

THE
WORLD'S NEED
OF RELIGION

BEING THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
WORLD CONGRESS OF FAITHS
OXFORD, JULY 23RD–27TH 1937

PREFACE BY
SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND

1937
NICHOLSON & WATSON
LIMITED LONDON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

First published in 1937

Printed in Great Britain by T. and A. CONSTABLE LTD.
at the University Press, Edinburgh

WHO'S WHO AT THE CONGRESS

AHMAD, AFTAB-UD-DIN, Imam of Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking.

ALI, A. YUSUF, M.A., LL.M., C.B.E., I.C.S. (retired), Barrister-at-law.
Author of books on the Islamic Faith and an English translation with commentary of The Holy Quran.

AMIRUDDIN, THE BEGUM SULTAN MIR. A Leader of Social and Educational activities in India.

BAKER, LEO K., B.A. Priest of the Christian Community, Streatham.

BELTON, THE REV. L. J. Editor of *The Inquirer*.

BISHOP, MRS. Bahai Movement.

BROWN, SIR FRANK, C.I.E., of *The Times* Editorial Staff.

BUONAIUTI, PROFESSOR ERNESTO, Rome. Distinguished scholar and author of books on religion. Latest works: *The Roman Church* and *Dante as a Prophet*.

CARRIT, GABRIEL. Secretary of the League of Nations Union Youth Department.

COOK, BRIAN. Has twice toured Canada under the auspices of the National Council of Education.

DAVIDS, MRS. C. A. F. RHYS. President Pali Text Society. Author of many books on Buddhism.

DODWELL, MRS. MARCIA A. B. Science Exhibitioner, Somerville College, Oxford.

GOLLAN, J. Secretary of the Young Communists League of Great Britain.

GOSVAMI, PANDIT A. B., Bhaktishastri, Missionary-in-Charge, Gaudiya Mission, London. President Editorial Board, "Gaudiya," India.

HALL, DR. ALFRED, Upper Chapel (Unitarian), Sheffield. President International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom, Utrecht, Holland.

HUME, DR. ROBERT E., M.A., Ph.D., D.Theol. Professor of Religions at the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Author of many books, including translation of the principal Upanishads.

KESSIE, PRINCE OF ASHANTI.

KOLISKO, DR. E., M.D., Vienna. Author and Educationist.

LANDAU, ROM. Author of *God is My Adventure*. Recently returned from an extensive tour of the Near East.

LINDSAY, DR. A. D., C.B.E. Master of Balliol College, Oxford; Vice Chancellor, Oxford University.

LYTTELTON, DAME EDITH, G.B.E. For several years British substitute delegate, League of Nations Assembly, Geneva; Past President Society for Psychical Research.

MAJOR, REV. H. D. A., D.D. Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

MAUDE, AYLMER. Author. Editor of Tolstoy translations in World's Classics Series, and of the Centenary Edition of Tolstoy's Works; Hon. Organizing Secretary of the Tolstoy Society.

MAUNG, MAUNG AYE. World Buddhist Mission, Rangoon, Burma.

MITCHISON, MRS. NAOMI. Author of *The Conquered* and other books.

MUDALIAR, SIR RAMASWAMI. Adviser to the Secretary of State for India.

PAYNE, F. J. Hon. Secretary, Society for the Study of Religions.

QADIR, SIR ABDUL, Kt. Adviser to the Secretary of State for India.

ROYDEN, DR. MAUDE, C.H. Was Lecturer in English Literature to the Oxford University Extension Delegacy.

SAMUEL, THE RT. HON. VISCOUNT, G.C.B., G.B.E., D.C.L., M.A. President British Institute of Philosophy since 1931; Hon. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

SPERRY, DR. WILLARD L. Dean of Divinity School, Harvard University.

STOBART, MRS. ST. CLAIR. Chairman and Leader of the Spiritualist Community (London); Founder and Chairman of Inter-Religious Crusade.

THOMAS, PROFESSOR F. W., C.I.E., M.A., F.B.A. Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Oxford University.

WATTS, ALAN W. Editor of *Buddhism in England*. Author of *The Spirit of Zen* and other works on Buddhism.

YOUNGHUSBAND, SIR FRANCIS, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E. Led Mission to Lhasa, 1903-4. President Royal Geographical Society, 1919. Author of *Everest: The Challenge, Modern Mystics, A Venture of Faith*, and other books.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WHQ'S WHO AT THE CONGRESS	v
PREFACE, by Sir FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND, Chairman of the World Congress of Faiths	ix
MEETING OF WELCOME: The Rt. Hon. VISCOUNT SAMUEL, Acting Chairman of the Congress	i
THE CALL FOR RELIGION	5
<i>Chairman:</i> The Rt. Hon. VISCOUNT SAMUEL	
<i>Speaker:</i> Dr. ALFRED HALL	
THE ESSENTIALS OF RELIGION	29
<i>Chairman:</i> Professor F. W. THOMAS	
<i>Speaker:</i> Dr. ROBERT E. HUME	
YOUTH'S ATTITUDE TO WORLD FELLOWSHIP (Youth Symposium)	55
<i>Chairman:</i> Sir A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR	
<i>Speakers:</i> BRIAN COOK	
GABRIEL CARRIT	
JOHN GOLLAN	
PRINCE KESSIE OF ASHANTI	
THE WORLD'S NEED OF RELIGION (Public Meeting)	75
<i>Chairman:</i> The Rt. Hon. VISCOUNT SAMUEL	
<i>Speakers:</i> Pandit A. B. GOSVAMI (Hindu)	
MAUNG AYE MAUNG (Buddhist)	
Dr. MAUDE ROYDEN (Christian)	
Mr. YUSUF ALI (Muslim)	
RELIGION: ITS VALUE TO THE WORLD	95
<i>Chairman:</i> Sir ABDUL QADIR	
<i>Speaker:</i> Begum SULTAN MIR AMIRUDDIN	
METHODS OF ATTAINMENT	117
<i>Chairman:</i> Dr. WILLARD L. SPERRY	
<i>Speaker:</i> Professor ERNESTO BUONAIUTI	

	PAGE
METHODS OF DISSEMINATION	145
<i>Chairman:</i> Dame EDITH LYTTTELTON	
<i>Speaker:</i> Mr. ROM LANDAU	
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	161
<i>Chairman:</i> Sir FRANK BROWN	
<i>Speaker:</i> Mr. YUSUF ALI	
APPENDIX TO "THE ESSENTIALS OF RELIGION," by Dr. R. E. HUME	175
INDEX	187

P R E F A C E

“The World’s Need of Religion” was the subject for deliberation at the Session of the World Congress of Faiths held at Oxford in July 1937, which was in continuation of the Congress held in London in 1936. The ultimate aim of both was to promote the spirit of fellowship through religion.

Obviously, our first task was to decide what precisely we meant by religion. And this was all the more necessary because the words religion and God are used with very different meanings nowadays. When Karl Marx wrote of religion being the opiate of the people, he was referring to something very different from what we in the Congress meant by religion. He was referring to a certain form of organized religion which taught people to submit to sufferings here in the assurance that when this earthly life was over they would enjoy untold blessings in a life hereafter. Churches who taught this doctrine were supported by States which wished to keep the working-classes in subjection, and therefore feared any discontent among them. And as Marx was urging the working-classes to rise against their supposed oppressors, he naturally inveighed against churches which taught submission. He very rightly wanted men to stand on their own legs and seek their happiness here and now. But it was certain churches, not religion as such, that provided the opiate which he condemned.

Then, again, often when people speak of religion they mean their own particular religion. Many Christians when using the word religion mean only the Christian religion.

So also with the word God. Innumerable persons when they say they do not believe in God, really mean that they do not believe in the antiquated conception of God with which they were brought up in their childhood or which

they have seen depicted in mediæval pictures—a venerable old gentleman with a long white beard. Innumerable other persons have never even tried to form a conception of that Creative Power which informs the Universe, and the operation of Whose Hand is manifest on every side and most assuredly in our own deepest selves.

As Dr. Robert Hume, the Professor of Religions at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, said in his thoughtful paper on the "Essentials of Religion," religion is an experience—a joyful, empowering experience of an influence which has entered into the individual from a source superior to himself. "It is," says Dr. Hume, "the consciousness of a relationship which the religious individual sustains to Power Divine—what constitutes a person's religion is his belief in some Cosmic Power or gods, and his experience of that power."

What it really comes to seems to me to be this. We are born into a world with which we ever remain inextricably connected. We are constantly being affected by this world and we are constantly affecting it. There is a reciprocal relationship between us. But the influence of the world over us is infinitely greater than our influence over the world. And naturally we are intrigued to know what is the essential nature of the world with which we are so intimately connected and what are the laws by which it is governed; for obviously we have either to conform to them or rebel against them at our peril, seeing that we have some small power of choice; we may choose whether we shall go round the corner to see the beauty of a sunset or stay where we are and see only an ugly street.

Now, when we ponder on the nature of this world of which we are all constituent parts, we most certainly find much pain and evil in it. We hear of men killing each other by the million, and of earthquakes, famine, and plague carrying off good men and bad men alike. Death takes our dearest, and it is only a matter of time before we ourselves are likewise removed. It is only a matter of time, too, before the whole human race and all animal life will suffer death,

for the heat of the sun must eventually give out, and life on this planet, even of the simplest vegetable form, become impossible.

These being undoubted facts, many are unable to regard the world with any affection. To them it is cold and hostile. They find themselves in it, so they make the best of it. They steel themselves to endure the worst. But they remain fundamentally pessimistic. They have no faith in the goodness of things, and know not religion.

But others there are who, while admitting the existence of an appalling amount of evil and suffering, are more impressed with the wonder and beauty of the world. Some of the greatest men of science are filled with awe at the mighty scale of things, and they marvel at the orderliness, the intricacy, and delicacy of the workings of Nature—all giving evidence, in their view, of the activity of some vast Cosmic Mind or Creative Power through the operating of which every one of us came into being. These men are inspired with great reverence for such a world. They have invincible faith in the orderliness of its working. They possess the firm foundations on which religion may be built, and they have, at any rate, the fundamental makings of religious men.

Others, again, are profoundly impressed with the beauty of the world. Wherever they look they can find beauty—beauty in the expression of a face, in a little child, in a flower, in a picture, or a bird, or a sunset, or moorland, or mountain. Always somewhere near at hand is beauty for those who know where and how to look; and it fills them with joy. At times, when they are in a specially impressionable and receptive mood, the beauty of a scene, or even of a single object, may stir them to a perfect ecstasy of delight. And what causes them such happiness they cannot fail to love. So they come to love the world which displays such beauty and brings them such delight. And here we have religion in another and a higher stage.

Yet others have an innate love of their fellows. They are

Arsenic

Precipitated as As_2S_3 from 9 N HCl with H_2S and weighed as such. Arsenate precipitated from ammoniacal solution as $\text{MgNH}_4\text{AsO}_4 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$, ignited, and weighed as $\text{Mg}_2\text{As}_2\text{O}_7$.

Arsenate precipitated from neutral solution as Ag_3AsO_4 . Precipitate dissolved in HNO_3 and the Ag^+ titrated with standard KCNS using ferric alum indicator ($\text{Ag}^+ + \text{CNS}^- \rightarrow \text{AgCNS}$).

Titred from 3 to 5 with standard I_2 in a solution kept nearly neutral by excess NaHCO_3 ($\text{AsO}_3^{3-} + \text{I}_2 + 2\text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{AsO}_4^{3-} + 2\text{I}^- + 2\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$).

Titred in strong HCl solution from 3 to 5 with standard KIO_3 ($2\text{As}^{+++} + \text{IO}_3^- + \text{Cl}^- + 5\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{H}_3\text{AsO}_4 + \text{ICl} + 4\text{H}^+$). Free I_2 is formed as an intermediate product and gives violet color with chloroform. Titration is to disappearance of this color.

Titred in HCl solution with standard KBrO_3 to disappearance of color of methyl orange indicator ($3\text{As}^{+++} + \text{BrO}_3^- + 9\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 3\text{H}_3\text{AsO}_4 + \text{Br}^- + 9\text{H}^+$).

(*Small amounts*) Reduced in acid solution with Zn and evolved as AsH_3 . The arsine oxidized to As and color compared to standards. Or AsH_3 absorbed in measured volume of I_2 solution. Excess I_2 titrated with standard $\text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_3$ ($\text{AsH}_3 + \text{I}_2 + 4\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_3\text{AsO}_4 + 8\text{I}^- + 8\text{H}^+$).

Barium

Precipitated as BaSO_4 , ignited, and weighed as such.

Precipitated as BaCrO_4 and weighed as such.

Precipitated with $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{CO}_3$ as BaCO_3 , ignited, and weighed as such.

Precipitated as BaCrO_4 . Precipitate dissolved in excess standard FeSO_4 ($+\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$) and excess Fe^{++} titrated with standard KMnO_4 ($\text{BaCrO}_4 + 3\text{Fe}^{++} + 8\text{H}^+ + \text{SO}_4^{2-} \rightarrow 3\text{Fe}^{+++} + \text{Cr}^{+++} + \text{BaSO}_4 + 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$).

Precipitated as BaCrO_4 and precipitate dissolved in $\text{KI} + \text{dilute HCl}$. Liberated I_2 titrated with standard $\text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_3$ ($2\text{BaCrO}_4 + 6\text{I}^- + 16\text{H}^+ \rightarrow 2\text{Ba}^{++} + 3\text{I}_2 + 8\text{H}_2\text{O}$).

Beryllium

Precipitated with NH_4OH as $\text{Be}(\text{OH})_2$, ignited, and weighed as BeO .

Precipitated from ammoniacal solution with 8-hydroxyquinoline, as $\text{Be}(\text{C}_8\text{H}_6\text{NO})_2$, ignited, and weighed as BeO .

Bismuth

Precipitated with H_2S as Bi_2S_3 and weighed as such.

Precipitated as basic carbonate, ignited, and weighed as Bi_2O_3 .

Precipitated as oxalate, $(\text{BiO})_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$, the precipitate dissolved in dilute H_2SO_4 , and the oxalate titrated with standard KMnO_4 ($5\text{H}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4 + 2\text{MnO}_4^- + 6\text{H}^+ \rightarrow 10\text{CO}_2 + 2\text{Mn}^{++} + 8\text{H}_2\text{O}$).

Boron

Borate heated with methyl alcohol and the volatile methyl borate passed through a weighed amount of ignited lime: $2\text{B}(\text{OCH}_3)_3 + \text{CaO} + 3\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 6\text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{Ca}(\text{BO}_2)_2$. The material is reignited and weighed. Gain in weight = B_2O_3 .

Borate treated with methyl alcohol as above and the methyl borate hydrolyzed: $B(OCH_3)_3 + 3H_2O \rightarrow H_3BO_3 + 3CH_3OH$. The CH_3OH is removed by evaporation and the H_3BO_3 titrated with standard $NaOH$ in the presence of glycerol (or other polyhydric alcohol) which forms a loose compound with the H_3BO_3 . Only one hydrogen of H_3BO_3 reacts.

Bromine

(*Bromide*) Precipitated as $AgBr$ and weighed as such.

(*Bromide*) (*Volhard method*) Precipitated as $AgBr$ with measured amount of $AgNO_3$ and the excess Ag^+ titrated with standard $KCNS$ using ferric alum indicator ($Ag^+ + CNS^- \rightarrow AgCNS$).

(*Bromide*) Titrated with standard $AgNO_3$ using eosin or other adsorption indicator.

(*Free bromine*) Excess KI added and the liberated I_2 titrated with standard $Na_2S_2O_3$ ($Br_2 + 2I^- \rightarrow I_2 + 2Br^-$).

(*Bromate*) Excess KI added in the presence of acid and the liberated I_2 titrated with standard $Na_2S_2O_3$ ($BrO_3^- + 6I^- + 6H^+ \rightarrow 3I_2 + Br^- + 3H_2O$).

(*Bromate*) Measured amount of As_2O_3 (dissolved in $NaHCO_3$) added. The solution is acidified, boiled, neutralized with $NaHCO_3$, and the excess arsenite titrated with standard I_2 ($BrO_3^- + 3H_3AsO_3 \rightarrow 3H_3AsO_4 + Br^-$; $AsO_3^{3-} + I_2 + 2HCO_3^- \rightarrow AsO_4^{3-} + 2I^- + 2CO_2 + H_2O$).

Cadmium

Precipitated as CdS and weighed as such.

Electrolytically deposited as Cd and weighed as such.

Precipitated as CdS and the precipitate titrated with standard I_2 in the presence of HCl ($CdS + I_2 \rightarrow Cd^{++} + S + 2I^-$).

Calcium

Precipitated as $CaC_2O_4 \cdot H_2O$, ignited at low heat, and weighed as $CaCO_3$.

Precipitated as $CaC_2O_4 \cdot H_2O$, ignited strongly, and weighed as CaO .

Precipitated as $CaC_2O_4 \cdot H_2O$, ignited, moistened with H_2SO_4 , re-ignited, and weighed as $CaSO_4$.

Precipitated as $CaC_2O_4 \cdot H_2O$, the precipitate dissolved in dilute H_2SO_4 , and the oxalate titrated with standard $KMnO_4$ ($5H_2C_2O_4 + 2MnO_4^- + 6H^+ \rightarrow 10CO_2 + 2Mn^{++} + 8H_2O$).

Precipitated as $CaC_2O_4 \cdot H_2O$ with a measured amount of oxalate. The precipitate is filtered and the excess oxalate in the filtrate is titrated with standard $KMnO_4$ as above.

Precipitated as $CaC_2O_4 \cdot H_2O$, and the ignited material (CaO , or $CaCO_3$, or $CaO + CaCO_3$) titrated with standard acid.

Carbon

(*In organic compounds*) Substance is burned in O_2 and the CO_2 caught in an absorbing agent (e.g., "ascarite") and weighed.

(*In iron and steel*) Alloy is burned in O_2 . The CO_2 is caught in absorbing agent (e.g., "ascarite," = $NaOH$ + asbestos) and weighed. Or the CO_2 is caught in a measured volume of standard $Ba(OH)_2$ solution and (1) the

has about it a suspicion of placidity and sloth. Often it is thought of as mere absence of war. There is nothing about it active, positive, initiative, and inspiring.

Happiness lies beyond and above peace. "The pursuit of happiness" was deliberately adopted by the framers of the American Constitution as the final aim of the American people, and in every school in the United States boys and girls are taught to repeat this clause in the Constitution. How often, too, do our own Sovereigns on great occasions affirm that what they have most at heart is the happiness of their people! And what statesman does not have as his highest ambition the hope that he may have contributed something to the happiness of his country? We are apt to ignore this great fact, or only perfunctorily acknowledge it, or even have doubts and suspicions about having anything so pleasant as an aim. It must surely be demoralizing and selfish, we think. Yet we Christians have adopted the hymn of the ancient Hebrew Psalmist:

"O be joyful in the Lord, all ye lands; serve the Lord with gladness, and come before his presence with a song. . . . O go your way into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful unto him, and speak good of his Name."

Likewise the Quran says: "Fear God, Desire union with Him. Contend earnestly on His path, that ye may attain to happiness."

And happiness is infectious; it unites. Others are naturally drawn to a happy man or a happy nation. The happiness we had in the Coronation attracted other nations to us. It is not—or should not be—self-centred and selfish. It is something in which all can share. Happiness is therefore a bond which binds men together—and binds them in that kinship of souls which it is the very object of the Congress of Faiths to create.

For we have in mind something higher than that blood relationship implied in the expression "Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man." The God of Whom we conceive

is the God Who is above all and through all and in us all—the God in Whom we live and move and have our being, and Who, as I would say, lives and moves and has His being in us. And such a God is nearer to us than a Father. He is as near as England is to all Englishmen or France is to all Frenchmen—part of them as they are part of him. This being so, men are united in a kinship far closer than brotherhood.

Such is the kind of religion which I, at least, had in view. A happy religion. A religion with a God in Whose image we ourselves are made, Who is unceasingly at work within us as well as in all the world about us, and Whose delight is in our happiness.

But in the Congress we did not think of religion as an impersonal abstraction. We thought of it in terms of individuals who professed and practised it. Certainly, in my own case, both at the Congress and during many years in India it has been less in Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Islam than in Hindus, Buddhists, Confucianists, and Muslims that I have been mainly interested. I have from time to time during the last fifty years read books on the different religions. But I have never caught on to them and they have never impressed me so much as have living embodiments of them with whom I have had to live and to deal in the practical affairs of life, and with whom I have often discussed religious questions. And during last year's Congress we were impressed not so much with what they had to say, but with the living personalities of the Hindu Radhakrishnan, the Buddhist Suzuki, and the Muslim Sir Abdul Qadir.

It was for this reason that in the Congress of 1937 we sought to give better opportunity for contact between persons of different religions. In the London Congress of 1936, though we met daily we did not live together. At Oxford, through the courtesy of the Master of Balliol and of the Principal of Somerville College, members were able to live together, have meals together, and have ample time and opportunity for informal talk and discussion. As a result

we were able to get more enjoyment from the Congress. And this I believe to be a most valuable result. For in an ordinary way western people have very few opportunities of meeting eastern people on terms of ordinary intercourse and of discussing fundamental spiritual problems on terms of absolute equality. Too often there is a barrier of superiority between them. No such wall existed at the Congress. Deep satisfaction at this ability to move freely about was often expressed. And perhaps what gave more satisfaction than anything else was the opportunities for all to attend the religious services of each—Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, Christian.

We naturally expected each member to think his own religion the best as he would think his own mother or his own country the best. But we also expected that experience would teach each when he met other men with other mothers and of other countries and other religions, not to insist too loudly on the superiority of his own mother, his own country, his own religion. We supposed that he would become inwardly aware, even though he might not outwardly acknowledge, that neither his mother nor his country nor his religion was absolutely perfect. And this secret acknowledgment might lead him to dwell as little as possible on the defects, and anxious to bring out all that was best in his religion as well as to assimilate from others whatever might enrich his own.

.

The World Congress of Faiths, and those other organizations which similarly strive to unite men of different religions in a common cause, all go to form what is the greatest movement of our times, and we may well have pride in taking part in the movement. For we are helping to bring unity to the human race—to give men a proper sense of community. These terrible warrings between nations are utterly repugnant to men in their senses. They are only possible on account of mankind's youthfulness and immaturity. They are not of man's innate nature. Inherently men are well

disposed to one another. The same creative urge runs through us all; and as the race—which as yet is only a single million years old and therefore, in comparison with the age of other animals, very young—grows to maturity, our sense of unity with one another will develop and intensify.

This process we of the World Congress of Faiths seek to further. We think not only nationally but internationally, not only in terms of one religion but of all religions. Together with others working on similar lines we seek to build a new world-order based on religion and aiming at the highest happiness for all mankind.

We would get men to realize the importance of religion and of religious individuals in promoting the peace and happiness of mankind. It is being recognized now that war is not an effective instrument of policy nor the sole means of obtaining political and economic security. In place of war we would put religion. The prescription we would recommend for peace is religion—religion rightly understood and duly practised.

So we would make a concentrated, persistent, and insistent effort to arouse the consciousness not only of this one nation but of all nations to the benefit and power of religion in promoting the happiness of mankind.

The League of Nations is strenuously striving to lay the political foundations of that new world-order. Just recently, on the initiative of Australia, and with the support of Great Britain and America, the League is also preparing an economic foundation for it. And now we would help in laying the spiritual foundations.

And the type of individual who will build this new world-order will not be of the strong man type—muscular, brawny, and loud spoken. He will be of the simple, supple, plastic, impressionable, and expressive type who will not so much dominate men by the power of an assertive personality as lure and captivate them, and so draw all men unto him.

Examples of such may be found in Ramakrishna in India and Ste Thérèse de Lisieux in Europe. Both of these had

found themselves in direct alignment with the Central Spirit of the Universe and had felt the full force of its impact on them. Both had experienced the ineffable joy which comes from being in perfect tune with the mighty rhythm of things. Both had had an insight into the very heart of the world. Both were forerunners of the man to come—of what man will be when he has grown out of his present juvenile, quarrelsome stage. We all want to excel and to improve ourselves, and these give in concrete form an ideal towards which we may seek to get nearer.

Necessarily, we shall have to train and school ourselves in the way we should go. We shall have to enter into the spirit of the Universe if we desire that the spirit should enter into us. Hindus have their ancient system of yoga, and the Roman Catholic Church its mystic way. Eminent psychologists are also paying attention to the scientific technique of communication between the spirit within the individual and the spirit of the whole Universe. But even to those who simply, yet steadily and persistently, seek first the Kingdom of God—that kingdom which is within us—and set their affection on things above—on the highest things in life—grace may come. In a few rare moments in a lifetime they may experience the bliss of union with God—of being filled with the Holy Ghost. And we may note that both Ramakrishna and Ste Thérèse de Lisieux experienced this union with God before they had undertaken any formal training—Ramakrishna before undergoing any yoga exercises and Ste Thérèse before entering the convent. Also, every mother has had an inkling of it first in the ecstasy of love for her husband and afterwards in the joy of bearing a child. Just a little of this she must have imparted to her child in its most impressionable stage. And as every single one of us and every bird and animal is born of a mother, we must all have latent in us this capacity for spiritual enjoyment.

As Professor Buonaiuti says in his not merely brilliant but deeply moving address, we have to cultivate our sense of the mysteriousness of the Universe. He reminds us that

the individual represents the universal life in miniature, and then he would have us recover the sense of the sacredness of life in all its manifestations. For this he regards as the very matrix from which spring all religious faiths; and only by reviving it can we restore to life-forces their elasticity and power of expansion. So he would have us gain contact with the central, mystery-shrouded nucleus of life and draw from the heart of universal spirituality its central elements and simplest laws.

.

Owing to a temporary indisposition I was unable to take any part in the Congress or in the immediate preparations for it. I am therefore peculiarly indebted to the Executive Committee for having borne the brunt of the work, and also to Miss Katharine E. Conder for the compilation of the report. More especially would I thank Lord Samuel for devoting so much of his time and energy to the business of the Congress when public affairs were so urgently demanding his attention. And all are greatly indebted to Mr. Jackman for the unceasing thought he gave to the preparations to ensure the success of the Congress.

So successful, indeed, has it been that the Committee have decided to hold another Congress in Cambridge next June, and to arrange for smaller meetings through the winter. Every effort is being made to bring followers of the different faiths together and to promote a spirit of fellowship between them.

As Lord Samuel said at the Oxford Congress, we recognize the influence of the existing faiths and seek to work through them, using the influence of each faith on its own devotees to bring about true co-operation in relief of the present dangerous situation. We afford opportunities for mutual understanding. And while recognizing differences we seek to transcend those which divide.

FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND.

October 1937.

WORLD CONGRESS OF FAITHS (CONTINUATION MOVEMENT)

International President

H.H. THE MAHARAJA GAEKWAR OF BARODA

Chairman

SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND

Secretary

ARTHUR JACKMAN

36 VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W. 1. Telephone: VICTORIA 0971

OBJECT

THE OBJECT FOR WHICH THE WORLD CONGRESS OF FAITHS IS ORGANIZED IS TO PROMOTE A SPIRIT OF FELLOWSHIP AMONG MANKIND THROUGH RELIGION. THE MOVEMENT SEEKS TO AWAKEN AND DEVELOP A WORLD-LOYALTY, WHILE ALLOWING FULL PLAY FOR THE DIVERSITY OF MEN, NATIONS AND FAITHS.

*It is earnestly desired that anyone interested in forwarding
the above object will communicate with the Secretary.*

WORLD CONGRESS OF FAITHS

OXFORD, JULY 23RD TO 27TH 1937

BALLIOL COLLEGE,
Friday, July 23rd.

MEETING OF WELCOME

VISCOUNT SAMUEL (*Acting Chairman*)

This is not a formal meeting but an informal welcome, at which it falls to me to express our greetings to all those attending the Conference. I do so on behalf of our Chairman, Sir Francis Younghusband, whose place, although all unworthy, I am endeavouring to fill. We are delighted that Sir Francis is able to come amongst us, and only regret that owing to his recent very serious illness his eager spirit has to be kept in check and he is not allowed to take any active part in our proceedings.

I welcome you here not only as Acting Chairman of the Congress but also as a "Son of Balliol." (Our critics sometimes pronounce it differently.) In this Hall I came to my meals for four years as an Undergraduate, and now I have the very great honour to be a Fellow of the College. So I would venture to express to the Master and Fellows of Balliol your thanks for their hospitality, and—like Poo Bah—as one of the Fellows, I will also acknowledge those thanks.

Oxford nowadays is almost overrun with Conferences and Congresses. Even as the quiet streets that I knew as an Undergraduate are now overrun with traffic, so is Oxford overrun with intellectual traffic. It is not a bad thing that Oxford should be brought into close contact with the great world problems. I think it was George Meredith who said that "the atmosphere of the universities is rather overcharged with the calm of the past, and this has to be resisted." Balliol has

always endeavoured to be in close touch with the problems of ordinary life, and so it is a good place to come for a Movement that is trying to link the religious traditions of the past with the urgent and anxious problems of the present. Our underlying purpose is an endeavour to show that the great faiths should not enter into rivalry nor even, as sometimes happens, into open conflict, but should rather help one another to transcend the differences that divide them.

The Officers of the Congress are very glad that so many have joined this Congress. About 150 are in residence, and in addition a number are staying in the town and will attend our meetings.

We approach our task in a serious spirit. We are engaging in no light and trivial work, for this cause, so near to all our hearts, touches the deepest interests of the modern world.

THE CALL FOR RELIGION

OPENING SESSION,
Friday, July 23rd.

THE CALL FOR RELIGION

VISCOUNT SAMUEL (*in the Chair*)

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—As you are aware, the Founder of the Movement and its leader, Sir Francis Younghusband, is most unfortunately disqualified by his recent illness from taking part in these proceedings, and he asked me to replace him. My Colleagues on the Committee endorsed this, and for that reason I appear as your Acting Chairman.

This Movement, as I understand it, is based upon three ideas. The first is the recognition that the world stands in great danger: that all mankind is faced by perils. Our generation passed through the World War, and that event in history profoundly shocked the moral sense of mankind, and now there is anxiety lest, in spite of all the lessons of that war, there should be a repetition of it. We watch the movements of the nations, we see armaments piling up and we observe the strain of international situations, and wise observers feel that all this gives rise to grave anxieties lest that terrible disaster of war should recur.

This generation refuses to accept events such as those as inevitable, as the work of some fate or destiny unknown and undefined against which effort is futile and hope is vain. Some of you will have read *The Decline of the West*, by Oswald Spengler, and will have seen there this idea of an overwhelming destiny. He does not explain what that force is; he uses the word and leaves it at that; but I believe that the great majority of thoughtful people in all countries and belonging to all groups reject that as a fallacy, and feel that, apart from the physical catastrophes of the earth on which we live, our disasters are our own and are due to the action, or more often the inaction, of individuals or of groups of

people; are due to our own action or inaction, individually or collectively; due to the mistakes of some and the crimes of others.

So that is the first idea—that the world stands in peril, and it is essential that we take steps to avert that peril and not regard ourselves merely as in the power of some inevitable fate.

The second idea that inspires our Movement is the recognition that mankind is now more closely knit together than ever before. Education, posts, travel facilities, press, radio, television, all these factors knit mankind into a closer unity than history has ever known. Some military clash in a remote village in China, or some railway accident in India, is known within a few hours all over Europe and America. Christopher Columbus would have been very surprised, I think, to have been told that within a dozen generations from his time men would be able to travel from Europe to America in twelve hours. We have therefore this strange antithesis of a world more closely united than ever and yet in ever greater peril because of the antagonisms of its inhabitants.

And the third idea has arisen out of the recognition that this situation cannot be coped with by pure reason and appeals to common sense alone, but requires also appeals to the better emotions of mankind. Our troubles are partly due to emotional stresses, particularly to the present form of patriotism in some countries. Patriotism can be consistent with internationalism when it means the duty of each country to other countries. But there is also a form of patriotism which is purely egotistical, and this nationalism is now, here and there, erected into a faith, exalted into a religion, surrounded by a glamour, and evokes excitement in the minds of millions and tens of millions of young men and women and older ones as well. This is, as all can see, the main cause of the world tension that prevails in our day, and it cannot be countered by pure reason alone. Siegfried Sassoon's latest autobiographical novel tells of an Irishman who had to argue with a very peppery Master

of Hounds, and who said to him: "Be reasonable, Master, be reasonable! Isn't the earth round and we all on it?" -

There are many who will not be guided by reason. Some emotion has to be found that will resist or dispel the other. There must be a spiritual influence of some kind. In Russia and among groups of people elsewhere, such an emotion is evoked by social enthusiasm; but this is based on materialism, and therefore it is not there that mankind is likely to find the spiritual emotion that our times require.

So it is that thousands of people all over the world who realize that this is the situation with which our generation has to deal are turning to religion as the right source of this spiritual emotion which is needed to save the world from its present perils; and many feel that the right course is not to start afresh and try to evolve a new faith but rather to recognize the influence and the power of the existing faiths and seek to work through them. Each has its defects—and each, perhaps, is especially conscious of the defects in the others—but if they are to be reformed and revived, the change must come from within rather than through pressure from without.

This Movement does not, therefore, seek to effect a change in any faith. Each has millions of devotees, and this Movement seeks to use the influence of each faith over its own devotees, to bring about true co-operation in the solving of the dangerous situation in which we find ourselves, so that mankind shall not only be more closely knit together, but shall be spiritually more harmonious.

Before asking Dr. Hall to deliver his address we are to receive a message of greeting from Maung Aye Maung of the World Buddhist Mission, Rangoon, Burma.

MAUNG AYE MAUNG

MY LORD, BROTHERS AND SISTERS,—As the representative of the Buddhists of Burma, I bring hearty greetings and best wishes to the members of the Congress. It is highly appropriate that the religion which in the long history of mankind first succeeded in overpassing boundaries, national, linguistic,

and racial, should be represented at the World Congress of Faiths. In a world that today is torn by strife and warfare, the loving spirit of the Buddhist religion is especially needed.

The beautiful land of Burma, the land of Golden Pagodas, has enjoyed the Buddhist religion for more than a thousand years; and today the Burmese people love their religion and live according to its noble precepts. The wonderful literature and the beautiful art of Burma have all been inspired by the teaching which the Buddha gave to the world some two thousand five hundred years ago. The happiness of the Burmese people and the freedom of Burmese women, a freedom unique in the history of the world, show the excellence of their faith. Today the Burmese people are the happiest and the Burmese women are the freest on the face of the earth. Many of the visitors to Burma have asserted that the Burmese woman is the most beautiful type of womanhood in the world. An American educator under whom I studied in Burma, has composed the following lines:

The Burmese maids
With flowers in their hair
And sunshades gorgeous fair
Go tripping by,
Their charms beyond compare.

My countrymen send their loving thoughts and kind wishes to all the members gathered here, and hope that the spirit of friendship and harmony will help us all to understand the unity of mankind.

DR. ALFRED HALL: THE CALL FOR RELIGION

Despite all the progress and increase of power which have distinguished the last century, man today is profoundly conscious that something vital is lacking. The word "need" occurs with painful frequency in a world of plenty. We have an instance of it in the theme of this Congress, "The World's Need of Religion." It was a need which inspired the Archbishop of Canterbury to broadcast a most eloquent appeal to the British nation at the beginning of the year and

to urge that the way of national recovery was to be found in religion. That appeal received a welcome from the other British churches. Everybody would agree that the appeal was timely. It may be said that the appeal for religion would be timely at any moment in the life of man. Yet the word "timely" can be used with especial appropriateness at this juncture, when men are forsaking the old strongholds and losing their grip on universal principles.

