests, and binds man with his fellow men in enduring bonds, that themselves become symbolical of man's deepest aspirations.

Man's social self links his values with his relations with his fellow men, which serve as the raw materi-

als of his valuation process. But man also aspires after an integration of himself with life or experience as a whole. Thus he regards those values as the highest which bring about the most complete integration of his impulses, interests and functions. These are expressed in the three ultimate categories of Truth, Beauty and Goodness, "a threefold cord, not lightly broken". Society similarly regards those objects of value as the highest, *viz.*, knowledge, art and religion, which exhibit the largest potentialities for bringing about the harmony and integration of impulses and interests, and the organization of experience as a whole. The personal and spiritual values are necessarily regarded as higher than the vital and economic values, and this underlies the ethical and legal framework of freedoms, rights and duties.

The above ordering of the values represents also the norms of rational conduct. Its psychological explanation lies in the ever greater fusion of instincts which gives more stable and durable, more common, deeper and more pervasive satisfactions. *Man prefers values that are durable, that can be indefinitely shared and are sources of union rather than of strife and division, that are the conditions of other values.* Finally, absolute values are to be preferred to relative ones, and it is these that are the sources of deeper joy and exaltation. It is the ultimate suprarational values of truth, beauty and goodness, which are the standards for the resolution of conflicts arising out of the domination of one level of values over another.

What is the relation of the ulti-



mate values of truth, beauty and goodness to social relations and institutions? Man's mystical consciousness is the ground of his apprehension of truth, beauty and goodness, which form the very substance of a Reality that transcends human and social experience. Man establishes his relations with God through stereotyped channels of impulses and habits, and it is thus that the tender feelings and yearnings of resignation and obedience, of child-and-father love, of self-abasement and self-affirmation, of gregariousness, companionship and even passionate man-woman love, which bind him in social life and relationships, are all implicated in his worship. It is in and through the various attitudes and loyalties in the family life that God, who overreaches all *human* aspirations, becomes revealed as the eternal source and background of the human affective life. On the other hand, a person seizes upon only those attitudes for his religious development which are the most appropriate to his own nature and social situation and can best bring about the unity of self and the universe. Where the gregarious impulse is the dominant disposition, God is regarded as equivalent to the group spirit. Divine companionship satisfies gregariousness on the ideal plane and, therefore, communion with God or with the angels in Paradise is among the most familiar of religious phenomena. Man's self-assertion finds complete fulfilment when he realises that God's servant is especially favoured with God's grace. The worship of the Madonna and

the World-Mother, the Infant Jesus and the Child Krishna, gives expression to the parental desire, which is a compelling urge among most individuals. Where sex-desire is strong the religious and love patterns slip into each other. Mystical love, as when the devotee calls himself the bride of God or the woman mystic speaks of God as the Betrothed and the Bridegroom, is a complex emotional pattern in which sex-love is divested of its physical significance; it overflows on all sides and into it are introduced other emotional patterns, such as the love of parents, of child, of friend and of dependents. When a person outgrows the sex-interest or his temperament is different, filial love or the love between friends may weave the religious pattern. There are ascending degrees of mystical contemplation included in such attitudes, the closest mystical communion achieved between man and the Supreme often expressing itself in terms of man-woman love. Social history and religious tradition also offer images, symbols and ideal forms of conduct, which elicit the appropriate instinctive and imitative behaviour, and its corresponding religious attitudes. In Christianity the image of Jesus on the cross has for centuries aroused love and pity for the unfortunate and the fallen, directing man's gregarious impulse to service and devotion to his fellow men. Similarly the Mahayana conception of God plunging Himself into the ever-rushing current of world-life and sacrificing Himself to save His fellow creatures has kept alive among the masses in Asia the ideal of self-forgetting service. Or,

again, the Hindu Vaishnava mysticism, stressing the image of the individual soul as the bride of God, has aroused an ardent and intimate relation between man and the Deity.

Thus, on the one hand, man's experience of the Holy is the result of the orientation of his subjective motives and attitudes and of complex social and institutional guidance. On the other hand, loyalties in the religious sphere such as expressed in the sentiments and relationships of filial reverence, or of man-woman love, or, again, of self-abasement and self-affirmation play the leading rôle in organising man's permanent attitudes and weaving the pattern of his social bonds. The family, the kindred, the group, thus come to possess a profound spiritual interest and significance for him, reconciling the concrete and the transcendental in the mutual give-and-take of the human and beyond-human aspirations. Accordingly, the religious attitudes and ideal forms of behaviour, rooted as these are in man's social impulses and desires, strengthen social solidarity and promote the conservation of the highest values. These he intuitively realises as above and beyond any measure in which man has so far succeeded in their realisation. These are quite distinct from the values of other levels and claim priority over all, even moral values. Truth, beauty and goodness are more than human values. Yet among man's finite experiences it is the social relationships that are most favourable to the discernment of these, to the realisation of man's oneness with their Becoming. The ideal social relations are, accordingly, a perfect

revelation of the true or the beautiful, *i.e.*, of the Holy in so far it can be discerned in human life and psyche. In phases of social life and relationships, wherever man finds the immutable and the eternal, glimpses of the reality touch him to his innermost depths and give a new and a super-human direction to his impulses and affections. Social relations are also transformed. Upon the individual is projected the substance of all value attitudes and the infinite dignity and majesty of human personality come in for recognition. Men move men not as means but as ends in themselves. Between the husband and the wife, between the child and the parents, in family relationships where the deepest joys are felt, a permanence between the individuals is established which excludes all *ad hoc* contractual relationship and the ends sought are not specific but represent a totality which excludes definition. Religion and the cultural process import the same non-contractual *Gemeinschaft* relationships which grow out of natural, *i.e.*, biological conditions and from local contiguity to other fields, such as those between the king and his subjects, between the landlord and his tenants and between the master-craftsman and his workers. Cultures in the East have sought to modify contractual relationships and instrumental ends in this manner through the rich symbolism that religions have introduced into daily social intercourse. On the one hand, religion fashions God in a human pattern, borrowing its symbols from family relationships. On the other hand, such symbols, pregnant with

emotions through the recreative experience of mystics, become condensed expressions of norms of human and social relations in the popular mind and regulate behaviour in the workaday world.

The mystical consciousness shows a unique flexibility and variation. Differences in mystical attitudes are grounded in differences in individual temperament, social history and tradition. Commonly the mystical attitude is personal, emotional and worshipful, saturated with the sense of unique relationship of self with God as Goodness, Love and Beauty. But sometimes mysticism is impersonal and acosmic. Now, it is an ecstatic communion with Nature in which æsthetic and religious emotions are finely intermingled. Again the inner self or over-soul becomes the essence

of mysticism, which revels in the eternal majesty and aloneness of the self. Then again, the barrier between the other and the self is abolished and mysticism waxes on the cultivation of pity and good will. An infinite charity, compassion or love for suffering humanity results from the mystic's identification of the universe with self. Again, mysticism seeks the Beyond and the Transcendent, something which has no reference and refuses to be disturbed in the sublime height of its Nirvanic calm. But again and again, mysticism measures its depth and its intensity in terms of all-too-human goodness, love and beauty. And as it does so it raises human relations, situations and experiences into another world. Between God and Society there is a give-and-take which has no end.

