

Studies in Sufism

STUDIES IN SUFISM

#####

<u>CONTENTS.</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
M.M. Zuhuru' Din-Ahmad: "MYSTIC TENDENCIES OF ISLAM"	263
Aristotle: Persian Mss. "ON PHILOSOPHY"	87
Amir Ali: "THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM"	141
Averroes: "THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY".	217
Anne Aucott: "TRANCE, EVOLUTION, LIFE & SUBJECTIVITY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE".	560
The Bab: "THE BAYAN OR SCRIPTURE OF THE BABIS".	56
E.G. Browne: "THE BABIS OF PERSIA".	73
C. Bjerregaard: "SUFİ INTERPRETATION OF OMAR KHAYYAM"	106
N.G. Bhattacharya: "ON SIDDHA YOGA".	565
N. Briggs; "SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE IN MYSTICISM".	588
V. Bhattacharya: "NOTES ON GAUDAPADA MANDUKYA KARİKA"	661
H.K. Challoner: "BLIND TEACHERS OF THE BLIND."	40
J. Beattie Crozier: "CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE."	165
W.H. Campbell: "NATURE AND GOD".	199
Major C.H. Douglas: "SOCIAL CREDIT".	1
Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION".	19
C.C. Everett: "VEDANTA & SANKHYA PHILOSOPHIES".	185
A.M. Fairbairn: "PESSIMISM, EASTERN & WESTERN".	161
A. Gibson: "BALZAC'S MYSTICAL NOVEL 'SERAPHITA' ".	97
Al-Gazzali: "WORSHIP IN ISLAM".	211
Nolini Kanta Gupta: "PHYSICS OR PHILOSOPHY".	579
Al-Ghazzali: "CONFESSIONS".	667
F. Huet: "CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM".	193
W.D.P. Hill: "INTRODUCTION TO BHAGAVAD GITA."	347
T. Hughes: "DICTIONARY OF ISLAM".	462 & 496
W.R. Inge: "THE TEACHING OF PLOTINUS".	361
Hanni Mirza Jani: "HISTORY OF THE BABIS".	45
Jones: "PEOPLE OF THE MOSQUE".	382
J. Kennedy: "BASILITES' BUDDHIST GNOSTICISM IN ALEXANDRIA."	224
Vedanta Kesari: Edl. "A MAYAVADIC CRITICISM OF AUROBINDO'S METAPHYSIC."	252
Earnest Kirk: "EDITORIALS" in "LIFE".	309

The Fallacy of Imagination—No Neutrality in this war—Science and Selfishness—Art and Science—The Mesmerism of Sanskrit—Jeans' Pessimism Concerning Civilisation The way to Truth—The Proper Place of Idealism—The War and the Inner Calm—The Mistaken Materialism of M.N. Roy—J. Krishnamurthy's teaching on Evil.

Inayat Khan: "THE WAY OF ILLUMINATION."	337
Joseph: "BERKELEY'S & KANT'S IDEALISM".	371
B.K. Kottar: "LITERARY AESTHETIC AND METAPHYSICAL STUDIES" (Second series)	502
Russia – Ouspensky – Wassermann – Fear of the Machine – Chinese Music – Mannheim on Society Beauty in woman – Tchekoy – Stefan Zweig – Emily Bronte – Creative Imagination – Japanese Poetry – Heine – Gomaliel Bradford – Morality – Pirandello – Chinese Yoga – Anonymity of the Ancients – Action versus Contemplation – French Culture – The Myth – Drugs – Mathematics and a Mystical Universe.	
D.B. Macdonald: "THE LIFE OF AL-GHAZZALI".	167,680
M.S. Mackenzie: "PERSONALITY".	291
Mohammed Missree: "MYSTICAL MEANING OF SUFI TERMS".	458
Mysindia Editor: "A CRITIQUE OF THEOSOPHY"	528
H.A. Overstreet: "THE VOID OF PLOTINUS".	390
E.H. Palmer: "ORIENTAL MYSTICISM".	28 & 459
E.H. Palmer: "SUFI INTERPRETATION OR OMAR KHAYYAM".	35
Bernard Palmer: "THE CASE FOR MEDIUM SIZED TOWNS".	70
Sri Krishna Prem: "YOGA ON THE BHAGVAT GITA".	408
Sri K. Prem: "YOGA OF THE KATHOPANISHAD".	444
Sister Pavita: "ORDEALS OF THE PATH".	567
M.N. Roy: "SCIENCE AND SOCIETY".	37
M.N. Roy: "PRINCIPLES OF POSTWAR INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION".	58
P.C. Rao: "SOME INDIAN RELIGIONS".	209
Rice: "A SYSTEM OF EDUCATION".	234
Anilbaran Roy: "THE LAW OF KARMA".	261
M.N. Roy: "POST-WAR PROSPECTS FOR PROGRESSIVISM"	296
M.N. Roy: "CRISIS OF SPIRITUAL AUTHORITARIANISM"	342
Swami Ramdas: "EDITORIALS".	644
The Name Practice – Awakening Spirituality Spiritual Hypocrisy – Serve God in the Distressed – God the Person – The New Birth – Be Dynamic – Mission of Human Life – Sages Fight Dark Forces – The Greatest Gain – Life is for Service.	
T.N. Ramaswamy: "A CRITIQUE OF ROY'S WRITINGS".	656

Suryanarayana Sastry: "ADVITA & PROGRESS".	130
C.T. Srinivasan: "IS VEDANTA A SCIENCE OF REALITY:"	106
T.E. Slater: "THE PROBLEM OF PAIN."	155
A. Srinivasan: "BERKELEY AND SANKARA".	159
E. Sell: "THE SUFI ALLEGORY OF SALAMAN & ABSAL."	204
Swami Siddeheswaranda: "PARIS LECTURES".	236
K.D. Sethna: "THE CURRENT OF INSPIRATION".	279
K.D. Sethna: "ALDOUS HUXLEY TURNS MYSTIC".	283
K.D. Sethna: "INDIAN THOUGHTS AND ENGLISH WORDS."	287
John Spiers: "INDIAN ART MUST MODERNISE."	302
K.D. Sethna: "SRI AUROBINDO AND BODILY AGE."	403
K.D. Sethna: "THE WAR BEHIND THE WAR".	531
K.D. Sethna: "A PLEA FOR SPENSER".	538
K.D. Sethna: "HAVELOCK ELLIS'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY".	541
C.T. Srinivasan: "MEANING & FUNCTION OF REASON".	546
Shankaran: "THE SCIENCE OF LIFE".	549
Maharaj Sahib: "SOLACE TO RADHASOAMI SATSANGIS".	553
K.D. Sethna: "SRI AUROBINDO' TEACHINGS".	607
K.D. Sethna: "THE MUSE AND THE MYSTIC".	631
Dr Paul Tuxen: "NAGARJUNA'S NEGATIVISM."	120
K.C. Varadachari: "SRI AUROBINDO & HIS PHILOSOPHY".	257
S. Vadecarr: "VEGETARIANISM NO PANACRA".	642
R. Visweswara Rao: "SUGGESTIONS IN EVERYDAY LIFE".	658
L.E. Whipple: "INTELLIGENCE AS UNDERSTANDING AND AS BEING."	90
Hugh Ross Williamson: "THE NEW CLERGYMAN".	634

ADDENDA:

F.E. Keay: "KABIR AND HIS FOLLOWERS."	673
Philo: "ON THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE OF THE THERAPEUTAK."	681
Garreta Busey: Review of Sorokin's "Crisis of the Age"	684

Major C.H. Douglas: "SOCIAL CREDIT".

It refuses to admit, as a fact, anything which cannot be demonstrated, and as a theory, anything which does not fit the facts. For example, the classical ideal contends that men "ought" to be good, brave and virtuous. The modern, that it does not understand the meaning goodness, that bravery and virtue are not capable of exact definition, and, that so far as the word "ought" has any meaning, it postulates the existence of a force so far undemonstrated.

The logical outcome of the classical ideal is to lay the emphasis of any observed defects in the social organisation on defects in the characters of the persons composing the society. Wars occur because people are wicked, poverty, because people are idle, crime, because they are immoral. Material progress, which in its essence is applied Science, is repulsive to the Classical mind, because it does, in fact, stultify the rigid Classical ideal. Conversely, the scientific attitude tends to the opposite extreme, towards what is called Determinism; that people's actions, thoughts, and morals, are the outcome of more or less blind forces to which they are subjected, and in regard to which, both censure and praise are equally out of place.

It is probable, that as in many controversies, there is a good deal to be said for both points of view, but it is even more probable that approximate truth lies in appreciation of the fact that neither conception is useful without the other. It is probable that in the less fortunately situated strata of society, a theory of economic Determinism would be a sound and accurate explanation for the actions of 98 per cent of the persons to whom it might be applied; that those persons are, in fact, obliged to act and think in accordance with limitations which are imposed upon them by their environment. In short, that their environment is more powerful in shaping them, than they are in shaping their environment. But this is not true of their more fortunate contemporaries. There are, without a doubt, circumstances in the world, in which the personal

(continued from the previous page) conceptions of individuals can have powerful and far-reaching consequences on their immediate and even national or continental environment.

All this is sufficiently obvious, but the important idea to be drawn from it, is that before human ideals (including the Classical and religious ideals) can be brought into any effective relationship with and control by the great mass of the population, that population must be released from the undue pressure of economic forces.

A clear understanding of the circumstances in which personality is of importance in effecting environment, and, on the other hand, the circumstances in which it is unreasonable to expect the development of personality which may be considered satisfactory in a pragmatic sense is of the first importance to a balanced consideration of the difficulties and dangers which beset the civilised world at the present time, as well as to the framing of proposals to meet the situation. No one, having devoted any consideration to the subject, can fail to feel exasperation at the exhortations of the sentimentalist forever clamouring after a "change of heart." What effect on his particular difficulties is it going to have, if the miner, abandoning self-interest goes to his employer and offers to accept half his present wages? Or the mine-owner, faced with a loss, who raises his men's wages? What effect on the dividends of the shopkeeper already in debt to his bank, and doubt as to the source from which he shall pay his next week's rent, and meet the difference on his overdraft, does it have, if smitten with the sudden desire to apply the golden rule to business, he sells his goods at half their cost to him, because he knows his clientele, who are coal-miners, cannot afford more; thus accelerating his progress to the bankruptcy court and the cessation of his activities as a distributor? What is the use of epileptic addresses on the criminality of war, when the enemies' aeroplanes, if not stopped, propose dropping poison gas bombs on a population which has, probably, not the faintest understanding of the

(continued from the previous page) *cacus belli*.

On the other hand, no one who has attempted to obtain a hearing for concrete proposals of a social nature from persons who seemed from their position in the world to be favourably situated in respect of their furtherance, can fail to have realised that a difficulty is always met with, in establishing a common point of view; that in fact, it is a condition of executive position-holding, that the point of view shall be in the highest degree, and in the narrowest sense, conservative. It is not an unfair description of the situation to say that those persons who in the main are anxious for changes in the social structure are powerless to effect them, while persons more favourably situated to bring them about, are rarely anxious to do so. There is not much difference in the "heart" of the two descriptions of person; the difference in behaviour arises from the fact that one is reasonably satisfied with his lot, the other is not.

The industrial unrest which is disrupting the world at the present time, can be traced without difficulty to an increasing dissatisfaction with the results of the productive and distributing systems. Not only do people want more goods and more leisure, and less regimentation, but they are increasingly convinced that it is not anything inherent in the physical world which prevents them from attaining their desires.

It is also a fact, that never during the past few decades have we been free from an unemployment problem, and it is also a fact that never during the past fifty years has any industrial country been able to buy its own production with the wages, salaries, and dividends available for that purpose, and in consequence, all industrial countries have been forced to find export markets for their goods.

Everyone capable of any sort of work should, by some powerful organisation, be set working for eight or any other suitable number of hours a day. To achieve this end, the use of labour-saving machinery should be discouraged, all scientific effort

(continued from the previous page) should be removed from industry (as was at first done in Russia), and, in particular, modern tools, processes, and the application to industry of solar energy in its various forms should be vigorously suppressed. Failing an alternative, one should dig holes and fill them up again. All this is the logical outcome of the attitude, not merely of the orthodox employer (although he may not realise it), but of the orthodox socialist, and it ought to be clearly recognised.

The other alternative, while recognising the necessity for discipline in the world, does not concern itself with that necessity in considering the modern productive process. It surveys the facts, finds an inherent incompatibility between the substitution of solar energy for human energy, on the one hand, and the retention of a financial and industrial system based on the assumption that work is the only claim to goods, on the other hand, and takes as its objective the delivery of goods, making the objective always subordinate to human individuality.

The vast majority of discussions which take place in regard to industrial problems are prevented from arriving at any conclusion from the fact that the disputants do not realise the premises on which their arguments are based, and in many cases use words (and "justice" is an example of such words which beg the whole question at issue).

It is patent that, in spite of this enormous actual and potential reservoir of the goods for which mankind has a use, a large proportion of the population is unable to get at them. What is it, then, which stands in between this enormous reservoir of supply and the increasing clamour of the multitudes, able to voice, but unable to satisfy their demand? The answer is so short as to be almost banal. It is Money. And we shall see, the position into which money and the methods by which it is controlled and manipulated have brought the world, arises, not from any defect or vice inseparable from money (which is probably one of the

(continued from the previous page) most marvellous and perfect agencies for enabling co-operation, that the world has ever conceived), but because of the subordination of this powerful tool to the objective of what it is not unfair to call a hidden government.

One of the first facts to be observed as part of the social ideal which leans for its sanctions on rewards and punishments, is the elevation of the group ideal and the minimising of individuality, i.e. the treatment of individuality as subordinate to, e.g. nationality. The manifestations of this idea are almost endless. We have the national idea, the class or international idea, the identification of the individual with the race, the school, the regiment, the profession, and so forth. There is probably no more subtle and elusive subject than the consideration of the exact relation of the group in all these and countless other forms, to the individuals who compose the groups. But as far as it is possible to sum the matter up, the general problem seems to be involved in a decision as to whether the individual should be sacrificed to the group or whether the fruits of group activity should be always at the disposal of the individual. It is quite incontestable that every condition tending to subordinate the individual to the group is, at the moment, fostered. Institutions which would appear to have nothing in common and to be, in fact, violently opposed, can be seen on closer investigation to have this idea in common, and to that extent to have no fundamental antagonism. Pre-war Germany was always exhibited as being reactionary, feudal, and militaristic to an extent unequalled by any other great power. Post-war Russia is supposed by large masses of discontented workers, to be the antithesis of all this. But the similarity of the two is daily becoming more apparent.

It is significant that the arguments voiced from all of these quarters are invariably appeals to mob psychology—"Europe must be saved," "Workers of the World unite," etc. The appeal is away from the conscious-reasoning individual, to the unconscious

(continued from the previous page) here instinct. And the "interests" to be saved, require mobs, not individuals.

No consideration of this subject would be complete without recognising the bearing upon it of what is known as the Jewish Question; a question rendered doubly difficult by the conspiracy of silence which surrounds it. At the moment it can only be pointed out that the theory of rewards and punishments is Mosaic in origin; that finance and law derive their main inspiration from the same source, and that countries such as pre-war Germany and post-war Russia, which exhibit the logical consequences of unchecked collectivism, have done so under the direct influence of Jewish leaders. Of the Jews themselves, it may be said that they exhibit the race-consciousness idea to an extent unapproached elsewhere.

The Jews are the protagonists of collectivism in all its forms, whether it is camouflaged under the name of Socialism, Fabianism, or "big business", and that the opponents of collectivism must look to the Jews for an answer to the indictment of the theory itself. It should in any case be emphasised that it is the Jews as a group, and not as individuals, who are on trial, and that the remedy, if one is required, is to break up the group activity.

The consequences of the exaltation of the group over the individual have often been pointed out in various forms of words, as well as having been demonstrated sufficiently in such countries as Russia and Germany, but it would be unduly optimistic to say that they are generally recognised or understood. And the reason for this is not far to seek. It is possible so to twist the meaning of words, that policies which result in conditions which are progressively obnoxious to the majority of persons affected by them, can yet obtain a considerable amount of support, by an appeal to high-sounding words such as democracy, justice, and equality.

And yet it is patent that the modern world can only be operated through a liberal use of the group

(continued from the previous page) idea. If we are to have great co-operative undertakings, by which alone, so far as we are aware, mankind can be freed from the necessity of devoting the major portion of his day to the acquisition of sufficient food, clothing, and shelter from the weather, there must be a submission by those concerned in such enterprises to a given policy, for instance, of production. This is, of course, common sense, and a matter of common observation, and to the extent that there is a legitimate relation between the group interest thus formed, and the personal interests, is sound in every way.

There is probably more nonsense spoken and written around the words freedom and liberty, than in regard to any other two words in the English language. As a result of this, we have been treated to a dissertation by Signor Mussolini is mistaken. Liberty will come into its own, although it is quite possible that two groups which appear to be enemies of it and have much in common, including quite possibly, a similar origin, i.e. Bolshevism and Fascism, may be necessary to clear the minds of the public of much of the misconception which surrounds the idea, by demonstrating what it is not.

The whole of our modern civilisation is hedged in, distorted, and confused by a number of limitations which have no validity other than that which we choose to give them.

Legalism is becoming an obsession. Yet non-automatic laws rest upon a very insecure foundation. When we see, as we do, statements in leading European and American journals to the effect that civilisation is tottering, it may be inferred without much difficulty that it is this fabric of non-automatic rules and regulations which seems to the writers to be in danger. The laws which govern the combination of oxygen and hydrogen, or the rate of acceleration of a stone dropped over a cliff, are never seriously endangered by any of the events to which so much importance is attached in wall Street and Lombard Street.

If we can conceive, what is in fact the case under the existing financial system, that money is a commodity in exactly the same sense as is tea or sugar, and that there is a powerful, if unobtrusive business ring which deals in money as a commodity, it will be readily understood that the balancing of budgets and the repayment of loans of taxation is a prime interest of those interested in the commodity. Money dealers are normally deflationists.

As no government can carry on for a month without money, it is not necessary to labour the point that the visible government of a country is obliged to take its orders and to shape its policy, and particularly its financial policy, in accordance with the instructions of the dealers in this indispensable implement, so long as they hold a practical monopoly of it.

The early Victorian political economists agreed in ascribing all "values" to three essentials: land, labour, and capital. While there might be a rough truth in this argument during the centuries prior to the industrial revolution consequent on the inventive period following the Renaissance, and culminating in the steam engine, the spinning-jenny, and so forth, there is now a fourth factor in wealth production, the multiplying power of which far exceeds that of the other three. the "progress of the industrial arts."

In dealing with the subject of Values in its human aspect, many points of practical importance arise. One of these can probably best be seen in correct perspective, by an examination of common human motives. It is involved in the complaint against the modern co-operative industrial system, that its routine operations are soul killing, monotonous, and without interest, and that a remedy can be found, and can only be found in a return to handicraft.

A good deal of the criticism which has proceeded from "Intellectuals," concerned, and rightly concerned, with the desperate defects of contemporary

(continued from the previous page) society, has been directed to stress this point. It is an aspect of modern industrialism.

When we do things under the compulsion of Society, we are blood-corpuscles, not individuals; we are doing them in the interests of Society primarily, and only secondarily, if at all, in the interests of our own individuality. As society is at present constituted, it is quite definitely to its advantage, and tends to the perpetuation of the present form of Society, that Lancashire mill operatives should work the maximum number of hours at a very dull occupation, with the minimum of change of work, and if individuals had no interests as such, that is to say, if they were Robots, contemporary society would probably work very well, and no difficulties would arise. But Lancashire mill operatives are developing individuals and their interests are clearly not the same as those of Society as at present constructed. In one way or another the various units which compose the Society are proclaiming unmistakably their objection to a purely passive role, and the conflict which we see proceeding all over the world at the present time will clearly determine whether Society has power to remould the individual so that he becomes purely a passive agent.

Just so long as a rigid abstraction is made the test to which physical facts conform (and any theory of money which pretends to measure values comes under this description), just so long must there be friction and abrasion between the theory and the facts (and facts are much harder than theories). Dissatisfaction and disappointment in the world as a result, can be predicted with certainty.

It is also difficult to conceive of any plan by which the possible advantage of the individual could have been advanced so rapidly, as by his temporary submergence in large groups, to which we give the name of nations or races. All this may be admitted as being applicable to within comparatively recent years, let us say to the middle of the last century, just as we may often be prepared to admit that

(continued from the previous page) a statesman who, under post-war conditions has become a hindrance to progress, rendered vital service under circumstances suitable to his talents.

But because a thing was once sound and desirable, it is by no means necessary to admit that it is permanently advantageous. Largely because of the progress in the industrial arts, but not less as the result of a general spread of education, a system of world organisation which is based on the deception of the general public, the practical necessity of expediency which might perhaps be excused in the past, has now become both undesirable and actively and practically vicious.

The inductive or experimental method of attack on the problems of life which may be said to be the outstanding feature of the Renaissance in the West, resulted in a profound disturbance of the premises of human existence. From the moment that the first crude steam-engine pumped the first gallon of water, if not before, the metabolic cycle contained a factor, a new method of entrance for solar energy, which was bound to result in a much steeper spiral of ascent. And at the present time it seems reasonable to believe that we have reached a point at which we are within sight of a considerable release of human energy from the mechanical drudgery of existence of toil.

Great deal of the opposition to any sort of reform, on the part of the more favourably situated individuals in society. These persons recognise that they have, in their fortunate position, something worth retaining.

In thus opposing claims for a general levelling down of the amenities of modern civilisation, such persons were probably on sound ground, although the tactics adopted by them may have been of dubious sagacity; but it is to be feared that, in many cases, this opposition to a bad change, has become crystallised into opposition to a change of any kind. It may, therefore, be of practical value to emphasise the fact that at the present

(continued from the previous page) time the alternative is not between change and no change, but between a change for the better, or a change for the worse.

The contention which is advanced in this book that as soon as Society ceases to serve the interests of the individual, then the individual will break up Society, is proved by the course of events at this time; and those persons who wish to preserve Society can do no worse service to their cause, than to depict their idol as an unchangeable organisation whose claims are to be regarded as superior to those of the human spirit.

The stage is set for a change of mechanism; in place of a Society based on restraint, a Society based on the conception of assistance, of co-operation, is overdue. Let us be clear that the only assistance which is tolerable or acceptable is that which can be declined if it is not wanted.

An overwhelming majority of so-called criminal cases can be traced, either directly or indirectly, to a financial incentive. Even crimes of passion take their origin, in the majority of cases, from physiological or psychological reactions which can be traced back to economic or financial causes. The world is full of organisations for the suppression of such social evils as inebriety and prostitution. The financial origin of the latter hardly needs emphasis, but it is not so generally recognised that habitual industrial overstrain, long hours, and insanitary conditions of work, and the excessive indulgence in alcoholic or other artificial stimulation, are almost invariably found in one and the same geographical locality. And in nearly every case, attention is directed to the suppression of the symptom, rather than to the removal of the cause, with the result that the partial suppression of one evil is only achieved at the cost of producing a fresh and probably more insidious disease.

There is, of course, the crude idea on which, originally, most of the orthodox Labour-Socialist propaganda was based. Observing the condition we have

(continued from the previous page) just outlined, the simple suggestion was put forward that the majority of the population were so poor, because a minority were so rich. This simple explanation died hard, even if it can be said to be dead.

Professor Bowley, who was, if I am not mistaken, connected with this institution, in a treatise on the Distribution of the National Income, referring to a period immediately preceding the first world war, estimated that the total British income in excess of £ 160 per family per annum, was only £ 250,000,000. Taking the population of Great Britain as forty-five millions, and the average number of persons per family as about 4.5, which is a usual assumption, it is clear that an "equitable" division of this income would result in an increase of the average family income by £ 25 per annum, which can hardly be said to be a promising basis for a sweeping reform by taxation. As in addition, such a distribution would, under present conditions, make the possession of such articles as motor-cars impossible to any private owner, and so would completely inhibit their production, and the wages, salaries and dividends distributed in respect of that production, it must surely be obvious that an explanation more complex than this must be looked for. The point we have to make is not merely that financial purchasing power is unsatisfactorily, distributed, it is that, in its visible forms, it is collectively insufficient.

There is every justification for these misconceptions; they are strictly orthodox in the sense of being the general teaching of the majority of those persons who claim to be experts on the matter; and it is necessary that they should be stated in order that the invalidity of them may be exposed.

There is no doubt whatever about the facts; in the past three years we have had the two conditions side by side; in Great Britain a restriction of credit and consequent industrial stagnation; on the Continent, enhanced credit issues, and great industrial activity.

The business of dealing in money as a commodity is, as has already been pointed out, advantaged by anything which accentuates the scarcity of money, so that any form of attack on the business system, the constructive effect of which is to support increased taxation, can, and does, receive support from the inner circles of High Finance. There is probably not a "levelling-down" movement of any description any where, which is unsupported from Lombard Street, Wall Street, and Frankfort.

They can manufacture "money" to an almost unlimited extent; this power resting on the general willingness of the public to accept anything which will function as money. But the psychology which has grown up on the basis of the theory of rewards and punishments forbids the exercise of this power, except in return for services rendered. The financial equivalent of all services rendered in the production of an article, forms the cost of that article, and conversely, nobody will furnish any services in connection with the article which are not represented by cost, and therefore go into price.

Now to a man who has one million pounds, it may be a theoretical hardship or "punishment" to reduce the purchasing-power of his one million pounds to that of five hundred thousand pounds, but the practical effect on his scale of life and on his personal freedom of his movements and initiative is nil. But to reduce the income of the man who has two hundred pounds per annum to one hundred pounds per annum, is the difference between simple comfort and practical starvation.

There are two separate and distinct inducements to what is called employment. The first of these inducements is involved in the necessity under which humanity labours to provide itself with bed, board, clothes, and such so-called luxuries as are effective in setting free individual energies. That is an elemental necessity imposed by the natural conditions of our existence, and it is a primary necessity, in the sense that until it has been met we are not free

(continued from the previous page) to devote our attention to other matters. It is incontestable that the most efficient method of dealing with this primary necessity so far evolved is by co-operative methods such as have been incorporated in the industrial system of the past hundred years or so.

But the second necessity under which men and women labour, after the primary necessity has been met, can broadly be described as the satisfaction of the artistic instinct; which can be further analysed and defined as the incorporation in material forms of ideals conceived in the mind.

The only method by which large masses of human beings can be kept in agreement with dogmatic moral and social ideals, is by arranging that they shall be kept so hard at work that they have not the leisure or even the desire to think for themselves.

It is probably true that there is an appreciable percentage of the population in respect of which any sudden access of material prosperity would be attended with considerable risk, and for that reason the transition from a state of artificial scarcity such as exists at the present time, to a state of prosperity, is most desirably accomplished by methods which do not too suddenly invest such persons with powers which they have not learnt to use. But to suggest that an obsolete and outgrown system of organisation, must be retained because of this risk, is to refuse to develop the railway, because of its detrimental effect upon the stage coach.

This idea of thrift, like that of economy, is an example of the perversion of an idea which has lost its original application. When the business of obtaining bed, board, and clothes did, in fact, necessitate the application to it of the major portion of the day, it was a sound and far-sighted policy to simplify these needs as far as possible, not because there is any inherent virtue in simplification per se (which is a common delusion), but because

(continued from the previous page) the setting free of the time of the general population for other aims was a valuable achievement. But the devastating rigidity of thought, which is a distinguishing characteristic of the Classical or "Moral" mind, fastened on this situation and crystallized it into a static virtue. Once a virtue, always a virtue.

A further example of the perversion and misuse of words, in order to obtain the defeat of the concrete embodiment of those words, is in regard to the common use of the word democracy, and its glorification as an end in itself. In so far as the word is used to suggest the detailed administration of public affairs by the majority, it is a pure fantasy, and not only never has existed but it would seem probable, could never in the nature of things exist. In any kind of world of which we have any conscious experience, it would be a nightmare. If ten men be selected at random, and problems of graded difficulty be submitted to them, it is possible that the very simplest problem will be solved by all of them, but a point will rapidly be reached at which a decreasing minority will have any grasp of the subject at issue. In so far as the matters submitted to their judgment are not matters of precedent (and progress consists in a constant departure from precedent) it is certain that the minority of our selected ten will tend to be right, and the majority will always be wrong. On matters of policy, however, in sharp contradiction to the methods by which that policy should be carried out, the majority may be trusted to be right, and the minority is very frequently wrong. To submit questions of fiscal procedure, of foreign affairs, and other cognate matters to the judgment of an electorate is merely to submit matters which are essentially technical to a community which is essentially non-technical. On the contrary, broad and even philosophical issues, such as, for instance, whether the aim of the industrial system is to produce employment, or whether it is to produce and distribute goods, are matters of policy, and it is noticeable that such matters are kept as far as possible from the purview and

(continued from the previous page) decision of the general public. In fact, the aim of political wire-pullers is to submit to the decision of the electorate, only alternative methods of embodying the same policy.

It is a matter of practical impossibility for the Political Head to obtain the removal of one of his own Permanent Officials. As a result, "Democracy," of which we hear so much, is defeated at the source; and it is this brand of ineffective democracy, forming the best possible screen for the operation of forces which are invisible and are not subject to criticism, which we are so constantly exhorted to preserve.

It should be clear without reiteration that this condition of affairs can only exist to perfection as a result of collectivist psychology. The prime duty of a State servant is obedience—impersonality; a surrender of individual judgment to a policy not necessarily understood. As we have previously indicated, there is a great deal to be said for this arrangement in the practical world of affairs, provided that the sources from which the policy originally proceeds are such as will stand the light of the fullest publicity; but when, as is the case at present, the policy is derived from sources which shun publicity by every means in their power, unquestioning obedience, so far from becoming a public duty, becomes a public danger.

This process of creating purchasing-power by means of book entries has, however, a further extension of far-reaching importance, which can perhaps be grasped by a consideration of the methods by which Great Britain financed the War of 1914-1919.

War is a consumer whose necessities are so imperative that they become superior to all questions of legal and financial restriction. *Inter arma silent leges*. That is why legalists and financiers, although their existing systems tend inevitably to produce wars, are so afraid of them, and why war, terrible in itself, has so often released

(continued from the previous page) humanity from bonds which threaten to strangle it. As a result of this situation, the bounds which are placed upon production for war purposes are defined by intrinsic forces and not by artificial limitations. That is to say, in order to maintain a connection between finance and production, finance has to follow production instead of, as in the normal case, production having to follow finance. The extension of production to its utmost intrinsic limits, therefore, involves an extension of finance at a rate out of all proportion to that which obtains in the normal course of events, and this extension at once reveals the artificial character of normal finance. It has been pointed out at some length, and probably sufficiently, that the Gold Standard, on which British finance was supposed to be based, broke down within a few hours of the outbreak of war.

In a remarkable document which received some publicity some years ago, under the title of "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," a Machiavellian scheme for the enslavement of the world was outlined. The authenticity of this document is a matter of little importance; what is interesting about it, is the fidelity with which the methods by which such enslavement might be brought about can be seen reflected in the facts of everyday experience.

There is, therefore, no room for doctrinaire theorising in regard to the "aims of industry"; the trouble about industry is not that its aims are wrong, but that it fails to achieve them. And it fails to achieve them for a simple reason. We have a machine which is designed to work in accordance with the only forces which are available to work economic machines, and the result is smoothness and efficiency. If we refuse to recognise these forces, or pretend that they have a direction which is contrary to the facts, or clamour for a change in their nature (a "change of heart"), we are likely to get an economic machine which is about as successful as would be a plough if installed for the purpose

(continued from the previous page) of driving an Atlantic liner. We are in the position of a would-be engineer who refuses to accept the principles of thermo-dynamics, and, instead of endeavouring to improve the steam engine, tries to alter the properties of steam.

The outstanding fact in regard to the existing situation in the world at the present time, is that it is unstable. No person whose outlook upon life extends even so far as the boundaries of his village, can fail to see that a change is not merely coming, but is in progress; and it requires only a moderately comprehensive perception of the forces which are active in every country of the world today, to realise that the change which is in progress must proceed to limits to which we can set no bounds.

That is to say, the break-up of the present financial and social system is certain. Nothing will stop it; "Back to 1914" is sheer dreaming; the continuation of taxation on the present scale, together with an unsolved employment problem, is fantastic; the only point at issue in this respect is the length of time which the break-up is in progress. But while recognising this, it is also necessary not to fall into the error which has its rise in Darwinism; that change is evolution, and evolution is ascent. It may be; but equally it may not be.

There is, at the moment, no party, group, or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society.

The position will be tremendous in its importance. A comparatively short period will probably serve to decide whether we are to master the mighty economic and social machine that we have created, or whether it is to master us; and during that period a small impetus from a body of men who know what to do and how to do it, may make the difference

(continued from the previous page) between yet one more retreat into the Dark Ages, or the emergence into the full light of a day of such splendour as we can at present only envisage dimly.

Died. William C. Aberhart, 64, Alberta's Social Credit Premier; in Vancouver, B.C. Ex-school-teacher, fundamentalist radiator, "Bible Bill" Aberhart preached a new millennium, was elected to produce it in depression-ridden 1935. His version of Clifford Hugh Douglas' theories tried to combine funny money, state control of credit, a feeble application of the Keynes public-works principles, handouts a'la Townsend. The attempt was foredoomed by Alberta's economic dependence, the hostility of courts and capital. One of the few non-Marxian reformers taken at his word and told by the voters to pitch in, he did not look like a demagogue to small Canadian investors who knew his administration's clean, high-ranking record in developing natural resources. — "Time" 1943.

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

Money is only a mechanism by means of which we deal with things—it has no properties except those we choose to give to it. A phrase such as "There is no money in the country with which to do such and so" means simply nothing, unless we are also saying "The goods and services required to do this thing do not exist and cannot be produced, therefore it is useless to create the money equivocating of them." For instance, it is simply childish to say that a country has no money for social betterment, or for any other purpose, when it has the skill, the men and the material and plant to create that betterment. The banks or the Treasury can create the money, in five minutes, and are doing it every day, and have been doing it for centuries.

Real credit is a correct estimate of the rate, or dynamic capacity, at which a community can deliver goods and services as demanded.

It endeavours, and fundamentally succeeds, in obtaining that objective with an ever-decreasing

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) amount of human energy, by shifting the burden of civilisation from the backs of men on to the backs of machines; a process which, if unimpeded, must clearly result in freeing the human spirit for conquests at the moment beyond our wildest dreams.

It completely denies all recognition to the social nature of the heritage of civilisation, and by refusal of purchasing power, except on terms, arrogates to a few persons selected by the system and not by humanity, the right to disinherit the indubitable heirs, the individuals who compose society.

There is the plant; there is the raw material; there is labour; and there is real, though not effective, demand; but production is decreasing along a very steep curve. Why?

The present trade depression is directly and consciously caused by the concerted action of the banks in restricting credit facilities, and that such credit facilities as are granted, have very little relation to public need. The banks, through their control of credit facilities, hold the volume of production at all times in the hollow of their hands.

There must be something somewhere which stands in the position of trustee for the collective credit, and should administer it in the interests of the individuals. There is such an organ—it is the Treasury.

But the Treasury does not in normal times deal with manufacturers, it deals with the banks, and the banks are so-called private institutions which administer this collective credit for their own ends, and those ends are by no means similar to the ends of the community of individuals from whom the credit takes its rise.

If, therefore, we wish to solve the first half of the problem, that of the control, in the interest of the consumer, of the credit issued to manufacturers, we have to put control of the policy of the banks at the disposal of the consumer interest.

You will no doubt ask what are the prospects

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) of such a scheme as we are considering. Well, in the first place, it has to be observed that the uncoordinated parts of it are coming into being with tremendous rapidity and, to those who have eyes to see, with irresistible momentum. In this country, it is quite obvious that not only cannot the public debt (all issues of securities, whether to so-called private companies, local authorities or Governmental bodies, are public debt fundamentally) be reduced, but the business of the country cannot be carried on for a month without a continuous increase in it. The immediate effect of an attempt to restrict the flow is a slump in trade and an avalanche of business crises, which is only just beginning, but which will, unless I am very much mistaken, or war provides an alternative, proceed to lengths quite sufficient to establish the principle.

It used to be a very common argument that the spur of economic necessity was ennobling to the character. Frankly, I don't believe it. The struggle to overcome difficulties is most unquestionably ennobling, but we have, I think, reached a stage when our attention may with advantage be diverted from the somewhat sordid struggle for mere existence.

The following paragraph from *The Threefold State*, by Dr Rudolf Steiner, a book which is attracting attention on the Continent, may be of interest:-

"Modern socialism is absolutely justified in demanding that the present-day methods, under which production is carried on for individual profit, should be replaced by others, under which production will be carried on for the sake of the common consumption. But it is just the person who most thoroughly recognises the justice of this demand who will find himself unable to concur in the conclusion which modern socialism deduces; That, therefore, the means of production must be transferred from private to communal ownership. Rather he will be forced to a conclusion that is quite different, namely: that whatever is privately produced by means of individual energies and talents must find its way to the community through the right channels."

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

Any attempt either to socialise administration or to govern by economic coercion quite inevitably leads to centralised organisation and centralised credit, resulting in all the well-known phenomena of inefficiency inseparable from the attempted subordination of the human ego to the necessities of a non-human system.

Credit is a real thing; it is the correct estimate of capacity to achieve, and the function and immense importance for good or evil of this real credit will be impressed on mankind with cumulative insistence in the difficult times ahead.

The community creates all the credit there is; there is nothing whatever to prevent the community entering into its own and dwelling therein except it shall be by sheer demonstrated inability to seize the opportunity which at this very moment lies open to it; an opportunity which if seized and used aright would within ten years reduce class-war to an absurdity.

They start with a theory of a different sort of society to the one we know, and assume that the problem is to change the world into that form. In consequence, all the solutions demand centralisation of administration; they involve a machinery by which individuals can be forced to do something—work, fight, etc.; the machine must be stronger than the man.

It is true enough, as our super-industrialists and orthodox economists are always telling us, that imports are paid for by exports, but on the whole, they are content to leave it at that. They do not explain, for instance, how a population which most certainly cannot, and does not, buy its own total production for cash (if it could, there would be no necessity either for home or export credits, and no "unemployment" problem), can become able to buy the imports which are exchanged for the unpurchasable surplus. They do not, again, explain how a textile worker, paid wages for converting a bale of raw cotton worth, say, £20 into goods worth, say, £60 can

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) benefit if in return for these manufactured goods two more bales of raw cotton at £ 40 are received — a condition common to trade booms. Nor do they generally publish the fact that English machinery is often sold to export agents abroad at far lower prices than those at which the same machinery can be obtained at home, or that it is possible to buy, in the bazaars of Bombay, a shirt made in Lancashire for a quarter the price at which the same shirt can be bought retail in Manchester.

While it is necessary to bear in mind that the object of industry should not be employment, but rather the delivery of goods with a minimum expenditure of energy on their production, it is yet true that at the moment unemployment does form a practical problem demanding alleviating treatment. The word is generally used to indicate labour unemployment, but it is practically impossible to have any considerable volume of labour unemployment without a capital unemployment representing many times the production value of the idle labour.

Labour costs are wages and form by far the most important item in the total purchasing power inside the country available for the distribution of goods.

Although a reduction of prices in relation to purchasing power is not only vital in connection with the more fundamental problems of industry and society, but is the only effective method of dealing with the immediate problem of unemployment, we are not as a nation pursuing this policy, but rather one which, if not diametrically opposed to it, is yet wholly inapplicable to the situation.

Mr Balfour has a personal code from which he will not depart, and that included in that code is a refusal to state clearly and definitely as a fact that which he knows or even suspects to be false.

The practical implication of their policy is a continuous rise in the level of prices of necessities; we look to a continuous fall in such prices. We believe it is no longer necessary to labour the

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) point that whoever controls credit controls economic policy; and it follows as a simple syllogism that just to the extent that control of food, clothes and housing is control of society, so producer-control of credit means the enslavement of society to Industrialism; whereas the whole world now rocks to its social base in an effort to subdue the dragon of the industrial machine in order that men may be free.

It is out of personal initiative that all progress of any description must come.

The New Zealander, who must suppose to be an intelligent man, would, we think, conclude that this was a matter outside logic and reason, and only comparable to collective hypnotism. And he would be right.

In certain things this country in particular is under a spell. At the time of the Armistice there was not an unemployed man in this country, but there was hardly an unemployed woman or child over fourteen and under eighty. The wheat cultivation was increasing at a rate unknown for generations, ship-building was proceeding at such a rate that the destruction of war has been more than made good in two years, manufacturers were becoming rich, workmen were becoming manufacturers. Production, which Mr Clynes will tell us all we need to make us prosperous, reached heights far in excess of anything ever touched in history, even outstripping such destruction as Dante never dreamed of. Then peace, with the wings of a dove, burst upon us. Hardly had the last stretcher-case reached a casualty clearing station in a grim and haunted silence than a bleat of real anguish rose from these sheltered shores—not from the battered wrecks in hospital blue, the sad-eyed women in black, or even from the new poor, but from Lord Inchcape and other bankers. We were a poor nation—no homes for heroes for us. Perhaps if we all worked harder than ever, and lived the simple life for twenty years or so, we might aspire to a few Nissen huts. As a preliminary to all of us

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) working harder prices rose 50 per cent., and the unemployment figures rose from nil to the present figure of about three million.

We intend that the general standard of living in this country shall rise, and we mean to proceed, not by attaching anyone, but by assisting everyone—by first demanding a conference of all parties for the purpose of exploring every avenue which might lead to lowering the cost of living without lowering the income of anyone.

No altruism is required or is desirable—if every rich man in this country sold all that he hath and gave to the poor, the poor would only notice it for about three months, and after that would, under the conditions which the Labour movement has not so far challenged, starve to death through unemployment and the failure of production, just as happened in Russia.

It is quite certain that the fundamental difference between political Roman Catholicism and political Protestantism (all religions are the basis of political systems) is that the first is essentially authoritarian and the second is individualistic. There are thousands of English Roman Catholics who are such because they are attracted by the beauty and dignity of its ritual and the artistic impact of its code of life. But the simple fact remains that when stripped to its essentials the Roman claim is a claim for the surrender of individual judgment and, in any important crisis, of individual action. That is one reason why Roman Catholics are so successful in the army, and it is the great reason why the Hierarchy of Rome, as apart from the many delightful personages to be found in it, is a danger to peace, freedom and development, wherever it is entrenched.

The world, panting and enfeebled from the first world war, was threatened with social upheaval and torn with conflicting idealisms on the one hand, and a prey to the megalomaniacs of industry and finance on the other. "All power to the Soldiers and Workers Councils!" murmured Lord

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) Inchcape, as he passed the plans for a few hundred new branch banks.

Well, they have all had their way. The greatest undivided unit of the world's surface, a national territory which could accommodate comfortably the United States and the whole of non-Russian Europe within its boundaries and still have vast expanses unoccupied; an area which is probably far richer in potential resources than any other under one control, has been nominally ruled for more than four years by the first Workers Republic. In that short space of time millions of the class in whose interests it is alleged that the Soviet Republic was created have been reduced to a state of famine and misery far in excess of anything experienced under the corrupt and inefficient regime of the Tsar. The control of the individual worker over his life and destiny, so far from having increased, has become a mere mockery, and the only tolerable portions of Russia appear to be those in which the writ of the centralised despotism of Moscow does not run.

The Labour Movement in this country and in America has met its Waterloo. Headed very vigorously and firmly away from one or two timid approaches to a consumers' policy, such as the demand for a trifling reduction in the price of coal, and bound hand and foot to an economic theory identical with the capitalism it professes to attack, it is now firmly established in the public estimation as an anti-public interest.

The factor most destructive of progress to the Labour Party and most useful to the forces opposed to its legitimate aspirations is its incorrigible abstraction from reality—an abstraction which is quite probably the result, amongst other things, of generations of "religious" instruction specifically directed to the preaching of "other worldliness," and to that extent also an instance of the direction of Labour thought by financial influences. It is rampant in every sphere of Labour political action, from the lionising of Mr George Lansbury, an honest citizen who would like to apply

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) his conception of the Sermon on the Mount to the game of cut-throat poker, to the instantaneous success of Mr Tawney's title for his book, *The Sickness of an Acquisitive Society*. I have not read that book, which is doubtless excellent, but its title suggests that the average man ought to work with the specific object of not getting what he works for — goods; a precisely parallel line of argument to that of the orthodox capitalist who insists that the major object of industry is to send goods away from those who made them, by export, or otherwise, so that "employment" may never fail.

Put shortly, the psychology of the Labour Party is a psychology of failure. To be poor is to be virtuous; to be well off is to be wicked; and the objective of all action is to replace the wicked by the virtuous. As a result, the official Labour Party is almost irrevocably committed to a policy of attack, of levelling down, and is bound to be opposed, sooner or later, by everyone with any conception of the possibility of levelling up, as well as by those who have anything to lose.

It is no pleasant thing to have to criticise that party. There was a period when organised Labour appeared to be the hope of the world, but that hope is now very dim; not only from the causes just outlined, but because the power given to it by the circumstances of war has been dissipated. Not a single proposition of the capitalist system has been challenged by it; every strike has been a fight for position in the system, a claim either that the office boy ought to be General Manager, or at any rate ought to control the General Manager.

The Government (i.e. Zaharoff-Sassoon) proposals for dealing with "unemployment" are based fundamentally on an export credit scheme buttressed by relief works at home, the latter to be financed out of taxation.

Now it is our contention that the use and control of credit is absolutely the vital issue of the present era. It is a force and can be used like other forces to destroy or to build, and it is quite possible

Major C.H. Douglas: "THE CONTROL & DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION."

(continued from the previous page) that in this Government proposal we are faced with a real crisis in the history of civilisation. If it is put into force, we are committed to a line action diametrically opposed to that urged in the pages of this book, and it is therefore vital that it should be understood.

The productive capacity of the industrial nations was so enormous that it overtook the wastage of a four and a half years' war in eighteen months, so that two and a half millions are unemployed in this country, and probably six millions in America.

E.H. Palmer: "ORIENTAL MYSTICISM."

Edward Henry Palmer, born at Cambridge in 1840, and murdered by Bedouins in the Egyptian desert in 1882, is one of the most romantic figures in the history of Oriental studies. The story of his humble origin, of the amazing flair for languages which led to his "Discovery" by the Fellows of St. John's College, Cambridge, and of his subsequent brilliant career, is too well known to need retelling.

His interest was aroused by a short manual of the Sufi system of theosophy, the *Maqсад i acsa* or "Furthest Aim" of 'Azis ibn Muhammad al-Nasafi.

A careful comparison of Palmer's "succinct account" with the text of Nazafi shows that it is in reality no more and no less than a version of carefully chosen paragraphs of the original: the skill with which this process has been conducted will be evident to the reader, who will find in this book a remarkably clear and concise account of the theological and philosophical basis of the Sufi system.

Of Nasafi himself virtually nothing is known beyond the statements of the author of the *Majalis al-ushshaq*, quoted by Rieu and followed by subsequent writers, that he lived at Bukhara, but fled before the invasion of Chingiz khan, and died at Abarquh, between Istakhr and Yezd, in 661/1263.

The system which is here expounded is largely based on the theosophical mysticism of the great Ibn 'Arabi (560/1165-638/1240).

Nazafi wrote in Persian.

These tenets are found principally among the Shites, or followers of 'Ali, and appear to have existed in Islamism from its very foundation; indeed the expression of the Coran, "I am the Truth" (Hacc), is the first principle of the system. They may be considered as forming the esoteric doctrine of that creed. Steering a mid course between the pantheism of India on the one hand and the deism of the Coran on the other, the Sufis cult is the religion of beauty, where heavenly perfection is considered under the imperfect type of earthly loveliness. Their principal writers are the lyric poets, whose aim is to elevate mankind to the contemplation of spiritual things, through the medium of their most impressionable feelings.

The Traveller in the path of mystic philosophy is the Perceptive Sense, which as it becomes further developed results in Intelligence, not however the intelligence of life, but such as is described in the words of Mohammed, "Intelligence is light in the heart, distinguishing between truth and vanity, not the intelligence of life." After a time our traveller merges into Divine Light, but of the thousands who start upon the road scarcely one attains thereunto.

The received notion of the "stages" in the "road," involves a paradox, the disciple who asks concerning them being told that there is not even a single stage, nay more, not even a road at all. This statement is differently explained by two sects, the Sufis and the Ahl i Wahdat, whom I shall call the Unitarians. The Sufis say that there is no road from man to God, because the nature of God is illimitable and infinite, without beginning or end or even direction. There is not a single atom of existent things with which God is not and which God does not comprise. Those who have reached it gaze always upon His face; they go not forth by day and retire not to rest at night without an abashed consciousness that God is present every where; for with Him they live, and in Him they act.

But Perception or Intelligence can never lead to this conviction, or reveal this glorious mystery; that is the province of the Divine Light alone. Such is the Sufistic explanation of the proposition, "There is no road from man to God."

The Unitarians interpret it as follows. They hold that existence is not independent, but is of God; that besides the existence of God there is no real existence, nor can there possibly be; for that which exists not, cannot exist of itself, but that which does exist, exists of itself, and that which is God.

When man imagines that he has an existence other than the existence of God he falls into a grievous error and sin; yet this error and sin is the only road from man to God; for until the Traveller has passed over this he cannot reach God. The error of imagining an existence separate from God is the only road to Him; the stages on this road are innumerable, and some philosophers even assert that it has no end.

Search after Wisdom, the guide without whom it is impossible to find the road.

He should be at peace with all the world, and refrain from all contradiction and opposition. According to the mother from whom he is born into the community each receives a different patronymic; thus one is called a Hanefite, one a Shafiite, one a Pagan, one a Jew, and another a Mussulman; but the true philosopher recognises in each a weak and helpless being like himself, he sees in each a fellow searcher after God.

Henceforth he can find no better employment than acting mercifully towards mankind. Now there is no mercy better than to devote oneself to the perfection and improvement of others, both by precept and example. Thus the Prophet is called in the Coran "a mercy to the Universe."

As before he renounced wealth and dignity, so now he foregoes eldership and teachership, esteeming freedom and rest above everything; the fact is,

(continued from the previous page) that though the motive alleged for education and care of others is a feeling of compassion and a regard for discipline, yet the real instigation is the love of dignity.

Those who make choice of obscurity are actuated by the knowledge that annoyance and distraction of thought are the invariable concomitants of society; they therefore avoid receiving visits and presents, and fear them as they would venomous beasts. The other class, who adopt submission, resignation and contemplation, do so because they perceive that mankind for the most part are ignorant of what is good for them. For this reason they retire from society equally with the other class, caring little what the world may think of them.

Provided he have the capacity, a single day, nay, a single hour, in the society of the wise, tends more to his improvement than years of self-discipline without it. It is however possible to frequent the society of the wise without receiving any benefit therefrom, but this must proceed either from want of capacity or want of will.

Everything that hinders or veils the Traveller's path must be renounced, whether it relate to this world or the next. Wealth and dignity are great hindrances; but to much praying and fasting are often hindrances too. The one is a shroud of darkness, the other a veil of light. The Traveller must renounce idolatry, if he desire to reach the Goal, and everything that bars his progress is an idol. All men have some idol, which they worship; with one it is wealth and dignity, with another overmuch prayer and fasting. If a man sit always upon his prayer-carpet becomes is idol.

It should be the renunciation of trifles, not of necessities, such as food, clothing and dwelling place, which are indispensable to man; for without them he would be obliged to rely on the aid of others, and this would beget avarice, which is "the mother of vice." The renunciation of necessities produce as corrupting an influence upon the mind as the possession

(continued from the previous page) of too much wealth. The greatest of blessings is to have a sufficiency, but to over-step this limit is to gain nought but additional trouble.

Renunciation is the practice of those who know God, and the characteristic mark of the wise. Every individual fancies that he alone possesses this knowledge, but knowledge is an attribute of the mind, and there is no approach from unaided sense to the attributes of the mind, by which we can discover who is, or who is not, possessed of this knowledge. Qualities however are the sources of action; therefore a man's practice is an infallible indication of the qualities he possess; if, for instance, a man asserts that he is a baker, a carpenter, or a black-smith, we can judge at once if he possesses skill in these crafts by the perfection of his handiwork. In a word, theory is internal, and practice external, the presence of the practice, therefore, is a proof that the theory too is there.

Renunciation and the knowledge of God are like a tree; the knowledge of God is the root, renunciation the branches, and all good principles and qualities are the fruit. The Traveller must acknowledge in his heart that God only always was, God only always will be. This world and the next, nay, the very existence of the Traveller, may vanish, but God alone remains. This is the true confession of faith; and although the Traveller before was blind, the moment he is assured of this his eyes are opened, and he seeth.

The Sufis hold that there are three aids necessary to conduct the Traveller on his path. 1. Attraction; 2. Devotion; 3. Elevation.

Attraction is the act of God, who draws man towards Himself. Man sets his face towards this world, and is entangled in the love of wealth and dignity, until the grace of God steps in and turns his heart towards God. The tendency proceeding from God is called Attraction; that which proceeds from man is called Inclination, Desire and

(continued from the previous page) Love. As the inclination increases, its name changes, and it causes the Traveller to renounce everything else becoming a Kiblah, to set his face towards God; when it has become his Kiblah, and made him forget everything but God, it is developed into Love.

The wisest of mankind are those who have renounced all worldly desires, and chosen the calm and peaceful lot of a recluse's life. Behind every pleasure lurk twenty pains; far better is it then to forego one fleeting joy and spare oneself a life time of regret.

He is Infinite and Illimitable, by which they mean not only without beginning or end, but also without determinate position of time, place, or direction.

The foregoing arguments are intended specially to confute the opinion that God is nearer to some men than others, namely, that the Wise approach nearer to Him than the Ignorant. Their great object, however, is the inculcation of the beautiful truth, that He is ever near to those who seek Him, whilst those only are far from Him who by their actions fail to acknowledge that He is.

They maintain that there neither is nor can any other experience save that of God, and explain this position by a simile thus: Had there never been night, and had men dwelt always in continual day, they would never have known what day really was, but from the constantly recurring contrast of night they can form a clear conception of day; so had there been other than God, God would have been known, and man could have formed a clear conception of Him; but as he cannot do this, it follows that there is no other than God.

Another class of Unitarians maintain that there are, it is true, two existences, but one is real, which is of God, and the other imaginative, which is but a mirage, and a reflection of the real. Thus neither the world nor the vicissitudes of human life have any real existence; they are mere reflections of the existence of God, he held as it were in the changing diorama of a fleeting dream.

Every animal possesses a vegetative spirit, a living spirit, and an instinctive spirit; but man has an additional inheritance, namely the Spirit of Humanity. Now this was breathed by God into man directly from Himself, and is therefore of the same character as the Primal Element: "And when I have fashioned him and breathed My spirit into him." (Cor.cap.15.v.29). The Sufis do not interpret this on the Life, but of the Spirit of Humanity, and say that it is frequently not attained until a late period of life, thirty or even eighty years. Before man can receive this Spirit of Humanity he must be furnished with capacity, which is only to be acquired by purifying oneself from all evil and immoral qualities and dispositions, and adorning oneself with the opposite ones.

The soul of man is the Primal Spirit, and if a thousand persons live, it is the same spirit that animates them all; and in like manner if a thousand die, the same spirit returns to itself, and is not lessened or diminished. If a myriad persons build houses and make windows therein the same sun illumines them all, and though every one of them should be destroyed, the sun would not be lessened or diminished.

The latter are, called Ascent, includes every stage, from his first use of reason for its true purpose to his final reabsorption into the Divine intelligence.

The Ascent, or upward progress, naturally presents itself to the Sufistic mind in the form of a journey, and the doctrines which profess to describe it are accordingly called the road.

When a man possessing the necessary requirements of fully developed reasoning powers turns to them for a resolution of his doubts and uncertainties concerning the real nature of the Godhead, he is called a Talib, or Searcher after God,

When in answer to his prayers the Divine influence or Attraction has developed his inclination into love of God, he is said to have reached the stage called 'Ishk, Love.

This Divine Love expelling all worldly desires from his heart, leads him to the next stage, called Zuhd, or Seclusion.

Occupying himself henceforward with contemplations and the investigations of these metaphysical theories concerning the nature, attributes, and works of God, which have been described in the Second Part of this treatise, he reaches his next stage, which is that of Ma'rifat, Knowledge.

Now this assiduous contemplation of startling metaphysical theories is exceedingly attractive to an Oriental mind, and not unfrequently produces a state of mental excitement akin to the phenomena observed during the recent religious revivals. Such ecstatic state is considered a sure prognostication of direct illumination of the heart by God, and constitutes the next stage, Wejd or Ha'l, Ecstasy.

During this stage he is supposed to receive a revelation of the true nature of the Godhead, and to have reached the stage called Hak'ikat, or The Truth.

He is then said to proceed to the stage of Jam' or Wasl, direct Union with God.

Further than this he cannot go, but pursues his habit, of self-denial and contemplation until his death, which is, however, merely, looked upon as a total re-absorption into the Deity, forming the consummation of his Journey, the last stage designated Fana', Extinction.

The glossary which I have appended to this work will enable the student of Hafiz and other Sufistic writers to interpret for himself the Mystical Poems of the East (continued on page 459)

E.H. Palmer: "SUFI INTERPRETATION OF OMAR KHAYYAM."

Islamism; Resignation; Submission to the decrees of God.

Mirror; The human heart. Mirrors in the East were of metal, hence the frequent occurrence of such expressions as "polish thy mirror," meaning "purify thy heart."

New Wine: Divine Love.

False: All that is not God.

Morning: The last stage of the journey.

Idol: God as the object of contemplation.

Idol-worshipper: A contemplative devotee.

The Holy of Holies: In Sufi poetry it represents the Perfect Man.

The House of Holiness: Ordinarily used to designate the Temple at Jerusalem, but in Sufistic language, a heart unpolluted by earthly love.

Purity: Inclination towards holiness without expecting reward or promotion, but rather seeking after God for His own sake.

Pagan: The revelation of God's majesty.

A young Pagan: The Germ of the state called ecstasy.

Unity: The Nature of God.

Soul: Darling. The Manifestations of the Beloved (God).

Darling of darlings: A constant mistress. God, the concentration of stability.

Ignorant: Worldly.

Attraction: The nearer approach of man to his Maker, through His Grace.

State: Ecstasy. The beatific state induced by continued contemplation of God. This is considered to be a divine gift, and a sure prognostication of speedily arriving at The Truth.

Wisdom: Metaphysics. Comprehension of the mysteries of Nature.

Tavern: The stage in which the Traveller is immersed in the Divine mysteries.

Khirkah: The patched and ragged garment of a religious recluse. Comeliness and soundness of principle.

The world: Anything that hinders man from seeking after God.

Monastery: The world of Humanity.

Profligacy: Thinking no more of human conventionalities.

Zunnar: The sacred Cord worn by the Magi: The Brahminical Thread. A mistress' ringlet; hence allegorically by the Sufis, the yearning after the appearance of the Beloved One (God).

Cupbearer: The appearance of Divine Love which calls for thankfulness.
 A Journey: Turning the attention towards God.
 Mistress: The appearance of The Truth (God).
 A Night lodging: The last stage on the Journey.
 Drink, Wine: The domination of Divine Love over the heart.
 Wine shop: The invisible world.
 Lover: Man.
 Pleasure: Joy in the Lord.
 Slain (as by the arrows of a mistress' glance). Acceptable to God.
 Embrace: Discovery of the mysteries of the Godhead.
 Drunkenness: Returning from the stage called "meeting" by way of cessation.
 Observation: Rejecting conventionalities, and penetrating deeply into the truths of Religion.
 Death: Eternal life. "Mors Janua vitae."
 Intoxication: Escaping from the domination of Love.
 Tavern: The domination of Divine Love.
 Wine-house: That stage of the journey in which inclination is developed into love by the effect of prayer.
 Voice: The voice of God calling in the heart and constituting Attraction.
 Meeting: The unity of God; also the mean between the external and the internal. Seeing God face to face.
 Time: Fixing the thoughts upon mortality.

M.N. Roy: "SCIENCE AND SOCIETY."@@@

The experience of modern civilisation has put a new content in the ancient Platonic ideal of Philosopher-King. The Greek sage had a prophetic vision; nevertheless, the forms of his thought were necessarily moulded according to the social patterns of his time. Kingship was an integral part of the then political organisation of society. Therefore, the best possible king was logically the climax of the speculation of an ideal society and its just administration. Essentially, the question was: How and by whom should the political administration of society be guided so

(continued from the previous page) that just and Good Life could be realised?

This remained the basic problem of political science until it appeared to have been solved by the theory of modern democratic government. But before long, the cleavage between theory and practice of democracy was detected, and the basic problem of political science once again began to trouble critical minds.

Even before the problem challenged the intellectual integrity of liberal social thinkers and political philosophers during the fateful period between the two world wars, it had been solved by the greatest critic of modern history. The solution was essentially similar to that offered by the sage of Athens. The Marxist view that democracy is possible only in a classless society placed before the modern world the Platonic ideal of Philosopher-King with a new content.

A City-State of the ancient world could be managed by one philosopher. The modern world is politically organised on a much larger scale. The idea of putting one man, however much qualified, at the helm of affairs is, therefore, out of the question in our time. Platonic ideal has necessity to be visualised in the setting of the modern world, Its form is transitory; the essence is abiding.

Philosophers must be at the helm of public affairs, if democracy is to be practised, if the greatest good is to be made available to the greatest number; if the old ideals of justice and good life are to be realised.

So long as philosophers distinguished themselves by proclaiming "ignorabimus", they could not possibly occupy the place allotted to them by Plato. In course of time, science indicated the way for philosophy to come out of that position of helplessness. But philosophers were too proud to stoop to conquer; they would rather fumble in the spiritual wilderness created by their sterile speculations. Science, in its turn, preferred to be modest; it would only describe. To explain was the privilege of philosophy

(continued from the previous page) which mystified phenomena instead of explaining them. Science would only find out how things happened. The question "WHY" was for philosophy to reply. And the reply of classical philosophy was either "ignorabimus" or to refer the world of phenomena to a mysterious metaphysical "nomenon."

This dualism-division of labour between science and philosophy was ended by the so-called "crisis of science" at the turning of the centuries—a crisis which has often recurred since then. The crisis was caused by the fact that, in course of its development, science crossed over the arbitrarily drawn line of demarcation and encroached upon the realm of philosophy. The latter dealt with the unknown, and even with the unknowable. Science brought within the ken of human knowledge one unknown after another. That meant loss of so much ground on the part of philosophy. The logical epistemological conclusion to be drawn from the progress of modern science is that whatever exists can be known; If the Universe exists physically, nothing in it is unknowable.

Nothing remained for philosophy to do. Science usurped its function. It had failed to perform its function of explaining the world. Science promised success where it had failed. But scientists themselves did not realise the philosophical implication of their achievement. Hence the "crisis of science."

A self-contained explanation of the world—without reference to any external cause—has become possible on the basis of a co-ordination and integration of the vast body of knowledge acquired by the different branches of science. The missing link is the apparent gap between physics and psychology. The gap is apparent, because psychology has been merged into physiology, and physiological phenomena can be casually connected with the inanimate world. Chemistry is the bridge.

Science has thus made philosophy possible, and in doing so challenges the autonomy of philosophy.

(continued from the previous page) On the other hand, science will overcome its recurring crisis by abandoning its false modesty and assuming the role of philosophy. Modern scientists are the philosophers of Plato's dream. As true philosophers, they alone can be truly free souls, and as such are fully qualified and therefore capable, to lead mankind to freedom.

H.K. Challoner: "BLIND TEACHERS OF THE BLIND."@@@

It seems to be one of the indisputable facts of life that the moment we make a supreme effort towards any particular goal a host of difficulties instantly arise to confront us. This may be partly explained by the action by the action of that Law by which any effort calls forth automatically resistance from opposing elements; action and reaction being equal and opposite. But it is also true that such resistance can—and often does—serve actually to strengthen resolve, calling into being the very qualities needed to overcome it. Unless, of course, the will or desire of him who strives is fundamentally weak; in which case the effort dies in inertia or despair.

Now, if this true of ordinary material life how much more must it be so in the life of him who is making an attempt to step out of the rank and file and go into training for the vaster life of the spirit?

This is one of the reasons why the aspirant to occult knowledge nearly always finds himself faced with peculiar difficulties and trials; in fact he seems often singled out by fate for tests of all kinds not usually experienced by ordinary men. Sometimes he does not even associate these objective happenings with his inner efforts. But all that will happen to him hence forward will be infinitely more subtle and of more vital significance than the events which normally confront, say the ambitious man of the world, just because the work of the occultist is infinitely more subtle and significant than the work accomplished by materially-minded men not in possession of his knowledge.

(continued from the previous page) Thus the work, too, will be infinitely more dangerous because any results achieved, whether they be good or evil, will have a more profound influence upon the man's future. For knowledge is power and brings with it enhanced responsibilities both towards our own selves and towards all beings and things.

But unfortunately, through ignorance, so many aspirants are totally unaware of what they may expect to encounter in the way of resistance and of "tests", and so fall early into many traps, succumb to many "temptations", fail many occult tests without even knowing that they are doing so.

It should be made clear at the outset that these "tests" are not brought about the agency of any "outside" being or entity in a deliberate attempt to trip up the beginner, to try his strength or to prevent further progress. They represent no more than the result of the working of a natural Law which comes into operation as all laws do, when certain machinery, either material, mental or spiritual, is set in motion. It is the forces within the aspirant himself which bring him these experiences, and nothing and no one else. It may be the recalcitrant elements aroused, by his efforts, to fight for survival; or perhaps a higher and wiser aspect of himself which draws him into those conditions best calculated to develop whatever qualities it needs. This Self is, in the long run, indifferent to failures; perhaps it sometimes even welcomes them, since it is through failure more often than through success that man ultimately learns most; and when the aspirant turns towards the True Occult Path he becomes above all else a learner, and the whole of Life, hence forth should become his teacher. It is sometimes almost as if all things quickened about him and changed their aspect, his effort acting as a magnetic centre towards which all forces converged; or-put another way—as if there awoke that in him which represented a seeing, hearing, perceiving quality, a sensitive, quivering antennae only potential in ordinary men. And this enhanced sensitivity constitutes

(continued from the previous page) a whole series of "tests" in itself.

But, in fact, there are obviously as many tests as there are aspects of the man; for every part of him must be subjected to trial, to a process of strengthening and above all purification, since strength alone without purity and integrity of motive would later on constitute a mortal danger.

Now one of the most common of these tests I would call "the test of the teacher."

All men in their heart desire the teacher. Actually he stands as a symbol of the goal; and he is what the goal is. That is to say, he need not necessarily represent a high ideal, but also any lesser aim if it is dominant enough; one even of which the aspirant himself may be unaware. And this is one of the main functions of such teachers at an early stage, to show the beginner to teach himself.

It is a curious fact that the average beginner in occult studies usually dreams of getting in touch at quite an early stage with a highly advanced teacher who will initiate him into the deepest mysteries of the arcane Science; will show him how to develop psychic powers; will act towards him as leader, "loving father", friend and guide, one upon whom he can always rely, can worship and admire. It seldom seems to occur to him to question his own readiness for such a remarkable relationship. He might with advantage seek an analogy in ordinary life and draw the inference. Does the great professor of mathematics usually teach the infant class its multiplication tables? The idea is simply silly. Why, then, should the advanced being—the Master—teach the beginner in a science infinitely more profound and difficult?

As a matter of fact the true preliminary work in every case must—for an occult reason to be understood later—be done by the man alone in one life or another. When he has prepared the ground, passed certain tests, a teacher—of the infant class, himself the pupil of one slightly more advanced—will almost certainly appear in some guise or another. But very often he will be summarily rejected as not being "occult" or advanced enough for the aspirant who,

(continued from the previous page) having studied a few books, or being possessed of a few psychic powers, considers himself now qualified for infinitely greater things. Test One failed more often than not through vanity and ignorance of another of those fundamental Laws of the great Mystery Tradition which follows in its every detail the Hierarchical Constitution of the Universe.

What happens then? Usually the aspirant comes into touch with another kind of teacher; often the leader of a large and flourishing group, or one purporting to teach only a chosen few whom he will initiate into deep and wonderful secrets and in whom he will develop strange and startling powers. Sometimes he advertises his wares, which surely shows a curious ignorance of that law through which like must inevitably be drawn to like, and does not need luring to it.

What sort of a test is this? Always one of discrimination. To be one of a favoured few; to be under the direct guidance of a leader who usually lets it be understood that he is an initiate of some sort, even perhaps an "adept", or at least in touch with adepts; that he is the repository of tremendous secrets, a purveyor of marvels, is a direct stimulant of pride and separateness. It also encourages the weakness of personality worship – not only that the teacher, but of one's own, as pupil of so great a wonder. It also searches out other flaws in the nature; that universal desire for mystery and marvel rather than for Truth; the longing to develop "powers" rather than spiritual insight which is real power; the glamour of possessing information which makes one feel superior to others and so on and so forth in infinite permutations of vanity and self-seeking. But perhaps above all it ends by testing courage – that courage which can admit error, can break away from the wrong kind of teaching and start off again, empty-handed, seeking for truth. The world is full of false teachers; teachers often as self-deceived as deceiving; and the aspirant is bound to come up against them time and again upon his journey. They might almost be said to be an intrinsic part of

(continued from the previous page) that journey; and they serve an extremely useful purpose if they succeed in opening the eyes of the traveller to his own weakness, thus equipping him for a further stage on his journey towards the True Path.

But unfortunately this is not always the case. Some people never leave the "Ashram" of the false Guru. They follow him with reverent, bent head to the end, refusing to listen to any teaching but his, worshipping his personality and foolishly insisting that in him only shines the Light.

What they are actually doing is disobeying one of the fundamental laws of life, which is the Law of Becoming.

For what is the Teacher? At all times he represents some dominant self in the man's own nature; he objectifies it. A call goes forth, and the nature of that call provides the nature of the response. That is why it is of supreme importance for the beginner to bring discrimination, common—and even uncommon—sense to bear when anyone offers him arcane knowledge. He must test the teacher, he must judge the Judge, so as to discover, before he commits himself to follow this leader, what aspect of his own self he embodies, whether one of the lower ruling selves which ordinarily direct the life, or whether the true Higher Self, the diviner part which would lead him to "Heaven." It will not be easy to discover this, for it will mean a clear-sighted analysis of the self and of all its mixed motives and desires of which few are capable. One way would be to apply the time-honoured test recommended by Jesus: "By their fruits ye shall know them". Not only the characteristic of the teacher constitute his "fruits", but also his other pupils, and above all the direction of his teaching.

For the true teacher of the Ancient Wisdom is aiming all the while at developing character, self-reliance and spirituality. That is why he will never encourage psychic powers in a beginner, because no beginner has the discrimination, integrity, nor the deep wisdom essential in order to wield them aright. Nor will he lay any emphasis on personality

(continued from the previous page) his own or anyone else's. He will make no great claims for himself, nor any great promises for the pupil. A study of the methods of the Zen Buddhist teachers should help the prospective pupil to see what a good teacher of aspirants is like. The Buddha's own methods will also prove illuminating as will the words of Jesus. In one thing all great teachers seem in agreement—they never seek to impose anything by force or with authority upon the beginner, not do they encourage absolute reliance upon authority of any kind. Their main aim is to clear the mists from the sight of those who, in this life, have been "born blind", and to teach them to walk without props by that eternal Light which shines potential in every being.

There are, of course, many good teachers, in Orders and working alone who will train the pupil in the right way from the beginning, but they must be found, that is to say the aspirant must be drawn to them by the inner urge for Truth—and for nothing less an urge which will drive him on and on from darkness forward into lesser darkness, and from twilight into Light.