The condition of men is not altogether hopeless. They are alive to the fact that somehow they have lost their foothold. They are not guilty of what Carlyle termed "the deadliest sin—the supercilious consciousness of no sin;—that is death." They are aware that something is wrong, seriously wrong, and they feel at a loss to discover how to set it right. Quite suddenly they have become aware that they are members of what Graham Wallas termed the Great Society, and that they are in need of principles by which to direct it. But how are they to find those principles? Where are they to discover them? We say at once that what the world needs is religion. But what do we mean by that? One of our aims in this Congress will be to answer that question.

What is this power or purpose or influence for which there is a call? We are plunged into difficulty at once, for it is common knowledge that no subject has been approached from so many different angles, or been organized in so many various ways or called forth so many diverse definitions, as religion.

That is quite explainable. Religion is concerned with no particular province of experience, but with the whole of human experience and much more. I add "much more," because religion reaches out beyond human experience to eternity.

• Because religion has the widest possible human range it varies with the experience of each individual and each group. Consequently it would be no help if I endeavoured to give another clean-cut definition.

But we can say that religion at least implies that life should

be related to the best, the highest, and the noblest that we can know or conceive. We may go further and assert that religion appertains to something fundamentally good and beautiful and true at the heart of the Universe, which we are to seek and to pursue.

There is a saying of Jesus in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." He thus linked this passing life of man with that which has endured from the beginning of things. He perceived that the smallest event in nature or in the life of man was bound up with the universe as a whole. The lily of the field reflected the divine glory and splendour. This little span of life on earth he interpreted in the light of eternity. It is what the wisest men in our own day and generation have done. We—small though we are—are parts of a universal and eternal system. The Ideal and the Ultimate towards which we move is built for ever into the very structure of the world. That Ideal was there in the unimaginable past, and it will be there in the unimaginable future. All time—past, present, and future—is part of one movement. The potentiality of the Kingdom of God existed when the morning stars sang together and the sons of God shouted for joy.

That was what Carlyle meant when he wrote his famous chapter on "Natural Supernaturalism." "Oh could I transport thee direct from the Beginnings to the Endings, how were thy eyesight unsealed, and thy heart set flaming in the Light—sea of celestial wonder. Then sawest thou that this fair universe, were it the meanest province thereof, is in very deed the star-domed City of God; that through every star, through every grass-blade, and most through every living soul, the glory of the present God still gleams."

The same truth underlies a statement I once heard the late Sir Henry Jones make concerning the method of Lord Kelvin in lecturing. The chance sight of a broken pane of glass in his lecture-room suggested to him a line of thought which took the whole universe into its scope. This has

been the method not only of philosophers and scientists, but of saints and seers. They have seen how the commonplace is bound up with the infinitely vast, how the tendency of the smallest part is or may be the tendency of the immeasurable all, and how every moment of time is related to the eternal movement. What we are experiencing and furthering or hindering in these passing lives of ours is not a dull mechanical process, but a spiritual movement which reaches from the divine centre to the furthest limit of the circumference, and includes everything. The Call for Religion would never be made were it not for that fact.

We have personal experience of this truth. When I stand on one of the open moors of Derbyshire, on the borders of Sheffield, I am at times conscious that the material universe stretches from my feet into what seems limitless space. I am a part of the whole. That is the result of my outward look.

Thou canst not stir a flower
Without troubling a star,

and I have a similar experience when I look within. My little peak of consciousness is united with the spiritual whole. My spirit stretches out into the infinite "Beyond that is within." My soul has no terminus. I cannot find where it begins or where it ends.

We may have the same experience when we gaze into the life of another human being and even into the eyes of any living creature. "Once," said Immanuel Kant, "I held a swallow in my hand and gazed into its eyes: and as I gazed, it was as if I had seen into heaven."

Man is part of a spiritual order and he has not yet become conscious of the fact. It has been said by someone that man is an eternal being and the tragedy of his life is that he lives as though he were a creature of time. For the sake of the transient he rejects and denies the universal which belongs to him.

Let us look at this truth from another angle. In the realm of psychology which has been employed to degrade religion, much stress has been laid on the dangers of repression. The

repression of normal natural instincts has been said to be the cause of nervous collapses. What has not been emphasized sufficiently is the danger of repressing what is noblest and best in human nature. For repression is not limited to the instincts, but is extensively active in the highest spiritual realm. In that lies much of our trouble, and the Call for Religion is the call to man to exercise those powers which are most truly human, because they lift him above all other living things on earth.

Some time ago a friend who was well on in middle life said to me, "Many of my old friends are retired from business, and I have still to work hard. The difference between us seems to be that they are miserable and I am happy." Why? Because the natural tendency of a healthy man is to be active and purposeful. A similar reason explains the unhappiness which so often accompanies the possession of wealth and the pursuit of wealth. Men by their selfishness and greed repress the tendency to 'generosity which is native to the human soul, and they punish themselves in consequence. Their sadness is the result of their denial of the good in themselves. It is pathetic when a thing or a word fails to accomplish the end whereto it was sent, for instance, the machine rusting to pieces because no hand uses it, and the violin falling to dust because no musician charms the tones from it; but saddest of all is it, when the divine quality in the human heart actually drives the good out of life because the possessor of it will not let it inspire his word and action.

Man is suffering because he refuses to listen to the call of the eternal within him, because he is repressing the better part of his nature. He is sad and distressed because he lives a narrow life, because he is what Gerald Heard terms "a fissured psyche."

If what I have said is true, then the Call of Religion is 'a call to the belief that the power in the Universe and in the heart of man is spiritual and is friendly. That power is the substance, the reality, which underlies the whole.

Faith has often been weakened and made fruitless because

this power has been regarded as something or Someone entirely extraneous: something that has to be introduced, superimposed or forced in, or Someone who is remote, distant, inaccessible, though dwelling in light. The type of theology that maintains this is lifting its head today. You have an instance of it in the recently published volume on *The Philosophy of Religion*, by Emil Brunner, who writes, "We can neither experience nor understand divine revelation, but simply believe it." Such theology is based on the doctrine of the impotence of man, and the call that is made to him is for the surrender of his reason and for distrust of all those powers and gifts which constitute him a being infinite in faculty and in apprehension like a god. Faith of that kind has often been accompanied by the fear that God may not really be there.

Religion must not be interpreted in any narrow sense. All sincere attempts at religion have been efforts to express the eternal in time, and the differences in religions have been due to the different needs with which man has been faced and the different outlooks which have resulted from the endeavours to satisfy those needs. They are all sidelights on truth, and it is time that the noise of battle between them died down.

Yet, as the Rev. W. M. Teape writes in his *Secret Lore of India*, "A battle there is, and the enemies are those mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 'the principalities, the powers, the world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places,' which beset and hinder the understanding and the endeavours of all men in their pursuit of a life of devotion to the Highest."

Acknowledging that fact, some men have hoped to find the lowest common denominator, which, as Sir Francis Younghusband has stated emphatically, is not the object of the World Congress of Faiths. Any such effort can only lead to an emasculated form of faith, of no use to anybody. I once made the attempt myself, by eliminating everything that could not be found in the great religions. Dogmas, beliefs, observances, and practices which some men esteem

sacred disappeared one by one. I was soon left with little of my own faith. Strangely enough I found the last to disappear was the collection or offertory. The idea of giving is in all religions. We must all admit that there is much of faith in the call, "Bring an offering and come into his courts." It made me think that perhaps the essence of religion might be found in service, especially the service of the Highest. .

The best approach to a common factor of which I know was that made by Max Müller, who wrote, "There is no religion, or if there is, I do not know of it, which does not say, 'Do good; avoid evil.' There is none which does not contain what Rabbi Hillel called the quintessence of all religions, the simple warning, 'Be good, my boy.' 'Be good, my boy,' may seem a short catechism; but let us add to it, 'Be good, my boy, for God's sake,' and we have nearly the whole law and the prophets."

Quite obviously there is not sufficient inspiration and healing in any common factor to make man whole. We used to hear much in days gone by about the sympathy of religions, and attempts were made to gather parallel thoughts from the sacred books of the world. Then it was pointed out that it is not a sympathy of religions which is needed, but a symphony of religions.

In a great symphony orchestra the instruments are many. Some are different from the rest; others are similar to each other; and again others are almost identical.

May not the religions of the world, many though they are, be made to form a symphony? Even those which are apparently most opposed have notes which can contribute to a harmony. Indeed those that have been most hostile to each other have sometimes complained that their opponents have stolen their instruments.

To take another illustration: I have been told that the art treasures of Italy are the richest in the world, though the art of the Netherlands makes a deeper appeal to me. But I am assured that the art of Italy presents more varieties and finds expression in more forms. The reason appears to be

that all the groups in Italy were inspired by a common love of art, but each group worked out its own genius, using the materials on the spot and supplying local needs. So it has come about that Roman art is different from Venetian, and Etruscan from Neapolitan, and Florentine from Milanese. Through the self-expression and self-determination of its genius, Italy has become the land which attracts students of art.

Some such method is required in religion. While we are all inspired by the love of religion and all animated by the desire to answer the world's Call for Religion and all encourage each other to aspire, each religious group should strive to develop its genius according to the needs of the people in its own vicinity. True, we have all much to teach. Every one of us here may feel that his faith has more to teach and to contribute to the common stock than any other faith. Yet the attitude should be that of mutual helpfulness and never of dominance.

Who shall show the way to the accomplishment of great principles, universal aims, moral ideas, and spiritual purposes, unless those who call themselves religious keep themselves free from what Sir Thomas Browne quaintly termed "improperations and terms of scurrility"? We must make a beginning in mutual respect and in the frank confession that every religion, and every life for that matter, has a contribution to make and should be permitted to make it. That is what the authoritarian in religion fails to see.

It will not be altogether irrelevant if I apply the illustration I have just used to the international situation, for that is a deep concern of religion. I regard myself as an internationalist and not as a cosmopolitan. In the *Oxford Dictionary* an internationalist is defined as "one who advocates community of interests between nations," and a cosmopolitan as "one who is free from national limitations." The distinction may seem fine, but it is important. I am not a cosmopolitan, because I do not wish to see myself or any man deprived of the qualities of the group to which he

belongs or has chosen to belong, just as I do not wish to be robbed of my individuality by being a member of society. But as an internationalist I desire that the particular genius of each nation, tribe, and group shall be respected and maintained, and that each shall be given the fullest possible freedom of development.

I give the word "group" in this connection the widest possible application. The forefathers of the English people were despised by the supercilious Roman as a wild sort of sea-rover. But the descendants of those sea-rovers have developed the art of seamanship to the benefit of the whole race. It may be that in some backward African tribe is some distinct genius awaiting development, which will add to the wealth of the world. Destroy that tribe and great good may be lost to humanity. The little tribe of Judah has laid mankind under a permanent debt through the religious message of its prophets, and I am convinced that the Jewish people have not exhausted their possibilities of service. The city of Athens contributed treasures in art, from which students of that branch of culture still draw a wealth of ideas. In spite of the union of England, Scotland, and Wales, it is a distinct advantage that there are still Welshmen and Scotsmen with their racial characteristics, and I trust I may add without prejudice, Englishmen too.

Nothing can be more dull to contemplate than a drab, uniform humanity with all its individual distinctions removed. That is what the advocate of the totalitarian state fails to see. There might be less objection to the totalitarian idea if it did not inevitably carry with it the elimination of many groups for the sake of a few leading types. The final result would be a stunted and dwarfed humanity. So I do not wish to see so much racial intermixture that many characteristics are destroyed. Let each race be given the opportunity to bring its genius to fulness for its own good and that of other races.

The Call for Religion is urgent. We have been caught in a maelstrom of contending interests and clashing personalities. The statesmen of the nineteenth century had hardly an inkling

of the social, economic, political, and international problems which are the concern of the man-in-the-street today.

What is the attitude taken by those in authority, by the leaders in the various countries, by men who are not deficient in thought, and we may add not wanting in sincerity and anxiety? Is it not a fact that it matters not to what branch of human relationships we turn? The thing that is patent is that the effort is made to get over the immediate difficulty and to hope that wisdom will suffice to solve the next and resulting difficulty. The question that is invariably asked is, "What shall we do in the present crisis?" If it is suggested that a comprehensive line should be taken, it is stated that we must explore the situation, which simply means that we must find out what worldly advantages we are going to gain or lose. Thus affairs of every kind are brought to a deadlock. Dangers ensue, and mankind writhes in agony and trembles with fear.

The old idea of the good old times has died a natural death. No one who reads can help being aware that for people as a whole, life is fuller and opportunity vaster than in days gone by. Yet there never was a time when cruelty was practised on so large a scale; never a century, for instance, in which the innocent non-combatant was made to suffer, regardless of age and sex, as in ours.

The story might be lengthened, but we all know it. How shall we be delivered? What we need to see is that the cause of this suffering, national and international, political and economic, social and individual, is to be found in short-time policies and expedient measures. Religion says definitely, "Thou shalt live as in the sight of God. Thou shalt act according to eternal principles." The tendency of those in power has often been to act according to the immediate advantage. The nation has been exalted above morality, man, and God. Religion has been in the way. It is openly considered today to be still more in the way, and the attempt is being made to get rid of it altogether in some countries.

A serious mistake is being made by opposition and in-

difference to religion. Following that great philosopher of religion, James Martineau, I would urge that the factors of growth in modern society are spiritual in character. As he said, "In truth, the animating spring of all improvement in individuals and in societies is not their knowledge of the actual, but their conceptions of the possible."

"The whole dynamics of man's life," he maintained, "lie in his spontaneous impulses, his regulative morals, his religious sentiments; these it is that work his understanding, dictating his ambition, determining its direction, sustaining its perseverance."

When we turn to the lives of the great scientists, we find, speaking generally, that they are pre-eminent not only for their discoveries, but for the patience of their souls, the industry of their days, and the reverence of their minds. The biographies of Kepler, Newton, Faraday, Darwin, and Kelvin may be read for moral edification as well as intellectual enlightenment. Always at the back of their efforts we are conscious of ideals at work which lift them out of the little realms of self and make them inhabitants of higher kingdoms. The motive may seem on the surface to be curiosity, but the inspiration and incentive of their labours come from their love of truth, their devotion to the service of humanity, their wonder before the immensities of God's mysterious Universe, and their marvel at life and every tiny portion of it.

To whatever branch of human activity we may turn, we soon learn that behind it are spiritual forces which supply the necessary motive power and carry great efforts towards achievement. Even those who are bent on material and selfish ends lay the stress on those qualities which contribute to the greatness of man's spirit, though they employ them for narrow and unworthy purposes. Religion demands that the spiritual energies with which man is endowed shall be employed for their rightful ends in the service of man and reverence for the Highest.

I wish to place before you some facts relating to the Call for Religion which occur to me as a working minister after

having spent thirty-seven years in three of our large industrial centres—Norwich, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and Sheffield. They may appear commonplace, but they are none the less important for that.

The first is that there has been a break-away from the religions of authority, and it has been most rapid since the Great War. It may be regarded as part of the rebellion against authority which has been most obvious in the attitude of youth. But it is by no means limited to youth. The grown adult shares it, though he does not give the same external signs of it, and continues in the ways which habit has made part of his nature. It may be urged that the religion of the spirit has also failed, for it has not delivered a message with the power to attract the great numbers which formerly supported the religions of authority. Our censure should be gentle, for the great weakness of the religion of the spirit is its inability and, we may add, its unwillingness to organize itself. Dogmas can be driven into the head, but religion cannot be driven into the heart.

Yet ideas, living spiritual ideas, related to the needs of the age, have been the forces which have swayed the people in all times and places.

We sometimes speak of the emotionalism displayed in the Methodist revival of the Wesleys, but the emotion was due to an idea. Wesleyanism has been described as "Arminianism set on fire." Behind it was the definite doctrine that the means for the salvation of all men had been provided by God. Every man in Christendom was given his opportunity. Every man was offered the means of grace. If he were damned, it was through his own wilful rejection of the divine love, not by the will of God, but against the will of God.

That was a great idea, vital in the age in which it was preached. It freed men from the fears and horrors of the Calvinistic doctrines of election, predestination, and reprobation in which they had been educated. It was a veritable deliverance from beliefs which had laid heavily upon the human soul.

The temptation is to think that the days are past when vast numbers of men can be caught and moved by ideas. But the mass-thinking in our time is too painfully obvious. The peoples of the various nations and of the world as a whole are not less susceptible to the ethos of the age or the Zeit-Geist than those in previous centuries, and perhaps owing to the increased facilities of communication they might be more swift in their response to a living message on world-fellowship. The actions of youth are decided by the standards whether a thing "is done or not done," in spite of all the show of independence and rebellion. If men can be captivated and held by national and limited ideas, why not by the conception of universal brotherhood?

Once we have the ideas clear, definite, and inspired, the power of the religion of the spirit will not be less widespread in its appeal than that of the best organized religions of authority. The wish may be father to the thought, but I cannot believe that the opportunity is lacking for the furtherance of the religion of the spirit. It is the world's need.

A second fact is evident. Religion is organizing itself in new ways. It no longer limits itself to Church life or acts under authority only. The movement away from ecclesiastical direction is not always a movement away from religion. Our habit of associating religion with the acknowledged organizations of faith accounts to some extent for the cry that religion is in danger. One meets in public life men who are really in earnest in their desire to establish the Kingdom of God. They believe that they can serve their day and generation, and perhaps not less the Universe and God, as statesmen, town councillors, workers in philanthropic and social institutions, teachers in college settlements, organizers of sport and play, and members of associations usually regarded as secular. So prevalent has this belief become that members of churches do not always associate their service to the community with their Church life or find the inspiration for it in religious services. Their activities spring from their consciousness of the immediate needs of men, and they serve without having

thought out any theory of service and certainly without self-conscious piety.

This side of life must not be overlooked in the consideration of the Call for Religion. Men today may indeed have more leisure and opportunity than their forerunners, but certainly our age is not behind any other in the expression of those forms of activity which were formerly associated with organized religion. These men are increasing in number and promise to be the rule rather than the exception. Nevertheless these labourers for man and God would achieve more and further the accomplishment of greater aims, could they all be brought under the influence of a dominating idea which was universal in its scope and had as its inspiration the controlling force of the conception of brotherhood. The danger is that temporary reforms, piecemeal measures, and pitiable shifts may be accepted as adequate substitutes for the world-wide aims which distinguish religion.

Our age is essentially one of work. It is characterized by activity in many directions. The time calls urgently for thought, reflection, aspiration and, above all, for the search for principles by which to direct activity. The motto of St. Benedict, "*Laborare est orare*," is true, but when our seeking is earnest and sincere, it is equally true to say, "*Orare est laborare*."

If I were asked, "What religious idea needs to be developed most today?", I should reply, "The doctrine of forgiveness." No definite teaching on the subject has yet been given to modern man. It has been cluttered up with doctrines about propitiation, expiation, sacrifice, atonement, mediation, intercession, judgment, and the like. In the Christian theologies, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, there has been no room for forgiveness. The doctrines of the Mass, a sacrifice and atonement by blood, have ruled it out. Possibly the doctrine of Karma has prevented its development in the East. The Allies failed in their aim to establish peace and goodwill after the Great War, because they had no knowledge even of the rudiments of forgiveness.

When forgiveness is studied, it becomes clear that a price has to be paid for it, and the greater part of it must be paid by the person or nation wronged because of the strong position occupied. There is no forgiveness when it is demanded that the defeated offender shall pay the whole penalty or the greater part of it. That is the old *lex talionis*, which is appropriately represented by the statue of justice with the scales in her hands. But

High heaven rejects the lore
Of nicely calculated less or more.

The only sane reason for condemning or punishing any person or group of persons is to help them to be better, or, in other words, to put them into such a state of mind that they can be forgiven. There is a call for the religion of forgiveness, for men and nations have no understanding of the quality of mercy, and forgiveness is the most difficult task they have to perform. Until they learn this lesson, retaliatory measures, vindictive tariffs, and other forms of bitterness will not cease to be, and man will be at enmity with his brother and war will ensue.

There is *no* Call for a Religion which endeavours to continue on its way regardless and free from care of the intellectual movement of our time. Religion must not indeed be governed and directed by new-fangled philosophies and wild Utopias, which are numerous enough, but it must not be cramped and hindered by ancient theologies and traditional dogmas. No religion can supply the message that is needed unless it takes full cognizance of the scientific discoveries, of the spacious outlooks, and of the whole intellectual revolution, which are distinguishing characteristics of the modern age. Religion must also, if it is to be of service, come into the grime and dust of the workaday world, and relate itself to the present economic and industrial problems. It must toil unceasingly for a higher social order. It must speak with moral force on the problems of peace and goodwill, and in season and out of season cultivate world-wide sympathies and world fellowship. Great are the treasures inherited by

religion from the past, and care must be taken to preserve them; but religion, if it is to continue to be vital, must live in the present with its face set towards the future.

A saying has come down to us from one of the lost Christian gospels, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It records that when Jesus was baptized by John, the voice from heaven declared, "My son, I waited for thee in all the prophets that I might find rest." What a striking image is that! God seeking for rest in the spirit of men like Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and having to wait until a greater than these arrived. And still the spirit of God waits, waits for the revealing of the sons of God, waits for the coming of the souls of men, in whom He can find rest.

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Mr. LEO BAKER said that he felt it so right that Dr. Hall had begun by giving a picture of unity, and he would wish also to begin from unity. If we looked back through all the holy writings of the different faiths, we always found a vision of law and unity. Man looked back to the time when he was near to Godhead, and when the power of God flowed into and through him. The history of religion was a record of man's long wanderings from that vision of unity and light, more and more into the shadow, which showed itself always in the same way—as an experience of separation. The separation was at first a separation of man from the divine, but as time went on this resulted in a separation within man himself, so that he became almost unable to feel, or to act in the right way.

In the Christian Scriptures we read of how the light came into darkness. The Chairman and Dr. Hall had emphasized that this was a time of darkness. Could we not feel that this darkness was our greatest hope for the coming of light? And that the darkness was the call of religion to our time, a call that came not from man but from the Divine Spirit,

which man could find when he realized again the unity within himself and his unity with the divine light.

The BEGUM SULTAN MIR AMIRUDDIN spoke on the relation of humanism and religion. Dr. Hall had mentioned that the aim and objective of religion was to inculcate ethical principles. Humanists urged that religion was unnecessary; that humanism could answer the need. She wished to emphasize, however, that humanism was not sufficient. The moral and natural elements in man were always in conflict, and human nature, however carefully nurtured, could never resist the temptations that life offered unless it took a stand in the impregnable defence of religion. Hence the great need in this age of materialism of the Call for Religion.

Mr. AYLMER MAUDE said that Tolstoy had come to realize, and had taught, as the Begum had said, that ethics had no roots unless they were rooted in religion. Life only had meaning if man identified himself with God and set himself to serve God.

Mrs. DODWELL referred to the great revival of interest in religion that was apparent among the students of South India. She said that they were discovering in religious conferences a spirit of fellowship that overcame differences and difficulties, and that all religions contained a deeper stream of spiritual life than was apparent in its outward forms. Each had to find it in the mysticism of his own religion first before any common basis could be found.

Mr. VIVIEN CARTER asked whether Dr. Hall believed that the new world order or unity of mankind would come about as the result of the spirit of religion only, or whether some kind of organization of the religions would also be required. In a Conference on the Unity of the Churches of Christendom¹ from which he had just come, the section dealing with the relation of the Church to the world had been most disappointing. A kind of non-intervention was the most that they

¹ Conference on Church Community and State. Oxford, July 1937.

could arrive at. He wondered whether religion could do any more for the world than be itself.

Dr. HALL (*replying to the discussion*): I should like to express my sense of indebtedness to those taking part in the discussion. I found much in common between Mr. Leo Baker and the Begum Amiruddin. Gerald Heard perhaps sums up the argument in his book, *The Sources of Civilization*, when he says that the duty of man is to achieve his unity. The great weakness of humanism seems to me to be that it leaves out of consideration the part that we all possess, the religious aspiring side. We all possess it. Some people may not develop it but it is there in everyone, although maybe undeveloped.

The question naturally arises: How are we to achieve that mystical element? The best way to become conscious of it is to develop each religion to the full. This will make for unity and for a harmonious whole.

In answer to the last speaker, I may say very definitely indeed that my own opinion is that war has failed absolutely. People occasionally say that certain wars have been justifiable. The way of force has failed. Let us try the way of understanding. It is difficult to say how far the religions can teach us that way, for even the churchmen who believe most in the brotherhood of man are rather tainted with nationalism when it comes to certain points. Religion does lead some people to a sense of world fellowship. To others it does not help much, but we, as a World Congress of Faiths, we at any rate, as religious people, have as our aim objective the effort to promote peace and understanding among mankind through religion.

THE ESSENTIALS OF RELIGION

SECOND SESSION,
Saturday Morning, July 24th.

THE ESSENTIALS OF RELIGION

Professor F. W. THOMAS (*in the Chair*)

After the general introduction to our subject under the heading of *The Call for Religion*, we naturally turn to the *Essentials of Religion*.

Everything that exists in Nature has, of course, an infinite number of characteristics, any one of which at a particular time may attract the maximum of attention. But nevertheless every natural creation has also a certain number of essential features which constitute its nature. It is to these essential features of religion that Professor Hume is about to direct our attention.

I think that Professor Hume needs no special introduction to this gathering. After Sir Francis Younghusband himself—whose presence on this occasion is another example of his indomitable zeal for the cause and who we all hope may carry away from this gathering a beneficial stimulus to his health—after him I think it may be said that few have done more to create an interest in this matter than Professor Hume. He is known in this country and in the East by various publications of which perhaps the chief is the Translation of *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*,¹ which is a most excellent—perhaps the best—introduction to that marvellous literature: also by a work entitled *The Treasure-House of the Living Religions*,² a most remarkable publication. In that work Professor Hume has collected more than 4000 quotations from standardized translations (in some cases translations that he himself has had to provide) of the canonical or sacred scriptures of all

¹ *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. Translated from the Sanskrit. Oxford University Press. 1921.

² *Treasure-House of the Living Religions*. (Selections from their Sacred Scriptures.) Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933.

the living historical religions. These citations are collected in fifty chapters grouped in three divisions, entitled respectively

Faith in the Perfect God.

Man and his Perfection.

Man and his Social Duties.

These citations have been modified by Professor Hume in one sole particular, which, however, produced a very remarkable effect. This sole particular is that Professor Hume has excluded all oriental or foreign names, whether the names of persons or geographical or otherwise. Thus we nowhere find the name of Jehovah, Allah, Krishna or any of the sacred names of the great religions of the world. Instead of these there has been substituted either the general term of God, or some equivalent which is suitable in the particular context. The result of this is that a number of striking quotations from the sacred Scriptures which might appear to us as representative of a particular religion, and as strange or external by reason of associations, controversial in some cases, with particular names, are reduced to such a community of idea and sentiment that anyone who reads this book and who follows the subdivisions of it from page to page, going through all the main essentials of religion and morality, will ask himself at every point whether he is really reading the scriptures of some other faith or of his own. This is a most ingenious device and a most convincing proof that the essentials of religion in all its main topics and features are common to all the traditional, living religions of the world.

This is a very remarkable feature and effect of reading Professor Hume's book. He will now proceed to address you, and I am convinced that some of the effect of his book will be reflected also in his address.

Dr. ROBERT E. HUME

Religion is one of the most simple and most natural experiences of human beings. Yet it is also one of the most

complex. A child of a dozen years can have an experience of religion which is abundantly joyous and permanently empowering. Yet to most religionists a lifetime's religious experience seems insufficient for compassing the potentialities of religion; and, accordingly, they postulate a life after death which, in some measure or other, will continue and fulfil the actual religious experiences of the present life.

Religious experience is not altogether uniform. Indeed, the various forms of religious experience are not merely diversified, but in some respects positively opposed to one another. Thus, for some persons religion is predominantly a practical experience; to other persons religion is predominantly mystical. Some systems of religion have emphasized the individual, while other systems have emphasized the group, or even the Impersonal Cosmic Power of Principle into which the individual should seek completely to merge and lose himself. In dealing with the individual, some types of religion have advocated the goal of self-development, while other types contrariwise have advocated self-repression. Even in advocating self-repression religions have differed; for example, Jainism advocated strongly an asceticism of the body, while the contemporary Buddhism advocated the repression of desire. In some religions the ethical emphasis has been strong, while in some other religions both the Ultimate Reality of the Universe and also the perfect human individual are beyond good and evil. In some formulations of religion the evil that there is in the world has occupied large attention, while in other formulations the evil has been considerably minimized. Some types of religion have been chiefly retrospective in their gaze; other types of religion have stressed a futuristic outlook, even a strong eschatological concern for the end of the world. Let us consider also the varied methods advocated as the proper method of salvation. More than a dozen different plans have been proffered for the great problem of salvation; for example, salvation by absorption in Deity; salvation by asceticism; salvation by devotion; salvation by faith; salvation by grace, whether irresistible or

co-operative; salvation by knowledge; salvation by obedience; salvation by the aid of an organization, whether a divinely established Church, or a personally founded "Sangha" or strictly human Brotherhood; salvation by virtue of a Teacher (Guru) or a Founder; salvation by the power of prayer; salvation by sacraments or by other sacrosanct means such as ablutions, pilgrimages, or transubstantiated food and drink; salvation by sacrifices; salvation by submission to diverse higher authorities, whether the Power or the Law of the Supreme Being or of some human counterpart or intermediary thereof; salvation by varied kinds of self-effort; salvation by the mediation of priests; salvation through the effect of varied power other than one's own. How can all these sixteen and more varieties of religious belief and religious experience be subsumed under any one unifying category?

Let us confess that our assignment to analyse the essentials of religion is exceedingly difficult. Some scholars have claimed that it is quite impossible, just because religion has been such a jumble of curious and even contradictory elements. Nevertheless, let us start again with the first proposition in this discussion, namely, that religion is essentially an experience. The proper logical procedure in this or any problem of definition is to designate the next higher category under which the particular category may be subsumed, and then to designate its differentia. By as much as religion is essentially an experience, therefore those persons are best qualified to analyse and define religion who themselves have experienced what may properly be designated as authentic, joyful, empowering religious experience. Religion is indeed a powerful experience; yet religion is also a very delicate experience. It cannot properly be treated as a coldly disinterested objective affair, like mathematics or physics or chemistry or astronomy. To many persons their religious experience is an experience so personal, so interior, so sacred that it can hardly be mentioned in common talk with persons who themselves exercise no respect for religion. And if the other person has himself

entered into the ineffable experience of religion, then to the mystic there is no need of further argumentation, or even of discussion, concerning the profound experience which both have experienced.

Nevertheless our procedure should be historical, scientific, philosophical, and unmistakably sympathetic. Forthwith let us proceed to assert that, while religion is primarily an experience, it is distinctly the experience of an influence which has entered into the individual from a source superior to himself. While religion is a subjective experience, yet it always carries a certain objective reference. Specifically, the distinctly religious experience is correlated with some super-human object of faith and worship. So, the differentia or delimiting reference in the experience of religion is not simply a zeal which is ardent or devoted, but a consciousness of a relationship which the religious individual sustains to Power Divine. Summarily I would venture to define religion as "that phase, or that aspect, of his experience, including his thoughts, his feelings, and his actions, whereby he endeavours to live in relationship with what he deems to be the Divine, that is, the supremely worthwhile Power or Powers controlling in the world." From a psychological point of view, religion is partly an intellectual experience; it is partly an emotional experience; it is partly an active experience of the will. What constitutes a person's religion is his belief in some Cosmic Power or gods, and his experience of that power. What differentiates one religion from another is the kind of deity believed in, and then the kind of experience which flows appropriately from that kind of deity or deities.

At this point in the discussion I must stop to point out what some of you may well have been thinking in your own mind, namely, that there have been some persons whose religion is not so emphatically theological as to insist upon any kind of a deity at all. At the present time there are the Ethical Culture Society and various humanitarian movements which are non-theistic. Indeed, there are some persons, very earnest and even quite happy, who disavow belief in God

altogether. They are eager to eradicate all idea of 'God from their own groups; and yet they display many of the traits usually associated with religion, such as profound commitment to a cause greater than themselves, and an enthusiastic self-sacrifice even to uplift humanity.

Along this line, a survey of the history of religions brings to light two somewhat similar anti-theistic revolts; they both started in the land of India in the sixth century before Christ. These experiments were conducted on a longer scale than any anti-Christian and anti-Semitic experiments in the Christian Era. I am glad to recall two enterprising noble men, both "noblemen" in their social standing, named Mahavira, the Founder of Jainism, and Gautama Buddha, the Founder of Buddhism. They sacrificed a rich patrimony for the sake of something avowedly better than the beliefs and practices which were prevailing in the religion then current. Vigorously did they reject the traditional concepts of deity, whether the numerous nature-deities of the earlier Vedas, or the concept of One Cosmic Impersonal Brahma or Atman which was being advocated contemporaneously in the Upanishadic pantheism. Experimentally they lived with great self-reliance, instead of depending upon either god or priest; and they succeeded in commending to others also a sturdy method of self-saving. So powerful and winsome were Mahavira and Buddha that those two non-theistic innovators in the realm of religion have been followed by an unbroken succession of seventy-five generations of professing admirers. The former group now numbers more than a million followers; the latter group, more than a hundred million followers. These two long-continued movements, each starting as an anti-theistic revolt in favour of a more humanistic method of self-salvation, are deserving of some detailed examination for the light which they can bring our modern humanitarian liberalism. To put the problem quite simply, let us ask whether, according to centuries of human experience, a great religious reformation is likely to endure which starts by renouncing faith in God?

The very oldest personally founded religion still alive is probably Judaism, which emphasizes faith in a righteous God, Jehovah. The next oldest personally founded religion in the world today is Jainism. The founder's personal name is recorded as Vardhamana, meaning "The Increasing One." Subsequently his adoring followers came to designate him as "Maha-vira," meaning "The Great Hero," and also as "Jina," meaning "The Victor" or "The Triumpher." He was born the son of a Hindu Raja about 599 B.C., a date which is perhaps the earliest approximately definite date in the long history of India. That leader of the world's earliest protestant religious movement was repelled by the self-seekingly adulatory prayers which were being addressed to the several score nature-deities in the traditional polytheism. Mahavira condemned as quite futile the inherited practice of talking so piously about the deities, as well as talking to them. He urged that men should take themselves in hand, and should control the natural powers within their own complex egos, instead of attempting to control the external so-called divine Powers in earth and air and sky by means of flattery and appeasement. Rather, a person should be realistic and scientific. Let me quote from the *Acaranga Sutra* (2. 4. 1. 12) as translated by Professor Jacobi in the *Sacred Books of the East* (22. 152). A devout religionist

"should not say, 'the god of the sky!' 'the god of the thunder-storm!' 'the god of lightning!' 'the god who begins to rain!' 'may rain fall!' 'may the crops grow!' 'may the king conquer!' They should not use such speech. But, knowing the nature of things, he should say 'the air,' 'a cloud is gathered, or come down,' 'the cloud has rained.' This is the whole duty."