RADHAKAMAL MUKERJEE

---

## NIRVANA

The sound of a drum before dawn,  
Is a summons of things to be heard,  
Not a word shall we say not a sound  
Shall arise, not the song of a bird.

The ocean is patient and endless,  
And endless and patient our dream,  
For ever was it thus, undisturbed,  
Whatever it may seem.

—BARNETT D. CONLAN

# NEW BOOKS AND OLD

## DEFENCE INVITES WARS\*

In this book Mr. Murry has "tried to reveal the actual growth of the modern world through the minds of some great men who experienced in act or imagination the travail of its becoming". An excellent way of tackling such a theme, because a human, a non-abstract, a non-pedagogic way. He chooses, for its unfolding, among other persons, Montaigne, Cromwell, Godwin, Morris, Marx. And what a capacity he has for being interesting, for being, in the best sense of that misused word, readable! One follows light-footed where he leads—which is not to affirm that the place at which he leads one *out* is necessarily satisfactory; or that he does not arouse irritation in one by the way. The way itself, however, is absorbing. He tells us: Look at That! pointing, for instance, to Cromwell on the eve of Dunbar; asks: Do you see That? indicating the early Christian Church or an aspect of pre-Revolutionary France. And lingeringly we look; charmed we 'see'.

Personally I consider that far the most enthralling spectacle to which Mr. Murry directs our eyes on this particular progress is Chaucer's England. In other words, the three chapters entitled, severally "The Pleine Felicitee", "The Village-Community", and "The Church and the Peasant", are the most valuable, the 'best done' portions of this latest book of his. We feel "on our pulses" the fourteenth-century countryside, the fourteenth-century mental ambient, the complicated, undefined, yet earthily *real* manorial customs. I cannot be too thankful that Mr. Murry did not exclude these chapters from his book, as certain friendly critics, it seems, advised him. Nor can I believe that the spell they cast on one is only due to the

unusualness of the subject matter: unusualness *in itself* cannot grip. No, I believe it is because they are full of a peculiar significance for us to-day. They knock at our vitals, they produce in us (though they are written without a shred of sentimentality) a *nostalgia*. If we have any humankindness—I mean humankindness—left in us at all, if we have not become in this age mere bewildered intellects, mere political theory-spinners, if we love England—the physical England—we are bound to respond to phrases such as "Common-fields"; "security of the peasant"; "disappearance of the little holdings"; "the holder really 'held' his strip of arable..."; "neither lord nor village-community 'owned' the land"; "the peasant had many holidays—ten times as many as the agricultural labourer has to-day"; "what the peasant really wanted, in striving for emancipation, was a little more security".

Mr. Murry makes it clear that the Church let down the poor peasant. He makes it clear that the freedom finally bestowed on the serfs was a thin poor freedom—no substance in it; it led to the Poor Law and to wage-slavery. He sees so many problems in so true a light that it is unendurable when that light wavers, when he fails to fix it—and dazzlingly—on the inevitable *solution* of the problems. He so nearly does, yet always he fails; and I find myself exasperatedly wondering how he is *able* to write with such warmth, penetration, humanity, of the (dispossessed) land-workers, of the evil growth of Money Power, of the devastating effects of the Machine, of the lack of true freedom for the individual, without perceiving the one antidote to these ills.

The sort of Socialism to which he

\* *Heaven and Earth*. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. (Jonathan Cape, London, 10s. 6d.)

here and there refers will not do the trick ; nor, I fear, that more frequently referred to regeneration of the Christian Church. No, the means to human freedom, to human security, to human life, in fact, is the socialization of *credit*—not of the means of production, but of credit, *i.e.*, money. Money, at present the great tyrant, can be made the good servant. There are no enemies to the human race to-day except the obscure and powerful group who manipulate credit ; who are not only behind capitalists but behind governments. Security for the peasant ? Of course it can be had. Security for every man on the land—big-holder or small-holder. Security for shopkeepers, factory hands and gardeners, doctors, school-teachers, artists, tramps. Security for the English earth itself—now criminally allowed to run to waste ; security for corn. It could be bestowed, such security, within *one month* of the establishment of a régime of communally-controlled credit—that it is to say, of Social Credit. *That* is the resolute, not only of the class war but of international wars, of the pointless bitter conflict between Right and Left ; it is the resolute, I venture to assert, even of such non-material phenomena as the hatred, the non-religion and uncharitableness abroad in the world to-day which so sickens Mr. Murry—and all of us.

But Mr. Murry will not point to *that*. After giving us a brilliant exposé of the modern situation, after tracing its growth from past periods, after making statements of irrefutable justice and wisdom concerning it he funks, it seems to me, the issue ; stops just short of following to their logical conclusions his own arguments. I found him failing in the same way in his last book but one, *The Necessity of Pacifism*, and was wrought to the same pitch of expectation there as here ; then bumped to the same plane of disappointment. If Mr. Murry were *less* illuminating, if he went

*less* far along the road of truth, one wouldn't mind. Other writers on the social situation, other writers offering remedies are so helplessly bogged that one is hardly disturbed. *Let* them flounder on, one thinks. But not Mr. Murry. *He* must follow out his thought ; must not be allowed to swerve, to shuffle, to damp down his light.

The fact that I have dwelt disproportionately upon one part of his book is a measure of that part's vitality. But indeed the whole is vital. Also it has far less of, almost none at all of, that rather repellent egotism which smears so many of his writings. It is fresh, vigorous, sensitive. I should like to single out for particular praise (after the Medieval England chapters) that chapter entitled "Imagination and the Machine"—a quite admirable piece of writing of which the high spot is the page on modern Germany.

Of the more sheerly literary chapters, perhaps that on Montaigne is the most delight-giving. With what heartfelt response one reads the following quotation from the old Renaissance philosopher, the "first conscious Individual man", as Mr. Murry calls him.

That so many fortified houses have been destroyed, while this of mine still endures, makes me suspect that they were lost because they were guarded. That gives the assailant both the desire and the justification. All defence carries a face of war. Let them fall upon my house, if it is God's will, but at any rate I shall not invite them.

If *Heaven and Earth* had only been written to remind us of that passage so painfully relevant to-day, its purpose would have been commendable.

Without, however, being able to pretend that I have read all Mr. Murry's works ; and without, as I have said, agreeing with his social and moral nostrums, I hazard the affirmation that this book is among the best he has produced—if not absolutely the best.

IRENE RATHBONE

*Stories from the Old Testament : Joseph and His Brothers ; Moses ; Ruth ; David.* Written and illustrated in colour lithography By MAUD and MISKA PETERSHAM. (J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London. Each volume 2s. 6d.)