To this searching test all, at some time, are forced to submit, for it is the test of their integrity of motive. But until the higher side of their nature has developed real power, as like as not they will again and again fall victim to these blind leaders of the blind, and with them be precipitated into the ditch of illusion. But it is no matter if they have the strength to arise from the mire and, freeing themselves from yet another snare of the Great Deceiver, the human personality—pass onward, ever onward towards where the True Master waits behind the Veil of Self.

HAJJI MIRZA JANI: "HISTORY OF THE BABIS".@@@

It is not always clearly recognised that the great schism which has divided Islam almost from the earliest times is not a mere question of names and persons but of principles. That the Prophet must have successors and Islam a supreme head or pontiff is recognized by both parties, but as to the

@@@ "Kitab-i Nuqtatu'l-Kaf" translated by Edward G. Browne.

(continued from the previous page) nature and method of selection of that head they differ widely. According to the Sunni view, any suitable candidate chosen by the consensus of opinion of the Muslims is competent to become the Caliph or Vicar of the Prophet, and though, during Umayyad and 'Abbasid times he was always chosen from one particular family, the method of selection in the period immediately succeeding the Prophet was entirely democratic. The Shi'a, on the other hand, hold firmly to the principle that the Imam, or supreme Pontiff of the Faith, must be a descendant of the Prophet (which practically means a descendant of his daughter Fatima and his cousin 'Ali), and not only a descendant but a particular descendant, nominated explicitly by his predecessor, i.e., by the Prophet in the case of the first Imam, and in other cases by the preceding Imam. Thus the right of the Khalifa to rule reposed on the will of the people, the right of the Imam on the will of God. The Imam was none the less Imam though recognized only by a small minority, and to recognise and yield allegiance to the rightful Imam was the supreme duty of the believer. "Whoever dies", says a familiar Shi'ite tradition, "without having recognised the Imam of the Age, dies the death of a heathen".

To the Persians, imbued as they were with the belief in the Divine Right of Kings, and accustomed from Sasanian times to regard their rulers as divine beings (Shapur I, for instance, calling himself in his inscriptions OEOE and alaha) the Shi'ite theory of the Imamate was naturally the more acceptable, and it is in Persia that it has always had its stronghold. And while some of the Shi'a contented themselves with regarding the Imams as "immaculate", others, known generically as ghulat, or "exceders", invested them with Divine attributes, or regarded them as Emanations of the Deity.

Of these Ghulat there were many sects, differing in details, but all characterized, according to ash-Shahristani,) by four cardinal doctrines

(continued from the previous page) viz. Metempsychosis, Anthropomorphism or Incarnation, "Return" of individuals or types in successive cycles, and variation in the Divine Purpose. Amongst the latest of these were the Shaykhis, or followers of Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa'l, of whom Sayyid (or Mirza) 'Ali Muhammad the Bab was one, while his rival Hajji Karim Khan of Kirman, whose sons are the heads of the present Shaykhis, was another. It is therefore in the doctrines of Shaykhis that the origins of the Babi doctrines must be sought. Now the chief doctrines of the Shaykhis were:

(1) That Ali and the succeeding eleven Imams (twelve in all) were divine or quasi-divine beings.

(2) That since the twelfth Imam, or Imam Mahdi, disappeared from mortal ken in A.H. 260 (4= A.D. 873-4), and will only return at the end of time "to fill the earth with justice after that it has been filled with oppression", and since the faithful are in constant need of his direction and guidance, which God in His Mercy must needs make accessible to them, therefore there must always exist amongst the faithful one who is in direct supernatural communication with the Absent Imam, to serve as a "channel" between the Imam and his people. This person they call "the Perfect Shi'a".

There was, therefore, nothing very new or original in the assumption by Mirza 'Ali Muhammad of the title of Bab, and the position of intermediary between the Absent Imam and his faithful followers. Very soon, however, he "went a step higher", as the Babis say, declared himself to be the Twelfth Imam or Imam Mahdi himself, and conferred the title of Bab on one of his followers, Mulla Husayn of Bushrawayh. Hitherto he had called himself "the gate", "the Reminder", "the Person of the Seven Letters", because his name, 'Ali Muhammad, comprises in Arabic seven letters); now he called himself the Qaim ("He who is to arise"), the Mahdi, and even "the Point".

It must be added that the theory now advanced by the Baha 'is that the Bab considered himself as a mere herald or fore-runner of the Dispensation

(continued from the previous page) which Baha' u'llah was shortly to establish, and was to him what John the Baptist was to Jesus Christ is equally devoid of historic foundation. In his own eyes, as in the eyes of his followers, Mirza 'Ali Muhammad inaugurated a new Prophetic cycle, and brought a new Revelation, the Bayan, which abrogated the Qur'an as the Qur'an had abrogated the Gospels, and the Gospels the Pentateuch. It is true that the Bab emphatically and repeatedly declares that he is not the last Manifestation of the Universal Reason or Prophetic Spirit, and that his Revelation is not final, but that he will be followed by another and a greater Manifestation, whom he calls "Him whom God shall manifest." It is also true that, deeply impressed by the obstinacy with which the followers of each Prophet had in the past rejected, for the most part, the successor whose Advent was foretold in their scriptures and traditions, he again and again urges his followers not to intimate the example of the Jews who crucified their expected Messiah, the Christians who rejected the promised Paraclete (by whom the Muslims understand their Prophet Muhammad), and the Muhammadans who, while professing to expect eagerly the return of the Imam Mahdi, persecuted, imprisoned and finally put to death him who was really intended in the traditions referring to the Imam. And so great was his fear that his followers might act in like manner in rejecting "Him whom God shall manifest" that he bids them, even if they cannot be sure that one claiming this high position is genuine, at any rate, to refrain from rejecting or persecuting him, but rather, if they cannot believe, to keep an open mind. But it is not true, so far as one can judge from the Bayan, that the Bab regarded himself as a fore-runner of "Him whom God shall manifest" in any narrower sense than that in which Moses was the forerunner of Christ, or Christ of Muhammad, or Muhammad of the Bab; while in as much as the Bayan contains regulations for the conduct of the Babi state, and implicitly assumes a time when Persia at least shall have adopted Babism as

(continued from the previous page) the state religion, it may be inferred that the Bab expected that the next Manifestation would be separated from his own by an interval of time more or less commensurate with those intervals which had separated previous Dispensations. Indeed the following texts from the Persian Bayan afford some ground for supposing that this interval was expected to be 1511 or 2001 years.

According to the Bab's conception, as set forth, for instance, in the Persian Bayan God, while comprehending all things, is Himself incomprehensible. As "none but Himself knoweth Himself", knowledge of God must be understood as meaning knowledge of His Manifestation, i.e. of the Prophet of the Cycle; refuge in His Manifestation; meeting Him as meeting His Manifestation, "for none can meet the Most Holy Essence". What is manifested is the Will of God, which created all things, and stands to them in the relation of Cause to Effect or Fire to Heat. Each Manifestation is more perfect than the last and includes all preceding ones, and each time the Divine Will returns with increased strength and fuller Utterance.

Another favourite illustration used by the Babis (though not, I think, occurring in the Bayan), to explain in what sense the successive Manifestations are identical and in what sense progressive, is that of a teacher engaged in teaching different classes of students of different ages and degrees of knowledge. The teacher is the same and his knowledge is the same, but he uses different phraseology and illustrations according to the capacity of his hearers. Thus to a class composed of little children he will perhaps say that knowledge is to be desired because it is sweet like sugar, in as much as their minds are incapable of appreciating its desirability in a less concrete and materialistic form; but to a class of older pupils, he will describe it in a different manner. So Muhammad, for instance, speaking to a primitive and materialistic people like the Arabs spoke of the Resurrection, Heaven and Hell in materialistic terms they could understand; but in the Bayan, which is addressed

(continued from the previous page) to a more highly-developed and civilized audience, it is explained that the Resurrection is the period of the Manifestation of the New Uprising of the Divine Will and is to be understood in the material sense in which the Shi'a Muhammadans understand it.

In order to judge aright the controversies which soon after the Bab's death divided his followers it is very necessary to have at any rate a summary knowledge of the teaching of the Bayan concerning "Him whom God shall Manifest". The following, therefore, are some of the principal declarations about Him in the Persian Bayan. He will certainly appear before 2001 years have elapsed. The desire of the Bayan and of the People of the Bayan (i.e. Babis) for Him exceeds all desire for He is divine.

Now amongst the Bab's followers were two half-brothers of Nur in Mazandaran, the elder named Mirza Husayn 'Ali and entitled Baha'u'llah (the Splendour of God") and the younger named Mirza Yahya and entitled Subh-i-Azal ("the Dawn of Eternity"). At a later date the rivalry which arose between these two half-brothers divided the Babis into two sects, the Azalis, who are now numerically few, and the Baha'is, who now constitute the vast majority of the Babis. At the time when Mirza Jani wrote, however (which, as we have seen, was between 1850 and 1852, within two years of the Bab's death), the utmost harmony appears to have existed between the brothers.

The Bab bestowed on him his personal effects, including his writings, clothes and rings, nominated him as his successor and bade him Subh-i-Azal write the eight unwritten Wahids of the Bayan.

Subh-i-Azal, who was indubitably appointed by the Bab as his successor, consistently refused to recognize his half-brother's claim, so that the Baha'i, who must necessarily accept the divine character of the Bab's mission (since he who believes in one Manifestation must accept all preceding Manifestations), is driven to make the assumption that the Bab, being divinely inspired and gifted with divine knowledge and pre-science, deliberately chose

(continued from the previous page) to succeed him one who was destined to be the "Point of Darkness" or chief opponent of "Him whom God shall manifest".

So difficult, and especially so opposed to the Shi'a theory of the Imamate, is this assumption that it is perhaps not to be wondered at that Baha'is endeavoured to get over the difficulty by ignoring Subh-i-Azal's existence as far as possible, and by suppressing all documents tending to prove the position which he undoubtedly held. Foremost amongst such documents was Mirza Jani's history, which, as we have seen, was so successfully suppressed that had it not been for the accident that an intelligent and sympathetic though unbelieving foreigner, the Comte de Gobineau, obtained and brought to Europe a manuscript of the work in question before the "exigencies of the time" demanded its suppression, it would probably have perished utterly. When I was in Persia in 1887-8 the Babis whom I met generally feigned complete ignorance of the very name and existence of Subh-i-Azal, and it was only because I had read the Comte de Gobineau's *Religions et Philosophies* that I was ultimately enabled to ascertain that he was alive and to visit him in the Spring of 1890 at Famagusta in Cyprus. And though I made many enquiries amongst the Babis in different parts of Persia for Mirza Jani's history, I found no trace of its existence. This fact is very instructive in connection with the history of other religions, for it is hard for us, accustomed to a world of printed books and carefully-guarded public libraries, to realize that so important a work as this could be successfully suppressed; and equally hard to believe that the adherents of a religion evidently animated by the utmost self-devotion and the most fervent enthusiasm, and, in ordinary everyday matters; by obvious honesty of purpose, could connive at such an act of suppression and falsification of evidence. The application of this fact, which, were it not established by the clearest evidence, I should have regarded as incredible, I leave to professional theologians, to whom it may not be

(continued from the previous page) devoid of a wider significance. Of this much I am certain, that the more the Baha'i doctrine spreads, especially outside Persia, and most of all in Europe and America, the more the true history and nature of the original Babi movement is obscured and distorted.

Now Mirza Jani's history contained, besides the portions which it was desired to suppress or alter, a mass of historical matter which was of the utmost interest to all Babis, whether Baha'is or Azalis, and of which the preservation did not clash with the "exigencies of the time". What may best be described as a "Bowdlerized edition" of the work was therefore prepared under circumstances fully detailed by Mirza Abul-Fazl of Gulpayagan, a very learned and devoted old follower of Baha'u'llah, and issued under the name of the "New History."

We must now consider in somewhat further detail how Mirza Jani's history was treated by the compiler of the New History. First he entirely suppressed the original Introduction and substituted one of his own of a much less metaphysical and more rationalistic character. Secondly, he entirely suppressed the original conclusion dealing with the history of Subh-i-Azal and the events immediately succeeding the Bab's death, and substituted a quite different conclusion of his own. Thirdly, he suppressed all mention of Subh-i-Azal, whose name only occurs once in a sentence clearly interpolated in the British Museum Ms. of the New History. Fourthly he toned down or suppressed incidents and expressions not in accordance with later Bahai sentiment or calculated to create an unfavourable impression on the general reader. Baha'u'llah greatly developed the ethical and repressed the metaphysical side of Babism; strove to make peace with the Persian Government by representing himself and his followers as loyal subjects of Nasiru'd-Din Shah, the arch-persecutor of the Bab and his disciples; told his followers that they should prefer to be killed rather than to kill, that they should "consort with those of all creeds with spirituality and fragrance"

(continued from the previous page) and that all men "were fruits of one tree and leaves of one branch". The original Babis, on the other hand, were more like the old Covenanters; they might consider themselves as "meek", but they fully intended to inherit the earth; they held those who rejected the Bab as unclean and worthy of death; and they held the Qajar Shahs of Persia in detestation which they were at no pains to hide. Hence considerable modifications had to be made in Mirza Jani's phraseology in order to bring it into harmony with Bahai ideas as to what should have been the demeanour and phraseology of their predecessors.

Sayyid Yahya's remark to Mirza Jani, that he would with his own hand kill his father if he should deny the truth of this (Bab's) Manifestation, is omitted by N.H.

One day the Mulla of Mah-Ku had the honour of waiting on His Holiness and having a discussion with him. While addressing that Proof of the Age he manifested some discourtesy, whereupon the Ocean of Divine Wrath was somewhat stirred, and He (the Bab) brought down his staff with such vigour on the figure of that foul creature that the august staff broke in two. He then ordered (his amanuensis) Aqa Sayyid Husayn, (entitled) Azis, to drive out that dog from the room, though the accursed fellow was a person of great consideration and was highly respected by the Khans—some three hundred in number—of Mah-Ku. Yet though His Holiness (the Bab) so vehemently displayed the quality of his wrath in respect to him, none ventured to chide him."

These are the sort of incidents suppressed in the New History, as not in conformity with the ideals of "Sweetness and Light" or "Meekness" advocated in the later Dispensation of Baha'u'llah.

The death of Muhammad Shah, who, according to Mirza Jani "went to Hell", while according to the New History he "passed away to the mansions of Paradise."

The sermon preached by Fanab-i-Quddus on that

(continued from the previous page) occasion certainly lends some colour to the accusation made by the Muslims against the Babis, viz. that they advocated communism and community of wives.

The following curious passage is also omitted by N.H.

"Amongst other instances, one night a dog was howling, and he (i.e. Sayyid Basir) remarked, 'This dog in the "return" (or re-incarnation) of such-and-such a person, whom God hath (thus) tormented on account of sins'. He likewise indicated his (former) abode, saying, 'It is the seventeenth house from this in which we are, and by such-and-such signs (ye shall know that) my statement is true'. After they had made investigations, these signs proved correct."

"Certain mischievous men represented to the Amir-i-Kabir, i.e. Mirza Taqu Khan that the Babis were intending a revolt, and that several thousands were assembled (for this purpose). Apparently this (statement) was not absolutely false, though the matter was not so serious as this. It seems that some hypocrite of their own party had gone and wrought this mischief."

The words in italics, it will be noticed, are entirely omitted by the New History.

The effect produced by these alterations is easier to appreciate than to describe, but it calls up quite a different picture in the mind, and transforms the exalted and indomitable enthusiasts of the early period into moralizing martyrs conformed to the later Baha'i ideals.

Thus there are now reckoned four sects of Babis, viz.(1) the so-called "Kullu-Shay'is", or old Babis, who remain stationary in the first Dispensation, and decline to concern themselves about the question of the Bab's successor. There must be very few, and I have never met with them. (2) The Azalis, who recognise Mirza Yahya Subh-i-Azal as the Vicar or Successor of the Bab, and consider that "He whom God shall manifest" has not yet come. These also are few, and their numbers

(continued from the previous page) are probably diminishing. (3) Those Baha'is who, recognising Baha'u'llah as "Him whom God shall manifest", hold that there shall be no fresh "Manifestation" for at least a thousand years (as explicitly laid down in the Kitab-i-Aqdas and other of their scriptures), and that in as much as Baha'u'llah's son 'Abbas Efendi (Abdul-Baha) advances some claim of this nature, he is to be set aside in favour of his brother Mirza Muhammad'Ali. (4) Those Baha'is, who, holding that "there is no intermission in the Divine Grace" recognise 'Abdul-Baha's claims (the exact nature of which I cannot confidently define) and regard him as the actual Theophany. These are the minority, and it is curious to observe how the history of Subh-i-Azal and his half-brother Baha'u'llah has repeated itself in the case of Mirza Muhammad'Ali and his half-brother 'Abbas Efendi, or 'Abdul-Baha, and how in the Babi church the "stationary" or conservative party seems ever doomed to defeat. Yet 'Abbas Efendi's position was a much more difficult one to maintain than his father's, for while, as we have seen, the Bab's utterances concerning "Him whom God shall manifest" made it almost impossible for his followers to deny the claims of any claimant, Baha'u'llah seemed to have left no loop-hole for a new Manifestation in the millennium succeeding his death. Thus it is written in the Kitab-i-Aqdas. "Whosoever lays claim to any (such) authority before the conclusion of a thousand years, verily he is a liar and a calumniator".

This last schism, I confess, and the bitterness to which it gave rise, created a very painful impression on my mind, for, as I have repeatedly enquired of my Bahai friends, where is the compelling and constraining power which they regard as the essential and incontrovertible sign of the Divine Word, when, in face of such text as "Associate with (the followers of all) religions with spirituality and fragrance" and "Ye are the fruit of one Tree and the leaves of one Branch", they can show bitter animosity towards those of their own household?

Although the Baha'is are in the habit of exaggerating the number of converts they have made outside Persia, it is nevertheless a fact that their religion has spread far.

THE BAB: "THE BAYAN OR SCRIPTURE OF THE BABIS". @@

As Gobeineau has correctly pointed out, all the later writings of the Bab are included in the term Bayan, though it is specially applied to those written in the Qur'anic style. Gobeineau reckons three Bayans, two in Arabic, of which one is much longer than the other, and one in Persian. It is to the latter that this Index applies. I read it through and made an abstract of the contents, in which I endeavoured to note every point of interest of importance, and from this abstract I constructed the Index or Concordance printed above. As the Persian Bayan has never been printed, reference could only be made to the Sections into which it is divided. It was evidently planned to consist of 19 Wahids, or "Unities", each containing 19 Babs, or chapters, but only half was written, and it ends with Wahid IX, chapter 10 thus containing in all 162 sections. It appears to have been purposely left unfinished, so that the remainder might be added by "Him whom God shall manifest". Part, but not the whole, of this Supplement was written by Subh-i-Azal.

All actions are to be performed for the Prophet of the Cycle.

From the time of Adam until the present manifestation 12,210 years have elapsed.

Men love Ahmad because they have been so taught to do from childhood.

A vacant place to be left in every Assembly for the manifestation and if possible, 18 more places for the "Letters" who will accompany him.

Bab is devoid of formal learning. Bab was 24 years of age at the beginning of his Mission. Date of his "Manifestation", 5 Jumada 'I, A.H.1260 = May 23, 1844. Bab is identical with the Imam Husayn. Salvation is obtained by belief in him. His family must be held in honour.

THE BAB: "THE BAYAN OR SCRIPTURE OF THE BABIS"

The chapters of the Bayan are arranged according to the "Number of All Things"; the Proof offered by the Bayan is adapted to the requirements of the Age; all creatures working together could not produce the like of the Bayan; the Bayan is incomprehensible save to such as are divinely aided. 700 verses from the Bayan are to be read night and morning.

Books called "speaking" and "silent"; only such as elucidate the Bayan are to be studied.

Christians were in duty bound to believe in Muhammad on his appearance.

Whoever denies the Bab and refuses to take refuge with him shall not escape the fire.

Meeting with God is equivalent to meeting with the Prophet of the Age, for none can meet the Most Holy Essence. Belief in God is incomprehensible without belief in manifestation availeth nothing. No one should have any will but God's Will. God loves not to see sorrow.

Study of grammar forbidden except in so far as it is necessary for understanding the Bayan.

"He whom God shall manifest" (the Manifestation) is the "Speaking Book"; on His appearance those who do not believe in Him cease to be believers. He is not to be asked 'Why'? His command is equivalent to God's command.

Jesus Christ was inferior to Muhammad. Those who believed in Jesus Christ returned in successive Cycles to believe in Muhammad and the Bab, and will return to believe in the Manifestation.

Study of dead languages prohibited.

Logic, its study forbidden as useless.

Unbelievers likened to stones and believers to mirrors.

The year to contain 19 months, each of 19 days according to the "Number of All Things". (361= 19²)

All things are to become new in this Manifestation.

“Number of All Things”. God has ordered the world according to “Number of All Things” 19 x 19.

Papers, the best to be used for books and letters

Perfume should be used, if practicable, instead

THE BAB: "THE BAYAN OR SCRIPTURE OF THE BABIS"

(continued from the previous page) of water for purification in God's House. Perfume to be used for washing the dead, when practicable.

Study of Philosophy forbidden.

One of the signs of the Qaim's advent, viz that Injustice has filled the earth, has been fulfilled.

The proof of a new Revelation is adapted to the needs of the age and the development of men's minds, and in each age that which men held in the highest esteem has been made the criterion. e.g. in the case of Quran eloquence, in the case of the Bayan wisdom, etc.:

The essential condition of any transaction is that both parties to it should be satisfied.

Travelling discouraged, (except for purposes of Trade.)

Zuhurs or of the "Point"; the later Zuhurs contain by inclusion all the preceding Zuhurs. All actions are to be performed for and in the name of the Manifestation of the Age, for such only are truly done "for God".

M.N. Roy: "PRINCIPLES OF POSTWAR INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION".@@

All economists may not as yet accept the theoretical proposition that labour creates all value. But if the proposition is stated differently, there is bound to be a greater measure of agreement. The modified statement is that labour is the creator of all wealth. The distinction between wealth and value is a subtle theoretical point which may be left out of the scope of this paper dealing mainly with the practical problems of post-war reconstruction and the part which Indian labour is expected to take therein.

This war is causing wholesale destruction. The world is bound to be seriously impoverished by it. The fundamental problem of post-war reconstruction, therefore, will be one of creating wealth quick enough. The allied problem of distribution, of course, will also have to be solved. But the problem of production is the prior problem. Therefore, labour is bound to occupy the central place in the

@@ "Independent India"

(continued from the previous page) scheme of post-war reconstruction.

If the impoverishment, caused by the war, will not be counter-acted quick enough by the creation and equitable distribution of wealth, then even the defeat of Fascism may not prevent a serious set-back to human progress to the extent of a possible breakdown of modern civilisation and the consequent relapse into barbarism. Big wars producing such tragic results are not unknown in history. The last great war almost brought about a similar tragedy. In a way, it did have that consequence. Fascism was bred in the conditions of economic disorganisation and social chaos created by the last world war, as well as by the peace treaty which concluded it only superficially.

Wars always cause impoverishment. But in our times, the evil is not unmixed. Not only during the period of preparation, but even actually in the midst of the wars in our time, old means of production are improved, and new ones are forged. Improved and new means of production make for the economy of human labour. Therefore, they can compensate for the loss in human life suffered by society in a war. That being the case, the problems of post-war reconstruction should be baffling, if the sovereignty of labour in the process of production will only be fully recognised.

Conventionally, the post-war period will be marked by an economic crisis—of so-called over-production. The qualifying term 'so-called' is used deliberately. Because, over-production is always imaginary. It may have some reality from the point of view of exchange for profit, which is called trade. But from the point of view of use, production generally speaking (not of any particular commodity), can never be excessive. Useful goods (and luxury also has utility) cannot be disposed of only when the power of consumption of the world as a whole does not keep pace with the growth of production. Owing to the widespread impoverishment, which will be caused by the present world war, the disparity between the possibility of production and actual capacity for consumption will be greater. That will be

(continued from the previous page) the case of the post-war economic crisis. The problem of post-war reconstruction will, therefore, be how to remove the cause.

The social value of labour has to be assessed not only as the producer, but also as the consumer. Such a comprehensive view alone can combine production with distribution. If labour is to be treated simultaneously as producer and consumer, then countries like India, which have still now remained in the backwaters of the world, will assume great importance in the scheme of post-war reconstruction. Because, the bulk of labour there is to be appreciated, at present, and perhaps for yet some time to come, more as consumer than as producer. Its development as such will directly contribute to the solution of the economic-crisis which will overtake the more industrialised countries of Europe and America after this war.

Since labour is the creator of wealth, India should be the wealthiest country of the world. But she is not. She is one of the poorest countries of the world. This anomaly is due to the fact that the great bulk of Indian labour is wasted. The productivity of Indian labour remains on a very low level, and it has remained there stationary for ages. Only a small fraction of Indian labour has been affected by the introduction of the modern means of production during the last generation or two. If the world is to be regarded as a whole, as the common home of the human race, then India's poverty means poverty of the world. For the sake of the post-war reconstruction of the world, this lamentable situation should not be allowed to continue. The task of the post-war period will be to rescue from impoverishment the countries which have had the misfortune of being devastated by the war. India is in a position to help the accomplishment of that task very greatly. Her vast reservoir of labour should be released for that purpose.

Increased productivity of Indian labour and the parallel expansion of the capacity to consume will make India such a gigantic factor in world

(continued from the previous page) economy as will win for her a correspondingly important place in the scheme of post-war reconstruction. Greater productivity of labour will increase wealth, and in order to remove all obstacles to that process, the increasing wealth must be widely distributed. That will make of India a prodigious buyer in a very short time. As such, she will contribute largely to the solution of the economic crisis of "over-production" in the more industrialised countries, impoverished by the devastations of the war.

Cultivation of land taking place under feudal relations of property does not permit introduction of the modern means of production. Consequently, the productivity of labour remains very low. The bulk of the total social labour has to be devoted to the production of food, just enough for bare subsistence and reproduction. Under such economic conditions, society stagnates. There is no appreciable increase in the creation of wealth. A considerable part of whatever is created is appropriated by a leisure-class which enjoys a parasitic existence. Consequently, society as a whole remains in poverty. By and large, that is the economic situation of India even to-day. Her potential riches are being misused – wasted.

Two things are to be done. Firstly, labour must be released from the primitive social function of producing food for a bare existence, by freeing it from the bondage of decayed feudal relations. And secondly, it must be more fruitfully employed through the introduction of modern means of production both in agriculture and industry.

The problem appears to be baffling. It is a vicious circle. Industrial backwardness keeps the country poor, and the poverty of the country hinders the development of modern industries. But the problem ceases to be baffling, a way out of the vicious circle becomes evident, as soon as it is remembered that there is a world of difference between production will be placed on the latter basis, the great asset of a vast reservoir of labour will assert itself on the situation, and not only will the problem of Indian reconstruction be solved, but a big contribution will be made to the solution of the problem of post-war

(continued from the previous page) reconstruction of other countries.

One principle which should guide the scheme of post-war reconstruction is to treat the world as a whole. Uneven development has been the cause of conflicts, which broke out periodically in devastating wars. Social and economic development in the different parts of the world may be co-ordinated, if it is guided by some generally accepted principles. No levelling is suggested. The economic development of particular countries may be adjusted to their respective natural resources, climatic conditions and geographical environments. But there must be co-operation instead of competition. It is not necessary to over-industrialise some countries and to hold forcibly in the backwardness of agrarian conditions. Even agrarian economy can be modernised, and the productivity of labour performed on land increased through the introduction of mechanical means of production.

A large measure of Government control of the economic life of the nation was introduced in Great Britain also during the last world war. But after the war, all control was removed. It is apprehended that the same thing may happen this time also. But the chaotic consequences of the restoration of laissez faire after the last war have their lessons, which are not likely to be disregarded this time.

A special committee of the London Chamber of Commerce, in its report submitted in May 1942, outlined "the general principles of a post-war economy". The following passage occurs in that report; "It is widely admitted that there was something radically wrong with our economic system."

What was "radically wrong with our economic system"? It was disregard for the original purpose of production. Instead of producing goods for the use of the community, industries produced only for exchange. In other words, production was not planned. It was chaotic. The result of such an economic system inevitably was recurring depression and dislocation of the economic life caused by so-called over-production. Ultimately, the result culminated in "the wretched financial history of the twenty-one years between the two wars," against the repetition

M.N. Roy: "PRINCIPLES OF POSTWAR INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION"

(continued from the previous page) of which the report of the special committee of the London Chamber of Commerce sounds a warning, and recommends preventive measures.

A bodily written document called "A Twentieth Century Economic System" which is incorporated in the Report of the Special Committee of the London Chamber of Commerce, anticipated the resolution of the British Labour Party Conference. It declared; "One of the crying needs of our civilization is a measure of material security and stability, and this system can provide neither. It ignores human nature and will not be tolerated by the workers in the second half of the twentieth century."

The basis for a new economic system has been laid by the war. Experience has proved that production can be planned, and that planned production eliminates the chaos of distribution. But the experience of war economy has also proved that production cannot be planned without placing some restriction on private ownership.

Is it, then, not possible to plan Indian economy, notwithstanding the chaotic conditions which are allowed to prevail during the war? It is possible, because in the last analysis the war has laid the foundation for planned economy also for India. The only obstacle is the unlimited right of private ownership and the reluctance to abandon an economic system which has proved to be radically wrong because it is antiquated.

If production was not artificially restricted owing to the fear of an imaginary post-war slump, the currency expansion with an adequate covering would increase the purchasing power of the people thus giving a tremendous impetus to the economic life of the country. The deliberately practised economy of scarcity results in an inflationary tendency even in the present state of currency expansion. The bogey of inflation, in its turn, scares the Government, and it is considering the suicidal policy of checking the possibility of a slight increase of purchasing power created by the conditions of war.

M.N. Roy: "PRINCIPLES OF POSTWAR INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION"

The general principles of post-war economy formulated in the Report of the London Chamber of Commerce include that international payments in future should be received only in goods and services. That is a very sound principle, which will undermine the practice of more prosperous and powerful nations getting others into "unpayable indebtedness". That practice is the foundation of modern imperialism.

If private ownership of the means of production has prevented the urgently needed expansion of war production and actually sabotaged production of consumers' goods, private control of the channels of distribution has created an artificial scarcity of primary necessities.

The absurdities of a radically wrong economic system can be removed by planning production, by producing to supply human demand, instead of equating supply with effective demand. No planning can be successful unless it is guided by the principle that the purpose of production is to meet the requirements of mankind. Once that principle is accepted, there can never be over-production, and the spectre of post-war slump will disappear.

India's economic life has been caught in a vicious circle, so to say. Increased productivity of labour is the primary condition for the economic progress of any country. India possesses an almost inexhaustible supply of labour. Nevertheless, she has remained economically stagnant because the productivity of her labour could not be progressively increased. Unless modern industries grow, labour cannot be withdrawn from land; but on the other hand, industrial development is conditional upon a rising purchasing power of the masses. While agriculture still remains the basic industry of the country, retarding the growth of modern industries by keeping the bulk of labour tied to the land, increase of the purchasing power of the masses is conditional upon a radical change in the relations of property in land. The vicious circle of Indian economy was the result of opposition to those changes necessary for the welfare of the community as a whole.

M.N. Roy: "PRINCIPLES OF POSTWAR INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION"

The Report of the London Chamber of Commerce says: "The limiting factor in the production of real wealth has been the failure to distribute to would-be consumers enough money to buy the potential output. Mass production implies mass consumption. We are driven, then, to investigate the mechanism for the provision of purchasing power. Whilst an amazing revolution has taken place in the science of production, no change, in any way commensurate, has taken place in the financial mechanism."

Industrialisation of India to any appreciable extent is not possible within the limits of production for exchange, that is to say, on the basis of the capitalist economy. The situation is still more aggravated by the fact that in India capitalist production itself takes place on the background of feudal and even patriarchal social relations. These relations deprive the agricultural producer practically of his entire surplus produce and consequently keep the bulk of the population on a very low standard of living which sets a rigid limit to the possibilities of the Indian market.

Assuming that consequently industries will flourish like mushrooms, what will happen to the additional commodities produced? They will have to be sold. And capitalist industrialists will not sell them except at a profit. So India under a National Government will presently come up against the old problem of the limited purchasing power of the people. That difficulty will slow down the development of industries, and who will be the scapegoat then?

It is a veritable dilemma. The only way out is planned economy. The capitalist economy cannot be planned. Therefore it is no use talking of industrialisation, whoever may indulge in that talk, either the British industrialists or the Indian nationalists, unless the realisation is there that it cannot be done except with the purpose of producing goods for the use of the people. Whoever will plan Indian economy from that point of view, will bring the Indian people nearer to the goal of freedom. It remains to be seen who will play that historical role.

M.S. MACKENZIE: "A SEMANTIC STUDY ON THE WORD 'MASTER'.[#]

When we meet a new word, we interpret it to ourselves by means of what we already know, but we may only gain a limited understanding of it until our experience has been enlarged. The word itself will contribute to this end if we desire it; in any case it will act as a focus for ideas which earlier we tended to scatter or mislay.

Sometimes an existing word is used in a special or technical sense, while retaining its historical meaning for ordinary use, and many mistakes of understanding are due to this. Such a word is Master. In France the word *matre* is used for one who has attained mastery in his art or profession, and *le matre* in his atelier holds a position analogous to a Master in his ashram in India.

Slavery and hunting are ancestral legacies from which we cannot escape by mere denial, for they are in our sub-conscious, and until we recognize them and equilibrate them they are liable to lead us to disaster. Enslavement is an element of sex-life however much it may be sublimated and however much the roles may alternate between the sexes.

Before we come to the occult conception of Master we must be free from emotional confusion about Master/slave, Hunter/hunted. We have known these things after the flesh; if we turn from them it must not be because we fear their fascination, still less because we feel disgust or indignation; we must have freed ourselves in our minds and emotions.

I stated that a word will act as a focus for ideas which, earlier, we tended to scatter or mislay. A focusing-point may be a point of danger unless we are alert, disciplined, controlled. By concentrating on a word we send out a signal: soon we may be caught in the beam of a searchlight.

Before beginning to concentrate on the idea of the Masters it is very important to make sure that we are fit in body and emotionally sound: it is especially important to ensure that no buried or suppressed emotions are likely to surprise us and lead us to disaster.

[#] The Occult Review. 1943.

One way of purifying our usage of a word is by resting it and by using other words temporarily. We may use Guru; the relation of the Guru to his chela is clearly seen in such works as *The Crest Jewel of Wisdom* and *In the Hours of Meditation*. We may use Shepherd, recalling the Divine Pymander, Shepherd of men. We may also use Father, a word familiarized to us not only by the Gospels, the Pauline epistles.

Lack of condemnation is the first sign of a Master. The woman taken in adultery was condemned by the Pharisees, but when she was brought to Jesus His light made their own imperfections stand out as black shadows, so that without a word of explanation or accusation they crept away. "Neither do I condemn thee," said Jesus. It was surely a monkish hand that penned "Go, and sin no more." If it were in keeping, a similar injunction would have been given to the Prodigal Son, where the captious elder brother played the same part as the accusing Pharisees.

The first step in the search for the Masters, as taught in Occult Schools, is to find the Master in the heart. All occult teaching insists on that individual experience as a preliminary step to any further contact. Help may be given in that preliminary stage, but it is the help of a physician. P.G. Bowen puts the case well in *The Occult Way* when he writes: "Occultism is for those only whose psychic health is already above the average—the diseased person goes to the healer to have something done for him. The sound person goes to an instructor to learn how best to do something for himself."

A seeker may fail to find the Master in the heart because he is looking for a slave-driver and he falls victim to his own fantasies, "drawn away by his own lusts and enticed." Of such people, the curse of Occult Groups, Manly Hall writes: "Most cut-joiners are crazy—some mildly, others violently."

If we seek a Master, why do we do so? The answer must surely be because we wish to perfect ourselves. If an occult student dedicates his life before

(continued from the previous page) he frees himself from bondage in his mento-emotional nature to such matters as slavery (including sex in its seductive aspect) hunting (and war), his mixed attractions and repulsions will bring him into the environment of someone, incarnate or discarnate, who will use him until he is of no further use. It happens.

Work is the first test of faith, for there is seldom anything remarkable about it; it may, in fact, be just the same work as before. Unless we see that by offering it as a holy sacrifice we make it different we have failed. So to offer means that we have put our life into it, not renunciation.

Interesting the whereabouts of the Masters is always discouraged, not only to safeguard them from intrusion but because the whole conception of the relationship becomes debased. It is not a case of the Master there and the pupil here in space and time; it is more an overshadowing of Spirit, a correspondence, an identification. The pupil has tuned his string to the same note as the Master's and one note results.

Many seekers rest content, thinking they have finished the course when they have experienced the overshadowing in the innermost places of the heart, but they have by no means finished. They must also learn to see the Master in the events that come, the people they meet, in unfamiliar guise. When our griefs are greatest we should be most alert for a new joy, a greater revelation.

When we have learned not to limit our conception of the Master to one form or image, however lofty, we come to the greatest, the highest conception of finding Him in all things, the Master in His world. Where He is we dare not label anything common or unclean. Was it not to show this forth that the Master Jesus ate and drank with publicans and sinners?

If we remove our search for the Master from the physical plane and from extension of any kind, it may still be necessary to have a symbol in our minds to which to refer our thought, love and will.

(continued from the previous page) For some it will be the figure of the Buddha in meditation: for others, the Christ on the Cross. The symbol must be a living reality to us, and in time we may forget that it is our own creation because the life flowing through it comes from the fountain of life.

There is another method which makes more appeal to minds not nurtured in Christianity or Buddhism. It is to watch the flow of images that passes before the mind habitually and to work up the one which makes the greatest and most constant appeal.

Do we then hold out to humble souls nothing but a long and dolorous succession of life after life until by slow degrees and with many failures and tears they awaken the reluctant god within? It may be so but it need not be so. It is necessary to point out that no one sincerely and with his whole heart seeks the kingdom of the spirit unless he be drawn thereto by what theologians call "prevenient grace". A man whose lack of development prevents him from going far in one life will not be attracted by holiness. Those who are appalled by what seems the bleakness of the way ahead reveal that they are not ready and that they are leaving human love and life and laughter for "compulsive, irrational aims." They have not been called: they have only had nightmare.

If we turn to this high endeavour, we must have mastered greed and fear, flattery and condemnation. These ordinary human frailties become terrible dangers the moment we apply the fire of aspiration. The reason is that in their proper setting they have their natural limits; once they are given greater scope they may become uncontrollable.

The inspiring records of the lives and sayings of the Masters of the human race, in so far as we can disentangle them from misrepresentation, reveal clearly that the negative way of asceticism, denial of life, leaving all, is an intermediate stage and that the full development requires a voluntary return.

If we place too much dependence upon an individual Master, however much we may owe him for our

(continued from the previous page) training, we tend to obscure our own showing of the Light and we limit our growth. Only the best should be good enough for us, nothing less than the All should suffice; as Krishna says: "who worship the gods go to the gods: My worshippers come to Me."

Many aspirants waste their time in knocking at doors which must be closed to them. Exclusiveness and scenery have their place in dramatizations of the Mysteries and other ritual performances because not only must the profane person be kept out but also those not mentally prepared or emotionally secure. But the way of the Mysteries is not fitted for many present-day aspirants; if they will but find their own place in the modern world they may come to realize the Presence of the One Master without specific ritual or instruction. They may become the Self-taught of whom Thrice-Great Hermes declared: "This race my son is never taught: but when He willeth it, its memory is restored by God."

Study of the word has shown us the strong duality of domination/submission. We must balance the opposites and free ourselves from the role of suppliant if we dare to match our Self.

Bernard Palmer: "THE CASE FOR MEDIUM SIZED TOWNS".@

Whereas the townsman goes into a frenzy of dismay when electric power pylons are made to march across a beautiful valley, the countryman raises a cheer because they bring the amenities of the town nearer to him, and make his struggle with Nature a less lonely one.

Is it any wonder, then, that a countryman with any pretence to intelligence soon begins to look longingly at the town where there are more people with whom to exchange ideas, more ideas to exchange; where there are theatres, concerts, lecturers, and all the other evidences of intelligent life? Where in fact, there is civilisation. All civilisation starts in towns, and spreads outwards through the suburbs in successively weaker bands. Towns are essential to the best development of man, whether artistically or socially.

@ "Mysindia" weekly.

Bernard Palmer: "THE CASE FOR MEDIUM SIZED TOWNS"

If we could but combine the advantages of both, how happy we could be! William Morris, and the town planners of last century, believed that they could, and laid out the first garden suburb, Bedford Park.

The truth is, our towns have grown too unwieldy in size. Their increasing population needs perennial rehousing, and spawns more and more suburbs right out into the country.

There is a size beyond which it becomes uneconomic for a city to grow. The force, economy in power, which gave the original impetus to the accretion of population, has largely died away. The day has largely died away. The day has gone when manufacturers always required heavy power plants, or the ready presence of coal, or good water or rail facilities for transport. Electricity has liberated industry from the thrall of the first, and the internal combustion engine from that of the last. The day of the large city has passed: the era of the medium-sized town is before us.

Services like sanitation, water supply, food distribution, acquire larger and larger margins of unproductive costs. Growing towns demand growing services, and where these are of the "permanent" variety (like sewers) the cost of extension or improvement is out of all proportion to laying new systems in new areas. Food, too, becomes more costly as the haulage distance increases, and certainly does not gain in freshness.

The school of thought which favours the medium-sized town offers many arguments for employing our large cities and building a number of smaller ones.

The smaller town permits more familiarity of its dwellers with the countryside, and conversely, owing to the greater number of towns that would be needed, more access to the intellectual life of towns for countrymen. Thus the two communities of town and country would be drawn closer together in understanding, and would each reap the benefits of the other's experience. The levelling up of town and country life envisaged by Lenin would thus be, to some measure, achieved.

The proponents of such ideas usually think of such towns as garden cities. That is, they favour the individual house set in a garden of generous dimensions. This is very true to the individualistic British tradition. Probably their greatest exponent is Lewis Mumford who, some years ago, published a very fine sociological analysis under the title *The culture of Cities*. In the course of his thesis he introduced arguments from psychology, sociology, biology, and, indeed, most of the sciences. It is the product of a truly integrated mind, and deserves close attention.

On the other hand, there are those who are more continental in outlook, and seek to arrest the decay of large cities by revolutionary methods of rehousing. The present norm for English housing schemes is twelve houses per acre. The land thus left uncovered is used for private gardens, roads and small open spaces. If, says this school of thought, these dwellings were placed one above the other in the form of huge blocks of flats, the space thus released could be used to lay out beautiful parks round each building. The *rus in urbe* ideal could thus be truly achieved. Many of the arguments against city life, it is claimed, could thus be neglected. Food distribution services would be greatly reduced as vendors would not have so much unproductive travelling between sales. The same argument would apply to collection of house refuse. Water, lighting and other services would be cheaper to install and maintain, with fewer heavy mains to provide and more of the cheaper indoor installations.

In point of fact, both methods of solving the problem of cities have been experimented with in the past, and will continue to be used in the future. There are people who prefer to live in flats, people who hate to do so, and a very large number who do not mind where they live, so long as it is cheap and convenient. Provision must be made for all tastes, and if flats are cheaper there will always be some who will sacrifice other pleasures for that of living in their own separate house.

Bernard Palmer: "THE CASE FOR MEDIUM SIZED TOWNS"

Industrialisation must mean a considerable measure of urbanisation. The question is, what sort of urbanisation? Is it to result in the dreadful slums which arose in England a hundred years ago?

A new city grows up round a source of employment: so why not experiment by building factories away from the larger towns, and try some real town planning? To make Bombay or Calcutta larger until they have "digested" their existing population would be to invite disaster. Here is a chance to learnt from the mistakes of others, and apply the lessons almost from the outset. Will the days to come see the opportunity of planning a new and pleasant urban India grasped, or will urbanisation just "happen," and pile up a burden of ugliness and misery for future generations?

E.G. Browne: "THE BABIS OF PERSIA."**

Babism is destined to leave a permanent mark in the world.

All that I could learn was that the sect existed in secret, and was believed to be increasing in numbers. I therefore determined that should I have an opportunity of visiting Persia, I would make the investigation of this matter one of my chief points. In the year 1887 this much-wished-for opportunity presented itself.

I was advised by my Persian friends, whenever I alluded to the subject, to obtain from mentioning a name so distasteful to the government. After remaining two months and a half in Teheran, I had scarcely added to the information which I already possessed to any material extent, and though I had met with people evidently well disposed towards the Babis, I had not found one who would avow to me that he belonged to them, or who would speak of them in any but the most guarded manner.

There are two seals with a particular device cut in cornelian which are used by some members of the sect. This device consists of a vertical straight line with a hook at either end turned to the left, which is crossed by three horizontal lines, also with curves at both ends. The upper and lower of these

** In: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. 1889)

(continued from the previous page) latter have also at each end an affix resembling the soft.

They a different manner of looking at things to the Muhammadans, but likewise they often employ words and phrases which are not used, or less frequently used, by the latter. One of these is the word "zuhur" (manifestation), which with them bears somewhat the sense of the word "dispensation" in the mouths of our theologians.

An Armenian gentleman at Shiraz said to me: "I like the Babis because of their freedom from prejudice, and open-handedness; they will give you anything you ask them for without expecting it back, though on the other hand they will ask you for anything they want, and not return it unless you demand it."

The tendency commonly observed in history to traduce and malign new religions, the tenets of which are imperfectly understood owing to the secrecy necessarily observed concerning them.

Babism attracts several very different types of thinkers.

Firstly, those who, having been rigorous and pious Muhamadans, are convinced by the arguments adduced by the Babis from the Kur'an and Traditions, that in the appearance of this religion are fulfilled the promises given, or believed to have been given, concerning the advent of the twelfth Imam, or Imam Mahdi.

Secondly, those who desire the reform and progress of their country, and behold in Babism capacities for this which they do not see in Muhammadanism.

Thirdly, Sufis and mystics, who regard Babism as a systematized and organized Sufiism, essential in its doctrines with their own pantheistic beliefs; and who consider its fundamental teaching to be the divine sprat latent in man, by the cultivation of which he can attain to the degree of "Fenafi'llah," or "Annihilation in God," wherein he may cry out, like Mansur-i-Hallaj, "Ana'l-Hakk," "I am the Truth" or "I am God."

Lastly, there are a certain number of people who are attracted by sheer admiration and love for the Bab, or his successor Beha. These stand more or less isolated from the Babi community; they are satisfied with dwelling in their minds on the perfections of their hero, and celebrating his praises in poems.

This young man declined to ally himself altogether with either the Beha'is or the Ezelis, the two unequal parties into which the Babis of to-day are divided. The former of these recognise Beha not only as the Bab's successor, but as "He whom God shall manifest" himself, of whose coming the Bab continually spoke, and of whom he declared that he read one verse of His was better than to know the whole Beyan. The latter recognise Mirza Yahya (called by them "Hazrat-i-Ezel," "His Highness the Eternal") as the Vicegerent of the Bab, and consider that "He whom God shall manifest" has not yet appeared.

On the death of the Bab, Mirza Yahya, who received the title of "Hazrat-i-Ezel" (His Highness the Eternal), was chosen by general consensus of opinion as his successor, and appears to have left Persia and taken up his residence in Baghdad almost immediately. He laid no claims to prophetic rank, being merely the "Khalifa," or vicegerent of the Bab.

Beha announced his divine mission, and claimed to be "He whom God shall manifest" (A.H.1283 = A.D.1866-7). On his making this announcement, the Babis were divided into two parties, some admitting Beha's claim, and others, at the head of whom was Mirza Yahya, who had hitherto been regarded by all as the Bab's successor and vicegerent, denying it. These latter argued that "He whom God shall manifest" could not come until the religion founded by the Bab had obtained currency, and the laws laid down in the Beyan had been adopted, at least by some of the nations of the earth. They asserted that it was an impossible thing that one revelation

(continued from the previous page) should so soon be abrogated by another, and that so brief a period should separate two "Zuhurs," or manifestations: while they further adduced texts from the Beyan to prove that more than a thousand years, and probably either 2001 or 1511 years (represented respectively by the sum of the letters in the words Ghiyas and Mustaghas according to the abjad notation) must elapse between the time of the Bab and the advent of "Him whom God shall manifest."

Against these arguments the followers of Beha quoted numerous texts from the Beyan to the effect that the day and place of His coming were known to God alone (Persian Beyan, iv.5, vi, 3, vii 10); that He will arise suddenly (vii,9), and is to be known by Himself, not by the Beyan(vii.11), for he is the fulfilment of the verse "Leysa Kemithlihi shey" (There is none like unto Him) (v.16); and that it was impossible that any one should falsely claim to be Him (vi.8). They urged, moreover, that all through the Beyan the utmost stress was laid upon "verses" (ayat) being the essential sign and proof of a prophet, and that the Lawh-i-Nasir, in which Beha announced his prophetic mission, and other writings of his, fulfilled the conditions which constituted "verses", viz. Eloquence of diction; rapidity of utterance; knowledge unacquired by study('Ilm-iladuni); claim to divine origin; and power to affect and control the minds of men.

The discussion between the two parties grew fierce, and finally they came to blows in some cases, and several on either side were killed. The Turkish Government decided to separate them, and it was determined to send Mirza Yahya and his followers to Cyprus, and Beha with his adherents to Acre on the Syrian coast.

Much difficulty was experienced in carrying out this arrangement, the Beha'is refusing to be separated from their chief. One of them cut his throat, and refused to allow the wound to be dressed and the haemorrhage checked, until he received a promise that he should be allowed to accompany his

(continued from the previous page) master to Acre. Others cast themselves out of the ships which were to separate them from him into the sea.

With regard to the seven Ezelis sent to Acre, they were massacred one night by some of the followers of Beha, but without the knowledge of the latter, so far as we can judge.

The followers of Beha have been increasing in number and influence, the followers of Mirza Yahya decreasing, so that among the many Babis with whom I formed acquaintance in Persia, I only met six Ezelis. These, of course, do not accept any of the writings of Beha as inspired, and their sacred books are confined to the Beyan, and other writings of the Bab. Mirza Yahya is also the author of some books, I believe, but these are only regarded even by the Ezelis, as of the secondary importance, while the Baha'is reject them entirely.

Thus at the present day nearly all the Babis are Beha'is, and the Beyan, and other writings of the Bab, are in their eyes already an abrogated revelation; -a sort of Old Testament, read occasionally for edification, but no longer authoritative as a guide of life and belief. It is this fact which makes copies of the Beyan so difficult to obtain, since they have become scarce; and moreover the Babis prefer to place in the hands of the inquirer the writings of Beha.

The latter are very numerous, since all the letters sent by him to his followers or others are regarded as inspired writings in the fullest sense of the word. Beha never appears in public, and never leaves Acre except to visit a garden which he possesses in his vicinity, and this he does at night. He is constantly waited on by one who known amongst the Babis as Jenab-i-Khadimu'llah (His Excellence the Servant of God), who admits those who desire an audience in parties of from half a dozen to a dozen, at stated times. A scribe is also present who writes so swiftly that he can take down verbatim all the utterances of Beha, which are subsequently copied out for distribution. These audiences

(continued from the previous page) of which I have spoken do not appear to last long as a rule.

It seems desirable to say something of the relations and antecedents of the Babi movement. Now these are of two kinds, which I may call formal and essential. By the formal relations of the sect, I mean the schools of thought wherein Mirza Ali Muhammad the Bab received his training, and from which he presumably acquired the germs of the doctrines which he subsequently elaborated. By the essential relations, I mean those religious or philosophical movements with which Babism has most similarity, though no external connection can be shown to exist between it and them.

That they adapt their conversation to those with whom they are speaking there is no doubt. With a Muhammadan they will speak of the coming of the promised Imam Mahdi, and emphasize the doctrine that the production of verses like those of the Kur'an is the essential sign and proof of the prophetic mission. With a Christian they will speak of the expected coming of Christ and the signs thereof, pointing out that if the Christians blame the Jews for not recognizing Christ as the promised Messiah, and failing to understand that the prophecies concerning the kingdom of the latter were intended allegorically and in a spiritual sense, they are equally to blame if they insist on a literal fulfilment of the signs of Christ's coming, and refuse to see that He has returned. So also, in speaking with a Zoroastrian or a Sufi, they will use arguments likely to commend themselves to their interlocutor.

This, however, is not so very remarkable, since the same method is common in greater or less degree to most proselytizers. But I remember on one occasion, during a discussion in which I was engaged with a learned Babi at Shiraz, some point arose connected with the nature of the divinity which they attribute to Bab and Beha, and manifestations of the Divine in general. One who was present was about to offer some further explanations when the

(continued from the previous page) chief speaker checked him, saying. "He is not yet ripe". This remark naturally suggested to me the idea that the doctrine was only disclosed by degrees, as the mind of the enquirer was found prepared to receive it. A certain comparatively small class of Babis, especially those drawn from the ranks of the Sufis, simply regard the one essential inner doctrine of all prophets and saints in this and preceding "manifestations" as the oneness of the highest portion of the human soul with the Divine Essence. Hence the doctrine of the divinity of Beha to them presents no difficulty at all for they have their Mansure, their Juneyds, and their Bayazide, each of whom claimed to be divine.

To these the prophet is merely the murshid, or spiritual guide, on a larger scale; and in either case the ultimate outcome of his teaching is to enable the murid, or disciple, to realise the same truth which he has attained to. Babis of this class ought perhaps to be regarded merely as Sufis attracted by the prestige and influence of Bab or Beha, but really retaining their original beliefs almost or quite unmodified, and, as it were, reading these into the doctrine to which they have attached themselves, rather than deriving them from it. It was only at Kirman that I met with Babis of this type, and when I repeated their views to some of the influential and learned Babis of Yezd, they unhesitatingly and strongly condemned them; and the following passage from the Lawh-i-Akdas (of which I spoke in my last paper as the most concise and authorities resume of the Babi doctrine of the present day) is clearly intended to discourage all such mystical speculation, and render impossible that method of allegorical interpretation which the Sufis have so freely applied to the Kur'an.

Sheykh Ahmad tried to combine theology with philosophy, and to reconcile dogma with reason. The result of this attempt, according to our author,

(continued from the previous page) was to satisfy neither theologians nor philosophers, the former disliking him as unsound, the latter despising him as illogical.

He used to live an austere life, believing that in his dreams he held converse with the Imams, and received instruction from them.

The use of perfume, and especially rose-water, is strongly recommended both by the Bab. The Babis often use rose-water to wash their faces, and frequently keep otto of roses amongst their sacred books. Some of the babi books which were not written expressly for me, but were given to me by their owners, still preserve this perfume.

Since the Babis believe that in every Zuhur or "manifestation" there must be a "Point of Darkness," opposed to the "Point of Light."

Briefly stated, then, the line of argument is this: The Unchanging and Unchangeable Essence of God has existed from Eternity of Eternities in unapproachable Glory and Purity. No one has known It as It should be known, and no one has praised It as It should be praised. It is above all Names, and free from all Likeness or Similitudes. All things are known by It, while It is more glorious than that It should be known through aught else. From It was produced Its Creation, which has had no beginning in time, and shall have no end. This Emanation or Creation was produced by the Primal Will, and though eternal in duration, is subsequent to the latter as to causation. Since it is impossible for created beings to know the Divine Essence, the Primal Will has, for their guidance and instruction, incarnated itself from time to time in a human form. These incarnations are known as "Prophets," and there have been endless numbers of them in the past, and there will be in the future. That which spoke in all the prophets of the Past, now speaks through the Bab (or the Nukta to speak more accurately since, as we have seen, the former title belongs to a period antecedent to these teachings), and will speak through "Him whom God shall manifest" and after him through others, for there is no cessation to

(continued from the previous page) these Manifestations. The Primal Will is like the Sun, which rises and sets day after day, but is always the same Sun, in reality, though we may, in ordinary parlance, speak of "the sun of to-day," or "the sun of yesterday." So in like manner, though we may, in common language, speak of Adam, Noah, Moses, David, Jesus, and Muhammad as distinct, in truth that which spoke in each of them was One, viz. the Primal Will. Have they accepted Islam intelligently, or unintelligently as a mere inheritance from their parents? If the latter, they are not truly believers at all, in as much as they believe without reason, and are, in fact, exactly like the unbelievers of old, who answered the appeals of the prophets who came to them with the words, "Verily we found our fathers in this religion, and we follow them." If the former, by reason of what proofs have they accepted it? They have never seen the prophet, neither have they witnessed any miracles, so that the written word of the prophet only is their proof.

What is the significance of the number nineteen, and of the peculiar arrangement of the Beyan? Each of the letters of the Arabic alphabet has, as is well known, a numerical value, and according to these values they are arranged in an order differing somewhat from that in which they are ordinarily placed. Hence every word may be represented by a corresponding number, formed by adding together the values of its component letters. This property is utilized in representing dates by a sentence which at once describes the events, and sums up in the numerical values of its component letters that number which is desired to chronicle. The cabbalistic method of interpreting texts, or discovering their inmost meanings, depends on the same property of the letters, as does the science of talismans. In short, the "Science of the Letters," and the "Science of Numbers," are in the East highly esteemed and diligently cultivated, and skill therein has always been considered an accomplishment of the highest order. The number 1, therefore, represents the Unmanifested, Undifferentiated,

(continued from the previous page) Unknowable Essence; 19, the manifestation thereof. Going a step further, we find 19×19 , i.e. 361, represents the manifested Universe. This the Babis call 'adad-i-kullu shey,' "the number of All Things;" and we add up the values of the letters in 'kullu shey,' we find they come to 360, which with the "One pervading the Numbers," makes 361. The number 19, being thus recognized by the Bab as the sacred number, plays a prominent part in his system. God, the One (Vahid = 19), the True Existence (Vujud = 19), the Living (Hayy \pm the One pervading the Numbers = 19), by means of the 19 "Letters of the Living" (Hurufat-i-Hayy) created "All Things" (kullu shey \pm the one pervading the Numbers = $361 = 19 \times 19$).

In the World, He is represented by Mirza 'Ali Muhammad, the "Point" (Nukta) and the 18 disciples, called "Letters of the Living," who first believed in him; these together constituting the complete "Unity". Each of the 19 members of the "Unity" had 19 immediate disciples, who represent the "Number of all things." (361).

They consider that men have continually fallen into error in not recognising the fact that the revelation which they believed it was not final. Consequently, on the arrival of the new "manifestation," they have always for the most part rejected it. The Bab is determined that his followers shall be, as far as possible, prepared and warned against this danger.

In this sense, therefore, they are all equal, but the same cannot be said of their revelations. For the human race is ever progressing, and consequently, just as a child is taught more fully and instructed in more difficult subjects by its master as its understanding ripens, so also the Primal Will, the Instructor ('Murabbi') of mankind, speaks in each successive manifestation with a fuller utterance.

But now the world has reached a stage of development when it can be told the truth about these

(continued from the previous page) things without parables and similes, viz. that Paradise is belief and Hell unbelief. But although this revelation is much fuller than preceding ones, it must not be considered final. On the contrary, it is merely intended to prepare the world for the fuller measure of truth which will be uttered.

Many such ordinances suggest to us the idea that the Bab had in some degree taken European civilization as his model.

Certain passages in the Beyan would tempt us to imagine that the transmigration of souls formed a part of the Bab's belief and teaching, as would certain modes of expression often employed by the Babis. Yet if you ask them whether they believe in metempsychosis, they will answer in the negative, and declare that the doctrine, though superficially resembling this, is in reality otherwise. I must make a distinction between "Individuality" and "Personality". The former is the real, essential, and permanent part of a man; the latter, the temporary peculiarities which condition him in a particular state. To make the meaning of this clearer, let us take the favourite Babi metaphor of the "Letters." The forms of these exist in the mind in unseen types which cannot be destroyed. They likewise have endless external "manifestations," which are transitory and perishable, and which show forth more or less clearly their original archetype. It is the same with men. Just as we may write an alif on a piece of paper, and then tear it up and destroy it, and write another, and say, "Alif has been written again," or "has returned", so also we may say, "Huseyn has returned in Mira' Ali Muhammad," for both are manifestations in different mazhars (places of manifestation) of the same Divine "Letter."

Next follows an absolute prohibition of mendicity couched in the following words: "The most hateful of mankind before God is he who sits and begs: take hold of the rope of means, relying on God, Causer of causes."

How cautious we should be in attaching too definite a meaning to the vague and mystical expressions in which these Babi texts for the most part abound.

Mirza Yahya Subh-i-Ezel is accused of having tried to poison Beha. As a comment on it I will therefore here give the Ezeli account of the same transaction, translated from a MS. which I recently obtained of a very rare and interesting work entitled *Hasht Bihisht*, composed, as I was informed, by the late Haji Seyyid Jawad of Kirman, an ardent partizan of Subh-i-Ezel's. It will be seen that not only the charge of attempted fratricide, but also the charge of bringing a false accusation of the same against the victim of the attempt, is brought by both factions of the Babis against the chief of the rival faction. Which version, if either, may be true, it is impossible to decide, but at least the fierce animosity which subsists between the Ezelis and Beha'is will be sufficiently apparent from a perusal of either.

The author of the Traveller's Narrative, who may very probably have been one of Beha's own sons, and who, at any rate, wrote under his immediate sanction, and had every means of ascertaining the facts, must have known this, and must therefore have deliberately and purposely antedated the 'Manifestation'. His reason for so doing is, I think, not far to seek. He desires to curtail as far as possible both the extent and the duration of Subh-i-Ezel's authority, and to give colour to his assertion that Beha was from the first recognised by the Bab as that Greater Deliverer whose advent he announced. Having accounted for the (according to him) temporary and nominal supremacy of Subh-i-Ezel by describing it (T.N. ii, pp.62-3) as a precautional measure designed to divert attention and danger from Beha'u'llah during his continuance in Persian territory, he is compelled, in order that his theory may appear consistent with facts, to represent this supremacy as ceasing on the arrival of Beha'u'llah at Bagdad.

The movement which now characterized the Muhammadan world was not so much the growth of rationalism among a certain section of Muhammadans in different countries who had come in contact with Europeans, or the adoption of European reforms in an Oriental garb, as was to some extent the case with the Babis, but the rise or development to almost unexampled influence of mystic sects, whose heads, each in their own way, claimed before their followers to be the door, avenue, or "bab," to the Deity. The orthodox clergy were puzzled how to act in this matter, for, on the one hand, they did not wish to quench the spirit of Muhammadan fervour evoked by these sects, and, on the other the interposition of saint- or chief-worship, was opposed to the true spirit of single-minded orthodox Muhammadanism. The fact was, that old bodies like the Naqshbandis, Kadiris, etc. had received a new lease of life from the impetus given by European encroachments, whilst new sects like the Senusis had acquired an enormous influence which might soon be a danger to the orthodox community. Sunnis were less affected by such aberrations than the Shiahs, whose quicker imagination, influenced by the spirit of Persian scepticism, ever made them a ready prey to false Imams; but even the Sunnis could not escape the contagion, for not only was there ever a covert affection for the "House of Ali," which was fostered by its descendants, the Sharifs and Sayads, but a "Mahdi" was also looked forward to by them as a Messiah for existing evils.

The Babis reminded him of the crude notions of reforms which germinated in the heads of young Hindus or Muhammadans who had just passed the Entrance Examination of an Anglo-Indian University and who wanted to combine reform with self-deification. If, however, Babism was something more than this, then it might have esoteric analogies to those pernicious sects which were more or less connected with the history or legendary tradition that had sprung up in connexion with the Seventh Imam, in other words, with the Ismailians, the so-called

(continued from the previous page) Assassins or Hashishin, the followers of the old man of the mountain and the worshippers of the mad Fatimite Khalifa of Egypt, Hakim. The direct lineal descendant of the Seventh Imam, was for the existing Ismailians, H.H. Aga Khan of Bombay, a very amiable nobleman, fond of racing, and as pious as many of his followers were impious; but he was the object of veneration or rather adoration of thousands in Central Asia, especially in Derwaz, Shignan Wakhan, Zebak, Hunza, etc. and to him, instead of to Mecca or Kerbela, was a pilgrimage properly due, for a living Imam was surely better than a dead prophet. Dr Leitner possessed some portions of the mysterious Kelam-i-pir, which, with these nominal Muhammadans, took the place of the Koran (thus offering an analogy with what he has understood Professor Browne remark as regards the Babis). The "Kelam-i-pir" was a work which practically dismissed most of the orthodox Sunni or Shiah observances; indeed to the Mulais or modern Ismailians the Sunni was a dog and the Shiah an ass, and the specific tenet was the inter-relation of all life, whether animal, human or that in plants and even stone, instead of personal immortality rewarded immediately by eternal bliss damnation.

Secrecy has formed one of the main elements of the policy whereby, under pretence of inculcating a stricter observance of the religious law introduced by the conquerors, it has been sought to transform their religion into something absolutely inconsistent with its real spirit. In the case of Ismailism, the mass of the people, it is well known, was kept in ignorance of the goal which it was helping its leaders to reach. A comparatively small number, whose vanity was carefully flattered, were, under the seal of secrecy, allowed an insight into mystical interpretations, all tending in a direction at best only dimly perceptible to the learner. Only a select few were allowed admission into the innermost circle of men who, with full and complete knowledge, laboured for the definite ends, to the attainment of which they had devoted their

(continued from the previous page) lives. How admirably their policy was based upon a deep knowledge of human nature and a profound insight into the character of the people with whom they had to deal, has been clearly shown.

PERSIAN MSS. ASCRIBED TO ARISTOTLE: "ON PHILOSOPHY" @

Do you not know that the meaning of the word 'philosophy' is 'fondness for wisdom'? and that the mind in its substance and origin is philosophy, and only delights in it, and only obtains peace therefrom?

O friends of wisdom! do you not see that the seeker after wisdom whose soul has become free from sin has mortified himself before death in respect of friends, and wealth, and empire, for the sake of which men desire the life of this world, and undertaken much sorrow and a heavy burden in seeking wisdom—sorrow so great that it can only be relieved by death? What desire has he for life who enjoys none of the pleasures of life; and why need he flee from death who can only rest in death?

The most acquisitive of scholars is he who acquires no knowledge until he has disciplined himself and corrected himself; the most accurate of speakers is he who attempts not to speak save after meditation, and the soundest of workers is he who acts only after deliberation. And no one more needs deliberation and caution in carrying out a plan, than the philosopher in undertaking matters of which the trouble is present and the reward prospective. First let him meditate; then, when meditation brings sight, let him make sight his guide to action; and if sight show that the action will be remunerative, then let him endure the trouble of doing before he reaps the fruit. And when after seeing he resolves to undertake the work, at the time when he should reap the fruit he ought not to be vexed at the trouble he has endured.

No one knows a thing who is unable to distinguish it from what differs from it—Lysias: How so? —Aristotle: If the saying of the wise Darius be true, that no one knows the truth who cannot discriminate it from the false, and no one knows

@ trans by D.S. Margoliouth in Journal Royal Asiatic Soc.1892.

(continued from the previous page) what is right who cannot sever it from what is wrong, then so long as you are not acquainted with the absent, you have no means of knowing the present.

Now tell me the explanation of a single saying that I have met with in the works of the great Plato: that everything that does good averts ill; but not everything that averts ill does good; and that the philosopher should amass a great quantity of those things which both avert ill and do good and be content with a small number of those things which avert ill but do no good – Aristotle. Plato tells you that only those things suit the philosopher which bring him good and avert ill from him; and thereby he means knowledge which brings illumination to the mind and averts the darkness of ignorance; and he bids him acquire much of it. And of that which averts ill but is unprofitable, which is food, clothing and lodging, he bids him be content with as much as it absolutely necessary, because to exceed the limit in these things does harm to the intellect, whereas to seek the mean averts ill, but does not positive good, since none of the pleasures of knowledge proceeds therefrom to the mind. Hence it behoves the philosopher to be easily satisfied with obtaining the means of subsistence and very eager to acquire knowledge. – Simmias: What is it that prevents that which averts ill from doing positive good when both agree in averting ill? – Aristotle: That which does positive good differs from that which averts ill in this, that whatever averts ill only, if it be pursued to excess, ceases even to avert ill, and becomes detrimental; whereas that which does positive good, i.e. knowledge, the more there is of it the more beneficial it is; whereas that which averts ill only does so, so long as it in moderation. Do you not see that if you are satisfied with a modicum of food, it averts the mischief of hunger? similarly drink and clothing; whereas all, if there be more of them than is necessary, become detrimental, and their power of averting ill even is annulled, like heavy armour which wounds or kills its bearer.

(continued from the previous page) Whereas that which both does good and averts ill (that is, wisdom) however much there be of it, does not, like heavy armour, weigh down its possessor.

Aristotle: Since the pursuit of philosophy is the best of the pursuits of this world, and the recompense there for is the greatest of the recompenses of the next world, philosophy is the best science that you can pursue—Diogenes: Is there any other knowledge besides philosophy or not?—Aristotle: The vulgar herd have a sort of knowledge and science and truth and honesty and generosity and other wasted virtues, which are as different from wisdom as the form of an animal is from a picture or sketch on a wall.—Diogenes: Why do you call those virtues of the vulgar herd wasted?—Aristotle: On account of the ignorance of the vulgar with regard to them—Diogenes: How so? —Aristotle: Because the vulgar wise man brings his knowledge into play there where it will not increase his gain, and their merciful man spares him who is worthy of exemplary punishment, and their veracious man brings his veracity into play when it pleases him, though the truth be obsence, and their liberal man keeps his promises to people's ruin, and their hearer bears to no purpose.

Now tell me: To whom was this thing, I mean wisdom, first made clear?—Aristotle: The minds of men are far from being able to attain to any thing so grand without teaching; just as their eyes are far from seeing without the light of a lamp—Diogenes: From whom did the philosophers learn it?—Aristotle 3/4 The heralds and ambassadors of the different ages in the different ages in the different regions of the globe were constantly summoning mankind thereunto; and the first person on earth to whom that knowledge came by revelation was Hermes.—Diogenes: Whence came it to Hermes? —Aristotle: His mind was taken up to heaven and it came to him from the Archangels, who had got it from the record of God. From him it came to the earth, and was received by the sages.—Diogenes: How am I to know that Hermes obtained that knowledge from the inhabitants of heaven?—Aristotle

(continued from the previous page) If that knowledge be the truth, it can come from above. — Diogenes: Why? — Aristotle: Do you not see that the upper part of each thing is better than the lower? The upper part of water and its surface are purer than the lower; the higher parts of the earth are pleasanter and fairer than the lower parts; the best member of man is his head, the purest thing in a tree is its fruit; and so on with everything. The fittest thing, therefore, to come from on high is wisdom.

L.E. Whipple: "INTELLIGENCE AS UNDERSTANDING AND AS BEING." @@

The books define Intelligence as "the capacity to know; to understand; to comprehend;" and its chief synonym is "Understanding." This is correct and it is well to know it, definitely; but it does not carry us far toward a practical comprehension of the meaning and uses of the word for philosophical purposes.

The structural activity of matter, alone, can never account for the element of Intelligence, in being. In all of its finest expressions, in the intricate structure of the cells of the brain-tissue and ganglia throughout the physical system of man, the entire action suggests an operator with a purpose and in possession of knowledge, ability and design.