The sturdy Mahavira scorned the idea which had been advocated numerous times in the ancient *Rig-Veda*, that Deity could in any way be categorized as "a friend" (*Mitra*) of man, and that therefore he could be appealed to for preferential treatment towards individual human favourites.

“Man! Thou art thy own friend! Why wishest thou for a Friend beyond thyself?” (Acaranga Sutra I. 3. 3. 4; *Sacred Books of the East*, 22. 33.)

Quite remarkable is the way in which the theistic “Argument from Design” was denounced in the Jain religion long before the scepticism of the Occident had attacked that famous argument which postulates a Creator in order to explain the origination of the world.

“Those who, on arguments of their own, maintain that the world has been created, do not know the truth.” (Sutra-Kritanga I. I. 3. 9; SBE 45. 245.)

In addition to his protests against traditional theology and piety, Mahavira proposed a half-dozen constructive reforms in religion.

He affirmed the reality of the material world and of the individual's soul and body, as over against the contemporary philosophy of the Upanishads, which involved the relative unreality of the world and of the individual.

Instead of the performance of animal and other sacrifices, which were enjoined in the priestly “Brahmanas,” Mahavira advocated self-sacrifice, especially bodily asceticism, and also active kindness to animals.

Instead of prohibiting the revered Sanskrit Scriptures from being divulged outside the esoteric circles, Mahavira preached his new doctrines of religion in the language of the common people; and so all the Sacred Scriptures of Jainism still stand in the Prakrit vernacular of his day.

Instead of the traditional hierarchical system of dividing society into four main castes successively superimposed upon each other, Mahavira established the remarkably democratic “Sangha,” “Congregation,” or “Fraternity,” for all persons who should become his sympathetic followers. And at the present time, some twenty-five hundred years later, this Brotherhood of Jainism stands as the oldest voluntarily entered Religious Order in the world.

Instead of continuing with the traditional religion's exclusive

interest in caste and country, Mahavira is reported as having had thrice a kind of divine urge to go forth and establish a religion which should be truly universal.

“Arhat (*i.e.* Blessed One)! Propagate the religion which is a blessing to all creatures in the world!” (Acaranga Sutra 3. 18. 6; SBE 22. 195.)

“Luck to thee, Best Bull of the Kshatriyas! Awake, reverend Lord of the world! Establish the religion of the Law which benefits all living beings in the whole universe!” (Kalpa Sutra 111; SBE 22. 256.)

“Victory, victory to thee, Gladdener of the world! O Hero! In the arena of the three worlds gain the supreme best knowledge, called Absolute Kevala!” (Kalpa Sutra 114; SBE 22. 258.)

But the non-theistic basis of that remarkable innovator, Mahavira, has not evinced the power to survive even in the history of his own system. He who previously had been a solitary ascetic patiently seeking the salvation of his own soul for twelve years, changed over into being a preacher and a leader of many followers. During the latter part of his life Mahavira is reported as having done very extensive preaching and converting throughout North India, even to seeking out and converting four kinds. In his own person he had fulfilled the ideal which he had preached, namely, a life quiet and unperturbed, self-denying, harmless, prayerless. Yet subsequently his later followers have represented him as possessing attributes which, to most religionists, seem to be genuinely divine. In their Sacred Scriptures he is represented as sinless.

“Having wisdom, Mahavira committed no sin himself. He meditated, free from sin and desire.” (Acaranga Sutra 1. 8. 4. 8. 15; SBE 22. 86-87.)

“The great Sage does not commit any wrong.” (Sutra-Kritanga 1. 6. 26; SBE 45. 291.)

“Knowing the current of worldliness, the current of sinfulness, practising the sinless abstinence from killing and whatever is sinful, the Venerable One left that undone.” (Acaranga Sutra 1. 8. 1. 15. 16. 17; SBE 22. 81.)

In the Sacred Scriptures of Jainism the Founder is revered as omniscient.

"He knew the thoughts of all sentient beings." (Acaranga Sutra 2. 15. 23; SBE 22. 200.)

"He possessed supreme, unlimited, unimpeded knowledge and intuition." (Kalpa Sutra 112; SBE 22. 257.)

"This wise and clever great Sage possessed infinite knowledge." (Sutra-Kritanga Sutra 1. 6. 3; SBE 45. 287.)

"Omniscient, he shines forth. . . . The Omniscient Sage has proclaimed the Law. The Omniscient is the most famous . . . he, the Omniscient." (Sutra-Kritanga Sutra 1. 6. 6. 7. 18. 25; SBE 45. 288. 29.)

Further, in the Sacred Scriptures of Jainism this remarkable person is represented as having been pre-existent and planfully incarnate.

"He descended from heaven. . . . The Venerable Ascetic Mahavira descended from the great Vimana (*i.e.* the Palace of the gods). . . . Here, in the continent of Jambudvīpa (*i.e.* India), in the southern part of Bharata-Varsha (*i.e.* North India), he took the form of an embryo in the womb of Devanada (his mother)." (Acaranga Sutra 2. 15. 1. 2; SBE 22. 189. 190.)

In addition to doctrinal deification, Mahavira has actually been worshipped idolatrously, even along with other divine beings, in the later history of his system of religion.

Valiantly had that humble, self-sacrificing devotee and preacher of religion pleaded with his fellow-men to be valiantly self-helpful in all matters of religion, instead of being feebly dependent upon sacerdotal, or any kind of divine, assistance. Yet, so strong and kind and patient and helpful had he himself lived, that his followers concluded that he was no ordinary man; he himself must have been veritably divine. And then there ensued the historic fact that through a period longer than the Christian Era his followers have turned into adorable deity him who theoretically was the denier of the divine.

Next let us consider the other oft-quoted instance of a system of religion which originated without the help of any kind of a god.

Gautama the Buddha, like his slightly older contemporary Mahavira, satirized the current lazy, selfish methods of praying to alleged supernatural Powers. With noteworthy skill and good humour Buddha ridiculed the claims for wonderful theological and scriptural knowledge which had been maintained by the religious leaders of his country. (See *Tevijja Sutta* 1. 12. 15. 24; SBE 11. 173. 174. 180.) In the *Dhammapada*, or "Way of Virtue," which is the most important document among the twenty-nine constituent documents in Buddhism's "Tri-Pitaka" or "Three Baskets" of wisdom-literature, there are more than a score of passages recording how the most daring and most effective religious reformer in the entire history of India appealed for a more heroic type of religion. Buddha praised self-saving, self-purification, and self-control as being the prime requisites of a happy and successful life, in protest against the hypocrisies and futilities of the religious aristocracy and theologians whom he encountered.

"It is good to tame the mind, which is difficult to hold in, and flighty. A tamed mind brings happiness." (*Dhammapada* 35; SBE 10. 1. 12.)

"Not even a god or a spirit (*Gandharva*), not Mara (*i.e.* the tempter), with Brahma (the Supreme Being of philosophic Hinduism), could change into defeat the victory of a man who has vanquished himself, and who always lives under restraint." (*Dhammapada* 104. 105; SBE 10. 1. 31-32.)

Buddha acted and spoke with audacious denunciation of the caste-system which had been, and which still is, prevailing in India. Five hundred years before the great Galilean, and with some of the very same phraseology, Buddha told the proud rapacious high-stationed sinners of his day that the really high-class and admirable person, as also the really despicable low-down person, must be adjudged in terms of

moral character, not primarily according to standards of heredity or social status or the externals of conventional religion.

"A man does not become a Brahman (*i.e.* a first-class person) by his family or by birth. He in whom there is truth and righteousness—he is blessed; he is a Brahman. O fool! Within thee there is ravening; but the outside thou makest clean." (Dhammapada 393-394; SBE 10. 1. 90-91; similarly SBE 10. 1. 39-40. 90-96; similarly Sutta-Nipata 520-527. 620-640; 10. 2. 88. 111-115; similarly Mahavagga 1. 2. 3; SBE 13. 79-80.)

"The man who is angry, and bears hatred, who harms living beings, who speaks falsely, who exalts himself, and despises others—let one know him as an out-caste." (Sutta-Nipata 115. 116. 121. 131; SBE 10. 2. 21-22.)

Buddha made a certain noteworthy application of his new system of ethical self-culture by organizing his followers into a Brotherhood or Monastic Order, "Sangha." He taught that all previously separating caste-distinctions are to be dropped on entering into this Buddhist fraternity, even as all rivers lose their previous differences when they enter into the mighty ocean. (Culla-vagga 9. 1. 4; SBE 20. 304.)

Many missionaries of Buddhism followed Buddha's own example (Mahavagga 1. 6. 1-16; SBE 13. 89-94) and precept (Mahavagga 1. 11. 1; SBE 13. 112-113; also Maha-Parinibbana Sutta 3. 65; SBE 11. 60-61) of wide itinerant preaching. The blood-thirsty militaristic King Asoka, who was perhaps the most famous convert to Buddhism, about two hundred and fifty years before Christ sent his own son Mahinda on an evangelistic expedition to the next neighbouring country southward.

The impression which was made by that Buddhist foreign missionary effort is recorded in the *Mahavamsa* or *Great Chronicle* of Ceylon (chapter 14, verse 55) as follows:

"When the world's welfare is concerned, who would be slothful or indifferent?" (as translated in J. E. Carpenter, *The Place of Christianity among the Religions of the World*, second edition, p. 94).

But the fact should carefully be noted that Buddhism's most notable accomplishment, namely, the evangelization and the assimilation of China and Japan into the great block of humanity which has become known as "the Orient," was accomplished by the Mahayana Branch of Buddhism; this "Greater Vehicle" has revered Buddha as being nothing less than divine, whereas the Hinayana or Lesser Vehicle Branch of Buddhism, which saw in him only a remarkably wise human teacher, has become almost extinct in the land of its birth.

Exceedingly remarkable is the transformation which has taken place in the later theological development of Buddhism. The Buddhist documents report various incidents which indicate that Buddha was genuinely human, subject to common sickness and death even after his great "enlightenment."

"Now, when the Blessed One had eaten the food prepared for him by Kunda, the worker in metal, there fell upon him a dire sickness, the disease of dysentery; and a sharp pain came upon him, even unto death." (Maha-Parinibbana Sutta 4. 21; SBE 11. 72.)

But his loving disciples felt unbounded admiration for the person who had considered it not a thing to be grasped after, to remain on the equality of a kind. Instead he had voluntarily relinquished his royal inheritance in the interests of something better than the current religion; and then for wellnigh half a century he made himself as one of the common folk of the world for the sake of their salvation. His conduct and character impressed his followers as being

"so unequalled in the world, so mild, so kind. And he held before him aims so high and endeavours so grand!" (Milinda-Panha 4. 1. 41; SBE 35. 178.)

He was "a king of universal kings, a conqueror." (Sutta-Nipata 552; SBE 10. 2. 102.)

Such emotional admiration for Buddha as perfect grew into formal adoration of him as being theologically divine, superior even to the gods of Hinduism.

"The noblest of men, like Indra himself." (Buddha-Carita 5. 45; SBE 49. 1. 56.)

"The heavenly beings, with Brahma at their head, went and worshipped him, propitiating his favour." (Buddha-Carita 17. 1; SBE 49. 1. 190.)

"Gods and men will worship him as 'the Great One that hath transcended time.' Nor is there, in the world with its gods, anyone Thy equal." (Iti-vuttaka 112; J. H. Moore's translation, *The Sayings of Buddha*, 132-133.)

Although Buddha himself was a simple, humble, self-effacing individual, who eschewed philosophic and theological speculations, yet the documents of the Northern Branch, which carried Buddhism through the Far East, have presented him as a Being far greater than the individual who for six years sought enlightenment, and who at his death passed into an inaccessible Nirvana. Buddhism became an international religion unquestionably when Buddha's own personage was reconstructed into a veritable deity. In the later documents he is presented as pre-existent, planfully incarnate, supernaturally conceived, miraculously born (Warren, *Buddhism in Translations*, 42. 46), as sinless, yet suffering inexplicably (Milinda-Panha 4. 1. 62. 66; SBE 35. 190-195), as having entered the world with a redemptive purpose (Sad-Dharma-Pundarika 2. 36; SBE 21. 40), as all-knowing and all-seeing (SDP 2. 39. 42; SBE 21. 44. 118. 121), as Saviour of gods and men (SDP 5; SBE 21. 119-120), "He is everlasting" (SDP 15; SBE 21. 302).

A sympathetic and discriminating examination of the two apparent exceptions, namely, Jainism and Buddhism, seems to me, not to nullify, but rather to verify, my summary definition, namely, that religion, even though it may start from non-theistic beginnings, does eventually, if not originally, involve belief in some kind of deity. At what precise stage a system of non-theistic ethics passes over into an unmistakable religion by reason of postulating a helping God, it is difficult to state chronologically or genetically. However, the history of

Jainism and of Buddhism would seem to show how there have been some admirably strong men repelled by the weak and unworthy beliefs and practices of some professed religionists; and how these sturdy religious reformers have sought to advocate more vigorous methods of self-saving salvation involving definite social benefits; yet the great masses, of men, even the professed followers of those gallant, self-reliant, humanitarian leaders, have derived greater satisfaction from a type of religious faith which postulates some veritable divine Power which is superhuman, even though quasi-human. The very earnestness of their loyalty to a person or to a principle or to a cause which evinces enthusiasm and sacrifice for something more than themselves will in due time demand a belief in a helping God. That eminent psychologist, the late Professor William James, whose learned book on *The Varieties of Religious Experience* was a pioneer in this very field of comparative psychology of religion, corroborates psychologically the generalization which I have drawn as an historian of *The World's Living Religion* concerning the permanent unsatisfyingness of disbelief in a divine Power in the world.

“The capacity of the strenuous mood lies so deep down among our natural human possibilities that, even if there were no metaphysical or traditional grounds for believing in God, men would postulate one simply as a pretext for living hard and getting out of the game of existence its keenest possibilities of zest.” (*The Will to Believe*, 213.)

Having taken a long time to maintain that nowhere has there been a lasting system which could be called a religion without faith in some kind of God, I must next undertake briefly, yet pointedly, to point out that the characteristics of divinity as taught among the religions of the world differ considerably on five momentous problems. The religions of the world differ among themselves concerning the mathematics of the deity, *i.e.* whether there is only one deity or whether there is more than one. They differ concerning personality,

whether the Supreme Being is personal or impersonal. They differ on the question whether the power of Supreme Deity is unlimited or is limited; if the latter, whether the limitation operates from outside itself, or from honourable inner moral considerations, such as deference for the moral independence of human beings who are to be trained in the exercise of moral responsibility. Religions differ on the exercise of genuine moral responsibility in the Godhead, *i.e.* whether the deity is unaccountably and essentially arbitrary, or is planfully responsible. Religions differ concerning the chief moral excellence of the deity, whether it is supremely just, or is supremely loving; *i.e.* whether the Divine Being exercises only retributive justice, or also exercises a love which is redemptively forgiving.

Along with these variable elements there should be noted five constant elements in the concept of deity.

Every religion which has survived has taught that the character of the supremely Divine Being or Person is *super-human*, even though in some respects quasi-human. Men have not for long subordinated themselves and given faith and worship and devotion to any object which is essentially inferior to themselves. Men thoroughly revere, and derive benefit from, only what is better than themselves, even though they may be moved to deal variously with various adversaries in the world.

God is supersensuous or invisible, even though in some respects mediated or represented by material objects. Real religion and thorough-going materialism are directly opposed to one another. In the highest type of religion, material things and even evanescent things can be made beautiful, and can carry religious value. But the object or objects of supreme value to religion are transcendent above all that the five senses can disclose.

God is controlling in the affairs of men, even though the divine Power may temporarily allow other forces to work. Religion of course develops some highly intellectual theories, even as does philosophy. But the distinctive object of religion

is a distinctly powerful Being, experience wherewith produces power for the believing worshipper.

God is responsive to the approaches of the religious individual, even though the responses may be different from what the ordinary human may desire or expect. Religion assumes the efficacy of a proper technique in attaining unto the knowledge of deity and in obtaining response from deity. But the most profoundly religious person testifies that he derives his greatest benefit from his religion, because he has found the clue to an interacting response between himself and the Divine in the world.

God is supremely worthful, worshipful, adorable. Religion is not satisfied merely with evolving theories or with going through the motions of submission and worship. The finest type of religion discovers, and manages to increase, the values which are inherent in one's self and in the world, by the process of establishing due connections with the Being or Beings which are of supreme value, and which evoke such emotions as awe, reverence, trust, obedience, co-operation, love.

Thus far I have emphasized the essential elements of the divine Power or Powers in the world. Next I would emphasize the religionist's connection with other human beings as another essential constituent.

From a careful inspection of the broad history of religion as well as of present-day religion, we perceive that in every religion proper human relationships are an important feature, even though a varying feature, of religion. If the divine Power is conceived of as an Impersonal Being or Process, then the appropriate experience flowing therefrom is that the religionist himself tends to depersonalize his life and to disassociate himself from other human personalities. On the other hand, if the Supreme Being represents personality raised to the highest degree, then the result of such faith tends to elevate the worshipper's own personality and also to put him into very happy and helpful relations with other human personalities. However, we may generalize at this point, and

assert, that every kind of religion, whatever be the type of philosophy and theology which it may avow, has also involved an ethic. To be finely religious means to live in the proper relation towards deity, and also to live in the finest possible relationship with fellow-men. However abstract and impersonal may be the religionist's theology, yet the closer interpenetration of social relations in the world today requires that religions shall produce votaries who are as helpful as possible both to their immediate associates and also to members of other religions. Through the increasing power of religion, there must henceforth cease all persecution of other religions and even of irreligion. Very strongly do I plead that an increasingly obvious need and open method for all religionists today is that we should increasingly strive to appreciate, to appropriate, and to share the finest experiences of all the religions in the world, and even of all persons who make no profession of religion. I submit that the finest type of religion succeeds in leading its followers to be the more humble, patient, sympathetic, serviceful, learningful. Even more than secular education and commerce, we religionists should exercise the high privilege and responsibility of religion to explore, to export, and to import the very best "goods" which can be found anywhere in the world.

Perhaps the greatest need is to practise the finest kind of religion oneself and then to help mediate it to others. Religion can indeed be taught. But religion should be lived—lived with winsomeness and with healing power! At the present time the life of the world is being sorely strained, even while it is being partly enriched by various developments, such as psychological analyses, philosophic and theological reconstructions, educational techniques, social readjustments, economic pressures, international interrelations. In this total situation one of the most pressing needs of man, and one of the grandest opportunities for religion, is to develop the type of religion in individuals and in groups which is characterized by the enjoyment of abundant opportunities, by the fulfilment of honourable responsibilities, by the possession of inner

resources, by the forth-putting of beneficial co-operation. This urgent need is especially needed in the matter of religions helping forward the great cause of peace and the abolition of war. On different aspects of this momentous theme let me present systematically some passages quoted from the sacred scriptures of six of the major religions of the world, namely, Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Christianity.¹

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Mrs. BISHOP (representing the International Bahai Bureau) recalled the story told by Plutarch of the sailor who heard the voice which cried, "When you reach Greece, tell the people that the great god Pan is dead," and when he delivered the message a great wail arose from the people because their god was dead and they had to search for a living god. This story was a prophecy of our times when the god of theologies and sects was dead and we had to search for the living God.

The Bahai point of view was based on the words of Baha'u'llah to his western followers, "I come to give you no new religion but to rekindle the fading embers of your faith." Each of the religions represented in the Congress were following a leader or a founder whom they had not seen but from whose wisdom they benefited. From the Bahai point of view these religions were best understood under two aspects, the essentials and the secondaries, or life and form, spiritual and material aspects. Under the secondaries were included the laws, customs, manners, and institutions; under the essentials came belief in God and in the omnipresence of spirit, the dignity of man, the sense of eternity, and the practice of certain fundamental precepts based on justice, knowledge, and love.

The speaker suggested that while religions differed in metaphysical speculations about the nature of God, they all agreed that Absolute Good exists, and that this vision should

¹ See pp. 175-186.

be enough to bring them together. The purpose of the Congress was not to emphasize the secondary aspects of religion, for when these were emphasized out of proportion to the essentials there was strife, which is a travesty of religion. When the essentials were emphasized a focus was created for power which could then be directed towards the world as a whole as an influence bringing about the recognition that the world's supreme need was a spiritual need, and releasing an energy which would be the basis for a new culture. It was in the shared experience of religion that we could clarify essentials and practise them.

Mrs. DANK said that it was always a revelation to hear about other religions and find them like to one's own. The call for religion, whether it come from within or without, could only be answered adequately through the essentials of religion. One of these essentials was an inspired witness and testimony to the existence of God. Every religion had been drawn from some such witness by an outstanding personality whose experience had come from an intense longing for God, from a deep concern with God for God's sake and not for the satisfaction of their own needs. There was at the present time a looking-forward to future manifestations of God, a belief that God would appear again. The speaker believed that to see God in our time might not mean the descent of God but the rising of man through his will to reach God.

Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS (Pali Text Society) said that she was unable to follow the lecturer when he called Jainism or Buddhism anti-theistic. The Jainist Scriptures from which he quoted were much later than the date of the birth of that movement, nor could Buddhism at its start be called anti-theistic. Its founder's first public utterance was an echo of the current Upanishad teaching that the self should be "thoroughly sought after." In that day the accepted religion of Immanence saw God as in the self of each man and made Atma replace largely the impersonal Brahman.

And in the Buddha's latest utterances was the injunction to "live as they who have the self (Atma) as lamp, as refuge, and none other." He had always added, "Live as they who have Dharma as lamp . . .," Dharma being the ideal, the conscience in man as a more dynamic concept than the static concept of self, his gospel being eminently concerned with man's growth. It was the aftermen who fell away from this theistic position.

Dr. KOLISKO said he had been impressed with the proof that had been given that there could be a universal religion and that it must be rooted in the individual. The religious life was in contradiction with modern economic life, and if we could make this less influenced by materialism it might be easier to introduce religion into modern life.

Dr. Kolisko referred to the letter that had appeared that morning in the Press, from King Leopold of the Belgians, inviting all sections of all nations to co-operate in seeking a solution of world economic problems. This seemed to be connected with the work of the Congress, because if from the side of economics there arose an appeal for the help of religious and philosophic bodies, we could feel that from all sides the needs of humanity were coming together, and that this gave great hope for world fellowship.

Mr. ALAN WATTS also referred to the possibility of error in assuming that Buddhism was an anti-theistic religion. The insistence that man must make himself good and that no outside force could help him was based on the realization that the true self of man was Buddhahood, was Godhead all the time, and that this life was the divine life all the time. This implied that every act of ordinary life was a supreme religious experience. Ordinary life was an extremely mysterious thing, but we were inclined to look beyond it for religious experience because it worried us to think that something so familiar was really the thing about which we knew least. Most religions said in some form or other: "Become what you are." They apparently denied the world,

but this was not really so. Ultimately one came to see that ordinary life was not a mirage, but a mirror of the Supreme life.

Mr. ARTHUR JACKMAN (Secretary, World Congress of Faiths) said that when he had first met Dr. Hume in connection with this Congress he had said that the Committee regarded the subject of this address as the heart and crux of the Congress, and Dr. Hume had dealt with it as such. He had shown that the various religions of the world had behind them the same fundamental and essential truth, which was, that we are all children of the One Father in process of growing up within the family of divinity. From that point of view all the religions of the world were merely emphases on the different stages of growth. Therefore in Congresses such as this we were not seeking to create something out of nothing; we were seeking to create an emotion or a medium whereby that which was true and inherent in the religions could find a normal, natural, and free expression among people who had, at least in some measure, glimpsed the oneness of human endeavour. The Congress of Faiths sought to give an opportunity for the free expression of spiritual fellowship.

Sir ABDUL QADIR referred to the differences in the concepts of God in the various religions, and in the ways in which those concepts were placed before their followers. The reason was that each teacher was addressing his audience according to their standard of intelligence. It was only when one came to the plane of the mystic in any religion that one reached the plane where all religions found agreement in essentials. This had been beautifully illustrated by two Persian poets:

There is but one Reality shining in Islam and Non-Islam ;
Differences of religions are mere speculation ;
Prejudice has separated the cup of the Brahmin and the Sheikh,
Otherwise there is but one Cup and one Cup-bearer.

CONCEPTS OF GOD

Thou art the shelter of the height and of the depth ;

All are "nothing" ;

Any being that exists, it is Thou.

NIZAMI.

Thou art the Height and the Depth ;

I do not know what Thou art,

But Thou art all that exists.

FIRDAUSI.

Dr. R. E. HUME (*summing up*): "I think we have accomplished this morning something of this search for a common understanding and that we are determined to love, and can agree to differ by acknowledging that we know in part and prophesy in part, while at the same time asserting a confident expectation that we shall grow in knowledge and by such growth shall benefit the cause of world fellowship. We came here with high expectations of delightful interchange and friendliness. We shall go forth from here with renewed dedication and the realization that even if we do differ in terminology, nevertheless our religion is bringing us closer together here and now, and that we can overcome differences by loving service to humanity under the power of an influence that is greater than ourselves, the influence of the Kingdom of God in which we can all participate."

YOUTH'S ATTITUDE TO WORLD
FELLOWSHIP

YOUTH SYMPOSIUM,
Saturday Afternoon,
July 24th.

YOUTH'S ATTITUDE TO WORLD FELLOWSHIP

Sir A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR (*in the Chair*)

I hope you will permit me to say how much I appreciate the purpose of this Congress. Its ideas all seem to be of the utmost importance. It is true that the major conflicts of the world have been due to differences of religious creed. It is therefore a very wonderful thing that a World Congress of Faiths can be held and that there can be the intention to make it an annual affair.

I feel also that it is a special privilege to take the Chair when we are to hear some of our young speakers. The world today is moved by the spirit of youth. Youth has come to dominate many policies in various countries. Youth today is clamant and insists on solving what it considers to be the problems of oppression and on freeing itself from the shackles of tradition. It is perfectly true that young men today are imbued with the spirit of earnestness.

This Congress has put forward the idea that true religion can secure the peace of the world. It will be interesting to hear from these young men whether it appears to them that behind all social regeneration there must be spiritual regeneration; whether they consider that the moving spirit must be and must continue to be the spirit which faith gives to all of us, whatever our creed may be.

BRIAN COOK

I am speaking this afternoon as one in no way particularly qualified to do so; I am speaking merely as one of the many

millions of young men and women who are anxious about the future, and are beginning to wonder precisely what they can do and what part they can play in the future of mankind.

We were born into a very troubled world. The early years of our life were clouded by the catastrophe of the Great War—a war of which we can only remember very little, if anything at all, and through that war the generation in front of us was virtually wiped out: young men who today would have been in responsible positions of government. This is not to suggest that those who are governing now are too old for their job. What I mean is that now, twenty years after the war, we find ourselves in a position of having to take the place of those who have gone, and of having to do, as well as to think and to say, something about this future.

I can only speak from my own point of view, particularly as I am not attached to any group or organization, but I feel and hope that this point of view is shared by many in this country and in Canada and America, where I was fortunate to spend several months at the beginning of this year. In order to define what this attitude is, I am going to ask myself and try to answer three questions:

1. Is world fellowship an unpractical ideal?
2. If not, how far have we gone towards world fellowship?
3. How can we further the cause of world fellowship?

In answering those questions I want to keep in mind a certain aspect. I want to answer them, bearing in mind what they mean in relation to the peace of the world.

1. Is world fellowship an unpractical ideal? That can be answered in one word: No.

2. In passing straight to the second question I want to explain why I think people are wrong who say that you cannot change human nature. Although the fears, the differences, the mistrust which exist in the world today always existed and always will exist, we have not to go very far back in

history to find that the differences were much, much greater even in this country not long ago. Then we found various sections in this small island fighting each other for their various creeds and beliefs. Yet we can say today that in England there is unity and fellowship with at the same time the freedom to express our individuality, to say what we like as far as our creeds are concerned.

It is obvious that through the centuries the world has been gradually growing towards this fellowship ideal, and more progress has been made in the last twenty years than ever before. But in the middle of the period from 1900 to the present day this progress received the greatest set-back it has ever had—the World War. Since then we have made great strides. If we lived now in the same kind of world as we did in 1914, could we have survived all these crises which have happened in the last few months? Could we have come through all those if there had not been a little more fellowship than before the war? Haven't we found in the last two years that things have happened which before would have provoked a war? Somehow today there has been born at the bottom of men's souls that feeling of tolerance and fellowship which says: Let us get together before we rush into any action.

There is something else that is different—Youth. How many meetings like this were held before 1914? I do not think there were very many. Meetings like this are going on all over the world today. I came across them in nearly every large city in Canada; people getting together and saying to themselves: We are not going to let it happen again. They are all rather doubtful as to how they can prevent it, but unlike the young men of 1914, and knowing very little about the war, we are not going to rush into something which does not require very much imagination to show what it would mean.

I want to say something about Canada. In some of those towns out there you will find members of every nationality in Europe living together with goodwill and friendship, having their own form of government, their own religions, and yet with no serious arguments or very grave differences.

This is the case particularly in Winnipeg, and also in the East where people say that French Canadians and British Canadians do not get on well together. The whole position in Canada today is a veritable object-lesson to the rest of the world as to how different groups can live together, and this is very largely due to the fair judgment and consideration which each receives from the British Government.

The youth of Canada and America are anxious to do something. We have watched during these last twenty years almost every possible attempt to bring the world together. We have watched magnificent efforts by such men as Laval, Stresemann, and others, and the Disarmament Conference, the Kellogg Pact and, greatest of all, the League of Nations. I cannot remember much of what I learned at school, but I shall never forget a remark which one master made to me: "You will always appreciate the things in life which have been the hardest to achieve." Why should we say that the League is a failure if it has failed to do everything that we expected of it? Do we not profit by experience? I think it is more necessary at this time than at any other to give it our whole-hearted support.

It is sometimes hard to believe that the world is not crazy, with armaments piling up, but I believe that the world is really marching towards fellowship, and that situations such as we have today are set-backs sent as if to try out our faith in an ideal that will be realized. Have we not all got the will to try to do something which has never been done before? And where there is a will there is a way.

3. How can we further the cause of world fellowship? How can we replace those antagonistic feelings, those fears which do exist in individuals and nations today? I mentioned disarmament. Surely, what we need is moral disarmament. If only we can remove the feelings which are behind and which provoke this hatred and antagonism, then at least we are going a long way towards what we seek. It will be necessary to rearm in another way—to rearm with faith and to have behind us a spiritual fellowship.

There is one thing that is common among all men and women—Religion. It is rather hard for some people to admit that, but if we just consider it for a moment we shall see that there is at the bottom of every man's soul the longing for something or somebody to look up to. It varies with different people naturally, but don't you feel that everyone has a faith in something which is underlying their movements, their feelings, their thoughts? That is faith, and I think that without faith the mind is at sea on every single issue. It is above everything else. I expect some of you would find it as hard to describe as I do now, but is it not a part of our faith that through seeking out that spiritual fellowship which lies behind all our minds, we shall find the way to world fellowship? Such an ideal is greater than love for one's own country. May I read you something which was said by Father de Munnyck at Geneva some years ago on the subject of patriotism:

"In the place of noble patriotism we too often substitute its loathsome travesty—Nationalism. Patriotism is an instinct of all right-thinking men and women in the same way as love for our parents. We must love our country, we must defend it, we must serve it, not because it is finer or stronger than others, but because it is our country, our mother.

"But above country, we must love God, who is Truth, who is Justice. When a man begins to love country above Truth and Justice, he degrades his Fatherland."

I have tried to show very briefly that I feel, whether I represent a large number of people or only myself, that we can achieve world fellowship and peace through religion. We are young; our minds are fresh and not full of prejudices. I think we should be able to start with a clean slate, wiped clear of the differences between nations and individuals. To create world fellowship is a task that may take more than my lifetime or my children's lifetime, but that should not deter us from pushing on. When we do come to it, won't its ideal be just the one word, faith, with everyone keeping

his own individuality and creed? This Congress is one of the most important steps taken towards it. It is a task that I am sure the young people of this country will welcome. Let us carry it out without any national snobbery nor yet any imperial snobbery, but with the justice and the consideration for which we, as a nation, are renowned, so that we shall build Jerusalem not only in this green and pleasant land, but in every land all over the world.

GABRIEL CARRIT

This great gathering of people of different faiths bears witness to the urgent desire of old and young to realize world brotherhood and peace. One might express the spirit of your Congress in the words of the old verse:

Lord make the Nations see
That men should brothers be.
And form one family,
The wide world o'er.

In a similar spirit my organization sets out "to achieve international peace and security by a Covenant of the League of Nations"; and Mr. Gollan here has often sung, "The International unites the human race."

We must not forget in our longings that at this very moment wars of invasion are taking place in Spain and China; the ordinary people of Germany and Italy are being sent to destroy the ordinary people of Spain; the people of Japan are sent to China; race is set against race, and creed against creed.

Whatever we may long for—War is on. What are we to do? That is what Youth is asking.

In every land where I have lately been, in England, America, Germany, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia, everywhere, a feeling of anxiety is eating at people's hearts, anxiety about bread and work, about future prospects for their children, about personal, religious, and political freedom. We are afraid of losing that freedom which enables us to devote

our bodies, minds, and spirits to their true purpose of human happiness and welfare.

We are horrified with the cruelty of a world in which one political system preaches the calculated annihilation of the Jewish people, persecutes all who hold pacifist or democratic ideas, civilizes a backward native people with poison gas, and destroys the population of Durango and Guernica under the ruins of churches and dwelling-houses.

We are troubled that men can sit still knowing of the economic chaos which permits—cows to be slaughtered for manure; wool to be used for road-making; fish to be thrown back dead to the sea; while in every one of our countries are men and women, classified by medical officers of health as inadequately nourished, badly nourished, seriously undernourished; and while thousands of young people are pining away in unemployment.

This situation hangs over us like doom. We feel that something must happen; and we are afraid that it will be war. War as a way out, and yet in every land young people know that for them war is no way out.

Facing such grave times, we are realizing the necessity of banding ourselves together, in spite of our different creeds and political theories, in order to save ourselves from war before it is too late.

Great difficulties and danger stand in the way, but to help us we have the knowledge that in each land young men and women have the same simple interests and ideals, the same sympathy for the rights of others, the same belief in the possibility of harnessing science and industry to the needs of a new and ordered life. And because it is our existence which is at stake we shall overcome the selfish interests and prejudices of those who would prevent us uniting to carry out this task.

In September 1936 seven hundred young people from thirty-six different nations, representing many faiths and political parties, met in Geneva for the first World Youth Congress.

We met in order to fulfil our responsibility and to play our part in the organization of peace through the League of Nations, to work for Social Justice and the defence of the Welfare and prospects of Youth, and to seek out the common ground on which the Youth of all lands and all opinions could join to achieve their ends.

We found it was possible to draft such a programme, and now, in those lands where the delegates have set up committees, the programme is being carried out under the guidance of the International Youth Secretariat which sits in Geneva.

It is therefore of great interest to the Youth Movement to be invited to speak at this Congress, because, while we wish you to know what we are doing and feeling, we know, for our part, that you can help us by encouraging the Youth in the different churches to play their part in the movement for peace and social justice.

Those who take upon themselves to lead the Youth dare not hold them back from joining their generation to preserve peace.

The man who is first and foremost devoted to religion cannot today honestly escape from the politics of peace and freedom.