Beautifully printed, captivatingly illustrated, with the inner covers delightfully decorated in Wedgwood fashion, these four volumes are bound to appeal to all—children and grown-ups alike. The publishers are fortunate in having secured the competent collaboration of Maud and Miska Petersham in this series of Bible tales—a series which, we hope, is not to end with the four volumes under review. The stories—and these of course it were impertinent to commend—are well and simply retold. Certain incidents in the lives of these Biblical characters are unsuitable for children, and these have been either skated over or omitted altogether without, however, causing any interruption in the narrative.

It is good, also, that the writers have kept strictly to the Biblical text in such passages as Ruth's appeal to Naomi and David's lament over the death of Absalom. We could have wished that room had been found for at least a portion of his lament over the deaths of Saul and Jonathan, one of the most glorious passages in the Old Testament.

What were known some fifty years ago and more as the "Plagues" of Egypt are here, perhaps more accurately, described as "The Ten Signs". How the Commandments came into being is related, but the Commandments themselves are not given—which seems a little curious.

The illustrations, both in colour and monochrome, are sure to please. We were specially thrilled with the depiction of Pharaoh and his host being trapped in the Red Sea. On seeing this illustration, and indeed on re-reading the history of Moses, we wondered whether the God of the Jews has any particular catastrophe in store for Pharaoh's moral descendant in Europe to-day.

T. L. C.

*The Glory of God : A Letter to My Son.* By ROBERT O. BALLOU. (Covici Friede, New York. \$2.00)

The title is rather misleading for this volume does not, in fact, depict the glory of God. The sub-title seems more appropriate. The author tells his young son the story of his religious life. David, the six-year-old boy, has asked him about God and in reply the father describes how he grew up in the Methodist Episcopal Church but later dissented from it and developed a wider outlook in religion.

Mr. Ballou frankly confesses that he is unable to find in the Churches any religion that can satisfy the rational mind of the age or the needs of a true Christian with a knowledge of modern thought. It is high time for the leaders of Christianity in all countries to reform

the Churches and to supplant their dogmas with the universal doctrines of the East.

The author asks his son to take as the most important task of his life the search for God—the God not of Jesus only, but also of Moses and Gautama, of Vardhaman and Lao-tze.

After quoting several dictionary definitions of religion, the author defines it as the constant awareness of a force which motivates the universe in a completely orderly way and moves through all life. In our opinion this definition falls short of universal adequacy. Awareness of a Cosmic Power not outside of us but within, as our inmost being, is essential ; that is why a modern mystic has defined religion as the manifestation of Divinity already in man.

SWAMI JAGADISWARANANDA

*Brahma-Sutras.* By SWAMI VIRESWARANANDA. (Advaita Ashrama, Mayavati, Almora. Rs. 3.)

We are greatly indebted to Swami Vireswarananda for the care and scholarship with which he has edited the *Brahmasutras*. His translation of the original text is lucid, his explanations clear and his rendering of Sankara to the point. The value of the edition is enhanced by two useful indexes : one of the Sutras themselves and the other of their general topics. The Swami has further displayed his learning in a long introduction, enlightening us about the nature and history of the *Brahmasutras*, to which he adds a very able discussion on "adhyāsa", or "superimposition", viz., Sankara's explanation of Māyā. For anyone approaching the study of Philosophy from the standpoint of Psychology the study of Adhyāsa is important, because it forms the very key to the validity of transcendental knowledge based on ignorance. A few general remarks on problems may not be inappropriate. For orientation I quote from the Swami's introduction :—

For centuries philosophic thought developed in India till it became so unwieldy that a regular systematization was found a great necessity. This led to the Sutra literature. These treatises were written in short aphorisms and were intended as memory aids to long discussions on any topic which the student had gone through with his teacher. The desire for brevity was carried to such extremes that most of the Sutra literature is now unintelligible, and this is particularly so with regard to the Vedāntasutras. Bādarāyana, to whom the Brahmasutras or Vedāntasutras are ascribed, is not the only systematizer of the philosophy of the Upanishads, but his work is probably the last and best.

With the acknowledged lack of a consistent system of thought (there are 191 topics discussed in the 555 sutras) these sutras share the common weakness of Indian philosophy, viz., want of order and overabundance of material, caused by super-detailed observation. Although there may be conciseness in detail yet there is vagueness in generalities, so that the chief impression is one of sublime bewilderment. This kind of literature can never have an intrinsic popular and

educative value like that of the masterpieces of epic narrative or heroic history (like *Sāvitrī* and *Manimekhalai*).

Apart from specifically Indian traits there are other stumbling blocks preventing a philosophy becoming a means of realising the Ideal. These are the pairs of opposites attached to intellectual activity, e.g., among others : the contrast (1) between subject and object ; (2) between sense-perception and super-sensory knowledge ; (3) between change in appearance and persistence of a substratum. All these contrasts are discussed with great ingenuity in Indian philosophy, culminating very often in a simile or comparison (*upamā*), and thus bringing metaphysical truth down to the simplest material illustration and settling the question through an appeal to the visible. Nothing can be said against this method : for is not the same done in mathematical proof when an equation or formula indicates that we substitute a comparison for the Incomparable because we must have something tangible which stands for the Intangible? We *must* make a comparison because that is the only way by which we can proceed from the Known to the Unknown. The whole of man's metaphysical activity is indeed an "*Adhyāsa*": the superimposition of Man on everything, measuring the whole Universe by his stature, acting as if he were God and dealing with God as if He were man (*cp. ātmā = puruṣavidhā*!). This is nothing else but what with a Greek term we call anthropomorphism. No dweller in the flesh (including philosophers) can retire to another sphere of being in that sphere's form ; he can only try to bring down the other sphere to his own level. Therefore it is wonderfully comforting and naively true when a metaphysical discussion on the intricate problem of cause and effect (or of unmanifest and manifest) is brought down to the homely aphorism of "paṭavat" "like a cloth" meaning that, as in the folded state one cannot make out whether it is a cloth or not, the world exists before manifestation in a potential state and takes a discernible form after

it, like the cloth spread out.

By the present edition these Sutras have been rendered more accessible to study. This does not mean that their study has become easy. Far from it. They remain very difficult, and the greater the ingenuity of the scholar or commentator in explaining the difficulties, the more complicated will the real problem become because the intellectual tangle increases, and every rationalisation of the Irrational will increase Māyā. But in themselves the *Brahmasutras* will

lift us above the trivial and with their own and the great Sankara's depth of thought will form a useful training, even if its result be the recognition of the insufficiency of reasoned thought. The real Brahmagyā lies on a totally different level : on that of divine revelation which transcends the limitations of thinking. Neither with spectacles nor with speculation can Deity be seen : It is seen only by those who perceive It in themselves with introverted gaze.

W. STEDE

*Hindu Scriptures*. Edited by DR. NICOL MACNICOL. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London. 2s.)