Now we would ask the materialist who hypothetically finds life in the cell, and postulates intelligence in the brain tissue: Which of these parts of the physical structure is it that knows so much; that understands so deeply; that comprehends all the intricacies of physical life; that can exhibit the supreme activity of Intelligence? All of the other parts, organs, and functions of the physical body operate, both together and separately; always with design, yet not always with the same design; and in every instance with a definite purpose, yet not all of them exhibiting the same purpose. They are not alike, in form, in structure or in operation; yet they all exhibit

(continued from the previous page) intelligence in their actions, and of the same order, as regards the qualities, abilities, and purposes. Either one intelligence is exhibited in different degrees by all these functional activities, or each has its own separate intelligence within itself. Let us examine this:

If the intelligence is a function of one physical part, alone, then that part, having the sole power of understanding, is the ruler and directs all the other parts. Well! Which of the parts, organs, or functions of the body thus rules the rest? Is it the cell? The ganglion? The nerve fibre? The nerve centre? If so, which of the many members of each is it that controls the others? Does the muscular system rule? The bony structure? The blood? The cuticle? The heart or any vital organ? Or, do you say it is the brain, we must consider the fact that the brain is an organ, and its tissues are composed of cells; and this would place Intelligence in the cells, making the Cell the intelligent director of affairs. What then becomes of the others? If all the intelligence belongs to the brain cells, alone, how do other cells perform their functions? If it belongs to cells of all kinds, but to no other parts, what gives the other and even finer parts their own apparent power and ability?

There are parts of the ganglionic nervous system that are too fine to be seen, even with the aid of the highest-power microscope: and probably too fine in construction and intricate in action for the cellular system to be responsible. These finer activities are not excluded from the field of Intelligence, but are, in fact, more completely involved with it than any other parts or functions of the human economy. It is most difficult, therefore, to attach Intelligence exclusively to the cell or to cell life; and it is equally difficult to attribute it to any one feature of physical action. What then! Has each part an Intelligence of its own, exclusive of the others? If so we have an army without a general. Many that understand, but

(continued from the previous page) no one to direct. Numbers, without one. Multiplicity with no Unit. This against all philosophical reasoning, and is contrary to the intuitions of the higher nature. It is also illogical and contrary to mathematical law. Where there are many organised activities there must be an intelligent head, i.e., one who knows and understands all the powers and modes of action involved in the entire system, and can direct every operative power. Manifestly, no one physical part, organ, or faculty that we can find, conceive, or imagine, can perform so high a functional act; therefore, we must look further for an adequate hypothesis for Intelligence capable of officiating everywhere, in all matter, and in the Understanding of the mind, as well.

As there cannot be an efficient body without a head, or a numerical body of anything without its structural one, and, as we find there are intelligences, groups of apparently intelligent, organs, functions, parts, or centres of force, each understanding its part, or being intelligently directed in its performance, we are logically forced to the conclusion that there must necessarily be a Centre of comprehension; an intelligent Director of the whole; a Head to the body of understanding; a One to the numbers of functional activity, and a Unit to the multiplicity of intelligent operators. This one, when found, must represent the Whole Understanding and be the Whole Intelligence.

The next effort of the materialistic mind is to attribute the power of the activity to Sense, and to make the five senses the seat of the operations of Intelligence. But the senses cannot think, any more than can matter itself. They are closely associated with matter and its movements, and simply report what is done; they never originate anything. No combination of the senses can be made to produce thought; but each sense at once produces, in evidence, whatever the mind establishes as a condition for it. This is proved in hypnotic experiment. Also, any one of the senses may be quiescent or even entirely destroyed, and still the man can think.

(continued from the previous page) The loss of any number of the senses does not lessen the power to think. In fact, the less active the senses are, the deeper the mind thinks, as a general rule; and we do not yet know but that if all the external senses become inoperative, the person can think to even a greater extent than while associated with them. The evidences of clear, unprejudiced thought, based upon a close study of the mind, all lie in that direction. The Senses, therefore, cannot be made responsible for Intelligence; it seems to be beyond them, and to exceed all their functions and powers.

After analyzing matter and the senses as thoroughly as we may, the activities of intelligence are still unaccounted for; yet there is the most undisputed evidence of the presence of Intelligence and its activities, as fundamental reality in the universe. It is observable in every sense operation, and in every organic function of the body of everything, in the mineral, vegetable, animal and human realms of life and being. As it is not physical, as regards either the mineral or the sensuous phases of the matter, and, in investigation, proves to be quite opposite in character from these external elements, we turn for explanation to the opposite element of being, and postulate Intelligence of spirit – the permanent activity of reality. Here we find an entirely different ground for investigation where research soon proves to be more productive of results.

When we fully consider the nature of Intelligence as an operative power, function, or element of being, and the many intricate processes by which we are made aware of its existence in the universe, including its relation to the activities of our lives, the question becomes not so much what is the Intelligence that rules the whole of these varied activities of our lives, the question becomes not so much what is the Intelligence that rules the whole of these varied activities, as who is the intelligent head and leader, directing affairs understandingly, and exhibiting such extraordinary powers of intelligence as to be beyond the range of both matter and sense? The

(continued from the previous page) subject at once takes the form of "Being," and individual action becomes necessary in order that we may comprehend its operations. Intelligence is more than "Understanding" because it is a subject capable of being understood, itself; there must be something which can "understand" it, and Intelligence is the power to understand. This view of the subject makes it easy to bring our investigations from the material to the spiritual plane and examine the element of Intelligence as a spiritual activity – the power to know, which belongs to Being, itself.

When we begin to investigate spirit as an element, every step carries us further into the realm of activity, where metaphysical truths can be demonstrated and understood.

All of the forces of Reality are metaphysical in nature, because spiritual instead of material; and they can be understood only through metaphysical investigation of the principles which engender their activity. While there may be a physical reproduction, in atomic structure, of the form and limitations of man's conception of a metaphysical truth, the reality of it subsists in spiritual substance, and can only be known through exercise of such faculties and functions as are like in its nature, and operate through the same laws to produce Reality in the result. There can be no exception to this rule. The power "to know" is necessarily a spiritual power, for there is nothing about matter, itself, that can account for an activity so intricate. The processes of thought-action are mental; they include the picturing of ideas, which are spiritual in their activity, and the imaging of the conception of things that are understood. The "things" which are understood, are spiritual things, else they could not be known; for material objects are only sensed in relation to their presence; they can never be understood except through analysis of their inner qualities, which are absolutely spiritual. They must be examined by spiritual faculties; otherwise only the shell of external appearance will be noticed and only matter recognized. The "understanding" of things,

(continued from the previous page) therefore, is a spiritual process of the activity of spiritual faculties, and is purely metaphysical in every possible feature of its nature, its character, its action, and its powers.

All "ideas" are necessarily spiritual. No amount of the aggregation of atoms, molecules, masses, or cells of matter itself, can be or become an idea; it can only crudely represent the separate from the structure of the personal man's limited comprehension of the idea. The idea is a permanent reality, while the expression is but a temporary and passing illusion. The activity known as a "Conception" is essentially spiritual in every particular, as it relates to spiritual ideas and indicates a knowing recognition of the truth of the idea conceived. There is no possible mode of the action of matter or of material form that can give any semblance of a Conception. You do not conceive a thing, an object, a form, an operation or an action—you simply sense its presence, in terms of material thought; but you do conceive an idea, and evolve uses and actions for the Conception, through appreciation of its real qualities. The substance of an idea is spirit; the activity of its being is spiritual activity; that which conceives its truths is spiritual being and the conception of it is the result of Spiritual Activity. Unless we admit this we have no facts to which we can point for evidence of our hypothesis, and no statement can be proved. In such event we can only dogmatize, and hope that others will be dull and unthinking enough to believe that what we state is true, without troubling themselves to investigate. Of course we do not desire such a result to our speculations, but unless we can establish permanent truth as our premise, this is where we shall eventually land. The material statement is invariably empty and its expectations hopeless. The "understanding" of Sense is void of Intelligence.

Its offices are all for the beneficent guidance of man through the tangles and the shadows of external appearances, the wiles of sensuous life, the allurements

L.E. Whipple: "INTELLIGENCE AS UNDERSTANDING AND AS BEING."

(continued from the previous page) of sense reasonings, the pitfalls of the emotional nature and the sophistries of false logic, into the open fields of the Truth and Reality of Being, where his soul will continually expand in the gaining of new understanding by every intelligent experience.

The defining of Intelligence as Understanding, alone, without carrying the conception far enough to include the nature of the being who understands, is the result of thinking in sense terms and attempting to account for activity, as nearly as possible, by mathematical theories.

But back of this there must be a faculty through which to know, and a Being of living reality which can understand. The nature of this Being must account for the ability to understand as well as for the power to know; and the principal element of its being, or consciousness, must be such as to clearly account for all of its activities. These activities, powers and abilities, are similar in character, a fact which points to one element of living reality as the source of all, and suggests that each such power of observation and interpretation may be a phase of the one element which is fundamental to every mode of comprehension.

In this sense Intelligence becomes more than a power—it is that which is powerful; more than ability—it is that which is able, or has capability for action; more than knowledge—it is that which knows; more than understanding—for it is the Being which understands.

It is also worth noting that the more deeply one thinks, without yielding to bigoted opinion, the more importance, he attaches to the relatedness of Life and Intelligence.

Its nearest expression, capable of being recognised on both the material and the spiritual planes, is Light; and, in the highest sense, Light has always been a synonym for Intelligence, with all systems of philosophical thought. Light and Intelligence are conceptions of living being, that cannot be separated; each finds both its being and

L.E. Whipple: "INTELLIGENCE AS UNDERSTANDING AND AS BEING."

(continued from the previous page) and its expression in the activities of the other. The illumination of Intelligence is a familiar phrase, and with spiritual philosophers the intelligence apparent in Spiritual Illumination is an equally familiar idea. It is entirely impossible to separate the ideas or their conceptions, because, without the other, either one is lifeless, in our comprehension.

A. Gibson: "DE BALZAC'S MYSTICAL NOVEL 'SERAPHITA' ".^{\$}

"La Comedie Humaine," the series of literary labors of which "Seraphita" forms a part, has been said to be as graphic a picture of the Nineteenth Century as the "Divina Comedia" of the Thirteenth. In this "Comedie Humaine" Balzac has succeeded in embracing all the varied expressions of human life, from the lowest forms of human degradation and despair, as portrayed in the hideous, grotesqueness of "Contes Drolatiques" up to the ideal heights of pure vision as unveiled for us in "Seraphita." In this latter masterpiece of literature, human intelligence seems to have reached the altitudes of the mastery of art, clearness of thought and lucidity of intuition rarely attained by any writer within the annals of history.

There can be no doubt that Balzac for his conception of "Seraphita" is indebted to the renowned Swedish seer Swedenborg. But this fact does not in the least detract from the worth of his book. On the contrary, to have been able to understand and render lucid the subtlest thoughts of the Swedish mystic, is in itself a stroke of genius.

Balzac has brought out the Swedenborgian ideas from the sphere of metaphysical abstractions to living, organized concepts, in harmony with the true philosophy of life.

In making Scandinavia the scene for his drama Balzac evinced the same knowledge of the inner nature of this strange people, as Shakespeare in giving to "Hamlet" a Danish lineage. In the Scandinavian people are found all the elements for the dreamer and the mystic. The very typical and geographical position of the country, isolated by water

^{\$} The Metaphysical Magazine 1901.

A. Gibson: "DE BALZAC'S MYSTICAL NOVEL 'SERAPHITA' "

(continued from the previous page) and mountains and poised on mighty plateaus, is adapted to give to the minds of its inhabitants a bent towards the inward and contemplative sides of life. With this mental attitude is coupled a certain forcefulness and power of will, which once made that people arbiters of the destinies of nations and engineers of new Eras.

It is a fact generally conceded by historians that in the progression of their international influence, these Norse folks laid the foundation to modern civilization.

While on the Falberg, Minna, overcome by her feelings, unfolded the mystery of her heart to Seraphitus who answers:

"Minna, a constant desire is that which shapes our future. Hope on! But if you would be pure in heart, mingle the idea of the All-Powerful which your affections here below; then you will love all creatures, and your heart will rise to heights indeed.....Perhaps, Minna, we may one day be together in a world where love never dies."

"Why," Minna interrupts; "why not here and now?"

"Because nothing is stable here. The passing joys of earthly life are gleams which reveal to certain souls the coming of joys more durable; just as the discovery of a single law of nature leads certain privileged beings to a conception of the universe. Our fleeting happiness here below is the forerunning of another and perfect happiness, just as the earth, a fragment of the world, attracts the universe."

In eloquent terms she unfolds the mighty object of life as announced in the processes of the universal evolution. Overwhelmed by the profound knowledge displayed by her love, Minna exclaims:

"How is it that in thy short life though hast found the time to learn so many things?"

"I remember."

Minna expressed no surprise over this probably unexpected answer. Seraphitus' words, understood or not, were to her unquestionable truths. To us, however, this answer, reveals a belief in one of

A. Gibson: "DE BALZAC'S MYSTICAL NOVEL 'SERAPHITA' "

(continued from the previous page) the oldest of the philosophic doctrines of the world—the doctrine of reincarnation. With his extraordinary knowledge Balzac must necessarily have come in touch with this ancient belief, accepted at present by more than 500,000,000 beings, and which holds that the soul of man lives on this earth as in a college, using the body as a means of coming in touch with the various aspects of nature, thus to gain experience and wisdom. The logic, justice and guarantee for growth, held out by this doctrine, has captured the noblest minds of all ages from Krishna to Origen; from Plato to Emerson. Seraphitus' answer reminds us of the words Plato puts in Socrates' mouth in his argument for immortality: "Knowledge is memory."

Contemporaries to Balzac, who belonged to his circle of personal acquaintance, have affirmed that the great author expended more energy, inventiveness, and creative genius in writing *Seraphita* than in any other work of his pen. In this book he aimed at the consummation of his boldest aspiration: the rational and logical working out of a character in which should be found the union of the individual virtues and traits severally manifesting in the separated men and women of earth. His great object was to show by all the force of philosophical demonstration, that such a being as *Seraphita* is an evolutionary necessity, the advanced type of one realizable humanity.

Seraphita displays all the sublimity and grandeur of a nature in which every motion and feeling is under perfect control, though fired by a love not less strong and intense because of its universality. In her heart she tries to give to every creature an equal place.

The battle he wages for his love is terrific. He pictures before her all the glories he would place at her feet, would she but be is: "Like Genghis Kahn my feet shall thread a third of the globe my hand shall grasp the throat of Asia, like Aurungzeb. Be my companion! Let me seat thee, beautiful

A. Gibson: "DE BALZAC'S MYSTICAL NOVEL 'SERAPHITA' "

(continued from the previous page) and noble being, on a throne! I do not doubt success, but live within my heart, and I am sure of it."

And pausing, he waits for an answer to this powerful appeal to the two weakest points in a woman's character: vanity and pride.

The answer came, quiet but firm and passionless as if carried by a breeze of eternal snow and ice.

"I have already reigned."

Before such a problem Wilfrid stood disarmed and powerless. Unable to understand the meaning of Seraphita's strange words, he satisfied himself with regarding her as a nature in which genius was blended with a reckless play of imagination and phantasy. He knew that Seraphita was born in the same village in which she lived, and had never been outside its borders, and therefore could not possibly have reigned in the sense that he understood it. But Seraphita, in this answer, shows her conscious knowledge of having existed on this earth before and brought the memories of that existence along with her.

The existence of such unconquerable coldness in the presence of so much womanly tenderness and compassion was a cause of bewilderment to Wilfrid, for he only recognized the one half of her soul—the woman; that which stood between him and his love like an unconquerable rival was the equally exalted and self-conscious other part of her nature.

The earliest life-forms in nature are equipped with hermaphroditic functions. The whole vegetable kingdom, almost without exception, is hermaphroditic and the same conditions of life fuel in the rudimentary stages of animal existence. Still more telling are the cases of human hermaphroditism which by physical science under the term atavism are recognized as authentic facts. By atavism is understood the occasional reappearance of organic conditions once belonging to the domain of rule, not of exception.

Nature works in cycles, and at the termination of a cycle returns to her point of issue. But

(continued from the previous page) as a cycle has more the character of a spiral than of a circle, a return towards the beginning does not negative evolutionary progress. For the circuit of experience, having the character of the spiral, brings the entity not only onwards, but also upwards, as the returning arc of the curve always passes over and above the point from which the movement set out.

This cyclic law in evolution manifests itself in every process of organised growth. The seed evolves the plant, and the latter, through its fruition becomes again the seed. The fruition of the animal-being takes effect in the generating of the spermatocytic cell, of the same structure and essence as the one from which the animal itself evolved. On a larger scale we find this principle inherent as a regulating factor in the movements of the solar system, which according to astronomy takes place in spiral orbits, thus pointing to a time of final return to the point of origin, while on a smaller scale every change in the modes and fashion of dress and general custom can invariably be traced to some preceding era of corresponding culture. The improvement and refinement noticeable in this recurring custom point to a spiral movement, as through it the pathway of evolution is constantly carried to higher stages.

The evolution of the human race forms no exception to this universal rule. Humanity, having sprung from a hermaphroditic origin, as shown by evolutionary records, will under the pressure of this cyclic law also return to hermaphroditism through the spiral gauge insure a rise to ever higher stages of evolution so that the close of a life-cycle will find the hermaphrodite evolved to planes and conditions vastly transcending those from which they started. The hermaphroditism of the future will be a reunion on the plane of mind of the two sexes. Impelled by this cycle of necessity, the man and the woman in their appropriate spheres of life, will then have accumulated all the experience obtainable by the soul through earthly existence.

The separation into sexes permits of an evolution

(continued from the previous page) of specialities. Applied to human kind, the evolution of the man means the bringing into development and active energy the qualities peculiar to man, viz. intellectuality, analytic, power, inductive reasoning, thought and concrete understanding in general; while the evolution of woman brings into action the qualities peculiar to her, viz: Will, Intuition, Love, Feeling. From this it follows that woman on the mental plane is positive as the qualities ascribed to her are in their very nature positive, while man on the same plane must be negative, as his entire mental equipment places him in the field of inquiry – a purely negative quality. This, however, does not prevent man, now and then, from passing out of the limitations of his sex, to bring into action the untuitive faculty and other spiritual qualities, original with woman. But to the extent that he succeeds in this he is really become a woman, or partaking of her nature. Calling into play through spiritual efforts, the feminine powers in his soul, he is symbolically awakening the consciousness of woman within him.

Similarly woman is often found to take up and cultivate some faculty original to man, and by so doing she on her side brings into consciousness the man slumbering within her.

The specialities of the two sexes embrace in their entirety the whole sphere of conscious existence. He evolves strength, she beauty; he understanding, she will; he desire, she love; he energy, she patience; he virtue, she innocence; he logic and reason, she faith and intuition; he selfishness, she self-sacrifice; he the realities of physical existence, she the hope; he the Earth, she the Heaven.

Proceeding side by side along the path-way of life, they apply their special qualifications to the vicissitudes of daily life. Learning by each other's examples, and trying to enter understandingly into each other's sphere of life, the man and woman gradually draw nearer, as, step by step, they exchange ideas and hopes.

This method of evolution will lead to a mutual understanding of the true relationship existing between the two sexes. The man, having learned to understand the woman, will follow her into the regions of love and intuition; and the woman, by a clearer perception of man's intellectual and more materialistic nature, will, without relinquishing her hold on her own attainments, make efforts to follow him in the more practical issues of his time.

Having fully grasped this inner relationship, and the motive underlying the separation of the human being into sexes, the distinguishing qualities of the latter will disappear, and the man and the woman again become one being, full-orbed, complete, and harmonious, both in substance and essence, in soul and body—a conqueror of selfishness and sin, and ready to enter upon new and higher spheres of being.

In *Seraphita*, the master-mind of Balzac unfolds the scheme of evolution of sex with a force and lucidity that captivate even the unintuitive reader.

Balzac has prepared an opportunity for a final down-sweep or arguments, intended to prove to everyone capable of following the thread of the daring and unconventional argument, the invincible logic of his idea sublime conception; the ideal man-woman.

Pastor Becker, who represents the very opposite of this idea, is a man in whom none of the specific feminine powers have awakened. Entirely unenlightened by intuition, he finds himself gauged and governed by instinct and sense perception. He does not recognise any proposition the truth of which cannot be analyzed and proved by reason. Intuition, faith, and trust have not yet shed their illuminating light on his consciousness. Though a clergyman and a firm believer in the theological dogmas of his time, Pastor Becker is, nevertheless, a thorough materialist, investing the elements and principles of his creed with a materialistic sense and character. Religion must yield its truths to the analysis and judgment of reason, or cease to exist. God, Heaven, Eternity, he conceived as things of sense and form.

Religion, however, being an art and a gift of

(continued from the previous page) inner vision is not to be treated as a science. "Science," Swedenburg is quoted as saying, "is the language of the temporal world: Love is that of the spiritual world. Science depresses man; Love exalts him. Science is still seeking; Love has found; Man, the exponent of science, judges nature according to his own relations to her; the angelic spirit (in woman) judges it in relation to Heaven."

Pastor Becker, representing the masculine aspect of nature, the typical man, is made the target for Seraphita's arguments. Her discourse, which covers thirty-three pages, employs the inductive method of reasoning, as Seraphita, in order to meet the Pastor in his own ground, must assume the attitude of the man—the intellectual reasoned. With any array of indisputable facts at her disposal and a power to wield them, defeating every sophistry, this wonderful being pours a current of irrefutable truths into the mind of the Pastor, who dazzled and overwhelmed, feels for a moment the ground tremble beneath his feet, and all his settled convictions, or rather doubts, broken up and scattered. With a clearness amounting to lucidity Seraphita proves that he, whose belief is based on the mandates of reason alone must necessarily deny God. Reason is the mental weighing and sifting the evidence arrived at through sense perception, and as the senses only relate us to the world of matter, while God ever recedes within the sphere of spirit, it follows that the former can never, by itself, comprehend the latter.

As that which is void of all attributes and forms, cannot be personal, so God can never be thought of as a personal God.

Belief, however, is never in opposition to reason and logic, it merely transcends them. "In you," Seraphita continues, still addressing Pastor Becker, "matter has ended in intelligence; can you therefore think that human intelligence will return on its path and end in darkness, doubt, and nothingness?"

For the ordinary mind to reach the lofty heights, comprehended in the spiritual evolution of man, one life is not sufficient. "A lifetime may be needed merely to gain the virtues which annul the

(continued from the previous page) errors of man's preceding life.... Who can tell how many times the human being lives in the spheres of Instinct before he is prepared to enter the sphere of Abstraction." The spheres, however, represent mental condition. Before attainment to the power of self-conscious thinking, the man talks and acts guided mainly promptings of self-preservation, circumscribed in his dealings with the world, by the narrow limits of personal motives and feelings. He lives instinctively, hence the term "The sphere of Instinct." Thus reason is regarded as the mere intermediate or preparatory stage for the entrance into the next sphere, the sphere of Abstraction.

To enter a new stage, the attractions, of the last one must be wholly overcome. "When matter is exhausted, spirit enters." Having conquered the sphere of Instinct the entity proceeds to the Abstract, where the soul must be able to subsist on its own divine essence; i.e., to live a subjective life. Very few people indeed are able to live an inner life, and draw the material for their consciousness from entirely subjective realms. Deprive the average man of the use of his senses and he will soon turn into a mental corpse. The entire sphere of consciousness in such a man consists in the action of the senses of the mind and reaction of the latter upon the senses. But the man should be far more than his senses, as the latter merely serve as temporary instruments for his relation to the physical plane, to fall away when no longer needed. For there are higher planes of life waiting for man to mount, but to enter them he must first be able to live and think independently of his sense-consciousness; i.e. to have formed a thought-sphere in the Abstract. Abstract thinking—the action of the mind independent of the sense-reports —means the birth of a new set of senses, capable of relating the Ego to higher realms of being. The employment of these inner senses is what Seraphita calls "To enter the Sphere of Abstractions," in which the evolving being finds himself in the "Vestibule of Spiritual Worlds."

C. Bjerregaard: "SUFİ INTERPRETATION OF OMAR KHAYYAM."

Empty Glass: Empty of Self.

New Moon: New beginnings.

Cypress-tree: Symbol of Exaltation because of its flame-shape and erect form.

God: The Beloved.

Tavern: Call of contemplation.

Lips: Open to mysteries of God's essence.

Tresses: Expansion.

Curls: Infiniteness.

Wine: Wisdom because material wine causes self-forgetfulness and so does divine wisdom.

Call in the morning: Sun-dawn - the inner light calling to matter-drowsy minds to wake up.

Hose: God.

Wilderness: Phenomenal world.

Tree: An oasis in the wilderness

with book of verses = inspired divine verses.

Bahram's sleep: If he was not awakened into the One he was in unbroken asleep in phenomenal life.

Poet: Seeker of Divine Beauty.

That by which "we come out of same door": What we go in by "is mere intellect alone."

C.T. Srinivasan: "IS VEDANTA A SCIENCE OF REALITY?"@

We live within the matrix of Nature which we try and hope to understand. How much do we know? What is life? No one knows. It emerges from darkness like a meteor, makes a transient trail and disappears into darkness again. What is Self, this 'I'? I rise from life and merge into life. The rising and merging belong to life as such. But self includes life within itself and transcends it by overflowing it. It becomes the province of science and philosophy to rationalise the matrix of nature in which we live and act, for the trail of human nature is indeed over all our knowledge. Yet we must not forget that even these rationalisations grow out of tradition and prejudices that we have

@ Journal of the Annamalai University. 1932.

(continued from the previous page) assimilated into our nature. The present day tendency is to emphasize science as the exclusive method of apprehending Reality. Far be it from me to minimize the importance of science which has so vastly enlarged our vision of Reality. But the lure of the Abstract is so strong that the little gain is out-balanced by an irretrievable loss of integrity. Scientists and philosophers may hypostasize analyses and classifications into Essences or Ultimate Units. Surely this is only a trick of language, for the so-called Ultimate Units indeed subsist as abstractions in the realm of Thought, where they enjoy a dubious eternity. Nature is not any more real at the level of electrons and protons than at the level of human consciousness. If proton be at the one end the Ultimate of analysis, consciousness is at the other end the Ultimate of synthesis. Nature without spirit becomes mere weather, for it is by Spirit that matter and motion are standardized into patterns, meaningful and beautiful. The analyses of science are pragmatic and do not pretend to give the full implications of the postulates involved. The recent history of science shows too clearly that the scientific constants are pragmatic constants. What science requires is a metaphysical continuum in which, to use Einstein's language, "there are no parts that can be tracked through time." Nature viewed as a whole, does not seem to come into being or likely to pass away. It is self-sustaining and has a definite structure. Over and above the routine of Nature, there is the Creative Genius which spiritualizes Nature and does not emerge in nature's cycles. It has its own individual life of infinite richness and value and "in fullness of time incarnates itself into the flesh of mother earth to produce the kingdoms of beauty, order and value." The patterns might be the stuff of which dreams are made, but surely. We, the weavers of the patterns, must be something else other than the dreams stuff. It is nature that seems to be rounded up in sleep and not "We", the creators of values. So much for the complexity of our subject matter.

The term science, no matter to whatever sphere of life or existence it is applied, is currently understood to signify a systematic study and exposition of things and factors that have been, are and yet to be. In its modern usage and acceptance no science can boast of having actually achieved such a happy consummation, although the Ideal of such a perfection is necessarily implied not only by the different sciences of our time but also in our very life and existence. Without such an Ideal no science is worth the name nor life itself worth the pursuit. This urge towards an evergrowing perfection is present in varying degrees of explicitness as aspects of One Universal Life. So long as the manifold aspects and life processes have not been gathered together under a common view-point, life continues to be full of errors, contradictions and pitfalls. Hence science demands not only truths and facts to be accounted for, but also errors and illusions which, though really non-existent factors, have nevertheless been assumed to be. It is quite logical that a science which explains successfully facts and figures, can also consistently account for error. The very value and function of a science depend upon its capacity to account for the error or ignorance besetting life and to remove such unreal factors by an exposition of the underlying truths. "If truth is not manifest, it must be made manifest, if it is manifest, it must be reached." So long as the basic truth of life is not understood and firmly grasped, life would be covered, as it were, with ignorance and contradictions. The phrase, "grades of Reality" being a misnomer, the differences in sciences are due to the different degrees of Reality emphasized by them. Thus we come to have a hierarchy of sciences based upon the degree of success actually achieved in life.

A science demands as its essentials the following facilities viz., observation, experiment, verification and inference. At the outset we must confess that these facilities are not given to us in their fullest measure. Error as such, is not in the Reality or even in life itself but rather in one or other of the organs and instruments of observation

(continued from the previous page) and experiment. Verification and inference themselves could be shown to be defective in one aspect or another and as yet, imperfect in every case. No body seems to be sure of his ground. Newton might have laughed at Ptolemy, but Einstein is making the present generation to laugh at Newton, possibly himself to be laughed at in turn by a future Copernicus. Is this pessimism? Human understanding! It is a frail thing and likely to pass away. Yet it is the only thing that counts for us as the real, and signifies our participation in the realm of nature. But let us not be fooled by our own self-delusions. Human mind has not once sifted out a grain of truth without letting twenty others slip by. In the words of Father Ogniben "Nobody has uttered truth but has presented twenty lies to support it". To see things as they are and understand their limitations are the characteristic marks of a scientific eye.

Further, factors like observation, experiment inference, etc., are, to a large extent, factors of individual experience. And our ordinary human experience does admit of a variety of contradictions, to wit, unity and differences, freedom and constraint, the eternal and the contingent, the infinite and the finite, etc. Logically speaking these mutual oppositions must themselves be necessarily and eternally cancelling one another. If mutual opposition be the only truth, there would indeed be no truth at all, for truth will be contradicted by error. But without these opposing factors distinctly perceived as such, life or experience could not be possible; and experience is the only factor on which all sciences and knowledge are based and to be guaranteed. Bosanquet might say that all these contradictions are resolved ultimately in the Absolute. This is putting the cart before the horse. Life alone is the sole repository of both knowledge and ignorance, and it alone can explain the truth of these contradictions. Every scientific problem is a life-problem only. And life contains the one solution of the different oppositions. Thus no science is independent of life, and life embraces all sciences within

(continued from the previous page) its fold and is infinitely more than a mere totality of sciences.

With the modern canons of scientific procedure, Reality can never be actually demonstrated, for, we have already pointed out how factors like observation, experiment etc., are not only limited in their scope but inherently defective in their nature and constitution. Let us take observation for example. What we observe seems to be real. But the illusions of the optic centres are too well known. The sun going round the earth seems to be perfectly real so far as the human eye goes. Our dreams and the optic illusions assure us that what is taken to be real, may not be so after all. A true scientific observation requires the whole of the Reality including the observing subject as well, to be placed before us as an object for observation. Such a task is futile, for how could the observer be possibly objectified or treated as an object. As Sankara put it beautifully, the cognizer is ever the cognizer and the cognized ever the cognized only, and it is impossible for one to be both the cognizer and the cognized at the same time. This is the law of contradiction. The instruments of our observation, our very eyes and the microscopes, are vitiated by the danger of mal-observation or non-observation. While we cannot absolutely trust our senses, how can we pretend to have been assured by the merely external and artificial though wonderfully constructed and delicate instruments like microscopes, telescopes, stereoscopes etc? Are these instruments really more wonderful, complex or delicate than the human eye? What is not possible for the human eye becomes utterly impossible for the artifices of the human mind. Bertrand Russel put it correctly when he said that we could never be assured whether what we observed through the microscope was really a motion in ether or merely a reflection of a quiver in the retina of the observing eye. So much for scientific observation.

What about experiment? Man is given only one chance to know Truth. A theory of reincarnation might

(continued from the previous page) after all be an Oriental balm to the many disappointed and disheartened human souls, but to a scientist nothing more than a belief. The religious dogma does not alter or affect the scientific conception. It is a rational but pious hope that we could not possibly be achieved here and now, we hope to achieve after death or in a rebirth. What I want to emphasize is not the rationality or the irrationality of the religious doctrine – this is a matter for the priests and pundits to fight over – but the tremendous and momentous significance of our present life. Have we really any positive proof or evidence to show conclusively that after death there is a sure return? Hence if any scientific experiment is to be conducted upon Reality, it must be done in the 'present' life, for science does not lie outside life. But experiment requires that the subject doing the experiment must live before, during and after the experiment. In other words the present experimenter must live as he was before birth, and continue to live after death. On the very face of it, it sounds absurd and impossible. Who know anything of the "before" or of the 'Hereafter? Our very limitations and littleness in this ruthless orderly machine of an immense universe seem to mock at our attempts to know Reality as it. The little blade of a grass seems to scoff a man's vanity and his presumptive claim to wisdom and superiority. In the absence of correct observation and experiment, verification, and interference are more or less speculative and dogmatic in character. Hence the reason why the best scientific truth is always open to be proved false and replaced by subsequent or more acute inference ad infinitum. The sum of all human endeavours has not even touched the Actual by the fraction of a millimetre. "Ages have past; still Thou pourest and still there is room to fill" (Tagore: Gitanjali.)

We are left on the brink of an abyss ready to be dashed to pieces. Are human existences and endeavours merely the accidents of a ruthless system of coincidences over which we have no control?

(continued from the previous page) What is this immense machine of a universe with its laws of evolution, development and growth? Who is its controller or is the controller himself its steering rod and wheel? What is the cause, purpose and the meaning of the whole affair? These must lie within this universe itself, for we cannot have the seed at one place and seek the tree elsewhere. Or is the whole thing a bit of constrained imagination and if so, whose? Hegel says "Reality is already an accomplished fact and does not wait for human cognition or recognition. That it does so wait is the illusionary under which we live and have our interest in life." If the evolutionary laws and processes disclosing themselves in manifold ways and existences in Nature are nothing better than hallucinations, human endeavours and aspirations become meaningless and unnecessary. What about science? Its methods, if stretched to their logical limits, leave us between the Scylla and the Charybdis. But the question is "Is Reality so?" The Real in order to be real, must be artistically the most beautiful, morally the perfect and scientifically the most correct or the rational. Hence human endeavours must have their place and meaning within the system of Reality. As Spinoza put it, if Reality had become the commonest of all things, humanity would not have waited so long for its salvation. The fault then does not and cannot lie in the Real, but only in the different methods we are pursuing. And the methods of modern sciences neither prove nor disprove anything in all the three worlds heaven, earth or hell.

The Western methods could broadly be divided into the empirical and the transcendental. Under the empirical come the positive, physical and physiological sciences and under the transcendental, the aesthetic, the moral and the religious. There is yet a third view which has escaped the attention of the Western philosophers and scientists. This is what is called the 'Avasthaic' View, and the method of enquiry is commonly called the 'Avasthathrya' which supplies the key to the understanding of the philosophy of the Upanishads. Till now Western scholars

(continued from the previous page) have not bestowed any serious attention on this subject. As this is a metaphysical method it is wrong to suppose, as some of our recent scholars do, that it has anything to do with psycho-analysis. It is not psychology but pure metaphysics, as all psychology is only a science based upon the observation of the enquirer in one state only, i.e. the waking. The method of Avasthathrya is a comprehensive view, more comprehensive than the usual transcendental and empirical views. It is the 'vedic' view and peculiar to the Vedas only. No other system of thought has even thought of it. The study of Vedanta is never complete without an understanding of this method and its application. It is not mysticism but the means by which clear reasoning leads to a direct perception of Truth. The importance of this method as the surest proof for establishing Reality was realised by Gaudapada and Sankara. Sankara's greatness lies in the fact that as a true metaphysician he bases his whole system of thought upon this important method. The Vedanta Sutra deals with this Method in Chapter III, pada 2, where Sankara describes it as the unique 'vedic' method. Gaudapada, his predecessor, gives it the foremost place as it is evident from his Karikas on the Mandukya Upanishad. Sankara's system will remain a sealed book if the method with all its implications is not properly understood. Vidyaranya in his Panchacasi, takes up Avasthathrya in the very first chapter in order to establish the Reality by an appeal to reason and facts of our experience. Even now in India there are several Mutts or religious organisations where this method is taught only to the most ardent students of philosophy. A metaphysical enquiry into the nature of Reality should be based upon reason and experience and therefore not even one aspect of our experience can be left out. Hence in the Upanishads, whenever the final teaching is taken up, this method is taught first and then only others, follow. Also this is the only Method which has a whole Upanishad entirely devoted to it. Mandukya Upanishad provides the clue to the whole 'vedic' position.

This 'vedic' Method resolves the totality of our

(continued from the previous page) experience in three states or 'Avasthas', waking, dream and sleep. This whole universe presented to our view, is a phenomena of the enquirer's waking state only. A shadow of it is presented in the dream state in which also the reality of the world is not doubted at that time. In deep sleep this world is nowhere. The first seven verses in the Mandukya Upanishad deal with the four modes or 'padas' of the soul's experience. The four are explained in the light of 'upasana' under the sacred syllable, AUM, where A stands for the Waking, U for Dream and M for Deep Sleep and AUM for the whole of experience.

Analysing these seven verses we get:

Deep Sleep	(Prajna, M)	Casual	Self plus ignorance.
Dream	(Taijasa, U)	Subtle	Self plus dream-world.
Waking	(Visva, A,)	Gross	Self plus waking-world
Thuriya	(Atman, Aum,)	Truth	True self or Absolute.

Here the enquirer finds out that the waking-world does not accompany him in deep sleep, and the dream-world is found to be illusory. The waking-world is the sphere of plurality, action and morality. Dream is a subjective illusion, and in deep sleep the Self perceives nothing. The Self is the permanent factor while everything else is a percept of the waking state or an illusion of the dream. As the invariable sub-stratum of the states, the Self is the Reality, because no state is possible without the Self. The ignorance of anything in sleep is only a waking idea. The ignorance that is assumed to persist in deep sleep is nothing but the indeninability of the true nature of the Self in terms of the waking intellect. As the unbroken thread and witness of the three states, the Self is the Real, while the world, mind, body and the states have only a contingent relation to the Self, being found in two of its particular modes viz. waking and dream. Sleep is the region of bliss as the Self reaches there is true nature of undifferentiated unity. Every one of us feels it as soon as we wake up from sound sleep. Sleep is not unconsciousness as the modern psychologist supposes it to be. It is the region of pure consciousness according to the Upanishad, i.e. consciousness bereft of its subject-object relationship

(continued from the previous page) which is the characteristic feature of the Waking and Dream. If otherwise, the return to waking consciousness after sleep would be irrational and unnatural. This is the truth taught by Brihaspati to Indra in the form of a story in Chandogya. Deep sleep is not an annihilation of the Self as Indra wrongly held it to be, but is the fullness of Self's existence as Prajapati taught Indra. In deep sleep, space, time and substance, the limiting adjuncts of the waking and dream, have become dissolved into the true nature of Self. There being nothing else other than the Self, the Self alone is the Real. This is the truth taught by the Mandukya. Is this solipsism? No. The 'I' that is conscious of having slept and dreamt, is the transcendental 'I' which is itself the 'thuriya' and which, therefore, is in reality free from sleep, dream or plurality. Is the 'thuriya' impersonal or abstract? The 'thuriya' is the super-personal according to the Upanishad. It assumes the role of an ego in two of its states, waking and dream, where it has created a non-ego for its view. Personality is the highest in our experience, and therefore our Self cannot be impersonal as the impersonal is below the personal. It must be something more than what we mean by the term person, and never below that.. The states dissolve in the Self but the Self is not lost in the states. The fact referred to as the person remains always as the 'I' in any experience, and never a 'he' or 'that'. It does not refer to any that we can discern as this or that in our experience. It refers to the whole of our person and thus transcends thought and speech, but is easily the only fact best known, as self-consciousness is always implied in experience. It is that which we feel but cannot express. Sankara describes the Self as Nitya, Buddha, Suddha, and Muktha—permanent, intelligent, pure and free. The person is That, "the highest and completest of all wholes, the most Real of reals." "It exists; it is real; it has being, however it may be interpreted.....Personality not only proves to be the prime unit of reality and existence..but is the only

(continued from the previous page) solution of the sceptic's problem of the one and the many." This is the truth taught by the Mandukya Upanishad.

Vedanta as a science, goes so far and says that the Self alone is real and free from the temporary attachments made in each state. Going a step further, it examines the nature and meaning of the states themselves. What, then, are the three states and what do they signify? The Self's three states may not mean three for the Self. That we have a memory of the three states nobody can deny. But does 'three' mean the number? As numbers they must belong to the same time-space series. But each state has got its own time-space series. Dream has got its own series while there is none in deep sleep. The three-ness of the Self's states is, therefore, an intellectual illusion of the waking intellect. And this question does not arise in dream or sleep. While the states are all fleeting, the Self alone remains as the one permanent Entity. "Dream becomes unreal in the waking, nor does the waking exist in the dream, both dream and waking are absent in deep sleep, and sleep too is absent in waking and dream. Their unreality is proved by their necessary intercancellations. But the Self is the Eternal Witness of the states and thus beyond them, the One which is of the nature of pure consciousness." Sankara's argument is a typical example of the 'vedic' reasoning.

Even an illusion must have some meaning in the Real. What do the three states signify? According to the Mandukya, deep sleep signifies the purity of our Being, dream, freedom, and waking, all-knowingness. The Self exists as the Knower in the waking; its aspect as Absolute Freedom is testified by its dream-creations. If in deep sleep the Self does not know anything, it is not because of the absence of knowledge in the Self but because of the absence of objects of knowledge. There is then nothing else, no second thing to be known, not even the sense of I-ness since individuation presupposes differentiation. The Self attains its pure nature in deep sleep and therefore there is no knowing there. It is such a Reality that we have in waking and dream

(continued from the previous page) but not realised so by the then ego which is only a by product of the states themselves.

How is this "vedic" method superior to the scientific method? According to the state-view, the modern scientific methods deal only with one phase of experience, viz., the waking. Hence when applied to the study of dream and sleep, they interpret them wrongly, dream being treated as the subconscious and sleep as the unconscious state. Modern psychology commits this blunder in its study of dream and sleep. The questions of the subconscious and the conscious are phenomena of the waking experience, and they do not arise in dream or sleep. What is true from the waking stand point may not be true from dream or sleep stand points. All casual explanations, to be true, must belong to the same time series. We have seen that the states are neither co-ordinate in space nor continuous in time. The conclusion according to the 'vedic' method is that no state is the cause of another state but in their metaphysical value all states as states, are unreal being contingent. Proceeding a step further, the method offers us a definite criterion of Reality: empirically it is the unchanging Witness of the states and transcendentally the Sole Entity. Thus we come to know conclusively what is the Real and what is unreal.

In the world real? According to this 'vedic' method, we have to answer thus: The Self being real, views what it sees as real also. Dream is absolutely real to the dreamers. The unreality, of a state is seen only when the state is over, for so long as a state lasts, it must be faithful to the character of its basis, the Self. It is the ever-present Self that accounts for the reality of a state. The order, correspondence, etc., adduced to prove the independence of the external world, is due to the presence of the Self whose nature is all-knowingness. The same accounts for the order and correspondence that we have in our dreams sometimes. Empirically this pure consciousness becomes an Act. Gentile, the Italian Realist, calls it an Act and makes it the Reality. Only he

(continued from the previous page) mistakes the empirical status for the transcendental, for act presupposes time. And Gentile's Mind is a creature of Time! Hegel's Absolute idea is merely a logical necessity. But the Atman is much more than that and therefore the Upanishad call it 'prajnanam' or the Super-consciousness.

We have thus this distinct advantage in the method of Avasthathrya, that we are able to review the whole of our experience for observation and judgment. If we take waking alone, such a feat is impossible. Modern science errs in its conception that waking exhausts the whole of Reality, and thus in granting absolute reality to waking, subordinates the other two states to the waking as its adjuncts, without any warrant of reason or of justification. According to the 'vedic' view each state is independent and all the three constitute the totality of experience. Thus by taking dream and sleep the 'vedic' method leaves out nothing of the Self's experience. We come to know conclusively what is the Real and what is unreal. Recent American writers like Mary Whiton Calkins, Dr Royce and others advocate a personalistic nature-philosophy "which makes it impossible to attribute sorrow or disappointment, yearning or doubt to the Absolute Self which is the all-knowing Person whose will is expressed in this existent universe of distinctively mental realities." Their Absolute Self is only assumed and not proven. And the 'vedic' method gives us the only possible proof of the existence of the Absolute Self.

If the Self is the only Reality what about the appearance of 'other minds' and their common stage of free play known as the world? How does this 'vedic' method answer the problem? We may say that the Self in its absolute freedom and by the very nature of that freedom, creates a whole world of illusory things and factors, all as mere ideas, and in its all-knowingness remains a Witness of them. Freedom seems to create free minds which in their enjoyment of their illusory freedom, forget their common basis, the really true and free Self. With the

(continued from the previous page) knowledge of the true Self, the false free minds or egos disappear and are merged beyond recognition in the Absolute Self just as the dream-figures get merged into the waking. The Real Self or Atman is neither benefited nor emptied by the appearance and disappearance of worlds, minds or egos. This is described beautifully in Hrihadaranyaka thus: "Having gone to sleep, the Self creates for itself and out of itself a world of things and men. Having sported in those pleasure gardens and dallied with beautiful women, it withdraws the worlds again into itself," By calling the worlds, minds and egos as illusions, nothing is lost thereby. This is not a method of physical destruction of things and worlds, a consummation so devoutly wished for by Von Hartmann of Germany. The 'vedic' method is a purely metaphysical method of valuation in terms of human experience and of reconstruction upon the results of valuation. We will still continue to live and do, to sleep and dream, but a knowledge of their unreality will remove their sting for us once for all. It will then be a 'knowing' existence, whose truth can be verified by each and every individual by his or her own ordinary experience. Herein lie the greatness and superiority of the 'vedic' method over every other method.

Whatever the sceptics might say, a true Vedantin can assure the humanity that there is no cause for misery, that life is real and of the nature of bliss, that soul is free and all bondage is the result of one's free choice. What cannot be mended, should at least be clearly understood. This is what is done by the 'vedic' method. Knowledge is only a thorough change in the angle of vision, and in the wider outlook on life, is seen as the result 'in Life' and not after death. Knowledge is meant for the living only. Death is a precept of the waking state, and one's own death is a metaphysical impossibility. Immortality is seen and proved to be our very nature by the method of Asvathathrya. There is no postponement of the day of release after death as all days and nights are only life's activities. Knowledge of the true nature of our Self removes all

(continued from the previous page) fears, doubts and unnecessary hopes. Heaven and Hell are life's ideas, the one a mere solace and the other a threat—who knows anything of them? Here is bliss realisable in life itself, 'here and now' by every thinking creature. For the Self is immortal, all-knowing and absolutely free from any taint of sin or virtue. Vedanta alone can justify Wildon Garr's statement: "It is an illusion to imagine that we can pass out of Reality."

Dr Paul Tuxen: "NAGARJUNA'S NEGATIVISM".@@

I propose to examine the problem of reality as it presents itself in the teachings of the great Buddhist philosopher Nagarjuna, who in the last half of the second century founded the Madhyamika-school of Mahayana-Buddhism. We all of us know that there are different kinds of reality. If we are dreaming, our dreaming is of course real enough. But what we experience in our dreams, we do not regard as just as real as what we experience when awake. When we compare the latter with our dreams, we are inclined to deny reality to our dreaming experiences. But also when awake we speak about different degrees of reality. Sometimes we feel deluded by our senses, at other times we do not doubt what they tell us about the external and the internal world. Now there are people who will make us believe that they know of another, higher reality than that of our daily life, and who accordingly do not look at this life as absolutely real. Mystics we call these people, but often there is not anything mysterious about them; on the contrary they very often are lucid intellects. And one of the finest and keenest representatives of this way of thinking is in my opinion just Nagarjuna. Not all scholars regard him like this. Let us see how he was estimated in India; let us, for instance, ask a critic of the 14th century, Madhava. His Sarvadarsana-sangraha has been a very useful little book to all students of Indian philosophy, before we had access to the works of the philosophers themselves.

All Buddhists agree about four statements, viz., that all is momentary, nothing is constant; that all is "pain", there is no possibility of harmony in life;

@@ Journal of Oriental Research. 1938. (Madras)

(continued from the previous page) that all is individual, is like itself alone, there are no common properties; and that all is void, nothing is real. These statements are all of them very significant, but they can be explained in different ways; and our understanding of Buddhism just depends on the way in which we explain them. Especially the last one about the unreality of all is open to different explanations; it can be taken as the expression of pure negativism, but there are also other possibilities of understanding it. To Madhva as to most of the opponents of the Buddhists on the side of Brahmanism the negative interpretation is the only possible, and this negative position he ascribes to the Madhyamika-school. It is, he says, just as a beggar, who has got admission into a house and gets more and more obtrusive; in the same way the Madhyamikas are not satisfied, when we have admitted the momentary flux and, granted the illusory character of pleasure, of universality and of reality; they maintain that the doctrine of Buddha terminates in that of a total void, in universal baselessness or nihilism.

The ultimate principle, then, is a void emancipated from four alternatives, viz., reality, unreality, both reality and unreality, and neither reality and unreality. If real existence were the nature of a water-pot for instance, the activity of the potter would be superfluous, and the same objection will accrue, if non-existence is its nature; in the last case it cannot be produced and in the first case it has of course no need of a maker. So much about reality and unreality; the two remaining alternatives are inadmissible, as self-contradictory. That is to say, the objects are not determined by any one of the four alternatives.

That the good Madhva believed the Madhyamika philosophy to be pure negativism is without doubt; that is shown by all his remarks in connection with this part of his work. But in the quotations I have given of his treatment there is something which ought to warn us against accepting his views. All is unreal;

(continued from the previous page) yes, so we were told; but the void that we had to look upon as the ultimate principle of the Madhyamikas was in his own words emancipated from the four alternatives, reality, unreality, both of them and neither of them. This is something quite different from pure nihilism; also in the opinion of Madhava and the Advaita-Vedanta there is a super-reality beyond reality and unreality. And when Madhava wants to give a further illustration of the teachings of the Madhyamikas, he cites a well-known verse: "A religious mendicant, an amorous man and a dog have each of them his own view of woman's body; to the mendicant it is a carcass, to the lover a mistress and to the dog a prey." This tells us nothing about an ultimate void, only illustrates the relativity of all ideas. And we are not a little surprised when we read on in Madhava's words "In consequence, then, of these four points of view, when all ideas come to an end, final extinction, which is a void, will result." I am not able to see that this is a necessary consequence of the above considerations; what we heard about the reasonings of the Madhyamikas much more leads to the doctrine of relativity; and relative, that is just what the word Sunya means within this chain of reasoning.

When Nagarjuna founded that school of philosophy which is called the Madhyamika-school, he had to be prepared for many misunderstandings of his reasoning. His was a mind so keen that many people could not catch the aim of his teachings. And it was not only his enemies who misinterpreted him; also his followers very often disagreed in their interpretation of his karikas. I cannot go into this here. That most people both in India and in Europe were inclined to emphasize the negative aspect cannot surprise us, because he himself lays stress on this side, and that for reasons which I shall explain later on. In India another reason asserts itself. There can be no doubt about the fact that the great Sankara is largely indebted to the Madhyamika-school. And it could not be agreeable to Sankara and his followers, that this fact should be too manifest; it is well-known that other Vedantins looked upon Sankara and

(continued from the previous page) his school as crypto-Buddhists, *pracchannabauddhas*. Therefore Sankara felt obliged to make the distance between his and Nagarjuna's doctrine as far removed as possible, and he uses in the commentary to the *Uttara-mimamsa-sutras*, when speaking about the *Madhyamika*-school, a language (ad.II, 2, 31) which is much more violent, much more unpolite than it is in his custom. As to his argumentation against Nagarjuna, he maintains that a doctrine which states the unreality of all is in opposition to all means of knowledge and thus does not need any confutation, for the reality of our world cannot be denied without assuming another reality. To this argumentation we may answer, that when Sankara reproaches the *Madhyamikas*, that their views are in opposition to all means of knowledge, Sankara himself in quite the same way maintains that the highest truth and reality cannot be realised by our means of knowledge, and moreover when Sankara states that the reality of the world only can be denied if we assume another reality, then that is just what Nagarjuna also does.

The teachings of Vedanta according to Sankara, and the teachings of Mahayana according to Nagarjuna have not a few ideas in common, but of course the difference is not to be overlooked. The teachings of the Buddhas, says Nagarjuna, are founded on the idea of two realities, the relative and the absolute; those who cannot understand the difference between these two realities are not able to recognise the profound truth in Buddha's doctrine. Such a distinction is not at all unknown to the *Advaitavada*, but the difference is more outspoken, when we think of the way in which the Vedantin and the *Madhyamika* try to lead their followers to the absolute reality. Here Nagarjuna mostly prefers the way of negation; he denies all our ideas and conceptions with the intention of conducting us to that reality which lies beyond those conceptions of ours. To put it in a few words, Nagarjuna wants us to comprehend that all conceptions are self-contradictory, are senseless, are without reality and therefore

(continued from the previous page) quite unfit to tell us anything about that reality which is the only real one.

In his 448 karikas, Nagarjuna examines all fundamental ideas of Brahmanism and Buddhism with the intention of showing their extreme impossibility. He begins with the conception of cause and effect, and it is to him an easy task to show that this conception cannot endure a thoroughgoing inquiry. And after that he in the 27 chapters of his work demonstrates that this also is the case with all other conceptions. What is self-contradictory cannot be real; and so there does not exist anything like sense-perception like the soul (atman), like the Buddha, like Nirvana, etc. You see that the fundamental ideas of Buddhism are shown to be wrong, just in the same degree as the ideas of Brahmanism, Nagarjuna does not make any difference in favour of his own religion. Because all our conceptions are self-contradictory they cannot tell us anything about reality.

In the 22nd chapter of his Madhyamika karikas he proves that the conception of a Buddha is nonsensical. Who is this Buddha we speak about? he asks; he cannot be identical with the psycho-physical functions which constitute the Ego; he cannot be different from them; they cannot be contained in him; he cannot be contained in them; and finally he cannot be in possession of them. You know that Buddhism does not accept a soul, an eternal personality, but instead of this assumes a set of functions, the skandhas in the material shape (rupa), feelings (vedana), conceptions (samjna), dispositions (samskara), and sense consciousness (vijnana), which makes out the transitory pseudo-units we call individuals. It is therefore necessary to examine the relation of a supposed individual, say the venerable Buddha himself, to this set of functions to these skandhas, as the Buddhists call them.

If Buddha was a real person, he must either be identical with the skandhas or be something different from them. And it will be evident that this

(continued from the previous page) relation is impossible, if we look at the matter from a Buddhist point of view. In this connection we can learn much from a former chapter of Nagarjuna's work, the 10th one. In this chapter he examines the relation between fire and fuel, but as it is mostly the case with Nagarjuna, he aims at the same time at another goal than that which is his direct one. You know that fire and extinction of fire in Indian literature is a common illustration of life and salvation from life. And in Buddhist literature this same simile is used to elucidate the relation between the individual and the skandhas, which, as I just said, form the basis of the individual. Fire plays the role of the supposed individual, the Ego, fuel of its base, the skandhas. This simile is well fit for the purpose of elucidating the individual and its foundation; fire is namely just as the Ego no permanent substance, but a chain of burning processes. With regard fire as something real, but it manifests itself only in relation to the fuel, just as the Ego manifests itself only in relation to the skandhas. In the opinion of an ordinary Buddhist the Ego is illusory but its basis, the skandhas, is real. But that is not the point of view of Nagarjuna and his Madhyamikas; he regards the basis as just as unreal as that fiction, the Ego, which was founded on the basis. Where fire and fuel stand in relation to each other, then they are without absolute reality; what is in possession of absolute reality can of course not be dependent on the relation to something different.

Now we get nearer to our problem. If fire and fuel should be in possession of absolute reality and nevertheless be dependent on each other, then they must either be identical or different. If fire be identical with its fuel, then follows identity between agent and object; and if fire be different from its fuel, then we should see fire produced without fuel. In the first case we should have *kartrkarmanor ekatvam*, something quite impossible; and the same difficulty would be the result, if we asserted the existence of a Buddha, who was identical with his

(continued from the previous page) basis, the skandhas. For if we look at Buddha as an individual identical with the skandhas, we give him a position as both agent and object, which will not do. We return to the simile which had to throw light on our problem. If fire was something different from fuel, it could manifest itself without fuel. In this case fire would be an eternal substance, and we should be able neither to kindle it nor to extinguish it. What Nagarjuna will have use to understand is this. If fire was absolutely different from the fuel, it could not have any relation to it, and, further, if a thing is dependent on another thing, it cannot be absolutely different from it (yat pratitya ca yat tasmāt tadānyan nopapadyate XIV, 5) Is fire absolutely different from the fuel, cannot be influenced by any endeavour to kindle or extinguish it, and is without function, without activity, is an agent without action, which is nonsense. We can now apply this reasoning on the conception of Buddha. If Buddha should be absolutely different from the skandhas, he could appear without them, which from a Buddhist point of view is impossible. And if absolutely different from them, he could not be dependent on them; he could never be realised; he would be just as unreal as the son of a barren woman.

Now I think it will be clear, which is the fundamental thought of the Madhyamika-philosophy, the thought which is final with regard to the reality or the unreality of things. A Madhyamika will not allow reality to anything which is dependent on any other thing; a real thing must be quite independent and unconditional. Fire and fuel stand in correlation to each other; they are dependent on each other; they have no sense at all if not in correlation. We cannot imagine fire without fuel, nor fuel (as fuel) without fire. In daily life, of course, fire and fuel are real enough, but absolute reality we cannot grant them. And quite the same is the case, if we try to find out if there ever was a man Buddha. Buddha and the

(continued from the previous page) skandhas are correlated, are dependent on each other, are accordingly without absolute reality. The relative reality of Buddha is one of the greatest importance to all of us, or rather to all the followers of Buddhism in their relative existence; he is the great teacher, the merciful Saviour, just as long as we are in need of him. In the real sense of the world, he is as inexistent as all other things in the world. We must never forget that an existence, which is dependent on something different, is no real existence; what does not exist in itself cannot be possessed of an existence; what does not exist in itself cannot be possessed of an existence founded on another thing, whose existence we first have to prove.

It is quite right that Nagarjuna has overthrown all these most significant conceptions of Buddhism, but that applies only if we ascribe absolute reality to them; as to their relative importance he is in no doubt. If we, for instance, look at the famous *pratityasamutpada*, the so-called chain of cause and effect, we see a chain of different links, where each link is dependent on the former one and conditions the following one. In this way we have *avidya*, *samskara*, *vijnana*, *namarupa* and so on. It goes without saying that here we have a convincing expression of the relativity of existence, and when Nagarjuna does not accept the *pratityasamutpada*, it is only from the point of view that we mistake its meaning and believe it to teach us the coming into existence of the different factors of life. "Nothing will be, nothing has been, nothing has not been, all these conceptions are wrong". Nagarjuna says, therefore, of this chain conditional and dependent causes and effects cannot tell us of something like an evolution, a development on each other, it is not an absolute reality, but only a relative one. It tells us that all things are correlated and thus unreal. In other schools of Buddhism this *pratityasamutpada* is the law which governs the functioning of the elements of existence, and

(continued from the previous page) these elements are in themselves real. Not so in the Madhyamika-philosophy; here the elements are without absolute reality.

He calls Buddha the foremost of all teachers especially because he has taught the *pratityasamutpada*, and he characterizes this *pratityasamutpada* in terms which perhaps will surprise you. It is that where nothing perishes (*anirodham*), where nothing originates (*anutapadam*), where nothing is transient (*anucchedam*), where nothing is permanent (*asasvatam*), where there is no identity (*anekartham*), where there is no difference (*ananartham*), where nothing comes (*anagamam*) and nothing goes (*anirgamam*); it is the blissful reducing to quietness of the whole world-extension (*prapancopasamam sivam*). These terms are indeed surprising in the work of the great dialectician, but they should in my opinion exempt him from being charged with Negativism. We must never forget that his negative dialectics aim at something quite positive.

How confident Nagarjuna is with regard to the perfection of his position, and his pupil, the famous Aryadeva, gives expression to the same opinion, when he says: A philosopher who neither accepts the position that anything is, nor that anything is not, nor that anything both is and is not, his position you cannot refute how long time you even try it. And Candrakirti, when discussing different theories about cause and effect, also states that this discussion only takes place for the benefit of the opponent to the Madhyamika-school these theories do not matter, because this school does not possess a position of its own and thus cannot be accused of contradicting its own theories.

We sometimes meet with an argument, which maintains that sceptical school of philosophy not acknowledging any means of knowledge is itself prevented from proving its thesis, just because it does not assume any means of right knowledge. If this argument had any weight, it could of course be used against the Madhyamika-school. But the position of

(continued from the previous page) Nagarjuna also helps to avoid this disagreeable consequence. In this connection he also states that the relativity (Sunyata) is no doctrine at all, but only the refutation of all doctrines, and as a matter of fact he ascribes the same attitude to Buddha himself. Those who look at relativity as at a doctrine he declares to be incurable (XIII, 8). To refute theories is not in itself something positive (na ca drstikrtanam nivritimatram bhavah 247, 4). Those who regard the teachings of Nagarjuna as a positive doctrine are like people who ask a man to sell them something. The man answers that he has not anything to sell them, but they insist on being given that nothing which he has to sell (na kimcin nama panyam 247, 6). Candrakirti rightly asks, how it shall be possible to explain to those people, that in this case there is nothing to be sold. I told you, that in the opinion of our philosophers Buddha had the same view. People keep to relativity as to a new and arbitrary theory are without hope of recovering. Buddha tells a story illustrating this. A man is ill and the doctor gives him a very strong purgative, which all right dispels all the unhealthy stuff from the patient's body but remains in him without coming out again. What do you think, Buddha asks, will this man be restored to health, Kasyapa. No, Master, on the contrary his illness will get much worse, when the purgative remains in the body having dispelled all the impure stuff. Quite so, says Buddha, in the same way, the teachings of relativity are as dispelling of all theories; but anybody who regards these teachings as a new theory I declare to be incurable (249, 2)

Without doubt you are surprised to hear these words of Buddha, words which do not resemble what we are used to look at as real Buddha words. The quotation is from Mahayana text, Aryartnakutasutra which does not belong to the earliest ones. But the Madhyamikas lay much stress on showing that the teachings of Buddha often are quite different and self-contradictory, and they give as explanation, that he had to comply with the faculty of comprehension

(continued from the previous page) of his disciples. Their comprehensions was of course not the same, and Buddha made concessions to their different giftedness. Therefore there is never any possibility of controverting the Madhyamikas through quoting the sacred scriptures (tasman nasty agmabadho Madhyamikanam 359, 6). Perhaps you will think that this is too easy a way to escape the difficulties, and perhaps you are right; The Buddhist schools very often distinguish between words of the Master, which have to be understood directly, literally, words which have to be taken in their usual or primary sense (nitārtha 43, 4), and words of the Master which have to be explained, to be interpreted.

Nagarjuna's teachings are not to be regarded as Negativism. He never forgets that super-reality which lies beyond the realities and unrealities of our world. But in another sense of the word Nagarjuna is a Negativist, because he never will allow his teachings to form a positive theory. In this he was a very prudent and cautious man, and may be not quite wrong.

S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri: "ADVAITA AND THE CONCEPT OF PROGRESS". @@

My conversion to Absolute Idealism was neither quick nor easy. And not till a detailed study of advaita in recent years did I acquire anything like an intellectual conviction as to that system. I can therefore quite honestly persuade myself that I have not been rushed into this system, which has claimed my final acceptance after a period of over two decades. The acceptance of it has not been due to preconceptions, prejudices, early influences or intellectual indolence. If therefore I seek to say something about the relation of advaita to the concept of progress, it is not because of any impulse to pour old wine into new bottles, or to exhibit ancient conceptions as quite in line with modern tendencies. It has arisen from an attempt to think out the concept of progress in relation to the background of advaita

@@ The Principal Miller Lectures, 1937. University of Madras.

(continued from the previous page) metaphysics. The result may be a poor thing, but it is mine own. And I say this not to disclaim indebtedness to past thinkers, but to explain and excuse the shortcomings of these lectures, the aim of which is to show that non-dualism, far from being inconsistent with a belief in progress, really calls for such belief. Success in establishing this thesis beyond my dreams; if I can persuade you that I have made an honest attempt to exhibit a reconciliation I shall be more than satisfied.

The prospect of success even for such a moderate ambition seems very gloomy indeed. Reality for the absolutist is beyond time. Neither time nor change is ultimately intelligible. We say every event exists in time; but does time itself exist in time or out of it? Has time a beginning or end? If it has, how is it distinguished from events which have beginning and end in time? What constitutes its superiority or distinction from them, whereby we may be justified in treating time as the container and events as contents? Again, that which existed before time began and will exist after time ends, is that also time or is it the timeless? The very use of the words, "existed before" and "will exist after" would seem to indicate its temporal character. If so has that a beginning and end? If not, it cannot be temporal. If it has, the beginning of that too must be in time so that we are launched on an infinite regress. If we say that time has its origin in the a-temporal this is not different from saying that it is a partial and so far forth defective phase or appearance of the timeless; and this is the conclusion we are driving at. Nor does it avail to say that time has neither beginning nor end; for the difficulty arises as to how this can be the substrate or container of events which come into being and are destroyed. To maintain the beginningless as the substrate of events is not far removed from subscribing to the view that time is an appearance of the a-temporal. With a worthy caution we may avoid the use of question-begging

(continued from the previous page) epithets and refrain from expressions like "only an appearance"; we may admit that the appearance is of a reality; we seem, however, compelled to conclude that the reality is timeless though it appears as temporal.

If that be the status of the container, the contents cannot fare better. Events are phenomenal; so is the transition from one event to another, change, in other words. Events, are the shadows cast in the interior of the cave by puppets carried on the heads of intelligent beings on the farther side of the wall at the entrance to the cave. We do not see this wall, facing away from it as we are placed. Much less do we see the puppets or the actions of the beings who carry them. But, noting the sequences among the shadows we formulate the laws of their behaviour. What objectivity can be for such laws? If we mark tendencies which we call progress or regress, can they claim a place except in our own fancy? Let us abandon the elaborate parable and examine the concept of change. The consequence of any two events is not enough to constitute the phenomenon of change. If we see white and then black, we do not say that white has changed to black, unless it happens to be known that one and the same object is in some way responsible for both the presentations. There must, in other words, be some identical substrate for the change, which is the possessor of the condition before the change as well as of the changed condition. How is this intelligible, that there is identity and yet that there is change in this identity? Are not the two concepts opposed like "light" and "darkness"? We do without a doubt assert identity-in-difference, as when we talk of personal identity persisting through childhood, manhood and old age, or of the identity of a substance in and through its variant forms. But verbal usage cannot guarantee intelligibility or reality any more than when we say that the sun rises or sets. Identity and difference are opposed *prima facie*. Any reconciliation of these has to proceed by distinguishing aspects, parts or phases. In respect of rationality

(continued from the previous page) I am identical, whereas in respect of physical configuration and abilities I have changed. Is such a reconciliation satisfactory? Do not mental powers too change from childhood to manhood and old age? If every thing that we can know and gauge about a personality undergoes a change through life, what do we mean by his rationality remaining identical? We may camouflage the contradiction by using words like growth and development; but in the end are we not deceiving ourselves when we put side by side sets of qualities like helplessness, confidence and passivity, virility, sophistication and alertness, slackness, confusion and dotage, and yet assert an identity running through them? There is no sameness whether of body of mind or of anything else that is observable; if an esoteric utility be sought, that surely transcends the phenomenal and for the good it can do differs not from the Absolute of the Idealist. The identical is that which does not change; and yet change must be of the identical. Solve this paradox if you can; then we shall admit the reality of change.

What is above time cannot change; much less can it progress; within the Absolute (if such an expression be not so misunderstood as to import space and time for the Absolute) there may be progress; though it is an open question whether a case for progress even to this extent has been definitely made out. Up to the realisation of the Absolute, time and change are for us real; for we continue till then to look on ourselves as finite cognisers; we have purposes and we are entitled to postulate a relatively real progress in so far as those purposes are steadily fulfilled, though in the last resort both purpose and fulfilment may turn out to be phenomenal.

Are we justified in assuming that progress is at least relatively or empirically real? The very multiplicity of the concepts of progress would seem to negative the assumption. In our country the notion of progress has for the most part been bound

(continued from the previous page) up with the unfolding of a divine plan. Man is not perfect, but he is perfectible, since God has so willed it. The difficulties of such a conception are innumerable. Is there realisation in time for man alone or God too? In the latter case, will not God Himself be subject to change in time and so far imperfect? In the case of a Being limited in time, where is the guarantee that His purpose will be realised? And so long as there is the risk of non-realisation, where is the certitude of human progress? If, on the other hand, the realisation is for man alone, God's plan must be already realised; and man's so-called progress can be but a weak, ineffective and pointless reproduction of the already accomplished. What is the justification for treating this as progress, as the steady and certain achievement of an unaccomplished end? And what is the contribution of man in formulating this end? Surely we do not consider ourselves as having progressed except where our achievements are fulfilments of our own needs, realisations of purposes formulated and consciously striven after by ourselves. In the repetition of an eternally fulfilled divine plan, there is no room for intelligent formulation or free striving. Whence then the talk of progress? So long as man's thoughts are bound up with a creator and his plans, there would seem to be little chance of free development.

Similar inconsistencies are found even in other aspects of the notion. Is progress indefinite or only continuous? While the early advocates of the doctrine of progress, like the Encyclopaedists, generally held the former view, Hume and Comte would not accept? Some held that progress was certain; others, e.g. Fortenelle, Terrasson, D'Holbach, went further and treated it as inevitable and natural, having nothing to do with human freewill. In general, the development of the idea of progress coincided with the belief in and the deification of the human reason. Man is perfectible, because he is educable; he can be civilized, because he can be made to know; his passions can be brought under control and made

(continued from the previous page) hand-maids to reason. Such a view, held by Saint-Pierre, Voltaire, Comte, Buckle.

Man can fly in the air and move under the waters; and the ether is at his command to fetch and carry messages. With all this development there has resulted little of harmony or felicity. Increased skill and knowledge have resulted in feverish armament races; command of new powers has been utilised for the acquisition of greater facilities for destruction; no nation is happy in its own achievements, as it is for most of the time engaged in looking at others' achievements with jealous or envious eyes. What was meant to cure has been turned to skill; and advance, instead of showing the benignant face of Visnu, wears the irate aspect of Rudra, the destroyer.

Taking the moral development of the world by and large, one does seem to note some kind of progress. There has been at some time or other the change of stress from the external to the internal from act to attitude, from form to significance; and this is all for the better. But this change took place long centuries ago. It is the difference, say, between the Jewish and the Christian attitude. It is the teaching of the Bhagvad-Gita in emphasising the renunciation not of action, but of the fruit thereof. And yet in these twenty centuries and more, what is the measure of real hold which the teaching has gained among men? Empty forms and symbols are regnant even in the world of today. It is still a greater sin to be discovered than to do wrong. Not infrequently our great men are but those who have managed to keep their exteriors untarnished. Sin and superstition denied free expression find safer and more extensive abodes by burrowing underground.

Even in the field of ideas, one cannot comfortably dogmatise about progress. While the extent of scientific knowledge has increased, its certitude has become much less. Its only definiteness seems to be indefiniteness. Speaking broadly, practice has taken precedence over knowledge, and the

(continued from the previous page) pragmatist holds sway.

An advaitin reconstructing their order of development would, it has been said, place Madhva's first, Ramanuja's next and Sankara's last; extreme pluralism would appear to him the attitude of naive common-sense; a stress on identity without being able to give up difference in some form would appear to be the next stage; last would come the realisation of pure identity as the absolute truth.