Not long ago one of the leaders of the young Catholics in Germany said to me: "I am, with my whole being, a Catholic; it is just because I am a Catholic that I must work for peace, and just because I am a Christian I am morally obliged to work against a system which corrupts and perverts every principle that I hold dear."

That duty lies on every one of you here, to work for peace, to oppose intolerance and aggression. The Youth of every land is waiting for a lead.

JOHN GOLLAN

I profess no religious faith whatever, but nevertheless I hold the principle of world fellowship very dear. In my

opinion the whole question of world fellowship today has ceased to be a mere philosophical conception, something to which we can agree or not, and has become a very great practical necessity. With us, in Britain, the idea of world fellowship is one that has existed for many years and to which many individuals and groups subscribe. We have to ask ourselves, I think, why it is that while hundreds of thousands of people in different countries subscribe to world fellowship, we have advanced so little in its practice. I think it is because of the economic developments of society in modern times, and particularly because of the modern division of the world into nations of conquerors and conquered, of colonies and metropolis.

It is very easy, of course, for an individual in a colony or an individual in a metropolis to subscribe to a similar point of view and have association in world fellowship, but it is not easy for the masses in both to subscribe to both. Many of their interests are diametrically opposed. Principally because of this there are extreme forms of nationalism in the world today and much national antipathy to other nations, although, of course, we have seen the parallel development of forms of world fellowship in the League of Nations by economic means, etc. More and more it seems that such developments are inevitable.

I ask this Conference: Is it possible for a mother in Madrid, holding to her breast the child that has been wounded in an air-raid, to feel much fellowship for the Germans and Italians who are invading Spanish soil? Or for the people of Peking to feel fellowship for the invaders whom they see approaching their gates? It seems that a large part of the world is at daggers drawn in spite of the aspirations of the world towards fellowship and in spite of such Congresses as this, where individuals of different faiths come together to find a common basis for fellowship.

Nevertheless we see other forces at work: movements whose principles are summed up in the phrase, "A nation which oppresses another nation can never itself be free"; and

for whom the great question is that of trying to develop equality between the nations. As long as economic inequality exists, world fellowship will be the conception of the few. A world fellowship of independent equal states is the conception which we hold today and which many other people must hold also, and we feel that the amalgamation of nations into a world fellowship is only possible if economic inequality is abolished and the countries are constituted into free economic states, developing their own national well-being and characteristics. That is why we in the Youth movements are doing everything possible to build up a fellowship of youth. We have very little of the world's goods to lose. We can on equal terms talk with the youth of Germany because we are not concerned with the aspirations of the various governments. We can freely discuss our common problems in spite of the fact that we were the conquerors and they the conquered. We both suffer from underfeeding and unemployment. The true necessities of youth are directly in agreement in all the countries, providing we have as the corner-stone, faith in the idea that each nation is as good as any other nation and, for instance, that anti-Semitism is an insult to humanity in its present stage of development.

Therefore we, in the Youth movements, are associated in ideal with the World Congress of Faiths, and are trying to spread understanding and the realization that if the problems of the people of Europe and America, of Britain and Germany are essentially the same, there is no reason why the youth of the world cannot co-operate in the solution of these problems. We are not necessarily bound to the foreign policies of our countries, and we can talk apart from these things.

In Britain the Youth organizations have combined together. In the British Youth Assembly we have got together twenty-seven National Youth Organizations of varied religious and political opinions. We find the possibility and the necessity of coming together to discuss these problems and of trying

to work out a common basis for social advance, for peace and fellowship.

First of all, in this committee, we had to give up any idea of political or religious partisanship. We had to understand the other fellow's point of view and work on those things which we had in common. And it was only to the extent that we did this that we could build up the necessary confidence to go forward together.

The world is entering a situation which may or may not end like 1914, but for the first time the Youth organizations of Great Britain have got together before the possibility of war has become an actuality. We hope to establish peace by contact with the youth of other nations, and we feel that it is only because of this national fellowship that we are going to be able to develop the true ideals of the world today.

PRINCE KESSIE OF ASHANTI

Last year when I attended the Congress of Faiths I found myself confronted with one and the same question: Are you really interested in this Movement? The question was put to me by almost everyone who talked to me. Naturally I got the impression that I had missed my way. It was not an encouragement to me, the more so as there were only about four young persons. .

To the young the very word "Religion" is anathema. It conveys the impression of sacrifice and constant praying or bending to someone or something. As Ruskin says: "It primarily means obedience." Hence young people detest anything with a religious atmosphere. But should it be so? Are they not the rising generation of whom Christ said: "Suffer them to come unto me"? Young persons should by all means be encouraged to take part in the Congress of Faiths and, if possible, to form a Youth's Fellowship of Faiths which will be part and parcel of the Congress Movement. Religion should, as Disraeli said, "be the rule of life and not a casual incident in it." Let us look at it as the spice

which keeps life from corruption rather than as a means of blind obedience.

Many a talented scholar, and especially the youth of today, have taken up the study of the Bible and other religious books to read, not in the humble, meek spirit of a sincere person, but in a proud and worldly temper, hoping to find some error, some anomaly at which to aim the arrow of scepticism and infidelity. We are all familiar with the difficulties involved in the analysis of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as, for instance, the doctrines of Baptism and of the Trinity. Every child—I am not speaking with exaggeration—knows that there are many unsolved problems in the Christian dogmas. Thus a child at a very early age would be heard to ask such questions as, “Who is God?” and “Who made God?” The task will be made more difficult for us if we approach the study of religion in such a spirit. It will, as Hare has put it, “present many difficulties to the proud, innumerable to the vain, but few to the humble.” We are to study religion as a means to an end—as a means to attain fellowship. Religion so far has been made to appear more in talk than in work, but the Congress of Faiths is trying to prove that it lies more in work than in talk. But it should be noted that in any movement or organization, the attempt to differentiate between races, classes, and castes in intellect, may lead to the downfall of that organization. It is here that the Congress of Faiths scores; it is here that the Congress of Faiths succeeds. Its officers and members of the Council are persons of different races. It is unlike most religions or governments, where the leaders are drawn from one race.

Among prehistorians there used to be a belief that racial and religious differences were of very ancient origin. They supported this hypothesis by saying that early man held tenaciously to the notion that people of his tribe were essentially different from those of other tribes. This sense of difference was due to the primitive concept of race, and even today many persons cling to that view. Not to go

further back than the view of Dr. Inge, it has been insisted that races are different in mental traits as well as physical, and that these differences are qualitative differences. Dr. Inge further remarks that excellence in racial achievement is a guarantee of racial superiority. He forgets that while one race achieves eminently, another is depressed, and that in time it is the other way round. I am sorry to deviate from the main subject, but it is important for the success of any organization whose aim is fellowship to think of all human beings as having the same mental and physical traits, and any opinion to the contrary leads to dissension. A race is not a permanent entity, something static; on the contrary it is dynamic, and is slowly developing and changing as the result of fresh increments of one or other of its original constituents or of some new ones. I suggest that the question is not one of achievement, as the ex-Dean would have us believe, but one of native potentiality, and such potentiality as is due to race. Again, I suggest that the hypothesis cannot be approached philosophically or historically. It must be attacked scientifically, for it is a question of environment. It is therefore in the province both of the psychologist and the anthropologist. Many psychological experiments have been conducted to compare the mental traits of all races, one of the most important being that conducted by Drs. Bounnet and Woodworth at St. Louis, in America. As a result of their investigation it was shown that practically all the sensory processes revealed no differences, but only similarities, among the various races. It is a question of opportunity and not one of racial determinants.

In one of his weekly articles in the *Evening Standard*, Dr. Inge remarked that Germany would sooner or later lose her philosophical and cultural ascendancy, owing to the Nazis's methods of oppression and deprivation of free speech and expression. Germany would, in short, sink into decadence. This is the correct clue, and the same reason is applicable to the present position of the subject of oppressed races. It was the French Revolution that paved the way

for the intellectual growth of the French peasants. In England, before the Reform Bill of 1832, the rulers of the country were drawn from the landed gentry, and it was the common saying that the working classes were intellectually inferior to the aristocracy. The Reform Bill and Franchise Acts and the coming of the Industrial Revolution brought a great change. Even about 1840, according to Laski's analysis, 95 per cent of the members of the cabinet were drawn from the aristocracy. As time went on the middle-classes took the lead, and today we are experiencing a middle-class rule, and now one often hears of the moral and mental decadence of the aristocracy. When Greece was ruling the Romans, the latter were considered barbarians; and when Rome was all-powerful, Britons were thought of as "stupid slaves." Today Britain and the other European powers are all-powerful, and all "coloured" persons are barbarians. Is it a wonder, then, if Dr. Inge makes such a sweeping statement? I am sure that if Dr. Inge had been a member of the Congress of Faiths, he would have had a different opinion.

In the world today, and particularly in the British Empire, fellowship is indispensable if the thousand-and-one ills of the world are to be eliminated or modified. One can hardly speak of the world and leave out the British Empire, for it is a potential factor in the cause of peace. The Empire is, unfortunately, weak in its joints; it is for the youth of Great Britain to remedy that weakness. A Youth organization with such aims and objects as the Congress of Faiths is, to my mind, the only solution. It will be a means of overcoming moral cowardice. Truth is impalpable, hard and ruthless, and therefore is shunned by those who prefer illusion; but the ready recognition of what is wrong is the first step towards rectification and reform.

The rulers of the Empire today connive at the truth, disregard advice, and honour their flatterers. The sincere critic of the British methods of government is a communist, agitator, and a rebel worthy only of His Majesty's prison or scaffold. But you see, those who favour the truth always win. Gandhi,

and not the Maharajas or the British bureaucracy, is winning India for the Indians. No honest and respectable person likes to be ruled; if there is to be any rule at all, that rule should be mutual; by that I mean that the Empire should be a composition of independent member-states; that is the only way for the Empire to survive and maintain the peace of the world.

The disinclination to recognize the fact of life and the truth about the "under dog" only tends to hasten the decline of imperial power by allowing the wheels of disaster to run downhill with the brakes off. Diogenes, the celebrated philosopher and cynic, refused to pander to the follies of the foolish, or flatter the vanity of the proud and mighty; he dealt out the unvarnished truth to all alike, thereby earning the nickname of "dog." This philosopher could not be cowed or awed by anyone. Once Alexander stood before him and said impressively: "I am Alexander, the great King"; "And I," he replied, "am Diogenes, the Dog." It is this spirit that is needed today, and it is that to which the youths of today should direct their attention. It is such a religious zeal which will lead to cleanliness and, as has been said by a famous Rabbi, "Cleanliness will lead to purity, purity to godliness, godliness to humility, and humility to the fear of sin."

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Mr. ALAN WATTS regretted if he seemed to strike a note of criticism if he pointed out that, with one exception, all the speakers had asked: What are we going to do about it? Most Youth groups seemed to be rather doubtful, but if we really had the will to world fellowship it would come about. Personally he did not find the vague idea of world fellowship very attractive. What he wanted was fellowship with individuals on ordinary human terms, as the best means to getting things done.

On the question of the prevention of war, he felt that the

best way was to forget it, and that organizations for the prevention of it were likely to bring it about by keeping people's minds on the subject. In any case, religious people should not worry about it since they should know something of eternity, and should realize that while a war might last a certain number of years, life would continue for billions of years, and progress would not cease for ever. It was no use working against one special evil, such as war, which is only a symptom. The task of promoting fellowship was a task of ages, and to that extent it was a personal task, depending on what each one did with his own life, and religion was the best guide to right living.

Dr. SCHULTZ GAVERNITZ said that she believed the promotion of world fellowship was not so much a matter of personal understanding, but that it depended on the establishment of social and international justice.

Mr. R. C. T. EVANS said that the root of the whole matter was the need for spiritual regeneration. By going to the main spiritual source, peace would be found.

Mr. AYLMER MAUDE said that faith had been defined as being faithful to something that one knew to be true, and that if one did not know and had no reason to believe that a thing was true, faith was of no value at all.

Mrs. NAOMI MITCHISON said that she thought all those present were there because they wanted Good, but that people were vague as to what they meant by that. Young people saw it in terms of human things, and that meant that they had to try to work out some system in which people could love one another and live in brotherhood. This could not be if some persons or groups were able to oppress others, and therefore the first thing was to see that our system of life did not include oppression. We had to ask ourselves how the various systems worked in with our idea of the Good. If you were going to love your neighbour as yourself, you had to think of him as an end and not as a means. For this reason we could not

work with nor feel brotherly towards the totalitarian state. People needed some common loyalty and mythology, and the loyalties and mythologies that produced the greatest good were those whose ideal was justice, equality, and generosity.

Sir A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR (*Chairman*). In the papers and discussion we have heard this afternoon it has been made clear that fundamental to, and underlying, all the problems of Youth there is the basic idea that spiritual faith is necessary if we are to find a solution to the ethical problems with which we are opposed. Some have sounded a different note from this, but it was a very high ethical note, and what is the motivating force behind an ethical ideal?

Why should there be peace and equality in this world? Because there is something that binds us all, and that is the divine element in us all. Always there is the fight for equality, but you can only guarantee equality of opportunity. Each stratum of society thinks of the others in terms of superiority or inferiority. Society is bound to be a pyramid, and this can only be overcome by holding to the fundamental concept that we are all children of God and that therefore it does not matter what colour we are nor what our possessions are. That concept will stand firm as the foundation for peace and equality, whether economic or national. If we think of these problems in that light, we shall realize that the foundation of justice is the fact of our divine kinship, and that the life which makes us all brothers is the spiritual life.

THE WORLD'S NEED OF RELIGION

PUBLIC MEETING,
OXFORD TOWN HALL,
Saturday, July 24th.

THE WORLD'S NEED OF RELIGION

VISCOUNT SAMUEL (*in the Chair*)

You will have observed from our list of speakers that our platform this evening is a very comprehensive one—Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Jewish; almost all the great religions of the world are represented. None of us would claim, I think, to have been authorized to represent any of those faiths, but it is a remarkable thing that five persons drawn from such a varied background should be gathered to speak on a single topic. All parts of the world—Europe, Asia, Africa, America—are represented by members of the Congress here. Youth and the elderly, men and women, all schools of politics (or almost all) have their supporters among the members of the Congress. Its appeal is indeed a comprehensive one.

We meet here in this ancient city of Oxford. The traditions of seven centuries surround us, and I wonder whether, during those seven centuries, representatives of so many of the great religions have ever been gathered together as is the case tonight. Indeed, I wonder whether it would ever have been a possibility before. This Conference has been the outcome of a long and painful evolution. It was not until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that religious liberty was won. The nineteenth century secured religious toleration, although this was perhaps rather the attitude of the politician who recently said of his rivals, "They are just as much entitled to be wrong as we are entitled to be right." In religion, where so much is uncertain, there is of course great room for honest difference of opinion, and in the last two or three generations the view has become widespread that differences of faith may not

necessarily be due to moral obliquity or deliberate perversity of character, but may be due to loyalty to one's upbringing or to intellectual conviction. So, after gaining religious liberty in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and religious toleration in the nineteenth, perhaps we shall attain to mutual understanding in the twentieth.

To this mutual understanding, various factors will contribute—the study of comparative religion, travel, contacts of all kinds. But this liberty, toleration, understanding, do not necessarily lead to the acceptance of the various theologies and doctrines, nor need it imply indifference to one's own creed. The faiths are indeed in many points widely different. Dr. Hume's analysis this morning of the various faiths showed that while there is identity in some respects and resemblance in others, there is definite contradiction in yet other aspects. That being so, what is the next stage to which the religions can be expected to proceed? May we hope that it may be to a reconciliation of beliefs? Even to amalgamation? Ultimately this may be so, but I think it must be a distant ultimate. Meanwhile, while we are awaiting a synthesis of religion that may come in a later generation, what is to happen? Are the faiths to continue looking askance at one another, or politely ignoring one another's existence? We cannot wait for that. The world is in a state of peril; and when a ship is adrift with rudder gone and fire smouldering in the hold, it is advisable that the passengers should join in trying to save the situation, even though they may not have been formally introduced to each other.

As things are, there is little movement. There are conversations and conferences and the realization that something must be done; but nothing happens. As someone has said: "Nothing gets done—but how magnificently!"

It is very easy to formulate desires, and it is very easy to write history; but as Maxim Gorky said: "Everybody knows that it is much harder to turn word into deed than deed into word." To turn ideas into events is very difficult, but that is our task.

In a somewhat separate sphere of activity an initiative has just been taken by the King of the Belgians, who has made an appeal to the whole world. He has written a public letter,¹ in which he appeals for a fundamental inquiry into the economic problems of the nations as the best means to the solution of political problems. If such a plan can work in with the machinery already set up by the League of Nations, it appears to me to be a proposal which should command the active support of all who desire the pacification of the world, that there should be an eager response from all those who are keenly interested in the promotion of world peace.

What, then, is to be our course in the future? Is it to be animosity, aloof indifference, or is it to be co-operation? If in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we won religious liberty, and religious toleration in the nineteenth century, and if we are gaining understanding in the twentieth century, is it to be left to the twenty-first century before we develop the sense of fellowship and active co-operation?

We in this Movement are anxious to establish that co-operation *now*. Let us then see the human race as two thousand millions of people travelling mysteriously on a planet through space-time, and let us answer the simple question, What are to be our relations with one another?

Pandit A. B. GOSVAMI (*Hindu*)

As a religious preacher it is my first duty to invoke the blessings of the Divine Grace for the eternal welfare of humanity as a whole and of all terrestrial beings.

Our subject today is "The World's Need of Religion." By explaining the two words—World and Religion—the problem may automatically be solved.

In the Bible I find "World" has been used to signify "the ungodly," and Hindu Scriptures maintain that this is really the case. The material world is the sphere of active opposition to the Absolute. The materialists scarcely admit

¹ See *Daily Press*, July 24th, 1937.

of the need of religion. The Hindu Scriptures insist that man must pass from "Biraja," or the sphere of universal scepticism, through "Brahmaloke," or the sphere of the dim reflection of transcendental knowledge, until we come face to face with the Personality of God in the region of religion. Religion transcends all mundane references and relativities. It is the proper function of the soul. It remains latent in all conditioned and dormant souls and becomes manifest when they are awakened through the influence of true devotees or through insight into revealed Scriptures. The religious function proper does not begin until a person has reached the plane of positive spiritual realization of the Absolute Personality through a systematic process of cumulative, strictly regulated endeavour on the right lines. The teleological reason for making such endeavour is that it is on the plane of spiritual service to the One Absolute Person that the present warring interests of conditioned humanity can find a universally acceptable solution.

Hindu Scriptures cry aloud, "Cast off your weakness and know the infinite power that is in you. Gird up your loins; waken your dormant soul and seek your eternal welfare." Jesus also said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you." If we do not first seek the Kingdom of God we cannot possibly establish peace and harmony in this world.

Let me, in consonance with the Scriptures, remind you that we are capable of bringing about the golden age in this world if we care to respond to the Divine call and to grapple with the demon of inertia dwelling in us. Let us ignite our poor inert souls with a spark from those great illuminated souls who have realized their own Selves and become whole-time servants of the Great Lord—the true devotees. This is not any national or political or military call to arms or to violence. It is just the opposite. A spiritual hero is not incited by any deed of daring like a military hero. The arena in which he acts is not that of strife or aggression but of endurance and self-sacrifice to all beings, including the lower animals. For

in obedience to the Law of Return, the pain I inflict upon another animal will come back to me, and the happiness I give to another will vibrate back to me, adding to my own happiness. The world has trampled on this great vision, and so the world is unhappy.

Experience shows that people with all the miracle of material progress find themselves empty-handed in more senses than one, and the greatest thinkers are realizing more and more the truth of the saying of the Lord Jesus: "Man liveth not by bread alone." People who may be the richest in worldly possessions may be the poorest in the things that really matter. Have we not higher interests to pursue, higher duties to perform? What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Our neglect of the soul cannot but entail spiritual poverty or even spiritual starvation. We are not sent into this world to follow our own bent, to indulge merely in self-satisfaction. The whole constitution of Nature works against this idea of life. The mind should never be held in subjection to the lower parts of our nature. Such a principle prevailing in society can lead to nothing less than utter demoralization—individual, national, spiritual. We must muzzle the brute in us in company with true devotees who can light our way to the goal by the effulgence of their spiritual power.

Without devotion man cannot establish his soul in purity and tranquillity. All efforts, however great, to achieve this end dwindle into insignificance when they are translated into action. Just as a circle is imperfect without a centre, and myriads of cipher carry no value without the initial integer, one, so when the One without a second, the universal centre, God, is ignored, all our attempts in any sphere of life become null and void. The slightest deviation from the devotion to the Central Figure of All-Love is liable to end in moral leprosy, chaotic disorder, and disruptive destruction just in the same way that a circle without a centre becomes an irregular figure.

The miseries of this world led people desirous of securing

eternal happiness to the search after the self, which in turn led to philosophy. The first philosophy of a people is its religion. Religion is often confounded with certain things which are only adjuncts to it or are the results of its influence. True religion is not a state of mind in which some theological propositions are accepted as true, but it is the real function of the soul towards the real and constant Presence of God, involving a sure trust in His Majesty, Might, Glory, Beauty, Wisdom, and Supremacy, the real nature of which only reveals itself when we offer our service and show a constant desire for unconditional obedience to His Blessed Will with all the resources with which He has endowed us. In Hindu Scriptures, "Dharma," or religion, means "true eternal nature." Liquidity is the Dharma of water. Solidity is the Dharma of stone. Heat is the Dharma of fire. When water becomes frozen into snow or ice, its original property of liquidity is not lost but remains latent. Solidity is occasional and foreign to water. Similarly true religion or love for God remains in latent form in the heart of all conditioned souls. The moment we look back to God and begin to serve Him, the ice melts—our adamant heart melts. I say adamant, because the heart is certainly stony which does not respond to God, Who is constantly pouring out on us His blessings and His help for the fulfilment of the best in us. When it melts, the soul's function begins to act. The soul is a divine spark, an infinitesimal atom compared with the Over-soul. Religion is a process of self-purification. It implies a faith in a living and a loving God. If we hold God as impersonal, the question of love ceases, as love is not possible with a nonentity. Love can have place only when the lover and the beloved are real entities. Our Vedic religion teaches us unflinching devotion to Krishna, which can only be understood by those fortunate few devotees who are initiated by Sat-Gurus; others are led through wandering mazes by their rhetorical and philosophical intricacies.

MAUNG AYE MAUNG (*Buddhist*)

MY LORD, BROTHERS AND SISTERS,—At the very outset I must express my deep sense of gratitude to the members of the Executive Committee of the World Congress of Faiths for giving me an opportunity of addressing you this evening on “The World’s Need of Religion.”

Today the world is torn by strife and warfare. On all sides we see chaos and confusion. The political, social, and economic condition at the moment has been so strained that there is danger of a world war breaking out sooner or later. Civilization is in the melting-pot. At this time of universal confusion the world is badly in need of a guiding religious spirit which will promote international peace.

More than ever the world is in confusion owing to wrong views (*Miccha Ditthi*). Right understanding (*Samma Ditthi*) is a necessary basis of all individual and national right action. Sound reason and good judgment unbiased by personal feelings and emotions are the essential prerequisite for right views. In the *Kalama Sutta* the Buddha said: “Do not believe anything on mere hearsay. Do not accept traditions simply because they are old and have been handed down for many generations and in many places. Do not hastily conclude ‘it may be so.’ Do not believe anything because people talk a great deal about it. Do not accept a statement on the ground that it is found in our books. Do not believe in what you have fancied, thinking that because it is extraordinary it must have been inspired by a god or other wonderful being. Do not accept on the supposition that ‘this is acceptable.’ Do not believe anything merely because presumption is in its favour. Do not accept because your informant is worthy to be trusted. Do not believe anything merely on the authority of your teachers. But whatever, after thorough investigation and reflection, is found to agree with reason and experience as conducive to the good and benefit of one and all and of the world at large, that only accept as true, and shape your life in accordance therewith.”

The fundamental causes of the present world chaos are greed (Loba), hatred (Dosa), and delusion (Moha). The Buddha said: "The world is on fire! On fire with what? On fire with greed, hatred, delusion, rebirth, old age, disease, death, sorrow, lamentation, grief, misery, and despair." The religion of the Buddha is the suppression of greed, hatred, and delusion. How are they to be suppressed? "Meditation on impermanence (Anicca) leads to victory over greed; meditation on suffering (Dukkha) leads to the destruction of hatred; meditation on the non-existence of an immortal soul or self (Anatta) leads to the cessation of selfishness." The Great War of 1914-1918 has proved once more the truth of the Buddha teaching, that hatred ceases not by hatred; hatred ceases but by love. According to a law of mechanics, action and reaction are equal and opposite. The force of hatred must therefore be checked by the opposite force, namely, the force of love.

After all, there is no world problem; there is only the individual problem. Nations are but collections of individuals. There can never be world improvement without individual improvement. When each individual realizes the fundamental unity of mankind and consequently overflows with loving-kindness, compassion, sympathetic gladness, and equanimity, universal concord will automatically be created.

The root cause of lust, hatred, and delusion lies in the notion of self (Atta). In the Anattalakhana Sutta the Buddha says that the idea of self is a fallacy. Because of craving (Tanha), pride (Mana), and error (Ditthi) one thinks "This is mine; this am I; this is myself!" The ideal of religion is the destruction of egoism. The realization of the doctrine of Anatta, the teaching of the non-self, is the true aim and final goal of religion. Self-conquest is absolutely necessary for the attainment of peace and happiness. Self-conquest is the greatest, the highest, and the noblest of all conquests. In the Dhammapada the Buddha said:

If a man in battle conquers
A thousand times a thousand men,
And another conquers himself alone,
He, indeed, is the Greatest Conqueror.

The world needs religion, the aim and object of which is to obtain deliverance from suffering (Dukkha). The Buddha said: "One thing only do I teach now as ever, Suffering and Deliverance from Suffering. Just as the mighty ocean has but one taste, the taste of salt, in exactly the same way the Mighty Dhamma has but one taste, the taste of Deliverance." As a true scientist the Buddha analysed the world and discovered that All is Suffering. The scientific method for the destruction of suffering is to be found in pursuing the middle path, the golden mean. What is the middle path? In the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta, the Buddha said: "There are two extremes which he who strives for deliverance should avoid. One extreme—the craving for the satisfaction of the passions and sensual pleasures—is vulgar, base, degrading, and worthless. The other extreme—exaggerated ascetism and self-mortification—is painful, vain, and worthless. Only the middle path which the Tathagta has found, avoids the two wrong ways and opens the eyes, bestows insight, and leads to wisdom, enlightenment, and deliverance.

The middle path is the Noble Eightfold Path which is summed up in the Four Noble Truths, namely, the Noble Truth of Suffering, the Noble Truth of the Cause of Suffering, the Noble Truth of the Destruction of Suffering, and the Noble Truth of the Path that leads to the Destruction of Suffering. The Four Noble Truths have a message full of hope, which answers to the real needs of the world.

What is the Noble Truth of Suffering? Birth is suffering; decay is suffering; death is suffering; sorrow, grief, pain, and despair are suffering; union with unpleasant things is suffering; separation from beloved objects is suffering; unsatisfied desires are suffering; in short, the five aggressions of existence (Khandas) are suffering.

What is the Noble Truth of the Cause of Suffering? Thirst Craving (Tanha) is the cause of suffering.

What is the Noble Truth of the Destruction of Suffering? Destruction of craving is the destruction of suffering.

What is the Noble Truth of the Path which leads to the

Destruction of Suffering? The Noble Eightfold Path, namely, right views, right aspirations, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right endeavour, right mindfulness, and right concentration, is the Path which leads to the destruction of suffering.

The Noble Eightfold Path is the scientific method *par excellence* for the attainment of peace and happiness. Above all, the Noble Eightfold Path is a unique teaching which meets the real needs of today.

Dr. MAUDE ROYDEN (*Christian*)

I think one of the delights of the Conference is that we see with our own eyes people about whom we have often thought and read, but whom it is very difficult to imagine as perfectly real until we have seen them.

One of the best of women, not only of brilliant ability but with the warmest heart, told me how once her husband read aloud from a newspaper an account of a mother who had seen her child fall into a sewer hole from which it had never been rescued. She was so shocked that she was exasperated with her husband for being able to continue his breakfast. But when her husband explained that it had all happened in Vancouver, she cried, "Vancouver! I thought it was here in Chelsea!"—and ate a good breakfast herself.

I refer to this because I am afraid that our western habit of thinking of the world chiefly as the western world is difficult to escape. I noticed at this afternoon's meeting that while all the speakers told us something worth while, yet, though we had an Asiatic as Chairman and an African as one of the speakers, the Europeans spoke of the world almost entirely in terms of Europe and America. If I seem to repeat that fault now, I hope our Oriental friends will "give me the hospitality of their minds," so that although I may speak in western terms and with western thoughts, they may be able to read beneath them something which is not merely of the West.

The world's need of religion and of God is always present. It is universal and lasts as long as humanity lasts. But it shows itself in different ways and in different times. At the present time, all the world over—but chiefly, perhaps, in the West—the need of God expresses itself in a tragic sense of futility. After the war almost everything that we had thought and hoped for, and for which we had sacrificed on a gigantic scale, failed to be realized. Among the younger generation especially there arose a dreadful or a cynical sense of the futility of life itself.

I have a correspondent whom I have never seen, but with whom I have a very interesting correspondence. He works in a factory, and only last week I had a letter from him on the outlook of the younger generation in his factory. He wrote as follows: "They worship speed. Everyone is a speedway fan. Since the war we have started work at 8 a.m., and the boys now are better developed physically. A good many camp out during the week-end. . . . Thirty years ago the shop-boy used to come in at lunch time with cans of beer on a long notched rod; now he has cartons of milk. Physically they are fine, but there is another side to the picture. They do not take the interest in world affairs that we did thirty years ago. . . . The middle-aged chaps who went through the war are interested in world events, as are also the elderly mechanics. . . . Sometimes I think it needs a terrific shock to waken the young to the significance of events happening in the world around them. . . . One thing I like about the modern boy, he will talk of sex openly and not in the furtive, joky manner that was the custom years ago. He is proud of the appearance of his body, and therefore wary of any conduct that may injure it. If only he would not be so content with things as they are in this maddening world!" The reason is that they feel it is all futile.

I was very much interested this morning in what Professor Hume told the Congress about the way in which certain religions have come into being. No one can have listened unmoved to that extraordinarily interesting narrative of how

more than once anti-god movements have become religious movements. We may compare the anti-religious movement in Russia today with Professor Hume's description of the beginnings of Jainism and Buddhism. Here is a people deeply moved by a religious motive to reject a religion which seemed to them unreal. They call themselves anti-religious, and yet today, while the humanitarian impulse has not ceased, there has come into it something very like the deification of Gautama Buddha among the Buddhists. Where the sacred icons hung there is now the bust of Lenin. The candles which stood before the Christ picture are replaced by flowers before the bust of Lenin. Surely we may find there once more the proof that, all over the world, men are unable to live without a God. It is because religion has so often been a caricature of itself that it has been replaced by worship of a Lenin, a Hitler, or a Mussolini. Something to worship, men must have, because the need of the world for religion and for God is ineradicable. Without it, life becomes meaningless, purposeless, in a word, futile.

The cure for the devastating sense of futility which possesses so many is the happiness which comes from the "sense of being taken up into a cause which you recognize as greater than yourself." Fascism, Nazism have a purpose which may seem to us to be a terrible one; but is not the fascination of the totalitarian state the demand which it makes upon the whole man to surrender to that which he at least feels to be greater than himself? It has seemed to me again and again that the difference between a life that is happy and a life that is not, is just that of being taken up into a cause that one recognizes as greater than oneself.

To identify oneself with God's cause is to have every atom of one's being, body, soul, and spirit, every opportunity or lack of opportunity, every single thing that life can bring, every instant of one's existence, taken up into the purpose of God. And it is for this, and for nothing less, that He asks. His purpose extends over the Universe and leaves out nothing and can never disappoint. It makes each of us of infinite

value, so that Christ could say of us, "Even the very hairs of your head are all numbered."

If we place ourselves against the purpose of God we do not destroy the Universe, nor do we destroy His purpose, but we destroy ourselves. If only we Westerners could unite the eastern sense of the immutability of spiritual law with our own special contribution—the discovery of scientific law—in our own spiritual life, how we should advance! We know, indeed, that we cannot break a scientific law—we can only break ourselves against it. "If a man throws himself over a precipice, he will not break the law of gravity," says Chesterton; "he will illustrate it." Let us then talk less about breaking the spiritual law of God, for we cannot do that either. But when He, in His love and compassion, calls us to act with Him, live by His law and let our tiny lives be absorbed in His purpose, all sense of futility is gone.

A. YUSUF ALI (*Muslim*)

We see evidence everywhere around us of a new orientation to religion. It takes various forms.

The tremendous economic unsettlement since the Great War has driven large masses of mankind to devote increasing attention to the satisfaction of primary physical needs. As the churches did not help in their primary quest, whole communities, as in Russia, turned their backs on religion and even began to decry and persecute religion. In this they failed to distinguish churches and organizations from religion. A reaction is already visible against that extreme attitude; for the inner needs of human nature are at least as insistent as its outer needs. "Man liveth not by bread alone."

Among educated men and women the gradual advance of science at a greatly accelerated pace during the last two centuries, and especially in our own generation, has suggested serious questionings about the office of religion or its use as a guiding force in human conduct. This tendency can be traced to the earliest stage in the history of human thought.

To go back no further than Lucretius, he denied (*De Natura Rerum*, v. 80-96) any divine plan or purpose in Nature, and at the same time contemplated a kind of determinism in Nature, which assigned a limited power to everything and fixed a boundary which none might pass. Increasing familiarity with the secrets and wonders of the physical Universe and the universality of its laws fastens men's attention to the physical world. This is apt to obscure the inner realities which are intimate truths to those who have vision, and can pierce through the curtain to the Holy of Holies within man's soul.

This worship of the mind has received fresh accession from the wonderful discoveries which have ministered to man's comfort and his intellectual and moral and even spiritual satisfaction through means which can be constructed, measured, explained, and regulated by purely physical means. To argue from this against the reality of spiritual life or spiritual experience is like arguing against the existence of things which are hidden from our eyes but which are testified by the evidence of good, true, and reliable men from their own intense inner religious experience. Let me explain this with another illustration. I see a spoon in a glass of water, but it is bent at the point where it touches the surface of the water. I put the spoon in when it was straight. Am I justified in laughing at people who tell me that it is still straight in the water, but that it appears bent to me on account of certain laws of refraction which I am unable to understand?

But no one can have studied deeply the trend of modern science who does not realize that modern science is less and less material as the area of its knowledge and experience enlarges. The spirit of the mediæval Islamic treatise, the *Ikhwan-us-Safa*, which expounds all the new sciences of its day, is deeply religious. Newton, who may be claimed as a father of modern physics and modern science, was a deeply religious man. Who can read the wonderful astronomical expositions of Jeans and Eddington, or contemplate the forces of radio-activity and atomic structure, or come into the remotest touch with the quantum theory or the problems of

energy and relativity, without feeling that matter itself appears in a more complex light to modern science than was postulated by the materialists of even a generation ago?