We welcome this addition to *Everyman's Library*. In less than three hundred pages are gathered together some of the valuable treasures of ancient Indian literature—thirty Hymns from the *Rigveda*, five *Upanishads* and the *Gita*. The book contains an illuminating Foreword by Rabindranath Tagore, in which he brings out the essential spiritual significance of the *Vedas*, the *Upanishads* and the *Gita*. In his introduction, Dr. Macnicol gives a sympathetic and historical account of these scriptures. It is however doubtful whether Krishna should be described as a god who possesses "a form of terror", just because Arjuna was filled with supernormal awe at the sight of his Universal form.

The translations reproduced here are well known, those of Max Müller and Barnett. There may be legitimate dispute as to how some particular text should be translated, but these English versions, on the whole, are faithful.

It may be noted here that although

these texts are described as Hindu Scriptures, and they are held in highest esteem, the Hindus possess no one volume like the *Bible* or the *Koran* by which their religious life may be said to be entirely guided. The study of the *Vedas* was once obligatory, but to-day at least the *Samhitas* and the *Brahmanas*, have ceased to be a living force; an orthodox Hindu may achieve all the religious progress he seeks without reading the *Upanishads* and the *Gita*, because he has other sources of inspiration. Although we all nominally owe allegiance to the *Vedas*, we actually derive our spiritual sustenance from various sources. There are different kinds of sacred literature, all together covering a very vast field—*Darshanas*, *Dharmashastras*, *Puranas*, *Tantras*, etc. ; these have religious authority for the Hindus, and one can always draw on them according to one's capacity and need. The Vedic Hymns, the *Upanishads* and the *Gita*, important as they are, cannot therefore give an adequate idea of the vast field, and the different kinds, of scriptures that nourish the Hindu in his religious life.

R. DAS



*The Wisdom of Confucius.* Edited by LIN YUTANG. (World's Best Book Series, The Modern Library, New York. 95 cents.)

Though twenty-five centuries have rolled away since Master Kung lived and taught, yet his teachings form the core of the philosophy of life of modern China. In spite of the onslaughts of Taoism, Naturalism, Legalism, Communism and the like, Confucianism is still a living force in the lives of millions because of the basic appeal of its humanism.

China was a small country in the sixth century B.C., but it was a country of culture and scholarship, though already a little effete. All its skills and knowledge it had taught itself, as there was then little cultural intercourse with countries outside its borders. But unfortunately its feudal lords and vassals were themselves destroying the stability of its society: personal ambitions and rivalries were stronger than loyalty, corruption was widely prevalent and the common people as usual were the sufferers.

It was at such a time that Master Kung came upon the scene. He was born of a good but poor family and learnt much about the sufferings of his people in the course of his first employment as a collector of tithes among the farmers. By temperament he was a scholar; he gave up his collector's post soon after his mother's death and adopted teaching as his profession, always studying the while. Chapter II of this book gives us a clear insight into the life and career of Confucius. For the first time we have here in English a translation of *The Life of Confucius*, the earliest biographical sketch of Confucius, written by the great historian Szema Ch'ien.

The political and social conditions of his time were no insignificant factors in the development of Confucius' philosophy. Chapter III on "Central Harmony" gives a complete and adequate basis to the whole

Confucian system, culminating in the doctrine of the Golden Rule. Living as he did in the midst of social and political chaos, it was but natural that Confucius should aim at the restoration of a rationalized feudal order. This he attempted through an ethical approach based on personal cultivation. Chapter IV on "Ethics and Politics" shows the logical connection between a world order as the final aim and the cultivation of the personal life by individuals as a prerequisite. His political philosophy therefore traces back the ordering of the national life to the regulation of family life, and the regulation of family life to the cultivation of the personal life which, in modern terms, is really education and training for good citizenship.

This idea is carried further in the Three Confucian Discourses (Chapters VI, VII and VIII) where we get a clearer conception of his social philosophy, which is a plan to bring about political reform by laying the basis for it in a moral order, and also to abolish the distinction between politics and ethics. We are then introduced in the tenth and eleventh chapters, to the Confucian ideas on education and music, which are singularly modern in point of view. Chapter V gives us the "aphorisms" of Confucius, selected and regrouped from the *Analects*. Finally the reader is given a selection from Mencius, which represents a most influential development of Confucian philosophy.

Dr. Lin Yutang has taken great pains to collect from reliable sources all pertinent texts which express the teachings of Confucius on education, music, ritual, politics, social and personal ethics, and to translate them into modern English. The result of his efforts is an excellent handy volume which is a contribution not only to a fuller appreciation of the Master's magnetic influence over four hundred millions of people, but also to a better understanding of his ideas as a well co-ordinated system.

J. M. KUMARAPPA

*The Philosophy of Whitehead.* By RASVIHARY DAS, M.A., Ph.D. (James Clarke and Co., Ltd., London. 6s.)

Here is a clear and concise exegesis of the fundamental ideas contained in Whitehead's three books, *Process and Reality*, *Adventures of Ideas*, and *Science and the Modern World*.

A great philosophical writing, such as Whitehead's, should be approached at first-hand, for its own direct and individual message to us. As in æsthetic appreciation, the philosophical exegesis should follow in the wake of the masterpiece. Taken in this way Dr. Das's volume is to be highly valued as exposition and criticism. He applies himself to his task with fine concentration upon the most important doctrines, attempting less than Miss Emmitt, in her recent book, to show their relationship with other systems of thought.

Whitehead's philosophy is variously called the Philosophy of Organism, Speculative Philosophy, and the Philosophy of Feeling. It is based upon a vast knowledge of science and western philosophical tradition. He broadly defines his aim as "the endeavour to frame a coherent, logical, necessary system of general ideas in terms of which every element of our experience can be interpreted".

In his introduction to *Process and Reality* he writes :—

There is no doctrine put forward which cannot cite in its defence some explicit statement of one of this great group of thinkers, (Descartes, Locke, Hume), or one of the two founders of all Western thought, Plato and Aristotle. But the philosophy of organism is apt to emphasize first those elements in the writings of those masters which subsequent systematizers have put aside. The writer who most fully anticipated the main position of the philosophy of organism is John Locke.

Whitehead seldom makes reference to Eastern thought, yet in this same volume says :—

In this general position the philosophy of organism seems to approximate more to some strains of Indian, or Chinese, thought than to western Asiatic, or European thought.

Dr. Das does not essay a comparative

study here with Hindu conceptions, but there is much in Whitehead's doctrine to stimulate such an attempt.

Yet few will begin to read Whitehead without the feeling of having entered an unfamiliar world, due only in part to the individual terminology which he uses ; it is due rather to his fresh and direct vision, in which the disciple of Hindu thought and Theosophy will find much of great significance, but where he will also feel a lack of important matter.

One misses in works upon Whitehead the emphasis which he so eloquently gives to speculation, originality, novelty, imagination, intuition, and the need of creativity in life. (See in *Process and Reality* the chapter on "The Ideal Opposites".)