Having developed so far what is called the pessimism of the advaitin, let us take a closer look at his system. Does he deny all progress? To belittle past achievement is not to deny the possibility of future achievement. Nor is it a negation of progress to hold that a readjustment is necessary of values and activities. Surely this is the advaitin's procedure. He does not deny the reality of happiness or the possibility of achieving it; in the past humanity has not done much to achieve it; that is because its efforts have not been properly directed. With an understanding of the real nature of happiness, that it is not external nor an attribute of the external, but the very constitution of one's self, the development of man is bound to change; progress will then be a reality, no longer a delusion. Granting that much of so-called progress is a delusion, there should be admitted at least as much progress as is implied in realising the delusiveness of the delusion.

The statement of such a position is bound to evoke a host of questions. Is a re-orientation of the kind suggested possible? Even if possible, is it worth while? Are we not asked to condemn what we actually hold to be valuable and turn to the pursuit of something which may be wholly elusive? It is bad enough policy to neglect the here for the hereafter; is it not insane when the pursuit is not even of the hereafter; but of what is not in space or time, and is, curiously enough said, to be ever attained? Scripture may tell us of one or two or half a dozen that have achieved self-realisation.

(continued from the previous page) Even on the large assumption that these are not mere tales calculated to ward off depression, what is the certainty that what they have attained is worth while or that the path they have trodden is open to others and will lead them to the same goal? The lazy contentment of the beggar in his rags and the idiot in his ignorance, how are these different from the contentment and peace that is the advaitin's goal?

The advaitin is ever ready to acknowledge facts though he is not prepared to treat all facts as absolutely real. It is a fact that men seek knowledge and happiness; it is also a fact that there is change from a state of ignorance to one of knowledge, from a state of misery to one of happiness, and that though none of these states can claim to be what it is absolutely, there is relative progression from the one to the other. Even the advaitin seeks and hopes to leave his interlocutor wiser than he found him. He cannot at the same time avoid the recognition of numerous paradoxes in the concepts of knowledge and happiness. Neither of these can relate solely to what has been attained; to re-affirm the known is not to know; to remember a past pleasure is not to be happy and sometimes it may be the reverse; "sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things."

For such a viewpoint, progress is, in a sense, both possible and inevitable. We are not condemned to wander round in ignorance and misery, since knowledge and bliss are real. We may appear to seek interminably; achievement, however, is certain; for, it is of nothing but our own very nature. We retire into ourselves unconsciously when we sleep. To establish firmly and consciously this state of attainment, so that there may be no further disruptions by delusive awareness, that is our ceaseless endeavour. The achievement of this end is certain; for if there were not this certitude there would be no striving at all. The seeking in time postulates the timeless reality; and this latter is both the

(continued from the previous page) starting-point and the goal.

But surely, it will be objected, when the all-perfect is timelessly real, how can there be progress towards it? If knowledge cannot relate to the already known nor action to the already accomplished, whence the possibility of progress for the absolutist? The question is common and in a sense legitimate; and advaitins have given different replies, some treating "achievement" as secondary or figurative in sense, while others treat the word as used in the principal sense. What should be noted, however, is that the question is due to a confusion resulting from the deficiencies of language. When we say that the known cannot be the object of knowledge, we speak of that which is temporal, relates to past time as compared with the present. But when we say knowledge is real or is given, we do not mean that it belongs to the past, but that it is atemporal. While there can be repetitiveness in respect of the past, there can be no such defect in respect of what is not in time. The charge that Absolute Idealism makes our world a meaningless copy of a perfect rounded archetypal Absolute is baseless. Of that which is not neither in space or time there cannot be a copy in space and time. There is in experience some amount of copying; but the copy and the arch type, the prototype and the reflection are of the same class. That is why the wise advaitin will not say that Brahman is reflected in maya; the prototype is Isvara, Himself limited by maya though controlling it, while the reflections are jivas, who have but very limited control of maya. Isvara is a knower, as jivas are; but Brahman is knowledge, neither is knower nor known. How can the knowing process or its result be a copy of knowledge? That it is a presentation on knowledge as substrate, the advaitin admits, while confessing at the same time his inability to explain the rationale of the super-imposition; such inexplicability, he would add, is due to the constitution of the appearance, which is indeterminable as real or as unreal. The processes of the finite world are therefore not futile on the

(continued from the previous page) ground of being repetitive.

Progress will be unstable; and it will continue to be unstable so long as one stops with the mastery of the external without an analysis of its significance and value, so long as one stops with science and does not turn to metaphysics. Progress goes with increase both in width and depth, in extent and content, in accumulation and interpretation, in acquisition and renunciation, in inclusiveness and harmony. If so far we seem to have achieved little, it is because both as nations and as individuals we have tended to be dominated by one or other aspect, to the comparative neglect of the other.

The Brahman of the advaitin is beyond time and change; it is static; how can this be reconciled with a doctrine of progress? The answer has been already indicated; progress is for the being that feels finitude and imperfection; it is for you and me, not for a God held to be perfect; it is the hungry man that needs food, not he who is the picture of satisfaction; to postulate progress for the latter too is to set up yet another ideal and purpose; straightaway there arises the question as the reality of this purpose, its temporarily, its inclusiveness of other purposes, its capacity to develop towards still another ideal and so on; if we are to avoid such endless dissipation we have to admit once and for all that the real is so to speak both the starting point and the goal. For the real there is no progress; but in the real there is progress and this is all that we as progressive creatures are concerned with. To call the Absolute static and then feel sore about it, is no more wise than to abuse ourselves and then chafe under it. Static and dynamic are concepts applying to what is in time; in characterising something as static we contrast it with the possibility of itself as dynamic; how can that which is a-temporal be static or dynamic?

The Absolute being entirely different from the

(continued from the previous page) world of appearance, he who would seek to realise himself as Brahman should negate the world and turn away from it. Progress on the contrary is possible only through living in the world, knowing it, acting in and through it. The path of Brahman-knowledge is *nivṛtti-marga*, while that of the progressive is *pravṛtti-marga*. An objection of this nature can find excuse in the confusion not merely of the opponents but also of some adherents of *advaita*. The non-dualist doctrine especially in its later phase has come to be identified with an effete type of asceticism, which affected to despise the world without taking the trouble to know it. Renunciation is the supreme duty; but, for him who has nothing, renunciation is hollow; to ignore the world is not identical with being ignorant of it; for it is the ignorant mind that despite rigorous self-castigation will be ever prone to the lures of the unknown; the ideal of the *advaitin* is to know and then to set aside.

And this is the answer to Bury who, after reviewing the idea of progress from the Middle Ages to the present day, concludes thus: "But if we accept the reasonings on which the dogma of progress is based, must we not carry them to the full conclusion? In escaping from the illusion of finality, is it legitimate to exempt the dogma itself: Must not it, too, submit to its own negation of finality?" True, the idea of progress cannot afford to be non-progressive; but in the process it cannot fail to be progress, i.e. what is not final. Like *pramēyatva* for all thinkers and *mithyatva* for the *advaitin*, the concept of progress applies to itself as much as to the rest of the world. And if the process seems unintelligible, we need only point to the phenomenal and indeterminable character of the world as well as of this concept. That is why for the Absolute there is no progress. It is rather the condition of all progress; and because of the certitude furnished by that condition, the *advaitin* confidently marches forward.

Ameer Ali. Syed: "THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM."

Each was an embodiment of the spiritual necessities of his age; each came to purify, to reform, to elevate a degraded race, a corrupted commonwealth. Some came as teachers of a smaller culture, to influence a smaller sphere; others came with a world-wide message—a message not confined to one race or nation, but intended for all humanity.

Just as in the western pagan world philosophy failed to satisfy the craving of the popular mind for a personal God who had dwelt among mankind and held familiar discourse with them, the theistic aspirations of the Upanishads did not appeal to the heart or touch the emotions of the masses in India. And a hero-god was soon found in Krishna a member of the warrior caste, who came before long to be identified with the Supreme Spirit and to be regarded in his earthly existence as an incarnate god.

His disciples were poor, ignorant folk. In spite of their credulous natures, and the vivid—not to say weird—effect exercised on their imaginations by the untimely disappearance of the Master they never regarded him as anything more than a man. It was not until Paul adopted the creed of him whose execution he had witnessed, that the idea of an incarnate God or angel was introduced into Christianity. And Paul, the Pharisee and the scholar, was deeply imbued with these half-mystical, half-philosophical notions of his time. A visionary and enthusiast by nature, not free from physical ailments, as Strauss suggests, he, who had never come in actual contact with the Master, was easily inclined to attach to him the attributes of a Divinity—of an Angel Incarnate. He infused into the simple teachings of Jesus the most mysterious principles of Neo-Pythagoreanism. The jealousy between the home hand the foreign, the Judaical and the anti-Judaical party, was shown in the curious though well-known antipathy of the two apostles, Peter and Paul.

For nearly three centuries the spread of Christianity

(continued from the previous page) was confined to the ignorant and uneducated. Not until the Christian Church had incorporated with its theology and ecclesiastical system many dogmas borrowed from its great and fascinating rivals, and almost all their rites and ceremonialism, and practices and institutions, did it make any headway among people of culture.

They regarded Jesus as only a man, and believed that a certain energy proceeding from the Supreme Father had united itself with the man Jesus, had given birth to the most philosophic sect of Christianity. The rise of Arianism is due principally to the revolt of the human intellect from the irrational teachings of the Church. In Alexandria, which was at that time the most fanatical of Christian cities, Arius had the boldness to preach, in opposition to his own bishop, that Christ was not of the same essence with God. Arianism soon spread itself.

In the latter part of the sixteenth century of the Christian era Socinus of the Sienna (in Italy) revived and amplified the doctrines of Arius. The unitarians of the present day are the direct spiritual descendants of the Socinians, who denied the divinity of Jesus. They also repudiated the doctrine of original sin and atonement. To them God alone was the object of adoration.

Monasticism withdrew a great number of those who might have been energetic and useful citizens into barren seclusion and religious indolence; but except when the monks formed themselves, as they frequently did, into fierce political or polemic factions they had little effect on the conditions of society. They stood aloof from the world—the anchorites in their desert wildernesses, the monks in their jealousy barred convents; and secure, as they supposed, of their own salvation, left the rest of mankind to inevitable perdition." —Milman, *Latin Christianity*.

We, moderns, perceive, in the ordinary incidents in the lives of nations and individuals, the current of an irresistible law.

His was not the communion with God of those

(continued from the previous page) egotists who bury themselves in deserts or forests, and live a life of quietude for themselves alone. His was the hard struggle of the man who is led onwards by a nobler destiny towards the liberation of his race.

No extraordinary pretensions, no indulgence in hyperbolic language, no endeavour to cast a glamour round his character or personality. "I am only a preacher of God's words, the bringer of God's message to mankind," repeats he always. From first to last no expression escapes him "which could be construed into a request for human worship", from first to last there is unvarying soberness of expression, which, considering the age and surrounding, is more marvellous; from first to last the tone is one of simple, deep humility before the Creator.

The mind of this remarkable Teacher was, in its intellectualism and progressive ideals, essentially modern. Eternal "striving" was in his teachings a necessity of human existence: "Man cannot exist without constant effort"; "The effort is from me, its fulfilment come from God." The world, he taught, was a well-ordered Creation, regulated and guided by a Supreme Intelligence overshadowing the Universe—"Everything is pledged to its own time,".

Such was the condition of the civilised world when Jesus commenced his preachings. With all his dreams and aspirations, his mind was absolutely except from those pretensions which have been fixed on him by his over-zealous followers. He never claimed to be a "complement of God," or to be "hypostasis of the Divinity." Even modern idealistic Christianity has not been able yet to shake itself free from the old legacy bequeathed by the anthropomorphism of bygone ages. Age after age everything human has been eliminated from the history of the great Teacher. Many minds, bewildered by the far-offness of the universal Father, seek a rest-place midway in a human personality which they call divine. It is this need of a nearer object of adoration which leads

(continued from the previous page) modern Christianity to give a name to an ideal, clothe it with flesh and blood, and worship it as a man-God. Can it said that when Abu Mughis alHallaj and the Bab called themselves "Truth" and the "Gate to heave," they meant to imply that they were part of the Divinity, or, if they did, that their "Claim" is tantamount to proof? But, as we said before, we deny that Jesus, whose conceptions, when divested of the Aberglaube of his followers, were singularly free from exaggeration as to his own character or personality, ever used an expression to justify the demand attempted to be fixed upon him. His conception of the "Fatherhood" of God embraced all humanity. All mankind were the children of God, and he was their Teacher sent by the Eternal Father. The Christian had thus a nobler exemplar before him. The teachings of the Prophet of Nazareth should have elevated him to purer conception of the Deity.

In the long night of superstition the Christians had wandered far away from the simplicity of the Nazarene teachings. The worship of images, saints, and relics had become inseparably blended with the religion of Jesus. The practises which he had denounced, the evils which he had reprehended, were, one by one, incorporated with his faith. Against all the absurdities we have described above, the life-aim of Mohammed was directed.

The teachings of Jesus, representing a later development of the religious faculty in man, recognised the true character of prayer. He consecrated the practice by his own example. The early disciples, in the spirit of their Master, laid great stress on the habit of devotion and thanks giving to God. But the want of some definite rule for the guidance of the masses, in process of time, left them completely adrift in all that regarded the practice of devotion, and under subjection to the priests, who monopolised the office of peculating the number, length, and the terminology of prayers. Hence missals liturgies, councils, and convocations to settle articles

(continued from the previous page) of faith and matters of conscience; hence also, the mechanical worship of droning monks, and the hebdomadal flocking into churches and chapels on one day in the week to make up for the deficiency of spiritual food during the six; hence also the "presbyter," who, merely a "servant" at first, came to regard himself as "the Lord of the spiritual heritage" bequeathed by Jesus.

Every place in which the Almighty is faithfully worshipped is equally pure. The Moslem, whether he be at home or abroad, when the hour of prayer arrives, pours forth his soul in a brief but earnest suppliant address; his attention is not wearied not by the length of his prayers, the theme of which is always self-humiliation, the glorification of the Giver of all good, and reliance on His mercy. The intensity of the devotional spirit embalmed in the church of Mohammed has hardly been realised by Christendom. Tradition, that faithful chronicler of the past, with its hundred corroborative witnesses, records how the Prophet wept during his prayers with the fervour of his emotions; how his noble cousin and son-in-law became so absorbed in his devotions that his body grew benumbed.

The Islam of Mohammed recognises no caste of priesthood, allows no monopoly of spiritual knowledge or special holiness to intervene between man and his God. Each soul rises to its Creator without the intervention of priest or hierophant. No sacrifice, no ceremonial, invented by vested interests, is needed to bring the anxious heart nearer to its Comforter. Each human being is his own priest; in the Islam of Mohammed no one man is higher than the other.

The institution of fasting has existed more or less among all nations. But it may be said that throughout the ancient world the idea attached to it was, without exception, more of penitence than of abstinence. Even in Judaism the notion of fasting as an exercise of self-castigation (from their

(continued from the previous page) connection with the Pythagoreans, and, through them, with the asceticism of the further East) were the first among the Jews to grasp this moral element in the principle of fasting; and Jesus probably derived this idea, like other conceptions, from them. The example of Jesus consecrated the custom in the Church. But the predominating idea in Christianity, with respect to fasts generally, is one of penitence or expiation; (Mosheim distinctly says that fasting came early to be regarded "as the most effectual means of repelling the force, and disconcerting the stratagems of evil spirits, and of appeasing the anger of an offended deity.") and partially, of precedent. Voluntary corporal mortifications have been as frequent in the Christian Church as in other Churches; but the tendency of such mortifications has invariably been the destruction of mental and bodily energies, and the fostering of a morbid asceticism. The institution of fasting in Islam, on the contrary, has the legitimate object of restraining the passions, by diurnal abstinence for a limited and definite period, from all the gratifications of the senses, and directing the overflow of the animal spirits into a healthy channel. Useless, and unnecessary mortification of the flesh is discountenanced, nay, condemned. Fasting is prescribed to the able-bodied and the strong, as a means of chastening the spirit by imposing a restraint on the body. For the weak the sickly, the traveller, the student (who is engaged in the pursuit of knowledge—the Jihad-ul-Akbar) the soldier doing God's battle against the assailants of the faith, and women in their ailments; it is disallowed.

"God wishes to make things easy for you, for," says the Koran, "man was created weak."

The Islam of Mohammed alone combines both the conceptions which have in different ages furnished the mainspring of human conduct,—the consciousness of human dignity, so valued in the ancient philosophies, and the sense of human sinfulness, so dear

(continued from the previous page) to the Christian apologist. The belief that man will be judged by his work solely, throws the Moslem on the practice of self-denial and universal charity; the belief in Divine Providence, in the mercy, love, and omnipotence of God, leads him to self-humiliation before the Almighty, and to the practice of those heroic virtues which have given rise to the charge that the virtues which here given rise to the charge that the virtues of Islam are stoical," patience, resignation, and firmness in the trials of life. It leads him to interrogate his conscience with nervous anxiety; to study with scrupulous care the motives that accure him, to distrust his own strength, and to rely upon the assistance of an Almighty and All-Loving Power in the conflict between good and evil.

In some religions the precepts which inculcated duties have been so utterly devoid of practicability, so completely wanting in a knowledge of human nature, and partaking so much of the dreamy vagueness of enthusiasts, as to become in the real battles of life simply useless. The practical character of a religion, its abiding influence on the common relation, of mankind, in the affairs of everyday life, its power on the masses, are the true criteria for judging of its universality. We do not look to exceptional minds to recognise the nature of a religion. We search among the masses to understand its true character. Does it exercise deep power over them? does it elevate them? does it regulate their conception of rights and duties? desist, if carried to the South Sea islander, or preached to the Caffrarians, improve or degrade them?—are the questions we naturally ask. In Islam is joined a lofty idealism with the most rationalistic practicality. It did not ignore human nature; it never entangled itself in the tortuous pathways which lie outside the domains of the actual and the real. Its object, like that of the other systems, was the elevation of humanity towards the absolute ideal of perfection; but it attained, or tries to attain, this

(continued from the previous page) object by grasping the truth that the nature of man is, in this existence, imperfect. If it did not say, "If thy brother smite thee on one cheek, turn though the other also to him"; if it allowed the punishment of the wanton wrong-doer to the extent of the injury he had done, it also taught, in fervid words and varied strains, the practice of forgiveness and benevolence, and the return of good for evil.

The practice of these noble precepts does not lie enshrined in the limbo of false sentimentalism. With the true follower of the Prophet they form the active principles of life.

Excepting for the conception of the sonship of Jesus, there is no fundamental difference between Christianity and Islam. In their essence they are one and the same; both are the outcome of the same spiritual forces working in humanity. One was a protest against the heartless materialism of the Jews and Romans; the other a revolt against the degrading idolatry of the Arabs, their ferocious customs and usages.

A religion has to be eminently positive in its "commandments and prohibitions" to exercise an abiding salutary influence on the ignorant and uncultured. The higher and more spiritualised minds are often able to forge on the anvils of their own hearts, lines of duty in relation to their fellow creatures without reference to outside directions. To the mass of mankind, however, sunk either in ignorance or barbarism, for the uncultured and the sodden, moral enunciations convey no meaning unless they are addressed in a positive form and formulated with the precision of enactments surrounded with definite sanctions. The ethical side of a religion does not appeal to their feelings or sentiments; and philosophical conceptions exercise no influence on their minds, their daily conduct of their lives. They are swayed far more by authority and precedent than by sermons on abstract principles. They require definite prescriptions to regulate not only their relations towards their fellow-beings

(continued from the previous page) but also towards their Creator whom, in the absence of such rules, they are apt to forget. The success of Islam in the seventh century of the Christian era, and its rapid and marvellous diffusion over the surface of the globe, were due to the fact that it recognised this essential need of human nature. To a world of wrangling sects and creeds, to whom words were of far greater importance than practice, it spoke in terms of positive command from an Absolute Source.

The present stagnation of the Musulman communities is principally due to the notion which has fixed itself on the minds of the generality of Moslems, that the right to the exercise of private judgment ceased with the early legists, that its exercise in modern times is sinful, and that a Moslem in order to be regarded as an orthodox follower of Mohammed should belong to one or the other of the schools established by the schoolmen of Islam, and abandon his judgment absolutely to the interpretations of men who lived in the ninth century, and could have no conception of the necessities of the twentieth.

Among the Sunnis, it is the common belief that since the four Imams, no doctor has arisen qualified to interpret the laws of the Prophet. No account is taken of the altered circumstances in which Moslems are now placed; the conclusions at which these learned legists arrived several centuries ago are held to be equally applicable to the present day. Among the Shiahs, the Akhbari will not allow his judgment to travel beyond the dictates of "the expounders of the law". The prophet has consecrated reason as the highest and noblest function of the human intellect. Our schoolmen and their servile followers have made its exercise a sin and a crime.

As among Christians, so among Moslems. The lives and conduct of a large number Moslems at the present day are governed less by the precepts and teachings of the Master and more by the theories and

(continued from the previous page) opinions of the mujtahids and imams who have tried, each according to his light, to construe the revelations vouchsafed to the Teacher. Like men in a crowd listening to a preacher who from a lofty position addresses a large multitude and from his vantage ground overlooks a vast area, they observed only their immediate surroundings, and, without comprehending the wider meaning of his words or the nature of the audience whom he addressed, adapted his utterances to their own limited notions of human needs and human progress. Oblivious of the universality of the Master's teachings, unassisted by his spirit, devoid of his inspiration, they forgot that the Prophet, from the pinnacle of his genius, had spoken to all humanity. They mixed up the temporary with the permanent, the universal with the particular. Like many of the ecclesiastics of Christendom, not a few were the servants of sovereigns and despots whose demands were not consistent with the precepts of the Master.

The method of proselytising adopted by the followers Abdullah ibn Maimun was the old Manichaeon one of throwing the acolyte into a sea of doubt with insidious questions and equivocal replies, "not," says Mohsin Fani's informant, "with any evil object, but simply to bring the seeker after truth and wisdom to the goal of perfection." The process varied with the religious standpoint of the person whom they desired to convert. The Dai (the missionary) would at first give a tacit recognition of the faith of the intended proselyte, and then by an insinuation of doubt and difficulties, gradually unsettle his mind, and end by suggesting as the only possible solution the peculiar tenets of the Batini system. For example, if it was a Christian whom he hoped to win over, he enlarged on the obstinacy of the Jews and the ignorance of the Musulmans, he conformed to all the chief articles of the Christian creed, at the same time hinting that they were all symbolic, and pointed to a deeper meaning which the Batini system alone could solve. And after the mind of the

(continued from the previous page) neophyte had been so far moulded he would suggest that the Christians had misinterpreted the doctrine of the Paraclete, and that the Ismailia Imam was the real Paraclete. Abdullah ibn Maimun also formulated in precise terms the doctrine of takeyye—outward conformity with an alien religious belief or practice. It had been in vogue among all the Manichaeen sects—not excepting the Paulicians. It was re-introduced by Abdullah ibn Maimun, partly to escape persecution, partly to facilitate the work of proselytism. Takeyye is the natural defence of the weak and suffering against the strong. All people have not the fibre of a martyr; and the majority of them have to submit where they cannot oppose. The primitive Christians had to practise takeyye. The Ismailias had special reasons for concealing their religious views in all countries within the sway of the Abbaside Caliphs; and this long-enforced habit became at last a second nature with them.

They differ on the amount of authority to be attached to the exposition of the Mujtahids, who call themselves the representatives of the Imam. The Usuli repudiates entirely the authority of the expounders of the law to fetter his judgment. He contends that the law is clear, and that it is his duty to construe it for himself with the light of reason and progress of human thought, and not to be guided in his judgment by the dictates of men as fallible as himself, and interested in maintaining the world in ignorance. He holds that God's revelations had not the object of hiding the Divine meaning in words difficult to apprehend. They were addressed through his Prophet to humanity to apprehend and to obey. Thus God's teachings delivered through His Messenger do not require the interpretation of priest or lawyer. The Akhbari, on the other hand, obeys slavishly the expositions of the Mujtahids.

According to the Usuli doctrines, the oral precepts of the Prophet are in their nature supplementary to the Koranic ordinances, and their binding

(continued from the previous page) effect depends on the degree of harmony existing between them and the teachings of the Koran. Thus, those traditions which seem to be in conflict with the spirit of the Koranic precepts are considered apocryphal. The process of elimination is conducted upon recognised principles, founded upon logical rules and definite data. These rules have acquired a distinctive type among the Mu'tazilas, who have eliminated from the Hadis Kudsi (the holy traditions) such alleged sayings of the Prophet as appeared incompatible and out of harmony with his developed teachings.

Babism, which made its appearance in Persia in the early part of the nineteenth century, has been represented in widely divergent colours. According to the Moslem authorities, it is nothing but a new form of Mazdakism, an Eastern socialistic communism. Its mixed gatherings of men and women are regarded in the same light as the ancient Agapie of the primitive Christians were considered by the followers of the older faiths. On the other hand, a European scholar Gobineau of great research and learning, who has studied the religious literature of the Babis, and mixed familiarity with them, represents Babism as the latest expression of an electric evolution growing out of the innate pantheism of the Iranian mind.

During the reign of Mohammed Shah, the hypocrisy and vices of the national clergy, says this writer, had reached such a pitch that a change was inevitable. The political and social conditions of the people were deplorable. In this state of affairs a young Mullah of Shiraz, Mirza All Mohammed, supposed to be Fatimide by descent, who had studied much, had travelled a great deal and made the pilgrimage to the holy cities, and had for many years resided in Arabia and Syria, began to preach a social and moral reform. He denounced the hypocrisy of the ordinary mullahs, and their reception of the most doubtful traditions to justify practices condemned by Islam. His words struck a sympathetic chord

(continued from the previous page) in minds already prepared for the reception of his views, and evoked extraordinary enthusiasm.

Mirza Ali Mohammed, either carried away by the enthusiasm of his followers, or unhinged by his own exaltation, in a fit of pantheistical insanity, assumed the title of Bab Hazarat-i-ala, and styled himself a part of the Divinity. His followers rose in arms against the constituted authorities and failed. The fanaticism of the clergy and political expediency gave rise to persecution, for which even Gobineau thinks the Babis were primarily responsible. The Bab was killed with most of his prominent disciples.

In the Koran the conception of human responsibility is so strongly developed that the question naturally occurs to the mind, How can these two ideas be reconciled with each other? It seems inconsistent at first sight that man should be judged by his works, a doctrine which forms the foundation of Islamic morality, if all his actions are ruled by an all-powerful Will. The earnest faith of Mohammed in active ever-living Principle, joined to his trust in the progress of man, supplies a key to this mystery.

The Caliph Ali had condemned in emphatic language all anthropomorphic and anthropopathic conceptions of the Deity. "God was not like any object that the human mind can conceive; no attribute can be ascribed to Him which bore the least resemblance to any quality of which human beings have perception from their knowledge of material objects. The perfection of piety consists in knowing God; the perfection of knowledge is the affirmation of His verity; and the perfection of verity is to acknowledge His unity in all sincerity; and the perfection of sincerity is to deny all attributes to the Deity.... He who refers an attribute to God believes an attribute to be God, and he who believes an attribute to be God, regards God as two or part of one... He who asks where God is, assimilates Him is

(continued from the previous page) with some object. God is the Creator, not because He Himself is created; God is existent, not because He was non-existent. He is with every object, not from resemblance or nearness; He is outside of every thing not from separation. He is the Primary Cause not in the meaning of motion or action; He is the Seer, but no sight can see Him. He has no relation to place, time, or measure...God is Omniscient, because knowledge is His Essence; Mighty, because Power is His Essence; Loving, because Love is His Essence...not because there are attributes apart from His Essence... The conditions of time or space were wholly inapplicable to Him" ..

Ibn-Tufail died in Morocco in 1185 A.C. He belonged to the contemplative school of Arab philosophy which was designated Ishraqi, an offshoot of ancient Neo-Platonism, and akin in its aspirations to modern mysticism. His contemplative philosophy is not founded on mystical exaltation, but on a method in which intuition is combined with reasoning. His famous work, called *Hayy ibn Yaqzan*, represents the gradual and successive development of intelligence and the power of perception in a person wholly unassisted by outside instruction.

But it is given to few to be saints and to still fewer to combine a holy life of concentrated devotion with the discharge of the daily duties of life. To the bulk of humanity the call to abjure the world and to betake ourselves to complete absorption in the contemplation of the Divinity is an inducement to mental lethargy. The responsibility for the present decadence of the Moslem nations must be shared by the formalism of the Ashari and the quietism of the Sufi. Mystical teachings like the following:

The Man who looks on the beggar's bowls as a kingly
And the present world a fleeting bubble, crown
He alone traverseth the ocean of Truth
Who looks upon life as a fairy tale.
can have but one result—intellectual paralysis.

In perfectly well-attuned minds mysticism takes the form of a noble type of idealistic philosophy; but the generality of mankind are more likely to unhinge their brains by busying themselves with the mysteries of the Divine Essence and our relations thereto. Every ignorant and idle specimen of humanity, who, despising real knowledge, abandoned the fields of true philosophy and betook himself to the domains of mysticism, would thus set himself up as one of the Ahl-i-Ma'rifat.

T.E. Slater: "THE PROBLEM OF PAIN."@@@

We are not the first to ask such questions. Ever since the dawn of human intelligence, all philosophy and theology have been bewildered by the burden of evil—the problem raised by the conflicting phenomena of the universe.

The summum bonum is, that whatever exist should cease to be. To escape from evil, we must renounce existence; there is no better or braver solution than that. Buddhism succumbs under the burden; it does not surmount it. If we lose sight of the personality of God, there is nothing higher for man than nirvana, loss of conscious being.

Shall we then adopt an entirely different method, and postulate with the Parsi and the Gnostic a rival Power; distinct sources for the evil and the good; some Manichaeian anti-god of diabolic nature, in order to clear the character of the Supreme?

The thinking of such a mind as Mill's has no doubt been of value to the world, but it belongs to an era which we have already left behind. Since the middle of the last century there has been a vast expansion of scientific knowledge, under the influence of the doctrine of evolution. No kind of dualism can be seriously maintained again. The advance of science points most clearly to the monistic conception of the universe, the philosophic need of regarding it as an intelligible whole, and of explaining all that exists, whether it may seem to be good or bad, by a

(continued from the previous page) principle of sufficient reason, as a necessary part of the dramatic whole. The universe is the manifold manifestation of a single, all-pervading principle of life, that the Rig-Veda finely calls, 'One-without a-second;' and the religious mind becomes of necessity monotheistic, with unfaltering faith, under the fuller teaching of Christ, in any all wise Heavenly Father, in whose perfect ways we must surely trust. The dualistic scheme of the universe destroys its unity, and is therefore unscientific. Two rival gods or forces, 'like two rival popes, destroy each other,' and deprive us of one supreme Divine Head. A God shorn of the His omnipotence is no God at all. The dominion of the world cannot be divided. God must be over all and in all; and His Providence must be all-embracing; including the evil as well as the good, the sorrow as well as the joy.

Professor Fiske reminds us that the modern science of mind is built upon the truth that consciousness, or conscious life—which constitutes the fundamental fact of the soul—exists only by virtue of unceasing change; that the whole fabric of human thought and emotion is kept up by the ceaseless relations of likeness and unlikeness, which manifest themselves from moment to moment "in sensations keen or dull, in perceptions clear or vague, in judgments wise or foolish, in memories gay or sad, in sordid or lofty trains of thought, in gusts of anger or thrills of love." Apart from this constant change we should be in a state of unconsciousness. And what does this mean? It means that we cannot know anything except as contrasted with something else. No picture can be seen unless the figures on the canvas can be distinguished from the background. "If there were no colour but red, it would be exactly the same thing as if there were no colour at all." If our ears heard only one unbroken roar, of waters, "the effect upon consciousness would be absolute silence." In the same way, "if we had never felt physical pain, we could not recognise physical pleasure;" and without knowing what is morally evil we

(continued from the previous page) could not appreciate what is morally good; we could not recognise its quality of goodness.

The primary cause and origin of all pain is a perpetual conflict between the ego—the man—and the universe; a feeling of distress arising from the contradiction between the inner life of man and external things, which are of a different nature from itself, and tend to crush it beneath the weight of invincible laws. Man soon knows himself to be limited and thwarted in all possible directions. He is never satisfied with what he possesses. He craves to know, but he finds there is a wall of mystery everywhere. He craves for enjoyment, but he sees "Pleasure and happiness changing into pain and sorrow. How shall he solve this contradiction of his being? Shall he resign himself to pessimism, and despair, and death? Is there no nobler deliverance? Thank God there is.

It is by the development of his mental and spiritual nature, in obedience to moral laws, that man disengages himself by continual struggles from a mere animal condition, which is bound and ruled by necessity, and can only submit to physical laws. In this struggle upwards from the brute to the man, in this deliverance of the life of the spirit out of mere physical existence, "may we not for see the divine purpose of pain? All births are painful;" but it is worth while to be born. "Consciousness, like every other child, was born in tears; the child of pain, it can only be developed by pain." The true goal of evolution, the divine end that was involved in the beginning, is the spiritual perfection of man—the making of character. That perfecting can be achieved, as we shall see more fully presently, only through struggle and discipline;

Suffering rightly received is an unspeakable blessing; suffering unsanctified, suffering resisted or resented, becomes a curse. Let a man persistently oppose God's will and the time inevitably come when he will be left to the dark way of his own devices.

From the depths of distress, from the initial contradictions of life, true religion springs. In the midst of a heritage of forces all around us, which we have not chosen or produced, we cannot escape a feeling of absolute dependence on some unseen Reality, and we seek outside ourselves the first cause and ultimate aim of our existence. It is this feeling of dependence on something outside ourselves, and yet within, that furnishes the experimental basis of our idea of God. On the one hand man is conscious of himself, and of the superior dignity of spirit; on the other hand, he is oppressed by the crushing weight of external things; and the circle of his mental life, so full of conflict, is completed only by the sense of common dependence of both man and the world on God.

True religion is the union of submission and faith. We may simply submit to our trials, and sink below them; it is by faith—faith in the wisdom and rectitude of a Divine Father—that we rise above them with a feeling of deliverance and even victory.

Hence we see that the essence of religion is Prayer. It is the commerce of the soul in its distress with the mysterious Power on which it feels its destiny depends; no empty utterance of words and repetition of formulas, but the close and silent communion of the spirit with its Father. It is the fellowship of kindred minds. There can be no real religion, which is a practical need, without this inward prayer; and it has been said that "A history of prayer would be the best history of the religious development of mankind; commencing in the crudest cry for help, and completing itself in perfect prayer which, on the lips of Christ, is simply submission to the confidence in the Father's Will.

If man be mortal, if this world be all, it is a cruel world; and no true idea of the Divine righteousness is possible. But God has eternity before Him.

A. Srinivasan: "BERKELEY AND SANKARA, A COMPARISON AND A CONTRAST."@@

Berkeley, an amiable English divine of the 18th century, to whom even satirists willingly allowed "every virtue under heaven," made his mark as a philosopher by his theory of perception. Perception has been described as the identity of the ego and non-ego. Different theories have been proposed explaining the mode of union of the two factors involved in perception. One school said, "no matter;" a second school repaid the compliment and declared, "never mind." A third combined both and uttered boldly "never mind and no matter". A fourth advocated the only other possible hypothesis, viz., the reality of mind and matter. Berkeley espoused idealism and taught that we can know nothing but our ideas and ideas are states of consciousness; we perceive nothing but ideas excited in us and there is nothing besides. Our knowledge consists of sensationations of blue and soft and sweet; an external something for these qualities to inhere in, is a gratuitous makeshift born of the fancy of philosophers; "That alone exists, which is perceived" said Berkeley. "Esse is percipi" and the talk about a material world is 'the vain rumination,' in the language of a Hindu philosopher, 'of airy nothing.' Berkeley claimed to disclose the whole experience of a common sense man and nothing but the experience, in the above analysis; yet by an irony of fate he was ridiculed as shocking common sense and confidently told to run his head against a post or fall down a precipice in vindication of his philosophy.

The unavailing indignation of the later defenders of common sense against the logic, faultless however much it may fail to convince, of Berkeley. Berkeley also earnestly claimed to interpret truly and loyally the consciousness of the vulgar and did not like his rivals argue for the existence of an external something which neither he nor they perceived.

@@ (Madras) Christian College Magazine. 1901.

A. Srinivasan: "BERKELEY AND SANKARA, A COMPARISON AND A CONTRAST."

(continued from the previous page) He only abolished what never existed, however persistently believed to exist. It was the fifth wheel to a carriage and an utter superfluity that one parts with, in the so-called external world.

We have been told by Berkeley that there are ideas in his mind which are alien to himself and that they are excited by God, being a mode of Him; such ideas are of course not fictions but facts. But Sankara's world which hangs from the footstool of Iswara is the result of illusion, for maya its mother is the principle of illusion. He has admitted the external world by the front door with all pomp and circumstance only to drive it out by the backdoor without ceremony. Berkeley had a start of Sankara but has been left far behind eventually in the race. Berkeley pruned away the material background for certain ideas—not ourselves—that we possess. Sankara strikes the axe at the root, and engulfs in one ruin the material background and the ideas of Berkeley that replaced it; nay, the perceiver and the perceived alike. Thus *achit* does not exist nor the individual souls. One spirit, one without a second, alone, exists. Ideas that are true represent the external world according to Berkeley: a material world that is ultimately produced by illusion according to Sankara. Even where they seem to agree, they differ even more than they concur. Here indeed Berkeley and Sankara may be said to be at one thus far: neither recognises any existence in the universe other than spiritual. Berkeley risked his reputation for common sense and Sankara incurred the suspicion of atheism, though the former truly took a brief for common sense with a vengeance, and the latter was like Spinoza intoxicated with God. Both left the practical world intact, despite the misconception of the many. Sankara has a hierarchy of unreality; the first order comprises absolute non-existence as the horns of a hare, the second, temporary illusion of dream perception corrected by waking experience: and the last consists of the arch-illusion

A. Srinivasan: "BERKELEY AND SANKARA, A COMPARISON AND A CONTRAST."

(continued from the previous page) of the world, which makes room only for divine knowledge. The world is true for the most and sufficiently accounts for the ordinary on - going of life.

A.M. Fairbairn: "PESSIMISM, EASTERN & WESTERN."@@

As Buddha stood face to face with the system of eternal change, conditioned in its operation, in its good or ill, by external acts, he said: "What is life on these terms? Can it be called a good? Is it not rather a misery? And can there be any benevolence in continuing an existence which must be either in idea or experience miserable? The existence which possesses such eternal possibilities of sorrow, nay, such dreadful temporal certainties, cannot be good; its very essence is evil; instability marks it; birth introduces to a world of greater suffering, if not in actual experience at least in possible event. And where the possibilities of evil are in number and in duration so nearly infinite, can existence be other than an agony to him who contemplates it with a serious and sober eye?

Existence, then, seemed to Buddha to be in its very essence sorrow; sorrow for misery that either had been, or was being, or was to be, endured, whether by ourselves or by others or by all combined, the whole creation which groaned and travailed in pain together. Now sorrow is not good; but, where it is inseparable from being, the only possible escape from sorrow is escape from existence.

If to be is to suffer, if to continue in being is to be confronted with the eternal possibility of ever darker and deeper suffering, then being is a thing better ended than mended. Buddhism measured by the purpose of Buddha, and the principles which were the assumed basis of all his thought, and of the thinking of all India in his day, is only formally pessimistic, in spirit and design it is an Optimism.

Pessimism first received conscious philosophical expression in the West at the hands of Schopenhauer, who was born in 1788 and died in 1860. I have

@@ (Madras) Christian College Magazine. 1902.

(continued from the previous page) no intention to enter into any details of biographical criticism, though no philosophy owes more to its author's peculiar psychology or more faithfully reflects the collision of the forces which now lifted him to heaven and now cast him into the dult. His life was rather mean and sordid than noble, the life of a man who never knew how to live to live in harmony and peace either with himself or with men, who quarrelled, spitefully, now with his mother, now with his sister, now with his publisher, now with his landlady, now with the obscurest and least reputable of the neighbours about him, and quarrelled ever in the meanest and most implacable way. It is too undignified a life to be alluded to further than to say that in judging a system we must ever remember its author's personal equation, reckon with his character, his intellectual and ethical qualities. He had moods when he reverently studied "Plato, the divine and the marvellous Kant," and moods when his hatred of Hegel broke into virulent and scurrilous speech. He learned from Kant's speculative system to affirm the subjectivity and limitations of knowledge; to argue that the realities of science and vulgar experience are only appearances, mere ideas of the mind, and that if we are to find reality we must seek it in man rather than in nature. And in the search for reality, Kant was again his guide, though it was the Kant that Fichte had made known rather than the Kant of Schelling and Hegel. Fichte started from the ethical philosophy, especially the idea of the categorical imperative and the freedom that was necessary to it. In his hands the ego became the creative idea; it not only organized and constituted, but it made the world. The categorical imperative and the Will that obeyed it represented the ultimate reality, the law that fulfilled itself in the Ego, and became through its acts and by its means the divine force in history and religion, the true moral order of the universe. And it is significant, as indicating an unsuspected

(continued from the previous page) unity in the two main sources of Schopenhauer's system, that Fichte's idea of moral order as deity had a curious kinship with Buddha's karma, which represented the inexorable concatenation of act and result, merit and reward, demerit and penalty.

Spinoza's thought was conceived in the terms of mechanics, Schopenhauer's in the terms of transcendental metaphysics; and so he could never accept the coarse materialism which seemed its only alternative. He said, "I am a metaphysician, though I do not believe in metaphysics," and he turned scornfully from men who argued as if organisation could explain thought. That he said was the philosophy of the barber's man and the apothecary's apprentice; it was not the philosophy of reason which conceived that since thought as Will explained organization, it was incapable of explanation by it.

In this exposition of Schopenhauer we have found in how remarkable a degree he repeated or echoed Buddha; but it would be a mistake to conclude that their systems were either identical or parallel. While they may have agreed in certain metaphysical principles, in ethical spirit and intention they differed absolutely. Where men are so utterly unlike their thoughts cannot be the same. The heart of Buddha's Pessimism was pity; he loved man, and because of his love of man he hated the existence that was sorrow. The heart of Schopenhauer's pessimism was more contemptuous than pitiful; his scorn was not so much for life as for the men lived it. There was nothing so alien to Buddha as Cynicism, nothing more native to Schopenhauer. The Hindu was moved by compassion for his kind, he wished to strike the fetters from off the enslaved soul; but behind the thought of the German was a colossal vanity. And when vanity measures the worth of men, its judgments tend to be as falsely low for others as they are fabulously high for self. Then Buddha was a rare and beautiful personality – tender, the ideal of all that was attractive and gracious to his people, who did not so much believe in his pessimistic

(continued from the previous page) Nihilism as in his ethical transcendence and the beneficence of his will. It was as the ideal of human grace, the realization of human loveliness that he was followed. But no process of idealization could have made the character of Schopenhauer admirable; and as a beautiful mythology could not redeem his system from its native hopelessness, so his Pessimism remains an unadorned abstraction, appealing to the intellect without any fascination for the heart. Buddha, by his personal transcendence, raised his system into religion; but Schopenhauer's personal qualities made it necessary to divorce the man from his thought, which became therefore a matter for rational criticism rather than imaginative appreciation. Von Hartmann is the best known of his disciples, and he has attempted at once to qualify and to develop his master's system. He has made mankind the victim of successive illusions; as one illusion vanishes another comes, leaving the process of final disillusionment, as its supreme problem, to the philosophy which, by preaching the vanity of human expectations, hopes to promote the beatitude of the future.

It is an instructive as well as a most serious and significant fact, that the more a merely mechanical notion of nature and of man prevails, the less hopeful and the less cheerful becomes the outlook upon life. The individual is lost in the universal, and in losing freedom he loses the power to contend against circumstances, and becomes the mere victim of chance. If the miseries that happens to us must be, and if we too must be, then they and we are equally integral and equally necessitated parts of being; amelioration is impossible to us, change is impossible to them, and what remains but hate for what we can neither avoid nor change? If in the midst of this necessity man is conceived as only the highest organism in the universal struggle for existence, then there is added a peculiar element of pathos to the situation; for in a nature where only the strongest survive it means that the feeble have no

(continued from the previous page) function save that of perishing, and that the system under which we live reserves all its mercies for strength and cunning.

But where Pessimism errs is on the one hand in making its appeal, to an unconscious will, and in assuming, on the other hand, that the creative will has done its last and best with existence. For the fact that evil exists, so far from lessening, really augments the need of an ethical will in the universe to contend against it and in behalf of good, and for the rescue of life from the dominion of sorrow or suffering.

Existence is not an evil, though evil exists. Life is not simply capable of being improved, and the greatest of all pleasures is to work for its improvement.

J. Beattie Crozier: "CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE."@@

The subject is suggested by Professor James's treatment of it in his recently published Gifford Lectures. In these lectures Dr James comes to the conclusion that, in conversion, the soul of man comes into direct and immediate contact with God or the Spirit of God. Dr Crozier does not admit this conclusion. In the first place, he notices the limitations of the beliefs which accompany the experience of conversion. The experiences have in general much in common; they bring illumination and a feeling of peace, for instance. But another fact is noticeable. The vision of God which is seen, or the voice which is heard is in accord with the previous mode of thinking of the individual who is undergoing the experience. Paul saw and heard the risen Christ against whom he had been striving. Luther, in times when demonology held its sway, saw the devil. Again mystics see what the systems, in which they have been brought up, predispose them to see. In the next place, while the person who experiences conversion believes that he has come into contact with the Spirit of God, he yet never gains by this experience any fresh knowledge of the world, or of the mind of

@@ (Fortnightly Review. 1902.)

(continued from the previous page) the spirit into whose presence he has come. Men like Paul and Augustine have, after their conversion, enunciated great systems, but these were the results of their intellectual nature and not of their conversion. The illumination profoundly affected their moral powers, but left their intellectual powers where they were. Conversion seems not to stimulate the intellect but simply in place of doubt to implant a conviction of a certain aspect of truth. In many natures the consequence is dogmatism, only the "sky-blue" natures retain moral and intellectual flexibility. Thus we look to the converted to keep up the moral fibre of nations, and to the men of all-round sympathies to promote intellectual expansion. In the third place, the reference of conversion to the presence of God is precluded by observation of the means by which conversion may be induced in simple and uncultured natures. In many cases the phenomena of trance: and the experiences resemble those which follow the inhalation of nitrous oxide gas. In light of these facts we must ask,—what is the psychology of sudden conversion? Light is thrown upon the point by the fact that the mind or brain is a system of inter-connected centres of activity. Some parts of the brain are, in our normal experiences, conscious while others are unconscious. These subliminal regions are the receptacle either for all that comes by the higher life of the spirit. They are excited by appropriate stimuli, as is the case, for example, in drowning. When the conscious mind is asleep the marvellous hidden powers of the subliminal regions are most fully called into activity. In hypnotism, brain-centres which are usually in abeyance burst forth into strange activity. In trance, the subject weaves into coherent form a whole mass of facts which must have been received by thought-transference. In line with such facts, Dr Crozier comes to the conclusion that in the case of religious conversion the lower passions and appetites are

(continued from the previous page) are inhibited, while the higher sentiments are immensely strengthened. And he finds support for this view in the effects of concentration as they may be seen in the Christian scientist or the Hindu yogi. If this idea is correct it shows why conversion leads to no intellectual discoveries. In cases of sudden conversion some of the centres of the mind are uncoupled from others with which they are normally connected. Now, intellect deals with related not with unrelated parts, consequently it has here no opportunity for exercise. Thus the rapture of one who is suddenly converted is apt to bring to the world little of help or moral inspiration. Thus far Dr Crozier goes: there is something wrong with a psychology which asserts that mind-centres (or brain-centres, for Dr Crozier does not distinguish between them) can be so dissociated that all the relation or connection, in which the sphere of intellect lies, is obliterated. Does not this look like a return to the faculty psychology? and is it not at variance with Dr Crozier's statement that conversion leads to a burning conviction? The self cannot thus be split up; normal conversion affects the whole of the self, and in its effects is as various as are the manifestations of the self.

D.B. Macdonald: "THE LIFE OF AL-GHAZZALI." @@

What rigidity of grasp the hand of Islam would have exercised but for the influence of al-Ghazzali might be hard to tell; he saved it from scholastic decrepitude, opened before the orthodox Muslim the possibility of a life hid in God, was persecuted in his life as a heretic, and now ranks as the greatest doctor of the Muslim Church.

It is necessary to make mention of al-Ashari, if only to show the recoil and compromise in the work of al-Ghazzali. We have here, as everywhere in the development of an idea, the movement of the Hegelian dialectic. The two streams of tendency – dogmatism on the one hand, logical, legal, systematic, and mysticism on the other, transcendental and intuitional – had separated far back, and the

@@ Journal of the American Oriental Society. 1899. (Al Gazzali was born in Persia and was contemporary of Omar Khayyam)

(continued from the previous page) separation had kept becoming more and more pronounced until the one crystallized in lifeless form and the other ran wild in shapeless fantasy. Al-Ghazzali, by training a theologian and lawyer, bridged the widening gap, took over mysticism with its intuitionism and spiritual life into the dry body of theology, and gave the Church of Islam a fresh term of life. It is this spiritually real and living side of his character and work that constitutes his abiding interest for us. Other theologians of Islam are important as links in an historical chain; he, in virtue of what he was in himself, of the conversion he went through and the experiences he had.

He tells us about his early doubts and struggles; how at one time all light had died out from his mind, how he gradually came back to some certainty, passed through a slow but real conversion, and reached a faith which nothing could shake. It is essentially, an *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, a defence of his life as a mystic against all his assailants, theological and philosophical; and in its autobiographic element may stand beside that of Newman. But it is also a defence of the faith written for a time of universal, all threatening doubt, and sketches the attitude which the believer should take and the arguments which he should use against the unbeliever and the heretic.

He was a man of too large calibre to watch his quotations they were loose to the end of his life. The meaning stood to him, as his defenders said, for more than the letter.

In his earliest youth he had given up acceptance of religious truth on authority; that his masters so taught him was no nonger a sufficient reason for his belief. Further, when he was under twenty, he began examine the theological questions and quarrels, and the effect upon him must have been very much the same as that which befell Gibbon.

The strain became too great, and for two months he touched the depths of absolute scepticism. He

(continued from the previous page) doubted the evidence of the senses; he could see plainly that they often deceived. No eye could perceive the movement of a shadow, but still the shadow moved; a gold piece would cover any star, but still the star was a world larger than the earth. He doubted even the primary ideas of the mind. Is ten more than three? Can a thing both be and not be? Perhaps; he could not tell. His senses had deceived him, why not his mind? May there not be something behind the mind, transcending it, which would show the falsity of the information given by the senses? May not the dreams of the Sufis be true, and their revelations in ecstasy the only real guides? When we awake in death, may it not be into a true but different existence? All this,—perhaps. And so he wandered for two months. He saw clearly that no reasoning could help him here; he had no ideas on which he could depend, from which he could begin. But the mercy of God is great; He sends His light to whom He wills, a light that flows in, and is given by no reasoning. By it al-Ghazzali was saved; he regained the power to think, and the task which he now set before him was to use this power to guide himself to truth. When he looked around, he saw that those who gave themselves to the search for truth might be divided into four groups. There were the scholastic theologians, who were much like the theologians of all times and faiths. Second, there were the Talmites, who held that to reach truth one must have an infallible living teacher, and that there was such a teacher. Third, there were the followers of philosophy, basing on logic and rational proofs. Fourth, there were the Sufis, who held that they, the chosen of God, could reach knowledge of Him directly in ecstasy. With all these he had, of course, been acquainted before a greater or a less degree; but now he settled down to examine them one by one, and find which would lead him to a certainty by which he could hold, whatever might come. He felt that he could not go back to the unconscious faith of his childhood; that nothing could restore. All his mental being

(continued from the previous page) must be made over before he could find rest. He began with scholastic theology, but found no help there. Grant the theologians their premises, and they could argue; deny them, and there was no common ground on which to meet. Their science had been founded by al-Ash'ari to meet the Mu'tazilities; it had done that victoriously, but could do no more. They could hold the faith against heretics, expose their inconsistencies and weaknesses; but against the sceptic they could do nothing. It is true that they had attempted to go further back and meet the students of philosophy on their own ground, to deal with substances and attributes and first principles generally; but their efforts had been fruitless: They lacked the necessary knowledge of the subject, had no scientific basis, and were constrained eventually to fall back on authority. After study of them and their methods it became clear to al-Ghazzali that the remedy for his ailment was not to be found in scholastic theology.

Then he turned to philosophy. He had seen already that the weakness of the theologians lay in their not having made a sufficient study of primary ideas and the laws of thought. Three years he gave up to this. He was at Baghdad at the time.

Two years he gave, without a teacher, to the study of the writings of the different schools of philosophy, and almost another to meditating and working over his results. He felt that he was the first Muslim doctor to do this with the requisite thoroughness. And it is noteworthy that at this stage he seems to have again felt himself to be a Muslim, and in an enemy's country when he was studying philosophy. He speaks of the necessity of understanding what is to be refuted; but this may be only a confusion between his attitude when writing after 500 and his attitude when investigating and seeking truth fifteen years earlier. He divides the followers of philosophy in his time into three: Materialists, Deists (Tabi-iyun. i.e. Naturalists), and Theists. The materialists reject a creator; the world exists from

(continued from the previous page) all eternity; the animal comes from the egg and the from the animal. The wonder of creation compels the deists to admit a creator, but the creature is a machine, has a certain poise (i'tidal) in itself which keeps it running; its thought is a part of its nature and ends with death. They thus reject a future life, though admitting God and His attributes. He deals at much greater length with the teachings of those whom he calls theists, but throughout all his statement of their views his tone is not that of a seeker but that of a partisan; he turns his own experiences into a warning to others, and makes of their record a little guide to apologetics. Dangers arise from each to him who studies or to him who rejects without study.

Warn against an attitude of intellectualism and belief that mathematicians, with their acuteness and success in their own department, are to be followed in other departments, or that all subjects are susceptible of the exactness and certainty of a syllogism in logic. The damnable errors of the theists are almost entirely in their metaphysical views.

He would probably have admitted that he had learned much in his philosophical studies—so at least I gather from his tone; he never speaks disrespectfully of philosophy and science in their own sphere; his continual exhortation is that he who would understand them and refute their errors must first study them; that to do otherwise, to abuse what we do not know, brings only contempt on ourselves and on the cause which we champion. But he cannot found his religion on intellect; nor can I understand that a man of al-Ghazzali's temperament could ever have persuade himself to find place in pure thought. He could be indifferent, a keen legal-minded onlooker upon the theological fights round him, such as we find him in his earlier life; but once the religious instinct was aroused, nothing could satisfy him except what he eventually found. It is absurd to speak of him as a renegade

(continued from the previous page) from philosophy, as one who turned his back on the light in which he had walked for a season and went again into the darkness of the obscurant. He was never a cold-brained student like al-Farabi, Ibn Sine, or, later, Ibn Rushd. He had never given his allegiance to pure reason, he had hardly even been a student of philosophy until he took it up in his search for help in the darkness; he had been a student of law, and what went with it, scholastic theology; but when his heart awoke and cried out and he found himself standing alone with the great world stretching around him, he could have followed no other path than that in which he did tread. It is still more absurd to speak of him as a conscious traitor, as one with a secret teaching only confided to his closest pupils, an unbelieving philosophy running in the teeth of his public utterances. His story rings true from beginning to end; his mental development is clear; we can see how, point by point, such and such only could he have been. And so, two possibilities and two only were before him, though one was hardly a real possibility if we consider his training and mental powers. He might fall back on authority. It could not be the authority of his childish faith; "our fathers have told us," he himself confesses, could never again have weight with him. But it might be some claimer of authority in a new form, some infallible teacher with a doctrine which he could accept for the authority behind it. As the Church of Rome from time to time gathers into its fold men of keen intellect who seek rest in submission, and the world marvels, so it might have been with him. Or again he might turn directly to God and to personal intercourse with Him; he might seek to know Him and to be taught of Him without any intermediary, in a word, to enter on the path of the mystic.

We have here the sect of the Ismailities that was founded by al-Hasan b.as-Sabbah. Ash-Shahrastani has described his teaching, and shows that it began and ended with the claim that only by an infallible

(continued from the previous page) teacher could truth be reached, that his sect had such a teacher or Imam, and that no other sect had. This is exactly the position which we find al-Ghazzali combating. He does it with a warmth which shows how close the battle was. It is enough that al-Ghazzali found the Ta'limites and their teachings eminently unsatisfactory; they had a lesson which they went over parrot-fashion, but beyond it they were in dense ignorance. The trained theologian and scholar had to patience with their slackness and shallowness of thought. He laboured long, as ash-Shahrastani confesses he too did, to penetrate their mystery and learn something from them, but beyond the accustomed formulae there was nothing to be found. He even admitted their contention of the necessity of a living, infallible teacher, to see what would follow—but nothing followed. "You admit the necessity of an Imam," they would say, "it is your business now to go and seek him; we have nothing more to do with it." But though neither al-Ghazzali nor ash-Shahrastani who died 43 (lunar) years after him, could be satisfied with the Talimites, many others were. The conflict was hot, and al-Ghazzali himself wrote several books against them.

An attempt to lay down a rule of guidance in theological dispute, there is a demonstration that those who have such a rule have no need of an Imam. The other possibility, the path of the mystic, now lay straight before him. In the *Munquidh* he tells us how, when he had made an end with the Talimites, he began to study the books of the Sufis, without any suggestion that he had a previous acquaintance with them and their practices. But probably this means nothing more than it does when he speaks in a similar way of studying the scholastic theologians; namely that he now took up the study in earnest and with a new and definite purpose. His native country was steeped in Sufism; his old teacher, the Imam al-Harmayn, had been a devout Sufi; according to the tradition the friend to whom his father had entrusted his brother and himself had been a Sufi.

Al-Farmadi guided him, and he followed his path and imitated all the practices that were put before him. He took part in dhikrs, and passed through all the laborious and wearying life of the Sufi neophyte, but did not attain what he sought. Obviously, his time was not yet come; his mind was not prepared to open to spiritual light. So he went back to his worldly studies, to the weighing of proofs and the settling of legal difficulties. But, at last, in 'Abd al-Ghafir's picturesque phrase, a door of fear was opened upon him, and the change described above came.

"I used at first to deny the ecstatic states of the saints and the grades of advancement of the initiated until I companied with my shaykh Yusuf an-Nassaj in Tus, and he kept polishing at me with exercises until I was graced with revelations and I saw God in a dream.

All Muslims, heretical and orthodox, laymen, theologians, and philosophers, believed and believe in dreams. Dreaming is one six and fortieth of prophecy, according to the tradition, and in dreaming the soul is set free to visit the upper world of the Unseen and learn its mysteries. This is a formal part of both philosophy and theology, and is presupposed by al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, Ibn Rush, al-Ghazzali, and all the rest. The ordinary man is freed from the darkening veil of the body in sleep, but then only, and not at his own will. The saint can also rise to spiritual intuition by ecstasy, which he can himself bring on.

He recognised that for him study of doctrines of the Sufis as contained in their books was easier than following practices.

It became plain to him that only through ecstasy and a complete transformation of the moral being could be really understand Sufism. He saw that it consisted in feelings more than knowledge; that he must be initiated as a Sufi himself, live their life and practice their exercises, to attain his goal. He looked on his present life, his writing and his teaching,

(continued from the previous page) and saw of how little value it was in the face of the great fact of heaven and hell. And he did now was for the sake of vain glory and had in it no consecration to the service of God. He felt on the edge of an abyss. The world held him back; his fears urged him away. He was in the throes of a conversion. In his feebleness and overthrow he took refuge with God as a man at the end of his resources. God heard him and enabled him to make the needed sacrifices. As I have already described, he abandoned all and wandered forth from Baghdad as a Sufi. He had put his brilliant present and brilliant future absolutely behind him, had given up everything for the peace of his soul. This date, Dhu-l-Qa'da 488, was the great era in his life; but it marked an era, too, in the history of Islam. It meant that the reign of pure scholastic theology was over; that another element was to work openly in the future Church of Islam, the element of the mystical life in God, of the attainment of truth by the soul in direct vision. But to trace these consequences belongs to a history of Muslim theology. He took himself at once to Syria, and remained there almost two years, living in strict retirement and giving all his time to the religious exercises of the Sufis with prayer and contemplation. While at Damascus he used to go up into the minaret of the mosque, shut the door upon himself, and there pass his days.

In spite of his former resolution to retire from the world, he was drawn back. The prayers of his children and his own aspirations broke in upon him, and though he resolved again and again to return to the contemplative life, and did actually often do so, yet events, family affairs, and the anxieties of life, kept continually disturbing him. This went on, he tells us, for almost ten years, and in that time there were revealed to him things that could not be exhausted. He learned that the Sufis were on the true and only path to the knowledge of God; that neither intelligence nor wisdom nor science

(continued from the previous page) could change or improve their doctrine or their ethics. The light in which they walk is essentially the same as the light of prophecy; Muhammad was a Sufi when on his way to be prophet. There is none other light to light any man in this world. A complete purifying of the heart from all but God is their Path; a seeking to completely plunge the heart in the thought of God is its beginning, and its end is complete passing away in God. This last is only its end in relation to what can be entered upon and grasped by a voluntary effort; in truth, it is only the first step in the Path, the vestibule to the contemplative life. Revelations (*mukashafat*, unveilings) come to the disciple from the very beginning; while awake they see angels and souls of prophets, hear their voices, and gain from them guidance. Then their State passes from the beholding of forms to stages where language fails and any attempt to express what is experienced must involve some error. They reach a nearness to God which some have fancied to be a *hulul*, fusion of being, others an *ittihad*, identification, and others a *wusul*, union; but these are all erroneous ways of indicating the thing.

Karamat are wonders granted by God to His walis, who may be ignorant that they are working them, and who ought rather to conceal them than to show them openly. They are sharply distinguished from the *mujizat*, or miracles of the prophets, which are evidentiary signs proving the truth of the claim to prophecy, and therefore a public, open nature. The prophet works *mu'jizat* at his will; the saint has wonders worked for him by God, and he may not know it. But karamat are granted also to the prayer of the saint, and it is lawful for him to show them to chosen persons.

He had returned to his native country and to his children, but had not undertaken public duty as a teacher. Now that was forced upon him. The century was drawing to a close. Everywhere there was evident a slackening of religious fervour and faith. A mere external compliance with the rules of Islam

(continued from the previous page) was observed; men even openly defended such a course. He adduces as an example of this the Wasiya of Ibn Sina. The students of philosophy went their way, and their conduct shook the minds of the people; false Sufis abounded, who taught antinomianism; the lives of many theologians excited scandal; the Talimites, of whom we have already heard, were still spreading. A religious leader to turn the current was absolutely needed, and his friends looked to al-Ghazzali to take up that duty; some distinguished saints had dreams of success; God had promised a reformer every hundred years, and the time was up. Finally the Sultan laid a command upon him to go and teach in the Madrasa at Naysabur fell in Dhul-Qa'da 499, exactly eleven years after his flight from Baghdad.

The use of takalluf, or straining to attain ecstasy, is defended by the tradition of the Prophet, "Weep, and if you cannot weep, then strive (or feign) to weep."

Philosophy had been tried and found wanting. In the Tahafut he had smitten the philosophers hip and thigh; he had turned, as in earlier times al-Ash'ari, their own weapons against them, and shown that with their premises and methods no certainty could be reached. In that book he goes to the extreme of intellectual skepticism, and, seven hundred years before Hume, he cuts the bond of causality with the edge of his dialectic and proclaims that we can know nothing of cause or effect, but simply that one thing follows another. But his end is very different from that of Hume. We are thrown back on revelation that given immediately by God to the individual soul or that given through prophets. All our real knowledge is derived from these sources.

After his call by Fakhr al-Mulk to teach at Naysabur. For he did not teach there long; before the end of his life, which was near, we find him back at Tus, living in retirement among his personal disciples, and having in charge a Madrasa for students and a Khanqah, or monastery, for Sufis. There every

(continued from the previous page) moment was filled with study, teaching, or devotion, until the end came. The keenness of his intellectual life and the austerities and privation of his long wanderings early wore him out. Nor was his latter end one of peace. 'Abd al-Ghafir tells us that it was clouded with controversy, envy, and slander, and perhaps in that lay the cause of his removal so soon from Naysabur to Tus.

"However much he met of contradiction and attack and slander, it made no impression on him, and he did not trouble himself to answer his assailants."

He never needed to appeal to any one in worldly goods, and though fortune presented itself to him he would not receive it, but turned aside from it and was satisfied with that amount by which he could protect his religion and escape the need of asking from any one. How rare this was among Muslim scholars, it is hardly necessary to say.

It now remains to consider somewhat more systematically his theological and philosophical position, and especially, the charge which has been brought against him of insincerity and of having a secret doctrine.

The soul (nafs) belongs to the 'alam al-malakut, is taken from it, and returns to it. In sleep and in ecstasy, even in this world, it can come into contact with the world from which it is derived. This is what happens in dreams—sleep is the brother of death, says al-Ghazzali.

But, just as those three worlds are not to be thought of as separate in time, so they are not separate in space. They are not like the seven heavens and seven earths of Muslim literalists, which stand, story-fashion, one above the other. Rather, they are, as I expressed it above, modes of existence, and might be compared to the speculations on another life in space of a dimensions framed, from a very different starting point and on a basis of pure physics by Balfour Stewart and Tait in their *Unseen Universe*. On another side they stand in close kinship to the

(continued from the previous page) Platonic world of ideas, whether through Neoplatonism or more immediately. Sufism at its best, and when stripped of the trappings of Muslim tradition and of Quranic exegesis, has no reason to shrink from the investigation either of physicist or of the metaphysician.

I have already sketched his agnostic attitude towards the results of pure thought. It is essentially the same as that taken by Mansell in his Bampton Lecture on The Limits of Religious Thought. Mansell, a pupil and continuator of Hamilton, developed and emphasised Hamilton's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, and applied it to theology, maintaining that we cannot know or think of the absolute and infinite, but only of the relative and finite. Hence, he went on to argue, we can have no positive knowledge of the attributes of God. This thought disguised by the methods and language of scholastic philosophy, is al-Ghazzali's attitude in the Tahafut. Mansell's opponents said that he was like a man sitting on the branch of a tree and sawing off his seat. Al-Ghazzali for the support of his seat went back to revelation, either major, in the books sent down to the prophets, or minor, in the personal revelations of God's saints.

From the account which has preceded of al-Ghazzali's experiences in his own search for truth, the relation which he laid down between scientific theology and the immediate insight of the Sufi should be clear. He had gained a knowledge of, and a belief in, God, prophecy, and the future life, through thought; but it was not an absolutely certain knowledge. It did not stand so sure to him as that the whole must be greater than the part; but yet it was a satisfactory, sufficing knowledge and belief. It had broken down before, it might break down again; yet, where one could not have any more, it was ample for the religious life, and the man who had it should call himself a believer. But through the vision of the Sufi it became absolutely certain and immediate; these things from objects of

(continued from the previous page) thought changed to objects of direct knowledge. And so he held that any one who wished to reach such absolute certainty and immediate knowledge must follow the path of the mystic; only so could he find rest. But, again, no one except one who was theologically schooled should venture to enter upon that path. It was beset with pitfalls; at every turn lay the risk of some frightful blasphemy. Many had been ruined in this way, and none could pass safely but the scientific student.

He brought philosophy and philosophical theology within the range of the ordinary mind. Before his time they had been surrounded, more or less, with mystery. The language used was strange; its vocabulary and terms of art had to be specially learned. No mere reader of the Arabic of the street or the mosque or the school could understand at once a philosophical tractate. Greek ideas and expressions, passing through a Syriac version into Arabic, had strained to the uttermost the resources of that most flexible tongue. A long training had been thought necessary before the elaborate and formal method or argumentation could be followed. All this al-Ghazzali changed, or at least tried to change. His *Tahafut* is not addressed to scholars only; he seeks with it a wider circle of readers, and contends that the views, the arguments, and the fallacies of the philosophers should be perfectly intelligible to the general public.

It is true that al-Chazzali in many places urges caution in the communication of doctrines proofs, and theological reasonings generally, to those who are not fitted to receive and understand them; but he did not do this to the degree that Ibn Rushd required. The position of the latter was that in the presence of the great multitude all reasoning about religion should be dropped, and the simple doctriness of the Quran taught in the literal sense. Al-Ghazzali perceived that the time had gone by for such trifling, and that philosophy and theology must come into the open if religion were to be saved.

This view of his character and work, if it is just, itself disposes of the third question to which I now turn. Had al-Ghazzali an esoteric teaching, did he secretly accept and teach the positions of the Aristotelian philosophers, while publicly branding them as unbelief? I cannot believe that the attentive student of his life will hesitate as to the answer to this question. The psychological development which I have traced above speaks for itself. Al-Ghazzali has taken us into his confidence, and laid before us, step by step, his doubting youth, his descent into the abyss of scepticism, and his gradual ascent to light and faith. From point to point each change is motivated, and originally united with what precedes and follows it. Only at the supreme moment does the chain break; then all al-Ghazzali can say is that God had mercy upon him, and gave him back the power to think and a trust in the operations of the mind. And this is psychologically true; arrived at such a point, no formula, no argument, could have saved him; there had to come, as did come, the free spirit of God, the wind that bloweth where it listeth.

The evidence for an esoteric teachings is twofold. It consists, first, of what he has said himself in his acknowledged works against the communication of certain doctrines and reasonings to those who are not fitted to receive them; and, second, of what has been said by others concerning alleged esoteric books of his, and the contents of these books when they can be found. As to the first point, it is perfectly true that he preached an economy of teaching. In the *Imla* (SM.i.pp 159 ff and 247 ff.) we have a formal defence of the practice of keeping certain theological reasonings and developments secret from those who are not in a position to hear them understandingly and who would therefore be led by them either into unbelief or into actions contrary to the Law. But we must distinguish this sharply from an esoteric teaching in the ordinary sense. In this advanced teaching there was nothing

(continued from the previous page) contrary to that of the earlier stages; it simply went further into details of doctrine and of argument. It was in fact an application of the principle of *bila kayfa*, i.e. 'without enquiring how,' which had long been laid down and accepted in Muslim dogmatics.

Al-Ash'ari (d.324) introduced *kalam*, as we have seen, into orthodox Islam, but under limitations. When he considered that further public examination or discussion of a doctrine was unadvisable, he cut it off with the above phrase, since then famous, *bila kayfa*. To advanced students, who were capable of entering upon such studies for the defence of the Faith were necessary, he permitted to go further; but that was all. Now this was essentially al-Ghazzali's attitude. In the *Munqidh* he warns against the study of philosophy; but he warns those who, in his opinion, are unfitted for it and would be injured by it, not those who, on account of their intelligence and character, could go through its fires untouched. In the *Ihya* he divides knowledge ('ilm) into useful and harmful and thus greatly shocks Gosche, who considers that Ibn Rushd stands incomparably freer in his estimation of philosophy.

Their object was to bring about a reform of religion in itself, and also of the attitude of theologians to students of philosophy (p.26 of translation). In them he sums up his own position under four heads; First, that philosophy agrees with religion and that religion recommends philosophy. Here he is fighting for his life. Religion is true, a revelation from God, and philosophy is true, the results reached by the human mind; these two truths cannot contradict each another. Further, men are frequently exhorted in the Quran to reflect, to consider, to speculate about things; that means the use of the intelligence, which follows certain laws long ago traced and worked out by the ancients. We must, therefore, study their works and proceed further on the same course ourselves; i.e. we must study philosophy.