In a sense matter itself has been spiritualized by modern science. More harmful to the growth of the best in humanity even than the hostility of materialists is the spirit of apathy and indifference to religion which seems to have taken possession of young minds in our own day. This indifference is often associated with cynicism about the most sacred associations enshrined in our souls. This indifference lowers ethical standards in individual and public life, and instils a poison into international relations. It consigns politics to professional schemers, converts national ideals into selfish forms of economic or exclusive nationalism, favours the growth of personal power and officious regimentation, and checks the exercise of that personal liberty without which power and energy become lifeless or life-corroding things.

Power confided to others, whether in small bodies or large, means a derogation from the growth and flowering of human personality. There may be many material advantages in this. But they are outweighed by the enormous damage which they do to the core of the human soul. Sooner or later remedial measures become necessary. Some seek them through artistic or literary channels; others through social service or practical work; still others from a new orientation of religious thought, work, and activity. The soul-hunger is recognized to exist and to demand satisfaction. We must all try to meet it, in our own spheres, in the manner which is most readily available to us and which can best help us to serve our brethren and sisters, fellow-members of our common humanity.

At certain times and among certain circles religion was or is looked upon as a matter of creed and formulæ. It should be a matter of life and personality. The enemies of religion have thrown out gibes about its being the root of many evils. They are looking at the misuse, and not the use, of religion or the religious spirit. Some confuse religion with superstition, and attribute all sorts of hidden terrors and clamorous

taboos to it. Religion should free the souls of men from fear—of themselves as well as of others. It should enable them to face the problems of life with confidence, because they know that they are fighting a spiritual battle in the ranks of the forces of the good and the true, which must prevail. It is not to the purpose to say that there are many religions, and they lead to conflict—spiritual conflict within and sanguinary wars in the body politic of humanity. Conflicts, unfortunately, do exist, and men have a habit of seeking self-justification for their most selfish or thoughtless acts by fathering them on religion or on any other labels that happen to appeal to large bodies of men. Religion, rightly understood, should make for peace by supporting righteousness, justice, and fair-dealing among men.

It is a happy sign of the times that thinking minds are beginning to realize three important truths. One is that unanimity is impossible of attainment where men's antecedents and experiences are different, and yet a true spirit of mutual understanding is always attainable wherever there is goodwill on all sides. The second is that our own ideas find truer and better fulfilment in ourselves when we pool our experiences with others, and that it is only in such an atmosphere that our souls can seek and find true consolation. The third is that though we speak of many religions from an external point of view, our common humanity gives us hope of one underlying faith, so long as we believe in One God, who made and loves us all.

An approach to the fulfilment of such hopes is being made by diverse men in diverse ways. The world is becoming more and more one. The best statesmen are seeking unity of purpose and the avoidance of conflict so far as the armed forces of nations are concerned. The most far-seeing economists are working out solutions to economic conflicts, maladjustments, and misunderstandings. In health matters, though different climates, diets, habits, and modes of life require different treatments, humanity is working towards organizations by means of which different countries and

different social grades within each country shall attain to standards which will make tolerably good health conditions attainable for all. Shall men of faith lag behind in such quest of unity? To do so would be to deny our faith in the unity of God's Plan and Purpose.

In this very city of Oxford there are two or three parallel movements taking counsel in this direction. I may be permitted to refer to the Oxford Conference of the Christian churches, whose object is to see how far unity—not necessarily of doctrine or creed, but unity of understanding, such as I have referred to above—may be possible among the Christian churches. I refer to this with all the greater personal satisfaction because I had enjoyed the honour and pleasure of personal acquaintance with Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden, who was one of the earliest high dignitaries to take up the idea with enthusiasm. In the spring and summer of 1918—the last year of the war—I was on duty in Sweden and the Scandinavian counties. I had many talks with the Archbishop then on the subject. I suggested a much larger idea, that of holding a Conference of all faiths. I understood Archbishop Söderblom to approve of it personally; but he thought the smaller scheme, confined to the Christian churches, might be more immediately practicable. I am glad it has reached the stage it has in Oxford. I am sure we all entertain the heartiest goodwill and sympathy with its objects.

Thanks to the energy of Sir Francis Younghusband, we are here pursuing the quest in a larger sphere. We invite all religions to sit in conference with us. Our object is not proselytism or preaching. We sit together, and some of us try to express the faith that is in us, so that all who participate in our gathering may know each other's point of view, and we may all go back strengthened for the work of moral and spiritual regeneration which we consider to be the crying need of the age. We shall take counsel among ourselves in order to understand each other. That is the only kind of discussion we shall have. We are not out for American methods. We are not seeking a synthesis, nor are we dis-

curring doctrines. In a spirit of fervent humility we are trying to see how far we can bring our emotions, convictions, experiences, and knowledge to bear on the furtherance of spiritual understanding, which can transcend all other kinds of understanding.

For there is a very real danger that the world as we see it may, in its lust or pride of power, or its greed of material good, submerge that precious human personality which it is the function of religion to foster and emancipate. Too logical an acceptance of the crude methods of "nature red in tooth and claw" may drown the inner voice within us, which cries out that our *own* nature has risen or should rise above that crudeness and respond to love and the finer instincts with which God has dowered us.

The State is extending its area of operations everywhere more and more every day. The fight between Church and State is—for most of us—a matter of past history. But the fight between cynicism and faith, between apathy and active well-doing, between international rivalry and jealousy and personal integrity and independence, is being waged about and within us with increased ferocity. Shall we so honour and reverence religion that she shall gird on us the armour and hand to us the quadruple banner of truth, beauty, goodness, and faith?

At the conclusion of the meeting it was proposed by the Acting Chairman, Viscount Samuel, and carried unanimously and with acclamation:—

THAT the following telegram be sent to the King of the Belgians in support of his proposal, as published in the Press of that date:

"TO H.M. THE KING OF THE BELGIANS: THE WORLD CONGRESS OF FAITHS NOW ASSEMBLED AT OXFORD FOR THE PROMOTION OF WORLD FELLOWSHIP THROUGH RELIGION, WELCOMES MOST HEARTILY YOUR MAJESTY'S PROPOSAL DESIGNED TO SAFEGUARD THE GENERAL PEACE OF MANKIND."—FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND (*Chairman*).

RELIGION: ITS VALUE TO THE WORLD

THIRD SESSION,
Sunday Morning,
July 25th.

RELIGION: ITS VALUE TO THE WORLD

Sir ABDUL QADIR (*Chairman*)

I must first of all say how grateful I am to have the privilege of taking the Chair at this meeting, and I am particularly glad to take it when a distinguished lady speaker from India is to address us. At the last Session of last year's Congress in London we were lucky to have a distinguished Muslim lady from Turkey, Mme Halidi Edib, to give us the point of view of Islam. We are again fortunate to have a Muslim lady, this time from India, to express the need of the world for religion from the Muslim point of view.

The Begum Amiruddin comes from a distinguished Persian family now settled in India. Her father, a most learned and wise man, was one of the first in his position to have his daughters educated. They all went to the University and are now doing useful work. The Begum herself is doing social and educational work in Madras. She is responsible for having had compulsory education introduced into that district. At one time there was difficulty about Muslim girls being included in such education, but she has achieved that as well. She is President of the Girl Guides in Bangalore, and Patron of a Society of Muslim and Hindu ladies of all classes.

By her presence here another point of great value is contributed to this Conference, and that is the principle of the status of woman in the scheme of life. This is a question on which for a long time there has been a great deal of misunderstanding, especially in the West—the status of woman in Islam. People believe that Islam denies the existence of the soul in woman. Actually Muslim teaching insists on the

complete equality of men and women, and makes this point explicit. All the virtues enjoined by The Book are explicitly stated to apply to both man and woman: "He shall do it and she shall do it."

From that point of view it is very desirable that we should give this practical demonstration of the fact that Islam allows women to address men and women, and to give them of their light just as men may do. This has been done in the past and is being done today, and is a point to be remembered. There are accounts of distinguished women in all ages in Islam who did all kinds of public work, and that continues now, in spite of the custom of seclusion. There are some, of course, who have now come out of seclusion, and among them is the lady who is to address you.

.

With regard to the topic we are to discuss: I have had the pleasure of attending three of the Sessions of this Congress, and have been greatly impressed by the fact that the work which we did last year has actually resulted in drawing us, all representatives of various faiths, nearer to one another than we were before.

While listening this morning to the beautiful prayer, and watching so many representatives of other faiths listening not only with outward formal respect but actually sharing the same sentiments and all converging towards the same central ideal, I thought what a great achievement that was. It was an expression of a passage in the Quran, where the Prophet asks all the "People of the Book," as the true followers are called, to come to the point which was common between them. Even at that time it was being said that we should eliminate those things on which we differ, and simply rally round those points which are common between us. That is the spirit in which this Congress movement was started, and I am sure that along those lines lies the possibility for the solution of the problems that lie before humanity.

The very title of this Session is a great step forward. The

great point about the title is the omission of the "s" at the end of the first word—Religion, not Religions. The point is religion itself, the essential thing under whatever name or form it is practised. Whatever the name or the label, we do not quarrel with him who comes to us with the essential principle. As long as we can get a common point of view from which to work for the good of humanity, we can differ as to forms as much as we like. Yesterday, while listening to some of those representing Youth, we heard a Communist say: "I have nothing to do with religion, but am a great friend of Internationalism." As the Chairman hinted, the essence is there; you may not call it religion, but I have no quarrel with you if you practise what religion teaches. Religion must begin a reconquest of the world, not by dogmatism, but simply by saying: "As long as we can get a common point of view for the working of religion, we are all one."

Begum SULTAN MIR AMIRUDDIN

This Congress is animated by the noblest ideals conceivable. When Sir Francis—the heart and soul of this great Movement, whom we are delighted has been able to be with us today, despite his illness, and to inspire us with his personality—was kind enough to invite me last year to the Congress that was held in London, unfortunately I was unable to respond to his kind invitation. But when I was asked again this year, the call of duty to this great cause I felt was such and so great and urgent, that I am now here before you.

For the call of this Congress is not a mere call to a livelier world consciousness, but a call to something deeper, to something more vital, to something that goes deep into the roots of the problems that beset mankind at the present day. It is a call for the promotion of the kinship of souls, a call for religion which comes at a crisis at the present time.

One of the most significant phenomena of our times is that the growth of scientific knowledge and the increase of

the critical spirit have led many individuals to regard religion as a superfluous hypothesis. When the old foundations of faith have, in many regions, been demolished, the question that comes surging up within our hearts is whether a spiritual integration of the world is possible. Happily amidst the dense clouds of religious apathy that envelop the horizon, we perceive also some rays of hope glimmering forth, indicating that the gulf of isolation between science and religion could be bridged. On the other hand, the opposition to the Theory of Evolution by the theologians of the West is giving way, a theory which I may, in passing, mention is not inconsistent with the Islamic conception of the world, reference having been made to it in the Quran on several occasions. On the other hand, the teleological argument of theists that the plan and purpose which are manifest throughout the Cosmos make it impossible to exclude the presiding activity of a Mind, is finding favour with some scientists. Science itself, under the leadership of Jeans, suggests a mathematical structure to the Universe, and there are indications that scientific discoveries would, in course of time, strengthen the ground for a spiritual interpretation of this Universe.

Religion, as I conceive it as a Muslim, is a relation in accordance with "reason and knowledge" which man establishes with the Unseen Reality and which binds his life to the Reality and guides his conduct. When we look about the modern world, certain aspects of the conditions prevalent strike the mind with the conviction that never before has there been an age when the guiding power of religion was more desperately needed. We must with gratitude acknowledge that science has endowed this planet with priceless gifts; it has prolonged life; it has invested us with powers to traverse the Universe with the speed of a hurricane; it has drawn humanity together through the medium of the wireless and the cinema; it has multiplied the resources of production. In short, it has taught man to produce a vast material structure which can bestow upon him happiness

and comfort beyond the wildest dreams of his ancestors. But the misfortune of it is that it has, simultaneously, conferred on him such powers also as would lead to the destruction of civilization if not controlled. The control by man of these external forces depends for its stability on his acquiring control over his own inner forces—his internal nature. It is therefore imperative that the science of matter in the knowledge of which he is immersed should be harmonized with the science of the spirit that he ignores today.

The world is involved in an incongruous situation. Old barriers of isolation have been abolished and the Universe has become, economically, a unit, yet the long-cherished unity of the human race appears to be far from realization. The contacts that are being made today demonstrate to us the painful truth that nothing divides mankind so much as the wrong kind of proximity, namely, a mere physical nearness unaccompanied by a cultural intercourse with and an understanding of those with whom one comes in touch. The fact that presents itself with tragic impressiveness is that outward uniformity towards which the different nations tend is not being accompanied by the inner unity of mind—the crying need of mankind. Racial antipathy sunders humanity and perpetrates injustice; rigid chauvinism fosters division and disharmony. Trade rivalries kindle international antagonisms, selfishness engenders selfishness, with the consequence that the modern peak of history's horizon looms portentous. The intrusion on the rights of others, the race of armaments, the multiplication of the agencies of destruction for the decimation of the innocent civilians of the expected belligerent countries, and the spirit of intolerance that reigns rampant in many parts, are some of the symptoms of the *malaise* which affects the world. Following the therapeutic procedure, our primary concern should be to locate the cause of the disease before prescribing a remedy. Careful examination makes it apparent that the ailment is traceable to spiritual thinness in the nature of men who are the constitutive organs of the entire organism, the Universe. Hence

what is needed for the treatment of this malady which is affecting the world is the vitalizing roborant of religion. Human personality, it must be remembered, is a combination of three elements—body, mind, and spirit—all of which require sufficient nutriment. When there is plethora of nourishment in one or more at the expense of any of the others, the equilibrium is disturbed and disorder results. Today it is the excessive gratification not only of the body but also of the mind that has starved out the soul—a condition that calls for serious attention.

The kernel of the world problems lies not in the human head but in the human heart. Economic maladjustments cannot be rectified by the intelligence of financiers at economic conferences without the previous suppression of greed and selfishness in human nature. And the calamity of the dreaded Armageddon cannot be averted by the efforts of eminent statesmen at the League of Nations and disarmament conferences without the condition precedent being satisfied, viz., the disarmament among the nations of the spirit of aggression and aggrandizement. It is the disregard of the principle of "live and let live" and the assertion of the rights of the particular as against the rights of the universal that should be curbed and suppressed, and the war psychosis that such a spirit engenders extirpated before we can glance down the vista of the future with complacency. The fundamental issue of the present era which is labouring in the throes of insecurity is spiritual. The struggle is not so much between two rival groups of powers as between two conflicting and incompatible philosophies of life. One based on self-interest and the other on the interests of the Universe. Ever since the conclusion of the last Great War we have set about on an inquiry as to how we can avert wars in the future. We should rather have been asking ourselves the question, "How can we foster and cultivate peace and understanding?"—a question which this Congress of Faiths has set itself to answer. And the answer to this is that peace can be enjoyed only after we have sown its seeds—the seeds of right relation-

ship—in the hearts of men and uprooted the existing weeds of fear, distrust, superiority complex of race and class, greed and selfishness, a task which can be more successfully performed by religion than by secular organizations.

Such a statement may seem a paradox in view of the fact that religion has a sinister record of dissensions and bloodshed. The history of the Crusades, the Thirty Years' War, and the *Autos-de-fé* of the Inquisition militate against the value of religion as a peace factor. And some, disgusted with fanatical feuds that persist even in this century of progress and with the omission of religion to make a useful contribution to the needs of the times, have taken the drastic step of abolishing it altogether. It must be conceded that religion has been much misused, that it has been recalcitrant to its duty, and has swerved from its original purpose, but to destroy it is tantamount to killing the body to cure the disease. It has been the saddest experience of man to witness the misapplication of the highest instruments of civilization, namely, of both science and religion. But because science has become a tool in the hands of many for executing designs of oppression and hate, would it be compatible with wisdom to advocate its destruction? Similarly, because religion has been misinterpreted and misused, would it be a calamity to desire its expulsion from the world?

It is not true religion, that is, religion as viewed in its pristine purity, that has been responsible for fanatical warfare. The prophetic souls that swung the world into a new orbit were inspired by the lofty ideal of establishing peace and harmony among mankind, and were endowed with a comprehensive vision of truth. An illusion of egotism, however, seized the minds of some later interpreters of the faiths, who hardly grasped the import of the original message and reshaped it in the mould of their own making. This illusion made them conceive truth from the angle of their own exclusiveness, generated in them an attitude of contempt for other standards and values, and coerced them to aggressively impose their belief upon others. As religion travelled

away from its sacred sources, it lost its original catholicity and hardened into arrogant dogmatism, and it is not fair to censure it for the misdeeds and enormities of those who scarcely comprehended its message. The poet Hafiz stigmatizes the infirmity of judgment of the narrow-minded bigots and deplors that—"Since they did not see the fact, they ran after fiction."

True religion, as distinguished from pseudo-religion, is basically universalistic in spirit and teaching. Cosmopolitanism radiates through the whole nature of man when his heart is illumined by the divine light. The function of religion as indicated by its etymology is to bind all human beings together in one bond of common fellowship and love and unite them to their Maker. All monotheistic faiths teach that men, despite their obvious differences, are brothers through their common relation to the Divine Creator. The unity of the human race is the natural corollary of the unity of God. The basic principle of Islam is its doctrine of Universal Brotherhood. This is stressed in the Quran in the words, "All people are a single nation" (chap. 2. 213). The term "Rabbul Alamin," as applied to God, signifies that all the nations of the world are regarded to be the children of one Father, whom He fosters, nourishes, and guides to their goal of perfection by degrees. The prophet Muhammad (may peace be upon him) made it his life work to preach universal love as the emblem of the love towards the Creator. "Do you love your Creator?" he said; "love your fellow-beings first" (Sahih Bukhari). The social communion that Islam creates transcends geographical, racial, and national boundaries, as also caste- and class-distinctions based either on birth or wealth. For according to the Quran, rectitude of action alone constitutes the criterion of nobility. And what characterizes Islam is that it was not content merely to preach the ideal of the equal worth of all personalities, but actually made it a fact of common law and established it as a practice. As a result, within the brief period of twenty-three years, as if by a magic wand, it exterminated race,

colour, and class prejudice from among innumerable, ever-bickering, heterogeneous units of humanity, not of one but of different countries. The hearts of men and women in the Orient began to beat in unison with the hearts of those in the Occident; the fairest of the Arabs and the Persians intermingled in terms of closest intimacy with the darkest of Ethiopians; and the most abject of human beings, the slaves, became not only commanders-in-chief of armies and governors of provinces, but were, in the Muslim world, raised to the status of royalty itself. To such an achievement history presents no parallel. If today these lofty principles preached and practised by Islam are followed, they will serve as a panacea to the many disorders which affect our sorely distressed world. When they produced such marvellous results in the days of old, it is easy to conceive how much more effective they will be at the present epoch when the different sections of humanity are brought into closer proximity.

The changes effected in the condition of women constitute another unique achievement of Islam in the field of human relationship: One of the essential teachings of the prophet Muhammad was "Respect of Womanhood." He enjoined that "Paradise lies at the feet of Mothers," and from the most degraded position that women occupied, he suddenly elevated them to the status of equality with men and granted them more than 1300 years ago similar legal rights and privileges, namely, the right to inherit, own, and dispose of property, and enter into contracts and agreements on their own account, which they have since enjoyed.

Many modern thinkers of the West entertain doubts as to the value of religion and assail it with the argument that it retards material advance instead of inspiring progress. In support of their contention, they vividly portray the picture of mediæval Europe, when learning was relegated to the domain of neglect, free thought discouraged, science banned, and the children of light consigned to the flames. *Prima facie* this would seem to make a plausible case against religion. Investigation, however, discloses that the conditions pre-

valent during the period known as the Dark Ages were not the making of true religion but of priestcraft, which adopted the policy of keeping the world enchained in fetters of ignorance and inflicted distortions and disfigurements on spiritual values.

True religion which helps man to discern himself and rise to the highest plane must, inevitably, be a supreme force in the development of civilization which connotes culture and material progress. All humanitarian principles which have contributed towards the well-being of mankind have drawn their inspiration from religious truths, one or other of which is imminent in whatever is true and good. Oswald Spengler rightly observes that, "Great cultures are entities, primary or original, that arise out of the foundations of spirituality." The truth of this statement is borne out to a remarkable degree by the history of Islam. Advance in humanity, in freedom, in intellect, and in multifarious arts of life in Arabia was the outcome of the birth of Islam, and proceeded everywhere in proportion to the influence and acceptance of its teachings. In the Muslim world, adherence to the rules of religion was accompanied by material progress. This was the natural effect of the laws promulgated by the Quran which were such as would lift man to the height of civilization in all pursuits of life. So long as the Muslims implicitly obeyed the injunctions of these sacred laws they prospered, and when they transgressed them, they did so at their peril. The welcome accorded to the gospel preached by Islam—that Nature with all its resources was created to subserve man's ends and should be harnessed to his use—gave mighty impetus to the cultivation of the various sciences—the fulcrum of human progress. The teaching that "Allah (God) has not created anything better than reason; the benefits which Allah giveth are on account of it," the exhortations to men and women to acquire knowledge since it "lights the way to Heaven," and the repeated emphasis on the necessity of seeking knowledge "though it be in China," raised people sunk in a slough of degradation, mental, social, and political,

to eminent cultural heights. But when Muslims reached the acme of their civilization, the evils that abundance of wealth and power brought in their train made this nation their captive; extravagance and self-indulgence crept in, and utter disregard of religious precepts culminated in the disruption of the Muslim Empires.

The resources of religion are indispensable for the improvement of the conditions that dominate modern society. The characteristic of the times is an over-emphasis on the pleasures of the sense in oblivion to the need for nourishing the soul. The existing spiritual anarchy is corroding the foundations of morality. New-fangled cults claim the allegiance of the young; indulgence is regarded as synonymous with self-expression and licence, conceived to be identical with freedom. When man makes hedonism his *summum bonum* in life and gives himself up entirely to the exaltation of the ecstasy of the flesh, he descends to the level of the animal. What society needs is a revaluation of its values. If the present-day ideals persist and the God of "a good time" does not release His hold on the minds of His innumerable votaries, the future does not present a prospect for gratification.

Oswald Spengler in his morphology of civilizations, entitled *The Decline of the West*, regards "religion without God," which the humanists are striving to establish, to be the symptom of a dying civilization. History reveals that spiritual bankruptcy has been the cause of the decadence of many a mighty empire. The formidable power of Rome could not withstand the overwhelming forces of destruction that irreligion let loose on her. The exhortations of Juvenal, Tacitus, and Livy remained unheeded, and the grandeur that was of Rome was soon no more.

Philosophies of history give us a vivid insight into what is likely to occur if certain conditions persist. Adherence to the policy of *laissez-faire* will not solve the problems of today; to lose sight of the seriousness of the situation and turn a deaf ear to the forebodings of the gloomy Jeremiahs is hardly consistent with wisdom. The inference from this

is not that we should give ourselves up to despair. Despair has the tendency of making history confirm its theories. Optimism and pessimism are both dynamic forces, it being the general law of life that what we believe with passionate intensity exerts a profound effect on our minds and brings about good or evil as is foreseen. There is no cause for despondency, as the situation is not beyond control. If we seek the succour of the spirit, we shall be able to skilfully navigate the boat of civilization amid the tumult of wild waters through which it is rushing today, and land at the farthest haven of progress. When the spiritual needs of the soul are satisfied alongside with material desires, and when the flaming spirit of love for humanity lit by religion in the heart of each individual and each nation, which comprises a group of individuals, makes the Mother Heart of mankind vibrate with virile power for the benefit of all its members, we may make bold to assert that modern civilization which has harnessed the steam, which has snatched the lightning from the clouds and conquered the air, will soar to further heights immeasurable.

The value of religion in imparting dignity, meaning, and worth to life by its doctrine of the hereafter can hardly be overlooked. To hold that human life is like "the grass of the fields that today is and tomorrow is cast into the oven," would place us below the level of other forms of creatures which is not consistent with facts. Since the whole of creation is fulfilling a purpose, namely, to minister to the needs of man, it cannot be conceived that he, the lord of all, is destined to drift and lead an aimless existence.

Man is a religious animal, and nothing can expel his innate tendency to look behind phenomena and pry into the great darkness which encompasses him. With all the surface of the materialism of today, there is an inexhaustible craving in human nature for a spiritual reality and response. The decay of material things and the temporary duration of our body suggest the need for the results of this life of the soul, otherwise this world would appear to be hardly rational. If we were

to be deprived of the belief that physical death does not mark the final stage of our journey, but is a further step in the evolutionary process of the "Mighty Atom," our earthly existence would be meaningless and futile.

It is inconceivable that man, the tempest-tossed mariner "sailing on life's solemn main," can ever do without the stable anchorage that religion provides. Without "one adequate support for the calamities of mortal life," the anguish that wrings the heart could hardly be appeased. It is the conviction in a transcending purpose that endows us with an unconquerable will and helps us to face the gravest crisis. We may be crushed by the weight of a material disaster, but if we have faith in our soul and in the spirit of the Universe, we can still rise up to our feet and go forward. The hope of the Beyond urges us on, draws the sting out of our affliction and saves us from the clutches of cynicism and despondency. So long as the elixir of unmixed and unending happiness remains to be discovered, so long will the human heart crave for the solace that the consciousness of an Infinite Power and the Life hereafter alone can give.

Recent statistics foreshadow the collapse of the anti-God movement in Russia. It has been reported that the membership of the militant Godless League has fallen from 5,000,000 in 1933 to below 2,000,000 at present, and that many anti-religious organizations there are threatened with disintegration. Religion, properly understood and genuinely practised, is conclusively a *sine qua non* for the happiness and well-being of man. The most urgent desideratum for the world at the present moment is a sustained endeavour at a spiritual awakening that will evoke and vitalize the forces of good, latent in modern civilization, resist the reactionary forces of degeneration and decay, lead men to apprehend the universal fulness of truth, and teach them to realize the organic character of the Universe. The sceptics who criticize religion have no alternative to offer in its place.

We must, however, not forget that before religion can become a dynamic factor in the establishment of a better

world-order, for which are inherent in it necessary ingredients, it needs to give a new orientation to its outlook. It has to adapt its philosophic idealism to the practical demands of life and accommodate itself to the intellectual needs of the generation. It has been rightly said that "mere philosophic perception of the essence of divinity is barren if it does not generate volition or give movement to human life in consonance with the qualities or attributes of that essence." Removed from the sphere of theory to the sphere of practice, religion should be made to permeate every institution and every phase of our modern life—the home, the school, art and play, commerce and industry, and in particular, politics. It should concern itself not merely with social problems; its efforts have, to a great measure, to be directed also towards the solution of racial and political questions. Moreover, it should be life-affirming and aim to impart a fulness to our earthly existence, and not life-denying, lulling men into quiet contentment with interests centred only on the life to come. The essence of true worship is to serve humanity, not to detach oneself from it; to counsel the soul to seek its happiness in changing and not in becoming independent of circumstances. The Scylla of excessive other-worldliness which shatters the spirit of progress is as much to be avoided as the Charybdis of inordinate this-worldliness which engulfs into the abysmal deep the progress already achieved.

Further, in our epoch of enlightenment, religion cannot afford to remain divorced from reason. To expect supernatural paradoxes to make an appeal to the minds of the present generation is mere delusion. A large measure of free thought is absolutely indispensable to human progress, and this is not incompatible with true religion, which is dynamic and not static in character. "When the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the Suns," the dominant note should be not the letter but the spirit of the Scriptures. What we need to realize is that "the dry bones of religion are nothing; the spirit that quickens the bones is all." The permanent articles of faith must not be confounded with the

temporary injunctions that were called forth by the passing necessities of a bygone age and regarded to be immutable to the end of the world. It is because of tenacious adherence to outworn theological dogmas and later accretions, because of the emphasis placed on rites and ceremonials rather than on essentials, that we find religion in the rear instead of in the vanguard of forces struggling for human progress.

At a time when spirituality is threatened with dissolution by materialism, the World Congress of Faiths has struck the right note in placing a call to religion in the forefront of its programme. It is, indeed, essential that the different religious sections of mankind should no longer remain apart, but unite and muster their forces against the common foe so that the fundamental truths which constitute the hope of the world may be kept preserved and intact. This Congress is further imbued with the lofty ideal of building a magnificent superstructure of fellowship on the foundation of the different faiths. The dominant factor in the achievement of this objective is the cultivation of a positive attitude of mutual goodwill among the adherents of the various religions, and not a mere negative ideal which manifests no ill-will towards other creeds. Such an outlook is engendered by the principles of Islam, which affirm that the religious emotion in man has a variety of experiences and deprecate narrow exclusivism. A Muslim believes that the grace of God encompasses peoples of all ages and climes, and that just as physical sustenance has been granted to each nation, similarly has each been endowed with spiritual sustenance in conformity with its special requirements. The Quran proclaims in categorical terms, "There is not a people but a Warner has gone among them" (chap. 35. 24). And not only does it recognize diversity of spiritual experience, but it also makes it incumbent on Muslims to extend their allegiance to all the religious personalities of the world. It declares, "Say: We believe in Allah and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and all the tribes, and what was given to Moses and Jesus and to the prophets from their

Lord; we do not make any distinction between any of them, and to Him do we submit" (chap. 3. 83). It goes even further and maintains that salvation is dependent not on creeds but conduct, and is not to be withheld from the followers of revealed faiths. The undermentioned verses bear eloquent testimony to its generous attitude.

"Surely those who believe and those who are Jews, and the Christians and Sabians, whoever believes in Allah and the last day and does good, they shall have their reward from their Lord, and there is no fear for them, nor shall they grieve" (chap. 2. 62), and "Surely those who say, our Lord is Allah, then they continue on the right way, they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve" (chap. 46. 13).

Fellowship of faiths can be achieved only by the cultivation of such a liberal attitude as Islam advocates. Critics and sceptics are not wanting who scoff at the idea of world fellowship being realized through religion, but to me, as a Muslim, such a fellowship forms part of my creed. When I was a girl, my father, His Eminence the late Muwayyid-ul-Islam of Iran (Persia), a renowned Orientalist who had made a profound study of the Arabic language and the Quran, a lineal descendant of the prophet Muhammad, and a devout Muslim, gave strong injunctions to my European governess to teach me the Bible, both the Old and the New Testament. And not satisfied with my cursory acquaintance with the same, declared that it should constitute one of my examination subjects. This insistence on the knowledge of a different religion from one's own to be imparted to a child at an impressionable stage of her career, demonstrates the attitude that a Muslim entertains towards other faiths.

The various religions differ one from another, not in their inward essence but in their outward manifestations—in theological details. Underneath variety, that which binds all men together, is the fundamental unity of their allegiance to the great ultimate spirit of Reality and Truth and the similitude of their spiritual aspirations. The Arabic term for religion is "Mazhab," which denotes a path. The

followers of the different faiths are all fellow-pilgrims who, though pursuing diverse paths, are marching towards one and the same "far-off divine event, towards which the whole creation moves." Let us therefore go forward with hearts animated by genuine goodwill and minds filled with a true understanding of one another, to the achievement of our common goal.

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Rev. LESLIE J. BELTON said that religion was a nebulous word, and could be made to cover all kinds of human aspirations, so much so that he could conceive of a state of so-called non-religion being nobler in some respects than certain expressions of the religious spirit: that, for example, the aspirations after human well-being at the root of Russian Sovietism were perhaps more religious than the kind of religion that was practised in Russia before the revolution.

The religion to which we should aspire was the religion of fellowship. In considering how we could give expression to the ideal of universal religion the speaker was reminded of the saying quoted in St. Matthew's Gospel: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me"; and of the story of Hanuman, who, wrathful at finding a beggar lying in foul filth, crying upon the Name of God, kicked him in the chest, and later when he was tending the image of God, found a wound on the breast of the image and heard a voice saying: "Inasmuch as you did this to the foulest of my creatures, you did it unto me." The lesson of that extraordinary similarity was simply that we are all members one of another, and are not separated, isolated beings.

There were two ways of regarding our kinship with God and with one another. We might think of God as the Wholly Other, entirely removed from our sphere of activity, as the sovereign Law-Giver; or we might see God as involved in creation, active in ourselves, the centre and soul of every

sphere, and see ourselves as bound together in Him so that isolation and separation were realized to be illusion.

When we reached a certain level in our own faith, and not until then, we found the underlying and all-enveloping unity. If we became members of this religion of fellowship, then we were lifted out of ourselves and discovered ourselves extensified in the lives of others. In so far as we had achieved this insight, it was for us to become "cells" so that wherever we might be we should bear witness to the religion of fellowship that alone would save the world.

Mrs. DODWELL said that, speaking as one who had been trained in science in this University, she would like to emphasize the value of bringing the scientific method and the results of scientific investigation to bear on spiritual matters. The gift of modern scientific technique was a great gift to the spirit of humanity. The scientist brought to bear all the attributes of the mystic, his concentration and his self-sacrifice, but the religious leaders had not led humanity in such a way that scientific discoveries might become a blessing and not a burden.

Religion should become the guardian of the world's knowledge. Many scientists were at work to prove the truth of esoteric knowledge, and if all the lines of scientific and mystical knowledge could be brought together, it would be possible to demonstrate the unity of life.

Mrs. BULLOCK suggested that fellowship through religion might be promoted if people travelling in foreign countries would worship in the churches, temples, and mosques of those countries instead of merely regarding them as objects of artistic interest.

The CHAIRMAN replied that this might not always be advisable, as some places of worship were exclusive, but that much good might be done if tourists would make contact with individuals in the various places and explain their desire for fellowship through religion and common worship.

Pandit A. B. GOSVAMI said that the purpose of religion was to reinstate the soul in its state of natural activity. The limitations that hampered body and mind were not found on the plane of the soul. These limitations could not be eliminated, but they could be transcended by devotion to God, which was the proper function of the soul. The soul had an everlasting existence, but when under the influence of the lower nature it was invested again and again with a corporeal frame. The idea that the human soul was transient was contrary to the doctrine that God was All-Good. The theory of the eternity of the soul, of the transmigration of souls according to the law of cause and effect, was the only one that gave a satisfactory explanation of the many problems of earthly existence and demonstrated the cosmic law of justice and love.

Mr. AYLMER MAUDE disagreed with the idea that the non-religion of Soviet Russia was preferable to the religion of Russia under Czardom. The religion of Czardom was certainly corrupt, but it was not the real religion of Russia. The real religious force there had been Tolstoy, and his teaching had been one of brotherly love.

Mrs. DANK paid a special tribute, as a non-Muslim, to the Muslim religion, and emphasized the tolerance of Islam for others who believed in God. If all would be earnest in seeking the One God, all differences and difficulties would be finally removed at that plane.

METHODS OF ATTAINMENT

FOURTH SESSION,
Monday, July 26th.

:
METHODS OF ATTAINMENT

Dr. WILLARD L. SPERRY (*Chairman*)

It is a very great personal pleasure and honour to be in the Chair for the Session this morning. As a Christian Protestant of the Left Party, I should like to take this occasion to say that I have learnt more from the writings of the Roman Catholic Modernist Movement, and particularly Tyrell, than from any other group, as interpreters of the Christian religion. They throw light on a great many dark places. Their Movement has been driven underground, but remains one of the hopeful movements of our time.