Dr. Das devotes himself in this work largely to the following categories of Whitehead's thought : actual entities, eternal objects, the extensive continuum, propositions, feelings, perception, truth and God.

For Whitehead the essence of experience is feeling, not knowledge. He gives much emphasis to the subject as the product of the object, which he considers more properly called the "superject". Yet he teaches that the world process is not so much toward objective results as towards subjective feelings; and "when they are obtained in some form of definite unity, the evolving actual entity realizes what is called its 'satisfaction,' and falls into...the status of an object, becoming an element in the objective construction of another entity which takes rise from it." This development of the feeling is referred to as "concrecence," one aspect of the double fluency of the world process ; the other, its objectification, is referred to as "transition".

Whitehead refers to perception as "symbolic reference". He deserves special credit for his teaching that there is another primary mode more fundamental than this, which he calls the mode of causal efficacy, ignored by both Kant and Hume. At the time of sense perception, we feel not only the sensum but also the fact that we are experiencing

with one of the sense organs ; in this he discovers the significant mode of causal efficacy.

Truth by itself is no value, and is not self-justified. That exalted status of being something that requires no external justification and claims realization for its own sake, belongs to beauty. The concept of beauty is more comprehensive than the concept of truth. Truth concerns the relation between appearance and reality. But in the case of beauty, the inter-relations of the different elements of reality, as well as the relations of appearance and reality, are concerned. Truth is valuable when it subserves the purpose of beauty. And it is because truth really performs an important function in the service of beauty that it is considered valuable for its own sake.

Whitehead declares (so writes Dr. Das) :—

The teleology of the universe is directed to the production of Beauty.

Dr. Das again :—

*The Coming Victory of Democracy.*  
By THOMAS MANN. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York. \$1.)

Thomas Mann's analysis of the present international situation comes on us as a surprise. He starts with defining Democracy as "that form of Government and of society which is inspired above every other with the feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man". Although this is more a description than a definition we have no quarrel with it. In applying it to value the different forms of government he allows himself to be influenced by his own feelings. Being an exile from Germany, he directs his attack against Nazism and Fascism. This subjective judgment vitiates his whole theme. He describes Russia, England, France and America as democracies working for peace and harmony. But for his bias against Germany and Italy his eyes would have discerned the Imperialism of England and America and the spitefulness of France. The mere absence of war is not peace. Peace cannot be founded on fear, suspicion and hatred, which are the components of the present-day atmosphere in Europe. For decades there has not been any distant

Every actual occasion begins with a hybrid physical feeling of God. In this initial feeling God is felt as conceptually feeling the eternal objects, and from this is derived a conceptual feeling of some relevant eternal object, which is nothing but a yearning after an ideal. Every actual occasion thus derives its ideal from the primordial nature of God. . . . There is a sense in which we may speak of God as one and also as many ; and there is a sense in which we may speak of the world as one and also as many. God is one in His primordial nature, and many in His consequent nature. The world is many in temporal procession, but one in everlastingness. . . . Every actuality, evanescent in this temporal occurrence, is invested with the quality of everlastingness, when it is taken up into the consequent nature of God.

Whitehead uses these words of God :—

He is the poet of the world, with tender patience leading it by His vision of truth, beauty and goodness.

E. H. BREWSTER

sign of peace in Europe. What we have is either static or kinetic war all the time. We can hardly agree with his conclusion that "Europe has arrived at a stage of social maturity in which war has become impossible as a political weapon", nor with his statement that "democracy is no longer interested in power and hegemony, nor in politics as a means towards gaining them, but is interested only in peace". Does he imagine imperialism is a thing of the past if he considers England and America as true democracies ?

We agree with his suggestion that "social reform must aim at spiritual as well as economic freedom". In our opinion this can only be done when nations are prepared to surrender a portion of their sovereignty to an impartial tribunal and subject themselves cheerfully to its regulations. We can have no peace as long as each nation maintains its right to defend itself. Every nation should divest itself of its army, navy and air-force and be content with the policing by a central body. Will the so-called democratic nations be prepared to do this ? To-day there is no such thing as a true democracy as all power rests with

the vested interests. We are sure a man of the calibre of Thomas Mann but for his personal prejudice would have sensed the lack of the true spirit of democracy

amongst those who hold the reins of government in the West. Though this may be understandable, his analysis is disappointing.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

*Mohammed.* By ESSAD BEY. (Cobden-Sanderson, London. 8s. 6d.)

The author, who writes ably in German, is of Jewish extraction and Russian origin (Azerbaijan). Adopting the name of Essad Bey he pretends to be a convert to Islam, but is unfamiliar with the Arab countries.

During the past few years, a good number of biographies of Mohammed have been written by Muslim writers and European scholars. The present work by Essad Bey is introduced by the publishers to the ordinary reader, who is neither scholar nor student, as "an account of the life of the Prophet of Islam which is at once fluent and authoritative". This narrative may be fluent but is, unfortunately, not authoritative. The author, who is obviously more of a novelist than of a historian, has written a biography which would mislead the ordinary reader and shock scholars and students of history. Even as a novel, this book is not of a high standard, and Muslims would ban this biography which is replete with errors: historical, linguistic, traditional, etc. Distorted facts and misinterpretations are met with throughout. To cite only a few examples: His account of the Prophet's marriage to Khadija, his first wife, (pp. 64-67) is inaccurate. His statement that Khadija's father was not inclined to consent to the marriage is incorrect, for he died a few years before. Further, Khadija bore for him four daughters, and not three; and three sons whose names were: Al-Qasim, Al-Tahir and Al-Tayib and not Atakhair and Abd-Manaf. The author states on p. 79 that Mohammed believed himself to be an inspired prophet and not Rasul (messenger of God). This is a flagrant and grave error, for the very

act of Faith (*Shahadah*) of Islam is a proof that Mohammed was a messenger of God. As an example of his careless interpretation may be mentioned his statement on p. 139 that prayer itself was not always obligatory, and that even pilgrimage and fasting could be avoided. His description of the reaction of the Muslims after the early battles is fantastically absurd, (p. 198): "The Moslems gave themselves over to pleasures, wine flowed through the streets of Medina, music could be heard from every house, and the pious warriors feasted upon the beauty of strange slaves." He, further, would have the reader believe that Islam was spread at the point of the sword; an absurd and false allegation.

The insincerity of the writer may be proved by many statements in his biography. Thus, for example, he writes, on p. 182: "The Prophet changed into a bloodthirsty despot who utilized every trick and treachery to punish even the suspicion of ridicule against his faith"; and he, shamelessly, describes the early Muslims as "the miserable desert robbers" (p. 171).

The author, however, has something good to say about Islam. He says on p. 90 that "Islam raised charity to an article of faith. . . Basically, it was the first attempt at social relief in a world which was religiously united." And on p. 143: "Islam deserves credit for having been the first to give democracy (that is, the thesis of absolute equality of mankind) development on a broad scale." He writes on p. 139: "Islam is probably the only world religion which recognizes the belief that the adherents of other religions are not barred from attaining salvation."