Second, there are two things in religion, literal meaning and interpretation. If we find anything in the Quran which seems externally to contradict the results of philosophy, we may be quite sure that there is something under the surface. We must look for some possible interpretation of the passage, some inner meaning; and we shall certainly find it.

Third, the literal meaning is the duty of the multitude, and interpretation the duty of scholars. Thus the external content of religion for different classes must vary. Those who are not capable of philosophical reasoning must hold the literal truth of the different statements in the Quran. The imagery must be believed by them exactly as it stands, except where it is absolutely evident that we have only an image. On the other hand, philosophers must be given the liberty of interpreting as they choose. If they find it necessary, from some philosophical necessity, to adopt in allegorical interpretation of any passage or to find in it a metaphor, that liberty must be open to them. There must be no laying down of dogmas by the Church as to what may be interpreted and what not. In Ibn Rushd's opinion the orthodox theologians sometimes interpreted when they should have kept by the letter, and sometimes took literally passages in which they should have found imagery. He did not accuse them of heresy for this, and they should grant him the same liberty.

Fourth, those who know are not to be allowed to communicate interpretations to the multitude. So 'Ali said, "Speak to the people of that which they understand; would ye that they give the lie to God and His messenger?" Ibn Rushd considered that belief was reached by three different classes of people in three different ways. The many believe because of rhetorical syllogisms (*khitabiya*) i.e. those whose premises consist of the statements of a religious teacher (*maqbulat*), or presumptions. Others believe because of controversial syllogisms (*jadliya*), which are based on premises which are conventional

(continued from the previous page) principles or admissions. All these premises belong to the class of prepositions which are not absolutely certain. The third class, and by far the smaller, consists of the people, of demonstration. Their belief is based upon syllogisms composed of propositions which are certain. These consist of axioms and five other classes of certainties. Each of these three classes of people has to be treated in the way that suits its mental character. It is wrong to put demonstration or controversy before those who can understand only rhetorical reasoning. It destroys their faith and gives them nothing to take its place. The case is similar with those who can only reach controversial reasoning but cannot attain to demonstration. Thus Ibn Rushd would have the faith of the multitude carefully screened from all contact with the teachings of philosophers. Such books should not be allowed to go into general circulation, and if necessary the civil authority should step in to prevent it. If these principles were accepted and followed, a return might be looked for of the golden age of Islam, when there was no theological controversy and men believed sincerely and earnestly.

Many Oriental writers assert specifically that in it he taught the eternity of the world, that God does not know particulars, and that existence in the next world will not be physical – all in flat contradiction to his position elsewhere.

The saying ascribed to 'Ali b.Abi Talib, "Speak to the people according to their understanding," was quoted by all – a very large number, including as we have seen Ibn Rushd – who held that different methods must be used in approaching different grades of intelligence. Dr Malter's description (xii) of al-Ghazzali as a man who tried to keep on good terms with all parties, though based on Ibn Rushd, is singularly opposed to the facts of the case. Rather, he got himself into trouble with all parties. He had a combative nature, especially in his earlier life, and later it took much grace and discipline to keep it down.

C.C. Everett; "VEDANTA & SANKHYA PHILOSOPHIES."@@

The Vedanta and Sankhya systems of philosophy are interesting as uniting, in each case, a very sharp and profound psychological insight with the most fantastic theories in regard to the practical bearing of this insight. This insight standing by itself, with no inhibiting ideas suggested by common sense, is taken to be the key that unlocks all the mysteries of the universe, and opens a way to final emancipation.

The insight upon which the Vedanta system rests is the subjective character of all experience. The Vedantist saw as clearly as Kant or Fichte, that the only world which exists for us is the creation of the productive imagination. This view is presented with absolute clearness. The entire universe is affirmed to be the work of Maya. It is pure illusion. It has no other substance than ignorance. This illusion we are told has two stages. It is first developing and then it is projected. The two forms of illusion are illustrated by this figure; A man sees a rope and thinks that it looks like a serpent. His next thought is that it is a serpent. Thus do we create a world by the power of our imagination; then we project it and conceive it to be a world existing independently of our thought.

This unquestionably true view of the world is, as I have already intimated, carried by the Vedantist into its most extreme logical results. If all my experiences are subjective, if I stand in relation only with my own thoughts and feelings, and if the only world that I know anything about is made up of these, what right have I to assume the existence of any other world? What right have I to assume the existence of either things or persons outside myself? Thus the Vedantist passes beyond idealism and comes to rest, theoretically, at least, in solipsism, or the doctrine that the individual self, alone, is.

In the defense and illustration of this doctrine, reference is very freely made to the phenomena

(continued from the previous page) of dreams. A very curious and interesting treatise, in regard to the date of which I know nothing, was translated for the Pandit and runs through many numbers of that journal. It is the only clear and consistent defense of solipsism that I have ever seen; consistent except in this, that the writer is striving to convince the reader, whereas according to his view only one of them exists. In this treatise the phenomena of dreams figure very prominently. The objector is represented as saying that if he alone exists, he ought to be the creator of all things. So you are, urges the author, if you are the one only, just as you are creator of all the objects of your dream. Again, the objector is represented as insisting that if there were but one being in the universe, when any one person is emancipated, all persons should be. So they are, replies the author, just as when you wake from a dream all the persons of whom you have dreamed cease to be. So far as solipsism rests upon the phenomena of dreams, it occupies a position very interesting from a logical point of view. It involves a recognition of the parsimony of nature, even greater than that shown by Newton. If in the dream the soul may create a world for itself filled with persons and things, merely by the power of the constructive imagination, what need and what right have we to seek for any different source of any other world.

It is obvious that this view of the world suggests a method of escaping from it. One has merely to give up altogether one's belief in the reality of outside things and put a stop to the work of the imagination, and the soul remains in the bliss of empty solitude.

In the much misunderstood system of the Sankhya we have an extremely interesting step in advance. It starts, substantially, from the position reached by the Vedanta, but brings to bear upon this a psychological insight even sharper than that which is found in that system. The most obvious difference is, that in the Sankhya, Intellect takes the place which is filled by Illusion or Ignorance in the Vedanta. To

(continued from the previous page) it the substance of the World is Intellect. This does not mean that we find in the world marks of intelligence; but simply that Intellect is the *causa materialis* of the world, just as Illusion is the *causa materialis* of the world in the Vedanta. Thus the one system starts from a position as idealistic as that of the other.

We may here leave wholly out of the account Prakriti, which most unfortunately figures as Nature in the English translations. We might call it somewhat awkwardly "The Prior," Professor Garbe calls it the "Grundform". We are expressly told that it is posited merely to avoid a regress us into the infinite. The Sankhyans could not conceive of Intellect as existing without some *causa materialis* of its own, so they speak simply of that which was before.

As soon as Prakriti takes form as Intellect, it has no existence in any other form. It has nothing more to do with what follows than Chaos has to do with the Cosmos. So, as was just said, we may leave it altogether out of the account, and recognize Intellect as forming the substance of the world. This Intellect concentrates itself into self-consciousness, that is, into the Me. This Me differentiates itself on the one side into the inner organs of activity and sensation and the "Mind," and on the other side into the elements of the so-called material world, which are, in fact, only projected sensations. We are told distinctly that the eleven organs and the five subtile elements out of which the world was formed are the product of self-consciousness. How clearly this subjective character of the world was recognised by the Sankhyans may be seen from a single instance. A potter, we are told, makes a jar. He makes it out of his own self-consciousness. Why then, it is asked, does it not disappear when he becomes emancipated? The answer is that while on his emancipation there is an end of the modifications of his special intellect, Intellect remains. A certain intellectual continuum or community is thus assumed, very much as in

(continued from the previous page) the idealism of Fichte. From another point of view it is said, "Let the Self-consciousness of the Deity be the cause why jars and the like continue to exist."

Thus far the Sankhya system is as purely idealistic as the Vedanta, though not solipsistic, as it recognizes innumerable individuals.

After having reached this point, the student of the Sankhya is surprised and perhaps bewildered to find, over against the Intellect and the Self, with its thoughts, its feelings, and its will, a something that is called Purusha and Atman. These words in the English translation are represented by the word Soul. This substitution, though perhaps not to be avoided, is as unfortunate as that of Nature for Prakriti. The two words Nature and Soul taken together, suggest a thoroughly realistic view of the world, whereas the system, as we have seen, is, at its foundation, idealistic. What sort of 'soul' is that which stands outside of intellect, feeling, and will?

This Purusha, we are told in many ways, is simply a beholder. It neither feels nor thinks nor wills. It seems to do them all. It seems to be glad or sorry, to hope or to fear. In point of fact it simply contemplates these emotions and acts. A favorite comparison that the Sankhya writers use to illustrate this relation is that of a crystal vase over which hangs the red flower of the Hibiscus. The color of the flower is reflected from the crystal so that the crystal appears to be red. In fact it is not red, it is absolutely colourless. Another example is that of a king who seems to be carrying on the war, while really it is his generals that are carrying on the war. This Purusha manifests itself by affirming itself over against the body. It speaks of 'my body'. But, it is urged, we speak of the body of a statue, and yet the statue and its body are one. The answer that is given to this objection is not so perfectly to the point as it might be. The writer fails to bring out the real difference that was undoubtedly in his mind, which is, that it is not the statue that speaks of the statue's body.

(continued from the previous page) In the statue itself there is not this line of cleavage. The body of the statue exists for us, not for it. We are told that to speak of the intelligence of Purusha is like speaking of the body of a statue, for Purusha is intelligence. On the other hand, to speak of the mind, that is the complete mental activity of Purusha, introduces a foreign element such as we introduce when we speak of its body.

The Purusha is evidently the pure consciousness abstracted from all content. We are, for instance, conscious of walking; but the consciousness does not walk. So, to these thinkers, while we are conscious of suffering, but the consciousness does not suffer. The consciousness is only the beholder.

The distinction here made is one that is familiar to our modern psychology, though psychologists take different attitudes in regard to it. Self-consciousness—and all consciousness is in a sense self-consciousness—involves two elements, the subject and the inner object. These two elements are sometimes spoken of as the I and the Me. These two elements are in our modern thought not outwardly or accidentally related. Neither precedes or follows the other; neither can exist apart from the other. Consciousness is a process all parts and stages of which spring into existence at the same moment. There is the fundamental unity, the differentiation into the I and the Me, and the recognition of the two as one and the same. The I recognizes the Me as itself, though the two are antithetic to one another. The I cannot be conscious of the I but only of the Me. If the I becomes the object of consciousness, it is transformed into the Me.

We use the term I in other senses. We sometimes mean by it the concrete personality. So far, however, as it represents the element of pure consciousness, it would seem hardly possible to define it in terms different from those applied to Purusha or Atman by the Sankhyans.

They give us, however, something more than the fact of this resemblance. In the fourth chapter of

(continued from the previous page) the Aphorisms of Patanjali we find the question of consciousness directly discussed. In this discussion the double aspect of consciousness is recognized as distinctly as I have just recognized it. As we have seen, the Sankhyans reached recognition of this division in consciousness, but felt obliged to give to each element an independent existence. Patanjali illustrates and defends this. In this book we read, "The thinking principle is not self-illuminating, since it is perceptible"; in a note it is added "A perceptible is known by a percipient, as in the case of a water jar, and so forth." Again we read in reference to Purusha or the Ego, on the one side, and the thinking principle, or mind, on the other—the I and the Me: "Attention cannot be directed to both at the same time. It is not possible to behold ourself and another at the same time." The differentiation in consciousness into the I and the Me is thus recognized; but because it is fundamental in the system that no element can have more than one attribute, the knower cannot be known.

An objector is represented as urging that self-consciousness may be the result of memory, or, as it is expressed, that one cognition may cognize another, and that thus the necessity of two elements could be avoided. It is replied, "If one cognition could cognize another, then that cognition being itself unintelligent and unable to illuminate another, we must assume a third cognition, and so on". That is, if my present self-consciousness is the result of memory, then that which is remembered must have been self-conscious. For this must be presupposed a previous moment of self-consciousness, and so on into the infinite.

I do not defend this reasoning. I wish merely to indicate that these writers discussed the phenomena of self-consciousness with as clear an understanding of the problem as we can have to-day, and that they solved it by supposing the consciousness to be made up of two separately existing elements.

The recognition of this objective element in

(continued from the previous page) consciousness made it easier perhaps for the Sankhyan to escape the solipsistic view to which the Vedantists were driven.

The Sankhyan system is interesting as occupying a position absolutely unique. It is, in its foundation, idealistic, for, as we have seen, all things consist of intellect; the material world being a development of self-consciousness. If we mean by the soul that which thinks and feels, then for the Sankhyan there is no existence outside of soul. Thus it stands where the Vedanta stands. Yet within the soul it finds both subject and object, the I and the Me. These, it insists, must be separate entities. Its lines of division are drawn within the sphere recognised by the Vedanta. It accepts the fundamental psychological doctrine of the Vedanta, but out of this it develops something that has been taken for realism. It is thus a system that sets our terminology at defiance. I have called it idealistic; but it is an idealism that embraces a dualism. There is only Soul, in our ordinary use of the word soul, but it is a soul made up of two entities; and we cannot easily avoid speaking of the half that is emancipated as in a special sense the soul, as in fact the Sankhyans themselves did in the word Atman. From this analysis it will appear how mistaken is the view that considers the idea of the soul as having almost faded out of this system. If, from the fact that Purusha plus Intellect and the rest, corresponds to the Soul of the Vedanta, we call the resultant whole of the soul, we have a very concrete significance for the word. If, on the other hand, as we more naturally do, we restrict the term soul to Purusha, we have an extremely clear cut and definite significance.

If it is urged that after all Prakriti and its products are in a sense material, it must be answered that the word can have no significance in this connection. We use the word 'matter' to express the result of generalisation. The materialists

(continued from the previous page) urge that thoughts and feelings are the result of processes such as are going on in the world of things in the midst of which we live. The word brings these subjective elements into relation with innumerable other elements that seem at first sight wholly foreign to them. To the Sankhyan there is no such world. Besides Purusha there is nothing that is not developed out of Intellect, through self-consciousness. The word 'matter' would be here as meaningless as a scholastic quiddity. The forms assumed by Prakriti are not merely the causes of thoughts and feelings. They are thoughts and feelings. The whole story is that, as we have seen, the Vedantists affirmed that the substantial cause of the world is Ignorance. For convenience of their reasonings they insisted that this was at once something and nothing. The Sankhyan pointed out the absurdity of this, put Intellect in the place of Ignorance, and claimed for it substantiality.

It is obvious that system like the Sankhya could be developed only out of a system idealistic like the Vedanta, though not necessarily solipsistic. This fact corresponds with the conclusion reached by Professor Garbe that, while the Sankhya view of the world is very ancient, it is yet later than the earliest Upanishads. The view of the Sankhya system here presented throws light upon the early blending of it with the Vedanta system exhibited by Father Dahlmann in his interesting work on NIRVANA. As the Sankhya has been generally understood, this community would be very strange if not impossible. It would be a union of Idealism and Realism. Now, however, we see that it is something that might well have been expected. It implies, indeed, that the idea of a multiplicity of 'souls' is not fundamental to the Sankhya; and this is what our analysis would lead us to assume.

With the general aspects of the system I have here nothing to do. I will merely state in conclusion, that emancipation is reached by a separation of Purusha from the Intellect in its various forms —

(continued from the previous page) the I from the Me. It is as if we should separate the north pole from the south. Intellect, including the Me with all its content, reverts to that condition called Prakriti, of which it is only a form, while the Ego, the pure subject of consciousness, remains wholly without object or content, intelligence but not intelligent; not positively blessed,—for the same cannot both know and feel,—but negatively blessed in the fact that it is free from entanglement with the changeful products of Prakriti. Here, as in the Vedanta, salvation consists in freedom from the network of ignorance. That which is, and all along has been, remains, freed from all complication with that which merely seems.

F. Huet. "CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM."

"Francis Huet was born in 1814, at the village of Villeau in Beauce, and died at Paris in 1869. A pupil of the Colege Stanislas and an incomparable worker, he was appointed at twenty-two professor of Philosophy at the University of Ghent, and retained the chair until 1850. He was the disciple of Bordas-Desmoulins, a spiritualist philosopher and a singularly vigorous mind and through him of Descartes and Plato.

Huet collected around him a group of his pupils, who studied the different systems of social reform throughly and each with his own preferences. It was in the discussions of this circle of friends all impregnated with the equalitarian ideas of our master, that convictions were formed in me, which have never since varied, but have been confirmed by contemporary history. Huet published besides *La Science d' Esprit* (2 vols, 1864).

Of the ideas contained in *Le Regne Social Du Christianisme*, M. de Laveleye says that Huet got them—"Straight from the highest moral inspirations of Platonism and Christianity. This work, whose every page is bright with an ardent love of righteousness, contains a complete theory of society or sociology based on

Madras Christian College Magazine. July, 1885.

(continued from the previous page) Christianity, which has not obtained the celebrity it merited because it is too Christian for Socialists, and too Socialist for Christians."

The plan of the book is described as being—"To grasp the innermost idea of society, to deduce from it our duties along with our rights; to bring together the moral, political, and economic truths which belong to, or are dawning upon our age, and, as they are thus disclosed to our reason; to discover beneath our errors and excesses the hidden working of Providence, and make clear all the spiritual greatness, the holiness, I make bold to say, of the revolution, which, at this day, is throughout Christendom relieving the poor and setting free the oppressed."

I have drawn from the sacred springs the social teaching of Christianity, and removing from it what comes from men, in order to keep myself to what comes from God, I found clearly that Christian redemption consists not only in producing through the Church citizens for heaven, but also in setting up here below a civil society, free and brotherly.

Christianity is the principle of which the new civilisation is the consequence. In the new social dogma, Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood, breathes the primitive spirit of the Church. But socialism on the other hand by rejecting Christianity and the Church, and contracting an unnatural alliance with materialism and anarchy, equally denies its origin, and condemns itself to inevitable defeat.

In the childhood of reason, men in their weakness resigned their natural rights in favour of the State, which, instead of the centre of common defence, became an instrument of dominion. Its chiefs, though styled fathers and pastors, ruled by terror, and forcibly controlled thought, religion, and feeling.

Modern apostles of anarchy, who denounce government on principle, do so on Rousseau's false but widely adopted idea that man is born good, and is depraved by society, meaning political rather than natural society. But as we have seen, it is only man's depravity which makes political society or government necessary.

Of the false systems of society, Individualism, denying what is common to men, stops short with a selfish and savage freedom, unable to rise to equality and brotherhood, while Communism perverts the two latter, and destroys the former. Socialism alone unites the three in their own godlike harmony.

The reign of Constantine, celebrated by panegyrists of theocracy, by historians who look only at appearances, by blinded Catholics, as the beginning of Christian society, was really a time of decay and abortion.

The power of the mediaeval theocracy came from the great movement of unworldliness, of absorption in heavenly things, which had inspired the Church from the beginning, and had no earthly objects such as the Hebrew institutions had. It impelled whole populations into monasteries and scouted intelligence as a profanity; but in so doing it annihilated the old theory of civilisation and the tyranny of institutions over man; it set the individual free.

The excesses of the Papacy were no part, but a depravation, of the work it had to do. They sprang from its reluctance to surrender power once acquired, when its use was gone, a reluctance which still sways it, but will not do so for ever.

But though the State must not, he says, ally itself with, or prescribe any particular form of faith, this is not to say that it is to be purely indifferent to religion, any more than it is to the press, to commerce, or to industry, although not allied with any particular form of them.

Material wealth has a spiritual value also when it helps the mind, and spiritual wealth has a double utility when it also furthers the well-being of the body. But spiritual value is always superior to material. Thus religion and philosophy are not less valuable in themselves than because the vigour they give to thought issues in new inventions and discoveries for the use of the body. But the value of the progress of invention lies much more

(continued from the previous page) in its tendency to set men free from bodily drudgery to pursue the things of the mind than its material usefulness.

The Christ used poverty to raise mankind to true wealth, just as Socrates ignorance to lead them to knowledge, and Descartes doubt to lead them to certainty. He had no more intention of perpetuating poverty than they ignorance and scepticism. Even when He was preparing His disciples for persecution, for suffering and death, He warned them against an exaggerated contempt of earthly wealth.

He divides all property into inherited and self-acquired. At the death of a member of his imagined community, all his inherited property will fall to be divided among the generation then entering upon life. But self-acquired property may be bequeathed, or given away before death, but only with effect for one generation; at the death of the legatee or donee, it also will be divided in the same way. The ages of fourteen and twenty-five are those, he says, at which the young will require a part and the balance respectively, of their shares. The law of succession therefore will be that the property, vacated each year by death, will be divided among the young people who in that year attain those two ages, the elder getting double the share of the younger. In practice, he adds, to avoid the hardships of chance, the amount of the shares will be determined by the average of several years. He declines to go into the details necessary to work out his plan, but, admitting that it could only be introduced gradually into society as now organised, he suggests that the way should be prepared for it by a heavy "death duty," the proceeds to be applied entirely in the education of the poor, and in providing them with the means of labour. He throws out also some suggestions to prevent abuse of the new system. He then shows that scriptural teaching as to the rights of man over things, accords with that of true Socialism, stamping human proprietorship as transitory, and condemning as impious the occupation of land in perpetuity. The land shall not be sold

(continued from the previous page) in perpetuity: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me. It belongs not to one man, but to all, for the earth hath he given to the children of men. (Psa. cxv. 16.) The Mosaic law also provided, by the institution of the jubile, for the preservation to all of the natural right of property.

Freedom of labour is, he says, the right to labour, the right of choosing an employment, and staying in it or leaving it as may be suitable. It secures order by making each producer responsible for his own productions; it favours the association of workers, the competition it allows is that of all the producers for the suffrages of all the consumers. The one thing it demands is the abolition of wage-labour. For the wage-receiver does not choose his employment freely, and never enjoys the power of competition; he is under the hard rule of a master; he is never free from fear for his daily bread. Economists have erroneously supposed, he says, that labourers can remove at will from one employ to another, blinding themselves to the radical evil of wage labour, and forgetting that in the face of competition neither the abundance of capital nor the invention of machines will benefit the labourer, since his wages by its operation always return to a bare subsistence. He further points out that in the association of capital and labour, so much talked about, wages really disappear the seeming wage-receiver becoming a capitalist. He dwells on the great future of industrial co-operation.

Here the chief point is the abolition of inequality, that is, of hereditary luxury and poverty. His social ideal does not absolutely exclude luxury and poverty, since there must always be those who will be poor by their own fault, and those who will be rich, by their own fault, shall we say, or merit? But hereditary luxury and poverty,—or 'divitism' and pauperism,—must be abolished, and a simple competence,—neither poverty nor riches, in the words of Agur,—become the lot of the vast majority.

He claims that his principles and proposals would renew the face of economic society, and bring

(continued from the previous page) mankind far on the road towards industrial redemption. But he attaches even greater value to their moral effect. Material improvement alone cannot possibly save society. If Christian feeling, the virtues of the family life, died out, economical revolutions could, no more than political, defend man kind from decay and corruption. Woe, he cries, to the country which shall adopt the teaching of a mechanical, sensual, and pagan Socialism, and forget.

His last topic is the relation of peoples to one another. The ideal is that there be but one people over all the earth. But we are still far from such perfection. Meanwhile he upholds the rights of nationalities, and shows that, as between individuals, so between states, freedom and equality are the surest means for bringing about the brotherhood of nations, in accordance with the Gospel spirit, which knows no narrow or exclusive patriotism, but teaches us to join to love of our own country, love also of the whole human race. He looks forward hopefully to the time when Christian peoples shall cheerfully vote their millions to relieve the distress of other peoples, and he maintains the right and duty of intervention when one people sees another unlawfully oppressed.

"The Christ made a new humanity. The old civilisations were convicted of impotence; in the greatest peoples of antiquity they never produced more than a superficial and deceptive progress, followed right soon by inevitable decay. They would have passed uselessly away from earth, had not Gospel civilisation incorporated with itself all that was good in the, founded true progress, and given a meaning to history. States till then were founded inviolably on the principle that man did not belong to himself. Social Christianity upset this, and gave him, back to himself, and through himself to his fellows. It freed conscience, and made reason rule. From its earliest hour, it assailed pauperism and divitism; it has to root out the abuse (exploitation) of man by man. It has hunted it from slavery

(continued from the previous page) to serfage, and from serfage to wage labour. By the right to an inheritance prefigured in the Mosaic institutions, it is to abolish in the end this remnant of ancient slavery, as it is by the sovereignty of the people to do away with kingship, another relic of paganism.

W.H. CAMPBELL: "NATURE AND GOD"

There is and ever has been a tendency in man to concentrate his attention on what are called the common objects of experience, on those things, that is, which can be seen and touched, and to regard them only as worthy of consideration and pursuit. It is not wonderful that it is so. All men are inevitably attracted by these, and most men are led to regard them as the only things real and practical, and to make their pursuit the object and end of their lives.

It is not surprising therefore if some of those whose lives have been devoted to the study of physical sciences should, impressed by the magnitude and grandeur of the visible universe, come to regard it as the supreme reality, and to consider matter and its laws the origin and explanation of all things. Those who have adopted this theory, have done so for the most part, somewhat unthinkingly, using, as is so frequent when treating of such subjects, terms, the true significance of which they have not even attempted to ascertain. When we speak of "matter" what do we mean by the term? This is a very important question, but one that few so-called materialists think of asking themselves. This material world, nature, which is regarded as the supreme reality, what is it? When we say, we see, or hear, or touch something, what is it exactly that we are cognizant of? When, to take a common example, we, as we say, see, a mango, what is actually present to our senses? A round yellow body of a certain size and shape, soft to the touch, and sweet to the taste? By no means; we are not touching the fruit, nor are we tasting it, we are simply seeing it, and all that we are directly conscious of is a coloured expansion of a certain form and size. Similarly when we touch a mango or taste it we are directly conscious of those phenomena only which are the proper objects

** Madras Christian College Magazine 1888

(continued from the previous page) of these senses. But although this is all that is present to the senses when we see, or touch, or taste a mango, it is by no means all that is present in our consciousness, else the true expression of our experience would be I see a colour, I feel resistance, I taste sweetness, not I see, or touch or taste a mango. There is a great deal suggested to our mind that is not actually present to the senses. In our past experience we have found that a certain arrangement of colour is accompanied by a certain tangible form, that in this present case, the particular arrangement of colour and shape regularly occur in connection with a certain sensation of resistance which we call softness and a certain kind of taste which we call sweetness. So regular has this connection been that the phenomena of colour, form, resistance and taste have become inseparably associated so that it is impossible for us to experience one without having the others suggested to us at the same instant. What we call a mango what we call sensible things, are thus in reality groups of phenomena bound together in certain fixed relations. These relations are fixed and permanent, and this it is that constitutes one of the main differences between "things" and our thoughts and feelings regarding them, but the phenomena themselves, what we see, and hear, and taste and touch, they have no permanence. By their very nature they are in a state of perpetual change, in the same moment appearing and passing away, so that it is impossible, as some of the old Greek philosophers have taught us, even to say that they are, for as they rise they vanish. Look, for example, to take a very noticeable illustration, at the sky at evening time, just after the sun has set. Along the horizon is a band of fiery red, above, a line of dark clouds which still glow like a furnace under the touch of the sun; higher still is the pale primrose or lemon hue shading away by imperceptible degrees into a delicate blue, and dashed with light crimson-tipped clouds; above all is the clear deep

(continued from the previous page) blue sky. Look for a few moments and you become conscious of a gradual change stealing over the scene, the glowing red pales away into a sober buff; the dark clouds grow darker and the bright ones lose their golden glory; and slowly the whole scene empties itself of its warmth and light and becomes cold and grey and sombre. When you look upon such a scene you are conscious of two things, first that what you see is ever changing, is never for a moment the same, second, that this change is imperceptible so that you cannot tell when one colour vanishes and another takes its place. Now what is true of this particular case is true of our whole sensible experience. A constant stream of impressions or phenomena is entering into our experience and passing through it. The stream is perpetual, but its waters are never the same; a phenomenon appears and disappears, and that is the end of it; similar phenomena may follow, but that which has once been can never return. Sense phenomena in fact exist only by being perceived, and cannot occur apart from some conscious experience. Try to imagine a sound that is not being heard, a colour that is not being seen, a taste that is not being tasted, and you will at once see how absurd it is to attempt to attribute to these things an independent existence. Whatever may be true of some unknown world outside of our experience, this at least is true that the world we know, the world of sights, and sounds and other sense phenomena, cannot be said to have any reality in itself; it does not really exist, it appears. It is the great glory of the philosophy of India, that, however much it may have failed to recognise the true significance of the things of sense, it has not failed to recognise their true nature and to see that, wherever reality may be found, it is not to be found in them. "As the play of a juggler is mere semblance, so the spectacle of the world is form without substance." But, as I have already pointed out, while the matter of our sensible experience is perpetually changing, the forms, or

(continued from the previous page) relations, or laws, in which, or according to which our experience occurs, are permanent. These laws, again, we saw, hold certain relations to each other, and all are co-ordinated so as to form one great complex system. This age has been marked by the great advance made in the discovery and elucidation of these laws and by the recognition of the fact that all natural laws are but factors in the working out of one great central principle. It is consequently somewhat fashionable at present to regard the laws of nature as the cause of the universe and to explain all things by reference to them. This is a great error, nothing less than confounding the manner of a thing's existence with the cause or reason of its existence. A law of nature is merely a certain recognized regularity; it tells us how things occur; it can never be the cause of their occurrence. The law (or as Mr Spencer calls it "the Formula") of evolution may be an expression of the manner in which the various changes take place in the sensible world, but that is all, and when we have learned that we have not taken a single step towards the solution of the questions, what is the cause of these changes? What is the source, the origin of these phenomena? There must be some active cause of this perpetual change, some fountain-head from which flows this constant stream. After all, it is a very superficial view which regards the universe merely as an aggregate of visible and tangible phenomena, and rests content with a recognition of the relations which these bear to each other. Men have ever felt this to be so. In all lands and in all ages they have believed that behind the visible lies that which cannot be seen, a hidden power by which all things must be explained. It is the existence of this belief that explains to a great extent, the universal prevalence of religion.

In recognition of this supreme reality, science is at one with religion. Although through the lips of some of her adherents, she seems to

(continued from the previous page) deny the existence of God, she yet proclaims in the most distinct and emphatic manner, that in all nature, there exists an ever present, ever active power. There is a power which is present in the whole universe, a power from which all things have come; we need not quarrel about names; our duty is seriously and reverently to ask ourselves "what is the nature of this power, and what relation do we and what we call nature, hold to it?"

The visible world, viewed in itself, and treated as a thing in itself, is a delusion, viewed in its relation to God it is full of deep and wondrous meaning; it is His thought becoming manifested to us, through eye and ear and all the varied senses, in language which all can understand, but the meaning of which none have fully learned. We have no right to say, as some do, that it is impossible from the visible world to learn aught of the One from whom it proceeds. We arrive at our knowledge of the Divine nature by the very same process as that by which in our daily lives we arrive at a knowledge of our fellow men. How do we get our knowledge of our fellow men? Not by entering into their inner life and sharing in their thoughts—that we cannot do for a thick veil separates each man from all others. However close we may draw together we can never get behind this; it is impenetrable. All our knowledge of our fellow men is derived from outward signs, manifested to our senses. In the form and colours and sounds, and varied sense impressions which make up human bodies, we recognize the presence of spirits akin to our own, and learn what we know of their nature and character. This judgment can hardly be said to be the result of an inference; it is certainly not the conclusion of a conscious logical process; it seems to grow up in us by one of those unconscious processes which lie at the root of so much of our experience, which come, when, and how, we know not. Now just as in the changes which took place in the outward forms of our fellow men we recognize the presence of intelligence and will, so when we look upon the various changes

(continued from the previous page) that take place in the universe, at the order and regularity which reign among its phenomena, and the co-ordination of all its laws in one great system, we cannot refuse to recognize in these changes and these laws the presence of reason and will. It is hopeless to attempt an explanation of the universe from a materialistic standpoint; if we do so we are inevitably compelled either to deny that we have any knowledge of the nature of matter or to attribute to it qualities which are not material but spiritual. It is not an unknowable by which we are surrounded, but a God who is every moment self-revealed. His greatness, it is true, cannot be measured, His being cannot be comprehended, even our own finite being we cannot comprehend, but His presence can be seen and His nature known through His manifestations of them. In nature mind stands face to face with mind; thought meets and interprets thought; the great central idea of Berkeley's philosophy is essentially true, Nature is a picture language through which the Infinite Reason expresses itself to the finite. This is not a logical proof of the existence of God, and cannot be put forward as such; it is by a living process higher than mere logic, that the soul of man comes into contact with the universal soul. Between us and God the world of sense hangs like a veil, half revealing and half concealing His greatness and glory. All things have an significance.

E. Sell: "THE SUFI ALLEGORY OF SALAMAN & ABSAL."@@

Jami, one of the most famous of the Sufi poets, flourished in the ninth century of the Hijra. He was a native of Khorasan and studied the mystic doctrines of Sufiism under the Shaikh-ul-Islam Saad-ud-din of Kashghar. In due course he became a great authority on this subject and was also famous as a grammarian and theologian. His poems were highly valued, and are still much esteemed as part of the classical literature of the Persian language. The stories of Laili and Muijnun, of Yusuf and Zulaikha will remain as long as Persian poetry finds admiring readers. There is, however, a small poem less widely known, but which is unrivalled as an exposition of the Sufi system.

(continued from the previous page) In a collection of short fragmentary pieces like the Divan of Hafiz, the pearls of Sufiistic love, touse an eastern metaphor, are loosely strung together, and it is only very patient students who can find the esoteric meaning of the poet. The advantage of the form of instruction adopted by Jami in the 'Salaman and Absal' is that the tale is continuous and is explained by the author himself. This authoritative interpretation is, as we shall see later on, a fact of considerable importance, for it raises a doubt as to whether Sufiism is, as it is commonly said to be, a pantheistic system. It is necessary at this stage to give an outline of the story.

Jami, according to the usual custom of the poets, commences by an invocation of the eternal spirit. Then confused and lost in the contemplation of self and of that 'other than self' he prays:—

"Do Thou my separate and derived self
Make one with thy Essential! Leave me room
On that divan which leaves no room for twain;
Lest, like the simple Arab in the tale,
I grow perplexed, oh God, 'twixt' 'me' and 'Thee'
If I—this spirit that inspires me whence?
If Thou—then what this sensual impotence?"

This gives the key-note to the whole story which is an account of the way in which the soul returns to Him who made it. The Arab story referred to is an amusing and excellent illustration of the manner in which matters of serious moment were lightly parodied.

A simple Arab of the desert came to the busy city of Baghdad. The busy bustling crowd confused this child of the desert. He longed for rest and sleep:—

" 'But then, on waking
How,' quoth he, 'amid so many
Waking know myself again?
So to make the matter certain,
Strung a gourd about his ancle,
And, unto a corner creeping,

Baghdad and himself and people
 Soon were blotted from his brain.
 But one that heard him, and divined
 His purpose, silly crept behind;
 From the sleeper's ankle slipping,
 Round his own the pumpkin tied
 Then laid him down to sleep beside.
 By and by the Arab waking,
 Looks directly for his signal,
 Sees it on another's ankle
 Cries aloud, 'oh good for nothing
 Rascal to perplex me so!
 That by you I am bewildered
 Whether I be I or no!
 If I – the pumpkin why on you?
 If you – then where am I and who?' "

After this serious and this comic introduction the story begins. A king, a successor of the famous Sikandar, had a wise counsellor who guided him in all matters of state-craft with so much skill that the rule of the Shah extended to the Koh-i-kaf, the limits of the then known world. Far and wide went the mandate of the Shah, and none dared to disobey his behest, but not withstanding all this power and glory the heart of the Shah was sad. He had no son and heir. He called for his counsellor, known as the Sage, and confided to him his intense desire for a son: –

"One in whose youth a father shall prolong
 His years, and in his strength continue strong."

The Sage points out that all the advantages of a son so eloquently described by the Shah relate to a good son, but, as bad sons are not unknown, his advice is:-

"Beware of teasing Allah, for a son
 Whom having, you may have to pray to lose."

The Shah retains his desire and "with magic mighty wisdom his own will colleague, and wrought his own accomplishment, when lo! from darkness came a child to light, a child formed in no carnal mould." His name was Salaman.

The poet then supplies the key to unlock the cabinet of meaning.

According to Jami's interpretation of the Sufi cosmogony: —

"The incomparable Creator, when this world
He did create, created first of all
The first Intelligence — first of a chain
Of ten Intelligences, of which the last
Sole agent is in this our universe,

A higher power supplies all that the Shah distributes to the universe. The higher power is the Sage, the wisdom. Then of pure spirit, with no taint of matter, the soul of man was produced. This is Salaman. The soul for its outward garb requires a body, through which as a medium it may perceive and receive the joy and delight of things of sense. This body is Absal: —

"These in such a bond
United as God only can divide
As lovers in this tale are signified."

The island in the deep is the 'world of being' in which the soul remains apart from its Creator. Salaman fell short of his desire, and this shows that in the external world of sense there is no permanent joy, and that existence in the 'other' leads to no real peace. Thus he goes back to his father, the soul returns to its true parentage. Still it needs discipline, until all desire of separate existence is purged away. The process, even after the fiery trial is slow, and so the Sage calls up a picture of the past, a phantom Absal, but follows it up by a revelation to Salaman of one purer and better far than the companion of his existence in the world of sense. Then all mortal love, all desire for phenomenal existence passes away.

The point of the allegory is that Salaman returns not to the "Incomparable Creator," but to that which He created "the Last and First Intelligence." This "First intelligence" appears under various names in Sufi writings. It is called the primal element, the pen, the spirit of Muhammad, universal reason (aql-i-kull). The world of this primal element is co-extensive with the universe.

(continued from the previous page) God's voice is said to be heard through it, hence it is called the 'Pen.' The Kaf of His power breathed on the Pen, and cast thousands of pictures on the page of "not being", that is, material things which have no real existence were brought into apparent existence by this primal intelligence, or, according to Jami, by the tenth or Last intelligence.

It is certainly to this, and not to the Creator to which Jami makes Salaman return. The Muslim idea of God is that of a pitiless fate—a God afar off. Sufiism is an attempt of the human mind to bridge over this gulf. This First Intelligence, or Primal element, is represented as a manifestations of God, a means by which other created beings are formed.

The question then arises, whether all allusions in the Sufi poets to the absorption of the soul in a superior being mean re-union with God, or with some manifestation of God. The Quran says plainly enough "from Him was the origin and to Him is the return" (Sura x,4). Jami might reply that 'Him' here means God as manifested in the First and Last Intelligence, by which He, the Shah of the allegory, created the worlds and through which, He executes His decrees. If Jami's exposition of Sufi doctrine is correct, it cast a new light on the subject, and makes even the most spiritual aspect of Islam dark and dreary, for it shows us how men, apparently longing for a closer communion with God, fell short of the mark, how even to them He is still "sterile in His inaccessible height," satisfied to let them feel that they can never be more than slaves, that nearness to Him is impossible. They felt the need of some intermediary, they found it in a revival of the old gnostic notions of the Aeons, forms of manifestation of the Ineffable and Incomprehensible. The gnostic theory was that God was immanent, incomprehensible, and the original source of all perfection. "From this incomprehensible essence of God an immediate transition to finite things is not conceivable. Self-limitation is

(continued from the previous page) the first beginning of a communication of life on the part of God – the first passing of the hidden Deity into manifestation; and from this proceeds all further self-developing manifestation of the divine essence. Now, from this primal link in the chain of life there are evolved, in the first place, the manifold powers or attributes inherent in the divine essence, which, until that first self-comprehension, were all hidden in the abyss of his essence. These divine powers, evolving themselves to self-subsistence, become thereupon the germs and principles of all further developments of life. To all this the Sufi would subscribe, and the origin of Sufiism is to be found in gnosticism.

Union with God to him seemed hopeless, and repudiating altogether, or ignorant of the true meaning of the Incarnation of the Son of God, his only aspiration was to become extinct in the Primal Intelligence, the goal of all his efforts. He believed: –

"In that glory is no 'I' or 'We' or 'Thou'
'I' 'We' 'Thou' and 'He' are all onething."

P.C. Rao: "SOME INDIAN RELIGIONS."

MADHYAMIKAS, hold (1) that all that exists is but momentary, so much so that nothing is a possible object of knowledge, and that all that exists is but an idea, and that when all ideas come to an end final extinction which is a void will result, and (2) that all transmigratory existence is pain and pain alone.

When they say that everything that exists is momentary, they mean that matter is not a permanent entry, and that it vanishes as soon as it comes into existence. For instance, suppose yourself gazing at a sunset, you will see the whole western heavens glowing with roseate hues but these melt away before your eyes. The change of colours is so rapid that within the millionth part of a second, you will see that the whole glory of the painted heavens has undergone an incalculable series of mutations.

Madras Christian College Magazine. 1886.

(continued from the previous page) One shade is supplanted by another with a rapidity which sets all measurement at defiance. Thus, all matter is of momentary existence. If it were permanent, it should be able to exercise its functions always. For instance, if a seed were a permanent entity with powers to germinate, it must always be germinating.

YOGACHARAS, while admitting the void of external things, deny the internal void, or the baselessness of mental phenomena. They hold that intellect is its own principle, self subsistent and luminous with its own light, and that what is cognised is not other than cognition itself. There is naught to be objectified by intellect and there is no cognition ulterior thereto. As for the appearance of an interval between the object and subject consciousness, it is merely an illusion which by constant reflection will melt away.

The followers of this religion are called Syadavadas as they always reject the idea of absolute. If anybody asks them "does the thing exist?" they say it exists in a certain way, if the opponents say it does not exist, they say it does not exist in a certain way. What they mean by this is that all statements made in regard to the existence of matter and soul are true from different points of view. For instance, matter, they say, does not exist permanently when you look to its form, but, it does exist when you look at it in the abstract and to the minute particles of which the various objects of matter we see are made up; for example, a pot is not a permanent entity, but the particles of which it is made are permanent.

As PRAKRITI is the source of pain, the soul seeks to throw it off and looks to final bliss or absolute isolation. This is effected by meditation and contemplation. As a wilful woman, whose faults have been seen by her husband, does not return to him, or as an actress performed her part retires from the stage, so too does PRAKRITI desist when the soul sees its faults.

Panini is the founder of the science of grammar. This system holds that the correct exposition of words, which it is the object of this science to explain, is the means of preserving the Vedas, that prosperity arises from the employment of a correct word, and that correct interpretation and use of words entitles one to Swarga or heaven. The supreme nature is the one object denoted by all words, but differences are produced by illusory conditions. Exposition of words is the means to final bliss.

AL-GAZZALI: "WORSHIP IN ISLAM"@@

These are the five daily performances, consisting of the morning, noon, mid-afternoon, sunset and evening Worships. These are prescribed, required or obligatory. If they are omitted for any reason they need to be made up.

A'isha bint Abu'Bakr, the favourite wife of Muhammad. From 'Aisha (is this tradition); she said, 'The Messenger of Allah used to talk to us and we to him, and when Worship-time came, it was as if he did not know us and we did not know him, so engrossed were we in the greatness of Allah.'

Khalaf bin Aiyub was asked, 'Do not flies annoy you in your worship, so that you chase them away?' 'I do not accustom myself to anything that corrupts my worship.' He was asked, 'How do you have patience for that?' He replied, 'I have heard that criminals exercise patience under the lashings of the sultan, so that it may be said, "Such a one is patient!" and they boast about that. Now, I stand before my Lord: shall I, then, move for a fly?'

It is related about Muslim bin Yasar that he, whenever he wanted to perform the Worship, said to his family, 'Go on talking, for I do not hear you.'

It is related also about him that he was worshipping in the mosque at al-Basra one day and a side of the mosque fell. Thereupon the people gathered together, but he was not cognizant of it until he withdrew from the Worship.

@@ The Book of the Ihya' translated by Calverly.

As for his head, if he will he may keep it erect, and if he will, he may incline it: to incline it appears more humble and more abasing. So let his gaze be fixed on the mat he worships on. If he has no worshipping-mat let him draw near to the encircling wall, or let him draw a line, for that cuts off the extent of his gaze and prevents the scattering of the thought. Let him restrain his gaze from exceeding the endges of his worshipping-mat or the bounds of the line.

Muhammad said, 'How many standing up will have as third portion from their Worship only fatigue and misfortune!' and he meant by that none other than the unmindful.

He said, 'A creature gets from his Worship only what he comprehends of it'. The verification of this is in the fact that the worshipper is in communion with his Lord, as the tradition about it has declared, and speech with inattention is not communion at all.

Fasting overcomes the physical powers, breaking the dominion of the fleshly inclination, which is an instrument of Satan's, the enemy of Allah.

Whoever knows the inner reality of the Worship knows that unmindfulness contradicts it.

First, the presence of the heart. By this we mean that the heart is free from everything but what the worshipper is engaged in and what he utters, so that the work may be associated with both the acts and the words, and that the thought may not be wandering to other things. Whenever the thought turns away from what it is not engaged in, and there is in one's heart remembrance of what he is about, and he is not unmindful of anything, the presence of the heart results.

Know that the cause of the presence of the heart is your solicitude about it, for your heart follows your solicitude. For your heart is present only in what you are solicitous about. Whenever a matter is one of solicitude to you, your heart is there present, willingly or unwillingly, for it is constituted that way, and is under compulsion in it.

(continued from the previous page) The heart, whenever it is not present in the Worship, is not without employment, but rather is roaming about in whatever matters of this life one's solicitude is turned to. So there is no expedient and no treatment for the presence of the heart except through turning one's solicitude to the Worship, as long as it is not clear that the object desired depends on the Worship. That includes faith and assurance that the next abode is better and more lasting, and that the Worship is a means of reaching it. So, whenever this faith is joined life and its chief concerns, there results from their association the presence of the heart in the Worship. By means similar to this your heart is present whenever you come before some great people who are not able to harm or benefit you.

Whoever loves a thing increases his remembrance of it, and remembrance of what is beloved rushes upon the heart inevitably, and therefore you see that whoever loves another than Allah does not have a single act of Worship free from idle fancies.

And if the strength (of the states) is in proportion to the strength of his assurance, his departure from them in the Worship can have no cause except (a) scattering of thought, (b) division of interest, (c) the absence of the heart from the communion, or (d) unmindfulness towards the Worship. Nothing disturbs from the worship except invading, engrossing fancies.

The remedy for the presence of the heart is the repelling of those fancies. The thing itself is not repelled except by the repelling of its cause, so, learn its cause. The cause for the coming together of engrossing fancies is either some external matter, or a matter that is itself inward.

The external thing may be what strikes the hearing or appears to the sight, for that sometimes snatches away the attention, so that it follows the thing and busies itself with it. Then the thought is drawn away to something else and it goes linking on. Likewise the sight of things becomes a cause of thought about them, and then some of those thoughts give rise to others. But for him whose intention is strong and

(continued from the previous page) whose solicitude is lofty, what occurs to his senses does not occupy him. But for one who is weak it is a matter of course that his thought branches off on it. The remedy for that is cutting off these causes by lowering the gaze, or worshipping in a dark house, or by drawing near to a wall in his Worship, so that the range of his vision may not be extended, and guarding against Worship in the streets and in places decorated and worked, and on dyed carpet. For that reason the Sufi devotees used to worship in a small dark house, just large enough for prostration, that their attention might be more concentrated. The strongest ones among them used to be present in the mosques and to lower their gaze and not to let it pass the place of prostration, and to consider that the perfection of Worship consisted in not recognizing those who were on their right or left.

The inward causes are more difficult, for he whose concerns carry him off into the vales of the earth is one whose thinking is not confined in one department—rather he does not cease to fly from one side to another. The lowering of the gaze is of no use to him for what took place in the heart previously is sufficient for the pre-occupation. So this is the way for him: let him restore the self forcibly to an understanding of what he is reciting in the Worship, and employ himself in this rather than anything else. It will help him to do that if he prepares for it before the Opening takbir by renewing to himself the remembrance of the next abode, the place of communion where he is, and the peril of his position before Allah, which is a place of perception (of things of the next abode). He empties his heart, before entering upon the Worship, of whatever he is solicitous about, and does not leave to his lower self any business to which his interest may turn.

This is the way to quiet the thoughts. Then, if the thing that excites one's thoughts does not quiet down by this quieting remedy, nothing will save him except the purge that drains the matter of the disease from the deepest veins. This is to look into the matters turning him away and pre-occupying him from the presenting of the heart. There is no doubt

(continued from the previous page) that they have reference to his chief concerns, and they have become the things of importance only on account of his desires, So he chastises his lower self by breaking away from those desires and cutting off those bonds. For, whatever pre-occupies him from his Worship is an opponent of his religion, and is of the army of Satan, his enemy.

But quieting does not benefit the strong, overcoming desires. Rather, they continue to attract you, and you to attract them. Then they overcome you, and all your worship comes to an end in the occupation of pulling this way and that. It is like a man under a tree who wants to do some clear thinking for himself. Then the voices of the sparrows disturb him, and he continually drives them away with a stick in his hand and returns to his thinking. Then the sparrows return and he repeats striking at them with his stick. Then it is said to him, 'This is the proceeding of a water wheel, and does not end. If you wish salvation, cut down the tree. So likewise the tree of the desires, whenever it spreads out and its branches extend themselves, has thoughts attracted to it as sparrows are attracted to trees and as flies are attracted to filth, and the business of getting rid of them is a long one. For, a fly as often as it is repelled, returns, and for that reason it is called dhubab, sometimes that is repelled and returns.

So likewise the stray thoughts and desires are numerous, and rarely is a creature free from them. There is one root that includes them all, and that is love of this life. 'That is the head of all sin', the foundation of all deficiency and the source of all wickedness. Let not the man, whose heart harbours love of this life so that he inclines to it for its own sake, and not in order to provide for his journey, nor to seek aid, by means of it, for the next abode, hope that the pleasure of communion in the Worship will be clear to him. For, whoever rejoices in this life will not rejoice in Allah and in communion with Him. The solicitude of a man is for that by which his eye is refreshed. If that by which his eye is refreshed is in this life, inevitably his concern

(continued from the previous page) goes out to it. Yet, for all that, it is not fitting that he should leave off the struggle to turn the heart to the Worship to reduce the disturbing causes, for this is the bitter remedy. On account of its bitterness the natural disposition abhors it.

These inner realities exist according to the degrees of understanding. The understanding is according to the greatness of the knowledge and the purity of the heart.

As it is obligatory to guard the head and the eye from turning to different directions, so likewise it is obligatory to guard the heart from turning to anything else than the Worship. So, whenever it turns to anything else than Him, remind it of the gazing of Allah upon you, and of the unseemliness of treating lightly the One who is communed with, when the one who is communing is unmindful, so that it should return to it (the Worship). Impose humbleness upon the heart, for freedom from turning away, inwardly and the outwardly, is the fruit of humbleness. Whenever the inward is humble, the outward is humble.

Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, in his Worship, used to be as if he were a tent-stake, and Ibn al-Zubair used to be as if he were wood. A certain one of them used to be quiet in his prostration to such an extent that sparrows alighted on him as if he were inanimate. All that is what the natural disposition requires before one of the sons of the earth who is to be magnified, so how shall it not demand it before the King of kings in the case of anyone who has experiential knowledge of the King of kings? Every one who is composed submissively before any other than Allah, while as a trifler, his extremities are restless before Allah, does that because of deficiency of knowledge of the majesty of Allah, and of His gazing upon his heart and his conscience.

SRI SANKARACHARYA SAYS: "There are no gods or Asuras other than men. Those among men who are wanting in self-control, but otherwise endowed with many good qualities, are the gods; those who are particularly greedy are men, while those who are cruel and given to injuring others are Asuras. So the same species, men, according to their lack of self-control and the other two defects, as well as their tendencies of balance, activity, and inertia are given the title of gods, men, and demons."

Averroes: "THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY." (Baroda edition)

If, by studying these books, a man has been led astray and gone wrong on account of some natural defect, bad training of the mind, inordinate passion, or the want of a teacher who might explain to him the true significance of things, by all or some of these causes, we ought not on this account to prevent one fit to study these things from doing so. For such harm is not innate in man, but is only an accident of training.

It is not right that a drug which is medically useful by its nature should be discarded because it may prove harmful by accident.

All the words of Law are not to be taken literally nor all of them given an interpretation.

A large number of people in the early days of Islam believed in exoteric and esoteric meaning of the Law, and thought that the esoteric meanings should not be disclosed to an ignorant person who cannot understand them.

We see that Abu Hamid (Al Ghazzali) has made a mistake in ascribing to the Peripatetic Philosophers the opinion that God has no knowledge of particulars. They are only of opinion that the knowledge of God about particulars is quite different from ours. For our knowledge is the effect of the existence of a thing. Such knowledge is produced by the existence of a thing, and changes with changes in the thing. On the other hand the knowledge of God is the cause of an existent thing. Thus one who compares these two kinds of knowledge ascribes the same characteristics to two quite different things—and that is extreme ignorance. When applied both to eternal and to transitory things the word knowledge is used only in a formal fashion, just as we use many other words for objects essentially different. How can it be supposed that the Peripatetic Philosophers say that God has no knowledge of particulars when they are of opinion that man is sometimes warned of the coming vicissitudes of the future through visions, and that he gets these admonitions in sleep, through a great and powerful Director, who directs everything? These

(continued from the previous page) philosophers are not only of the opinion that God has no knowledge of details such as we have but they also believe that He is ignorant of universals. For all known universals with us are also the effect of the existence of a thing, while God's knowledge is quite other than this. From these arguments it is concluded that God's knowledge is far higher than that it should be called universal or particular.

God has favoured such of his creatures as cannot understand logic, either on account of their nature, habit, or lack of mental training, by quoting examples and parables of such things and has urged them to testify as to their truth through them. For everyone has mental capacity enough to understand them by the help of dogmatic and exhortatory argument which are common to all men. This is why the Law has been divided into two kinds: exoteric and esoteric. The exoteric part consists of those examples which have been coined to express certain meanings; while the esoteric is the meanings themselves, which are not manifested except to the learned in philosophy.

There are persons who cannot believe a thing except through their imagination, that is, it is difficult for them to believe a thing which they cannot understand a thing except with a reference to space and hence believe in God as though physical. They ought to be told that things of this character are parabolical.

One group of men, who class themselves among philosophers, say that these things should be taken literally. For, according to them, there is not a single argument which makes their literal sense absurd and unreasonable. This is the method of the Asharites. But another group of philosophers interpret them; but they differ very widely in the interpretation itself. Amongst these may be mentioned Abu Hamid (Al Ghazzali) and a large number of Sufis.

It is therefore unsuitable that these interpretations should be published in any other than learned books, for in this way they will reach none but the learned. But it is a mistake both in religion and philosophy if they are put in other books,

(continued from the previous page) with dogmatic and exhortative arguments, as Abu Hamid has done. Although the author's intention was good, the idea thus to increase the number of learned men, he caused a good deal of mischief through it. For, on account this method some people began to find fault with philosophy, and others to bake religion, and still others began to think of reconciling the two. It seems that this was the very aim which Abu Hamid had in view in writing these books. He has tried to awaken the nature of men, for he never attached himself to any particular way of thinking in his books. He was an Asharite with the Asharites, a Sufi with the Sufis and a philosopher with the philosophers.

If these matters had not become commonly known among men, we would not have said anything about them and would not have entered in a plea on behalf of the interpreters. For these things are suitable only for mention in philosophical books.

You ought to be aware that the real purpose of the Law is to impart the knowledge of truth and of right action.

If any of these interpretations are disclosed to those not fit to receive them—especially philosophical interpretations—these being far higher than common knowledge, they may led to infidelity. For he wishes to nullify the exoteric meaning and to prove his interpretation. But if the exoteric meaning is shown to be false without the interpretation being established, he falls into infidelity, if this concerns the principles of the Law. So, the interpretations should not be disclosed to the common people.

They have thought that faith, even before knowing the methods common to all and to which the Law has made a call on all, is the only method of arriving at truth. Thus they have mistaken the real purpose of the Law-giver, and being themselves in the wrong they have led others astray.

We may go on in this way, finding all the obscure and intricate doubts, from which, not to speak of the common people, even clever men, learned in scholastic theology, in philosophy, cannot escape.

(continued from the previous page) So if the common people be burdened with a knowledge of these things, it would be an unbearable problem for them.

We of course do not deny that the control of physical desires is a condition for healthy thinking, as physical health is one of its conditions. For the control of desires is profitable in acquiring knowledge by itself, if it be made a condition for it, just as health is a condition for education, though it is not very useful for it. That is why our Law has invited all of us to this method and has insisted upon it, that is, for work, not that it is sufficient in itself, as these people think, but that it is useful for thinking as we have already described.

The people may be divided into three classes. In the first place there are people who cannot notice any doubt arising out of them, especially in things which the Law has left to be taken exoterically. These people are the greatest in number, and may be described as the masses. Then the second group of men is one which has doubts; but has not power to solve them. These are above the masses and below the learned people. It is for them that they are found in the Law allegorical sayings, and it is they whom God has censured. For there is no allegory in the Law for the learned or the common people, and it is in this light that all the allegorical sayings of the Quran should be understood.

The Divine Book is a miracle of clearness and lucidity. So it is far from the real purpose of the Law for one to say about a thing which is not parabolical, that it is so, and then set about interpreting it according to his own ideas, telling the people that their duty lies in believing his interpretations.

The primary purpose of knowledge for the common people is action, so that which is most useful in action, so that which is most useful in action is most suitable for them. But for the learned men, the purpose of knowledge is both knowledge and action.

The law should be taken literally; and the conformity of religion to philosophy should not be told to the common people. For by an exposition of it we should be exposing the results of philosophy to them, without their having intelligence enough to understand them. It is neither permitted nor desirable to expose anything of the result of philosophy to a man who has no arguments to advance, for there are no arguments to advance, for there are no arguments either with the learned people who have a mastery over both the subjects, or with the common people who follow the exoteric of the Law. So his action brought disorder in respect to both of these things, religion and philosophy, in the mind of the common people, while he saved them for the others.

The right thing would have been not to disclose philosophy to the common people at all. But if teaching of it was absolutely necessary, then only that section of the people should have been taught who saw that religion was opposed to philosophy, in order to show them that it was not so. And also it might have been taught to those people who thought that philosophy is opposed to religion.

The cause of such a perplexing situation in the Law, which has compelled its votaries to take refuge in such worthless arguments, as would bring a smile to the lips of anybody who has made the least effort to distinguish between different kinds of arguments, is the exposition of anthropomorphic qualities of God to the common people, a fact which has been prohibited by God and His Prophet. It is so because it is very difficult for a man to believe at the same time that there exists One without a body, who can be seen with our eyes. For the things which the senses comprehend are in the bodies or the bodies themselves. Hence the Mutakallimun have tried to prove that the Divine Vision will be an addition to our existing qualities at that moment. This also should not have been disclosed to the common people. For since their intellect cannot go beyond their imagination that which they cannot imagine is non-existent for them. To imagine a thing which has no body

(continued from the previous page) is not possible, and hence a belief in the existence of an object which they cannot imagine, is impossible for them. It was for this reason that the Law refused to disclose this secret to them, and described God, for their sake, in terms which they can imagine, ascribing to him the attributes of hearing, seeing, having a face, & c. &c. at the same time telling them that He is not like anything which can be imagined. Had the intention of the Law been to make clear to the masses the fact of His having no body, it would not have mentioned these things in detail. But as light was the highest of imaginable things, it was given to them as an illustration of God, for it is the best known of the things both to the senses and to the imagination.

It is necessary to bear in mind the limits which the Law has set about the instruction of every class of men, and not to mix them together. For in this manner the purpose of the Law is multiplied. Hence it is that the Prophet has said, "We, the prophets, have been commanded to adapt ourselves to the conditions of the people, and address them according to their intelligence." He who tries to instruct all the people in the matter of religion, in one and the same way, is like a man who wants to make them alike in actions too, which is quite against apparent laws and reason.

The case of religions is just the same as that of God. There are some foods which agree with all, or most of the people. Such is the case with religious also. So the dispensations before our own were meant for some particular peoples, ignoring all others, but our religion was meant for the whole of the human race.

Now divine revelations has informed us in all the religions that the soul will live, and all the argument of the learned people have established the same. The souls are freed from physical desires after death. If they be pure, their purity is doubled by this freedom from desires. If they be evil this separation increases their depravity, for they are troubled by the evil which they have already earned, and their regret increases about the opportunities which they lost before their separation from the body, for this purification is not possible without it. It is to this

(continued from the previous page) that following verse refers:- A soul would say, "Alas, for that have been negligent in my duties towards God: Verily I have been one of the scornors."

Man should follow that which he himself has thought out but anyhow it should not be the view which may deny the fundamental principle altogether. For this would be denying its existence. Such a belief leads to infidelity, on account of a distinct knowledge of this condition being given to man, both by religion and by human reason, which is all based upon the eternal nature of the soul. If it be said whether there is any argument or information in the Law about this eternal nature of the soul, we would say that it is found in the Quran itself God says, "God taketh unto himself the souls of men at the time of their death; and those which die not. He also taketh in their sleep. In this verse sleep and death have been placed upon the same level, on account of the change in its instrument, and in sleep on account of a change in itself. For had it not been so it would not have come to its former condition after awakening. By this means we know that this cession does not effect its essence, but was only attached to it on account of change in its instrument. So it does not follow that with a cessation of the work of the instrument, the Soul also ceases to exist. Death is only a cessation of work, so it is clear that its condition should be like that of sleep.

It is very difficult to understand that is an example, but when once understood, you can easily comprehend the thing illustrated. In the interpretation of this also, there is a consideration; about these people who know that if it an example, it illustrates such and such a thing; but they doubt whether it is an illustration at all. If they are not learned people, the best thing to do with them is not to make any interpretation, but only to prove the fallacy of the views which they hold about its being an illustration at all. It is also possible that an interpretation may make them still distant from the truth, on account of the nature of the illustration and the illustrated. For these two kinds of

(continued from the previous page) occasions if an interpretation is given, they give rise to strange beliefs, far from the law which when disclosed are denied by the common people. Such has been the case with the Sufis, and those learned man who have followed them. When this work of interpretation was done by people who could not distinguish between these occasions, and made no distinction between the people for whom the interpretation is to be made, there arose differences of opinion, at last forming into sects, which ended in accusing one another with unbelief. All this is pure ignorance of the purpose of the Law.

From what we have already said the amount of mischief done by interpretation must have become clear to you. We always try to acquire our purpose by knowing what should be interpreted, and what not, and when interpreted, how it should be done.

J. Kennedy: "BASILIDES' BUDDHIST GNOSTICISM IN ALEXANDRIA."@@

Two questions, the early contact of Buddhism with Christianity, and the origins and character of Gnosticism, have attracted much attention of late. Although these questions are independent of each other in the main, they happen to join hands in the case of the great Gnostic Basilides. I propose to show that the famous scheme of that arch-Gnostic was an attempt at fusing Buddhism with Christianity, and thus to throw some light upon the one question and the other.

Before the birth of our Lord any considerable importation of Indian ideas into the West was an unlikely thing. Firstly, Indians and Arabs kept up a lively exchange across the Indian Sea, but Indian merchants and sailors were not to be found beyond the shores of Arabia and the Persian Gulf; while the trade by land was chiefly in the hands of Bacterians, and the Bactarians were zealous Zoroastrians until converted to Buddhism by the Kushan kings in the first century A.D. In either case direct intercourse with Alexandria and the Roman Empire was practically nil. Secondly, the agents who might be supposed to carry Buddhism to the West were few. We have none of

@@ The Journal of Royal Asiatic Society. 1902.

(continued from the previous page) the soldiers, the officials, the women and slaves who spread the rites of Isis and Mithras, and for that matter Christianity itself, throughout the Empire. Hindoo merchants and sailors alone visited the West, and of these the merchants only were Buddhist. Thirdly, down to the battle of Actium India received much of its civilization and its impulse from the West, from Persia first and foremost, and in a lesser degree from the Bactrian Greeks. It was the long peace with the Parthians inaugurated by Augustus, and the destruction of Aden and of the Arab monopoly of the Indian trade, in the time of Tiberius or Claudius, which first opened up those direct communications between India and the Empire that lasted with such brilliancy for two centuries. Therefore, although it would be unsafe to deny the possibility of an earlier contact between Buddhism and Christianity, the probability of it is exceedingly small. We must look to the two centuries succeeding Tiberius for the earliest fruitful contact between the two religions, and it precisely to this era that Basilides belongs.

If Buddhism was to influence Christianity, Gnosticism might be supposed to furnish the most likely channel. Gnosticism was anterior to Christianity, and was open to Indian influence.

In this fluid mass of primitive Gnosticism it is possible to find many Indian analogies. We have similar theories of emanation, the same threefold division of souls, the same belief in transmigration, and an almost identical scale of ascent for the soul after death.

Basilides is usually held to have been "steeped in Greek philosophy," although a few, on the strength of the "*Acta Archelai*," have claimed a Zoroastrian origin for him. It is the purpose of the present essay to prove that the system of this supposed coryphaeus of the Greek philosophy was Buddhist pure and simple—Buddhist in its governing ideas, its psychology, its metaphysics; and Christianity reduced to a semi-Buddhist ideal for the result. The moment we apply this key every fragment takes its place, the

(continued from the previous page) system is complete, and we can reconstruct the whole.

Let me state at the outset what I consider it is that I have to prove. I assert, then, and shall try to show, that Basilides had opportunities of becoming acquainted with Buddhism; next, that pessimism and transmigration, the two basal doctrines of his philosophy, are held by him in specifically Indian forms, which cannot have been derived from any other quarter; and lastly, that the system is developed on Christian-Buddhist lines with many Buddhist coincidences, great and small. And the correctness of this view is proved by the fact that the master key of Buddhism effects what no other key has done; it resolves difficulties, reconciles conflicting opinions, assigns each fragment to its proper place, and gives us a complete, symmetric, and intelligible whole, a revivification and restoration of one of the greatest of Gnostic philosophies.

Basilides flourished at Alexandria under Hadrian (117-138 A.D.), and is said to have been the disciple of Glaucias—the "interpreter of S. Peter." Clement affects to doubt the tradition, but apparently only from a general suspicion of such claims. There are no chronological difficulties, the tradition was accepted by the Basilidians in Clement's time, and as they professed to base their doctrines on the secret teachings of S. Matthew and not of S. Peter, they had no reason to invent a fable. He belonged therefore to the second generation after the Apostles, and to the great age of the Gnostics (Clem. Strom., vii, 17.106, p.325). Possibly he was somewhat senior to his contemporary, Valentinus, and his death occurred before or soon after the accession of the elder Antonine. His great work, the "Exegetica," in twenty-four books, is said to have been "a commentary on the Gospel"; and Origen says that he composed odes—probably like those of the Gnostic Valentinus and of Bardaisan. The doctrines of Basilides were to be found not only in his own "Exegetica," but in the numerous writings of his son and chief disciple, Isidore.

(continued from the previous page) And when we have said this, we have said all that is known with certainty regarding him.

Basilides named his son Isidore after the great tutelary goddess of Alexandria, we are probably correct in considering him a Hellenized Egyptian. Basilides had a perfect command of the ordinary Alexandrian Greek and wrote it with vigour, but his predilections, if not his training, were mainly Oriental. Eusebius and Theodoret tell us, on the authority of Agrippa Castor, that Basilides had a special regard for the prophecies of Barcabbas and Barcoph and other barbarous apocryphal writers. His son Isidore wrote a commentary on the Prophet Parchor, and quotes the prophecies of Ham, and although Isidore knew something of Aristotle, he studied by preference the poems of Pherecydes, the singer of the wars of the Titans and the teacher of Oriental metempsychosis to the Greeks (Clem.Strom.vi, 6.53, p.272). It is clear that father and son took their stand on the wisdom of the East, and that the sources of their knowledge were unfamiliar to the Christian writers and historians.

Isidore must have been born when his father was a comparatively young man, and probably before Basilides joined the Christian Church.

Being above all the great emporium of the trade with the East, Alexandria was the chief resort of Oriental merchants, and Dio Chrysostom, in an oration which he delivered to the Alexandrians, in the reign of Trajan, when Basilides was a youth, gives us the following enumeration of them: "I see among you not only Hellenes and Italians, and men who are your neighbours, Syrians, Libyans, and Cilicians, and men who dwell more remotely, Ethiopians and Arabs, but also Bactrians, Scythians, Persians, and some of the Indians, who are among the spectators, and always residing here. This colony of resident Indians must have been a colony of merchants from the west coast of India—probably from Ceylon or Barygaza, the chief depots of the Alexandrian trade. Colonies of this sort have been dotted along the shores of the Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf from the earliest

(continued from the previous page) days of intercourse with India, and we have literary evidence of the existence of similar colonies in Socotra and Armenia in the first and second centuries A.D. We can therefore form a fair estimate of the character of this Alexandrian colony. Now Indian merchants, as a rule, have always been Buddhists or Jains. Buddhism was a merchant religion par excellence; there are few parables or birth-stories in which a Buddhist merchant does not figure, and Ceylon and Barygaza were head-centres of the Buddhist faith. If we find that Basilides was a Buddhist philosopher it is easy to discover the sources from which he learned his philosophy.

It must also be borne in mind that Basilides was a sincere Christian, utterly ignoring Buddha and all Indian mythology. If we forget this, we shall utterly misunderstand him. He adopts the Buddhist philosophy, but not the Buddhist religion; the Buddhist faith is nothing to him. And it is as a metaphysic, not as a religion, that Buddhism first penetrated to the West.

The Basilidian system is based upon certain fundamental conceptions of the nature of sin, of suffering, and rebirth.

The universality of suffering is for Basilides the cardinal fact of the world. "Pain and Fear are inherent in human affairs as rust in iron." Buddha laid the same foundation—"Birth is suffering, old age is suffering, sickness is suffering, death is suffering, to be united with the unloved is suffering, to be separated from the loved is suffering, not to obtain what one desires is suffering. In brief, the conditions of individuality and their cause, the clinging to material form, sensations, abstract ideas, mental tendencies, and mental powers involve suffering." The universality of suffering is the fundamental fact, the extinction of suffering the goal, of the Basilidian theology.

But Basilides' pessimism takes a distinctively Christian cast. If suffering accompanies all action, it is especially the concomitant of sin. This theory

(continued from the previous page) lies at the bottom of Basilides' famous paradox—"the Martyrs suffer for their sins"—a paradox which shocked the conscience of the Church, and was utterly perverted by Basilides' followers. Basilides thought no sorn of martyrdom; it had its consolations and was a good. But still the martyrs suffered for their sins, although they might be unconscious of them, or like the new-born babe might be innocent of actual transgressions. But why must the infant suffer? Why must the martyr have committed sin? Because, so Basilides says, suffering is the consequence and the proof of sin, if not of actual sin committed in this life, yet of an inherited tendency to sin; otherwise we accuse the Divine Constitution of the world. "And I will admit anything," he cries "rather than admit that the Divine Constitution of the world is evil", (Strom.iv, 12.84, p.217).

And this leads us to the keystone of the Basilidian as of the Buddhist system—the fatal law of transmigration which governs all things in heaven and earth. Every act produces fruit, so every life bears the burden of its fruitage in the following rebirth. "Basilides lays down that the soul has previously sinned in another life, and endures its punishment here, the elect with honour by martyrdom, and the rest purified by appropriate punishment."

Origen says that Basilides interpreted Romans vii, 9 as an apostolic reference to transmigration, and he complains in his Commentary on S. Matthew iii that Basilides "deprived men of a salutary fear by teaching that transmigrations are the only punishments after death." The Basilidians interpreted the phrase "unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me" of this series of rebirths.