We have as our lecturer this morning one who for a time has been identified with that Movement, one that remains one of the prophetic movements and hopeful movements of our time. In the religions of the world the problem we have to solve is the nature of time. The nations of the West have a profound feeling for history, and the Christian religion has had to consider whether its passionate interest in the sequence of things in time should remain, or whether it should cast in its lot with those religions which conceive of spiritual principles as being timeless. As Professor Birkett of Cambridge said: "It was in the second century that the Christian Church decided to continue writing the annals of God in time."

Professor Buonaiuti has continued faithfully to write the annals of God in time, and to interpret what had already been written on that subject. He comes to us as a companion in our perplexities and distresses, and in our hopes. It was Nietzsche who said: "There is an aristocracy of people who have suffered." That aristocracy comprises a much larger number of people today than twenty-five years ago.

As one of his admirers has said, Professor Buonaiuti is a penetrating, learned, and sympathetic student of personal religion in the Early Church and in the Middle Ages, and is in intimate touch with the problems of the present age.

Professor ERNESTO BUONAIUTI

A Roman by birth, brought up a Catholic, excommunicated from the Church of my forefathers on a charge of heresy, I have come to understand George Tyrell's great saying, that there are excommunications which are salutary, and that the revival of religious life today lies with the exiles from the established churches who live, and are able to proclaim, a spiritual life which is universal, outside the narrow limits of the churches—more prone, alas, to create divisions than to promote unity—and I am happy to be with you here today, under the shelter and inspiration of one of the most venerable centres of culture and religion in the world, in order to seek with you some way of satisfying the world-wide longing for a religious experience which shall be at the same time deeper and more brotherly.

I cannot talk to you in your own inexhaustible language, and my only qualification for talking to you at all is the irreparable suffering and ostracism which have come to me, and the restless anxiety which makes me scan the horizon every time the sun rises at dawn and disappears in the glory of sunset for signs of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

.

One of the greatest sociologists of the nineteenth century, we may even call him the creator of social science, your countryman Herbert Spencer, has indicated at some length the analogies which may be drawn between the individual as an organism and the organic life of the community. The social organism, like the individual, is characterized by specialization of function, by processes of growth and decay, by the solidarity of its members in the unfolding of their

common organic life, and by various crises of development. Assuming this parallelism, we are justified in thinking that social organisms may also have diseases and periods of infection. No one will wish to dispute the fact that society today is passing through a period of constitutional impoverishment. The difficulty is rather to diagnose the nature and the cause of the disorder. Following up the analogy we might say that the disease from which contemporary spiritual life is suffering is one which has attacked the respiratory organs. What our social life lacks is the oxygen of big ideals, the fresh air of the great realities of the Spirit, the sense of real values beyond all the merely sensible and empirical.

We have made extensive provision for the care of the physically disabled, for social prophylaxis and the prevention of contagion, for building up the strength of invalids and for restoring the energies of underfed, suffering children, but we have lost sight of the no less imperative need of providing oxygen for the social respiratory organs, in order that society may breathe deeply and healthily. This is not the moment to call to account those institutions to whom *ex hypothesi* is entrusted the task of keeping the air breathed by the community pure, nor to inquire whether it is not precisely to these institutions that the chief responsibility for the steady poisoning of the spiritual atmosphere must be assigned. It is a fact that the organized churches seem to have become incapable of providing the atmosphere which supports the spiritual life of the community with those elements which should renew and elevate that life, and without which the spiritual horizon seems to become dark, heavy, and stifling.

We see on all sides praiseworthy efforts to bring the churches together and to discover statements of faith which, blotting out the old disputes over dogma and discipline, shall restore to the Christian faith, the world over, that constructive power of leadership which seems to be so disastrously lost.

But we wonder whether the crisis of contemporary spirituality does not reach down to regions in the sub-conscious life of the community deeper than those in which

ecclesiastical institutions and dogmas have their roots. The present crisis of faith is not a denominational one; it is rather a crisis of intensive spirituality. We venture to ask ourselves whether it does not involve every form of faith, every form of religious tradition; in fact we ask ourselves whether the problem, which must present itself to everybody who is aware of the tortured unrest of the world, is not in fact the problem of the very possibility of faith itself, of the possibility of determining its content, of the necessity for a return to that sense of the sacredness and mysteriousness of the Universe from which religion derives its first impulse and its continual renewal.

It is our very conquest, amazing as it is, of the physical forces of the Universe, our very control of what St. Paul called the *elements of the world*, which has brought about the dimming of our spiritual sight and rendered obtuse our capacity to respond to God's call to us and to understand His revelation of Himself. Our great advances in the technique of living together have been effected at the cost of our spiritual development. Indeed it would almost seem as if true spiritual well-being varied inversely with a technical mastery of the means of living. All those who, the world over, sense the dangers now threatening the spiritual traditions of mankind, must recognize the urgent necessity of undertaking a cure for the revival of their own listless spirituality, so that by the reanimation of their own weakened energies the strength of those who are their brothers in distress and in hope may be revived.

As Spencer said, there are indeed surprising analogies between the working of the human organism and that of the social body.

But this is only the reaffirmation of an idea which goes back to the remotest antiquity and was proclaimed in the earliest religious utterances which transformed the magical cult of the primitive races into a mystically social concept of the Universe. According to this conception the individual represents the universal life in miniature, and there is no

physical phenomenon in Nature without its parallel and its complement in the individual. The analogies in fact between the working of the individual organism and the epiphenomena of social life represent only an intermediate stage between those vaster analogies which exist between the human organism and the whole life of the Cosmos.

If, accepting this order of ideas, we think that the crisis affecting our contemporary life bears something more than a metaphorical resemblance to those diseases which so tragically consume the respiratory passages of the individual, the very terms of the analogy may help us to draw conclusions as to the nature and course of the disorder.

.

We may note then that diseases of the respiratory passages are cured by the pure air of the mountains, by the vast horizons of great altitudes. If the disease afflicting our collective spirituality is a disease of the lungs, we may hope to restore them to a healthy expansiveness only by seeking, on those same heights where of old the greatest revelations of God were vouchsafed, the pure and limpid atmosphere of our earliest adventures in the world of spirit.

This may be taken quite literally as well as symbolically. For us, to climb is to return to our origins. When our far-off ancestors, descending from their prehistoric abodes, took their several paths throughout the world, their starting-place was those high plateaux of the Middle East on which the destinies of human civilizations were decided. We might say that it was on the plateau of the Hindu Kush that European and Asiatic civilization took leave one day of each other, to meet again somewhere, somehow, on the road leading to the fullest development, the highest expression of their respective endowments, of their respective ideals. You will remember the old custom between host and guest in the ancient world. At the moment of separation they broke a bone, and retained each a portion, so as to be able to recognize each other, if they should ever meet again, by the exact coincidence of the

two pieces. These were the symbols of a former hospitality ever ready to be renewed. Millenniums ago, at the moment of that separation which their different roads across the world necessitated, our forefathers exchanged the symbols of their common brotherhood, so that some day, somewhere, tired of their wanderings and longing to be gathered once more under the same roof-tree, they might, all at once, renew their mutual understanding, and their fellowship in the elementary ties of blood-relationship, by putting together the still cherished fragments, the jagged edges of their sorrows and of their unrealized ideals.

So here are we, met today to exchange the symbols of our remote community of faith and hope so that this divided human family may come to realize its solidarity and unity in the eternal values of faith.

The old faiths are worn out with agelong deterioration. The established traditions are impoverished, and their usefulness destroyed, by a process, for which they themselves are responsible, of a too minute and casuistical determination. If they are to regain their sadly diminished power of building character, if they are ever again to become pure and wholesome, fit instruments for our spiritual renewal, we must bring them back to their original sources, test them on those touchstones of reality, the central value of the religious consciousness of mankind, try to transform them in the fire of that sacred experience which once caused our forefathers to emerge from a primitive stage of magical religion towards a religion which was mystical and full of grace. In the language of Bergson, our static religion and static morality need today, as never before, to be transformed into a dynamic religion and a dynamic morality, which is not subject to the rigid limitations of dogmatic formulæ and bureaucratic discipline, but seeks only the free highroad which unites men of all types who seek to penetrate the mysteries of God.

The boldness of such a programme must not frighten us. If we are really convinced that the need for religion springs today from one of the gravest spiritual crises in the history

of civilization, we must be prepared to accept daring ideas and radical solutions.

We shall suffer some discomfort on the way. Our lungs, shrivelled and diseased by our weary stay in the foetid atmosphere of the lowlands, with all their contagions, cannot but suffer a severe reaction caused by the sudden transition to the rarefied, vibrant mountain air. But this is the price of salvation, and there is no birth, or rebirth, which does not involve a danger of death.

But we cannot in any way close our eyes to a state of things as obvious as it is tragic. In relation to the physical world the stage of our spirituality, actually by reason of the immense progress of science, is not substantially and morally different from that of a savage or of primitive man who believed that by means of his magical powers he could with his own hands control Nature and transform her into a docile robot, mechanically obedient to his will. The scientist who thinks that by his calculations he holds world forces in his grasp, a toy of his will, is morally no better than the magician, with his incantations and ritual, who imagines that he can snatch from his surroundings the oracles which he wants and the cure for his various ills. There is an apparent, illusory mastery over Nature, which really reduces man to the condition of a slave in relation to the physical world, for it makes him lose that awareness of the intangible region of mystery and the unexpected, which alone gives him his peculiar privilege of being a son of God and co-worker with Him.

And we must recover this awareness if ever we are to rediscover faith amid the existing forms of faith, and amid the various human sciences that one science which alone can safeguard man from becoming once more, at any moment of his history, and at any stage of apparent human progress, a barbarian and a savage.

It is thousands of years since the first prophetic-messianic religion, the religion of Zarathustra, tried violently to change the basis of spiritual life from a magical worship of the cosmic

forces to an intimate sense of the moral character of the life of the Universe, and of the unceasing conflict between life and no-life, light and darkness, good and evil in this world. This fight is staged in two settings, the physical world and the heart of man. But man is not merely a point in the immense field on which the two conflicting principles meet; he himself is an instrument in the service of the good principle, which labours in the Universe in order triumphantly to affirm its disputed sovereignty. Various other teachings of the same prophetic-messianic type followed that of Zarathustra. All represented an attempt to escape from a purely physical conception of the world to a moral conception. All tried to replace the category of being, as the indispensable and prime factor in a dialectical account of the Universe, by the category of life, of goodness, of the Kingdom of God.

We are not here to attempt the arduous task of assessing the relative importance and value of these different teachings. At a moment like this, rendered dramatic by the corruption of the old spiritual traditions, and by the lack of any sure orientation in our work of spiritual reconstruction, our imperative task is to climb once more the mountain heights of the past in order to recover the possibility of discerning on the horizon the dawn of our own destiny.

Zarathustra identified the principle hostile to good with falsehood. It is no metaphor which identifies falsehood with darkness. We would say rather that there is a falsehood in the physical world which is darkness, and that there is a darkness in the human world which is the capacity of man for lying and bloodshed. I am sometimes inclined to wonder whether the first thing for anyone who wishes, in this universal religious shipwreck, to grasp some working principle of salvation, some sure basis of faith, is not, above all, to concentrate his spiritual energies on escaping from that purely metaphysical conception of the world, to which the ecclesiastical traditions have accustomed us, in order to attain to a conception which is absolutely and exclusively moral.

It is not without profound significance that all the great

reformed religions, from Zarathustra through Buddhism to Christianity, regard as essential to religious life, not the problem of the nature of God, but rather that of our conduct in relation to the Divine in the world and in the life of men.

And it is so and not otherwise that the disturbing problem as to the possibility of faith for us today must be approached. What our modern world lacks is a sense of the sacredness of life in all its manifestations, for only from such a sense can spring those perceptions and reactions of which human society has imperative need if it is to be distinguished from the pack life of animals and the primitive life of the clan, which depend on reprisal and rapine. This sense of the sacredness of life is the very matrix from which spring all religious faiths. If the specific task of the human intellect is that of organizing and arranging our empirical knowledge of the world in static, unchangeable forms, we can at once understand how human culture is for ever dramatically torn between the need to shut itself up in the neat schematizations of the intellect and the need to overleap these so as to restore to life-forces their elasticity and power of expansion. The conflict between faith and the faiths is just one aspect of this perennial drama.

It is inevitable that the peaks of intellectual attainment should be moments in which the primitive sense of the sacredness of life is enfeebled, and, paradoxically enough, an age of rational enlightenment may be, at the same time, an age of ferocity and barbarism. A return to the conception of the sacredness of life may mean the salvation of civilization.

But what is this recovery and revival of the sense of the sacredness of existence, that sense which is the fount and origin of all faith, but an immediate and deliberate contact with the real values of life, with all that they involve and demand?

Faith is not adhesion to a statement of dogma; faith is not inscription in the registers of a visible community. Faith is not acceptance of a speculative system. Faith is essentially

a quickening of the Spirit before the enthralling and tremendous mystery in which the forms of universal life and its development are involved.

It may be said that the positive faiths, the established religions, betray their proper nature when they try to formulate, accurately and exhaustively, just what is ineffable and incapable of formulation, that original direct religious apprehension. Of this truth we have a striking example in the history of the most imposing branch of Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church. For centuries and centuries the Christian Church knew nothing of any theoretical proof of the existence of God. From the New Testament writings, in which faith in the Father and His righteousness is an unchallenged assumption, through the patristic literature down to Carolingian times, the Christian faith was an intense and living experience which did not concern itself to prove the existence of God with syllogism and category. It may be said that the first proof, technically conceived and outlined, of the existence of God was that attempted by St. Anselm, with his ontological argument. The scholastic philosophy replaced the *a priori* method by the *a posteriori* method derived from Aristotle, with its proofs derived from conceptions of motion and cause. But we might say that, while St. Anselm thought out his arguments with a view to putting an imaginary unbeliever in the wrong, unbelief and atheism actually made their appearance in the world of Christian thought at the moment when the Thomistic philosophy believed that it was basing an incontrovertible proof of the existence of God upon dialectical processes, supposed to have the coercive force of a mathematical theorem. The case is a highly enlightening one. Faith cannot be the result of a syllogism, and, if we want to make our faith in the Divine depend on a dialectical process, we deform the act of faith and we profane that conception of the sacred reality before which our hearts would, and should, lie prostrate. We must not forget that Aristotle set forth with his notions of cause, of potentiality, and of act only to arrive at the assertion of a

motionless prime mover whose essential quality is that of being impassive and perfect in himself, and of being able, as he says, to do without any friend whatsoever.

The great historical religions, on the other hand, have conceived God as the Father, the great Provider, who watches over His children and suffers whenever we wander away from Him, and whose heart is wrung as often as we make shipwreck of our lives.

Our spiritual asphyxia began on the day when we tried to turn faith into a mechanical argument, our religious sense into an arithmetical calculation.

Nor need we imagine that if we restore faith to that pre-logical, pre-dialectical stage which is its specific domain, we are in danger of impoverishing the fulness of our spiritual life. There are many realities in the world of which philosophy knows nothing, and there are, hidden away in the recesses of our consciousness, capacities for apprehending the sacred reality outside ourselves that have nothing to do with our proclivity for syllogistic argument.

On the contrary. An exaggerated development of the reasoning powers of an individual, or of a group, always takes place to the detriment of a full, healthy, complete life of the spirit, because, as Bergson has shown so beautifully in his *Evolution Créatrice*, pure intelligence always causes arrest and paralysis in the upward thrust of the *élan vital*, and every time, in the life of an individual or in the history of a society, that the laws of life demand a renewal of efficiency, it is precisely to all the extra-logical regions of the spirit that recourse must be made. Is not faith essentially, in its own living, organic dialectic, just a direct apprehension of, and contact with, the central, mystery-shrouded nucleus of life?

In our Mediterranean world the beginnings of both experimental science and of speculative thought are generally referred to those Ionic philosophers who, at the dawn of Greek culture, tried to identify the primordial elements of the world. The various Ionic schools chose in turn earth, air, fire, and water as the one original element underlying the

phenomenal changes and transitions of the Cosmōs. In the same way faith, too, is a constantly renewed effort to draw from the heart of universal spirituality its central element and its simplest law.

Rejecting, then, all attempts to limit or transcribe by any kind of abstract formula the formidable mystery of the Universe and of life, whoever, amid the shipwreck and dissolution of all the traditional faiths, and in disquieting awareness of the crisis which threatens, and which already envelops us, is conscious of the need of a faith which may uplift and purify, must approach this mystery in a spirit of reverent awe and worship, asking for light not imposing formulæ.

We, too, are in search of the simple elements of life; but we shall not try to find them by means of the instruments of our so proud, but poverty-stricken, intellectual investigation; nor shall we imagine that we have reached them when we have elaborated complex solutions of the problem of being.

For the elements of the mystery in which we are immersed are beyond us and overwhelm us. This mystery is in the life of our individual spirit; it is in the complex logic of collective human life; it is in the vast whirling panorama of cosmic existence. The attitude of faith in the face of mystery is not the attitude of one who tries to solve a riddle or to analyse the parts of a whole; it is the attitude of one who seeks to insert himself within it, in conformity with the laws which the Divine principle in the world holds in His power and directs to His ends. And our contribution towards the solution of the religious crisis in which we are involved will have been loyally and honestly made when, closing our eyes, as was taught of old by the eastern mystics, to all that is empirical, and opening wide the eye of the soul on the interior world of spiritual realities, we have offered our ephemeral existence as a voluntary sacrifice to the principles of goodness and light, which are bearing the immensity of universal existence towards a destiny which God has planned.

Faith is not just a statement of fact; it is the subordination

of the will to that heavenly economy which is bringing the Universe to righteousness.

In the dawn light of Ionic philosophy, rationalistic, scientific speculation may have been satisfied to imagine that the kaleidoscopic flux of world forms was a process arising from fire or wind, earth or water; faith must discover the mystery that dwells in the devouring fire of love, in the consuming hurricane of grief, in the crushing earthweight of remorse, and in the brackish waters of death.

These are the great values and the elementary forces of the spiritual life. Faith consists wholly in awareness of the sacred character of these values and these forces. And civilizations cease to be religious and lose their faith when they turn love into a coarse biological episode, grief into a particular physical phenomenon, remorse into a psychical disease, and death into an insignificant event in time.

For faith to revive we must become aware of the enormous depth of responsibility and the great aureole of mystery which make the fact of love grave and terrible. For faith to revive we must become convinced that there is no grief or suffering which does not conceal and contain an infinite capacity for expiation and redemption. For faith to revive we must become tragically aware that no man ever kills his brother in this world, that no drop of blood is ever shed, that no tear falls from human eyes, that does not lay a heavy weight of responsibility upon every rational creature. For faith to revive we must patiently cultivate the perception, fraught as it is with terror and with joy, that life and death are not nicely separated by a dividing line in time, but are on the contrary continually in contact one with the other, and that, at every moment, life endures the onslaught of death, and that, at every moment, too, life draws from the fleeting triumph of death material for fresh victories and loftier flights.

Old Heraclitus, perhaps echoing unconsciously some remote Iranic proverb, pronounced the mysterious words: *ἀθάνατοι θνητοί, θνητοὶ ἀθάνατοι, ζῶντες τὸν ἐκείνων θάνατον, τὸν δὲ κείνων βίον τεθνεώτες*—"Immortal the mortals, mortal

are the immortals; the mortals seek to suck the life of the immortals; the immortals seek to transfigure and revive the death of mortals."

Thus faith is a daring conquest of all the hidebound determinations of our empirical knowledge and of our rational habits of thought. It is the revelation of a transcendental reality, of which the world of appearances is but a pale, colourless reflection. To be born again into faith is indeed to pass beyond empirical experience, and to touch, in that other world of impalpable spiritual experience, realities of which phenomena are at the same time an expression and a travesty.

It is therefore by contact with the central facts of our own inner life and spiritual pilgrimage that we must, above all, try to recover that sense of the sacredness of the world to which the historical forms of faith have always and everywhere made appeal.

When our spiritual consciousness has become capable of realizing the mystery inherent in the most rudimentary expressions of our mental and emotional life, when we have become aware of the profound significance of love and grief, of remorse and death, and of their vast extra-individual range, then we shall naturally be drawn to look with the eye of faith, which is hope and awe, on the arch-mystery of the social life of men.

Probably the chief cause of our pitiful religious shipwreck, and of our loss of confidence in the traditional forms of faith, is due to the fact that our rationalistic enlightenment labours under the delusion that social life can be mechanically regulated and disciplined.

An organic, living faith became impossible for us when we forgot that the soil in which man's social life has its roots, and from which it derives its nourishment, is a region of grace freely bestowed. "Hast thou seen thy brother?" the primitive Christians asked each other. "Thou has seen thy God. Bow down and worship." Here is the fundamental formula for every religious faith. The deep conviction that we have not to seek God a long way off, in unusual, miraculous acts, but

that life is altogether a miracle, and the Universe an Odyssey of prodigies; the deep conviction that God is not at the other end of a discoverable series of causes, a first cause and motionless mover, but that He is in every meeting of soul with soul and is to be found in the eyes of our suffering brother and in the beating of every broken heart. This is faith, and the only faith which can save us.

Probably our deplorable spiritual poverty began on the day when we forgot that man's life in society is an infinite mystery, and that true communication between man and man is communication of the gifts of the spirit.

Of course when we deplore an impoverishment in our sense of the possible grace concealed within social life, when we attribute our religious decadence to forgetfulness of the sacramental value of all spiritual communion between men, we implicitly recognize that the magico-sacramental structure, so widely in use in certain confessional forms of the Christian tradition, no longer performs that constructive, concrete work of edification which was its original function.

We need only recall on the one hand St. Paul's teaching with regard to the eucharistic love-feast, and the present-day Catholic doctrine of the miracle of transubstantiation by means of a formula on the other, in order to measure at a glance the abyss separating the social mysticism of primitive Christianity from the individualistic supernaturalism of present-day Roman practice.

For St. Paul, Christ is present in the bread when, and only when, the community itself is, first of all, the living mystical body of the Lord. And participation in the mystical body of the Lord is not just a guarantee of individual survival, which might equally well be guaranteed to the partakers of an Orphic or a Mithraic agape; it is rather a shared anticipation, a common foretaste of that banquet, which God the Father will prepare for His faithful in His Kingdom.

Perhaps the distinguishing feature of Christianity, and the chief reason for its immense historic development, is to be found precisely in the fact that Christianity has carried to

its sublimest and most inclusive expression a mystical interpretation of man's life in society. This life, in the light of the Christian message, which in this, as in so many other points of its teaching, is heir to the religious traditions which came down from the Iranic plateau, is seen no longer, and not only, as a potential bureaucracy, but also and above all as a complex of mystical relationships whose normative value is in inverse proportion to their rational comprehensibility.

On the basis of this assumption, we may say that the Christian Church is irrevocably condemned to lose its disciplinary virtue in the world, whenever its visible, official, bureaucratic elements threaten to predominate and to stifle the mystical and the sacramental.

We may go further. We may say that when the Church, and the churches, come to rely absolutely on their this-worldly, bureaucratic powers; when they find it necessary, in the discharge of their spiritual duties, to have recourse to, and depend on, the purely political organizations of the world; then the Church and the churches are irreparably guilty of treason to the other-worldly principles which gave them birth, and the care and preservation of which is their true task.

The crisis of the faiths to-day, and more especially of the Christian faith, lies wholly in this fact alone, that Christianity has forgotten that her real task, her own peculiar trust from which there is no escape, is to assert, and to show forth in her own life, before all organized bodies whatever, all forms of corporate life, political and social, the principle that there exists a supra-sensible community of spirits, above all the actual barriers between man and man, above all artificial divisions of caste, whose social unity is due to grace derived from the outpouring of the Spirit of God.

The spiritual shipwreck of our race began when we disastrously forgot that the social life of men has nothing in common with the herd life of animals, which is capable of a mechanical discipline by violence.

The human community lives in history because it is the vehicle and embodiment of a Divine Spirit, who disciplines

and educates by rules which belong to the other world of transcendental realities and ideals, which altogether surpass any this-world realization of them.

When this undercurrent of the Spirit beneath the whole structure of man's everyday social life comes to be realized, then the foundation is laid for a real faith in the active working of a Divine Principle which, through our infinitesimal, but indispensable, contribution to the effort of travail, is realizing all the time, here and now, the ideal of His Kingdom.

From a realization of the transcendental character of our particular individual experience, from a belief in a divine plan actively realizing itself in the development of man's social life, there naturally arises faith in a transcendental Principle, the scene of whose work lies also in the physical world.

It is little more than a century since Schleiermacher postulated, as the basis of every faith, the sense of our absolute dependence on a Wholly Other than ourselves, of whose potent action we are aware even before we can know anything whatever of His nature or His will. More recent religious philosophy, thanks especially to extensive comparative research in the multiform world of man's religious belief, has been able to analyse, in all its nicest refinements, the working out of this sense of ours of our utter dependence, from which every form of faith arises. This Other than ourselves, who must uninterruptedly support our existence if we are to escape an instantaneous precipitation into nothingness, is a sacred reality which disturbs our whole being to its remotest roots by its enthralling splendour and its tremendous potency. Both philosophy and theology are too prone to place this transcendent reality far away on the edge of some dim horizon that seems to have no real connection with the deeper regions of our sentient existence.

Faith, a faith worthy of the name, must exert itself, now more than ever before, to span the abyss which our presumptuous metaphysic has carved between us and our Father who is in Heaven.

Let us learn from the exquisite Gospel parable not to feel ashamed of the squalor of our tattered garments and the parched thirst of our shrivelled souls.

In the live thought of the highest historical expressions of faith, God is not only the Father who suffers when He is forsaken by His children, and who discerns, while they are still a long way off, the wanderers who are returning, eager to get ready a great feast to welcome them home, but—we must boldly use a word which will sound irreverent only to those who fail to realize the sublimity and infinite value of every act and every moment of human life—He is also the Companion and Sustainer of all our weary strivings after truth and justice.

This reassuring certainty that the Father is not far from us, but is continually at our side, holding in His hand the frail thread of our brief existence, this firm assurance that the fatherhood of God is not something active, once only, at the mythical beginnings of the world, but is ceaselessly at work in the dramatic unfolding of cosmic life, necessarily leads to an apocalyptic, eschatological interpretation of life and history, without which, we believe, there never can be real religious faith, and never has been since religion first emerged from being a belief in magic and became ethico-prophetic in character.

Ever since the Iranic prophet Zarathustra became aware of the living dialectic of two principles in eternal conflict, and prophesied the resolution of the conflict on the day when the principle of light should succeed in bringing under his dominion all his companions in effort and aspiration, the vision of the Kingdom of God, conceived, not as an individual reward in a disembodied immortality, but as the supreme realization of all transcendental values, has become, for ever, one of the fundamental elements of faith.

And Christianity has brought that element to perfection by making the Kingdom of God the final *dénouement* of the cosmic and human drama, and, at the same time, presenting man with the possibility of realizing that Kingdom already, here

and now, in a spiritual fellowship of human brotherhood over which broods for ever the inspiration of the Spirit of God.

It has now become a commonplace to say that Christianity has reached a turning-point in its history.

The crisis is not confined to Christianity. We may say that it is a crisis of all established religious traditions. This does not depend on human malice ; it arises from the radical changes which our technique of industry and labour have undergone in relation to the physical forces of the world.

By a strange, though understandable, paradox, the impoverishment of our spiritual life is proportionate to the increased resourcefulness and elaboration of our technical progress.

We must summon up courage to recognize this intimate, desperate poverty of our spiritual life.

Blessed are the poor, declares the Gospel, for our salvation lies in the recognition of our fundamental poverty. Our spiritual life is one continual act of mendicancy.

What is love but a begging for love?

What is grief but an imploring demand for consolation?

What is remorse but a desperate cry for forgiveness?

What is death but an impassioned claim to survival and remembrance? Our spiritual life is in fact a sum total of wants and miseries.

It is this sense of our inherent poverty which should make us approach social life in full awareness of our dependence. We must not forget that the more aware we are of our essential deficiencies, the more plentifully we shall find them satisfied in the joy of a common life lived in fellowship and love; because, when human society really presents itself to us as an organization for sharing the common benefits which are showered by God on all who seek Him and call upon Him, reverently, and in brotherly comprehension of the needs of others, then, indeed, life will cease to be that terrible drama of violence and brutality to which man's unfettered instincts have reduced it, and will become a joyous foretaste of that

Kingdom of God, in which one day the God of light and loyalty will overthrow once for all the principle of darkness and deceit.

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Mr. ROM LANDAU said he supposed that everyone who knew Italian was especially grateful that morning for this knowledge. The point which had struck him particularly and was new to him was the fact that 1000 years after Christ, God as a natural reality, as the power which carried us on His shoulders, was for the first time approached in a spirit of intellectual inquiry. He questioned whether we could return to a position of the religious problem in terms prior to those of the Scholastica. This was a very important, and in fact almost the central, problem in modern Christianity, because just at that very moment the profane character crept into all our churches, and religion ceased to be a living fact and became more and more an observance. Could that spirit of reality that filled Christianity before that particular moment be regained and revitalized within the framework of the Roman Catholic Church or of any Christian Church today? Could we revitalize and spiritualize the churches and make Christianity a reality not only in individuals, but in organized religion by basing ourselves upon the teaching of the Church and within the Church?

Professor BUONAIUTI (summarized and interpreted by Mr. ROM LANDAU). The professor said that the question touched him intimately in his own experience, and therefore he could only give an answer as personal. In fact, an answer was impossible because the individual could not give an answer for the whole of the religious community. The question was too vast. Looking historically upon the question, Christianity, as embodied in the Roman Catholic Church, no longer had that spiritualizing and revitalizing power. But we could not see what powers were active in

the background, and so could not know in what way it might revitalize itself in the future.

Dr. ALFRED HALL said that the Professor had pointed out that it was well to go back to original sources and make them the touchstone of reality. He had quoted Bergson, but Bergson's idea of the *élan vital* seemed to suggest a force driving from behind, whereas surely what one needed was rather an ideal that drew one on?

Professor BUONAIUTI replied that Dr. Hall's problem seemed to be not a spiritual but a scholastic one. The *élan vital* could not be separated from the force in front of us which drew us on. We were carried on by the stream of divine life, and therefore there was no difference between the force behind and that which was before. It was all one stream, and time was an extra-religious category.

Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS acknowledged indebtedness to Professor Buonaiuti for the quotation from Tertullian: "Hast thou seen thy brother? Thou hast seen thy God. Bow down and worship." This was anticipated centuries earlier in the Upanishads, when the teacher Yajnavalkya had said that the wife was dear—anyone was dear—because the Self was dear, which in the immanence of that day meant that the God-within-you was dear. The Buddha had carried that idea a step further, adding: "Since to every man the self is dear, let him see to it he harm no other man." He might have carried it further still as the great basis of human fellowship. He saw each man as a wayfarer through life with every other man, all sharing a common goal. Whether Bergson's *élan vital* was of the *vis à tergo* or not, here was the great drawing force—the sharing in a wayfaring towards a common goal.

Mr. PAYNE said that Professor Buonaiuti had asked: "What is love but a begging for love." Did he not think that love is such that when it springs up in the heart it is impossible to suppress it?

Professor BUONAIUTI replied that the essence of the Gospel was to be found in blessedness: "Blessed are those who recognize that life is to go a-begging." The day life first manifested itself in the world, the day that a lichen appeared in the crack of a rock, that day the poem of life had its beginning, and it is a poem of research and of imploration, because every life is in need of the external world. The life of man, more than any other manifestation of life, is an uninterrupted appeal to others, an appeal for help and assistance.

Mr. AYLMER MAUDE said that when theologists began to divide God, Christianity lost God. The same was true of the present meetings. So long as people talked about aspirations, they were one. If they tried to say anything definite and clear, they disagreed. It was the curse of a great many organized religions that, having received revelations from of old, they discouraged thought, lest their followers should wish to contradict the revelations. As an example of this, the churches said that God created the whole world. This implied that God also created that which is evil in the world, therefore God could not be All-Good. From this confusion the churches could find no way out.

Professor BUONAIUTI asked whether it was not reason which created duality and division. Religion being the power that unifies that which might be an apparent contradiction, we could not possibly explain religious mystery with reason. It was better that we could not do so because reason divides while religion always unites—that is, the religious instinct, not organized religion.

The Begum SULTAN MIR AMIRUDDIN disagreed that the exercise of reason was detrimental to spiritual understanding. From the point of view of Islam, reason and spirituality were not contradictory, but complementary. Through the exercise of reason were we able to see God. Because of this, Islam

gave the mighty impetus to the cultivation of the sciences. Science and religion were not antagonistic in Islam. When Islam was at the height of its intellectuality it was at the height of its spirituality, and was able at that time to hand down the torch of civilization to Europe.

Professor BUONAIUTI regretted that he had to be unchivalrous to a lady, but definitely contradicted what the Begum had said. Having been brought up on a basis of rational investigation into religious matters, he thanked God every day that he had been able to preserve the simplicity and power of faith which is the only possible approach to religion, and he felt that in any and in all religions, not only the Roman Catholic, those two powers must always be antagonistic, without any possibility of compromise. Religion could only be approached purely spiritually and through faith.

AFTAB-UD-DIN-AHMAD (Imam of Woking Mosque) said that reason was helped and extended through religious experience in the same way that eyesight was helped by spectacles. He did not feel it was true to say that reason could lead us to God without the help of spirituality.

Professor BUONAIUTI agreed with the Imam that the senses and reason could help our spiritual conception and could act as a kind of spectacles, but fundamentally more important that the eyes of the mind were the eyes that man carried in his heart—intuition and imagination. All mystical tradition, Islamic included, had always stressed the importance of opening the spiritual eyes and closing the physical eyes. This simply meant that the physical eyes and ears belonged to a lower order and not to the higher order which touches the spiritual level.

Mrs. MONTGOMERY, speaking as a member of the Waldensian Church, said that she felt that it was the creative love in Christianity that needed to be stressed.

Professor BUONAIUTI indicated that this was, of course, true.

Dr. WILLARD L. SPERRY (Chairman) said he was struck by the fact that all those present who were not ultra-orthodox members of their own churches were faced with the same dilemma. Churches possess the symbolism by which religion could be communicated. These symbols had the inestimable advantage of a long history. We were able to make use of them by acts of accommodation, but we were not able to create new symbols for the aspirations which arose in our common mind. The difficulty of a Movement like the Congress of Faiths was the difficulty of creating the necessary symbols for the communication of our ideas.

Professor BUONAIUTI questioned whether the symbols of religion, or its sentiments, were the first to appear. Would not the symbols of religion be born as soon as there was a real religious feeling within us? The lack of new religious symbols showed that the force of religious feeling was not yet strong enough. When religion began to mean enough to us as of social significance, then new symbols would replace the old and would arise quite naturally from the religious vitality within us. The same reason accounted for the lack of religious art among us today. As soon as we began to live up to the exigencies of a new experience, we should create the new symbolism.

CHAIRMAN: It is my office to thank Professor Buonaiuti on behalf of those persons happily equipped with a knowledge of Italian who could follow verbally what he said; and of those who with a little Italian and French could follow to a certain extent what he said. It was a tribute to the beauty and clarity of his speech that we understood so much.

And where we did not understand Professor Buonaiuti, we felt. Like a certain student who, after listening to a lecture by Emerson, said: "I do not remember a word of what you said, but to listen to you was like breathing ozone." We

who did not understand what Professor Buonaiuti said, feel also that we have been breathing ozone.