ZAKI ALI

*Walt Whitman and the Springs of Courage.* By HANIEL LONG. (Writers' Editions, Inc., Santa Fe, New Mexico. \$2.50.)

In regard to "any grand production of literature", the only way to understand it, says Whitman, "is to minutely study the personality of the one who shaped it. This supplies not only the glass through which to look, but it is the atmosphere, the very light itself". This very method Haniel Long uses. The author deals with Whitman's belief in phrenology, culture, religion, love between man and woman, and with his associations with intimate friends and admirers like Mrs. Gilchrist and Peter Doyle. In spite of his strenuous attempt to discover the poet's personality in all these directions, Mr. Long does not fully succeed for Whitman is elusive and enigmatical.

In dealing with what he calls "Whitman's Americanism", Mr. Long informs us that while the poet's Americanism repelled the literary men of his time in New England, his European critics acclaimed it as of tremendous cultural significance. They maintained that the ideas Whitman had expressed in his *Leaves of Grass* were so rare and utterly new, that they "could never have come out of Europe". They were alien, not only to Europe, however, but also to America. They may well be described as a synthetic product of Indian and American thought. Unfortunately, the author does not take into consideration the influence of Oriental ideas of Walt Whitman's thinking. Thoreau was right in humorously calling the *Leaves* a mixture of the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the *New York Herald*. Assimilating some

ideas, Whitman reproduced them according to his own genius.

It may be pointed out that the poet's presentation of Oriental ideas in the light of American thought led the Puritan New Englanders to label him as irreligious. In the chapter on "Whitman and Religion", the author quotes a passage which gives us Whitman's attitude toward religion.

Declares the poet :

I claim everything for religion : after the claims of my religion are satisfied nothing is left for anything else ; yet I have been called irreligious—an infidel (God help me !); as if I could have written a word of the *Leaves* without its religious root-ground. I am not traditionally religious—I know it ; but even traditionally I am not anti : I take all the old forms and faiths and remake them in conformity with the modern spirit, not rejecting a single item from the earlier programmes.

The fact that, "living in an age of emphatic denominationalism, of fire, brimstone and finality", Whitman stood fearlessly for the principle of taking what is best in all religions and remaking them in conformity with the modern spirit shows his unflinching courage and prophetic vision. Naturally therefore the poet provides an excellent example for the author's whole discussion of the sources of human vitality and courage. If Walt Whitman is a prophet of the New Age, he is so in trying to bring about synthesis of ideas, Eastern and Western. In trying to interpret how "Walt Whitman dared (and cared) to be Walt Whitman", Mr. Long reassesses his value as a prophet to the modern age. In spite of its shortcomings, the book, not only helps one to a better understanding of Walt Whitman but also makes clear the magnitude of his achievement.

RATNAM KUMARAPPA

*Nyayamrita Lahari*. By R. NAGA RAJA SARMA. (In Sanskrit). (Available from the author, 1/42 Car Street, Triplicane, Madras)

Pandit Mahamahopadhyaya Ananta Krishna Sastri of the Calcutta University recently brought out in the "Calcutta Sanskrit Series" a volume entitled *Nyayamrita-Adwaita Siddhee* with two introductions—one in Sanskrit, the other in English. Dr. R. Naga Raja Sarma has written this pamphlet to refute more than twenty points selected from that book. Ostensibly, the refutations contest the views held by Pandit Ananta Krishna Sastri, but really this pamphlet criticises adversely from the standpoint of the views held by Madhawacharya in the *Purnaprajna Darshanam*, some well-known theories propounded in the Sankara-Vedanta. We shall, however, give but one example to illustrate how Dr. Naga Raja Sarma has tried to establish his Dwaita position as against the Adwaitist views.

*Brahman* in Sankara-Vedanta is held to be the material as well as the efficient cause of the universe. But Madhawacharya does not consider Brahman as the material cause. What constitutes the material cause of a thing can never be the cause of its destruction. Gold is the material cause of a necklace, and other ornaments produced from it; but how can the same gold constitute itself the cause of the destruction of those ornaments? In the *Brahma-Sutras*, Brahman is held to be the cause of both the production and the destruction of the world, which shows that Brahman is to be viewed only as the efficient cause. By what proof, the author asks, can Brahman be established as the material cause? By immediate perception? No; for Brahman the Absolute is not an object of sense perception. Inference also is of no avail. The material cause changes into its products. How can Brahman be held as the material cause of the changing world of *nama-rupa*? From *Sruti* we learn that Brahman is not liable to change. To avoid this difficulty, the Adwaitins have recourse to the *vivartavada*, according to which

the world of *nama-rupa*, though apparent, is *unreal*. Thus the proof of inference fails to establish the material causality of Brahman. The last proof—the *Agama*—is also useless; for the *Sruti* states only the efficient causality of Brahman.

Our author finds several mistakes in the introductions by Radhakrishnan and Suryanarayanan, of which only two seem very serious.

There has been much confusion in determining the age of Madhusudana and Gadadhara—two well-known figures in Indian philosophical literature. In this respect, the English and Sanskrit Introductions have reached mutually contradictory conclusions. In the Sanskrit introduction, Madhusudana's age is shown to be the closing portion of the sixteenth century and Brahmánanda, a contemporary of Gadadhara, as belonging to the seventeenth century, whereas the English introduction assigns Madhusudana to the sixteenth century. A statement in one of the Introductions that Gadadhara was rendered mute when he met Madhusudana at Mathura proves inconsistent, if they belonged to different centuries. Another mistake about some well-known works is made in the English introduction. It is stated that Vijayindra wrote a book, *Goodárthadeepiká-Yukti Malliká* which refutes some of Madhusudana's views. This, our author shows, is a blunder. There are three distinct works. Vádirája wrote a book, *Yukti Malliká*. There are two other works from the same hand, *Gurvarthadeepiká*, a commentary on the *Gita* and the other an exposition of the commentary on the *Brahma-Sutras*. The writers are wrong both in giving the name *Goodarthadeepiká* for *Gurvarthadeepiká* and in grouping three separate works under one name.

Dr. Naga Raja Sarma displays a striking command of Sanskrit. His style throughout is simple, chaste and sweet in its easy flow. Nowadays, to be able to write in Sanskrit—almost classic in its diction—reflects credit on the author of this pamphlet.

KOKILESWAR SASTRI

*Founders of Vijayanagara.* By S. SRIKANTAYA. (The Mythic Society, Bangalore. Rs. 5 or 10s.)

Now that the particularly Hindu institution of Aryanism has been appropriated by a Teutonic nation it is opportune that archæologists have brought to light in the Indo-Sumerian civilization of Mohen-jò-daro a pre-Aryan civilization, which was materially just as advanced as the Aryan.