The Basilidian soul is not a simple, but a compound composed of various entities. These warring entities influence the actions of the man; and as some of them have the character of animals and others of plants (Clem. Strom., ii, 20.112, p.176) they explain how rebirth in another than a human

(continued from the previous page) form is philosophically conceivable.

Man is enthralled in the fatal bondage of rebirth, but during the present life his will is free. This is stated in the clearest manner. "If I persuade anyone that the soul is not a single entity, and that the sufferings of bad men are occasioned by the violence of the 'appendages' (a technical word of which more hereafter), then the wicked will have no small excuse to say I was compelled, carried away, involuntarily acted, nor did I will my deed, although the man was led by his lust for evil, and did not struggle against the compulsion of the 'appendages.' It behoves us to rise superior by virtue of our rationality, and to appear triumphant over the baser creature within us". (Clem.Strom, ii, 20.113,114, p.176). And again, "Only let a man will to achieve the good, and he will obtain it" (Clem. Strom., iii, 1.2, p.183). Man's will is free to act, but the consequence of his action is inevitable: that is the sum and substance of the doctrine.

With the freedom of the will comes the possibility of salvation.

The Buddha had a practical end in view; he wished to discover and to preach the mode of liberation. For Basilides the way of salvation had been found in Christianity, and his purpose is purely philosophical. The burden of existence weighs upon him; how shall he harmonize the constitution of the world and the universality of suffering, how "justify the ways of God to men."

In the popular belief each successive transmigration is occasioned by, but is not the result of, the previous life. The Indian philosophers introduced the law of causality; causes are equalled by their effects; and each rebirth is the exact resultant of the preceding life. Transmigration is for them the reign of causal law in the spiritual world; it has the rigour, the universality, the invariability of Fate; it is the self-made destiny which overshadows man from the cradle to the grave: and it is this law which enabled Buddha, and Balsides after him, to

(continued from the previous page) explain the origin of evil, and the method of salvation.

The Buddhist doctrine of personality has mightily puzzled modern scholars, and the Basilidian theory of the soul was equally puzzling to Clement. He compares it to the Trojan horse which was full of warriors, and a little further on he says that the Basilidians, like the Pythagoreans, believed in two souls (Strom., ii, 20.113, 114, p.176). Three passages contain all that we know of Basilides' psychology. The first consists of Clement's summary. The Basilidians "are accustomed," Clement says, "to call the passions Appendages, stating that these are certain spirits which have a substantial existence, having been 'appended' to the rational soul in a certain primitive turmoil and confusion, and that again other bastard and alien natures of spirits grow upon these, as a wolf, an ape, a lion, a goat, whose characteristics (say they) create illusions in the region of the soul, and assimilate the desires of the soul to the animals; for they imitate the actions of those whose characteristics they wear, and not only are they familiar with the impulses and impressions of the irrational animals, but they even ape the movements and beauties of plants, because they likewise wear the characteristics of plants appended to them. Moreover (these Appendages) have properties of a particular state like the hardness of a diamond." (Strom., ii, 20.112, 113, p.176.) According to Clement then, there is a rational soul. There are also certain appendages adhering to it. These parasitic appendages are the various affections which have a substantial unity of their own. They are intermixed with the rational soul by a primeval confusion, intermixed, be it noted, and not intermingled, since the whole process of evolution is to disentangle them. These entities, as well as the rational soul, remain always separate and distinct.

The soul is not a simple entity, that it suffers from the violence of the parasitic appendages, and

(continued from the previous page) that it can rise superior to them by virtue of its rationality.

The resemblance of this conception to the Buddhist theory of the Skandhas is remarkable. Man is a compound, say the Buddhist, of five Skandhas—or 'aggregates' as Professor Rhys Davids translates the word. The highest is reason, the lowest the material body. The other three, in an ascending scale, are the Sensations, Abstract Ideas, and Potential Tendencies. So far as one can judge, the Basilidian analysis of man is identical with the Buddhist.

Whether Basilides postulates a soul or not, he certainly postulates a God. But his God is the most abstract, the most remote that ever was imagined. Like Philo and the Alexandrian Jews, the Gnostics, and the later Kabbalists, he declares the Absolute God to be unknowable and unutterable, unpredictable, inconceivable. But no one has equalled Basilides in the energy of his expression. He strains negations to the utmost. 'Not-being God' is Basilides' name for Him. He will not use the article, although Hippolytus does so. To assert that God exists is to affirm a predicate, and He who is unknowable is above all predicates. But there is an earlier stage than 'not-being God.' "Was when was nothing, nor was that nothing any kind of entity, but in plain, unreserved, unequivocal language, there was altogether nothing. And when I say 'was,' I do not assert that 'there was,' but I merely indicate my meaning when I affirm that there was another nothing." Absolute existence is absolute nothing, said Basilides, anticipating Hegel.

From nothing one passes to the germ of something. Beside 'not-being God' there exists the world conceived as a seed-mass, posterior to Him in thought, but co-eternal with Him in reality. This seed-mass is conceived both as an individual seeds, the world of actuality, precisely as Prakriti bears the same doubles signification in the Sankhya philosophy. The relation of not-being God to the cosmic germ is described as follows:-
"When there was nothing

(continued from the previous page) neither matter, nor incomprehensible nor imperceptible, nor man, nor angel, nor a God, nor anything that has a name, or can be perceived by sense, or conceived by mind, or what is of more subtle still, when every (predicate) has been removed, not-being God without or act of mind or sense, without plan, without purpose, without affection, without desire, willed to make the world. And when I say willed, I mean (an act) involuntary, irrational, insensible; and by the 'world' I mean, not the world of length and breath (the world of space), and which existed subsequently, and has a separate existence, but the germ of a world. And the seed of the world held all things in itself, just as a grain of mustard-seed contains within the smallest body all things at once (in embryo), the roots, the trunk, the branches, and the leaves, the numberless seeds of other plants born of that one plant, each seed in its turn the parent of innumerable other seeds, a process many times repeated. Thus not-being God made a not-being world out of things that are not, casting down and depositing a certain single seed containing in itself the whole germ of the universe. This cosmic seed, this not-being world, is purely ideal, like not-being God; it is beyond all predicate; "the not-being of the world which had been deposited by not-being God" (Haer., vii, c.9).

From the transcendent cosmic seed we pass to the individual seeds which in their aggregate form the actual world. "The non-existent seed of the world constitutes at the same time the germ of a multitude of forms and a multitude of substances" (Haer., vii, c. 9). "It had all seeds treasured up and reposing in itself just as not-being entities and designed to come into being by 'not-being God' " (Haer., vii.c.10). But how existence evolves itself from non-existence Basilides cannot say. "Whatsoever I affirm to have been made after these, ask no question as to whence" (Haer., vii, c.10). The Buddhists also asserted that from the non-existent the existent is evolved.

The actual world, then according to Basilides,

J. Kennedy: "BASILIDES' BUDDHIST GNOSTICISM IN ALEXANDRIA."

(continued from the previous page) is preceded by an ideal world deposited by an ideal God. But this is evidently a mere accommodation to the infirmity of human thought. We shall see hereafter that the world of actuality has no end. We may conclude that it had no beginning, and that creation is a mere fiction of the mind. But neither Basilides nor the Buddha definitely say so.

The Father is inconceivable, and above all created things or human predicates. The Sonship, on the contrary, is deposited in the cosmic germ, but being consubstantial with the Father, cannot stay there; it must be restored to communion with Him, and its evolution is the history of the world-process (Haer., vii, c.10). But this Sonship is not single; it is a collective germ, containing the seeds of many Sons within itself.

Had the Gnostics prevailed Christianity would have been at an end; happily it was the Church of the simple that triumphed. And yet, perhaps, something has been lost with the disappearance of the traces of the struggle. Some great truths held alike by Orthodox and Gnostics were allowed to fall into the background. The Church resolutely set its face against all inquiries into the origin of evil. But whenever Christian poets and divines have dared to overleap the limits of our ignorance they have always begun with that first supposition of the Gnostics – the pre-existence of the soul.

"THE RICE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION."@@

America as usual is experimenting. A brilliant professor called Rice with a band of teachers has started a college in the Black Mountains, and the reading of their achievements is most fascinating.

Briefly this college does not believe that education means cramming and stuffing knowledge, they believe that their job is to bring young people to intellectual and emotional maturity—that is a subtle balance between the intellect and the emotions. Rice maintains that the very phrase "to get an education" shows the mentality behind. One can't "get" education: one can only experience it. He continues, "One "gets"

@@ Mysindia 1943.

(continued from the previous page) only information or facts, and the facts acquired have to do with the past and are worthless to one destined to live in the future. Besides, many of the facts taught in history, economics, psychology etc. are no longer facts but only guesswork or wishful thinking. There are stubborn facts in the early stages of the physical sciences, mathematics and biology, which must be learned. But once these stages are passed, one is in the realm of the imagination. I am opposed to head-stuffing, in philosophy, art, music and dramatics, for these subjects are the best training ground for the imagination, the chief distinction of man. It is only through imagination that education can reach and develop the whole human being."

Rice wants education to be so transformed that schools will turn out artists, not necessarily professional painters or sculptors, but people who will have the artistic approach to live as a whole and to everything in life, whose values will be qualitative and not quantitative; Who will be modern, and as such distinguished not by what they will know but by what they will do with what they know. The central effort in Black Mountain College is to teach method and not content, to emphasize process and not results to make the student realize that the way of handling facts and himself amidst the facts is more important than the facts themselves. Logic as severe as can be learned is the central pivot in their curriculum. Dialectic is also important, and no feelings are to be spared, for you can't be nice where truth is concerned.

In this college they take it for granted that both the world and the individual who is being prepared for it are changing, moving, and dynamic, and this challenging method is different from the other institutions of Rip van Winkles. Differing from Adler who thinks that everyone is obsessed with the thought of how to be superior to others, Rice maintains that people are striving to fit in with their own unique jobs, that a man is supremely happy when he has found his job. Isn't this Carlyle's growl,

(continued from the previous page) to cease knowing thyself, but know your work? And by rigorous psychological tests the student in this college finds out that instead of becoming a philosopher, he'd be happier as a plumber.

Another tenet in this college is that every man constructs a mask to present to the outer world: meanwhile the real self within writhes, knowing the mask to be a lie, and it is the task of this college to befriend the real self and ruthlessly to scotch the mask. Another important central feature is the Werklehre classes which are compulsory, that is work with material and forms. Possibly very few will become painters, but all will have a sense of form and order, an appreciation of the essences of life which are buried by facts.

This is veritably a college of phoenixes, where the students are taught to burn up with self-contempt, a scotching of unwanted traits, so that out of the ashes a new self is born.

Swami Siddheswaranda: "PARIS LECTURES"@@

The dominant characteristic of Bhagvadgita is that it offers a remarkable example of synthetic construction.

Buddhism, as it was presented, was but a means of approaching the Divine in a particular way, that of reason (Jnana Yoga); and if we hold to reason alone, we have the right not to accept a personal God. We have to throw overboard all theistic conceptions.

Buddhist Philosophy is very difficult to understand. It necessitates a subtlety of mind which ordinary men do not have. It cannot attract any but the elite.

The Theosophical Society, which also played an important role in India, has to be mentioned in this connection. Thanks to that Society, Europe took interest in Hindu civilization and in the study of Sanskrit Texts. Of course they emphasized the study of the Puranas (Mythological Treatises) and left in the shade pure philosophy:

@@ Vedanta Kesari. 1940. (Trans. from my French edn)

The Bhagavadgita has for its fundamental basis this same synthetic attitude. This poem is in itself a synthetic work. It brings to us numerous means of approaching mystic philosophy. Sri Krishna was the apostle of synthesis of different systems.

We may remark here that there exists a great difference between Hindu philosophy and the Aristotelian philosophy which has inspired all the European culture of the Middle Ages and has also given birth to philosophic Christianity. This latter proceeds in effect in a categorical fashion. In the presence of a dilemma, it does not know anything but a plain 'yes' or 'no'. Hindu Philosophy admits that the 'yes' or 'no' answer to two different aspects of one and the same reality. For Hindu philosophy there does not exist any absolute contradiction in Maya. On whatever subject it works, we search for a ground of agreement, to conciliate contrary views. We have to establish a synthesis.

When we take up this attitude there is no place for any quarrel or fight. We open ourselves naturally to a great toleration. We respect the belief and the concepts of our neighbours.

Humanity has need of 'lived ideals' rather than ideologies. Human aspirations require the proper orientation that assembles on a social plane the achievements of thought and action. The conquest of matter by mind, mind by Super mind, has been the record of all progress in all ages and climes. If up till now that achievement has been the privilege of a few evolved souls, it is only an augury what the future of humanity has in store 'for the good of all, for the happiness of all' as the great Buddha once pronounced. It is in the nature of manifestation to give expression to variegated values, and as such we cannot hope to have a standardized society where everyone will have the same height and level in consciousness. For in the degree the human is evolving into the divine, Nature throws out from the subhuman types. To expect the millennium where every unit in creation would have attained the full level of evolution is the very antipodes of the law of manifestation.

The Real includes all aspects of analysis and synthesis; and that synoptic whole is the content where religion and philosophy are welded into realizable Ideal. The manifested, the Jagat, we call Maya; but that word is the most misunderstood amongst all the Vedantic terms. Taken out of its proper setting it is always labelled as illusion, and the philosophy of Illusionism does not leave any scope for human endeavour; And it is immediately baptised by Occidental scholars and thinkers as more pessimistic than pessimism itself. Maya is the relative aspect of that Advaitic Reality. Relativity is ignorance, is Avidya, only in so far as it makes us forget the Unique which is its other aspect, the Absolute. That higher viewpoint is so forcibly expressed by Sri Shankaracharya: "Because everything springs from the Self, is dissolved in It, and remains imbued with It during continuance, for it cannot be perceived apart from the Self. Therefore everything is the Self." (Brihadaranyaka Upanishad. page 358, Mayavati Edition). Sri Krishna expresses the same thing in the religious language when he says 'Vasudevah Sarvamiti sa mahatma sudurlabhah—It is hard to find the realised soul who sees the Lord everywhere'. But now can one know this basis in Self, of the Sarvam, the All, the manifested manifold, the Maya, if one has not experienced consciously that other aspect which is the static,—the Contentless Consciousness of the Absolute, in Nirvikalpa Smadhi. That aspect of Reality as static is not the negation of consciousness. In fact it is the summation of all relative consciousness. We are so habituated to live on the dynamic plane—in the flux,—that we do not take into account that fundamental basis in pure Consciousness wherefrom proceeds experiences based on subject-object relationship, expressed normally in our daily experience as 'diminution of consciousness', or 'enlargement of consciousness', An unconscious diminution as in deep sleep, coma, or death is not the value one gives to that basis Consciousness, the Prana, the Chinmaya, which one realizes only in the Nirvikalpa Samadhi. In that state of Samadhi

(continued from the previous page) one does not attain any diminution of consciousness, though there is resemblance to it, as the opposites in nature have a tendency to appear alike. So for want of proper term we call it the Fourth state, or the Ruriya, reached only in Samadhi of the Nirvikalpa variety, Samadhi where there is absolute absence of mentation. There, in that state, one touches the fund and centre of a tornado which is always a silent centre from where all the whirly and wheeling forces proceed. In fact it is the Great Silence that intervenes between two ideas, between two Bhavas. The primary Bhava in every experience is the Ahambhava, that of egoism. And in the Savikalpa experience this Ahambhava, unites itself with the Ishtabhava—the Consciousness of the Ideal—and in that Union there is virtual ecstasy, the supreme culmination of the Dwaita and Visishadwaita realizations. To reach Adwaita one must go a step further; even the state of experience has to be transcended. Pure knowledge transcends experience where one has to posit the experiencer and the experienced and the instrument to experience. When even the pure ego is absorbed in that subject-objectless consciousness, one gets Jnana of that aspect of Reality which is in Contentless Consciousness. In our state of ignorance even when we are unconscious of it, it is the Presence of That that makes knowledge in the relative field possible, and realizing which alone one can understand the passage from Sri Shankara I have just quoted. Ramakrishna realized that state under the inspiration and direction of Totapuri. And the great experience by which he could unite himself with the world at large and remain as proper guide to it came with his experience of Bhavamukha.

After the experience of the Nirvikalpa Samadhi Ramakrishna realized the integral reality and placed his other experience before the world—the realization of Bhavamukha. That word literally means 'at the threshold of Bhava', i.e., that state which gave him the Absolute and the Manifested in one organic vision. Here the distance between metaphysics and psychology

(continued from the previous page) gets closed. In the experience of Nirvikalpa the human psyche does not function; for, the Knower, the Knowledge and the Known, all get welded into a non-multiple unity. In the Bhava of the supreme religious experience, one is at-one-ment with Cosmic Consciousness. It is the very apotheosis of the maximum of enlargement of consciousness according to psychological achievement.' But how can these two opposite experience meet and join hands. The answer to that riddle one finds in the unique experience of Bhavamukha which has hardly any or no parallel in the history of mysticism. That is the state known as Dwaita-adwaita-vivarjitam, the state beyond Dwaita and Adwaita as conceptual approaches to Reality. It is this realization that made Ramakrishna the Guru of his own Guru, Totapuri. Totapuri knew only the static aspect of Reality and considered every manifestation as unreal. But the manifestation from the basic consciousness springs as the Shakti or energy of Brahman.

From the standpoint of synoptic vision there is one Reality and we cannot posit anything about it in terms of human thought. As Sankare says, the function of all Upanishadic texts is to tell us that any possible specification of Brahman will land us in error. From our first approach we say that the flux is unreal; for we are caught up, in it and as non-contradiction is considered in our philosophy to be the test of truth, the fleeting modes cannot be considered as true. But when one rises to the Turiya and views all from the Self, there is nothing to be contradicts; for everywhere one realizes the same homogeneous mass of Reality. And it is this which is indicated by the Bhavamukha experience of the Master.

Let me close this homage to the Master by quoting his saying that when we weigh a fruit we should take into account not only the seed but the pulp and the rind – the fruit in all its entirety. We have always the habit of taking only a truncated view of life. For our ego accompanies our intellectual pursuits and vitiates our understanding through the prejudices common to all. If in our philosophic discipline

(continued from the previous page) we can be relieved of our prejudices of the intellect, and if in our religious discipline we can be freed from the prejudices of emotion, the world will be a much happier ground for us all to live in.

But life cannot remain static. It is not immobile. And the human spirit cannot accept all these laws under circumstances which have changed. The laws of Manu which were just in his time and continue to be the framework of our organization are to be modified to suit modern conditions. These laws are not bad in themselves. It is the application which is defective. The laws of Manu inspire the decisions of Hindu tribunals. If the situation of women in India is not what it should be, it is not our religion which is to be blamed. At a certain epoch the legislator had reduced the laws to suit a particular social state. They are not related to the present needs and so there must be corrections and modifications. The spiritual should work on the social plane also.

The Divine Benediction can descend on earth not only under the forms of a great personality like Buddha, Krishna, or Kali, It can manifest itself also as a great idea like that which was produced at the time of the French Revolution, when people were enthusiastic for Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. At the end of the great unrest of the 18th Century, humanity discovered a great Idea.

When this idea is associated with a great personality, it acquires more force. The principal idea which inspired the French Revolution was a great spiritual idea; but the men who were in power were not sufficiently spiritual. The deformed and travestied it. They had not an internal life sufficiently pure. They had not the necessary Sadhna.

In India, the spiritual idea has always been associated with an eminent spiritual personality who has given to it an adequate social and political form. In Europe, the great Idea is often manifested without the support of a great personality.

When we regularly practise meditation we awaken the internal life. We get at that moment an internal

(continued from the previous page) peace; but meditation alone does not suffice. The religious effort should be extended further. Otherwise, we would incur the risk of limiting ourselves, of forgetting the duties of our external life. The internal life is nothing but one of the two aspects of Life. The Totality is composed of these two aspects, the internal life as well as the external life. In practising Yoga properly, we should organize our internal life so as to comprehend the relation which exists between the individual self and the Totality. The true peace, the true understanding will not come to us until that relation is established. Yoga should not be regarded as an evasion, a means of escape. In working thus, we conform ourselves to the vigorous teaching of the Gita.

If we take the term Yoga in a narrow sense, we cannot comprehend both the phases of Reality and we have to throw overboard the personality, and be out of harmony with the life normal. We shall then be incapable of fulfilling the duties of our everyday life and we shall have no harmony with our surroundings. So long as there exists a lack of harmony with our environments we miss our goal. It is indispensable above all that this harmony should be established.

At the commencement of the spiritual life, we feel very strongly the dangers of the external life. It is then necessary to open ourselves to internal purification until we understand the position of the individual self in relation to the Totality. The aspirant (Sadhaka) may break some links with the external life so as to rest in himself and to analyse himself. But he should take care that this new orientation does not make him abnormal.

The Bhagavadgita begins when Arjuna is about to engage himself in a conflict. Conflict is indeed the sine qua non of spiritual life. Dharma is the substratum of our life.

Religious life itself is very often but the manner in which we conform our life to these conventions. True spiritual life, on the other hand, does not begin

(continued from the previous page) until conflict emerges. Only in conflict do we get that attitude which the practice of spirituality demands.

If we do not fight with our surroundings, no progress is possible. If the inferior animals had not reacted to surroundings, they would have remained in the same stage of evolution. They would never have raised themselves in the scale of beings. The fight begins in each individual for new power. The reactions produce the adaptation to circumstances, and the function creates the organ under the pressure of need. When we reach the human plane, we find that each being possesses two distinct series of anterior memories. These are two entirely different heritages. The one is biological and the other divine. The divine heritage demands that we should seek for the destruction of the ego. The biological heritage demands that we should preserve that ego. To fight, to suppress (or rather to modify) the elan of the inferior life, is our real Dharma, and this fight has an eminently spiritual character.

Dharma has many aspects. One is social, another mental, and the third spiritual. The complete spiritual life demands the synthesis of these three aspects. And this synthesis constitutes Dharma.

Spiritual life does not mean mere meditation, philanthropy, or the observance of ceremonials. It consists in so ordering all the multiple functions of our life as to direct them all towards the same goal, namely, Liberation.

We should have synoptic conception of things, and keep in mind Liberation as the ultimate end. Liberation (Mukti) is not annihilation of the ego. Rather, it is a comprehension of Total life. For the generality of mankind, the ego does not mean totality. Each being has got only its own particular perspective, but Liberation cannot come unless one perceives the totality. To achieve this Liberation, there are two methods. The first consists in satisfying in a legitimate manner the demands of the external life, to respond to the needs of the senses not losing our self-control, the while. This is what is called

(continued from the previous page) 'Pravritti Marga'. Here the tension of the ego is gradually relaxed.

The second consists in following the call of the inner life.

It is not necessary that an aspirant should renounce completely and all at once the external life. This may give him too rude a shock. Moreover, if we appear under some external pressure, under a particular spiritual influence, to have succeeded in rooting out the least trace of desire, the ego may still subsist in hibernation. One day it may wake up again and demand satisfaction. It is not wise to strain our natural faculties.

Vedanta admits that it is not possible to renounce our desires all at once. We cannot simply resolve desires out of existence. That is why the Vedanta declares that we should give a legitimate place to our desires so that by gradually restraining them we may acquire the power to go beyond the state of desire. The Vedanta, in fact, prescribes that we should satisfy our just desires. It acknowledges their legitimacy.

The instinct directs all our attention towards the ego. It tends to goad us on to the ego. Instinct is a biological heritage, a result of our animal descent. Instinct works to assure our protection. If there were no instinct, animal life would have ceased to exist long ago, because the organisms would have been deprived of all means of defence. Instinct then works for the preservation of the individual. It functions so that the ego may survive. All action from outside is in reality a menace to or an attack on the ego. Each organism is protected against external assaults that tend to destroy the ego. The ever vigilant ego rises to meet the challenge of external factors. The reflex thus created is an instinctive act having for its object the preservation of our existence and the continuance of the ego.

In order that we may clearly discriminate between the call of the instinct and that of the superior life, it is indispensable that we should engage ourselves in a conflict. Then only do we begin to

(continued from the previous page) regulate the course of our life. The conflict would create a tension between the instinct and the intelligence. We shall understand that our life has been misdirected up to now. We shall then be in a position to follow the teachings of the Bhagavadgita and give our existence a new orientation. Then the conflict will present itself under a different garb, and to get out of it we shall choose that method which answers our inner yearnings best.

The instinct should not doubt be controlled, because the superior life commences only when the instinct is bridled. But complete renunciation is not a possibility in the beginning.

As long as intelligence sleeps, we do not ask ourselves why we follow our impulses. But when intelligence wakes up, we begin to question ourselves: 'Why do we have desires at all? Why should we permit them to exercise their force on us?' We then begin to know the anatomy of our desires. When we sound the depths of our existence, we begin to ask about the why and how of it: we enter the moral life and the intellect begins to function. We wish to know the ultimate cause of all things—that thing which is the object of our search. We find then that all the desires which had free play in us, all the instincts whose calls we heard, have one cause.

He seeks outside what is within himself. When we get an intellectual comprehension of this, we see—thanks to the experience of the sages who have realised—that we also have arrived at the threshold of the spiritual life. This vision comes to us at times of crisis. It is in moments of conflict that spiritual life progresses.

By intellect we at last realize the truth. That truth is within ourselves. Owing to our biological heritage we have been led up to this time by your instincts. It is now that Sadhna (religious practice) enables us to tame little by little the instincts that have survived. Then we know that immortality is in us.

When the internal tension is relaxed by the fulfilment of our duty, thus understood, we naturally attain

(continued from the previous page) the spiritual life. When conflict presents itself, man asks to himself: What should I do? When he reckons the difficulties that confront him in the fulfilment of Dharma he is seized by fear and fright. He seeks to fly from the solution of the problem with which he is faced. To such a man this is the message:- You have a duty to fulfil. Fear troubles and paralyses you. You have the feeling that you are going to lose something. Be, on the contrary, assured that you lose nothing in fulfilling the duty which is demanded of you. The goal of our life is really the quest of immortality. We ought never to lose sight of the fact that all our acts, all our aspirations constitute a search—that the elan of our life tends towards the realization of the reality. Even the acts that realization of the reality. Even the act that satisfy our desires can be directed towards the ideal. But when a man loses sight of the ideal, then verily he is a boat without a rudder.

To reach the spiritual end, it is essential that we should arm ourselves with patience. The change of attitude can never be attained by a few week's efforts.

It is essentially a message of Hope; we are assured that each of can, keeping to his, own place, remaining in his own particular situation, spiritualise his or her life.

Renunciation is only the crowning point of the path of evolution. Scientific truths hold good in spiritual matters also. Nature does not march by leaps and bounds; that is why we have to pursue the investigation of the spiritual life on the external plane fulfilling our daily duties. This investigation is thus a part of religion.

If the spirit of renunciation is the result of reverses or failures in our life and we thus have a cert in bitterness towards life, our renunciation will be only formal. It will not last; our ego will remain dominant. It will be over filled with desires. That renunciation is then the result of an internal deception and it is not a truly spiritual attitude.

The proper attitude will be the outcome of an introspection. We may recall the example of the

(continued from the previous page) Muskdeer. We try in the beginning to localise our desires in the external. Experience reveals to us that the perfume of the musk is in us. St. Augustine has said on this subject: 'I have searched for you in the public places of the world city. I have missed you. I was searching outside, when you were really in me.'

In fact, our search is always going on without any intermission.

The great sages got this experience by the mystic way. Thanks to them, we are able to know that the same potentiality is in us. Human nature is based on this Reality. This is the true basis of 'Sat'.

When we attain this spiritual knowledge, we possess what is called in India 'Chit' (Absolute knowledge). This knowledge is indispensable if we wish to avoid once for all fear and death. To acquire this knowledge we have to exercise a rigorous control over our internal life; thus only can we concentrate our attention on the centre, the 'Sat.'

It is also this internal experience which reveals to us 'Ananda' the supreme Joy, the permanent happiness which lives above the dual throng.

To sum up, real nature is called in Sankrit Sacchidanda Existence, knowledge, and Bliss absolute.

If we consider the living beings below man, we can see that the turn tends towards the preservation of the individual. It is directed by instinct and knows no error. When we come to man, intelligence begins to manifest and conflict and error begin to play. Man has thus two privileges: (1) to fall in error and (2) to be discontented and restless. We must become 'Jivanmuktas' to preserve a balanced mind at all times. In all the inferior stages, there is an eternal conflict; that is the indispensable condition of a new ascent. Ego does not manifest in man except to enable him to rise to a higher plane.

He has the legitimate right to make unfortunate attempts, to pursue his personal experiences; in short he has the right to deceive himself. When, at last, he finds that truth is within him, he seeks to realize a new type of humanity,

The power to reproduce this superior type remains latent in humanity.

In the state, which is established after liberation, it is sometimes said that the ego dies. This is not the exact term which should be employed. The death of the ego is not really a suicide. Even after liberation, personality subsists. Look at the example of the Maharshi. Jesus, after having realized God, gave up his life for a great cause. Buddha, who had attained Nirvana, was destined to live for more than twenty-four years. Many great personalities have lived for a long time after their liberation so that they may show the efficacy of the spiritual life.

We think that when man finds himself surrounded by instinctive inferior forces, brutality, ferocity, hatred, etc., he can find the means to liberate himself if he has constantly before his eyes a great ideal. Take then the instance you prefer, whether it be that of Jesus, or of Buddha, or any other great sage. The ideal is no more a person. It helps us to free ourselves, from yielding to the influence of surroundings.

We have to work for this for this end. To lead a good life, it is indispensable that we rest constantly in a conscious state. Otherwise it is not possible to have even the least spiritual progress.

The ideal thus understood is not a prison. On the contrary it offers the only means to reach to the height of knowledge.

The great sages humanity has known have produced a new type of men and the power of reproducing anyone of these types is in us. If a superior man has realized the spiritual worth, that same value will be equally found in us. This archetype lives in our own being because we feel in us the hope of realization. Thus all the great masters of the past, Zoraster, Buddha, Jesus, etc., slumber in us and earnest practical meditation can enable us to bring out this internal power. If we seek outside us, our search will be in vain. We will find it nowhere except in the depths of our hearts.

We see then that we have in us two heritages: (1) the biological and (2) the divine. The example to be followed is within us and the conflict between these two opposing elements is ever going on. If there is no knowledge, then it is by ignorance that we do evil and ignorance is no sin. To sin in the proper sense of the word, there should be three factors: (1) the consciousness of ideal, (2) the knowledge that the act is a sin, and (3) the consent in spite of all these to the reprehensible act.

Error is a necessary stage. It is the point we have perforce to pass to reach a superior stage.

The Maharshi declares that in spite of a very high degree of consciousness, which he has attained, he has had no personal experience of God. When anyone puts him a question, he generally asks: Who has put this question? All other questions come only later. The basis of the Maharshi's teaching is the study of oneself. Each can, according to his own way, turn towards a spiritual life, and spiritual life is a question strictly personal. Dogmas, rites, beliefs and theology are but the diverse means which enable us to tangibly feel the spiritual life. They have no value except that of prompting the individual to begin the great pilgrimage; but he who has had realisation in this very life is verily God Himself.

Many religions (Christianity, Islam, and some aspects of Hinduism) hold that realization comes only death. They proclaim that this life is limited, that man must abandon and disdain all things on earth. It is only in Heaven that he will find the Truth.

I would be far from criticising this attitude, if it would enable the individual to turn his attention to lead a spiritual life here and now. Vedanta gives to spirituality a far wider definition; it admits that man can travel towards the Supreme Goal, while integrally fulfilling the duties which present themselves to him; it thus includes the Divine as an element in daily life.

If this attitude does not satisfy us, we can always appeal to the concept of God; but if, like the

(continued from the previous page) Buddhists, we reject this latter concept, we can, still lead a spiritual life. Our principal endeavour should be to reduce in ourselves the tension of the ego. The chrysalis disappears when the perfect insect, the butterfly, breaks out from its prison and comes out of its cocoon one day; when this moment comes, it can enjoy the fullest life; it can spread its wings to all the breezes. The butterfly has a rhythm totally different from that of the chrysalis.

According to the ideal of Jivanmukti it is in 'this house itself' (the body) that realization must take place. The result of our attempts must evidently pertain to the present.

If we go through the history of all the nations we can see that men have always left the management of their affairs in the hands of those whom personal interest governed; those were thus often led to take a cruel and anti-social attitude in order to protect their own interests or those of their community. In order that humanity may rise, it is indispensable that true society embracing the entire world shall be established and individual governments shall no longer follow the creed of separatist politics. The errors of history have not yet allowed such an orientation to humanity; the day when humanity shall feel the need of choosing as its representatives men of such quality, will veritably be a day of benediction.

Here we must remember that we have in us two quite different heritages; a spiritual and biological one. The biological heritage is entirely instinctive. Endeavours after unification attempted on this lower plane cannot succeed: the individual will not progress and man will always remain a wolf for man.

Since this physiological force has developed in us, it must become a new auxiliary; thanks to it, we can rise still higher and free ourselves from the prison of our ego. Every human being has in him the possibility of surmounting yet another step and passing from the human to the superhuman plane. This force which is latent in every being, we, in India, call

(continued from the previous page) Kundalini. In the last analysis, it is this stress, which according to the level of evolution reached by the individual, manifests itself at a different level. We have to sublimate this energy. One can compare the effort which will be involved to the drawing of the water flowing out of a hose. If the pressure is not sufficient, the water stops at a lower level. In order that the water shall mount up to the higher levels there must be no waste at the lower levels.

If we know how to direct our efforts properly, we will finish by realizing the ideal type which the Bhagavadgita presents to us. We shall no longer be affected by good or bad fortune. We shall have expelled from us envy, cupidity and all forms of desire; in one word we shall have freed ourselves from the grips of the external world. At last when our intelligence shall have been firmly established, we will never go astray. In truth, there is no partition between us and the Absolute. It will suffice if we make a first attempt to attain to this state of indifference towards the things of the external world. All disharmonies will vanish. This is the true role of intelligence.

So long as the Ego remains the master of our life, we will establish new gradations of value; we will set up new differentiations between men; we will lose the vision of oneness; we will distinguish castes and sub-castes; we will raise frontiers among men. This is how cruelty is born, and this cruelty is the first fruit of our ignorance. When intelligence dawns, all differentiations cease to be, all agitations vanish and the vision of Totality is attained.

I do not attempt to give popular lectures (they are often difficult) and I do not attempt to get up an audience; even as such the Indian way of philosophical approach is extremely difficult, and I feel I would have done a part of the dream Mr V.S. — had of me if I succeed in presenting Vedanta amongst the University minds and make Vedanta penetrate the intellectual milieu.

The experience of Turiya which alone can give

(continued from the previous page) Jnana is only consciously finding the silent that separates the ideas,—ideas working, according to Gaudapada, in single kala as thoughts and ideas and working in dvikala as matter. This way of analysing experiencing alone can explain time, space, causality in empirical life. All these have been dealt with impersonally. People are extremely interested, especially philosophical circles, about the implications of these positions, as Europe wants to know the development of pure philosophy in Vedanta, and not interpretations and commentaries of theological positions. The psychological and epistemological positions of Vedanta have great future in the West.

Editor: "Vedanta Kesari" (Madras)1942:

"A MAYAVADIC CRITICISM OF AUROBINDO'S METAPHYSICS".@@

The Life Divine, Vol.1. seeks to be a new presentation of the wisdom enshrined in the Vedanta. As such, a criticism of the older systems of Vedanta, especially of the Mayavada associated with the name of Sri Sankara, occupies an important place in the book. These criticisms, coming as they do from so highly creative a mind as that of Sri Aurobindo, are no doubt very illuminating, but they leave the relevancy of the Maya doctrine in the Vedanta practically untouched. The central problem of all systems of spiritual philosophy, especially of the monistic type, is to explain how the perfection of the Deity is not marred by an imperfect world, which springs from, and subsists in, Him. Whatever its other defects be, the Maya doctrine has the supreme merit of giving a satisfactory answer to this knotty problem. If the world is only an apparent manifestation of Brahman, very real, no doubt, at the level of individual consciousness, but only an appearance in reference, to the Brahmic consciousness, the intellect can possibly understand the statement that God is unaffected by the imperfections of the world. For a thing that is only an appearance can have an existence of a kind without affecting the integrity or the real nature of the sub-stratum, of which it is an appearance.

A unity of existence, achieved through the denial

(continued from the previous page) of absolute reality to multiplicity is not acceptable to the system advocated in this book. According to it, the Absolute, no doubt, transcends both the One and the Many, the Changeless and the Changeful. But so long as the Absolute cannot be conceived by the mind, it will be a partial and fallacious reading. It to ignore any of these two aspects in which the mind apprehends It. It is this fallacy that has found expression in one-sided doctrines like asceticism and materialism, the first denying the reality of the Many and the second of the One. Both these one-sided theories have had disastrous consequences on civilization that of the first being greater than that of the second in many respects. So Sri Aurobindo's system seeks to steer clear of these two, the Scylla and Charybdis of man's mental life, by insisting on the equal reality of both change and changelessness, of both the One and the Many.

While the inherent realism of our mode of thinking is thus satisfied, it is open to question whether this is not achieved by an unnecessary mystification of things. For the system of thought represented herein is monistic, asserting the unity of existence, and unless it be by sanctifying mystification, one's understanding gets simply puzzled as to how the ultimate Reality does not lose its identity in the real multiplicity into which it breaks. To help the mind in overcoming the difficulty, other categories like Truth, Consciousness, Supermind, Overmind, etc. are brought in as intermediary terms between Absolute and the relative. While they have much mystical value, they do not, unlike the clear analysis of the Mayavada, help in the least in comprehending how the One remains the One in the midst of change. For if these intermediary categories are different from Sacchidananda, Dualism is the inevitable consequence. But that, the system of Sri Aurobindo never claims to be. The only other alternative—and that is the one adopted in this book—is to assert that the Absolute remains unaffected in spite of real change in It, be it through intermediary terms. One wonders how this is an improvement

Editor: "Vedanta Kesari" (Madras) 1942: "A MAYAVADIC CRITICISM OF AUROBINDO'S METAPHYSICS"

(continued from the previous page) on Mayavada, as it is claimed to be, unless an intellectually absurd concept must necessarily be an improvement on an intellectually understandable one. For what this doctrine leaves as a mystery, fit to be established only the power of repetition and sanctification of contradiction, the Mayavada seeks to explain by telling us what 'change' means to the Absolute.

Incidentally it is also relevant to note here, that it is not quite correct to describe Sri Sankara's doctrine as Mayavada, as his critics often do. His doctrine is essentially Brahmanavada. The unity of Existence is its fundamental principle; the relative reality of the world (Jaganmithyatva) is only what follows from it. A proper appreciation of this would disarm much of the criticism directed against Sankara.

The system of thought advocated in the present work as also in the other writings of Sri Aurobindo is sometimes spoken of as a new development in Hindu philosophy. This is not, however, quite correct. For it is not, however, quite correct. For it is not much different from that well-known aspect of Hindu philosophy described generally as Bhedabheda or Identity-in-difference, and the type of monistic philosophy advocated by the cult of Shaktism. What is, however, new is the ethical implication drawn out of this doctrine, supplemented by certain extensions of the modern theory of evolution. For example, it is argued that if Matter is only a manifestation of the Spirit, there is no reason why the perfection of the Spirit should not express itself in an increasing measure in life at the physical level. This increasing expression is the meaning and implication of evolution. Evolution has not stopped with the coming of mind and the dawn of our present human consciousness. The next stage in it is the expression of the Supermind at the plane of our earthly consciousness and the consequent appearance of perfect life on earth. Spiritual aspirants in the past have attained to the Supramental consciousness by passing out of earthly Consciousness. This process, which is described as the

(continued from the previous page) ascent to the Spirit, is different from the higher stage of evolution referred to above, and is distinguished from it as the descent of the Spirit into matter.

But one wonders whether a total rejection of the Maya doctrine, which is so intrinsically related to the theory of spiritual monism, is after all necessary to establish the view of life described above. Maya doctrine is in no way opposed to the concept of evolution and the coming of a higher kind of life on earth; it only questions the wisdom of characterizing evolution as a real modification of the Absolute; for that would be equal to saying that the Absolute loses Its perfection—its character as Sachichidananda. The question as to whether evolution has a purpose or not is relevant only within the field of evolution; to carry it into the Absolute will be to take a purely personal view of It, which is tantamount to denial of the Absolute. So the Mayavada merely states, by its doctrine of appearance, how the Absolute is not in the least affected by change while making ample room for evolution and progress in a limited sense within the field of change. This view of evolution and its course have been set forth by Hindu thinkers in their doctrine of Cycles. According to this doctrine evolution is not a movement in an endless straight line towards greater and greater perfection, but a cyclic or wave-like motion with ups and downs, or periods of progress followed by periods of decline. So the coming of a more evolved type of human beings, with higher powers than reason developed in them, is in no way against the Maya doctrine. The darkness of the age of mind may be lighted by the dawn of supramental consciousness. But no worldly perfection is of eternal duration; for that is impossible in this world of change. So in the wheel of evolution a set back or decline will follow a period of rise or progress. Thus, in the light of the Hindu theory of evolution, even if there is to be an age of supramental consciousness and world transformation, that will not be eternal, nor be the unconditioned perfection of the Spirit.

Editor: "Vedanta Kesari" (Madras) 1942: "A MAYAVADIC CRITICISM OF AUROBINDO'S METAPHYSICS"

From the fact that in a monistic philosophy Matter is not different in substance from Spirit, it cannot be argued, as is done in this book, that the perfection of the Spirit can become manifest at the plane of Matter. From the point of view of real transformation, if this occurred, Matter will resolve into Spirit, there being no longer that difference in vibration responsible for the state called Matter. From the view-point of apparent transformation, which is that of Mayavada, the universe of manifestation, though non-different from the Spirit, is of another order of reality, being only a reflection, an indication, of the Supreme Spirit. From both these points of view, therefore, the perfection of the Spirit is gained only when consciousness is free from all limitations, which is but another name for Matter. There is, however, this difference: In the former case this freedom can be attained only with the disappearance of Matter, whereas in the latter case the persistence of Matter does not bar the realization of this freedom at the level of consciousness, provided the Spirit's non-affectedness and one's identity with the Spirit are recognized. It would therefore seem that an ethics based on a doctrine of perfection in life, which is the one that Sri Aurobindo holds, has some sort of sanction only in the light of the monism advocated by Mayavada. Even this is not the perfection at the level of consciousness. All that we call perfection in Matter is only an imperfect reflection of the Spirit's perfection.

The concept of the supramental is the key to the psychology advocated in Sri Aurobindo's system of thought. The supramental, according to him, is the intermediate link between the individualized mentality of man, with its divided outlook, and the absolute unity of Sachchidananda.

This linking principle of Supermind is of great practical importance in the system of Sri Aurobindo. For it is pointed out that if there were only the unity of Sachchidananda on the one hand and the divided mentality of our human consciousness on the other, perfection of the Spirit in the physical life would

Editor: "Vedanta Kesari" (Madras) 1942: "A MAYAVADIC CRITICISM OF AUROBINDO'S METAPHYSICS"

(continued from the previous page) have been impossible. Spirit and the psycho-physical nature of man would be two opposite entities, one of which must be abolished if the other were to be enjoyed. But the Supermind, the link and the transition between the two, assures the possibility of man realising the one Existence, Consciousness and Delight in the mould of the mind, life and body.

Does not the idea of Divine immanence, common to all systems of Indian thought, including Dualism, give this very assurance which Sri Aurobindo finds in the concept of the Supermind?

The book is full of very original and striking thoughts, which, like the one stated above, shed much light on obscure problems of religion and philosophy. Although we cannot agree with the central metaphysical position adopted in the book—namely, its unmerited hostility to Mayavada—we have no hesitation to state that the work is a first-rate contribution to modern Indian thought, and it will require the labours and skill of many interpreters to bring out in clear and simple language all the implications of the doctrines set forth in it with an abstruseness, dignity and versatility characteristic of a first-rate creative work on philosophy.

K.C.Varadachari: "SRI AUROBINDO AND HIS PHILOSOPHY"*

Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy is a philosophy of life, of evolution, of growth into the consciousness of the Divine. It is like most Indian philosophies a way of life towards the realization of freedom from samsaric bondage. In attempting to sketch out a way out of this apparently interminable samsara, which Buddha has even described as a hopeless cycle of births and deaths, it is evident that a clear conception of all the several motives and purposes and ends striven for must be known. The nature of this bondage, the nature of the world and all that it signifies to man and his hopes require clearest perception and understanding.

The struggle to get out of the present and to aspire for a state where this discontent cannot prevail at any time, from which there can be no sliding or fall back into the mire of bondage, thus, whatever

* Vedanta Kesari 1942.

(continued from the previous page) form it takes, is the fact about all attempts at knowing, for it is clear that knowledge alone get rid of all ills, Samsara. Nanyah pantha ayanaya vidyate.

It is however the second of the endeavours that seems to be the most distinctive feature of the view of Sri Aurobindo, namely, the impulse towards perfection. The reason, is not far to seek, for, whatever may be the initial conscious goal of man, man returns to the one resounding note of his terrestrial life, the sense of free occupation, undistraught with frailty and faults, unoppressed by environment and a sense of dismay at life itself, and unthwarted in his love and humanity.

There are theories of life such as the materialistic or worldly view, the lokayata, which are at their best only glorifications of this world and its impermanence. Delighting in this impermanence man seeks to enjoy the world for what it is worth at any one moment without thought of the morrow.

As an anti-thetical movement to this terrestrial view, there has grown up amongst us a superterrestrial view sponsored by most religions and the mystics, a view not evolutionary in conception, but metaphysical mainly, which asserts the existence of other worlds, spiritual and perfect and luminous, to which we shall have to go, once we abandon this body of ours belonging to the imperfect and ignorant universe.

This view does so ant justice to life itself. It cannot bring into reality on this human plane that immortal sense that we seek to discover in art and beauty. But with all that has been promised in the future land of Hope, there has been on the part of the believers in the superterrestrial domain a verish anxiety to reflect on this incorrigible planet something of that profound hereafter.

When we come to the absolutistic or illusionistic theory, we find that neither the reality nor the value of this terrestorial existence is accepted. In its view, 'evolution itself is a mistake, a delirium of the will to live' and the will grow powerful, which is a living error conjured up by an ignorance that has somehow found its way to veil the incorruptible and transcendent

(continued from the previous page) Being of infinite knowledge and, in some cases, has become even the very power, Shakti, of that Pure Being.

The relative reality theory when inspected reveals that at one stage there is an inner contradiction, which makes it impossible for it to be called a theory of reality at all, since its apex culminates in a grand unreality, from which a psychological twist or jump alone can land us on its opposite pole, the Real or the Absolute. It cannot be said that evolution the one supreme fact of our experience, is itself delusion and a product of a myth-making function, as Bergson might say.

There is a single Spirit working in diverse ways at different stages. It is that which upholds the universe of different planes of matter, life, mind, intellect, intuition, supermind, overmind and other planes. The running thread of unity of Brahman or spirit is present in all and grants them the reality that is there because of Him, but it also reveals the evolution of each into the other, which is but an expression of the psychological shift of enjoyment of Brahman in each plane either successively or simultaneously.

The Truth then is capable of being grasped only by intuition into the nature of evolution as well as of Being. Such an intuition will reveal that the principle of evolution is the 'thread' that binds all planes of being and experience from the inconscient metal, subconscient plant and animal, to the conscient Divine. Accordingly we see that there are grades of existence and experiences, each with its own peculiar law of being, suited to the fullest expression and experiencing of its nature.

We conclude that the Superconscient sustains, controls and moves and lives and enjoys itself in all planes, according to its own unique laws of synthetic or total or integral existence. This view does justice to the terrestrial in so far, as it grants reality and value of its own order to it; to the superterrestrial view in as much as it accepts the integral immortality of the soul and the actual existence of mansions of spirit over and above the perceived universe of matter,

(continued from the previous page) and asserts however that the two are unreal in so far as they deny the truth of one another. They form the two faces of the one continuous reality of brahman or Spirit. It would be clear that from the foregoing the third view, the Absolutistic is denied categorically by Aurobindo. But it is not so. For we can see that whilst illusionism is denied, the relative value of the higher and highest planes are recognised, for without that vision even the material and the vital and the mental cannot be appreciated and enjoyed adequately. We may say adapting Jajnavalkya's words that not for the sake of matter is matter dear but for the sake of the Self is the matter dear.

Sri Rurobindo seizes upon the central fact of his intuition into evolution, the Sacchidananda, which is not merely the libido of the psychoanalyst or the elan vital or mind-energy of Bergson, but the Supreme Spirit of which these are but vital and mental and intuitional manifestations, according to the plane in which they work, and enunciates the necessity of realising oneself as at one with it. This Supreme Consciousness ever-present in all, appearing as it does in manifold ways through its power, wonderful, Maya is the one force of evolution. Man, who is struggling for the knowledge, perfection and enjoyment of the free state of being, must become cognizant of this Supreme Consciousness as the central fact, indeed as the soul and self of himself, and offer himself to it his total being. By such a total surrender and offering, complete emancipation from the law of its mind happens to the soul, and the soul is guided into the recognition and acceptance and obedience to the law of the Highest Plane of reality, namely, the Brahman.

"To live on earth, to suffer and rejoice, is a glorious thing in the light of the Vision seen by "Gothian" "In The Ageless Way." This light is about to dawn and flood the earth, so that all men will possess the certain knowledge that life is continuous, whether here in the body or elsewhere; that experience accumulates from stage to stage of existence; that we live and have our being as component units of a manifestation of all-comprehensive Spiritual Power, and are therefore subject to Spiritual law." (By P.S. Wellby. in "The Occult Review.")

Anilbaran Roy: "THE LAW OF KARMA".@@

The Soul is eternal and immortal, a portion of the Divine; but it descends into terrestrial life to manifest some of its divine powers and possibilities under the conditions of material existence. It is these possibilities that it develops through many lives and various personalities, and the machinery by which this is done is the law of Karma, which is ultimately determined by its own way of becoming, svabhavas tu pravartate (Gita, V: 14)

The ordinary notion about karmaphala is that if a man commits sin he will have to suffer for it, and that virtuous acts will bring rewards for him. That there is some truth in this is amply proved by experience even in this life, and for this we need not assume the existence of rebirth or after-life. But the exact operation of this law is not known, and it is a crude belief that our sins and virtues bring punishments or rewards with mathematical precision. There are too many exceptions to the rule that sin brings punishment and virtue reward. 'Attila and Jenghiz on the throne to the end, Christ on the cross and Socrates drinking his potion of hemlock are not very clear evidence for any optimistic notion of a law of moral return in the world of human nature.' But that does not altogether invalidate the law of Karma; it only shows that we do not know all the forces that are operating, and therefore cannot formulate the law correctly. Even the laws of physical Science are now recognized as being nothing more than of a statistical nature, and they have continually to be changed and modified in the light of fresh experience and knowledge. Still they are of great practical utility; so also is the Law of Karma which greatly enhanced the sense of responsibility.

There is evidently a substantial truth behind the current notions of Karma, but it is a part only of the whole. The vital being demands success and it is not clear what morality has to say in the affair, since we see in most things that it is a right understanding and intelligent or intuitive practice of the means and conditions, and an insistent power of the

(continued from the previous page) settled drive of the force of the being of which success is the natural consequence. The creation of moral conditions for world's prizes seems to be an artificial imposition which impoverishes the free play of the mind force and the life force. But in truth the greatest force for success is a right concentration of energy, tapasya, and there is an inevitable moral element in tapasya. The moral is not the sole element still there is always a moral element among the many factors of individual and collective or national success, and a disregard of acknowledged right has at some time or other disastrous or fatal reactions.

Natural calamities like earthquakes occur according to fixed laws of Nature and only those suffer who come in the way of the working of these laws. If you put your hand into fire it will be burnt; if you knock your head against a stone wall it will be broken; there is no question of sin or virtue here. The physical law is the right, the justice, the duty, the ought, of the physical world. No law or Karma, the moral law included, could exist if there were not, to begin with, this principle as the first foundation of order. The one 'sin' of which all persons involved in a natural disaster is guilty, is the ignorance of the laws and operations of Nature. Coming events cast their shadow before, and even animals are known to have a sense by which they can protect themselves from coming dangers. Man can develop faculties of vision and work by which he can become complete master of Nature, and that is Nature's intention, *ihaiva tairjitah sargah*. (Gita, V; 19). All these calamities of Nature are a peremptory call to man to perfect himself in knowledge, man has advanced far in this direction; but this knowledge has to be supplemented and perfected by occult and spiritual knowledge.

Referring to the universal reason or Logos working behind these calamities, Sri Surobindo says: 'Its presence, when felt by the cruder kind of religious mind, generates the idea of calamity as a punishment

(continued from the previous page) for sin, — not observing that it has a punishment too for ignorance, for error, stupidity, weakness, defect of will and tapasya.'

But it is a popular ignorance which supposes that somebody judges our action and distributes suffering and enjoyment with mathematical precision. Sufferings and enjoyments are determined according to the needs of our evolution. The soul sometimes invites suffering as a short cut to spiritual progress. Blindness, lameness, insanity, these may be the devices of Nature to work out quickly some effects of our past work which were standing on the way of the evolution of the soul. In finding true forms of self-expression, the soul has often to make all sorts of experiments; some of these may have disastrous consequences and have to be worked out by intense physical and mental suffering. This may seem to be a terrible necessity, this chain of Karma; but the soul has accepted it of its own accord; it is a rule or law of the game which it has agreed to play. Man's nature is what it is because he has so made it by his past; he may change what he has made.

M.M. Zuhuru' D-Din Ahmad: "MYSTIC TENDENCIES OF ISLAM."

It is reported in the traditions that once the prophet was offering his prayers in the Ka'bah when an unbeliever named 'Uqbah b. Abi Mu'ayt brought the entrails of a big camel and placed them on his back and shoulders while he was down in prostration before his Allah. It is said that he was so busy and so much absorbed in his prayers that he did not feel it in the least and was quite unaware of the occurrence until his daughter who happened to pass that removed the burden from his back. It is this complete absorption in prayers, say the Sufis, which is the foundation of ecstasy and rapture.

The first advice that a Shaikh gave to his disciple was "First reform thyself and then try to reform others." The Sufis claim to derive this principle from the verse of the Quran that lays down, "It is most hateful to Allah that you should say that which you do not do. There is no doubt that this principle

(continued from the previous page) is a sure safeguard against presumptuousness. In theory this principle appears to be quite sound, but its results proved to be fatal and disastrous. Even on psychological grounds this principle is not very sound. There is no possibility of setting a limit to the progress of an individual human soul. If a man decides first to develop his own soul and then to preach the Gospel of Truth to others, the time of conveying the mission to others will never come. It is a strange paradox of human nature that the more a man progresses morally the more he feels himself wanting in goodness, and the more he becomes conscious of his shortcomings. Just as a rich man desires more in proportion to his possessions, similarly with the moral progress of man his standard of judging his own conduct rises higher. His conscience becomes more delicate. He begins to feel even his trifling shortcomings, which an ordinary unreflective human being would pass over very lightly. It is well known paradox of Ethics, that the nearer one approaches his ideal the further away it flies from him.

This paradox explains the various verses of the Quran wherein prophets are represented as praying to God for forgiveness. The prophets being as a class superior to others spiritually and morally, are always conscious of their trifling shortcomings much more than others.

The dependence of the spiritual class on the earning members of the society was demoralising in many other ways. Firstly, it created a special class of priesthood; secondly, it made spiritual favours saleable commodities, and thirdly, it made spiritual leadership a profession, which as such drew people of inferior intelligence to its fold, and lowered the status and prestige of sainthood. This special class always tried to monopolise the spiritual blessings to themselves and to their offspring, with the result that the majority of the society had either to go without any, or had to beg them as a favour from the members of this privileged class. This class in order to preserve themselves as a class always preached to

(continued from the previous page) the people that it was impossible to have direct communion with God except through the intervention of one of the members of the class either living or dead. It was on account of this intervention that the more influential priests were raised to divinity by those of their blind followers who had first approached them only to be guided to the Almighty God.

Islam's renunciation of this theory was based upon a thorough understanding of, and a keen insight into, the past history of religions and human spiritual consciousness. History had shown how innocent and truthful prophets like Christ could be deified under its influence. It was also responsible for introducing the custom of worshipping the souls of their forefathers in many ancient tribes. This theory is a blind advocate of authority, forbidding everything that goes against it. Its upholder abhors independence of thought. In this way it creates a slave mentality and undermines the progress and originality of the spiritual faculty. Under its influence genius is strangled and progress set back. It destroys the faculty of independent criticism, for it never allows it to be exercised.

Islam saw these things clearly and therefore denounced the theory of Intervention altogether.

It loosens the responsibility of the individuals with respect to their moral and spiritual duties. Nobody will like to bother himself about his moral and spiritual welfare and obligations, if he can just buy them by paying a few coins or by doing homage to someone else. It takes away the feelings of personal responsibility, thus suggesting easy means of keeping away the painful consciousness of one's own sins. But by weakening the feelings of moral and spiritual responsibility it also reduces the grasp of religion and morality on consciousness almost to nothing.

The early Sufis as a rule earned their own livelihood and never accepted any alms of charity from their followers or from any other persons. Even in our own days, there are many Sufis who are

(continued from the previous page) strongly opposed to the acceptance of alms. But in the early days of Islam it was a general rule, while at present there are only few exceptional instances of those who labour for their living. The attitude of the prophet on this point was uncompromising. He had forbidden his Al (a term which in the technique of the Quran conveys the notion of both descendants and followers) from accepting any kind of charity for their livelihood.

There has been a revival of this theory of the intervention of holy persona among almost all the orders of the Sufis, on account of the influence of other religions like Christianity and Brahmanism. Later on, we shall find that the effect of such influences on Islamic mysticism has not been very wholesome on the whole.

In seclusion even the term of self-reformation is shorn of all its true meaning, because when there are no temptations to overcome and the will is never exercised, real character never develops. As intellect develops by grappling and over coming mental difficulties, so does character develop by overcoming temptations rather than by avoiding them. You would not call that person a good mathematician who, instead of solving the difficult problems, would simply keep them away from his attention. Similarly it is difficult to call that person a good man who, instead of performing his duties of manhood, would simply avoid them.

Asceticism is not totally valueless. It possesses disciplinary value which cannot be equalled by any other of the methods that have been tried so far for the reformation of character. True, it does not become a man to throw off the difficulties behind his back and run away from them instead of looking them in the face, still some measure of training and discipline is essential to start with. It is our experience of every day life that those, who throw themselves headlong into the sea of temptations without sufficient previous moral training, become moral wrecks. It is safe, therefore, that before entering into the

(continued from the previous page) battlefield of temptations one must undergo some kind of moral discipline. Asceticism serves this purpose.

It must be noticed, however, that asceticism is useful only as a preparation, as a means to something higher. Any person, who makes it the end of his life, acquires a morbid and cynic disposition, which is highly prejudicial to the harmony and sweetness of life. As an end of life, therefore, asceticism is harmful and defeats its own purpose. To stick to it beyond a particular period of life is destructive for the right formation and smooth progress of character.

But instead of extreme and harmful asceticism another one of healthy kind is also possible. We have already seen that an extreme asceticism which appears in the form of seclusion in Takyah, monastery of temple is highly prejudicial to the fair development of the individual character as well as to the human society in general. We have also seen that it is not totally useless, and that up to a particular limit it would serve the purpose of a moral discipline. Now we should see whether the principle can be adopted without its defects and whether such an asceticism which can serve the purpose of a good discipline without destroying the society has ever been conceived by any one of the religious systems. Islam and its founder had really taught this kind of beneficial ascetic discipline. It can best be expressed in the words of Rumi, "Water in the boat causes its destruction, while the same water is the cause of its movement when underneath it." In simpler words, "Live in the world, but let not the world live in thy heart."

We should live in the world, face its responsibilities and meet its difficulties without allowing these things to take possession of the soul within us.

This kind of attitude can be illustrated by a historical anecdote which is so often quoted by writers on mysticism. One great Sufi known by the name of Ibrahim Adham used to travel with great pomp

(continued from the previous page) and splendour and with a large retinue of servants, and his tents were pitched with golden pegs. One day a wandering dervish happened to pass by his tents and was extremely surprised to learn all those things of luxury were owned by one who was once a king and now a Sufi. The dervish with a begging cup in his hand approached the kindly Sufi and said, "It is strange you call yourself a Sufi and still own so much of worldly goods, and thy tents are fixed with golden pegs." He bade the dervish take a little rest, and after an hour or so invited him to travel to Mecca in his company. The dervish agreed. The princely Sufi started for the pilgrimage with the dervish, leaving all his tents and retinue behind. They had not gone far when the dervish remembered that he had forgotten his wooden cup in the tent and requested him to allow him to go back to fetch it. The Sufi then remarked, "This is just the difference between us two: I could afford to part with all my valuables without the least, mental worry, while you could not part with a cup of practically no value, without much inconvenience. Those golden pegs which so much surprised you were driven in the earth and not in my heart."

The superiority of this kind of asceticism over the cruder forms discussed above is clear and unquestionable. It is not suicidal. It does not make a hell of society. It does not allow a seeker of truth to shrink from the responsibilities of life. It does not ask us to shun society or make each person a self-centred entity independent of all social relationships. It only changes the angle of vision, and thus gives a new direction to our activities.

The second kind of teaching, the Sufis, say, he could not impart openly, since every man could not easily grasp its intricate and knotty problems. This esoteric teaching, therefore, he secretly conveyed to his more advanced followers, particularly to his cousin and son-in-law 'Ali.

They say that one should first try to be one with God, think of Him alone and love Him. If one can do it the purpose of his life is fulfilled.

They liken the progress of the soul to the travels of a seeker who before arriving at his destination has to pass through so many halting stations, each of which has first to be reached patiently in order that it might form the starting place for the next and ultimately for the last and the final stage.

The second stage according to the Sufi writers is that of Self-negation. When the seeker has successfully crossed the wild field of wonder, and gets accustomed to the love of the Infinite, the passion of surprise slowly subsides into a feeling of self-negation.

So long as the hold of Islam was sufficiently strong over the mind of the public, the idea of the renunciation of self in favour of the spiritual guide did not appear as an active theory. The original founders of various Sufi orders did never clearly press for this belief as an essential doctrine of Sufi faith. No renunciation of self other than that one in favour of God was known to them.

Patience would mean resistance against all sorts of evil opposition, from whatever source it may proceed. It may proceed from the evil element in our own nature, from lower animal instincts of our own self, or from others, who may oppose us because we choose to stand for the cause of the good and the right.

The devil within us may be no less potent than the devil without us. Therefore, the quality of patience according to this interpretation would mean persistence in the path of Allah in the teeth of all oppositions and hindrances.

When a disciple has passed through surprise and has escaped from the snares of Satan by patience and persistence, the will and knowledge of God are revealed to him through Ecstasy.

A number of strange stories and uncommon miraculous occurrences have been associated with the early Sufis by their biographers, specially when the biographer happened to belong to their order. But most of these records are unauthentic and unreliable when

(continued from the previous page) judged by the historical criteria. Most of these biographies were written in the third or fourth generation after the great Sufis had passed away and no critical acumen was exercised in collecting the material about them. Their contemporaries hardly mention anything about such miracles although they speak highly of their piety and their moral and religious fervour. We should also remember that most of such biographies were written when saint-worship had taken deep root among the Muslims, and when they looked upon the Shaikh as a divine being.

Hallaj had cried out that he was the Truth, meaning thereby that a human being could advance to such an extent that there remained no difference between God and man, that one became inseparably intermingled with the other. Islam had given a sort of dualistic explanation of the problem of creation. It had laid down that no creature, however high it might rise in progress, could ever become at one with the Creator. According to Islam the Creator and the creatures, remained eternally different realities. Even the apostles, though the most perfect of creatures, ever remained humble slaves to the Creator, content with the humble dignity of prophethood.

Either a dead matter should be posed as eternally co-existing side by side with God Himself, which explanation was given by Vedanta philosophy in India and Peripatetic school in Greece, or the world was an emanation from God. The later alternative was accepted by Ibnul-'Arabi and others of his cast of mind, since the solution given by Vedanta philosophy placed the Unity of God in a doubtful position. For if matter existed eternally side by side with God then it must be deified as well, inasmuch as it possessed the attribute of eternity, an essential distinguishing characteristic of Divinity.

The Sufis had learnt from Islam that there was no God but one, and therefore the only way to explain the diversity of existence consistently with this Unity was to conceive the diversity as so many different forms of existence of one reality called God.

Islam, as I have pointed out above, never conceived of raising the creatures to the level of the Creator under any circumstances. This theory never thought of filling the chasm that Islam had created between God and human beings. Human soul might progress even so far as to talk with its Creator, but it ever remained a distinct entity. The vague notions of the merger of human soul into that of God, that were borrowed from the Aryans, specially of the Indian stock, were totally unknown to the founder of Islam or to the early Muslims.

The fundamental postulate of the Unity of God which was so vehemently pressed by the prophet was intended to emphasise only the Unity of God as an object of worship, veneration, devotion and service, and the theory of the unity of creation was only taken up to serve as a proof for this view. This fact becomes quite clear if we analyse the Muslim Logos (Kalimah), "La' ilaha, illa' llahu". It means, "There is no being, fit to be an object of worship excepting one Allah." They will all perish and nothing beside Allah will continue to exist eternally.

After laying down certain general principles of universal nature for the guidance of human life, it proposed to leave every individual free to develop his personality to its highest extent. It gave general law so far as was essential for this purpose, but it wanted to make the foundation of human activity spiritual, because this was the only way of giving life a serious turn and of making the reformation useful and permanent.

The stages through which a soul has to pass during its progress towards God, are not connected with any part of the physical body. They are arbitrary, imaginary and even unreal. Each seeker can classify his experiences differently. To explain them briefly we can say that the heart begins by concentrating its attention upon itself, or in the words of the later Sufis by attending to the attention and influence of the Shaikh, Murshid or spiritual guide. At this stage the heart begins to feel its own existence.

At the time when this theory was announced, the personality of the spiritual guide had become indispensable. He leads the seeker through all the stages of spiritual progress. It is easy to see that the individual will has been destroyed, free opinion strangled and the path of the prophet forgotten and neglected.

The third stage is marked with the seeker's rising above time. His conception of God now becomes elevated above and beyond time. For this purpose the guide prescribes certain practices related to imagination and mental vision, which slowly leads him above the limitation of conceiving things in time. In the previous stage he had risen above number, now he ascends even higher than the conception of time. When he once rises above these limitations and weaknesses of human nature, that is number and time, he becomes fit to receive the vision of God.

The Unity of Existence is to be regarded as such, through all times and all ages, till the idea of time is completely eliminated.

The fourth stage is that of remembrance, of remembering Him, or realising His reality in one's heart, which has now gone beyond material limitation. This is different from merely muttering His name which was the characteristic of the initial stage.

When thus the disciple begins to realise His attributes in his heart, he must retire from the world. This retirement is not necessarily seclusion, but a sort of mental detachment from worldly things. He should refrain from attaching importance to anything excepting the remembrance of Allah. He retires from everything but Him, with Whom he is constantly busy at heart. He hears from none but Him, sees none but Him, touches nothing but His reality. From this stage begins abnegation of self (fana). So far his efforts were directed towards rising above his environment and soaring towards Him, but now he reaches sufficiently near unto Him, and slowly begins to merge into God.

When he has attained this stage, the next step

(continued from the previous page) he is to take to be careful in preserving this state of affairs. He must endeavour to perpetuate this condition. He must see that the stage of development, which he attained, is not lost and that he does not fall down from the height he has reached. This is the six stage of his flight.

After he has sufficiently persevered in his efforts, and has guarded the position for a sufficiently long period, he is to forget himself, the world, worldly things and all relations; in short he is to forget everything excepting the one idea of God. This forgetfulness of everything besides Him is a symbol of perpetual bliss. This is abnegation of self in Him. It is the gate of Heaven, passport to merger in the Universal Divine Unity of Existence. It is to be remembered that this is the last stage to be achieved by a seeker.

According to another version there are seven stages or valleys which a seeker must pass through, before he merges into the Infinite. They are the preparatory stages, at each of which the seeker acquires a new character and after crossing them one after the other he draws nearer to his goal. They are enumerated as follows:-

1. Consciousness in breathing (Hush dar dam).
2. Carefulness in movement (Nazar bar Qadam).
3. Movement in residence (Safar dar Watan).
4. Secrecy in society (Khalwat dar Anjuman).
5. Perpetuity of consciousness (Diwam-i-agahi).
6. Criticism of consciousness (Muhasabat-i-Nafs).
7. Permanence in annihilation (Baqā dar Fana).

In the first stage the seeker must be conscious of the reality of God in every breath that he breathes. He should not pass a single moment of his life without being conscious of his relationship with the Infinite. Every occurrence, every activity, and everything that he attends to, should constantly remind him that he is a created being whose creator is Allah, to Whom he owes his very being, and in Whom he lives.

When once he takes that attitude and begins to feel himself in the perpetual presence of God, he must

(continued from the previous page) necessarily begin to reform his actions and watch his movements. This is the second stage at which he not only begins to act and move in Him, as well. The first stage consists in merely being aware of an Immortal Infinity while the second stage consists in acting according to the Infinite will. The first was merely the relationship of general awareness, while this is a definite relationship through the objective will. In the first stage the seeker was to take care not to breathe without the consciousness of the idea of God, and in this stage he is to be careful not to do any action without consciously relating it to the perpetual presence of God. At first he was merely to think according to the commands of God, and now he is to act for God, in obedience to God, in God and after God.

Next the seeker is to detach himself from the association of place. He is to rise above the attachments of space and environment. He might live in a place, as physically he cannot but live in a place, as physically he cannot but live in a place, but spiritually he must rise above place and its associations. He is to feel as if, while living in a place, he is constantly in travel. Living in a place or going away from it is not to affect his mind in the least. Space in mystic terminology represents the grossness of life, the material or vegetative element in human nature. Thus a seeker is not to attach any importance to place or to things that are in place. He is to dissociate himself from all that is material, spatial and worldly. God is immaterial, non-spatial and spiritual. In the spiritual progress, the material or non-spiritual element of life is to be totally neglected. This principle is equivalent to the principles of watching the number and watching the time in the previous scheme.

The next stage is retirement. It does not necessarily mean physical seclusion but mental retirement, concentration on the idea of the Beloved One, even when in society. At this stage the seeker is to rise above society. The attachment of persons, society, relatives and other associates is to be sacrificed for the attainment of the ideal. At previous stages

(continued from the previous page) he had to give up the associations of space, time and number, here he has to rise above his associations with other persons. In this spiritual progress he is to disregard the love of all his kith and kin. He is to sacrifice their affection for his love of God. This sacrifice is an essential stage in the attainment of His ideal. The heart must be purified and emptied of the love of all if God's love is to be realised. One can live in retirement even while living in society. It is a very desirable state of mental concentration. Learn to concentrate your mind upon your object of love in the presence of others. According to this view society is not necessarily inconsistent with the realisation of one's ideal, provided he does not attach any importance to it.

When the seeker has passed through all these stages, he will live perpetually with his Creator. He will think of Him and talk of Him alone. He will be perpetually busy with Him. He will never rest for a moment without Him.