I should like to refer to the journal *Religio*, of which he has been the editor for twelve years or more, gathering to his help many of like mind—a work of reliable scholarship and dependable prophecy. One of the pioneering journals of the century in our field.

METHODS OF DISSEMINATION

FIFTH SESSION,
Monday Afternoon,
July 26th.

METHODS OF DISSEMINATION

Dame EDITH LYTTTELTON (*in the Chair*)

I have great pleasure in taking the Chair today for Mr. Rom Landau, as I have often wished to meet him. I would rather it had not to happen on a platform, for I have no idea whether the few introductory remarks which I have been asked to make will irritate or stimulate him. Every chairman desires, of course, to do the latter. However, I must hope for the best.

Mr. Landau is, I see from the programme, going to tell us interesting things about his interviews with various people, probably mystics, using that term broadly, and anything he can tell us about such personalities must perforce be of intense interest to us. There exist among our fellows, both eastern and western, people with peculiar powers and faculties which we call supernormal faculties; we know much now about the curious composition of the human mind and the supernormal faculties which many possess, and no longer feel that utterances or visions are necessarily inspired because they have found expression in strange and unaccustomed ways. We have to judge by the content which is far more interesting and important than the mechanism by which any experience is conveyed to others. And even this content, however august and imperative, cannot, as we know, express more than a fragment of the ultimate truth, for this does not lie within the guardianship of any one man or any one religion.

"That which can be expressed cannot be true," said the great Chinese philosopher Lao Tse, hundreds of years ago, in some such words explaining that our minds are not large and powerful enough to understand what we may have been privileged to hear or see or feel, and that therefore what we

express can only be a fragment of the truth, however real the experience itself may have been.

The nostalgia of the human spirit, its impression of exile, the longing for another life, is one of these real experiences, and we have innumerable records of individual and corporate efforts to see, hear, and feel a spiritual presence. All the religions of the world express this longing: most of them say that they have come nearer to direct revelation of truth than any other religion: each religion considers that it touches the very mantle of God. In a sense, none do; in a sense, all do. Poor little *homunculus*, with his dark mind and his feeble body, is yet able to stand outside his own being at inspired moments and even hear and see and feel the vibrations of a greater and more ethereal world. Words are clumsy vehicles for thought and vision, and even the greatest mystical genius of the world can often only give us a faint idea of his intuitions. Very often, too, the message that we receive does not come through religion at all; it comes through poetry, music, or art.

I have been concerned for many years with the study of the supernormal faculties of mankind, and I feel that in a proper scientific comprehension of them we shall find the explanation of our limitations as well as of our transcendences. We are not what we seem; we are not mere pieces of mechanism; we are not mere biological specimens; we are, if one may borrow that term, amphibious. We can inhabit different fields of existence.

Many have felt that in the study of telepathy or trance or clairvoyance or prophecy or any other supernormal faculty, they will find a highway into spiritual regions; it is one of the delusions to which the human mind is prone. The great thing we have to realize and accept is that no mere mechanism, no system or dogma or belief will give us, of itself, what we ardently desire—access to a life beyond the reach of our senses, access to God.

It is this passion of yearning which has produced so many curious aberrations and so many magnificent dreams, embodied

in various religions. Supernormal faculties may give evidence of what is called extra-sensory perception, yet in themselves be of little value. What may be of immense value is the manner in which they are used.

When Mr. Landau tells us, as I imagine he will, of strange occult powers, I for one shall be longing to hear to what use such occult powers have been put; have they developed great character or pregnant visions or fine and ennobling visions? If they have done so we may be sure that although they have not captured the universal truth, we have witness of access to another form of life, and learned something of the way to the fields of paradise. We see through a glass darkly, but we see. . . .

Mr. ROM LANDAU

I am sure you all sympathize with me for having to speak to you this afternoon after Professor Buonaiuti, instead of before him. After that Italian masterpiece I can only present you with a very sketchy essay in bastard English, and after the spiritual heights to which he took us this morning I fear I must take you down to the very prosaic plains of everyday necessity, suggested, perhaps, by the title of this address and far less exalted than my kind Chairman suggested.

I have been asked to speak to you about the subject indicated by the somewhat forbidding title of this talk in connection with a recent experience of mine. That experience, although quite personal, has a very strong bearing upon the deliberations of this Congress, and I need not therefore apologize for its personal character.

Dissemination—of what? Not of religion, of which we have had quite enough, but rather of those spiritual truths in which we all here believe. There are two possibilities for the dissemination of truth; we can do it either among the masses or among individuals. I shall confine my remarks to the latter, for I believe that few things are more important in our time than to make the men who are responsible for

the state of affairs in the world more conscious of a spiritual way of looking at things instead of the traditional materialistic one. Would such men listen if we spoke to them? This is where my personal experience comes in.

Early this year I set out on a long journey through the Near and Middle East. As far as Port Said I had the very great pleasure of travelling with our Chairman, Sir Francis Younghusband, on his way to the Ramakrishna Centenary in India, and his company made me regret that I could not go on with him to India instead of disembarking at Egypt.

I visited eight Muslim and three Christian countries: Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Palestine, Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. My object was twofold: to investigate the religious and spiritual conditions among the people in that part of the world, and especially among their leaders; and secondly, to disseminate among those leaders the spiritual truths which we in this Congress so firmly believe.

I was convinced, from the first moment when I decided to go to the East, that no appeal had a greater chance of success than the personal one, and I was very grateful to Sir Francis when, one day on board ship after I complained to him that the job I had set out to do was far too big for me and really required a whole Royal Commission, he replied that jobs of that kind could only be done by individuals; no organization, not even the World Congress of Faiths, could do them. Often I was grateful to him, and found new courage through his words, especially when, worn out by continuous interviews, at times in a language which either I or my host only half understood, I would wonder whether there was any sense in what I was attempting to do.

I mentioned two reasons for my going out, but there was a third reason which I somehow dreaded to admit, even to myself, although it was, perhaps, the most important. I wanted to ascertain that those spiritual foundations, those spiritual premises on which we base ourselves in this Congress, are not just Utopian dreams which might not survive when

brought face to face with the practical exigencies of life as represented by those realists who are responsible for the state of affairs in the present world. Would these men respond to those truths in the spirit in which we would like them to respond, or would they regard me as yet another of those harmless, sentimental lunatics from England who set out every now and again across the world to preach some new gospel of peace?

Perhaps it was not altogether by accident that I began my investigations in that part of the world which is the cradle of western civilization, where Assyrian, Egyptian, Hebrew, and Greek cultures were born, where Judaism, Christianity, and Islam came into being, where Byzantium and Rome find their cross-road even in our time.

So that you may judge for yourselves whether my findings can have any practical value, I should like to mention that I did not go to see the kindly heads of philanthropic societies, of whose welcome I could be assured beforehand, but men who were actually leading the affairs of their country. I visited four kings, six prime ministers, twenty-three other ministers, nine heads of churches, and rectors of universities, presidents of banks and scientific societies, intellectuals and educationists.

Even quite early in my travels I realized that, among the masses, nationalism was still the main driving force. This was not, however, the case among the leaders. Among the leaders in most countries I seemed to detect a certain tiredness over nationalistic appeals. It seemed that they went on preaching them, but no longer believed in them so wholeheartedly, and were looking out for something new. They had seen too many examples of western rationalistic methods in politics, which were based on materialistic philosophies, and too many international conferences, both political and economic, to have much faith in the efficacy of western unspiritual rationalism. They seem to be waiting for something new, and though not clear in their minds as to what it should be, are conscious that it must be something quite different

from all methods of the past. What could this new gospel be? Since the war the West has shown the East three new doctrines: Communism, Fascism, and Nazism. None of these seem to have much chance of success in the Near and Middle East. In the Muslim countries today, no matter how much the Muslim religion may have weakened, its traditions are still so much in the blood of the people that no doctrine, such as Bolshevism, which is against individualism, the family, private property, or the law of inheritance, has much chance of succeeding. Fascism, as you know, is primarily a system of social and economic readjustment rather than a philosophy. It can only be adopted by a country with a highly developed economic and social life. The whole national existence of most of the eastern countries is still too young, too primitive, to provide the necessary understructure on to which the Fascist façade could be superimposed. As for Nazism, I shall not speak about it myself, but will read to you a few sentences by one of the leading Arab thinkers of our time, the blind Sheikh Said Shahrastani in Baghdad. His words seemed to sum up what I had heard from many other people:

“A theory of supremacy of race and blood is just as alien to the Arab spirit as is one of idolizing the state to the disadvantage of the individual. Muhammad made no difference among the different races and colours. Admiration for Hitler among a few Arabs is usually confined to those who do not know the Quran and do not live up to its teachings.”

What, then, is left for those statesmen who are waiting in the East for a new gospel? The answer is provided by what became the essence of my findings during my journey. For those spiritual and religious truths in which we gathered here in this Congress believe, and of which I tried to speak to those men, seemed to be the very thing for which they were waiting. I don't mean to imply that all the politicians received them with open arms. Far from it. But the fact remains that the majority—the overwhelming majority—not only

responded with interest but with genuine enthusiasm to those ideas.

To prove to you that I was not carried away by my own enthusiasm, I shall read to you five statements taken at random from the many conversations I had in the East. I am only going to deal with men who were really outstanding in their own countries. The first, from the King of Saudi Arabia, was also meant as a message to this Congress:

KING IBN SA'UD. "I do not believe that you can rule a country well without resting upon a religious basis. You cannot separate political conduct from ethical conduct. I myself have always tried to act solely according to the word of the Prophet, even if this meant a political loss at the time, but in the long run I always found it was the religious road that led to a political success."

NAJI BEY AL ASIL (Iraqi Minister of Foreign Affairs). "In my opinion the whole chaotic state of affairs, especially in the western world, is due to its departure from the essence of religion. Although it is difficult for one or a few individuals, even if they are ministers, to translate their highest religious beliefs into reality, they must make all efforts to act as an example, an ethical and moral example. A nation as a whole can and must be taught to do it through right education."

Dr. KAYALI (Minister of Education and of Justice in Syria). "In every one of us there is the spiritual urge for something better than matter. It is the duty of the state to strengthen that urge in the young through right education. In those who are exposed to western thought and who have turned away from the religion of their fathers, the religious instinct must be cultivated not within the framework of any particular denomination, but in the direction of ethics, in the direction of social service and selfless collaboration."

AMIR ABDALLAH (of Transjordan). "The necessary strengthening of the religious spirit can only be effected by organizing the efforts of all those who believe in the power of religion. Societies in different countries should be formed irrespective of the denomination of their

members; they should collaborate in trying to strengthen the religious feeling of the people and, above all, fighting atheism. Something similar should be done in schools for the children."

Professor VARVARESOS (Governor of the Bank of Greece). "I do not dare to say that I don't believe in God, but I don't dare to say that there is God. All I know is that there is a power beyond our comprehension. In my own little way I can serve only by trying to lead a life based on ethics and morals. I don't believe in the churches as they are today with their dogma and observances. I want them to be ethical and moral institutions of a practical kind."

Naturally you will ask now, if the Near and Middle East are so full of spiritual enthusiasm, why don't they come forth with a gospel from which the West can learn? The first answer is that the Middle East at present is going through such a stage of transition that it is quite incapable of producing a gospel of its own. Secondly, the Near and Middle East have been for so many years under the influence of the West that they can hardly be expected suddenly to depart entirely from that influence. Every aspect of life is based on western methods; they have taken from us their political systems, their means of transport, their education, sanitation, even their amusements and many of their new customs, and it is not likely that they will suddenly create an entirely new doctrine of their own. I have little doubt that they are waiting for the West to produce such a gospel, and when I say West I mean—for a number of reasons—Great Britain. In India it is not at all the same, for the Indians are tired of westernism both in thought and in politics, since, for them, westernism is identical with Britain and British rule. But most of the basic conditions are entirely different in India and in the Near and Middle East.

I think there is yet another reason why those men whom I quoted to you and many others, similarly important men, do not seem able to translate their better spiritual convictions

into their daily actions. It is a more personal but an equally important reason which also has a bearing on conditions in the West and probably affects many statesmen in the West. It is primarily a feeling of shyness, of self-consciousness. Very often a minister would say to me at the end of our conversation: "None of my colleagues must know of what I told you"; and the next day I would visit one of his colleagues and be told exactly the same. They were afraid to make their spiritual convictions known and were hiding them. Yet the really important thing is that everyone should know about them. Individual good intentions are all very well, but they have no power if they are not co-ordinated and organized and made real. Only when brought together and organized properly can the good intentions and spiritual convictions of men scattered all over the globe produce that inner spiritual revolution which we here must regard as our final goal—that is to say if we want to be more than a nice comfortable week-end party with kindly and ineffective intentions. And that is where I believe the Congress of Faiths has a mission. Ever since I came back from the East, having spoken to 185 different responsible men, have I felt that it is for the Congress of Faiths and for no other organization to become a clearing-house for the good intentions of bashful statesmen. I do not mean this as a joke, but am in dead earnest about it.

But it is not only in the Near and Middle East that people have those good intentions and yet are unable to translate them into reality. I do not believe in what is so fashionable these days—to dismiss a politician by saying that he is only a hard-boiled cynic. Naturally his good intentions are probably covered up by a thick crust of cynicism, but if you scratch long enough and put your finger on the right spot, you will usually get a response. It may perhaps be the duty of a Congress of Faiths to do all the necessary scratching and putting of fingers on tender spots. But if you want to bring about the spiritual conditions in which our aim—Peace and Fellowship through Religion—can be realized,

you must do it. For I don't think we can achieve much without the collaboration of those who are responsible for the affairs of the world.

What are the other methods of dissemination? After my recent journey I came to the conclusion that at any rate in the eleven countries of the Near and Middle East, the churches, which at one time were the noblest guardians of spiritual truth, could no longer claim to be the sole channels through which such truth could be translated into activity. Other bodies, societies, universities, even government departments, and especially individuals, have taken over those activities. What does this translation of church activity into social or communal or civic activity mean? It means that among those who are undertaking that work, the tendency prevails to replace the letter of religion by its deed. I think we are almost entitled to say that in those who have taken upon themselves to carry the cross which at one time glorified only the spire of the churches, the word is becoming flesh.

What once was religion is becoming social work, ethical conduct, education. This process is a very general and significant one, although today we only see its initial stages.

As for quick and direct results, I believe more than ever that personal contacts are of paramount importance. We must try to create individual contacts among ourselves, and especially with people who are really important in the world of earthly activities. And once we have established such contacts, we should go on building them up and extending what has been suggested while the contacts existed.

We cannot force any statesman in East or West or anybody else to adopt spiritual methods instead of the usual materialistic ones, but we can go on awakening their consciousness until their own conscience and common sense will show them that spiritual methods are more efficient than rationalistic ones.

I think that such lines might suggest the direction in which some of the methods of dissemination might be carried on by the Congress of Faiths.

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Mr. YUSUF ALI asked the speaker whether he did not think that the group of eleven countries of which he had spoken divided themselves into three totally different groups? And whether he had intended to suggest that the Congress of Faiths should definitely change its main objective, which he had understood to be the bringing together for mutual fellowship, people of different faiths, and make of it a sort of spiritual bureau which would say: "We from the West can come and tell you how to run your policy." This was not to imply that religious and ethical problems were not important in politics, but would the states that had only just received their independence welcome a society or a congress or an individual who offered them a gospel which would revolutionize the whole of their state?

Mr. ROM LANDAU replied that he realized the divisions between the groups of countries, and had therefore found it the more remarkable that they should all have responded in more or less the same way.

He had not intended to imply that the Congress Movement should change its foundations or direction, but had merely suggested that it might add to its other activities that of assisting spiritual but bashful statesmen, who do not know how and when to express their intentions and do not dare to admit them.

Mr. LEO BAKER endorsed what Mr. Landau had said as to the need of statesmen for occasional injection with a spiritual virus. He asked Mr. Landau how far the politicians and leaders of the eastern countries were in association with the real genuine spiritual teachers of the East? Were they co-operating with religion or were religion and politics, as in Europe, in two separate camps?

Mr. LANDAU said that this was a very important question, too complicated to deal with in a few moments, because it affected the fundamentals of Islamic life. Most of the states-

men he had met were trying to base themselves on western ideas, and that westernization had taken them away from traditional religion; although most of them performed their traditional religious duties, few seemed to regard religion as the main inspiration of their lives. This might be accounted for by the fact that very few of them were familiar with the reformed Islam. Therefore the eastern situation was very interesting, because it was so contradictory and so transitory. The influence of the West had been to turn attention away from the Prophet, towards the leaders of the West.

AFTAB-UD-DIN (Imam of Woking Mosque) said that he had listened with much interest to Mr. Landau. It was the first time he had heard from a Westerner about the message of the West to the East. As a Muslim he was open to all messages from any quarter, but he wished to say that all knew that the present chaos in the world was the creation of the West. If the East today were following materialistic lines, it was under the tutorship of the West. As long as anyone had any materialism in their minds they were unfit to give any spiritual message. After any achievement in civilization, a nation was prone to forget the spiritual basis of that civilization, and he considered that the West had forgotten it. Her standards were tinged more or less by materialism. He questioned whether the western peoples were undergoing that experience which is known as repentance and remorse? Had they dived deep into that spiritual cleansing and come forth with faith and fervour?

Mr. LANDAU entirely agreed with the Imam. He had not wished to suggest that we could give to the East a new message, but that our final aim must be an inner spiritual evolution that must affect everyone who mattered in the world. Naturally only those who had undergone such an evolution could give such a message.

Dame EDITH LYTTELTON said that if one really longed for the spiritual basis of life, he did not waste time pushing a particular form of belief, but went down below the forms to

that which was common to all races. She asked whether anyone had had the experience of a real understanding on spiritual matters with someone of another faith?

Mrs. DODWELL said that she had a very close friend, an Indian guru, one who had followed the Path of Initiation and who taught it to others. She had explained to him the path she was attempting to follow in the West, the path of Rudolf Steiner, and he had said with a smile: "It is the same."

Dame EDITH LYTTTELTON (Chairman): "In closing the discussion I should like to say one word. The fundamental idea of this Congress is surely to bring together all these points of view and get below them to something upon which we can all agree. The political aspects are taking us away from what we are trying to do. We ought to recognize the spiritual force which lies behind every movement whatever it be, even if it is purely national, and realize that which is fundamentally in common between us. On those lines interviews such as Mr. Landau has been describing are of value, because what is going to save the world is the relation of the human soul to God."

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUDING SESSION,
Monday Evening,
July 26th.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Sir FRANK BROWN (*Chairman*)

You will have noticed from the programme that our proceedings this evening constitute the last meeting of the Congress for conference and discussion. The Chair was to have been taken by Viscount Samuel, but owing to pressure of important business he has had to leave for London. We are all most deeply indebted to Lord Samuel, particularly as he is a very busy public man.

Of course at this last general meeting some reference must be made to the presence among us all through the meetings of the one to whom we owe the idea of the Congress—Sir Francis Younghusband. We have been so delighted to have him with us, and have felt his presence to be a real help in the discussions.

I hope it will not be out of place also to thank those who have been responsible for the arrangements here—Mr. Jackman and his devoted band of helpers. I think that, looking back on the last few days, we can say that the work of 1937 has followed well on the work of 1936. We had a great Congress in London for an entire fortnight last year, and those of us on the Executive Committee had a great deal of anxious thought as to what should succeed it. Oxford has often been called the home of lost causes. We shall none of us feel, after being inspired by the meetings we have had, that we have been concerned in a lost cause. We are confident that there is in the human mind and heart that which cannot rest purely and only upon a material conception of life, and that the spiritual side of life must find expression. In spite of totalitarian states and carelessness about religion, we are

confident that we are on the side that must ultimately be victorious.

I think at this closing meeting we may say that while we have maintained complete loyalty to our personal beliefs, we have been in agreement with nearly all that has been said, and that we have been glad to take council with those of other faiths and to join with them in putting things on a practical level so that we may apply in our individual lives the standards which have found expression during these days. I speak to you as a Christian believer, and I do so in the knowledge that there is a cord of duty and of sacrifice which should bind all those who have the religious outlook. I am reminded of the declaration of the Hebrew prophet when he was thinking what sacrifice he could offer to justify himself before his God. He came to the conclusion that it was not in sacrifices nor in burnt-offerings, but in a humble and a contrite heart that his God would be well pleased. It is in that spirit that the proceedings of the Congress have been carried on, and in that spirit we shall go forth to work for the promotion of fellowship among all the races of mankind.

Mr. YUSUF ALI (*summing up*)

I appreciate the honour of standing before you at the last Session in order to take a rapid glance at the great ideas that have been placed before us from time to time during the Congress. Before I do so it would be fitting also to acknowledge our indebtedness to the various people who have made the Conference such a success. Our Chairman tonight has mentioned two outstanding personalities to whom we owe so much: Sir Francis Younghusband and Viscount Samuel. May I also be permitted to mention the various authorities who have given us their hospitality?

We were received when we arrived by the Master of Balliol, Vice-Chancellor Dr. A. D. Lindsay, and the menfolk have had the hospitality of that splendid college, famed for its learning. After living there for these few days it is perhaps

not only for its learning but also for its hospitality that we shall remember it. The ladies and those gentlemen who were accompanied by ladies were received at Somerville, and Somerville has shown that it can entertain not only Oxford ladies but ladies from elsewhere, and also men, as those who dined there on Sunday evening can testify. We would also thank the other colleges that have kept their doors open for us.

Dr. Thomas's hospitality as Head of the Indian Institute was likewise much appreciated. Those of us who come from India found ourselves on familiar ground among the exhibits housed there, and our colleagues in the Conference found much to interest them. And today we have had the delightful hospitality of Dr. Major at Ripon Hall. Then there has been private hospitality to individual members by delightful hosts and charming hostesses, all in the Oxford tradition.

Besides all these, I hope it is permissible to mention the Sessional Chairmen, the very distinguished persons who have presided at our Sessions: Professor F. W. Thomas, Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, Sir Abdul Qadir, Dr. Willard L. Sperry, and Dame Edith Lyttelton—all well-known personalities whose presence among us added dignity and knowledge to our proceedings.

I hope the various speakers will not mind if I mention them collectively. I who have attended the whole of the meetings know that every word that has been said was said in the earnest spirit that we were out to encourage, and that they all contributed to that spirit of fellowship and understanding which it is the chief object of the Congress to promote.

We began with a message from our beloved Chairman, which set the note of all our proceedings. Sir Francis Younghusband, in spite of his illness, sent us a message in which he spoke of joy and gladness. He himself illustrates that message. We have found joy and gladness in receiving the thoughts of others and discussing them. Even when we disagreed, the criticism has contributed to further understanding. In gathering up the threads and taking with us the

precious memories of this Congress, we have something to dwell upon, something joyful to look back upon.

At our very first meeting we had great, instructive, and fruitful ideas from our Acting Chairman, Viscount Samuel. He reminded us that the problems of this world cannot be coped with by pure reason alone; there are emotional stresses and social difficulties that all go to make up the complicated structure not only of the individual but of society. We have to exorcize egotism and take our stand on the solid platform of understanding and goodwill.

I call to memory that great, comprehensive, historical view of comparative religion given by Dr. Robert Hume, under the title of *The Essentials of Religion*. In his analysis, like a chemist, he transformed metals and showed us the basis of them, the ultimate atom, indispensable and indestructible.

Dr. Alfred Hall, speaking on "The Call for Religion," pointed out that after all, the true office of religion is to help us to express the best in us and to take advantage of every opportunity we have in life to bring out that best and co-ordinate it with all the other interests we have, and thus build up a spiritual life that can lead us ever outwards and upwards.

None of us is ever likely to forget the Youth Symposium. It is a feature of our times that we call Youth into our councils so that we may listen to them, because everything that passes in their minds and hearts is of the utmost interest and importance to us. The future course of events will be influenced by the rising generation, and if we fail to learn their views we shall be under the disadvantage of not knowing the forces that will build the future and also of undoing our work in their eyes, because they will feel that we do not understand them.

One spoke to us as a traveller in many lands, and told us what Youth is thinking in Canada and America and the various hopes and fears of post-war youth. Another represented the Youth Group of the League of Nations Union. He naturally took an international point of view, and told us of the reactions of the youth of the nations on each other.

We had a young member of the Communist Party who frankly admitted not having any interest in religion, but yet who fitted into our scheme because he felt that some great master-key must be found to guide us through the chaos of the post-war world. Our young African friend, Prince Kessie of Ashanti, gave us his view from an entirely different angle of vision, and showed us that after all, the youth of all the races, nations, and creeds are thinking along similar lines, and that they feel that the generation that is passing away and the stress of the war has left them a legacy of responsibility which the coming generation would fail in their duty if they did not shoulder and understand.

I hope that at a later conference we may see a much larger proportion of young people, so that they may judge us by what we are trying to do and perhaps also by what we are trying to undo. The task before us and before them is the same—to construct a better order out of a debris of disappointed hopes and aspirations, a chaos of untried ideals.

May I mention at this point the devotional services held each day?—one conducted by a Hindu, one by a Muslim, the service in Christ Church Cathedral as representing the established Church of England, and the Buddhist service today. There may be differences of opinion as to whether people can enter into the devotional spirit of a religion to which they do not subscribe, but there can be no doubt that, given the right atmosphere, we are enabled to enter into the basic ideas underlying every earnest man's prayer and longing to reach the spiritual.

At the Public Meeting we had very valuable speeches, the famous speech of Dr. Maude Royden following that of our Hindu and Buddhist friends and my own humble plea as the last, on the "Need of Religion." As our Chairman reminded us, it was remarkable that five persons, each belonging to a different faith, each loyal to his or her own faith, should speak with a united voice on a common platform, on the needs of religion in general.

We shall remember the very earnest and eloquent appeal

of my country-woman, Begum Amiruddin. She gave us the Islamic view of religion, but I have heard it said by many that this view is not so very different from that held by all the others. That further opens our eyes to the fact that in whatever form we express our religious views, if they are expressed with true regard to basic and fundamental human needs, they will tend to converge to a point.

This morning we had the wonderful speech of Professor Buonaiuti. Even those who could not understand his beautiful language, saw him bring out his clear Italian accent and appreciated all the various accompaniments of southern eloquence that so vividly enforced his meaning. We were thrilled that even though he spoke to us in a language we could not understand, we ourselves felt the things he tried to express, even though we had to be content with the cold medium of a printed translation.

And lastly, we had our friend Mr. Rom Landau telling us of his experiences in the Near and Middle East, his new adventure, the adventure of infusing spirituality into politics.

Was not that a great and varied menu? It is wonderful to think that in this short time we have heard all these things, and had them placed before us in a way that enables us to compare one with another and to go away with the consciousness that our coming has not been in vain.

Let me try to sum up some of the great ideas that have been put before us, like gems that shine with various rays, like bricks on which we can build up our own religious conceptions.

Everyone will agree that this is a period of very rapid world changes, and it is therefore specially necessary that we should have a beacon or lodestar to steer by. We are engaged in a quest for this beacon or lodestar so that we can say to ourselves that whatever flux and change there may be, there is within us the capacity to look to that star to light our steps, to search out the beacon to give us direction.

Throughout the discussions, but especially in the Youth

Symposium, war and the post-war unsettlement have been often mentioned. No one can fail to be moved by the fact that the war was a tremendous cataclysm in every sphere of relationships, relationship of men to men, of men to women, of countries, races, social grades, social, political, and economic systems, one to another. The new Indian Constitution has writ large on it the co-operation of India with Great Britain during the war. However much we may regard that cataclysm as a catastrophe, the only thing we can do now is to approach future problems in such a way that we can realize the solidarity of mankind. It is very difficult to bring that about. What are the best means to that end? Some of the reactions of the post-war settlement seem to lead in the opposite direction from the one we thought we were travelling in. But we know that sometimes we have to travel East in order to go West. And we feel in an assemblage like this that the greater the danger, the greater is our need for working for our great ideals.

We find that everything is more or less mixed up in life, politics with economics, economics with religion, religion with history, and so on. Look at King Leopold's letter. He wants a rational organization of world economy in the widest sense, in which everyone can co-operate and join up and work whole-heartedly for the ideal of the New Jerusalem, the City of God in which the citizens rejoice in hope and present blessings, in which the stranger is received with love and not with suspicion.

We have noticed the contrast between those who are impressed with the mysticism of religion as opposed to those who lean to rationalism, but not one word was said that could mar the harmony with which our proceedings have been conducted. It is sincere faith that removes barriers, the religious spirit that pours a balm when other hopes have crumbled in the dust.

Professor Buonaiuti expressed our thought when he said that all we want to do is to keep the air pure for the community, to bring to bear all the light we can, whether from

reason, intuition, or mysticism, in order to carry out our ideals.

A contrast was drawn between the Abstract and Universal and the Concrete and Individual. Some preferred to tackle problems in the concrete and deal with the individual; others said that that was not enough, that we must take mankind in the mass; that concrete facts and single individuals were but raw materials for the web and pattern of life; that the Eternal is the Type or the Archetype, and the single thing or individual is but ephemeral. The analytical mind discerns nothing in the community but a collection of individuals, and looks upon humanity as an abstract term. To the mystic, any facts or details are matters of no moment except as pointing to the Whole, the Absolute, and the Universal. Such are limitations incident on our viewing such problems from particular points. What we have to do is to realize Oneness, both from a practical and from a spiritual basic point of view. We have unity in our individuality; all our faculties, tasks, and interests make up one complete Personality. Further, we have to realize our Unity in Humanity; my neighbour and I, though we seem to be different, have a Unity through our Creator who is One. Further, we have to realize the Unity of God's Purpose and Plan: without it the whole panorama in outer nature and in the world within us seems disjointed and aimless.

We have to try to understand ourselves and our relation to Nature and to universal principles, and we have to bend our spiritual gaze on the Nature of God.

Some believe that religion can only be viewed emotionally. Mere reason is not enough to move our hearts; we must suffer and love so that we may share in the suffering of others; and without those emotions we have merely the cold philosophy of the mind, which is insufficient. Others lay stress on Rationality: to them emotion is a dangerous guide unless checked and controlled by reason. Yet others hold that if we both understand and have emotional experience, that is not enough. In religion we must also have

that practical exemplification of the principles we preach and which ultimately shape life.

These few points are perhaps enough to provide us with material for a broad foundation for religious research, and if we think over them, and meditate on them, we shall draw fresh inspiration from them and shall find that we are indeed making progress in evolving our spiritual life.

By way of conclusion, let me quote you some beautiful lines of a celebrated Persian mystic. To give you an idea of their beautiful lilt and rhythm, I will recite them in Persian and then give you an English rendering of the words:

Man Tan shudam ;

Tu Jān shudi ;

Man tu shudam ;

Tu man shudi ;

Tā kas na gūyad

Ba'd az in,

Man digaram,

Tu digari.

I am the body ;
Thou art the soul ;
I am thou ;
Thou art I ;
Let no one say
Hereafter,
That I am other,
And thou art other.

Or, to take a more practical point of view of how unity can be achieved even in the face of such of our brethren as do not want it, an American poet has expressed it in homely language:

They drew a circle to shut me out—
A rebel, a heretic, a thing to flout!—
But love was wise and knew how to win ;
She drew a circle that took *them* in.

That brings us to the central point of our gathering. We want co-operation, unity, understanding, a joy in each other, faith and confidence in the ultimate goodness of things.

SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION

Mrs. ST. CLAIR STOBART commented on the delightful unanimity of the Conference, but thought that through fear of hurting one another's feelings there had not been a sufficiently clear definition of what religion is. Religion had been assumed to be a common characteristic of humanity, involving belief in God, brotherhood, and sacrifice, but one fundamental factor for unification had been omitted, namely, the assumption of an after life. It was this assumption which had given the churches throughout the world their hold over the people. Assumption alone, however, was not enough. Men today demanded scientific proof, and it was because the churches refused to consider the scientific proofs that they were losing their hold. Dean Inge had said that the moment we were asked to accept scientific proof for spiritual truth, the alleged spiritual truth became neither spiritual nor true, but the speaker believed that although certain spiritual truths could not be proved, the most fundamental, namely, survival after death, was susceptible to scientific proof, and that the recall to religion would not be effective until that proof was admitted, and, moreover, that its acceptance would be the most effective factor in the unification of races and creeds.

Mrs. BISHOP pointed out that at this year's Congress a greater emphasis had been placed upon the discussion, and that the level of the discussions had been much higher than had been the case last year. This shared and communicative experience had been one of the inimitable delights of the Congress, and the speaker hoped that the Movement would continue to be a Congress of Faiths and not a Congress of doubt. For this reason she was not persuaded that the participation of statesmen and people of the world would be a very great help. They were not always free, whatever their personal convictions might be, and little might be gained by bringing in people with high responsibilities and great names if they could not come whole-heartedly. We needed to guard against forgetting God. The power of such a work

came from God and from the angels, a power that was latent in our minds and could be discovered. It was this power, the power of the Holy Spirit, that had helped us to clarify our beliefs and to realize the essentials of religion.

Colonel LUARD said that we could not acquire the spirit of fellowship at any moment; it was just as much the result of technique and strenuous training as physical prowess was the result of physical training. It had been said that the idea of God was the interpretation of experience. We had words for the world without, but when we came to describe the world within we had to adapt those words for the purpose. We gradually became aware that Creation is still going on and that each of us had a part to play in it.

Mrs. HANBURY reminded the audience that in the past the struggle for truth and equality had often ended disastrously because man had depended too much on his own mind without first lifting that mind to be inspired by the author of his being. She suggested that at future meetings at least two minutes of silence be allowed at the commencement, so that the power of God might flow into our minds. By this means it might be found that all the deliberations would be lifted to a higher plane where some realization might be found of the purpose of God.

Dr. ALFRED HALL quoted a saying of Confucius: "Fishermen use baskets to catch fish; when they have caught the fish they neglect the baskets; teachers use words to convey ideas; when they have conveyed the ideas they forget the words. May it be mine to converse with men who forget the words." That seemed to be the main purpose of our Congress—to arrive at something deeper than words. Only by a fuller religion should we arrive at unity. Therefore we should develop our individual religions to the full and then we should attain the highest mystic experience.

Rev. L. J. BELTON had noticed a cleavage between those who maintained a rational approach and those who maintained

a mystical approach. He wondered whether that was not due to a confusion of terms. Were not both the scientific and the mystical approaches legitimate? Was the distinction not rather between the intellectual approach and the intuitional approach? But the intuitional approach led and must always lead to something rational because we lived in a rational Universe.

This Movement was the greatest thing in the speaker's life. He believed it to be the Great Idea before the world today. This did not mean that we had to give up our single allegiances, but it meant that we should all work for its fulfilment. He hoped that in time its headquarters might become a clearing-house for the findings of many similar movements.

Rev. OSWALD YOUNGHUSBAND pointed out that in his kinsman's book, *A Venture of Faith*, a certain dissatisfaction had been expressed with the bishops. Why did not Mr. Landau or Mr. Yusuf Ali tackle the bishops? With the bishops on our side we should also have the clergymen.

Mr. LEO BAKER said that a material sense gave rise to an atmosphere of worry and a spiritual sense to an atmosphere of love. How could these two circles of experience be made to come together? He had felt that it was particularly in the morning devotional services that the two circles had drawn together. Every one of the three services held during the Congress had mentioned the stages of consciousness through which man could pass.