Vijayanagara is an excellent example of Aryanism creating a civilization and an empire out of Dravidian soil. I read Mr. Srikantaya's book as a layman. In these days the layman must take an interest not only in archæology but in higher physics. I am sure that Mr. Srikantaya, in lecturing on this subject under the auspices of the Universities of Annamalai and Mysore, respectively, and now in publishing the substance of those lectures in book form, wishes to enlist a larger audience than that of his fellow historians and archæologists for what is undoubtedly an interesting thesis—namely, that the empire of Vijayanagara came into being for the protection, the consolidation and the extension of Hinduism, which in the fourteenth century had a flourishing centre at Vijayanagara. If Mr. Srikantaya's contention is right, this instance is in strong contrast to the case of Asoka, who created an empire and found the establishment of Dharma was necessary to keep that empire together. To quote the author :—

The origin and establishment of the Vijayanagara empire was not born of any attachment to any particular form of Hinduism. It was a comprehensive movement, taking into its fold all forms of the Hindu faith, including the prevalent forms of Jainism and other religious faiths of a non-descript character, for the preservation of the independence of Hindu *dharma*, free from the onrush of the proselytising Muhammedan, and to provide for it a peaceful home. . . . Like the love of country with the enemy at the gate love of religion takes hold when it is fiercely attacked from without. Such a love appeared in the Karnataka country in the fourteenth century, long prior to the development of the national idea in Europe.

One of the prominent leaders of this movement was Vidyaranya, the St. Paul

of this period, according to Mr. Srikantaya, identified also with Madhava, which was possibly an appellation like "Sripada" or "Sankaracharya" for eminent Gurus.

Those better qualified than I am might dispute it when Mr. Srikantaya eulogizes his hero thus :—

There is no one to compare to Madhava amongst the gurus of Sringeri in learning. But for him the Vedas would have been a sealed book to Sanskrit scholars . . . his encyclopædic knowledge enabled him to comprehend the Vedas in their true light.

There is much scholarship and erudition in this small book but it suffers from a superfluity of language, permissible in the lecture room, but awkward in a book. The using of the passive and active tenses in the same sentence, the omission of the definite article, the introduction of staccato sentences like pellets from a toy pistol, such as "Currency was tampered with and inflated" (p. 27), and the piling up of tables and footnotes—in short, all the lesser sins of the modern Indian author and printer and publisher combined are found here. Nor must I pass over another common caprice of Indian scholars, that, for example, of referring to the same person as Madhava, Madhavacarya, Vidyaranya, Vidyatirtha, all in the same breath. And Mutt in one sentence, followed by Matha in the next. How confusing it must be to non-Indian readers! And the price asked is needlessly prohibitive.

Indian scholars have a responsibility. First, they must set an example of concise, coherent speech and writing for the intelligentsia of their own country. Secondly, they must try to arouse an even larger interest in Indian culture abroad, which again makes it necessary that they should be concise and coherent. I make these comments simply because Mr. Srikantaya with his unusual knowledge of, and enthusiasm for, this subject could have presented this material to better advantage with more careful editing.

J. VIJAYA-TUNGA

*Social Interest : A Challenge to Mankind.* By ALFRED ADLER. (Faber and Faber, Ltd., London. 10s. 6d.)

With the death of Adler, and the dispersion of the Viennese schools, it is likely that psychology approaches a crisis. So far the development of this kind of thought has been in the hands of sharply-differentiated groups, each under the banner of a leading personality. That under Freud had the greatest initial success, that under Adler has probably made the greatest progress in recent years. This is partly because Adler's views are more reasonable and more easily adapted to an orthodox medical practice than the horrific hell-glances of Freud; and partly because he was content to leave them rather as a working hypothesis than to explore their full implications.

He sees mankind working towards a goal of perfection by the exercise and growth of their "social feeling". Thus, the child makes use of the material it finds in its heredity and environment so as to construct a "style of life"; that style will be good or faulty according to whether it achieves for the owner a genuine co-operation with his fellows. Now this is common sense. It must often be a relief for a patient to come upon it after a prolonged entanglement with the cruelly-brilliant probing of the Freudians. Yet it does not take us very far after all. The business of constructing a "style of life" which will approximate to an "ultimate goal of perfection"

is a matter of such importance that it has never been left entirely to the individual. What Individual Psychology discovers among its patients is various imperfect copies of the life-styles taught by the great religions and modified by secular forces. Adler neither chooses among these, nor attempts a synthesis of them. The result is in practice, his "ultimate goal" must become no more than the healthy norm, the acceptance of the average standards of his day as sufficient to aim at. "When we speak of virtue we mean that a person plays his part; when we speak of vice we mean that he interferes with co-operation." One cannot help visualising those words framed and hung in the manager's office of a modern mass-production factory as a tribute to that statistical average man to whom our civilisation bows the knee.

The healthy norm is so often an unhealthy thing to contemplate. It needs more than that to inspire the advance in social feeling of which the world stands in need. Still, Adler cleared the way when he set up the necessary hypothesis that health, in the fullest meaning, depends upon the building of life-styles expressive of social feeling. That is a better legacy than a completed system. He has left to his successors, now that his part is unfortunately over, something to work on, a way of looking freshly upon the fundamental human relations. How they are to live in this light is for them to discover.

JACK COMMON

*Resources for Living : A Plain Man's Philosophy.* By GAIUS GLENN ATKINS. (Harper and Brothers, New York and London. \$2. 50c.)

Though I am not able to share the confession of a reviewer's faith that "to smoke a pipe with Atkins is to understand a good deal more about the mood of modern religion than can ever be put into a polite essay...", I am glad to commend this volume as revealing an honest, sustained and vigorous effort to emphasize and underline the truth that if modern mankind will but direct its

energies to kindling into activity certain "resources" which now lie latent, mundane life will be rendered not merely happy and free from discord but the spiritual blessings of a higher life can be actually enjoyed, "an Unseen Comradship attending us". I would particularly commend the chapter on "The Resources of Religion" in which he observes, "Without religion in some form or other the finer graces of life have hitherto been burnt out." As a philosophical book the volume is disappointing. If a plain man, a sophisti-



cated man, a dictator, a world-monop-  
 alist, if each should have a  
 "philosophy" characteristically one's  
 own and proceed to put it into practice  
 employing means fair and foul,  
 philosophy, I am afraid must become  
 emptied of all concrete content. "Love  
 and labour, the free and happy use of  
 all our faculties in creative play,  
 contentment in friendship, the enjoy-  
 ment of the beautiful and faith in  
 realities beyond the testimony of the  
 sense are the true resources of living",  
 concludes Atkins, but, "Getting-on-in-  
 the-world" is to-day the only ruling  
 gospel, and Atkins nowhere tells what  
 a plain man is to do when confronted  
 with the inevitable conflict between the  
 "Getting on" of one individual and  
 another, one nation and another. For in  
 certain situations of life and characteris-  
 tic moulds of thought and patterns of  
 behaviour plainness is just emptiness.  
 To a specific problem with which he  
 felt himself confronted, Arjuna

demanded an answer. Without beating  
 about the bush, Krishna rendered an  
 answer understanding of which  
 revived an inactive Arjuna into a  
 dynamic fighter against sham, and  
 simulacra, humbug and hypocrisy.  
 Philosophers, in the sense of  
 academicians, writers of books plain and  
 sophisticated, act and live under the  
 urge of "Getting-on". To the many  
 modern miniature editions of Arjuna,  
 Atkins gives no fool-proof rule of life,  
 but, when he exclaims, "We do not  
 know from what ancient sources this  
 self-conscious mystery we call 'I' has  
 been derived or *to what ultimate des-  
 tinies it is committed*", (italics mine)  
 there need be no surprise if readers leave  
 him alone and turn to interpreters of  
 Eastern Wisdom like Madame  
 Blavatsky who have courageously seen  
 and said something definite and reas-  
 suring about the ultimate destinies of the  
 finite self.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA

## AN AUTHOR AND A REVIEWER

I hope my old friend Mr. Delisle  
 Burns will forgive me for having over-  
 looked till this late date his review of  
 my book *The World's Design* published  
 in your July issue.

May I express my deep regret that he  
 should have written it? A reviewer is  
 entitled to differ from the author, but  
 not to misrepresent him to his readers.  
 In a fairly long career as an author, I  
 do not recollect a review of any of my  
 books in which my views have been more  
 systematically misrepresented than in  
 this instance. To wit :

*Author* :—Purpose of the book : To  
 react against the prevailing view that  
 "peace" means "no-war" or "war  
 against war" by defining peace not as a  
 negative state of no-war but as a posi-  
 tive state of common work towards con-  
 structive, civic aims, concretely defined

in detail and understood as stepping  
 stones towards "the intelligent organi-  
 zation of life on the planet".

*Reviewer* :—"The purpose of this  
 book is to argue in favour of peace."

*Author* :—Co-operation in itself means  
 nothing. Concrete aims of a positive  
 character must be set to the men who  
 are to co-operate. Progress is to be  
 understood as evolution towards more  
 awareness of unity and therefore towards  
 less violence in collective life.

*Reviewer* :—"The author shows that  
 there is a natural tendency towards co-  
 operation between men; that such co-  
 operation has been more inclusive as civi-  
 lization advances; and he is of opinion  
 that there is a natural tendency towards  
 co-operation of all the different peoples  
 of the world."

*Author* :—Collective security implies

collective policy and cannot succeed without it. Sanctions fail because they are both ahead of subjective feelings and behind objective relations.

*Reviewer* : "He gives us some criticism of collective security and sanctions to both of which he is opposed in principle."

*Author* :—No hope unless :

a. The League is explicitly acknowledged by Great Britain and by France as the embryo of World Government and unless such acknowledgement is backed by the immediate and unconditional surrender to the League of the ex-German colonies.

b. Surrender of British, French and other colonial empires to the League on certain specified conditions to include a World Bank, a World Trade Commission and a European Federation—also disarmament.

*Reviewer* :—"His summary of action to be taken, such as the limitation of armaments and improvement of international trade, follows the accepted lines which have guided the practice whose failure he criticises in the earlier part of his book."

I could continue this parallel until the

whole review were exhausted. Your readers may judge by what precedes whether Mr. Burns has acquitted himself of the task of giving them a fair account of the book he was reviewing. As for me, I am glad to hear that there is an Englishman who says that the giving up of the British colonial Empire and the definite acceptance of the League as a Superstate follow "accepted lines".

Now, Mr. Burns's intelligence and integrity are not in question. How are we to account for this way of wandering from the facts? I can only surmise that my reviewer is smarting under my criticisms of the policy adopted of late by the Left, which, bitten by the violence-bee which Marx put into many a Phrygian bonnet, bids fair to precipitate the world into an abyss of blood and fire in close collaboration-in-opposition with the ruthless machiavellian States. Hence, my excommunication from the Church of the Left.

May I end, all the same, on a note of cordial sympathy and admiration for the single-mindedness and ability wherewith Mr. Burns has always served what he thinks right and true?

S. DE MADARIAGA

Switzerland

## ENDS AND SAYINGS

[Below we print some extracts from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky on the subject of Christ and Christianity to which this issue of THE ARYAN PATH is devoted.—EDS.]

The Church has lost the key to Wisdom and Truth, and has endeavoured to bolster itself upon authority. The people have educated themselves to ask "Why?" And they will have an answer, or they will reject the Church and its teachings, for they will not accept authority. Religion and its principles must be demonstrated as mathematically as a problem of Euclid. But are you able to do so? Are any of the Church's dogmas worth any of the tenets of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, or the similar utterances to be found in all religions?—*Lucifer* II, 5.—in 1888.

Alas, alas! How little has the divine seed, scattered broadcast by the hand of the meek Judean philosopher, thrived or brought forth fruit. He, who himself had shunned hypocrisy, warned against public prayer, showing such contempt for any useless exhibition of the same, could he but cast his sorrowful glance on the earth, from the regions of eternal bliss, would see that this seed fell neither on sterile rock nor by the way-side. Nay, it took deep root in the most prolific soil; one enriched even to plethora with lies and human gore!—*Isis Unveiled* II, 303—in 1877

If this kingdom of Heaven or New Jerusalem is to be a reality, then a common platform for all religions, sciences and philosophies must be found. This, Christianity *per se*, cannot, in the nature of things, offer—neither, for that matter, can any other so-called religion—as it now stands; for all unduly exaggerate the personality of their Founders, Christianity more than others, as it makes Jesus very God of very God, and of his brother-teachers

*in Christ* (or CHRISTOS) false prophets. We speak here of modern Church Christianity, not of the mystic religion of Christos, the LOGOS, the Western aspect of the one religious philosophy, which can bind all men together as brothers.—*Lucifer* IV, 449.—in 1889

We cannot think what led Renan into such an erroneous delineation of the character [of Jesus]. Few of those who, while rejecting the divinity of the Nazarene prophet, still believe that he is no myth, can read the work without experiencing an uneasy, and even angry feeling at such a psychological mutilation. He makes of Jesus a sort of sentimental ninny, a theatrical simpleton, enamoured of his own poetical divagations and speeches, wanting every one to adore him, and finally caught in the snares of his enemies. Such was not Jesus, the Jewish philanthropist, the adept and mystic of a school now forgotten by the Christians and the Church—if it ever was known to her: the hero, who preferred even to risk death, rather than withhold some truths which he believed would benefit humanity.—*Isis Unveiled* II, 340—in 1877

Christianity is on trial. . . . What of truth is there in this Theology? Through what sects has it been transmitted? *Whence was it primarily derived?* To answer, we must trace the history of the World Religion, alike through the secret Christian sects as through those of other great religious subdivisions of the race; *for the Secret Doctrine is the Truth*, and that religion is nearest divine that has contained it with least adulteration—*Isis Unveiled* II, 292.—in 1877