The last stage is that of severe self-criticism. Here the seeker is to criticise his consciousness and to continue to examine it strictly in all its thoughts and feelings. He is not to allow any thought or action to pass uncriticised. This stage serves as a very valuable advice to all who advance towards a spiritual goal. It is a good advice even to those who have no ideals to attain, but intend to live a moral and happy life. If you can just weigh your actions and thoughts of the day before you go to sleep at night, it will provide you an excellent moral exercise and give you a very good moral training and teach you how to form right moral judgments. To repent for one's evil actions and to appreciate and feel pleasure in good ones before one forgets them is an excellent psychological method to improve one's practical morality. It checks you from persisting in the evil path and resists the tendency of the physical organism to repeat automatically its previous actions, and at the same time encourages you to do good and think aright.

This has been mentioned as the last stage, since

(continued from the previous page) the critical faculty is the last to be developed in the spiritual progress. The passing of correct spiritual judgments naturally comes as the last stage in the scientific theory of religious insight and spiritual flight. Moreover, criticism is useful and wholesome only when it comes after certain stages of progress. The misuse of this faculty is highly prejudicial to the spiritual progress. In early stages its use may prove more injurious than useful. But at a later stage it is highly beneficial and saves the seeker from many snares and pitfalls. It helps to distinguish right from wrong and good from evil.

The final stage of mystic experience, that is, Fana, merger into the Infinite and the Absolute Reality or Baqa, that is, perpetual living in Him.

As for the classification of these various stages or valleys of spiritual progress it need not be pointed out that they are imaginary and any number of classifications can be mentioned. It is immaterial for a real seeker in how many parts or stages you divide or describe the flight of his spirit towards the Absolute Ideal and its abode of perpetual bliss. Properly speaking there are no stages. It flies and flies and every flight is marked with restlessness and anxiety to reach still nearer to its object of love and desire.

This theory of stages or valleys indicates as if there were so many halting places in the course of flight. No such conception is correct. It is a perpetual flight, without halts and without resting places.

A nation that failed to recognise its prophet was punished by Divine wrath and was overtaken by some calamity which ended its career on the earth.

His will is free and there is nothing like history, previous ideas, or actions to bind it, as in our case.

The Sufis have developed a different classification of saints. There is only one Qutb who rules the universe at a time. When he vacates his seat, another of the same rank takes his charge. His duty is to execute the commands of God in the universe directly or through the instrumentality of an Imam. The theory,

(continued from the previous page) briefly speaking, conveys the notion of the government of God in the universe through His chosen ones, a form of spiritual hierarchy. The number of saints fixed in each class is simply arbitrary and imaginary. This theory is clearly development of those days when saints had begun to be worshipped as intermediaries to God. But this theory goes a step further than the theory of intercession. The latter only placed intercessors between men and God to plead for men, but this theory placed saints also as executors of God's will which was recognised by almost every religion to be directly operative without the intermediacy of any persons. Even messengers did not claim to wield any divine power, while this theory invested certain saints with the divine power which they could exercise for the benefit or harm of human beings.

Thus, this theory is a complete departure from all that is Islamic, and is believed to explain the influence Sufis have, the power that they can wield, for the advantage or disadvantage of others. That simple principle of praying to God was almost forgotten.

It may be asked why at this stage of the development of the Sufi doctrines so much importance was being attached to such imaginary and unreal classifications of the saints? The position becomes quite clear to us when we understand that it is a period of general degeneration in the Islamic world. Its distinguishing feature is the popular and practical acceptance of the theory of intercession of persons for the attainment of salvation. The personality of the Shaikh or the spiritual leader looms large.

It is an age of saint-worship in the literal sense of the word. Every city of moderate size has its own patron saint. The matter did not end here. The dead saints began to be worshipped. They began to be considered as intercessors on behalf of their followers before God and even sacrifices were offered on their tombs. Their aid was invoked, under the belief that they heard and granted their prayers. They were actually seen in dream or in wakefulness by their pious followers, specially by those who claimed to be

(continued from the previous page) their successors either by blood or by spiritual relationship. They were said to guide their followers or worshippers sometimes invisibly through spiritual media and sometimes by visiting them in person. It is quite clear from this how far the Aryan, more particularly Persian, element had influenced the mind of the Muslim public.

With the zeal of its present head Ibn Sa'ud, who is now master of whole Arabia, Nahilism is regaining its original vigour and now it appears to be only a question of time for it to eradicate the degenerated Sufism out of the Muslim world.

Another movement which was more directly connected with the reformation of Sufism was Sanusi-ism in Africa. It was a reformation within the pale of Sufism. Its founder was himself a renowned Sufi and intended to reform Sufis on their own grounds, and according to their own principles. So far as the general reformation of the Muslims is concerned, both these movements were based upon almost the same principles. The object of both was to reform the Islamic society on the basis of original Islamic traditions, and to check its growing tendency in the direction of polytheistic practices.

Sanusi-ism differs from its sister movement, in so far as it refers to Sufism directly, while the other only refers to it indirectly. Wahhabi-ism refuses to accept it as a true representation of Islam, while Sanusi-ism believes Sufism to be a valid representation of Islam, provided it is reformed in certain respects. The founder of this movement and his successors are called Shaikhs or spiritual guides.

This movement, although harried out of Africa by the high-handedness of the Italian governments, is still gaining ground among the Arabs.

There is one distinguishing feature of all Sufi movements that they are considered as a source of danger by the government of the country in which they originate. But Islam never distinguished the political aspect of a movement from its theological, spiritual and social aspects. Islam itself was an all-embracing movement, which in abstraction could be analysed into

(continued from the previous page) so many aspects, but which in reality was concretely one and unanalysable, and so it had no clearly defined parts with clearly defined boundaries.

The pernicious practices introduced in the circle of their credulous votaries by the illiterate Sufis still persist and are considered to be the essence of Sufism, by some still more ignorant to be the essence of Islam. The time is ripe for reformation. Sufis as a class are no more than parasites living upon the income of Muslims. The Shaikhs get a fixed share of the income of their disciples and live a luxurious life, sometimes even more luxurious than the rulers of big states.

But there have always been noble exceptions, not wanting even in our own days. Some of the Shaikhs even now are of a high moral character, of great service to society and of real saintly nature. They work for their own livelihood and act according to the dictates of the Quran and Traditions. They are extremely honest in all their dealings and sincere in their faith. In their silence and serenity they shed their light and lustre all around them and are a source of spiritual pleasure and elevation for all those who come in contact with them.

K.d. Sethna: "The Current of Inspiration."@@

As Abbe Bremond would say, "the current passes." Inspiration has come through. But what exactly has happened?

Is the inspiration due to a change of meaning? That the meaning has changed its shade cannot be denied if we bring a subtle scrutiny to bear upon the words. The first version speaks of an enjoyment that takes place with a prolonged consistency, while the second involves an absolute unconditional untrammelled response, a response that is perpetual. "A constant joy" has a somewhat restricted substance: it moves from moment to moment through one's life—steadily accompanying one, but not necessarily without beginning and ending somewhere. "A joy for ever" has a free triumphant flow as if from beyond one's birth to beyond one's death—the flow of a larger than individual consciousness, a larger

@@ ALL INDIA Weekly. April 1944.

(continued from the previous page) than even any time-consciousness, I might say. It is as if not merely our appreciation of an object but also our sense of an inviolable "archetype" of it on a divine plane were suggested. There is the hint of some endless and undying and godlike essence of beauty, existing and persisting behind earthly objects that perish and human experiences that pass.

Now, such a hint may strike us as right and also as more in tune with the rest of the ENDYMION-passage. But we shall mislead ourselves if we believe that the sheer meaning has metamorphosed Keat's line. Apart from the context of a line, the rightness or wrongness of meaning in poetry is irrelevant. A poet can hold any opinion and turn it to great verse. Though the meaning of "constant joy" does not accord so well with Keat's context, there is nothing in it to prevent a poet from making it memorable in a different context—if he knows how to do so: that is, if he knows how to give it a finer expression than Keats did. On the other hand, the meaning of "a joy for ever" can make poor poetry in spite of its according with Keats's context: its effectiveness comes from the way it has been expressed. Modify the expression and it may fall quite flat. The form, therefore, and not the sheer significance of Keats's new line is the wonderworker.

When Degas the painter complained to Mallarme the poet: "I have so many ideas! How is it I can't write poems?" Mallarme replied: "My dear chap, poems are not written with ideas—they are written with words." Of course Mallarme did not refer to meaningless words: poems are not written with gibberish. Nor was he referring to intellectual formulation in language: poetry is not logic set to metre. He was simply stressing the importance of form. Perhaps a less epigrammatic manner of putting the matter would be that poetic form consists in words that embody ideas imaginatively, emotionally, rhythmically. Any kind of idea will do, provided there is a certain ordering of the words chosen, creating an imaginative and emotional stir and bringing about a rhythm which reinforces revelatory word-suggestions. How vitally the imaginative, emotional and rhythmical elements hold together can

(continued from the previous page) be easily sown. Mark what a world of difference there is if Keats's line, without any word being altered, suffers a slight change of word-order, thus: "A thing of beauty is for ever a joy."

The idea or the logical meaning remains the same—and yet that large, unobstructed, profoundly thrilling finality is gone. It is a fine thought, but not fine enough feeling and not fine enough imaginative experience: the stirring of the consciousness does not occur in the depths and spaces of our being. A clipping and a jumping enter into the rhythm, and there is a forced holding of the emotion and the imagination instead of a natural release of them in us. Technically, one may say that the release is got by two means. First, the immediate following of "joy" by "for ever" in Keats's line throws, from the standpoint of grammar, a glow of eternity, of divineness, of archetypalness on the former: the reversed sequence deprives the latter of its adjectival possibilities and so, while logically leaving everything the same, seems to thin away the glow. As an adverb, "for ever" has less spiritual potency. Secondly, a syllable hanging out in "ever" beyond the pentameter scheme gives by its unaccented extra sound the impression of indefinite continuation, the breaking through from the limited into the illimitable, the exceeding of confines and emerging into freedom and fulfilment—in short, a reinforcing of word-suggestions by sound-suggestions. Yes, the technique has an effect but the technique itself is the hand of an inner force fingering deftly its medium, guided by a light and rhythm of the being and not from without by mechanical skill.

These variants have much to recommend them: nothing in them, however, is so satisfyingly suggestive, so aptly vibrant as "for ever". They lack the perfect inevitability of inner and outer form possessed by Keats's phrase.

Going to the root of the question, we shall find this perfect inevitability to be a mystical value. Keats himself supplies a clue by the Platonic sense of beauty he has brought into his line. That "for ever" extends, as I have indicated, the joy of beauty to a divine and archetypal realm. The beauty, therefore, of a line of poetry as of any other thing can be seen to lie in its participating in this realm. Perfect inevitability of form, according to this view, springs from and manifests some supreme and flawless Creative Delight behind the time-process. Modern aesthetics fights shy of such a theory, but whoever interrogates clearly enough his experience of poetic or any other beauty at its intensest cannot put by the sense of the ultimate, the absolute, the Divine. It is not mere pleasure that is given us. Poetry does not end with causing a happy equilibrium, as I.A. Richards contends, between the diverse impulses at play in our nature. Pleasure is there and a happy equilibrium is there; there is also much else. What is basic is our recognition of an irreproachable finality, an utter perfection that confers on every poetic statement a godlike power. Various poets make various statements, they differ among themselves, but each of them seems to bring the compelling touch of the ultimate and the absolute. Though our intellect may not agree, we cannot help feeling that here is something unchallengeable, something that can stand like a deity and command our consciousness. We feel that it participates in a Being that is flawless and "a joy for ever". The participation is through form alone; that is why all kinds of statements are possible in poetry and the question of "truth" in the scientific philosophic or historic connotation does not arise. Perfect form or beauty is "truth", as Keats in his Ode ON A GRECIAN URN declared, in one connotation only; the Being in whose flawless and eternal beauty it participates is the basic reality, the fundamental archetype, of all existence, so that whatever fails to manifest this Being is to the extent of its failure a falsity and not the truth. Art is a wonderful effort to manifest it. Inspiration, that passing of

(continued from the previous page) "the current", is the artists inner sense of it governing his medium. We can analyse the governing, study the elements of imagination, emotion and rhythm, but these elements fuse into a masterpiece because the touch of a mystical Power falls on them. Nothing save that touch metamorphoses Keats's line and makes it dance through the ages on the lips of men.

K.D. Sethna. "ALDOUS HUXLEY TURNS MYSTIC."@@@

I have always been an admirer of Aldous Huxley. But to his recent work I take my hat off with special fervour. His intellectuality was never dull—under his "high brow" were fine imaginative eyes which gave his brain-work not only distinctness but also brilliant and colourful penetration. Now the penetration reaches depth.

Though not a supreme creative artist in language, he has written all his books with a dextrous sensitive marshalling of words and his intellectuality he has turned into a help rather than a hindrance, so that his style is vivid without losing self-control, the enthusiasm of expression is never allowed to get ambiguously purplish, one feels at once heat and coolness, sympathetic intensity and analytic detachment. This combination leads one to depend upon his literary craft—aware that a man who keeps so close a watch on his own mental excitement will not land one in any unescapable morass. It is this combination that renders his new "depth" of mysticism such a valuable aid to the times.

Huxley is no raw neurotic of the supernatural. He may not be an inspired RISHI either—but his poise and steady comprehension, the balanced ardour of his piercing look carry conviction: they have a mature favour, so to speak, and give the transcendental a sort of sobriety which makes it acceptable to commonsense no less than to intuition. There is a sober ecstasy about Huxley's mysticism— and because of it he is able to score one bull's eye after another in arriving at essential truths and

@@@ "The All India Weekly. June, 1944.

(continued from the previous page) their bearing on life. At one single point only the seems to miss the mark; but here too the fault perhaps lies not in failing to grasp the truth but in imperfectly disentangling it from the Christian version of it which provokes his censure.

That Huxley should come to the *via mystica*—at least mentally—was not inconceivable. To say this may sound well nigh a paradox when we consider his old cynical attitude towards the mystics and his pre-occupation with the peculiarities of the sexual instinct. But that preoccupation of his was not sensual: it was intellectual, a fascinated yet detached scrutiny—no wallowing of the mind in the various weaknesses so much as a lucid and vivid observation from a coign of vantage outside the muck. There was always an undertone of ridicule, a sense of the stupidity of sexual indulgences. Men are such fools, Huxley seemed to say, they fall so easily a prey to the copulative function: they talk with shining faces of the soul's yearning for its mate and then proceed to translate it into an idiotic play of the genitals, or else they are driven as by a gadfly, slip without love or even true lust into insincere adulteries and move like machines of inconsequent momentary desire. Thus Huxley not only saw through the sentimental pseudo-spirituality of Middleton Murry whom he satirised in *Point Counterpoint*; he saw as well through the shallow concupiscent antics of the new Freedom, the superficialities of the sophisticated satyrs. What remained to be seen through was the spell that D.H. Lawrence was casting with his pseudo-mysticism of the passionate Subconscious.

Lawrence had what might be called a dark light about him, an inverted intuitiveness, a vision of the Divine upside down, which made him regard the genitals at the top and the idealistic mind at the bottom, the blind Subconscious as the supreme mystery and the unknown Superconscious as a puzzled reflection of it in the passionless intellect looking outside its own self for truth. The Life Force surging from the abyss of the abdomen, warm with its imperative instincts, absorbed in its propagative

(continued from the previous page) zest, unashamed of its quivering lust of body for body, happy and entranced in the beauty of touch and clasp and interpenetration of flesh by flesh—an innocent debauchery untroubled by ideas of sin and spirit, a natural intensity of physical tenderness enveloping all in its close laughing voluptuous heat, an extension of unreasoning naked contact of life-energy to the whole universe in order to feel everywhere some primeval sea of dark entranced oneness: this was the religion of D.H. Lawrence,. Lawrence was a tremendously sincere personality and he actually lived in the inspiration of the Subconscious. Expressed by him with rare genius, his gospel had an appeal for Huxley: it had honesty no less than drive, it threw no false halo around the hot surge of life's mystery as the hypocritical sex-sentimentalists and it gave sense to the elemental oneness the poet in Huxley had always contacted, some basic beauty in the world which was more immediate than the intellect's experience. Lawrence stood like a prophet among his contemporaries—whole-hearted powerful-visioned, fierily vital-warm and rich and deep with concrete realisation.

Huxley could not help being drawn to Lawrence But he could not be quite absorbed by him. Lawrence tended to abolish the intellect instead of giving that liberation beyond itself which would transform and fulfil it surge to order out the jostling world. Lawrence tended to befuddle the poetic faculty instead of giving it a luminous exaltation and not just a dark rapture. To both the intellectual and the poet in Huxley the Life Force appeared to be not its own finality: it was trying ever to exceed itself, to rise to values beyond its own first feeling and formulation—it was always on the qui vive to bring out what was behind it, a secret it did not know and could not find altogether in its own physical passionate being. There was a discontent at its core, a gap in the midst of its richness, which could not be filled by mere instinct and blind tenderness and overflowing amorphous heat of the Subconscious.

(continued from the previous page) The evolutionary elan could not be set at rest by Lawrence, for life does not want mere physical companionship and physical self-propagation and physical ecstasy of the abdominal abyss. It wants a more complex, a more clear form of consciousness, a perfection that is greater than the gratified hungers of the body and the vital being no less than the constructed equilibriums of the experimental mind. The keenest cry for that perfection Huxley could hear only in the mystics he had ridiculed and it could be heard undeniably even through the most ridiculous things they did.

In one of his books he speaks of Madame Guyon picking up from the floor a gob of spit by some sick person and putting it into her own mouth. Madame Guyon was a genuine mystic: Huxley recounts with a cynical smile her morbid self-humiliation. But I am sure that in his heart he was struck by this act to an attitude other than cynicism. A sensualist could pick up a gob of spit thrown by his mistress and swallow it with exultant lust. Any show-room in the underworld of Paris will enact for you the drama of sensual coprophilia, men and women practising an intricate art of dirt. Under the sex-spell all perversities are possible; but Madame Guyon's gesture was different in essence. It was, no doubt, misguided and morbid, yet she was not delighting in filth—there was not the ghoulish, the demonic complex in her, though the outward form of her act was such. She was moved to surpass the recoil of her nerves, the pride of her purity, the shortsight which could not feel God's oneness everywhere and drew a line at so-called dirt. Her self-humiliation was a perverse aspect of her desire for self-transcendence; it was an extreme point reached by the instinct of asceticism, the instinct to accept suffering and mortification as a discipline for the soul. To rise superior to every shuddering sense, to live in a consciousness that cannot be tarnished by any dirt of the world, to see on all sides the one Divine, to annihilate all self-conceit and self-importance, to bring an impersonal unflinching love to all creatures as though all were a single Godlike spirit—nothing short of this lay

(continued from the previous page) at the root of Madame Guyon's gesture as it lay at the root of St. Francis' kissing the wounds of lepers in an ecstasy of adoration. We can recognise here the spiritual being drawn dangerously near the demonic, the perverse—the lower forces trying to darken the higher; but the presence of the higher cannot be denied nor can we deny the beautiful rapture that here seems to stoop so low.

Huxley, while holding up such things to scorn, could not avoid seizing with his keen intellect the superb *fons et origo* of the folly. How could he when he had before him not the follies merely but the marvellous exaltations, illuminations, self-dissolutions, beatific trances and their fruit in splendid action, regenerative work, life-transfiguring service? So he faced the fact that amidst several aberrancies there was at the centre of mysticism a light which alone appeared to come from beyond the protean futility of the bare intellect or the elemental life-force: it struck him as the only thing which had the power to bring a transforming, uplifting, harmonising magic that was lasting in its effect and gave human nature a really new mould. His aim henceforth was to fix upon the essential truth of mysticism and disencumber it of its erratic misuses. He came to believe that the intellect was not a discoverer of ultimate truth but an instrument for checking the lower passions, the personal vagaries and the delusions of grandeur that lie in ambush to trip up the mystic and seduce him into crooked paths—paths of morbid austerity, camouflaged sex, egoistic ambition, power politics. A keen watch for the authentic article and the detection of what is spurious and specious were Huxley's command to himself. The result has been a fine understanding and evaluation of the mystical experience.

K.D. Sethna. "INDIAN THOUGHTS AND ENGLISH WORDS."@@

Some time ago an Indian poet published a book steeped in mystical vision and experience. It drew a varied response from both Englishmen and Indians. Some hailed it as a pulsing, original,

@@ "All India Weekly. May, 1944.

(continued from the previous page) revelatory document; others saw in it a good deal of jejeune clap-trap dressed up in cheap and much-flogged symbolism! I will not discuss its merits or defects on purely literary grounds. What I wish to touch upon is the remark by one critic that the book left a vague feeling of inadequacy because it was written by an Indian in a foreign tongue not indeed ungrammatically or unidiomatically or with incompetent technique but with a certain Indianness of thought which fitted like a round peg the square hole, as it were, of the English language.

For, good poetry is a perfect fusion of substance and form. If the poet's vision is not assimilated by his words, his form becomes somehow faulty, he fails in finality of expression. Of course all poetry has a certain *sura*, so to speak, of the unexpressed and even the inexpressible. There is, for instance, an unfathomable depth, an undertone and overtone of consciousness in Wordsworth's "Voyaging through strange seas of thought, alone." But Middleton Murry would not complain that here there is something forced into the words, which they do not naturally tend to hold: their basic genius and tradition have been harmoniously pressed to a particular end, not contradicted and balked by a meaning, an attitude, a psychology that are unEnglish. If there were an Englishness of mind, then according to Murry the words would not be potent enough to make that perfectly crystallised centre round which the unexpressed and the inexpressible could hang like a halo. Short of that centre, poetry would leave a vague feeling of inadequacy and never be absolutely first-rate.

This implies that no Indian can write first-rate English verse—for the one fundamental and all-undermining reason that his psychology does not fit the English-minded words he is using.

But Murry's statement is most puzzling. Can we say that the English Muse has one definite basic psychology? When the Romantic Movement caught English poets, did not all the hoary-headed classicists find the result unEnglish in temper as well

(continued from the previous page) as style? How bewildered was even Matthew Arnold by the unEnglish ethereality that ran riot in Shelley's work! And what about that pre-Romantic Blake? Are his "embryo ideas" and "unevolved images" and "vague mystic grandeurs" English? Is it English of Wordsworth to poeticise the exaltations of pantheism? Is the early Yeats English—Yeats of the dim poignancies and the rich obscurities? Nobody can affirm that the average Englishman has the foggiest notion of what AE is singing about; yet AE's poems are a living language, English written by an Irishman with soul of an Indian. Can we or can we not stamp as English the Bible's poetic passages, with their lavish oriental imagination, their gorgeous Hebraic religiosity? The English language is the most composite in the world—influences Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, French, Greek, Latin, Italian and Hebraic have gone into its making as well as its mind. It has a capacity to assimilate everything, it can take any colour of thought, shade of suggestion, glow of feeling, pattern of experience and turn them into truly English effects—that is, effects achieved with perfect adequacy by English words. What has happened in the past can happen again. Middleton Murry seems to be talking through his hat, especially when he implies that even a praiseworthy knowledge of English poetical forms and a notable command of the English language at the disposal of Indian inspiration can fail to produce good English poetry. There ain't no such person" as English poetry with one simple and uniform body and soul!

The only genuine criticism possible about a foreign poet handling English is that his knowledge of the verse-forms and the natural idiom is not at all remarkable and therefore produces ineffective poetry, in spite of whatever talent or genius he may have for self-expression in his own tongue. Granted the expressive gift and that intimate knowledge, English verse with its infinite chiaroscuro and plastic possibility is out and out the best medium for any living vision, any momentous

(continued from the previous page) experience. Does Middleton Murry realise that he is not merely condemning Indians but also the English language? If his mouthpiece, the critic who, while genuinely appreciating the substance of that book of mystical and spiritual poems as rare if not new, had gone berserk and, though conceding to the author the rudiments of grammar, accused him of not knowing balance of construction, vividness of phrase or subtlety of metrical rhythm, the argument would have been on grounds that might be plausible. But to charge English words with semi-impotence in expressing fully what may be new or not commonly appreciable is to forget all innovators and to fall into an error.

The fact is that English words have so diverse a genius and tradition, so multiple and complex a psychological history that they are fit for any use. Much more than any other language they could be mottoed with the Roman poet's phrase: "Nothing that is human is foreign to me." It is not improbable that an Indian who has mastered English will still be felt by Englishmen as having a slight peculiarity of expression which is not cent per cent English in turn and tone. It will, however, be critical misfire to forget the numberless foreign strains in the composition of English speech. Each strain, when it first entered into English, brought its slight peculiarity. In our own day, Conrad's novels are not cent per cent English in turn and tone: does any one dream of pulling them down from their pedestal of great style and great literature?

English poets have not displayed en masse and in all its bearings the type of inspiration which shines out in the recent work of Sri Aurobindo or those who have come under his influence. But a prelude to it is already there; hence that inspiration would be a fall flowering of something that is native in essence and not foreign to English words. Even if the inspiration were entirely new, the English language by its multifariousness would prove competent to assimilate and convey it. Nowhere can we play Canute to such a language: "Thus far and no further." When, on the contrary, we see in the first place that the manifold suggestion, either

(continued from the previous page) delicate or powerful, which is mystically and spiritually the most desirable as an expressive mode in which it beats all other modern languages, including the Indian ones, and in the second that in recent times this potentiality has been evoked in the service of mystical and spiritual vision and emotion by English poets with a glory of insight and a sense of vibrating vastness that are unique, when we see these two factors Murry's dictum grows still hollower.

It is idle, therefore, to act Middleton Murry when Indian poets who are at home in English write from the mystical and spiritual heart of their country. Whatever vague feeling of inadequacy there may be must be traced to the average reader's difficulty in absorbing Yogic inspiration and not to any unbridgeable gulf between Indian thoughts and English words. In its full form this afflatus from dimensions of consciousness so far explored only by fits and starts will constitute a new age by the sustained height and depth and breadth it will reveal. The English tongue will bear a taste of the occult and the Unknown as never before. That will be an Indian extension of its basic genius. Still, the fact remains that the extension will be all the more easy and abundant because it will employ the super-suggestive quality residing in the language of England and complete a vital trend of English poets as well as the singers of the Vedas, the Upanishads and the Gita triumph in essence when Sri Aurobindo, summing up his Yogic ideal, chants the mantra.

M. Shaw Mackenzie. "PERSONALITY." @@@@

A very interesting change is taking place in the use of the words "personality" and "individuality", and it is important that these terms be defined when used, otherwise they may be taken in

@@@ "The Occult Review." January 1944.

(continued from the previous page) precisely the opposite sense of that intended.

Everything seemed cut and dried and easy of application at the end of last century. The individuality equated with the Higher Self, the personality with the lower: the personality was to be repressed and vigorously disciplined, the individuality was to be encouraged to grow. In astrology the transition of ideas was made by equating the Individuality (Higher Self) with the Sun in the horoscope and the Personality (lower self) with the Moon. Anyone who had a packet of good lunar aspects was looked upon as elementary, a young soul, or as one who had deliberately chosen the primrose path.

Now, one of the most important living psychologists writes a book "The Integration of the Personality." By C.G. Jung, (Kegan Paul.) on the integration of the personality and upsets the whole apple-cart. What are the occultists doing about it?

They can either refuse to modify or enlarge their concepts, refuse to revise their nomenclature, holding fast to the dogma committed to them, or they can be flexible and adjust their vocabulary to the occasion as a wise man will carefully change his wearing apparel when in the space of a few hours he flies from a chilly, damp, sunless country to a dry hot one. A man is not his clothes; a belief is not the words in which it is enshrined, but both clothes and words must be respected, for they have power to maintain or alter the health of the body.

Here I must enter a plea that the occultists should recognize one of the chief dangers of their study. An occultist believes that he is entrusted with knowledge for which the masses are not ready. It is therefore his duty to be silent. But his secret knowledge will poison him if he does not allow it to work in his daily life. It engenders pride: "I am different from others"; Isolation: "I must remain apart from others. I do not speak their language. They do not speak mine." Then he goes to his daily round with pride, isolation

(continued from the previous page) and a secret as ingredients of his personality and does a poor job of work compared with that of his extraverted colleagues. If a secret means something which is not allowed to function in any way, it becomes a septic focus. On the other hand, it loses its power if it be not sacredly guarded. A true occult secret is like radium, carefully treasured and freely used; the radiations are effective and health-giving. A true occult secret is like love, which manifests best when the injunction is obeyed: "Never seek to tell thy love."

To return to individuality and personality. At first sight it may seem that the words are being used somewhat loosely and that while the flexible occultist may follow the fashion in order to be understood in a psychological discussion, he need make no change in his own practice, but a little consideration will show that the change really corresponds to a change in value, and one reaches the surprising conclusion that the academic philosophers and psychologists have reached a higher occult position than those who remain faithful to the earlier use of the terms.

The study of occultism has two further dangers the first, which is well known, is that it may force development at too rapid a rate and so bring disruption and chaos. A neatly arranged scheme of God in His Heaven directing the world works for those who are nurtured on it, and their lives can be contributions to the upbuilding of the world and the stabilization of law and order. Remove that picture, and the soul concerned may be overwhelmed by forces for which it can find no name. But the second danger, no less real if less obviously disastrous, is the retardation of development, and it may be observed that occultists and mystics who go no further than the Higher/lower Self truth very often remain caught and imprisoned, their life-currents diverted under a recurrent desire to crucify the personality and to make sure that it is well and truly dead. It is true that the recognition of the Higher/lower Self duality

(continued from the previous page) is a necessary stage of the way: "The good that I would I do not, that I do." A beginner on a bicycle, before he has learned to handle it, feels that the machine has a will of its own and is determined to land him in the ditch.

A man buys a car as an instrument of travel and at first finds him instrument strange until he has learned its use and its ways. Then when the car is thoroughly run in and he is expert, he feels it as an extension of himself. If it has a weakness, he localizes it, just as a man who knows his body recognizes a physical weakness. Similarly the man who is introduced to the ideas of Higher/lower Self has first to separate himself from his instrument and learn to say: "I am not my body. I am not my desires." After making the separation in his consciousness, he then, for practical purposes, reunites them for his life-time.

But if his development stops there, his life will tend to become dammed up. He will either have his time and interests fully occupied in repressing his personality—or trying to—or else he may find that the temporary separation did its work too thoroughly and his personality, which should have returned purified and responsive to direction, is an inert and uncertain instrument. But the uncertain instrument is not the only result: as his interest moves from the lower to the Higher Self, impoverishing the former and endeavouring to enrich the latter, he begins a new and more subtle form of self-worship. "My individuality. My Higher Self." It is of the great danger of pride in the Higher Self that light on the path warns us. "Virtue and Wisdom are sublime things: but if they create pride and a consciousness of separateness from the rest of humanity, in the mind of man, then truly are only the snakes of self reappearing in a finer form... he narrows his horizon steadily, till at last the fierce driving inwards leaves him but the space of a pin's head to dwell in." Nicodemus in "Renascence"

(continued from the previous page) (Faber & Faber,) writes similarly: "...We have every reason for supposing that individual systems, individuals which are divorced from Being, are thereby sundered from reality, cut off from life eternal and doomed to corruption and death. They are self-excommunicated, cut off from communion with Being..." After examining definition of individuality and personality, saying, "We thus arrive at the conclusion that both individuality and personality are essentially 'masks' of Reality the form or role which Eternal Being assumes in the process of becoming", he arrives at the following: "Individuality tends to be closed to life, to defend its integrity and uniqueness against all comers, for its essence is difference, and that difference has been achieved at hazard and is ever under threat of extinction. But personality is open to life and others, for its through its persona that the spirit communicates with life, becomes a 'mouth for the world' ".

Nicodemus spoils his argument, in other essays, by sneering at fertility faiths, Yoga and such scriptures as the Bhagavad-Gita and by taking his stand upon Christianity alone. Here again one feels that it is all a matter of definition. If by Christianity he means the record of the last 2000 years, we may well hope to escape instead of returning to the swaddling bands of dependence on authority, to pass from the gloom of shuttered ignorance and iron dogma into the larger freedom of the future in which the other folds and other shepherds will be included, in a wise, life-giving synthesis. But if he means the necessary development of man the animal, of man the creature of circumstance, of man the slave of his own principles into the freedom of which Christ was the gracious type and supreme example, then there is nothing in that freedom to antagonize those who seek freedom using other names. We may then call the word Christianity a scientist's classification of the next kingdom of Nature, although, in view of its history, many would welcome a change

(continued from the previous page) of name. We are watching a new type develop just as if we were watching the slow development of the horse, the dog, the cat from earlier forms, just as, within narrower time-limits, we can watch a butterfly escape from its chrysalis. But we are not only watching an experiment: We are ourselves part of it.

In truth, if a man comes to a knowledge of his own nothingness, if he sees that there is no closed system which he may call his individuality, he will then with care and, may I say, with delight seek to integrate his personality. Life rejoices in paradoxes, and the greatest paradox is that of the livingness of the self-surrendered man. "I live, yet not I." "Your individuality is not your own. It is a mistake to consider a self-surrendered life as if it were suffering from the continued effect of bomb-blast. Eckhart says finely: "God would rather take a man standing up than lying down."

In the story of the birth of Moses we are told that his mother made the sacrifice of her son, abandoning him so that he might be found and taken to the Royal Palace. But she did not lose him after all, for she was appointed his nurse. After separating from our personality, full of stresses and strains and convulsive reactions, our job is to take it again and nurse it. When the subtle distinction between owning a personality and nursing it is perceived, we are on the road to integration.

M.N. Roy. "POST-WAR PROSPECTS FOR PROGRESSIVISM."@@

There are many people who still doubt whether this war will really introduce any fundamental change in the economic and social structure of the world, or even of Europe. But there is a very large volume of opinion to the effect that after the war the world cannot possibly return to the conditions

@@ "Mysindia." 1944.

(continued from the previous page) of 1939. We have lived through a period which is far from normal. The whole fabric of the world has been shaken by the experience of these last four years of war.

The nearer we come to the end of the military conflict, the sharper become the fundamental political issues involved in this conflict. The handling of these issues by some of the great Powers constituting the anti-Axis alliance does not inspire very great confidence.

It may be that they imagine that this war is being fought against a few individuals, and that except for those few there is not much difference between this or that man in the Axis camp. But all these men stand for something; they are not individuals. They are Fascists, representatives of the system which represented a passing age, and which plunged the world into this cataclysm.

Fascism was an instrument created for the effort to maintain a worn-out system. Consequently, the beneficiaries of this system everywhere are patrons of Fascism. It was under their patronage and with their connivance that Fascism grew and captured power.

All these efforts to prejudice the post-war reconstruction of Europe have until now miscarried. After Darlan was disposed of prematurely, serious efforts were made to boost Giraud.

But De Gaulle, to-day is the accredited leader of the French Liberation Committee, and the sanction behind that Committee is no longer a number of discredited Generals, but the underground resistance movement in France. That is the logic of history in operation.

The war is going to end by destroying the Fascist military machine. If others default we can rely on the Red Army.

One thing is certain: Adherents of progressivism will have an entirely different atmosphere to operate in; the atmosphere will be much more

(continued from the previous page) favourable than ever before. What is still more important is that there will be many more people fighting for progressivism and co-operating in the effort to establish than before the war.

When one social order decays, there is general disintegration and decomposition. Large sections of the people on the periphery of the ruling class, which were previously benefited by their loyalty and look for new moorings, as the old order progressively fails to promote their interest and the crumbs they used to get in the days of prospering capitalism get more and more meagre, and even vanish altogether. That is the symptom of the disintegration of a society the symptom of a decaying system. In the period between the two wars, capitalism could not employ a large number of manual workers. Later on, a large number of middle class people also could not be employed. After this war, the inability of capitalism to keep the different classes of society together by providing them with a tolerable means of subsistence, will be greater. Indeed, it will have nothing to hold out before them—nothing to live for and even to die for.

A characteristic feature of modern civilisation is the existence between the capitalist class and the working class of a numerous class of intellectuals, educationists, technicians, artists, etc., etc. They constitute a very important factor in modern society. The decay and disintegration of the capitalist society throws these elements also on to the scrap-heap. But their concern is not only materialist, they are the standard-bearers of the human spirit. When the capitalist social order appears to hold out the perspective of an endless development, not only economic, but in all spheres of life, the cultural aspects of social life as well as civil liberties, freedom, of speech, press and association etc,—the intellectual middle class flourishes. It operates as an integral part of the capitalist society, as its ideological spokesmen, and apologists. There

(continued from the previous page) is nothing to be ashamed of in that when capitalism seems to promote culture. But in the period of decline, all these things disappear, as the established regime employs more and more violent means to cling to power. In that crisis, this very decisive section of modern society perhaps the most important section of modern humanity, is suddenly left not only without economic security and prospects, but with no perspective of cultural development and creativeness Capitalist society offers them no future any more.

That spiritual crisis is a necessary stage in the advance towards Socialism.

There is a mutation in the process of social evolution. The change becomes qualitative. That is exactly what is happening to-day. We hear about one reactionary Mr Amery or Mr XYZ. There may still be thousands like them. But for every one of them there are many thousands of others who are not reactionaries—in England and almost every where in the world of to-day.

Capitalism has exhausted all its possibilities; it must be replaced by a higher form of society so that humanity can progress. If the presupposition of our very striving was not there then we should be mere utopians—romantic visionaries. In every way—theoretically, pragmatically and analytically—we come to the conclusion that the capitalist society has been in the process of decline. This war has accentuated the process; after the war it will not be possible to repair the ruins.

I am speaking from experience—a bitter experience. We must learn from that, if we propose to be builders of progressivism and not mere dreamers.

The transition of the whole world to progressivism will be a much longer process. The time has come when our faith and confidence of are being put to an acid test. You will not have the pleasure of seeing things happen just according to your doctrinaire blue-print of revolution. Things are

(continued from the previous page) not happening as Karl Marx wrote a hundred years ago. Therefore, if you want to be text-book, you will not be satisfied. But things are happening according to the laws of history discovered by Marx. That would satisfy Marx if he lived, and it should console his intelligent disciples.

In that sense, progressivism has become so much necessary that it is becoming almost inevitable. There is actually nothing inevitable in history. The concept of inevitability is unknown in Marxian philosophy. Because inevitability is only another name for fatalism, that predestination. Marxism places man in the centre of the world. Just as I am a man, doing certain things, you may be another man engaged in a contrary process. Consequently, neither can I predetermine, nor can you, whose action will succeed. Therefore nothing is inevitable when a necessity becomes of the highest order. And such is the case with progressivism to-day.

After this war, the world will have to choose between Fascism and Progressivism. I am not becoming wise to-day—on after-thought. Already in the beginning of this war, while all manner of people were talking about democracy, I said democracy was a dead goddess, that the issue was not between democracy and Fascism, but between Fascism and Progressivism. The rise of Fascism meant the death of democracy in the conventionally understood sense. The complete discredit of democracy as conventionally understood was the condition for the rise of Fascism. That was my opinion in 1940. I gave public expression to the opinion also. To-day, as I just tried to explain briefly a large number of people are joining the army of Progressivism. They do not belong to the working class; they were born and brought up in the tradition of democratic freedom. The ideal of dictatorship stinks in their nostrils; but they are such valuable allies that you cannot offend their susceptibilities. We must adjust our ideals to theirs. By widening the concept of democracy—after all Progressivism is real democracy—we can all unite our ideals. When more than three

(continued from the previous page) years ago I said that this was not a fight between Fascism and Democracy, but between Progressivism and Fascism, I also said that Democracy could survive Fascism only by becoming Social Democracy.

There are masses in England also, and they cherish the same ideals as ours. We are not entitled to doubt their sincerity. They have sacrificed incomparably more in this war than you and I for the ideals held in common by them and us. I can tell you that no British government, after the terrible experience of this war, will be able to carry the British people with it for the programme of restoring Fascism. It may still be possible in America, because, like ourselves, America has been very far away from the realities of this war. But the people of Europe will not stand for it.

Fascism is capitalism in decay. In the period of prosperity, capitalism can raise production and thus raise the standard of living of the entire society, can raise human culture and that whole spiritual superstructure of civilisation. Therefore capitalist culture is associated with certain ideals of freedom. But when capitalism exhausts all its possibilities and cannot perform any useful role without encroaching on the preserves of the ruling classes, it begins to tear down the ideals which it itself created to demolish the institutions built by itself and cherished by civilised humanity. It ultimately destroys all liberty and sets up a dictatorship. Because the system can be maintained only by increasing coercion, which cannot be exercised except through a dictatorship. The economic contradictions of capitalism will become sharper after this war. The world will be poorer; world markets will be disorganised; competition will become keener; many countries will be deeply indebted. Consequently the internal contradictions of capitalism will become sharper. Capitalism will have to produce at the least possible cost, and that kind of capitalist economy is possible only as a counterpart

(continued from the previous page) of the Fascist State.

In consequence of this development inside the capitalist camp, there is divergence of opinion; there will be infiltration; there will be doubts, and the world will enter into a period of transition. The capitalists, still having the State power in their hands, may think otherwise; but they will see that restoration of Fascism would be bound to lead to another war, and that would not pay. It is too costly and risky. So they will have to resign themselves, and admit control of this and control of that, a little more control here and there; and that will mean the beginning of the declining (for them) path towards Socialism. Once the process begins, the logic of the process itself will accelerate its pace. And in proportion as it accelerates, Socialism will come nearer.

But while telling you that the present international situation makes the future of Progressivism bright indeed, I want to draw your attention to the fact that the process henceforth may not be of the kind you may have dreamt of. If you want not only to dream of Progressivism but to contribute to the process of its attainment, you have to take a realistic view of the present world situation and try to adjust yourself to that movement. If you do not do that, you will be out of the current. You may consider yourself to be the purest Progressivist, but you will contribute nothing to the attainment of Progressivism.

John Spiers: "INDIAN ART MUST MODERNISE."@@@

Mr Beverley Nichols' writings generally do not appeal to me. I think his "Down the Garden Path" books sentimental, slushy, and not even good literary compost, while his maudlin essay "The Fool Hath Said" makes me quite mentally sick.

(continued from the previous page) It is therefore somewhat unfortunate, really, that from such a source something was said about art, and about Indian art, that needed saying. But as it is with the idea and not the personality that I am concerned, that cannot be helped and in any case doesn't matter. But I hope it will matter for many people to be disturbed, one way or another, whether they are critical experts or mere dilettantes, by the discussion on the fundamentals of art which Beverley Nichols has provoked in his "The Living And the Dead."

He sees "a universal refusal of the Indian artist to look at life with his own eyes, and a stubborn insistence on looking at it through a number of ancient spectacles, of which the most powerful is, of course, Ajanta".

Beverley Nichols calls upon the Indian artist to accept the colour, poverty and tragedy of India as the rich source of his art, to refuse to submit to a sense of inferiority and bitter frustration.

One of the chief reasons, I believe, for the touchiness of the critics is confusing art-values with irrelevancies.

As R.H. Wilenski has shown art is always in service to some idea. Generally it is service to a religious idea, as in the case in Europe in the Middle Ages and as in India today.

Art has also served the romantic idea. Art has served the Court and State and commerce in all countries (e.g. Moghul art in India, the Versailles art of Watteau, modern poster-art.). Art has also served the idea of representation, of holding the mirror up to nature, an idea which is being less pursued now that the camera is able to do it better. The art of today—at least the art which is most exciting—is no longer in service to any of these ideas.

Criticism based on the idea is not artistic criticism, but ideological criticism, whether of religion, science, philosophy or politics. All these ideas are merely convenient symbolisms which the original creative artist uses as a medium to present his original experience of life.

One critic has stated that Indian art reached its apotheosis, its ultimate perfection, when Europe was in barbarian darkness. This is a relative truth, Art is always reaching perfections, original discoveries.

To say that Indian painting ends with Ajanta or with anything in the past, that Indian art has reached finality, is to have a very depressing and limited view of man's development and genius. And if it was true it would be right for the Indian artist in search of material to leave India and go elsewhere for material. But no Indian artist really believes that—and a good thing too. Here it is not Indian art that is being defended, but Indian antiquity, Indian archaeology. An ancient piece of sculpture or an archaic fresco may be wonderful. There is an undoubted national thrill in contact with objects thousands of years old. But period and age is again irrelevant to value in art. It is a matter of survival value, and fashions change with the needs of the times. Just now it is fashionable for political purposes to see something great in everything purely Indian, and the older it is the better. And while some Indians may fool themselves into believing this sort of thing, it will surely not fool the more intelligent, and certainly does not fool the rest of mankind. Which is not to be taken as a condemnation of things Indian, please! For the whole world is sick of the heavy hand of the past, and not only in art. But art is unfortunately the most exploited subject in this period of reactionary survivalism.

Beverley Nichols has not condemned the Oriental Idea of art, but only this belief in the finality of Indian art. When the Indian artist sets out to work the critic grabs him and directs him firmly to Ajanta, as a critic in Europe might hustle an artist to a gallery of old masters or show a sculptor the Elgin Marbles, with the solemn admonition "Look ye on this and despair!" I have met dozens of art students in India—may they be saved from their "art schools"—who, because they have nobody of sufficient gumption

(continued from the previous page) to tell them better, feel naturally frustrated and go on making pretty photographic pictures or popular derivative compositions based on the past.

Beverley Nichols, like many a visitor to India, sees this country in terms of artistic discovery without the spectacles of Indian ideologies, religions or traditions. The only ideology which he stresses in his address is the ideology of India taking her place in a more unified world. He is naturally appalled at the isolation of the Indian artist, not only from the world of to-day, but from the life of the Indian people of to-day. But then, cultural isolationism is a natural by-product of living on the dead past.

Beverley Nichols is rightly and probably righteously indignant with the wastage of artistic life which is throttled with the codes and shastras of high panjandrums. He is in love with the life of India—not with the symbolism, nor I think with the poverty and economic degradation of man in India—but in love with a life which he sees pulsing with exquisite colour and rhythms, an enormous world of tropical and savage splendour, rich in innumerable, incomparable designs and patterns of form and light. "Let India here and now be your Ajanta!" he cries. And immediately there is an uproar from the high priests who imagine they are guarding the sacred temple of art. I suspect strongly that the artists of Ajanta had something like this told them, too, in their day. I suspect strongly that they were also persecuted, for why otherwise did they have to escape like revolutionaries (which they were) into a wild and jungle territory?

I try to imagine what could be done with the rickshaw-puller and the tea picker, the mill-worker and the peasant, the student, the politician and the rich zamindar, the moneylender and the infinite variety of beggars. All this multitudinous life loving and hating away under a hot sun is the living source itself, the living inspiration, the source for contemplation lying

(continued from the previous page) at the very doors of the Indian artist.

But to look only on the past is defeatism. I believe with Herbert Read that no artist "by taking religious thought, can add a cubit to his artistic stature". Art is no more in religion than it is in science. But an artist can use the materials provided by religion and science. Both can evoke moods, and science can tell the artist quite a lot about technical difficulties. But neither can tell the artist anything about what Clive Bell calls significant form. It is ultimately the artist who extracts some order, rhythm, quality, lines and colours from nature, or from his memory of nature, and then intensifies it, sets to work on its presentation, so that the result is something precious. That preciousness has to be understood. Not many artists understand it, except instinctively.

And also apparent in the further confusion of art is cultural snobbery. It is so common in India as it is in Europe. There are a hundred snobs who simulate approval of a Beethoven symphony or a Bach fugue to the dozen or so who get real pleasure out of listening. Snobs are people who are out to make an impression for social or personal purposes. So we find a certain leisure class in India appearing to swoon with exstasy over Indian art, especially the difficult arts of painting and sculpture and dancing, people whose lives are dead, flat and empty and who have never had a vital living relation with anything.

But craftsmanship and technique are insufficient to make a work of art. They may be and usually are necessary qualifications for the creation of a work of art—and creation in the full sense of the word man-alive art must be. On the admission of a recognised critic of Indian art, Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, even Ajanta itself would not be there. On one page of his book "The Arts And Crafts of India and Ceylon" he writes: "Not only are images of men condemned, but originality, divergence from type, the expression of personal

(continued from the previous page) sentiment, are equally forbidden." He then quotes the shastrs: "(An image made) according to rule Shashtra) is beautiful, no other forsooth is beautiful: some (deem) that beautiful which follows after (their own) fancy, but that not according to the rule (appears) unlovely to the discerning." But even he is sincere enough a lover of originality in art to see that the paintings on the walls of the Ajanta viharas attain their importance because of a departure from these strict doctrines. "The Ajanta art," he admits, "though it deals with religious subjects, is too free to be spoken of as hieratic; it is rather discovering than following the types that were to remain prepotent through so many later centuries.

One has only to read the lives and letters of artists all over the world, from VanGogh to Hokusai, to know that the whole time serious artist lives his life to his work. In other words his whole life is a meditation, a contemplation and an inspiration. All artists of worth are creative yogis. It is this union with a more vital world of reality and their proof of it by and through their works, which sets them aside from fake artists and the mass of art producers. It is this too which distinguishes them from the snob-followers and the connoisseurs and the little people of little vision who allow the dead to eat them up.

Even if we dispute his personal life and views we cannot in justice dispute his original, magical world. He bows us that world in his art, There after our world is enriched. It is always possible that he may run to some political or religious book or sage, but no original artist ever belongs to a "school" or a "tradition". Instead he makes his own tradition." He is a master in his own right.

I am genuinely concerned with the future of art in India for probably the same reason as Beverley Nichols. I am anxious to see a living art and not a passing-off of traditionalism. If

(continued from the previous page) one is sensitive at all to the feeling of love of a country, it hurts deeply to see so many opportunities lost and the art-spirit of India bypassed into the worship of the past, instead of being vitally concerned with world of the present.

I heartily agree with those who say that India has her own mighty creative contribution to give. But it must be given, not borrowed from antiquity. I therefore qualify my agreement by emphasising the quality of uniqueness. This means that it would be equally deplorable and depressing to see Indians artists (as many are doing) copying the traditions of the West. I want to see something new and something that is Indian at the same time. I do not think this is asking the impossible. That attitude I feel sure would be churlish and an affront to the power of India and her artists. The cultural superiority doctrine, which is national snobbery, will not work either way.

The truth is that in Europe today the direction of the artist is towards expressionism in art, fumbling its way perhaps through surrealism (which is the photographic method applied to the mind and the sub-conscious world of dreams) and abstract art (attention to form and design without obvious relationship with representational ideas). It is in many respects puritanical and formalised, and in its sensitivity of line and spacing has some slight correspondence in spirit to many Oriental symbolic styles—particularly to the Chinese. This will be seen more clearly perhaps in modern furniture which is almost identical with some of the oldest Chinese pieces.

Another important fact is that many critics in Western countries do not like this art of today. They call it too revolutionary, too much a break with the past. What they do mean is that it is unfamiliar. For the conventional critic of East or West the unfamiliar is always a danger. It strikes sharply at the fundamental basis of the critic's view of life and art.

The trouble with most so-called schools of Western art in India and the teachers is that they have not developed with the art discoveries made today in the West. All that the school can give is a valuable training in technique and skill.

John Spiers: "INDIAN ART MUST MODERNISE."

I would have the artist follow his own idea, finding his own type of symbolism, from the East or from his own intelligence and imagination. The symbol taken need not be based on familiar things at all. It need have no "perspective" or "hieratic origin", "religion" or "story", any more than a fine piece of architecture or a mud pot has. But it must be the artist's own precious contribution.

What has been said in "The Living and to Dead" needed saying, and took courage to say (the white man talking down to the brown is an idea nearly impossible to leave out), but I hope that emotionalism will not be allowed to interfere in the criticism of Beverley Nichols' address and that what he said will be at tonic to the hundreds of young artists in whose vision and capable, delicate hands lie the future of art in India.

ERNEST KIRK: "EDITORIALS."@@@

"The Fallacy of Imagination." "The Oxford Dictionary defines "Imagination" as "fancy; the mental faculty forming images that are not present..." Put in still plainer language that means imagining objects that do not exist in reality.

That definition will serve our purpose, and on its basis what I am going to suggest and try to demonstrate is that anything imagined in this sense fancied, created out of nothing, so to speak, has in fact no existence and is an illusion, a fallacy. Indeed, I wish to show that the mere imagination of a thing that does not exist is much more a fallacy than are many of those things that are regarded by some people as mere appearances, in contradistinction to what is thought of by them as REALITIES. For example some Monists of a certain Vedantic school will think of physical existence and physical pain, etc., as MAYA, as having no reality, as compared, say, with what they posit in their own minds as the one Infinite Life Force, which they consider to be the only reality.

That, too, is a form of imagination and one could apply this also in a reverse direction to an Atheist who fondly imagines that what cannot be seen by the physical eye or handled by hands and measured in terms of the laboratory, does not exist and is therefore an illusion. For imagination as defined, is a state or condition in which the human unit of life-thinks or imagines, or FANCIES he sees something that has no existence in fact. And in his enthusiasm and self-hypnosis he invites you to see, what? — nothing.

A story I once read, I forget where and when, illustrates this point. It concerned a certain powerful monarch who surrounded himself with magicians who were reported to be able to weave by their magic such marvellously fine subtle, and invisible garments that only those who possessed wisdom could see them. An experiment, so the story goes, was made with the monarch himself. The magicians clothed him in the invisible robes. In actuality he was naked. But as no one present among the courtiers was willing to admit this fact all those assembled, except a little child who blurted out the truth, professed to see what did not actually exist, except in imagination.

That, roughly, illustrates what we mean by the term "imagination" — a state or condition in which a person fancies or imagines something exists which does not exist at all. It is a fallacy, but he imagines to be a reality.

I would like this fundamental truth to be grasped because, as I have said, it applies as much to those who DENY as it does to those who AFFIRM. A person who confidently and fantastically denies that certain things of which he has no knowledge, do not exist, is in no way different in principle from the person who affirms that certain things exist just because he fancies they exist, when in reality they do not exist at all outside his imagination. Both are ignorant. Both, for reasons of their own, have committed the fallacy of creating something out of nothing under the pressure perhaps of wishful thinking or prejudice or habit of thought, or because it

(continued from the previous page) is written in a book labelled "sacred".

A thing either exists or it doesn't. If it doesn't exist no amount of imagination will or can produce it. Conversely if it does exist no amount of scepticism or denial or repudiation will make what exists non-existent. Take the question of the survival of the human unit of consciousness after the dissolution of the physical vehicle, and the evolution and development of that self-consciousness in other states and conditions. Either these things are true and exist; or they are false and do not exist. If they are true and do exist they can neither be created by imagination nor can they be spirited out of existence by the mere denial of them.

When I assert, as I do assert, the possibility of certain physically embodied human beings travelling in full consciousness, and without going into SAMADHI or a trance, from one state of human existence to another more inner and fuller, and bringing back first hand knowledge of that state and condition, either what is asserted is true or it is not. If it isn't true imagination will not make it true; and if it is true mere repudiation or denial will not alter by one iota the facts.

"Is there," it may be asked, "any sure guide or criterion here?" Most certainly there is. Roughly speaking I would say that a good and safe criterion is that of harmony with the demonstrable and universal facts of life. If a statement or belief or proposition of any kind clashes or is out of harmony with the known and demonstrable facts of life, it may be safely set aside as being untrue or unacceptable. If, for example, some one comes along and claims that certain beings living on this earth are capable of defying death and living to any age they like, such a claim, being out of harmony with the known facts of life, may be safely turned down as false. Similarly, if it were held that the "Golden Ages" of Humanity were in the PAST, and not in the remote FUTURE, such

(continued from the previous page) a contention, clashing as it does with well established law of evolution and progress, could be safely said to have no foundation in fact.

It is well, also, here to avoid all speculation and wishful thinking about the Unknowable, something by the way which seems to exercise a fatal fascination on a certain class of minds. Indeed, there are many people who seem to take a perfect delight in philosophising and spinning theories—another form of imagination—about that of which nobody knows anything at all.

There are two safeguards here. The first is the realisation of the simple truth that nothing absolutely nothing, can be known, or ever has been known about the intrinsic nature of life itself—the unknowable. The second simple guiding truth is this: that life of any sphere can only be known by the way It manifests in matter or forms. That manifestation in its entirety contains everything that exists, whether it be visible and objective or whether it be invisible, intangible, and what we, speak of as subjective. All that human beings can do is to understand the *modus operandi* of that manifestation and co-operate intelligently with the same. They certainly cannot add anything to that manifestation by a process of imagination; neither can they change anything by the denial and denunciation.

That is the real meaning of the phrase "the Rock of eternal truth." It means that which rests not on the shifting sands of beliefs and wishful thinking or on the mirage of imagination, but on those things that are an expression, a manifestation in all worlds and spheres of the One Grand Infinite Life Power.

A great deal of nonsense is often talked about so-called creative works of art or science. These things are frequently referred to as being the laborious or spontaneous production of the personality, meaning by that term also, the brain and the glands etc. It cannot be too often or too strongly emphasised that all great living creations, that is all

(continued from the previous page) things of life, whether of art or of science, whether of philosophy or of reform, are not the result of "spontaneous self-generation and development" but of that when is an expression or manifestation of life, contained, if you will, within the impulse or influx that comes from the one life through chosen instruments. That is the real cause and producer of all manifestations. We have a potent illustration of this in the dual rays of light and heat—corresponding in the human kingdom to intelligence and love—that come personally from the sun of our solar system which give life and vitality to all physical manifestation in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms.

What we have to fall back upon are the manifestations of the one Life in multitudinous forms in every kingdom of nature subjective and objective. This is the only revealed truth, the Eternal Rock of truth and not anything fancied or imagined, for anything outside this is an illusion a fallacy.

No Neutrality in this war:— It often seems to us in this war that there is a SIXTH columnist group in every allied country more sinister and dangerous than any FIFTH columnist group could ever be. It is the group that Hitler has banked on so successfully in Germany and other countries. We refer to that mass of credulous and superstitious people, some of whom, though they have not the ghost of an idea as to the real issues in this struggle, yet frequently venture to give expression to half-baked and utterly confusing and dangerous ideas as to this, that, and the other. And unfortunately some of these people are to be found in the editorial dens of responsible newspapers, and as war correspondents. Perhaps that is because they have money, or it may be because of the "influence" of some relative. But whatever it be it certainly is not because they have understanding. They are a positive nuisance and a danger and should be pensioned off, or else put in concentration camps for the duration.

This is a global war, with global issues of deciding whether future mankind shall be governed on a dictator—vested—interest basis or whether it shall be governed on the evolving principles of democracy and the four freedoms. Should the dictators win there would no longer be any freedom religious or otherwise. Nor would there any longer be any room for neutrality and “independent sovereign states”—except those that are tolerated by or suit the purpose of the dictators.

Indeed whatever happens in the future this war as already made it perfectly clear to all but fools and nitwits and religious fanatics, that neutrality and isolated independence—whether religious or mundane, economic or political—belong to a dead and dying past. The specious argument advanced by Devalera that Eire’s neutrality is an keeping with loyalty to the democracy of Eire will deceive no one. It is meaningless, antedivian.

The plain truth is that something is taking place now in this war that will vitally effect humanity as a whole for generations to come. Neutrality mongers, in so far as they do no seriously interfere with the progress of the war may be ignored. When they do interfere with that progress they have of necessity to be dealt with. There can be no sloppy sentiment allowed here. The matter is too serious. Too many millions of people have already died for the cause for that.

Everything being at stake neutrality, except where desired, is a crime against humanity. And that is true also at this juncture with regard to appeals for peace. The appeal must rather be to harden the heart, stiffen the will and go through to the bitter end—the complete destruction of Hitlerism and Tojoism. In the circumstances the Pope’s appeal is understandable. As head of a great religious organisation which has millions of members fighting on both sides he might find it very awkward to advise those members of the Church fighting on the side of the United Nations to steel their hearts

(continued from the previous page) and destroy those other members of the church who are fighting on the side of the dictators. That is the problem of all religions and not only that of Christianity. It is in fact part of the universal problem of evil which no religion and no pacifist has yet been able to solve, or come any where near it.

Proof of that is seen in the misguided zeal by which men like the Rt, Hon. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri continue to urge as a solution of the world's troubles, total disarmament and the appearances at the peace table of pacifists. Such an attitude entirely ignores the facts of life and human nature.

In his book, "Beggar My Neighbour," Mr Lionel Fielden has the following about Gandhi:

"The bother about Gandhi, as far as Englishmen are concerned, is that he makes you feel small, or to put it a little differently he makes you feel that your soul, or your motives if you like, may be rather mean and paltry."

Well, friend Fielden is of course, entitled to his own reactions to Gandhi, but when he generalises in this absurd fashion about "Englishmen" he is simply romancing and making himself ridiculous. Fielden's reactions are certainly not ours, and we are English and have known Gandhi for probably a longer time in India than has Fielden. Many are the hours that we have sat listening to him and studying him in meetings and conferences, and twice at least we have headed deputations to him but never once has he had the effect upon us described by Fielden.

Indeed, if we are to be quite frank, the impressions made upon us by Mr Gandhi have invariably tended to a rather opposite direction—We have thought of him—and still do—not as a profound thinker, or as one who has a clear and synthetic grasp and understanding of the demonstrable and universal facts of life, but rather as a religious fanatic and Puritan with the instinct and ability of appealing to the mass mind.

We came to that conclusions early in his first non-violent campaign in India over 20 years ago.

Gandhi's theory of ahimsa is untenable and contrary to the facts of life, and since then we have seen no reason to revise our conclusions. Indeed, the more the facts of life are studied, together with some of Gandhi's admitted "Himalayan blunders," the more clear does the falsity and untenability and danger of Mr Gandhi's position become.

Moreover, Congressmen themselves, in so far as they are honest and with themselves, will admit the limitations of human nature on this score, and the consequent impracticability of the adoption of AHIMSA as a CREED in practical politics.

As an ideal to be aimed at most people will, we think, admit that AHIMSA has a place. It may even be possible to certain rare individuals to practice it. But everybody knows that any serious attempt to organise society on this basis would be doomed to failure. Nature and not Nurture would assert itself.

And so when Mr Gandhi takes the fanatical and impractical and utterly untrue and unnatural attitude and insists on applying it enmasse as a workable policy in the life of anation, or in the life of evolving Humanity as a whole, how is it possible to have respect for his judgement as a "wise" man? It isn't To do so it would be necessary to ignore the clear facts of life and take leave of one's senses.

Surely the criterion of the truth of anything is not whether a person who is labelled a "Mahatma" says it, or whether a lot of people believe it, but whether what is asserted and claimed is in harmony with the demonstrable facts of life.

"Science and Selfishness.":- The greater and more advanced the scientist the more cautious and humble be is and the less ready he is to fix limits or dogmatise. Many are ready to agree that only

(continued from the previous page) the FRINGE, the EXTERNALITY, of knowledge has yet been explored by orthodox science and that there must be deeper layers still unexplored more wonderful than any yet known.

Nothing can or ever has been known about life itself, and that life can only be known by the way it MANIFESTS in form or matter.

Humanity is always learning, always finding out its mistakes and correcting the same—a very slow and very painful process, from ignorance to knowledge, from weakness to strength and from selfishness to unselfishness.

The trouble here is that human beings are inclined to be Copernican in their ATTITUDE to science, or knowledge of the facts of life. Ordinary human nature, including that of scientists, is inclined to measure everything by its own limitations of knowledge and to make everything revolve round and answer to that centre of egotism and pompous ignorance. What they do not know not only does not exist, but those who say it does are fools and nincompoops.

Orthodox science, then, is that little bit of knowledge about the surface of things that has been fairly well tested and demonstrated in our laboratories and factories and shown to be supported by facts. The far greater body of knowledge is still unknown to our savants. But as we have seen by the history of the past, especially the past 150 years or so, ignorance as to the existence of those demonstrable and universal facts of life does not disprove them. They were there all the time. Scientists did not create them. They only discovered what had existed from the very beginning. They discovered them because humanity had reached a point in its evolution where this was possible and practicable and inevitable. That is the only rational and sensible explanation as to why steam and electricity, etc, were not discovered earlier.

The fact that scientists generally did avoid political issues only went to show on which side they stood—on the side of traditions and conventions governing society. But the very forces of progress and reform that science had released would eventually force the scientists to newer and more sensible alignments with society which was itself being slowly transformed and integrated into one whole by science. From this standpoint scientists, more than anybody else, had altered the conditions governing society and in the postwar world this would grow in significance and importance.

"Art and Science.":— Life by itself cannot be expressed, whether by way of art or by way of science, without some form, while on the other hand form is impossible without life. Of life itself we know nothing, absolutely nothing, and so cannot even speculate about it. All that can be known about life is by the way it manifests in form or matter. We have also much evidence to show that life is all-pervasive. Sir C.J. Bose proved by his wonderful experiments that life existed in metals as well as in plants. The basis, therefore, of both art and science is life. Without life there can be neither art nor science.

It will prevent us from making the silly and foolish mistake of thinking that a great artist is necessarily a saint. He is normally no more a saint than is a great scientist, or a great sportsman, or a great industrialist, or a great explorer. Apart from his particular gift he may be very ignorant and defective.

The old fashioned idea that genius can be produced biologically at will, or through education or environment, will be abandoned as the fallacious wishful thinking it is. So, too, will be abandoned the equally erroneous notion that great impulses and thoughts—which are things of life—are secreted with from the glands or the brain as bile is said to be secreted from the liver.

(continued from the previous page) An artist will then be seen to be what he truly is—a specially prepared Human instrument through whom certain of the influxes of life can the more readily and more perfectly be caught and expressed in the form of some great work of art.

Always the natural born artist will want scope and freedom to express himself in terms of life and not so much in terms of any set form, less still in terms of any dead custom or tradition. Indeed, in his enthusiasm he may sometimes ignore or underestimate the other expression. And that of course is sometimes true of the natural born scientist who may see everything in terms of science, and not in terms of life, less still in terms of that harmony which is a balanced combination of both.

Nothing striking happens, either by way of art or science, until the pre-requisite conditions for its happening have first been provided. For instance, though electricity has been in the world from the very beginning it is only in comparatively recent years that it has been discovered and turned to practical use, and that, too, only among the more advanced nations of the world. Why is this? Obviously because the conditions for its discovery and use had first to be provided in a growing understanding and intelligence. All of which emphasises the truth of Evolution. Were it otherwise we should be justified in looking to the Hottentots, or the Aborigines of Australia, or other primitive peoples, for discoveries relating to steam, electricity, etc.

And that is true also of great works of art—music painting, sculpture architecture, etc.—with this difference, that music and painting and singing and dancing, not being dependent in limited circles on the use of steam and electricity, and being more simple and natural expressions of life, are almost as old as man himself. But of course these “expressions” evolve as man evolves. A great work of music like Beethoven’s 9th Symphony could not be effectively given to the world and rendered until the requisite conditions, by way of the necessary instruments, etc. had first been provided.

(continued from the previous page) of the necessary instruments, etc, had first been provided.

It does not necessarily follow that because a person is an expert in one direction he is thereby capable of speaking words of wisdom in another direction.

“The Mesmerism of Sanskrit.”— According to a statement made by Mr S.V. Ramamurti, Adviser to H.E. the Governor, “No Indian can grow to the best of his ability unless he draws his sustenance from his roots. The main roots of Indian Life are in Sanskrit and allied culture. Alone, among the ancients, Indians sensed the values of the spirit, not in a dim, mysterious way, but as something clear and of value in-day to-day life. The discovery of Greek and Latin led to the renaissance of Europe.. The renewed study of Sanskrit literature in the light of modern knowledge will, I believe, similarly lead to a renaissance of India and hence the world.”

Why in the light of modern knowledge? If the “roots” of a everything are in Sanskrit why shouldn’t those “roots” inspire and throw light on modern knowledge, instead of vice versa? Then why the abominable superiority complex as expressed in the words “alone” among the ancients, Indians sensed the values of the spirit”? Why also the conceited suggestion that a renewal of the study of Sanskrit will lead to a renaissance of India, and hence the world? If Sanskrit is so culturally dynamic as all that why has it not exercised a greater restraining influence among those profiteers and racketeers in this war who are well versed in Sanskrit lore?

We have no wish to say anything that would appear to be little anything ancient in linguistic affairs—Dravidian, Sanskrit, Grek, Latin, Egyptian, Chinese, Hebrew, Pali, Chaldean, Atlantean, or even the oldest language of all, that of signs and gestures. But to be continually harking back to and calling for a renewal of one or other of these linguistic efforts and accomplishments of the ancients

(continued from the previous page) as containing the secret of rejuvenation and cultural renaissance, both for India and the world, strikes us as a negation of everything progressive and dynamic. What, we suggest really matters is not the linguistic label on the bottle but the contents—contents which can be drunk from any bottle, ancient or modern.

“Jeans’ Pessimism Concerning Civilisation.”:—

Sir James Jeans, the well known scientist, takes a depressing gloomy view of civilisation. Sir James is reported as suggesting that civilisation was in the process of destroying itself and says:

“Perhaps civilisation carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. Certainly the pessimist would take that view and point to the way we are using the coal and oil that should be preserved. the way we are cutting down trees and turning fertile areas into dust bowls; the way we are waging wars, which grow ever more and more destructive...mankind’s knowledge of destruction has increased and, so far as we can say, it will go increasing.”

Scientists use to tale of the Sun of our solar system in that pessimistic way. It was a great ball of fire which would eventually exhaust itself and bring ultimate extinction to itself and everything depending on its outgoing rays of light and heat and life. But that view is no longer held. It has been discovered that in some way, which is attempted to be explained by science, a process of rejuvenation is perpetually in motion in the very elements composing the sun. And as all the planets of our solar system, including our little Earth, are sustained by the constant outflow of the sun’s vitality and life—“giving power, it follows from this that all the planets of our system must similarly partake of that rejuvenation in perpetuity.

And if that is true of physical planets, how much more must it be true of human beings who draw their real inner sustenance from the one infinite, all pervading Life, of which our visible Sun is but a kind of Clearing House for this solar system and of which each human being is in reality a finited

(continued from the previous page) unit of that Infinity? Changes of course there must be in the gradual evolution and development of mankind. And in these changes there must necessarily be the “destruction” of many outer forms of human society. New wine (a greater expansion of human awareness) must be provided with, new bottles—new systems of government and new and saner methods of managing our political, social, financial and economic affairs.

But in those changes there is no occasion for pessimism. Always, if taken integrally and as a whole, our “civilisation,” inner as well as outer, is a slight improvement on the “civilisation” that has preceded it. What is more, each “civilisation” provides another rung in the ‘Jacob’s ladder’ of evolution by which we climb to something better and finer.

It is certainly true, as Sir James says, that with the advance of science mankind’s knowledge of destruction has increased. It may also be true that it will continue to increase. But surely knowledge, as it increases and deepens into understanding, will construct as well as destroy. Indeed that is the nature of real intelligence. A civilisation void of any intelligence—is there such a civilisation anywhere now?—may also have within it the seeds of new aspiration and resolves that call for optimism and not pessimism, for hope and not despair.

“The Way to Truth.”:— In the GITA there is a statement which runs something like this: “By whichever way a man approaches me by that way do I welcome him.”

The word “Me” there, I suggest, is intended to represent two totality of Truth or Life, and the word “way” the innumerable approaches to that totality. In some respects it is not unlike that other scriptural statement in the NEW-TESTAMENT; “I am the way the truth and the life”, for the “I” there would appear to have the same meaning as the word “Me” in the GITA statement. They both appear to mean the totality of truth, or the one infinite

(continued from the previous page) Life — omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent.