Professor Buonaiuti had given the dynamics of religion, and each had felt moved out of the sphere of mere words into the sphere of experience. It was this reality of common experience that all treasured as something of real importance. It had been an historic moment through which we had passed. Together all had approached a little nearer to the centre which lies behind all the circles of men's lives. A definite stage in consciousness had been reached by humanity, and that had been the great value of the Congress.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Passages from the Sacred Scriptures, collected by Dr. R. E. Hume, to illustrate Address on "The Essentials of Religion" (see p. 29).

Advocacy of Peace and Non-injury ; Condemnation of Fighting, Killing, and Violent Force

CONFUCIANISM

"Persons without love cannot long dwell in adversity; they cannot long dwell in prosperity. The loving are at peace in love."—Analects 4. 2.

(Translated from the Chinese for the present writer by Professor Lucius Porter of Yen Ching University, Peiping, China. Compare Lyall, *Sayings of Confucius*, p. 14.)

"All men have a mind which cannot bear to see the sufferings of others. If men suddenly see a child about to fall into a well, they will experience a feeling of alarm and distress. Let them have their complete development; and they will suffice to love and protect all within the four seas."—Mencius 2. 1. 6. 1. 3. 7.

(Legge, *The Chinese Classics, with a Translation*, vol. 2.)

"When one subdues men by force, they do not submit to him in heart, but because their strength is not adequate to resist. When one subdues men by virtue, they are pleased in their hearts' core, and submit sincerely."—Mencius 2. 1. 3. 2.

(Legge, CCWT 2. 196, *The Chinese Classics Translated into English*, 1. 169-170.)

"There are men who say: 'I am skilful at marshalling troops!' 'I am skilful at conducting a battle!' They are great criminals."—Mencius 7. 2. 4. 1.

(Legge, CCWT 2. 2. 2. 479 ; CTE 1. 368.)

TAOISM

"Peace and quietude are esteemed by the wise man. The killing of men fills multitudes with sorrow; we lament with tears because of it."—Tao-Teh-King 31. 2. 4.

(Goddard, *Lao-tzu's Tao, and Wu Wei*, New York, Brentano, 1919, pp. 26, 27. Compare Legge's Translation in *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 39, p. 74.)

"Disastrous years follow in the wake of great armies."—Tao-Teh-King 30. 2.

(F. H. Balfour, *Taoist Texts, Ethical, Political, and Speculative*, p. 19.)

"Arms, however excellent, are unblest implements, detestable to all beings. Therefore he who possesses the Supreme (Tao) does not abide them."—An original translation from the Chinese.

(Compare R. E. Hume, *Treasure-House of the Living Religions*, p. 274. Compare also Carus, *Laotze's Tao-Teh-King, Chinese-English*, pp. 194-195.)

BUDDHISM

"Rise! Sit up! Learn steadfastly for the sake of peace."—Sutta Nipata 331.

(SBE 10. 2. 54.)

"Happy is the devotion of those who are peace."—Dhammapada 194.
(SBE 10. 1. 53.)

"A bhikku (*i.e.* a member of the religious Brotherhood) ought not intentionally to destroy the life of any being."—Mahavagga 1. 78. 4.

(SBE 13. 235.) Similarly Mahavagga 5. 10. 9 (SBE 17. 30).

"The arhat (*i.e.* religious person) is incapable of taking life wittingly."—Sandaka Sutta.

(*Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol. 5, p. 371, where the documentary reference for this passage is given as Majjhima Nikaya 1. 523.)

"Not for our life would we ever intentionally kill a living being."—Mahavagga 6. 31. 13.

(SBE 17. 117.)

"Friend! Let not quarrel arise, nor strife nor discord nor dispute."—Mahavagga 4. 16. 6.

(SBE 13. 343.) Similarly Mahavagga 10. 2. 2 (SBE 17. 293). Similarly again Mahavagga 10. 2. 20 (SBE 17. 306).

"The bhikku (*i.e.* a member of the religious Brotherhood) must be able to hear and to make others listen, able to learn, able to bear in mind, able to discern and to make others discern, skilful to deal with friends and foes, and no maker of quarrels."—Cullavagga 7. 4. 6.

(SBE 20. 261.)

"He lives as a binder together of those who are divided, an encourager of those who are friends, a peace-maker, a lover of peace, impassioned for peace, a speaker of words that make for peace."—Tevijja Sutta 2. 5.

(SBE 11. 190.)

ISLAM

"God calleth to the abode of peace."—Koran 10. 26.

(Rodwell, *The Koran, Translated from the Arabic*, p. 277, "Everyman's Library.")

"Cause not disorders in the earth."—Koran 2. 10.

(Rodwell 339.)

"(Saith the Lord): 'We have ordained that he who slayeth anyone, unless it be a person guilty of manslaughter or of spreading disorders

in the land, shall be as though he had slain all mankind; but that he who saveth a life, shall be as though he had saved all mankind alive.”—Koran 5. 35.

(Rodwell 489.)

“If two bodies of the faithful are at war, then make ye peace between them.”—Koran 49. 9.

(Rodwell 469.)

“Make peace between them with equity; and act with justice; for, God loveth those who act justly.”—Koran 49. 9 continued.

(Sale’s translation; various editions.)

CHRISTIANITY

“From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence—even of your lusts! Ye lust, and have not. Ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain. Ye fight, and war. Yet ye have not. Submit yourselves, therefore, to God. Draw nigh to God; and He will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands. And purify your hearts. Humble yourselves in the sight of God. And He shall lift you up.”—James 4. 1. 2. 7. 8. 10.

(Authorized, or King James, Version, from which translation the subsequent passages are quoted, except such as are indicated otherwise.)

“All they who take the sword shall perish with the sword.”—Matthew 26. 52. Similarly Revelation 13. 10.

“Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not covet. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”—Romans 13. 9. Similarly Matthew 19. 19.

“Blessed are the peace-makers; for, they shall be called the children of God.”—Matthew 5. 9.

“Be at peace with all men, if possible—so far as that depends on you.”—Romans 12. 18.

(Moffatt’s translation.)

“He who would love life, and enjoy good days—let him keep his tongue from evil, and his lips from speaking guile. Let him shun wrong, and do right. Let him seek peace, and make peace his aim.”—1 Peter 3. 10-11.

(Moffatt’s translation.)

The Principle of the “Golden Rule”

CONFUCIANISM

“Is there any one word which could be adopted as a life-long rule of conduct? Is not sympathy the word! Do not do to others what you would not like yourself.”—*Analects* 15. 23.

(Soothill, *Analects of Confucius*, pp. 747, 749. Compare Legge, CCWT 1. 301 and CTE 1. 226.)

"Surely you would not make a bower into a battlefield, nor a shrine of prayer into a scene of warfare! Have nothing which is obstructive of virtue. Seek not to vanquish others in cunning, in plotting, in war. If I slay a whole nation and annex the territory in order to find nourishment, wherein does the victory lie?"—Kwang Tze 24. 2.

(H. A. Giles, *Chuang Tzu, Mystic, Moralist, and Reformer*, p. 315. Compare Legge's translation in SBE 40. 95.)

"The tender and yielding conquer the rigid and strong. To compel by show of force is no gain to a nation."—Tao-Teh-King 36. 2. 3.

(Goddard, LT 29.) Similarly Tao-Teh-King 78. 1 (Goddard, LT 51).

TAOISM

"Pity the misfortunes of others. Rejoice in the well-being of others. Help them who are in want. Save men in danger. Rejoice at the success of others; and sympathize with their reverses, even as though you were in their place."—Tai-Shang Kan-Ying Pien, characters 196-228.

(R. K. Douglas, *Confucianism and Taoism*, p. 259. Compare Legge's translation in SBE 40. 237; Suzuki and Carus, *Tai-Shang Kan-Ying Pien*, pp. 17, 19, 53; Balfour, *Taoist Texts*, 103; Wiegner, *Moral Tenets and Customs in China*, 247.)

HINDUISM

"Do naught to others which, if done to thee, would cause thee pain."—Mahabharata 5. 39. 72-73, Udyoga Parvan.

(Monier-Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, p. 446, where the reference number for this passage is according to another method of verse-enumeration of the Mahabharata, namely, 5. 1517. Compare also four other translations of the passage: Dutt 5. 63-64; Roy 5. 126; E. W. Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 479; John Muir, *Metrical Translations from Sanskrit Writers*, p. 273.)

"One should never do to another that which one regards as injurious to one's own self. This, in brief, is the rule of righteousness."—Mahabharata 13. 113. 8, Shanti Parvan.

(Roy 11. 558. Compare Dutt 13. 250; Muir, MTSW 273.)

"This is the high religion which men of wisdom applaud: The life-breaths of other creatures are as dear to them as those of one's own self."—Mahabharata 13. 115. 21, Anushasana Parvan.

(Roy 11. 562. Compare Dutt 13. 252.)

"Men gifted with intelligence and purified souls should always treat others as they themselves wish to be treated."—Mahabharata 13. 115. 22, Anushasana Parvan.

(Dutt 13. 252. Compare Roy 11. 562.)

"Act in such a way that there may be peace."—Mahabharata 5. 78. 6, Udyoga Parvan.

(M. N. Dutt, *Mahabharata*, vol. 5, p. 117. Compare P. C. Roy's translation, *Mahabharata*, vol. 5, part 2, p. 246, where the reference number for this passage is Mahabharata 5. 77.)

"Do thou assure them, and establish peace for all."—Mahabharata 13. 166. 12, Anushasana Parvan.

(Roy 11. 773 and also Dutt's translation 13. 347.)

"One should abstain from all acts that are fraught with injury or malice. Whether in need of food and of the necessities of life, or transcending such need, one should be of virtuous disposition, and abstain totally from inflicting any kind of injury."—Mahabharata 12. 295. 24. 30, Shanti Parvan.

(Roy 10. 543. Compare Dutt's translation 12. 455.)

"One should never desire to extend one's own life by taking the lives of others."—Mahabharata 12. 298. 9, Shanti Parvan.

(Roy 10. 554. Compare Dutt's translation 12. 459.)

"Abstention from injury to all creatures in thought, word, and deed, kindness and gift are the permanent duties of the good."—Mahabharata 12. 162. 21, Shanti Parvan.

(Dutt 12. 241. Compare Roy's translation 9. 526.) Similarly Mahabharata 12. 278. 4-5 (Dutt 12. 418).

"All acts that are done without injuring any creature become serviceable to the doer both here and hereafter. Those acts that involve injury to others, destroy faith; and faith being destroyed, involves the destroyer in ruin."—Mahabharata 12. 264. 6, Shanti Parvan.

(Roy, 10. 370. Compare Dutt's translation 12. 394.)

"He attains to endless happiness who desires not to cause the sufferings or bonds or death to living beings, but desires the good of all."—Laws of Manu 5. 46.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit. Compare Buehler's translation in SBE 25. 167.)

"When one cultivates to the utmost the principles of his nature, and exercises them on the principle of reciprocity, he is not far from the path. What you do not like when done to yourself, do not do to others."—Doctrine of the Mean 13. 3.

(Legge, CCWT 1. 394; Legge, CCTE 1. 226.) This passage occurs also at Li Ki 28. 1. 32 (SBE 28. 305).

"Do not do to others what you would not like yourself."—Analects 12. 2.

(Soothill 561.)

"What I do not wish others to do to me, that also I wish not to do to them."—Analects 5. 11.

(Soothill 261, 263.)

BUDDHISM

"(Thinking) 'As I am, so are these; as these are, so am I,' identifying himself with others, let him not kill, nor cause anyone to kill."—Sutta Nipata 705.

(SBE 10. 2. 126-167.) Similarly Sutta Nipata 629 (SBE 10. 2. 112-113).

"All men fear death. All men love life. Remember that thou art like unto them. And do not kill, nor cause slaughter."—Dhammapada 129-130.

(SBE 10. 1. 36.)

"Is there a deed thou dost wish to do? Then bethink thee thus: 'Is this deed conducive to my own harm, or to other's harm, or to that of both? Then this is a bad deed, entailing suffering.' Such a deed thou surely must not do."—Ambalatthika-Rahul-Ovada Sutta.

(Mrs. C. F. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism, A Study of the Buddhist Norm*, a volume in the "Home University Library of Modern Knowledge," no date, p. 125, where the documentary reference for this passage is Majjhima Nikaya 1. 415. Compare the translation of the passage by Lord Chalmers in *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol. 5, p. 299.)

CHRISTIANITY

"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for, this is the law and the prophets."—Matthew 7. 12.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."—Matthew 19. 19; Matthew 22. 39; Mark 12. 31; Luke 10. 27; Romans 13. 9; Galatians 5. 14; James 2. 8—altogether seven times in the New Testament.

"As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."—Luke 6. 31,

Positive Means in the Attaining of Peace

CONFUCIANISM

"The moral man is able to make the people good. The moral man, by living a life of simple truth and earnestness, alone can help to bring peace and order in the world."—Doctrine of the Mean 33. 4, 5.

(Ku Hung-Ming, *Conduct of Life*, p. 59. Compare the translation by Legge, CCWT 1. 432-433 and CTE 1. 319.) The passage occurs also at Li Ki 28. 2. 65. 66; translated by Legge (SBE 28. 329).

"Seek to be in harmony with all your neighbours. Live in amity with your brethren. Tranquillize, and help, the lower people."—Shu King 5. 17. 2.

(SBE 3. 212. 213. Compare Legge, CCWT 3. 2. 490, where the documentary reference for this passage is Shu King 5. 17. 6.)

"They (*i.e.* the men of wisdom), wishing to be sincere in their thoughts, first extended their knowledge to the utmost. Such extension of knowledge lay in the investigation of things. Things being investigated, their knowledge became complete.

"Their knowledge being complete, their thoughts were sincere.

"Their thoughts being sincere, their hearts were then rectified.

"Their hearts being rectified, their persons were cultivated.

"Their persons being cultivated, their families were regulated.

"Their families being regulated, their States were rightly governed.

"Their States being rightly governed, the whole Empire was made tranquil and happy."—Great Learning, Text 4, 5.

(Legge, CCWT 358-359; CTE 1. 266.) This passage occurs also at Li Ki 39. 2-4. (SBE 28. 411-412.)

TAOISM

"Since he, the holy man, does not quarrel, therefore no one in the world can quarrel with him."—Tao-Teh-King 22. 2.

(Carus, *Canon of Reason and Virtue*, 88.) Similarly Tao-Teh-King 66. 4. (Carus, CRV 121.)

"Requite hatred with goodness."—Tao-Teh-King 63. 1.

(Carus, *Laotze's Tao-Teh-King, Chinese-English*, p. 129.)

"To those who are good to me, I am good. And to those who are not good to me, I am also good. Thus all get to be good.

"To those who are sincere with me, I am sincere. And to those who are not sincere, I am also sincere. Thus all get to be sincere."—Tao-Teh-King 49. 2.

(SBE 39. 91.)

"He is a just man who regards all parts from the point of view of the whole."—Kwang Tze 25. 10.

(H. A. Giles, CTMMR 347. Compare Legge's translation, SBE 40. 126.)

"He taught universal love and beneficence towards one's fellow-men without contentions, without censure of others."—Kwang Tze 24. 12.

(H. A. Giles, CTMMR 329. Compare Legge's translation, 40. 108.)

"Turn toward all creatures with a compassionate heart.

"Be faithful, filial, friendly, and brotherly. First rectify thyself; and then convert others. Take pity on orphans. Assist widows. Respect the old. Be kind to children. Show endurance in humiliation; and bear no grudge. Extend your help without seeking reward. Give to others; and do not regret or begrudge your liberality.

"Those who are thus, are good; people honour them. Heaven's reason gives them grace. Blessings and abundance follow them. Whatever they undertake will surely succeed."—Tai-Shang Kan-Ying Pien, characters 148-246. .

(Suzuki and Carus, TSKYP 52. 53. 54. Compare SBE 40. 237.)

HINDUISM

"May all the regions be without a foe for me! We hate thee not. May we have peace and safety!"—Atharva Veda 19. 14.

(R. T. H. Griffith, *Hymns of the Atharva-Veda, Translated*, 2. 274.)

"Where there is intelligence, there is forbearance. Therefore follow counsels of peace."—Mahabharata 2. 73. 5, Sabha Parvan.

(Roy 2. 195. Compare Dutt 2. 97.)

"If there were not amongst mankind persons equal to the earth in forgiveness, there would be no peace amongst them."—Mahabharata 3. 29. 25, Vana Parvan.

(Dutt 3. 42. Compare Roy 3. 83.)

"Those self-controlled truth-seers attain the supreme peaceful liberation whose impurities are removed, whose doubts are resolved, and who delight in the good of all beings."—Bhagavad Gita 5. 25.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit. Compare the translation by Davies 71, and by Telang, SBE 8. 66.)

"Thou shouldst perform acts looking to the universal good."—*Bhagavad Gita* 3. 20.

(Telang, *Bhagavad Gita, Translated into English Blank Verse*, 22. Compare E. J. Thomas, *Song of the Lord, Bhagavad Gita*, 24.) Similarly *Bhagavad Gita* 12. 4. (Davies 131.)

"The wise should work desiring to promote the general good."—*Bhagavad Gita* 3. 25.

(Davies 51.)

"By nature we are merciful, reluctant to give pain to anyone. We desire your well-being, as well as of others—even as we wish the good of ourselves."—*Mahabharata* 12. 82. 6, *Shanti Parvan*.

(Dutt 12. 123. Compare Roy 9. 267.)

"This is the utmost limit of usefulness of their fellows—that everyone should sacrifice his own life, wealth and thought and word; and do always what is beneficial to others."—*Bhagavata Purana* 10. 22. 35.

(S. Subba Rau, *Srimad Bhagavatam, Translated*, 2. 2. 113. Compare the translation by Dutt, *Prose English Translation of Srimad Bhagavatam*, 10. 107.)

"Ever seek to promote the good of others; and do evil to none; for, the best riches are universal benevolence."—*Vishnu Purana* 3. 8.

(H. H. Wilson, *Vishnu Purana, Translated from the Original Sanskrit*, the six-volume edition of 1864-1877, vol. 3, p. 86. Compare the translation by Dutt 3. 86.)

"God is most pleased with him who does good to others; who never utters abuse, calumny or untruth; who never covets another's wife or another's wealth; who bears ill-will towards none; who is always desirous of the welfare of all creatures."—*Vishnu Purana* 3. 8. 13-15. 17.

(H. H. Wilson 3. 85, with "God" in place of the Sanskrit designation for the Deity "Kesava." Compare Dutt 191. 192.)

BUDDHISM

"A truth-finder, laying aside cudgel and sword, lives a life of innocence and mercy, full of kindness and compassion for everything that lives. He heals divisions, and cements friendship; seeking peace, and ensuing it; for, in peace is his delight, and his words are ever the words of a peace-maker."—*Culla-Hatthi-Padopama Sutta*.

(*Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol. 5, pp. 128. 129, where the documentary reference for this passage is *Majjhima Nikaya* 1. 179.)

"Cultivating an unbounded friendly mind, continually strenuous night and day, he will spread infinite goodness through all regions."—*Sutta Nipata* 507.

(*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 10, part 2, p. 83.)

"The noble disciple, freed from covetousness, abides suffusing the whole world with heart possessed of kindness, wide-spreading, grown great and boundless, free from enmity, and peaceful."—*Samyutta Nikaya* 42. 8. 13. 4. 2.

(Pali Text Society, *Book of the Kindred Sayings, Samutta-Nikaya*, vol. 4, pp. 253-254, with the word "noble" in place of the technical Pali designation "Ariyan.")

"Lord! I give up my own will, and live according to the will of these venerable brethren. Our bodies, Lord, are different; but our minds, I think, have become one. In this way, Lord, do we live in unity and concord, without quarrels, looking at each other with friendly eyes. Certainly, Lord, do we live in earnestness, zeal, and resolvedness."

"May every living thing, feeble or strong, omitting none, seen or unseen, dwelling near or far, whether they be born, or yet unborn:—may every living thing be full of bliss!"—Sutta Nipata 145. 146.

(F. L. Woodward, *Some Sayings of the Buddha according to the Pali Canon*, p. 65. Compare SBE 10. 2. 25.)

ISLAM

"Overcome evil with good."—Koran 13. 22.

(Pickthall, *The Glorious Koran, An Explanatory Translation*, 251.)

"Turn aside evil with that which is better."—Koran 23. 98.

(Rodwell, *Koran*, 149.)

"Turn away evil by what is better. And lo! he between whom and thyself was enmity shall be as though he were a warm friend. But none attain to this save men steadfast in patience."—Koran 41. 34-35.

(Rodwell, *Koran*, 194-195.)

"O ye who believe! Carefully avoid suspicion. Verily, some suspicion is a sin. And do not play the spy, nor backbite each other."—Koran 49. 12.

(SBE 9. 240.)

"The believers, men and women, are protecting friends one of another."—Koran 9. 72.

(Pickthall, *Glorious Koran*, 200, where the documentary reference for this passage is Koran 9. 71.)

"Verily, God enjoineth justice and the doing of good and gifts to kindred. And He forbiddeth wickedness and wrong and oppression. He warneth you, that haply ye may be mindful. Verily, God hath knowledge of what ye do."—Koran 16. 92. 93.

(Rodwell, *Koran* 207.)

CHRISTIANITY

"Let us eagerly pursue the things that make for peace and the up-building of each other."—Romans 14. 19.

(Helen B. Montgomery, *Centenary Translation of the New Testament*, p. 430.)

"Walk worthily of the vocation wherein ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."—Ephesians 4. 1. 2. 3.

"The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace."—James 3. 18.

(W. G. Ballantyne, *The Riverside New Testament, A Translation from the Original Greek into the English of To-day*, p. 390.)

"Follow after peace with all men and holiness, without which no one shall see the Lord."

(Ballantine, RNT 383-384.)

"Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye were called in one body; and be ye thankful."—Colossians 3. 15.

God Involved in the Attaining of Peace

CONFUCIANISM

"The Most High God looked down on earth. His people's peace He sought."—Shi King 3. 1. 7. 1.

(William Jennings, *The Shih King, The Old Poetry Classic of the Chinese*, p. 286. Compare Legge, CCWT 4. 2. 448.)

"God leads men to tranquil security."—Shu King 5. 14. 2.

(SBE 3. 197. Compare Legge, CCWT 3. 2. 455.)

"Thy statutes, O Great King, I keep, I love;
So on the realm to bring peace from above.
Night and day do not I revere Great Heaven,
That thus Its favour may be given!"

Shi King 4. 1. 1. 7. 2. 4.

(Legge, *Chinese Classics Translated into English*, vol. 3; *Shu King, or The Book of Ancient Poetry, Translated into English Verse*, p. 354.)

"Heaven, to protect the inferior people, made for them rulers, and made for them instructors, that they might be able to be aiding to God, and secure the tranquillity of the four quarters of the empire."—Shu King 5. 1. 1. 7.

(Legge, CCWT 3. 2. 286. Compare SBE 3. 126.)

TAOISM

"The whole world will flock to him who holds the mighty form of Tao (The Supreme). They will come, and receive no hurt, but find rest, peace, and tranquillity."—Tao-Teh-King 35. 1.

(Lionel Giles, *The Sayings of Lao Tzu, Translated from the Chinese*, a volume in "The Wisdom of the East" Series, p. 21. Compare Goddard, *Lao-tzu's Tao*, p. 28.)

"The good commander is not imperious. The good fighter is not wrathful. The greatest conqueror does not wage war. This is the imitation of Heaven."—Tao-Teh-King 68. 1. 2.

(W. G. Old, *The Simple Way, Lao-tze, A New Translation of the Tao-Teh-King*, 1904 edition, p. 152. Compare SBE 39. 111; Carus, CRV 122-123; Goddard, *Lao-tzu's Tao*, p. 28.)

"He who serves in harmony with the Tao (The Supreme) will not subdue the empire by force of arms; such a course is wont to bring retribution in its train."—Tao-Teh-King 30. 1.

(Lionel Giles, SLT 41. Compare SBE 39. 72.)

"The true sage, when in obscurity, causes those around him to forget their poverty. When in power, he causes princes to forget their ranks and emoluments, and to become as though of low estate. He rejoices exceedingly in all creation. He exults to see Tao (The Supreme) diffused among his fellow-men, while suffering no loss himself. Although silent, he can instil peace, and by his mere presence cause men to be to each other as father and son. He makes God his guide; and men make him theirs."—Kwang Tze 25. 1.

(H. A. Giles, CTMMR 336-337. Compare SBE 40. 115.)

"They [that is, true religionists] proceed to be the people of God. If men revere them, they rejoice not. If men insult them, they are not angered. But only those are capable of this who have passed into the eternal harmony of God."—Kwang Tze 23. 12.

(H. A. Giles, CTMMR 309-310. Compare SBE 40. 89.)

HINDUISM

"Him Who is the Constant among the inconstant, the Intelligent among the intelligencies, the One among the many, Who grants desires—the wise, who perceive Him as standing in oneself, they and no others have eternal peace."—Katha Upanishad 5. 13.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit. Compare R. E. Hume, *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*, 357-358.)

"The Overlord, on Whom the worlds do rest in the midst of confusion, the Creator of all, of manifold forms, the One Embracer of the Universe—by knowing Him as kindly, one attains peace for ever."—Svetasvatara Upanishad 4. 13. 14.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit. Compare Hume, TPU 404.)

"The [Divine] One, Who rules over every single source, in Whom this whole world comes together, the Lord, the Blessing-giver, God Adorable—by revering Him, one goes for ever to this peace."—Svetasvatara Upanishad 4. 11.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit. Compare Hume, TPU 404.)

"(Saith the Lord): 'I am the same toward all that live. I have no foe, no favourite. Whoe'er devoutly worships ME—they are in ME, and I in them. Who worships ME devotedly, however sinful he may be—he is to be accounted good, because he is of right resolve. Soon he becomes a pious soul, and cometh to eternal peace.'"—Bhagavad Gita 9. 29. 30. 31.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit. Compare R. E. Hume, *Treasure-House of the Living Religions*, p. 270.)

"Righteous men are generally distressed by the distresses of mankind. That, verily, is the supreme worship of the Person Who is the Universal Spirit."—Bhagavata Purana 8. 7. 44.

(An original translation from the Sanskrit, with "righteous men" to represent the Sanskrit word "sadhu." Compare John Muir, *Metrical Translations from Sanskrit Writers*, p. 275; S. Subba Rau, *Srimad Bhagavatam*, 2. 1. 35.)

ISLAM

"The word for the Merciful Lord is 'Peace' (Salam)."—Koran 36. 58.
(Pickthall, *Glorious Koran*, 453.)

"He is God, Who knows the unseen and the visible. He is the Merciful, the Compassionate, the King, the Holy, the Peace-giver."—Koran 59. 22. 23.
(SBE 9. 227.)

"God is your Lord and our Lord. Let there be no strife between us. God will make us all one. And to Him shall we return."—Koran 42. 14.
(Rodwell 272.)

"God will heal the bosoms of a people who believe, and will take away the wrath of their hearts."—Koran 9. 14-15.
(Rodwell 472.)

"Whatever the subject of your disputes, its decision doth rest with God."—Koran 42. 8.
(Rodwell 371.)

"God will guide to paths of peace him who shall follow after His good pleasure, and will bring them out of the darkness to the light. And to the straight path will He guide them."—Koran 5. 18.
(Rodwell 487-488.)

CHRISTIANITY

"Be fully equipped. Take courage. Be of one mind. Live in peace. Then the God of love and peace will be with you."—2 Corinthians 13. 11.
(W. G. Ballantine, RNT 315.)

"The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds."—Philippians 4. 7.

"May the God of peace Himself give you peace at all times and in every way."—2 Thessalonians 3. 16.
(H. B. Montgomery, CTNT 560.)

"Now the God of peace make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight."—Hebrews 13. 20-21.

(Some of the foregoing selections, together with many more, may be found in R. E. Hume, *Treasure-House of the Living Religions*, Charles Scribner's Sons, Publishers, New York and London.)

INDEX

Abdallah, Amir, 151
 Acaranga Sutra, 35-8
 Ahmad, Aftab-ud-din-, 139
 Ali, A. Yusuf, 87-92, 155, 162-9
 Amiruddin, Begum Sultan Mir, 24-5, 95,
 97-111, 138
 Asil, Naji Bey Al, 151
 Asoka, King, 40
 Atma, 48-9

 Bahai Bureau, International, 47
 Baha'u'llah, 47
 Baker, Leo, 23, 25, 155, 172
 Belton, Rev. L. J., 111-2, 171
 Bergson, Henri, 122, 127, 137
 Birkett, Prof., 117
 Bishop, Mrs., 47, 170
 Bounnet, Dr., 67
 Brahma, 42
 Brahman, 40, 48
 Brown, Sir Frank, 161-2
 Browne, Sir Thomas, 15
 Brunner, Emil, 13
 Buddha, Gautama, 8, 34, 39-43, 49, 81-3,
 137
 Buddhism, 31, 39-43, 48-9, 86
Buddhism in Translations (Warren), 42
 Buddhist Mission, World, 7-8
 Bullock, Mrs., 112
 Buonaiuti, Prof., 117-41, 147
 Burma, 7-8

 Calvinism, 19
 Canada, 57-8
 Canterbury, Archbp. of, 8-9
 Carlyle, Thomas, 9-10
 Carpenter, J. E., 40
 Carrit, Gabriel, 60-2
 Carter, Vivien, 24
 Caste-system, Indian, 39-40
 China, 41, 60, 63
 Christianity, 66, 126, 130-2, 134-5, 136
 Columbus, Christopher, 6
 Communism, 111, 113, 150, 165

Conference on Church Community and
 State (Oxford, July 1937), 24
 Confucius, 171
 Cook, Brian, 55-60

 Dank, Mrs., 48, 113
 Darwin, Charles, 18
 Davids, Mrs. Rhys, 48-9, 137
Decline of the West (Spengler), 5, 105
 Dharma, 49
 Diogenes, 69
 Disarmament Conference, 58
 Dodwell, Mrs., 24, 112, 157

 Eddington, Prof., 88
 Edib, Mme Halidi, 95
 Ethical Culture Society, 33
 Evans, R. C. T., 70
Evolution Créatrice, 127

 Faraday, Michael, 18
 Fascism, 86, 150
 Forgiveness, doctrine of, 21
 French Revolution, 67-8

 Gandhi, 68-9
 Gavernitz, Dr. S., 70
 Germany, 60, 62-4, 67
 Gollan, John, 60, 62-5
 Gorky, Maxim, 76
 Gosvami, Pandit A. B., 77-80, 113

 Hall, Dr. Alfred, 8-25, 137, 164, 171
 Hanbury, Mrs., 171
 Heard, Gerald, 12, 25
 Hebrews, Gospel according to the, 23
 Hillel, Rabbi, 14
 Hinayana Branch of Buddhism, 41
 Hindusim, 41, 78, 80
 Hitler, 86, 150
 Humanism, 25
 Hume, Prof. Robert E., 29-47, 50-1, 76,
 85-6, 164

Ibn Sa'ud, King, 151
Ikhwan-us-Safa, 88
 India, 24, 39, 68-9
 Indra, 42
 Inge, Dr., 67-8, 170
 Internationalism, 6, 15, 97
 International Youth Secretariat, 62
 Isaiah, 23
 Italy, 14-15, 60, 63

Jackman, Arthur, 50, 161
 Jacobi, Prof., 35
 Jainism, 31, 34-9, 42-3, 48, 86
 James, Wm., 43
 Japan, 41, 60, 63
 Jeans, Sir James, 88, 98
 Jeremiah, 23
 Jesus, 10, 23, 78-9, 87, 131, 136
 Jews, Persecution of, 61, 64
 John the Baptist, 23
 Jones, Sir Henry, 10
 Judaism, 16, 35

Kant, Immanuel, 11
 Karma, 21
 Kayali, Dr., 151
 Kellogg Pact, 58
 Kelvin, Lord, 10, 18
 Kepler, 18
 Kessie of Ashanti, Prince, 65-9
 Kolisko, Dr., 49
 Krishna, 81

Landau, Rom, 136, 145-57
 Lao Tse, 145
 Laski, Prof. 68
 League of Nations, 58, 60, 62-3, 77, 100, 164
 Lenin, 86
 Leopold, King of the Belgians, 49, 77, 92
 Lindsay, Dr. A. D., 162
 Luard, Col., 171
 Lyttelton, Dame Edith, 145-7, 156-7

Mahavamsa or *Great Chronicle* of Ceylon, 40
 Mahavira, 34-9
 Mahayana Branch of Buddhism, 41
 Mahinda, 40
 Major, Dr., 163
 Martineau, James, 18
 Mass, the, 21

Maude, Aylmer, 24, 70, 113, 138
 Maung, Maung Aye, 7-8, 81-4
 Mitchison, Naomi, 70-1
 Montgomery, Mrs., 139
 Moore, J. H., 42
 Moses, 23
 Mudaliar, Sir A. Ramaswami, 55, 71
 Muhammad, 102-3
 Muhammadanism, 95-6, 102-5, 109-10, 150
 Müller, Max, 14
 Mussolini, 86

Nationalism, 6, 25, 59, 63
 Nazis, the, 67, 86
 Nazism, 150
 Netherlands, 14
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 18, 88
 Nietzsche, 117

Pali Text Society, 48
 Patriotism, 6
 Payne, F. J., 137
Philosophy of Religion, 13
Place of Christianity among the Religions of the World, 40
 Psychology, 11

Qadir, Sir Abdul, 50, 95-7

Racial superiority, 67-8
Religio, 141
 Rig-Veda, 35
 Roman Catholic Church, 21, 126, 136
 Roman Catholic Modernist Movement, 117
 Royden, Dr. Maude, 84-7
 Russia, 7, 86-7, 107, 111, 113

Sacred Books of the East, 35-6
 St. Anselm, 126
 St. Benedict, 21
 St. Paul, 131
 Samuel, Visct., 1-2, 5-7, 75-7, 92, 161-2, 164
 Sanskrit Scriptures, 36
 Sassoon, Siegfried, 6
 Sat-Gurus, 80
Sayings of Buddha, 42
 Schleiermacher, 133
Secret Lore of India, 13
 Shahristani, Sheikh Said, 150

- Söderblom, Archbishop, 91
Sources of Civilization, 25
 Spain, 60, 63
 Spencer, Herbert, 118, 120
 Spengler, Oswald, 5, 104-5
 Sperry, Willard L., 117-8, 140-1
 Steiner, Rudolf, 157
 Stobart, Mrs. St. Clair, 170
- Teape, Rev. W. M., 13
Thirteen Principal Upanishads, 29
 Thomas, Prof. F. W., 29-30, 163
 Tolstoy, 24
Treasure-House of Living Religions, 29
 "Tri-Pitaka," Buddhism's, 39
 Tyrell, George, 117-8
- Upanishads, 34, 36, 48, 137
- Varieties of Religious Experience*, 43
 Varvaresos, Prof., 152
- Wallas, Graham, 9
 War, failure of, 25
 War, menace of, 60-1, 69-70
 Watts, Alan, 49, 69-70
 Wesleys, the, 19
Will to Believe, 43
 Woodworth, Dr., 67
 World War, 5, 19, 21, 56-7, 82, 100
 World Youth Congress, 61
World's Living Religion, 43
- Yajnavakya, 137
 Younghusband, Sir Francis, 1, 5, 13, 29,
 91-2, 97, 148, 161-3
 Younghusband, Rev. Oswald, 172
- Zarathustra, 123-4, 134