But as no one knows anything at all about the intrinsic nature of life itself, but only as it manifests in a multitude of ways or forms, it follows, and must follow, that all we can know about life is by the way it MANIFESTS or EXPRESSES itself in some form or other. So that in reality truth is life in manifestation, LIFE EXPRESSED IN SOME FORM OR OTHER ON ANY PLANE OR IN ANY STATE AND CONDITION, FROM THE SIMPLE AND MOST MUNDANE TO THE MOST COMPLEX, SUBTLE, AND INTANGIBLE, FROM THE GERM OR SEED TO THE FULL BLOOM AND FRUIT. Truth, therefore, is not anything mystical or mysterious—that is merely ignorance mixed with superstition; in its completeness it is the how and why and wherefore of life in manifestation in every sphere and realm. In plant life, for instance, it would be the way life expresses itself in the plants, a knowledge of which is labelled botany. A botanist who knew all about plant life with something like accuracy would know the truth in that particular branch of life's manifestation. In other sciences truth is seen in regard to measurements, quantities, qualities, etc., and their properties and relationship to each other and the whole. The formula $2 \times 2 = 4$ is a mathematical truth. It is life expressed in that way. It is the same in the realm of art, of philosophy, of astronomy, of astrology, of sex, of reforms, and even of in politics.

The idea that so-called religious people—Mahatmas, Masters, Rishis, Seers, Yogis, Saints, etc.—are the only people capable of seeing and approaching the truth is a fallacy that badly needs liquidating. More often than not they see a particular aspect of truth only. The real scientist who is not governed by beliefs or anything written in a book called "sacred", but in the book of life, and who is guided by the demonstrable facts of life—the way life manifests in form—is often nearer the truth than are those who profess to specialise in truth, so-called. But there are those of course, who have a more complete understanding of

(continued from the previous page) truth in its entirety, and who are able to view it synthetically and with a grasp of the general principles of the whole. But these are very few and more often than not remain unknown and in obscurity.

The chief thing I am trying to make clear here—in addition to giving a definition of truth is that truth is nothing more and nothing less than a demonstrable manifestation that can be known and tested in its relation to the whole. There is, I emphasise again, nothing mystical or mysterious about it.

A person either knows or doesn't know. If he doesn't know he usually either becomes dogmatic and says it doesn't exist or else he takes refuge in mysticism or superstition or mere beliefs and ceremonies. But neither attitude effects in the slightest degree the actual manifestations of life in any realm, objective or subjective. And it is these manifestations that constitute truth. There is no other truth and never was and that, too despite the incredulity of modern Pilates who, continue to ask the old foolish question "what is truth?" Truth is everywhere around us in nature. All that is necessary is the seeing eye and the understanding heart.

And that brings me to the second part of this discussion—the Way to Truth. What is the way? Roughly speaking the way is by growth, evolution, developments, and in itself multifold.

1. Self dependence and independence of thought and action and the unwillingness to do anything or make any important decision not in harmony with one's own inner connection and thought—the highest best thrill is within one.

2. Willingness, while keeping an open and alert-mind to any old belief or custom and follow the facts as they are clearly revealed. Needless to say this applies as much to politics and religion as to anything else. It is a form of detachment.

(continued from the previous page) Loyalties to parties and persons though useful and even essential at certain stages of one's growth, become positive barren to a wider understanding and practice at another.

3. I would mention as the next requisite to a knowledge of the truth in its synthetic and wider aspect a discovery or understanding of one's own natural life qualities and what is involved in that discovery. Most people have not yet made that discovery. In a vague way they know that they like certain things better than they like others and that doing the things that they like, and for which they themselves best fitted, gives them a certain amount of happiness, but they have no idea of the real implication of all things. If they had they would have in their hands a key to unlock many problems. They would know for instance why are here and why they pass through certain experiences that may be painful and trying. They would learn to act in harmony with this inner natural law or natures and doing so would greatly expand their knowledge of truth.

4. The big and essential part struggle, ignorance and frustration played as aids and spurs to the attainment of discrimination and strength and understanding.

"The Proper Place of Idealism.":— The subject should be considered in the light of two basic and universal facts which were (1) the ego-centricity of the personality and (2) evolution, which meant that we learned sense and discrimination gradually and through experience.

Human nature being almost universally egocentric, was not yet at such a level of development as to permit of the adoption of ahimsa in the practical affairs of life and of the Government of a country. It might, we urged, be all right as an ideal, or for adoption in individual cases but not otherwise. In support of our proposition we should that members of the congress, like other human beings, compelled in business. metaphonically cut one anothers throats

(continued from the previous page) when the "business" occasion seemed to demand it, used locks, bolts, bars, Police and Courts to protect and defend their property, and generally acted on an egocentric basis. In other words ahimsa was purely an idealistic slogan and had very little to do with the hard facts of life.

This point was largely conceded by the prime opposer. His chief submission, however, was that in such a state of things it was highly essential that someone should blaze the trail and pioneer the ideal of ahimsa, and that Mr Gandhi ought to be honoured and revered for doing this.

There is no harm in this so long as the idealism which it represents is not mistaken for realism and attempts are made to apply it to the masses in practical politics. When that happens it becomes an Utopian snare and delusion which is bound to bring many nasty repercussions in the train.

And it is precisely the same in economics and labour questions. The ideal, and which many think is communism, and which others think is expressed in "Bellamy's Looking Backwards," or in some other form of ahimsa Utopian Socialism—may serve a useful purpose as an ideal but when attempts are made to ignore the facts and take short cuts to the ideal then the trouble begins.

We are not trying to belittle the ideal. Ideals certainly have their place, if only as finger posts pointing in a certain direction. The ideal, "do unto others as ye would they should do unto you," is a useful reminder of certain potentialities that are to become actualities in the Golden Ages of the future. But do we legislate and organise society on the basis of that ideal? Certainly not. We organise on the basis of what we know are the present day realities, one of which is that human beings, generally speaking, think and act not in terms of that ideal but in terms of quite a fair amount of I-ness and My-ness. That is practical common sense. It takes into account the facts, including the fact of Evolution or a steady progress towards something better. Always the trend, speaking generally, is towards something higher and better.

This does not necessarily mean the slavish acceptance of the doctrine of gradualism. It is true gradualism would appear to be the rule in Nature, but saturate us points, followed by sudden upheavals and explosions and comparatively rapid transformations, are sometimes also reached. It almost looks as if human as a whole had reached one of those Saturation points and as if some revolutionary changes would be witnessed in the post-war world. But it would be folly to imagine that the end of the war will usher in an economic millennium. It will not, But old Orthodox forms of economic exploitation and egocentricity will continue to raise their ugly heads. But with the growth of a newer and better understanding they have less power than they use to have. So there is no harm in dreaming dreams and in having high ideals, always provided a firm hold is kept on the actualities of life.

"The War and Inner Calm.":— With a stillness and peace broken only by the sound of the whispering zephyr breezes in the tops of the tall blue-gum trees or the sweet music of the birds, up here in these ideal surroundings and atmosphere it is difficult, and, on the fact of it rather sacrilege, to switch one's mind to the grim struggle and horrors of the global war.

It may be that in most of the countries of our planet there are still little havens of peace and beauty where those who are fortunate enough can relax and lose themselves for a time and even succeed in temporarily forgetting the struggle and the sufferings of the war. That is as it should be. It certainly is true that we have still amongst us in human society children of an older growth, who, are apparently quite untouched by and unconscious of the global and revolutionising nature of the present struggle, and who are still quite satisfied to play with their earthly toys and get pleasures out of the same. That too, in a way, is as it should be. It only means that these people are still

(continued from the previous page) children in real understanding, responding only in their limited knowledge to those things they do understand. They too, are manifestations of the same one infinite Life Power, integral and essential parts of It.

So that when you come to look at the panorama of life from the standpoint of the whole—not an easy thing to do—there are really no inconsistencies and incongruities. Striking contrasts, yes, but no inconsistencies. Everything is seen to be an integral and essential part of the whole at every stage of evolution and development. The winter is a contrast to the summer, childhood and youth to full manhood and womanhood, but without the winter there could be no summer and without childhood there could be no full manhood and womanhood. So, too, without war and struggle there can be no peace and no real discrimination and strength. The man who, regarding the former as "evil" and unnecessary takes refuge in caves and ashrams of sweet sounding scriptural phrases and ideologies, does but deceive himself. It is true that the peace he seeks, the "Kingdom of Heaven", is within, but always the way to it is through test and strain and struggle. Were it intended otherwise we should have been born wise and not ignorant, strong and not weak. And what applies to the individual applies to humanity as a whole.

But in the actual struggle itself we are apt to lose sight of the wood in the trees the principles in the details, the whole in the part, we apt to think there is no connection between the two. In the tensivity of the moment the part blots out the whole. Instead of the loss of a brave son or husband on one of the many battle fronts being regarded as the honour and glory that it really is, it too often brings with it a sense of gloom and depression and sadness almost beyond human endurance. Courage: Could it be otherwise it would be. And out of the sorrow and sadness and loneliness comes joy and strength and gladness and a sense of greater comradeship and unity.

The clash and din of that invasion must and will contrast sharply with the peace and calm of the Blue Mountain peaks and valleys, but the contrast is only on the surface. Deep within it is the same one life manifesting in a diversity of evolving forms.

"The Mistaken Materialism of M.N. Roy.": —

With the general movement in the direction of a more scientific and intelligent production of the necessities of life, and a more equitable distribution of the same, we invariably find ourselves in the deepest sympathy and ready to give all possible co-operation that does not obviously clash with the known facts of life. When, however, some of the high—brow exponents of Socialism begin to do puja at the shrine of Karl Marx and interpret his view in a way which clearly are at variance with some of those facts, including that of the fuller and more complete question of determinism, we find ourselves just as strongly under the "historic necessity" of protesting, as we should if some highbrow mathematician seriously contended that the formula $2 \times 2 = 5\frac{1}{2}$ and not 4.

As a rough and ready illustration of what we mean we will take a few extracts from a speech made some time ago in Calcutta by M.N. Roy which appears in the issue of "Independent India" for 18th June, 1944. Here is a sample: "Marxists do not believe in the old saying that man proposes and God disposes. Still the wisdom contained in the old saying need not be entirely rejected. We need only replace God by some other concept, as for instance, history. As Bernad Shaw has said the Marxist idea of historical determinism is only a new name for the good old providence."

The real point here is not what Marxists believe, but whether what they stand by is supported by the demonstrate and universal facts of life. To quote Bernard Shaw in support of the Marxist

(continued from the previous page) belief is almost equal to quoting a bald headed man's testimony about the valuable properties of a certain hair-restorer. Shaw, as is well known, rejects entirely the idea of what Shakespeare speaks of as a "divinity that shapes our end rough-hew them as we will". So that when he talks of a "historical determinism" as being "only another name for God" he means just about as much as does an ordinary toper who advocates temperance.

Speaking as a Marxist M.N. Roy says Marxists do not believe in the old saying that "man proposes and God disposes." As we have said, what matters profoundly here is not what Karl Marx or Engels or any of their present day disciples—or even their opposite numbers in Fascism-believe but whether what they believe is in harmony with the known facts of life.

We need not quarrel with the dethronement by Marxists and others of a personal God, "sitting in the seventh heaven", as Roy puts it. We may even agree with him in a broad sense when he says "our God walks this earth. It is not wishful thinking"? No, but isn't that rather a vague and woolly kind of thinking? What exactly is meant by the assertion "Our God walks on this earth"? Would it include the expression or manifestation of life in all the various kingdoms of nature, visible and invisible, objective and subjective, poisons as well as healing medicines, reaction as well as progress? What is "the historic determinism" of these things? Has it been measured and tabulated? What, for instance, is the determinism of our solar system, with each planet revolving with much mathematical precision on its own axis, and round the sun? Is there any "revolutionary" having been able to deflect by the millionth part of an inch the course of our earth in its movements? Before the days of Copernicus and Galileo the great mass of the people of our planet believed that it was the centre of our solar system around which even the sun revolved and did obeisance. That belief and wide spread ignorance did not make any difference to the facts. And neither of course

(continued from the previous page) does the refusal of Marxist to believe in the old saying that "man proposes and God disposes" make any difference to the facts.

The truth here is that Marxists, speaking generally, are profoundly ignorant of the facts of life. They come to conclusions on economics on the most superficial and ephemeral scraps of knowledge. Worse still, they become bumptious and dogmatic wise-acres. Knowing nothing, or next to, nothing, about the complex and historic problem of evil, they have a cut and dried and rather empty-headed remedy for everything—socialism. Some of the more conceited and ignorant of them have been known to boast that if they were God they could make a better world than exists!

Of course they have some crumbs of truth. In the fact of historic necessity Marx stumbled on a cross section of universal truth, which might be called evolution. He showed that when a thing had served its purpose and was no longer useful to society it disappeared logically and of necessity. If there was an upheaval at its disappearance, in the form, say, of a revolution, the revolution in reality took the place of a "midwife" to deliver the new child.

That is not a new truth. It is as old as the hills. It is the "new wine" of a fuller life, referred to in "The New Statement" which has to be provided with new bottles—new laws and media of expression. The same old truth of evolution is plainly hinted at in the words "first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear." It is found similarly in the words of St. Paul: "when I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

Darwin also stressed it in his "origin of species" in which he sought to show that from "one or more forms" the wonderful world as we know it

(continued from the previous page) to day has evolved. The poet glimpses the same old truth in the words: "The old order changeth, yielding place to new. And God fulfils Himself in many ways. Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

Marx applied this with great skill to the capitalistic system. But the truth of evolution applies to everything, and not only to a cross section of economic determinism in the history of mankind. And ofcourse the term "everything" includes the inner or subjective worlds of thought, including all kinds of so-called religious schools of thought. It is ridiculous and childish to limit to it the economic crust of things. It applies as much as to the inner as it does to the outer, as much to the rise and fall of nations, empires and systems of all kinds as it does to all the millions of solar systems that comprise our Universe.

Looked at from the standpoint of the whole there is thus an inevitability about change and flux and growth, and what we call evolution. It cannot be deposed or altered by man's puny efforts alone.

But according to Roy "there is actually nothing inevitable in history. The concept of inevitability is unknown in Marxist philosophy."

So much the worse, we would say, for Marxist philosophy which places man in "the centre of the world." Let it be admitted that man has the power to do many things, denied, say, to the animals proper. It is clearly possible, for instance, for man to work with the laws and facts of life in such a way as to vastly improve the living conditions and longevity of the people. But there are also very inevitable limitations.

Can a Marxist, for instance create a thing of life, even so low a for of life as an amoeba? He cannot. When the hour strikes for him to shuffle off this mortal coil has a Marxist any power to prevent it? He hasn't. Has he power to decide

(continued from the previous page) what mental or life. qualities his children shall be endowed with? He hasn't. Has he had any choice in the selection of the nature of or chief driving force within himself? He hasn't He finds himself with a certain quality which makes him what he is and he just accepts the inevitable and carries on.

M.N. Roy says "nothing is inevitable in history". But is he right? How many Marxists, for instance, have striven heroically to achieve certain things and have failed? How many, on the other hand, have "succeeded" beyond their dreams and expectations? Again, how many of them have been driven by some inner compulsion to do things which have resulted in isolation, social ostracism, and suffering? Where is the unrestricted free will here? On what ground does Roy say "nothing is inevitable," thereby implying either that things happen by chance, in a haphazard way, or are determined by man? Isn't it nearer the truth—the demonstrable facts of life—to say that man's efforts are an integral part of all embrasive determinism? Doesn't everything point logically and irrevocably to a deeper and more command fuller apprehensive inevitability in which man can co-operate, but in which he is less the prime actor than he thinks?

In that outworking of the inevitable cannot Roy see that those we term reactionaries are just as essential at certain stages as are those we call progressives? Cannot he see that this is how evolution works—by the clash of opposites—until discrimination and wisdom are born? Cannot he see that to label that fuller life to which the whole creatain moves with inevitable, irrevocable certainly, "Socialism," is just about as foolish and feeble as it would be to fix a limit and give a form to the infinity of space, or, to change the figure, to the unfolding and developing powers of man's intelligence and understanding, which have no finality?

There is also M.N. Roy's Socialistic cocksureness about Russia. Says he: "If Hitler had won the battle of Stalingrad we would not be here to-day. We would be either welcoming our Fuehrer coming from Singapore on a white horse, or in concentration camps."

Isn't that a specimen of the inflated and distorted notions of Marxist in relation to world events. In the scheme of things there is no doubt that Russia is playing a leading role. But so, too, is the British Commonwealth. What would have happened if Hitler had won, instead of having lost, the Battle of Britain? And that what about the great help in war materials given to Russia in the hour of her sorest need by America and Britain?

But though we talk like this we fully recognise the value and necessity in evolution of men of M.N. Roy's calibre and culture even though, from our point of view, he does give us the impression of sometimes failing to see the wood for the trees.

"J. Krishnamurti's teaching on Evil.":—

Those who have followed with some understanding the teachings of Mr J. Krishnamurti will know that his approach to the problem of evil—and its solution—is a purely individual one. It consists in what he calls a choiceless discernment of the "modus operandi" of what he calls the "I" process which discernment, he affirms, brings the "process" to an end and automatically gives birth to the "bliss of reality."

He divides the world of to-day into two categories, namely, those "who maintain that the individual is nothing but a social entity, the product of conflicting environment," and those who assert that "man is divine", an idea "expressed and interpreted in various forms to be found in religions." He submits that those who accept the idea that man is essentially a social entity, "the product of environment," will naturally favour the regimentation of thought "in every department of life." On the other hand he submits that those who accept the "religious idea," "the idea that there is some

(continued from the previous page) unseen, divine power which controls your destiny, and so compels obedience, reverence, and worship, then you must also recognize the implication of this idea." He asserts that this idea "is based on faith, which must give birth to fear." He also thinks that those who accept this idea "must seek guides, Masters, paths, disciplines, and perpetuate the many forms of authority."

According to Krishnamurti these two categories are eternally in conflict. Neither the one nor the other offers any solution! Then he comes forward with his own solution Says he:— "Instead of belonging to either of those two groups, or being forced to make a choice, I say there is a different approach of the comprehension of individuality, of man. This lies through direct discernment, through the proof of action, without violation of sanity and intelligence....If I can comprehend myself, what I am, whether the "I" is an identity in itself and what is the nature of its existence, then there is a possibility of comprehending the real, the true."

"The art of living," he affirms, "is to bring this "I" process to an end," which he declares can be done by "right effort and discernment...." It does not demand faith, nor does it depend on any system of thought and or belief."

Quite so. But it surely depends on a clear and accurate understanding of the facts of life. What are those facts? Do they not include evolution, involution, and Development? Do they not also include an intelligent direction on the part of the infinite one Life Power? But Krishnamurti does not think so. He would appear to reject entirely the idea that the one Life, which manifests in multitudinous forms, is omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent. His approach to the problem of evil is conditioned by this idea. So, too, is his suggested solution. Says he: "I have explained that the world is made up of unique forces without a beginning which are not propelled by one supreme force or by one transcendental, unique energy."

The above was in answer to a question as to whether in his view there was any such being as God or as we would say the one Life. He admits a form of "energy" in the universe which is "self-active," but declines to endow it with any supreme wisdom, love, or power. "Has the idea of predestination any actual validity? he says: "Action arising each moment from limitation, ignorance, modifies and renews the "I" process, giving to it continuity and identity. This continuity of action through limitation is predestination. By your own acts you are being conditioned, but at any moment you can break the chains of limitation. So you are a free agent at all times. You are not the plaything of some entity, of some mysterious force, good or evil.

"When we think about destiny, we imagine that our present and future are determined by some external force and so we yield to faith; we accept, on the authority, of faith, that some unique energy intelligence, God, has already settled destiny."

Here he quite obviously plumps for free will and rejects any idea whatsoever of destiny or a guiding, directing entity called God, or Providence, or an Infinite Life Force, and proceeds to the "solution" of the problem of evil, or of sorrow and misery, entirely on this basis. But what we have to consider here is not what Krishnamurti asserts or believes, but whether what he asserts is in harmony with the known and demonstrable and universal facts of life. Is it? Had J. Krishnamurti, for instance, any choice in being born where he was born in Southern India? Did he even have any choice in those early contacts with Dr Annie Besant and other leaders of the Theosophical Society which unquestionably resulted in introducing him to a wider and bigger world than would have been possible without those contacts? Can he tell us how he came to have that inner driving force and life quality which

(continued from the previous page) makes him what he is? Did he get this from his parents, or from environment, or what? By what process of reasoning and logic does he arrive at the conclusion that the "unique energy" to which he refers is void of directive wisdom, love and power? Would he care to explain the marvels of our solar system on that basis? Can he ignore these facts and attribute the acceptance of them merely to faith and "belief"?

It is all very well to concentrate on what he calls the elimination of the "I" process by awareness. But isn't this an attempt to find a sort of "short cut" to complete detachment, or the attainment of human perfection? Isn't this another form of illusion?

There was much of the earlier teachings of Mr Krishnamurti that was healthily challenging and provocative and rational. We ourselves gladly testify to help received in certain directions. But his later teachings—are these in harmony with the facts of life? And after all the criterion of the truth of any claim or assertion must be the demonstrable and universal facts of life. There is, in reality, no other criterion.

Inayat Khan: "THE WAY OF ILLUMINATION." It is true that a point in history can be found at which the words Sufi Order first began to be used. The words simply describe a group of persons who have drawn together because their thoughts and points of view are alike. To draw together in this way brings a tendency to form an exclusive circle, the nature of whose exclusiveness is easily liable to be misunderstood. Did these persons not fence themselves off, the others (who are the vast majority) are apt to compel them to do so. If the group of persons give themselves no name, the others will soon find one for them.

The Sufi Order has a point of view which differs from others only in its constant endeavour to comprehend all others within itself.

Limitations and boundaries are inevitable in human life, forms and conventions are natural and necessary, but none the less separate humanity. It is the wise who can meet one another beyond these boundaries.

First there is the work of teaching pupils, and second there is the work carried on by each pupil within himself. There is only one teacher, namely he who brought the Order into Europe and there are some who are authorised to assist in the work of teaching.

The initiate follows the path of meditation, the Murshid only hands him the torch by which to observe what he meets on his path and to guide him to the goal.

Those who wish to orient themselves intellectually about the Sufic view-point can do so in this way, but the real insight into the philosophy is only achieved by ardent pupils.

His object is to become endowed with the capacity for being himself a teacher. However sincere his desire might be to serve humanity, and "leave the world better than he finds it", it should be clear that the surest mode of achieving this lies in the improvement of himself. He must first create peace in himself who desires to see peace within which he desires to see without.

This is not the only order of the kind in existence. Obviously, other groups of people are seeking to realise and spread among others the knowledge of unity, the religion of love and wisdom, the removal of the variety of beliefs and faiths, the inflow of love, to overflowing, in the human heart, and the rooting out of all the hatred produced by distinctions and differences. The Sufi welcomes all these workers, seeing them to be fellow-workers, he wishes to avoid all opposition or hindrance to their work. It is not necessary that every person should belong to one and the same organisation; rather is it desirable that each shall use his talents according to the direction and organisation which suits him best.

It should be clear that such a work would become unmanageable if it were to comprehend every human being; the teaching of history also shows that world-wide movements are not immortal. This shows that there is a good reason for multiplicity of Orders, and that one should guard against assessing the value of one or other against another. Indeed, the need of the world at the present time is so great that if there were a thousand times as many societies as there are there would still be too few to meet it.

What is the Sufi's belief regarding the coming of a world teacher. How, at the stage at which the world has arrived at the present time, with its national, social, and religious distinctions, can it surrender itself entirely to one teacher, and take him as the real and only divine messenger?

Beliefs and disbeliefs are the cause of sects, each of these being blinded from the vision of the whole of existence. As soon as thought is restricted, it ceases to be Sufism.

Why is there so much suffering in life, when God is described as merciful?

If God were a separate being from man, and if He rejoiced in the suffering of man, then He is to be blamed. But He, as the Sufi realises, is the sufferer, and the suffering, yet He is beyond all suffering. This fact can be understood not merely by believing in God, but in knowing Him. Suppose your hands dropped a heavy weight upon your feet and hurt them, are your hands to be blamed? No, for they share the pain with the feet, and although the feet seem to have been hurt, yet the one that feels hurt in your being is your absolute being. In reality, that "Being" feels hurt, and therefore the hands shares the hurt of the foot. So it is with God, our very life is His, and He is not void of feeling either the joy or the pain which we feel. In reality, He feels what we imagine we feel, and at the same time His perfect Being keeps Him above all earthly joys and pains, and our imperfection limits us, so that we become subject to all joys and pains, however small they may be.

It is absolutely true that the whole of life's sins may be forgiven by Divine mercy in one moment, just as a chemical solution may wash away the stains of years from the surface of a rock in a moment. The real question is, is the request earnest enough? It is not so easy as it seems, for this is the matter of Divine mercy, and if a person has continued to commit sins, at every sin he has lost his belief in the judgment of the Divine Being and in His Power. Therefore he has sown the seed of disbelief in his heart and has reared this plant by his sins. That being so, how can he in the end develop sufficient faith in a moment to believe in Divine Mercy? The simplest thing becomes the most difficult for him.

For this reason, the teachers of humanity have taught man faith as the first lesson in religion. Those are forgiven the sins of their whole life, who have always believed that any moment death might come and have safeguarded themselves against doing anything that does not meet with the pleasure of their Lord, and whenever, owing to human imperfection they have failed in doing right they most earnestly have asked forgiveness.

Conscience is a sense which is born when Consciousness holds before itself in a scale—on the one side an action, and on the other side ideal.

Intelligence is the grasping faculty of Consciousness, with, by every means, recognises, distinguishes, perceives, and conceives all that is round and about it.

Wisdom is the knowledge which is illumined by the light within.

Intellect is the knowledge of names and forms, their character and nature, which is gathered from the external world.

Intuition is an inner message, given in the nature of warning or guidance, perceived by the mind independently of any external source.

Inspiration is the rising of a stream from the depth of the heart of the genius and manifests in the realm of poetry, music, painting, sculpture, or art.

Vision is a spiritual dream which is witnessed either when awake or asleep. It is called a dream because the radiance of the vision brings about a semi-sleep to the seer, even when awake.

This state of ecstasy is not different from the natural condition of man when touched on hearing a kind word spoken, or moved to tears either on separation from the one he loves, or on the departure of his object of love, or when overjoyed on the arrival of his long expected beloved.

What he does in the life of the mureed is to show him how he should clear his path toward the Light within by his own self. This is the only purpose of man's life on earth.

That one is not already following another course of spiritual training. In such a case, why go to another kind of teacher as well? It would be like travelling in two boats, one foot in one, and the other in the other. When each boat goes its own way, although in the end they meet at the same goal, yet the traveller will sink in the sea. No one could seek guidance under two teachers except out of lack of patience with the one or lack of confidence in the other, making him still cling to the first. Such is the person who goes from one teacher to another, from one method to another, and never able to gain that which is only to be obtained through steadfastness. Those who have a desire to teach while coming to learn should not pose as disciples, they must come as teachers.

No-one need fear taking initiation out of an idea that he undertakes something he may not be able to fulfil. If he does not wish to progress beyond a certain point, that is only for himself to say.

The question, why do the awakened ones not awaken people in the world from the sleep of confusion? is answered thus:

It is not to be advised that little children whose only happiness is slumber should be awakened.

(continued from the previous page) Their growth depends on their sleep. If they are kept up late they become ill, and are not so useful in the affairs of life as are grown-up people. Childhood needs more sleep, and the children must sleep. Such is the nature of immature souls. They are children, however old their bodies may appear. Their fancies, their joys, their delights are for unimportant things in life, as the life of children is absorbed in sweets and toys. Therefore those who are awakened walk slowly and gently, lest their footsteps may disturb the slumber of the sleeping ones. They only awaken on their way those whom they find changing sides. They are the ones to whom the travellers on the spiritual path give their hand quietly. It is for this reason that the spiritual path is called the mystical way. It is not unkind to awaken a few and to let many sleep, but on the other hand it is great kindness to let those slumber who require sleep.

M.N. ROY: "THE CRISIS OF SPIRITUAL ASTORITARIANISM VERSUS INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM."

These are the two vital questions: one regarding the past and the other about the future. There is a logical connection between the two questions. The answer to one would determine the answer to the other. But there is still another question, the answer to which would not only help an intelligent approach to the problem; it would also clarify the fundamental issue which is being side-tracked deliberately. Casuistry does not answer these questions. Nor is it of any importance now to discuss those events. They are mere episodes of past history significant only as symptoms of a deep-seated disease—expressions of an underlying conflict. The whole controversy, therefore, misses the point, and is utterly useless for the solution of the problem. By side-tracking the fundamental issue, it only prejudices the future of the people.

He need not be suspected of dishonesty. No neurotic person ever is; and neurosis is the psychological foundation of demonstrative saintliness. It is an observed psychological phenomenon that

(continued from the previous page) neurotic persons, even if they are subjectively sincere, are often driven unconsciously by motives which are contradictory to what they believe to be their motives; they attempt to harmonise the contradictions of their own feelings, their emotional conflicts, by ideological constructions or fallacious moralisings, without ever doubting their moral integrity. His casuistry, therefore, could be explained only in the light of the understanding of the operation of the subconscious mind. This understanding has taught psychologists to be skeptical about words, even of saints, and not to take them at their face-value.

An insight into his personality, his character structure, is indispensable for a proper understanding of his present efforts to confuse issues. Let it be also understood that they are not rational efforts, made with a conscious purpose; they are motivated by subconscious urges. The urges have been driven into the darkness of the subconscious mind and sublimated, because essentially they represent a fear of freedom. Yet, he claims to be and is acclaimed as such, the personification of spirituality. That is the basic contradiction which confuses the epoch-making issue of contemporary history.

But the dialectics of history is ever so very impartial as to make the other things equal. In every social crisis, the dice are loaded against the forces of progress. As against the future, the past always has the great weightage of death. The greatest enemy of freedom is the fear of freedom, and in any transitional period of history, the fear of freedom is acuter, the greater is the degree of relative freedom already attained. Relative freedom, that is, freedom from certain restrictions or inhibitions, but not yet positive freedom to accelerate liberating process of social as well as cultural. It creates a feeling of lonesomeness and isolation. The prospect of freedom

(continued from the previous page) from the past may be welcome; but the fear of the uncertainty of the future, at the same time, encourages atavism. That is how is created a psychological atmosphere congenial for the rise of authoritarianism which is a negation of the urge for freedom, although often it gets the strangle-hold on mass psychology by means of sublimation—by making the negation of freedom appear as the struggle for freedom; not only making it so appear, but actually believing the fraud to be an honest performance with the highest of motives.

It being the fundamental issue of contemporary history, it had its roots in the social conditions and cultural atmosphere of each country. Only it was sharper or confused, according to the degree of the differentiation of social forces and cultural state of each country. India being backward in this respect, the issue was so very greatly confused that the operation of the fear of freedom could appear as the conscious urge for freedom; that authoritarianism incorporating the negation of freedom could claim to be, and was hailed as, the champion of mysticism.

Notwithstanding casuistry about his attitude towards the Ashram, it is a fact, evident to all critical students of contemporary history, that with his advent authoritarianism became the fundamental principle of Indian Mysticism. While preaching about the divinity of the soul—he has failed to let them apply this tenet for their own selves & lives) he demanded submission to a spiritual authority. Religiousity is the psychological mainstay of authoritarianism. There, have been other instances in history. Critical historians and students of social psychology are still to teach the world to what extent the urge for freedom expressed by the Renaissance movement was counteracted by the fear of freedom represented by the Reformation, and thus laid down the cultural foundation for the rise of authoritarianism in a subsequent epoch. When it is realised that Luther and Calvin, while revolting against the Catholic Church, laid the psychological

(continued from the previous page) foundation of a political authoritarianism, one should not be shocked by the discovery that Gandhi played the same reactionary role in India. And his role has been all the more reactionary because it was played in the setting of social conditions and cultural environments much more backward than those of Europe in the seventeenth century.

Apparently, he preaches not submission to God, but love of God. The love, however, is to be demonstrated through self-effacement, humiliation, suffering and sacrifice. If love is self-effacement the equation is clear for the critic, love is equal to submission. The complete submission to a superhuman authority, demonstrated through unreserved faith, is the only means for man to acquire power which will bring him freedom. Only through prayer can man demonstrate his love for God and share in God's glory which gives him power. Prayer is an action of helplessness, which results from the absence of power. Man must realise his absolute powerlessness to have the power to be free. Evidently he can have it only by the grace of God, which comes through the intermediary of the saint or the leader, who has opened the hope before the hungry vision of devotees or followers weighed down with the feeling of powerlessness and helplessness. Unconditional submission is the condition for salvation—and also for power.

The influence of any doctrine is proportionate to the degree in which it appeals to the psychic needs of those to whom it is preached. In other words, there is a large element of historical truth in the saying that a people gets the kind of leader it deserves. Only, it is not a matter of conscious desire, but of an automatic conformity with subconscious cultural urges. The personality of the leader, his conscious behaviour—physical as well as mental, including emotional—is determined by the given social environments and the cultural background, which are equally operative for the entire human group of which he is an individual member. An authoritarian leadership can be established only

(continued from the previous page) when there is a mass psychology of predisposition towards submission. That psychological trait results from powerlessness and helplessness, or from a feeling of uncertainty about what may be in store in a dimly dawning future, as against the security of conservation and tradition. This feeling is the fear of freedom.

The last war brought about a degree of unsettlement in the traditional patterns of society and habits. Nevertheless, the vague dissatisfaction against the traditional conditions of life did create in them a subconscious urge to be free from those conditions. That unconscious urge created a fear complex in them. How could they live if the context of their very existence—the traditional setting of their being and becoming—disappeared? The incipient urge for freedom was overwhelmed by the fear of freedom— a feeling which grows rankly in the atmosphere of a mediaeval culture which made no room for the concept of individual freedom. The eternal theme of that culture was submission of man—either to the will of God or to his own KARMA. Culturally, the masses were thus predisposed to authoritarianism; the mass psychology was of authoritarianism. In the critical moment, they created a leader accordingly — one who could sublimate the fear of freedom as striving for freedom, which was to be had with the means of power to be derived from complete submission to a super-human authority.

The conviction that man, by collective action, could make his own destiny, was lacking. There was a search for an authority—a power to rely upon. Modern education, at least partially outside the traditional patterns of the social organisation, and the consequent new setting of life, had meant a slight advance towards the concept of individual freedom. But freedom meant further isolation from old moorings and drifting away from traditions which offered a sense of cultural solidarity, and therefore a general security, as against the dim hopes held out by an uncertain future. Fear of freedom was the natural psychological reaction,

All that made him feel isolated from the old social organisation and cultural moorings which appeared to have offered greater security to have offered greater security to the individual. But he could not retrace his steps Lonesomeness and helplessness created in him the neurosis of masochism—the desire to give up the independence of one's individual self and to fuse one's self with something outside in order to acquire the strength to face life. The faith in God with and reliance on his love are the result of the sense of powerlessness and helplessness. The new mooring was found in submission to a supernatural authority; suffering and sacrifice were the expressions of submission. The lonesome individual, frightened by the spectre of freedom, found refuge in submission to an authority and on that token became the preacher of the doctrine that self-effacement, humiliation, suffering and sacrifice were the only source of power. Power which is to be derived from a negation of freedom, cannot logically attain freedom.

No useful purpose will be served by side-tracking the issue. Deliberate confusion may help defeated Fascism to regroup its forces, but it will do so only with the purpose of returning to the offensive at the earliest available opportunity. We may be indifferent to that danger. Those to whom 'truth' is neither a racial concept nor a mere word, cannot allow either casuistry or opportunism to confuse the issue concerning the future of mysticism.

W.D.P. HILL: "INTRODUCTION TO BHAGAVAD GITA."

Sacerdotalism was laying its dead hand on the more simple and joy our faith of early days; religion was in the grasp of the priests. But the Ksatriyas in those far-off times seem to have revolted from the priestly dominance; and in Ksatriya circles there grew up a body of speculative thought and mystical doctrine which later

(continued from the previous page) the more spiritually minded Brahmans themselves were eager to learn.

Just as the Buddhists and the Jains, whose sects no less than that of Vasudeva sprang from free speculation and restless revolt from sacerdotal tyranny, could not long rest content with a world made void of a living God, but set their founders in the empty place, so too the Satvatas found in the sun an object of adoration too remote and too impersonal to satisfy their peculiar spirit of devotion. It was not long before they turned their worship to the person of the Master, tending to make him one with the Sun he had taught them to revere.

The universe is a puppet-show; Brahman is sole producer, Brahman is scenery and players, Brahman is sole spectator. The universe is Brahman, sportively self-deluded, taking delight in itself. The means of production is the power of delusion, or MAYA; scenery and puppets are Brahman, self-stamped with 'name and form', its 'lower nature' – PRAKRITI; as spectator it is PURUSA, retaining its proper nature. Like every thoroughgoing monistic system, the system of the Bhagavadgita robs the universe of meaning; personality, freewill, good and evil, even AVATARA itself, are incidents in an idle show. The performance is renewed day by day; with each night the curtain falls.

But to say that the universe is void of meaning is not to say that the performance is unreal. There are passages in the Upanisads which justify Samkara in deriving from them his theory of complete illusion; but the Gita follows rather that doctrine which allows to the universe a temporary reality as such. Brahman really possess the power of self-manifestation as the world; it is in truth source and support and place of dissolution; it really exercises its power of delusion, and manifests itself as Self and not-Self; both these are said to be eternal, because they both proceed from the eternal One. But these conceptions of transcendence and immanence which are everywhere to be found in the Gita, belong

(continued from the previous page) to a lower plane of reality; for where there is one, that one cannot transcend or rest in what is not itself; and for deluded man the world is but phenomenal, veiling rather than revealing the true nature of its source. Revelation guides him; reason concurs; yet he is compelled to move in his own world of vain experience, and to make use of delusive things to effect his Self's deliverance from their power. It is for the wise man to study the rules of that dramatic production in which he seems to be involved, and because Brahman's play means sorrow and pain for him, by that study to endeavour to win a way out of the coil.

To this end the message of the Gita leads. Brahman descends as Krishna Vasudeva to play a special part in the drama of life, and to teach his fellow-players how best they may win through the 'thicket of delusion' to the 'calm bliss' of perfect truth that is himself.

MAYA means delusion, deceit, or trick. Samkara uses the word MAYA in his monistic system as equivalent to that ignorance whereby the individual falsely attributes existence to the objects of experience. While his view of the universe may undoubtedly be found in the Upanisads, it will be seen that no passage in the earlier books (except possibly that in the svetasvatara Upanisad) can justify this interpretation of the word MAYA. The Bhagavadgita, and the Epic generally use MAYA, not as identical with PRAKRITI or with AVAIDYA, but as that power of delusion possessed by ISVARA, whereby through the medium of PRAKRITI and its GUNAS he veils his real being from all save those who pierce through his disguise. The MAYA of the Lord effects delusion, or MOHA, in man.

The author of the Gita is interested in man and his destiny; for man is the centre of creation. Brahman, it is true, dwells equally in every living creature; but to man is given a gift denied even to the Lords of heaven—man alone in all creations scale can win release.

Arjuna stands for the average good man. Like all good men he knows and fears the power of evil, and longs to conquer it. Conscience urges him to do his duty, while caution and human pity bid him hesitate till he is sure where duty lies. He is humble and diffident; he cannot trust his own judgment; he looks for a decision to one whom he calls friend and on whose wisdom he relies; more, he is ready to surrender himself with implicit confidence to one whose judgment he approves. He is a Ksatriya and fearless; his life has been spend in the hard knocks of war; he is as dauntless in thought as in action, as ready to face the truth as to face the foe, and anxious to follow it wherever it may lead him. But he must be assured of the truth before he acts on it; he is cautious, thorough, slow; he perseveres in questioning all he hears; his is no genius, no brilliant insight; he plods along the path of knowledge. He is concerned with daily duties, a man of action; no contemplative recluse, abandoning the world for solitary meditation; no 'man of knowledge', scorning work as worse than futile. The message of the Gita is a message to the ordinary man.

When we forget the unfamiliar metaphysic that lies behind, man in the Gita is not unlike man as we know him, not unlike ourselves. He wills and thinks and feels; his senses relate him to an outer world, whence come temptation and pleasure and pain and all those groups of opposite sensations which the Gita calls 'pairs (dvandva)'. He is a prey to passion—desire and wrath and greed and love and hate. He formulates ideas and wills to act. And above and behind thought and desire and will there lies the consciousness that life is but a passing show, that things are not what they seem, that the real Self stands apart from all activity and passion, changeless amid the changing, undying, true. So Krishna at the outset of his teaching declares the vital distinction between the body and the embodied Self, as vital as the difference between what is and what is not.

It is here—in these two master-passions, longing and resentment—that sin has its seat; they excite the man to evil thought and action. It is these evil passions that are the direst foes to true discernment; they create that delusion which robs a man of knowledge, obscures for him the vision of the Supreme, and leads him to believe that he—his real Self—is active. If these passions successfully assault the mind, reason and will are overthrown and the whole man is lost.

But all this is on the lower level of reality. When we turn our thoughts to absolute reality, and remember that 'Vasudeva is All', good and evil, virtue and vice lose their distinction and are seen for what they are—no more than elements of that great drama which is the universe. The passions that cause sin are born of one constituent of unconscious (and therefore guiltless) PRAKRITI. Sin can be no offence against a holy God; rather it is a hindrance to man's upward progress, a part of those Strands that bind the Self to birth. The true aim of life is not to conquer sin because sin is really vile, but to rise to heights of knowledge where good and evil are both left behind as untrue effects of ignorance. If Krishna promises to deliver Arjuna from all sins, such deliverance is not the final end; goodness leads to release, sin to bondage; but release is from rebirth, to the attainment of the Brahma-state, where, for the liberated, right and wrong have lost all meaning.

It is this double view of truth—the higher and the lower—that explains the apparent weakness of Hindu doctrine in general (with its incurable inclination to pantheism), and the much-blamed 'inconsistency' of the Gita, on this subject of freewill. The very form of the Gita implies that Arjuna is free to choose; when Krishna has finished his teaching, he says, 'This knowledge have I taught thee, mystery of mysteries; fully consider this; then, as thou wilt, so act'. Yet, immediately before,

(continued from the previous page) he has warned him that such apparent freedom is but part of that delusion which controls life's play:

The word Yoga bears many meanings in Sanskrit literature. Derived from the root YUJ-, to unite, its first meaning was Union; but the word early began specially to denote that control, or those methods of control, by which alone union with the Supreme could be attained; and when Patanjali (for whom there was no Supreme with which to be united) wrote his Yogasutras, he defined Yoga as 'restraint (nirodha) of the modifications of mind. In the Bhagavadgita, whenever the word is used in a technical sense, with a very few exceptions it means control, or some particular method of control: thus, when used in compound with Karman, Jnana or bhakti, yoga means control as exemplified in right work, right knowledge, or right devotion: When used alone in contradistinction to Samkhya, it stands for Karmayoga, the method of right performance of duty as opposed to theory and inaction. Krishna, called Yogesvara, uses it of his own divine power, especially as exhibited in creation; and once (v. 21) it bears the sense of contemplation.

In one place yoga means an ascetic of the yoga school which, like the Samkhya, was beginning to take shape. But it must be remembered that, while there is plenty of evidence that many ascetics practised yoga methods of posture and breath-control, attempting by such methods to reach that trance-like state which the Gita describes as 'thinking of nothing at all', we must not read into the Gita that strictly systematic philosophy of control which found expression so many centuries later in the Yogasutras and which gave rise to so vast a literature in after days. It was, perhaps, the special merit of the author of the Gita that he applied these current methods of control to man's whole personality, bringing into their right and balanced relationship the functions of reason and will and emotion. It must also be borne in mind that for the Gita, unlike the Yogasutras, yoga

(continued from the previous page) could retain its fuller, more original content—control that leads to union with Vasudeva-Brahman.

Let us, gather from the scattered teachings of the Gita, and briefly summarize, as far as possible in order of ascent, the general characteristics that marks the progressive discipline of control.

The aspirant must enter on his course with a determination increasingly to withdraw his senses from their objects. The enemy stands without; he must be denied admittance to the 'citadel of nine gates'. Complete withdrawal of the senses themselves is not always practicable; but the mind must learn to reject impressions, must refuse to be disturbed and excited to desire, must be no more affected by the assaults of passion than the broad expanse of ocean by the entry of innumerable streams. Such discipline results in the absence of desire and every passion; and the influences that urge to sin fail to operate when the senses and the mind refuse to dwell on outward things.

From without come those opposite influences—cold and heat, pleasure and pain, the glory of honour and success and the shame of failure and ill-repute—which the Gita calls the 'pairs'. The aspirant must learn to regard these influences as unreal and impermanent, as bearing no true relation to the Self; and, first, he will endure them, and, finally, with practice, so ignore them as to be unaware of their attack. So vital is a 'balanced mind' to progressive attainment that very early in his instruction to Arjuna Krishna defines control as Balance. (Chapter 2, verse 48.)

Thus gradually all the changing scenes of the drama of life, and all the persons who play their part on life's stage, become for the ascetic scenes and figures in a dream. Their day is his night, their night is his day. What they value as permanent and real he regards unmoved as shadowy and fleeting. He is awake to enduring truths that have for them no meaning. Friends, relations, worldly goods—on these he places no reliance; he isolates his Self; he is independent, satisfied

(continued from the previous page) in Self alone; for 'self alone is friend of Self, and self alone is enemy of Self'.

But steadfast meditation on the Self will lead the aspirant to higher heights of perception.

He, then, himself is Krishna Vasudeva; and with the realization of this tremendous facts the philosophic coldness of his outlook on the world gives place to that universal sympathy, that high, sacrificial, non-binding desire for the welfare of the world, that marked the highest adepts of old and is in Krishna's heart, together with Supreme devotion to the Lord, who is one with him and one with all.

And now the aspirant has reached the final stage. This is the 'state of Brahman'; he has 'passed beyond the Strands'. Still in the body, he awaits the final severance to win perpetual release. He is serene, and steadfast, and at peace. He enjoys that highest pleasure which, unlike the transient pleasures of the world from which he turned, will never know an end.

Krishna attacks, on the one hand, those who act with a desire for such rewards as heaven or victory or material wealth, and cannot approve, on the other hand, of those philosophers who push the doctrine to its apparently logical conclusion and teach that, inasmuch as all action binds the Self to repeated rebirth, release can only be attained by complete cessation of activity.

The author of the Gita must be credited with the popularization of a doctrine of right action which proved a healthy corrective to the prevailing tendency among thoughtful men to aim at complete withdrawal from the world.

How, then, can the fact that works inevitably cause rebirth be reconciled with the doctrine that certain works are necessary and right? Shall not a man renounce all action altogether? No; the 'binding' quality of action lies, not in the mere performance of a deed, but in the motive and desire that prompt it. The gradual abandonment of motive and desire destroys that element in action which causes rebirth; this is the true renunciation (Samnyasa, tyaga), the true

(continued from the previous page) control (yoga), not the abandonment of work itself.

If this main principle is firmly grasped, it will not be difficult to understand the paradoxical language which the Gita so constantly uses when treating of action and inaction. Right action is inaction—for, like inaction, it ceases to bind the Self to earth. The state of worklessness (naiskarmya) is only reached through work, for worklessness is not inaction but action that bears no fruit. Krishna, and all who follow his example are at the same time active and inactive; for, though they work, work does not touch their Selves.

Work must not, and cannot, cease till death; yet there are stages through which the aspirant must pass: —

(a) First, he must learn to suppress all selfish motive. The desires of those who work for reward (and win it, with rebirth) are various and unstable; the desire of one who sets out for the goal of non-desire is one and sure; he fixes his mind on release, and, to that sole end, on the service of God and the welfare of the world. Such earnest work, with a single eye to liberation, accomplishes the purification of the Self; the lower nature is brought under control.

(b) Now, when the self is cleansed and governed the aspirant begins to scale the heights. Work becomes less; more time is spent in quiet meditation and practice of physical control; the aspirant loves to leave the busy haunts of men and for a time in solitude to meditate upon the Self, aiding his concentration by postures and control of breath prescribed to that end. This stricter course of meditation leads to fuller knowledge; and ever-growing devotion to the Lord resolves all works into an offering to him.

(c) Finally, the 'state of Brahman' is reached—release while still alive. Works must go on till death, but every motive has been left behind. No longer is there even desire for release; for release has now been won. As when a potter's wheel whirls on after the potter's work is done, until it loses

(continued from the previous page) the power of the original impulse and comes to rest, so he continues to do desireless works, his Self now realized as one with the Supreme.

He combats the widespread fallacy that the man of knowledge should aim at complete inaction; inaction is neither right nor possible; theory and practice, knowledge and work, are not opposed, but, as the learned realize, two sides of one well-balanced mode of life. Knowledge must find its complement in work; its function is to bring all work to true fulfilment.

Apart from this insistence on the union of work with knowledge there is no great difference between the Gita doctrine of Jnana and that of the Upanisads. In both the alike Jnana bears a higher and a lower sense; the higher Jnana differs from the lower, not so much in its content as in its nature; the higher is uncaused, direct and personal the lower is obtained by ordinary means, dependent on authority. Yet, though the higher knowledge dawns uncaused, the acquisition of the lower fits a person to receive the higher revelation. Four times in the Gita the higher knowledge is associated with the lower, as vijñana with jñana. Jñana, says Samkara, is 'the knowledge of the Self and other things, acquired from the scriptures and from a teacher', while vijñana is 'personal experience of the things so taught.'

Jñana, then, is primarily concerned with the Self, and aims at realizing the oneness of the Self with the Absolute. In a secondary, auxiliary sense, it has for its object the contents of sacred books, the interpretation of those books by the teacher, and, in general, the solution of all religious and metaphysical problems.

So, if he persevere, he will at last 'scale the heights of yoga' and reach that plane where work becomes less and leisure may be found for more sustained contemplation of the Supreme. Now the seeker after knowledge will more often turn aside from the haunts of men, and retiring to the forest or to riverbanks

(continued from the previous page) will sit for hours in postures that conduce to concentration until at last there dawns on him the light of perfect knowledge, the peace of self-realization, the 'Calm of Brahman', which is release. This final experience is mystic, ineffable; to know is to be; the man of perfect knowledge is the Absolute; deliverance is won.

Bhaktiyoga is the approach of love to a personal Lord. Its foundation is faith(sraddha) and the response with which it meets is grace (prasada). This being so, it is evident that bhakti can only manifest itself in man when God is conceived of as personal, a Saviour worthy of trust and ready to be gracious.

No doctrine degenerates so rapidly as a doctrine of emotion. The later history of bhakti exemplifies this truth. With that history this study is not concerned; but it will be useful, by way of contrast, to note three respects in which the Gita conception of bhakti is more pure and true than that of the Puranas and the later Vaisnava sects.

First, the object of devotion of the Gita was a person worthy of love. 'A man is as that wherein he puts his faith'; and if the character of Krishna Vasuveda of the Gita may be judged from the tenor of his teaching, and from his profession of love to Arjuna and to all mankind, if, too, the Krishna of the poem be distinguished from the Krishna of the rest of the Epic, it is clear that the worship of that Krishna could only have an ennobling effect upon his bhakta. Contrast with such a person the emorous profligate of the Puranas, the Radha-lover of the Caitanyas. Corruption *Optimi pessima*.

Secondly, the bhakti of the Gita is no unreasoned ecstasy, divorced from the duties of practical life and the dictates of common-sense. Devotion is but one essential element in a religious attitude, where knowledge and work play their due part. The Gita recognizes that no true emotion should isolate itself from the functions of reason and will; the balanced man must

(continued from the previous page) develop to its best every element that makes up personality. But it was not long before emotionalists began to preach that ecstasy was all; sound study was ignored; the wild hysterical dance and the passionate repetition of the sacred name began to take the place of the more unexciting duties of the home and the simple service of mankind. The later bhaktas made the same mistake with bhakti that the earlier jnanins had made with jnana; isolation and over-emphasis ruined the very mode of approach they desired to exalt.

Thirdly, the bhakti doctrine of the Gita is perfectly simple. The later bhaktas elaborated the system to an almost incredible extent; Sridhara, for example, stats that no less than eighty-one minor forces of bhakti lead up to the highest. This later analysis is bewildering and unattractive; we turn back with relief to the original gospel of the Gita.

Krisna's teaching holds out to his disciple a hope of ultimate attainment to that highest devotion (para bhakti) which is release, where perfect love and perfect knowledge coincide, here entry into Krisna's being and to be Brahman are one. It is for this reason that the best Jnanin is also the best bhakti. These last are the most perfect votaries; for they devote themselves in love to a Lord whose being they understood; their eyes have pierced the veil of delusion, and see in Krisna the incarnate Lord of all and Brahman absolute. Nor, conversely, can the jnanin be perfect in his knowledge unless he thus utterly devotes himself to the one he knows. Here reason and emotion meet, expressed in act. Jnana and bhakti coincide once more; for Brahman and Krisna are one.

But though bhakti and jnana thus ultimately meet in one, where both are perfected, thus justifying, Krisna's always implicit claim that both are essential to release, it is yet possible to travel to that goal by one or the other road. When Arjuna asks his master which is the better way, Krisna replies that concentration on the Absolute alone will doubtless lead the contemplative to that point where he will understand that Vasudeva is all, and worship him with love; but that from the very outset to seek refuge

(continued from the previous page) in Vasudeva as Lord, and so to reach the knowledge of the All, is the better and less toilsome way. Few, indeed, can walk unaided on the path of knowledge; and it is Krisna's desire to open the door of liberation not only to the feeblest seeker after truth but to the worst of sinners and to those born in sin—to Sudras and to women. For these the way of bhakti is the only way; and it is for this reason that bhakti is declared to be the most vital among the various elements that contribute to the balanced character, and that in Krishna's view a grain of bhakti redeems the weakest and most sinful aspirant, and outweighs in value the highest forms of knowledge when love is absent from them.

To all men Krishna is impartial, desiring the welfare of all alike. All may approach him and win his gracious love; the fire is ever burning, ready without reserve to warm the hearts of all who seek its warmth. And those who come to him he loves; in them he dwells perpetually, and they in him. He delivers them from sin; justified by love, they are accounted righteous and aided in that moral discipline that fits them for release. He gives them knowledge and true discernment, and power to keep what they have won. Love for the Lord conforms the votary to the likeness of the Lord; like Krisna, the bhakta works, for the welfare of the world; his heart, filled with divine grace, goes out in selfless compassion and long-suffering to all; the pain of all is his, their pleasure his.

The Christian ideal is positive—the fullness of eternal life; the Hindu ideal is negative—deliverance from repeated birth and death.

It is the notion of this contrast that colours the many terms used in the Bhagavadgita, and in Hindu literature generally, to express the state of liberation. Deathlessness (*amritava*) is used more than once. In contrast to the sickness that afflicts this life, that state is called 'the realm where no sickness is (*pada anamaya*)'. (Cf. Svet. Up. iii. 10. The state of release is called '*pada*' by metaphor.)

{Illegible} With the philosophy of the Bhagavadgita, more self-consistent than that of the Upanisads and less obscure than that of the Sutras, the ancient commentators were faced with the alternative of denying their own tenets or wresting the text to their own ends. Each one chose the latter course.

The earliest a surviving commentary on the Bhagavadgita is that of Samkaracarya (A.D. 788-850), the famous founder of the advaita school of Vedanta philosophy. Samkara was a brilliant scholar, gifted with one of the acutest intellects in history. The orthodox pandits of Benares, a stronghold of advaita belief, reverence him as an avatara. His Gitabhasya is full of keen argument; but not even the subtlety of a Samkara can conceal the fact that the advaita and the Gita systems are not at one; nor is he able, in face of plain texts to the contrary, to make good his claim that the Gita severs action from knowledge, the latter alone qualifying the aspirant for release. A quite undue emphasis is laid on the power of knowledge; his cold, clear intellect exalts jnana at the expense of karman and bhakti; and when Gita text is obdurate, he does not scruple to 'understand' additional words that reverse the sense.

The philosophy of the Bhagavadgita more nearly approximates to that of the visistadvaita school. In the eleventh century A.D. Yamunacarya of the Sri Vaisnava sect wrote the Gitarthasamgraha, and in the twelfth century his more famous successor, Ramanuja, again commented on the Gita. A comparison between the bhasyas of Samkara and Ramanuja is most instructive. Ramanuja expounds the poem in a manner far closer to the intention of the author; he errs, perhaps, in excessive emphasis on bhakti, reading 'devotion' into many references to unqualified yoga where the word more probably implies 'right action'.

Madhvacharya, or Anandatirtha, wrote two works on the Bhagavadgita—the Gitabhasya and the Gitatatparya—both attempting to deduce from the poem the tenets of the dvaita school of which he was the founder (A.D. 1199-1278). Many of his interpretations are so extravagant

(continued from the previous page) as to rob the commentary of much interest for the scholar.

The Bhagavadgita became the playground of western pseudo-mystics. Like all great religious books, the Bhagavadgita has suffered a great deal from the 'esoteric interpreter', and of this genus Oxley may be called the spiritual father.

(1:1) It is to be noted that many interpreters of the Gita, while not denying the historicity of the episode, lay greater stress upon its value as allegory. (See the commentary of Pranavananda Svamin of Benares; of Chhaganlal G. Kaji (Rajkot, 1909), and other Theosophical works.) While such interpretations are often fanciful, it cannot be denied that the author broadly identified the Kauravas with adharma, or evil, and the Pandavas with dharma, or good; and it is significant that the first two words of the poem should present to the mind a parallel between the battle of the Kurus and the battle fought for Right.

(8:4) Adhyatma is the manifestation of Brahman in its proper form as Self in individuals.

(8:9) A man will naturally turn at the last hour to the object of his life-long devotion.

(13:10) Is jnana non-moral? While the jnana is undoubtedly super-moral, the constant cultivation of such qualities on the path of jnana renders it less likely that the adept will, as a matter of fact, contravene ordinary canons of morality.

W.R. Inge: "THE TEACHING OF PLOTINUS." :— @@@

May there not be catabolic and anabolic ages—generations which are glorious spendthrifts, and generations which are storing force for some new development? And may not political calamities actually liberate philosophy and religion, by compelling them to attend exclusively to their own business? This kind of liberation, I think, actually occurred at the period of which I am inviting your attention.

@@@ "Proceedings of the British Academy." 1929.

(continued from the previous page) We are witnessing, if you like to put it so, the sighs of classical antiquity, and the birth of Catholic Christianity. But the second was the child of the first. The Christian Church is not the beginning of the Middle Ages; it is the creative achievement of classical antiquity, which may be said to have died in giving birth to it. In the history of ideas death in childbed is the rule rather than the exception. Think of the limitations of the Hebrews, with their tribal religion, their Bedovin morality, their blindness to art and science. But in their pure desert air arose the prophetic religion, which culminated in the Galilean Gospel, and at last shattered in the mould into which it had been poured. And consider how in the same way Hellas had to die in giving birth to Hellenism—to that Hellenistic civilisation to significant facts of which we are living even to this day. Rome too was dying in giving birth to Romanism.

WE are invited to look at religion liberated for the first time, disentangled from fetishism and idolatry, emancipated from nationalism and from politics. We are to look at it as now universal and individual, embracing in thought the whole universe, but worshipping a Deity whose throne is the inmost shrine of the human soul; we are to observe how it has struck a close alliance with its old enemy philosophy, which, after being cosmocentric with the Ionians, and anthropocentric with the post-Aristotelian schools, is now content to the theocentric yet without renouncing one jot of its reverence for the great unbroken tradition, which, from Thales to Proclus, spans the longest period of unfettered thought which the human race has yet been permitted to enjoy.

In the sphere of religion, the rivals were the Oriental mystery-cults, now naturalized in the empire and the Christian Church. In philosophy, the Greek schools, now coalescing into what is called Neoplatonism, were winning an easy victory over the Gnostics, who represented a barbarized Platonism. Behind these, controversies, there was a deep cleavage between

(continued from the previous page) those who wished to preserve the classical culture as a whole, and those who, at first indifferent to it, had been provoked to hostility.

Plotinus is by far the greatest figure of this age of transition. His Christian contemporary Origen, was a learned Biblical scholar, and a theologian of remarkable independence; but as a thinker though he deserves to be treated with great respect, he was not to be compared with Plotinus. Modern scholars are beginning to realise that Plotinus is one of the great figures in the history of thought.

One who could say without self-reproach, "if any man seeks in the good life anything beyond the good life itself, it is not the good life which he is seeking".

The three truths which Plotinus is most anxious to establish are (1) the spiritual nature of reality, as against the materialism of the Epicureans and Stoics; (2) the possibility of gaining a real knowledge of ultimate truth, as against the scepticism of the New Academy and the pragmatism of eclectics; and ((3) as against the Gnostics, the unity, goodness, and sacredness of the universe. There is no sense in which the charge of 'extreme dualism' can be fastened on Neoplatonism. There are no hard and fast dividing lines anywhere in his chart of reality, no salto mortale from one grade of existence to another. He names the rungs on the ladder—the scale perfection is; but he lets us know that it is not really a ladder, but an inclined plane.

Numenius, so far anticipated Plotinus that Amelius had to write a treatise to vindicate the originality of his master. Numenius really seems to have tried to incorporate the wisdom of the East in his teaching, and is said to have referred to Christ—respectfully, it would appear. He taught that there is a supreme Godhead, who as regards the world of space and time is an idle king, and a 'Second God', who is 'double'—Janus-faced—looking both toward the eternal and toward the temporal worlds. The 'Third God' is the spirit of the world. The Soul of man is also 'double'. These doctrines certainly resemble the philosophy of the Enneads.

Plotinus maintains, in opposition to materialism, scepticism, and Gnostic dualism, that reality is spiritual, that reality is knowable, and that reality is one.

It is only when we exercise his highest faculty of our nature, 'a power which all possess but few use', that we are ourselves completely real and in contact with reality. This reality is neither an independently existing external universe, nor a subjective construction created by the mind. It is constituted by the unity in duality of the spiritual faculty and the spiritual world which it beholds in exercising its self-consciousness. Spirit and the spiritual world imply and involve each other; neither has many existence apart from its correlative. If the spiritual world may be called the self-externalization of spirit, Spirit may with equal propriety be called the self-consciousness of the spiritual world. Plotinus is not an idealist in the modern sense; he does not believe that mind creates its own objects, nor that all reality is thought. The famous maxim is not an assertion of mentalism; it only means that Spirit does not contemplate the spiritual world as existing independently of itself.

A critic may say that Plotinus seems to waver between a true monism, in which the one real world is set against imperfect constructions of varying degrees of unreality, and the different idea of a stairway of worlds, in which the human spirit, obeying its homing instinct, traverses a real journey 'per tenebras in lucem'. A journey through the unreal, it may be objected, is an unreal journey. The objection is a serious one, and it affects other systems as well as Neoplatonism. It is bound up with the notorious crux, what kind of substantiality we ought to give to evil. There are two elements in reality as we know it, existence and value. It is sometimes said, untruly as I hold, that while the natural sciences confine themselves to the existential aspects of reality, neglecting for their own purposes all valuation, art morality and religion give us a kingdom of ideal values. By the materialism of the

(continued from the previous page) last century, the kingdom of values was described as epiphenomenal. It floated above the real world as a kind of luminous haze, and was often supposed to be a merely subjective or imaginative picture of the ought-to be, in no way affecting the uniform sequence – miscalled causation – of the world of phenomena. Other theories were those of psychophysical parallelism and neutral monism, in which the two orders were supposed to keep step without interfering with each other. How they came to be tied together in a kind of three-legged race, was not explained, and could not be explained. But the view that science presents us with facts without values is quite untenable. It is probable that there can be no cognition without valuation, and it is certain that the work of the scientist, which aims at establishing law, harmony, and uniformity in the natural order, is very far from being indifferent to values. It is true however to say that the thought of the last three centuries, dominated by scientific interests has forgotten that other constructions, based on art, ethics, or religion, may be as legitimate as the scientific construction, which is concerned with only one value, that of order, and which consequently can only give us an abstract view of reality. For the other values (and we cannot improve on the classification of the ultimate values which we find in the later Neoplatonists and implicitly in Plotinus himself, as Truth, Goodness, and Beauty) claim to be at least as real as the world described by science.

This realization of the intimate and indissoluble connexion of existence and value seems equally fatal to the disguised materialism called epiphenomenalism, and to the opposite philosophy which is sometimes called idealism, but which, to avoid confusion, we will follow Henry Sidgwick in calling mentalism. We must not seek to abolish the duality by negating either side of the opposition.

In Plotinus, as we shall see in the part of this lecture, we have a courageous attempt to do justice to both sides, to existence and to value. He sees a world characterized by an infinite number of degrees

(continued from the previous page) of truth, and by a parallel series of degrees of value. His radical optimism inspires the faith that the fully real is fully knowable, and fully good.

In the nineteenth century the most popular attempt to bring our judgements of fact and judgements of value together was by throwing our ideals into the future, and by assuming that 'Evolution', which merely means the appearance of more complex forms in the place of simpler, was an automatic machine for generating higher values. That Herbert Spencer and even Darwin held this amiable superstition cannot be denied. Bosanquet says that to throw our ideals into the future is the death of all sane idealism, and this verdict, though harshly expressed, conveys a salutary warning. The essence of this expedient is to suggest that though judgements of value—the Is and the Ought-to-be, are at present widely discrepant, there may be a natural tendency for them to converge, and ultimately to coalesce. The world is a bad place, but it is getting better. The theory is helped out by the doctrine that God himself is undergoing a parallel course of evolution. He is realizing himself in the creation. Give Him time, and He will fulfil all expectations. According to this popular philosophy, the real at present falls short of the ideal, and the ideal is not yet wholly real. Time is the physician who will cure them both, and at last join them together in holy wedlock.

Since this solution never even suggested itself to Plotinus, and would have been summarily rejected by him if it had been presented to him, we need not discuss it any further. It is, I think, manifestly unsatisfactory, both from the scientific and from the religious points of view, and it raises insoluble difficulties for the philosopher.

We must therefore try to forget this modern attempt to solve the difficulty, and consider what alternatives were left for Plotinus.

A favourite theory on these lines was that 'Matter' or 'Flesh' is a substantial reality with

(continued from the previous page) evil qualities, and that 'the corruptible body presseth down the soul'. The spiritual journey in that case consists in liberating our personality from the fetters of sense, and escaping into the realm of the pure Ideas. This is metaphysical dualism, and it has been freely attributed to the Platonists. It is not real Platonism, but we have admissions that such doctrines were actually taught by some Platonists in their popular lectures, as good enough for those who could not understand deeper teaching. Platonism has had to pay dearly for this insincerity. Dualism was impossible for Plotinus, who could not allow any substantial reality to an anti-God, a rival to the all-embracing source of being, the One who is also the Good.

The alternative is to retain monims at all costs, and to force our value-judgements to confirm to it by holding that evil is only a defect of goodness, its appearance of positive malignity being valid only within the sphere of the moral sense, which is essentially dualistic. It is required no longer to use its minus signs.

This is on the whole the solution to which Plotinus inclines; but he is not comfortable about it. To begin with, he tries, not unsuccessfully, to minimize the importance of physical evil. 'It is unreasonable to find fault with the whole by looking at the parts.' Our world is only a copy of the spiritual world, which it resembles as much as it can. But the conditions of its existence require strife and tension; it is split up into discordant interests. Viewed as a whole, it is very near its archetype. 'All things that are Yonder are also Here'. But when we contemplate it as it affects individuals, it is far from perfect. Nevertheless, it is our fault if we take earthly troubles too seriously. Death only means that 'the actors change their masks', and no ill-usage can really injure the soul. If we object to seeing our native country conquered, and our friends killed or enslaved, we should learn to fight better! This is actually the consolation which he would have offered

(continued from the previous page) to Belgium in 1914. In all this the influence of Scoticism will carry us a long way in bearing the inevitable troubles of life like brave men?

Evil, according to Plotinus, does not touch any of the Divine principles. Not only the One, and Spirit, but the Universal Soul, are impeccable. The individual soul also, on its higher side, is impeccable; it is only by 'coming down' into the world of space and time and change (a metaphor which we must be careful not to take literally) that the soul becomes liable to sin. The only line of demarcation which we can find anywhere in this system is that which divides things which have *ovota*—permanent substantial being—from those which have it not. And this line seems to cut across the personality of man; for 'the soul is ourselves'. So difficult did this doctrine of an impeccable soul, intimately bound up with a lower soul which is not impeccable, appear to the school of Plotinus, that most of the later Neoplatonists reject the view that the soul 'does not all descend'. For asks Iamblichus, 'if the will sins, how can the soul be sinless?'

The half-real world of becoming corresponds to and is in a sense created by soul, which perceives matter 'by an illegitimate kind of thought'. The irrational soul does not see things as they are. The half-blinded spiritual faculty, the clouded perception, and the indeterminate object, are all transformed together when the soul is 'awake'. It then enters the sphere of real being, instead of 'that which we wrongly call being' here below.

Is then the world here below only illusory? Certainly not. There is a chain of degrees of reality extending from the One to Matter, on the verge of non-existence. Plotinus does not pretend to know how or why the world was created. It was not created in time; it is in a sense as everlasting as its creator; in fact creation in this philosophy means only logical or axiological, not temporal priority.

The One is beyond existence. And similarly Spirit does not lose anything by creating the universal Soul and the world which belongs to it. What we must understand quite clearly is that the higher principles do not live their own life in the lower. Nothing accrues or can accrue to Spirit and the spiritual world from the time-process. The action of the higher principles on the lower is purely one-sided. There are some thinkers who regard it as almost axiomatic that this is impossible. They say that in the spiritual as in the mechanical world there can be no action without reaction. I do not see why they are so sure of this; the argument does not trouble me at all.

It is needless to say that the picture-book theology of heaven as a fairyland existence in time and space receives no countenance in the *Enneads*. Ends are realized through time but not in time, which devours its own children. The final satisfaction of human hopes within the temporal series is impossible.

Whether Plotinus was a keen observer of the beauties of nature, we do not know. But he rejects with generous warmth the world-renouncing creeds which he saw around him. 'Do not suppose that a man becomes good by despising the world and all the beauties that are in it. Those who despise what is so nearly akin to the world yonder prove that they know nothing of the world yonder, except in name.'

The relation of particular souls to the great Soul is rather obscure; I will give you Porphyry's explanation, which is quite correct as the doctrine of the school, and rather clearer than anything in Plotinus. 'We must not believe that the plurality of souls subsist as well as the universal Soul, independently of bodies, without the unity of the universal Soul absorbing the multiplicity of the particular souls, or the multiplicity of particular souls splitting up the unity of the universal Soul. Particular souls are distinct without being separate; they are united to each other without being confused, and

(continued from the previous page) and without making the universal Soul a simple aggregate. They are not separated from each other; they are distinct like the different sciences in a single soul.' 'We must preserve the truth of individuality,' says Plotinus; but without losing sight of unity. 'All have a fellow-feeling with each other and with the All; so that when I suffer, the All feels it too.'

The soul neither comes into existence nor perishes; it is in itself the principle of life. When separated from the body, the lower functions of the soul are not extinguished, but are inactive. Opinion, reasoning and memory are not needed under the conditions of life Yonder.

Immortality may mean unending continuance in time, or a state which is absolutely timeless, or a state which transcends time; but for which time has a meaning. The religious faith in immortality, I have said (and I think I am expressing in my own words the view of Plotinus) 'is the faith that all true values are valid always and everywhere; that the order of the universe is just, rational, and beautiful; and that those principles which exalt us above ourselves and open heaven to us are the attributes of the Creator in whom we live and move and have our being'.

Plotinus does not shrink from saying that there is that in us which makes contact with the One possible. His philosophy leads him to this belief, and his personal experience as a mystic confirms it.

There are several passages in which Plotinus refers to this experience. I can only give you two specimens, which will convince you that he is attempting to describe what he has actually seen and known.

'We must not be surprised that that which excites the keenest of longings is without form, even spiritual form; since the soul itself, when inflamed with love for it, puts off all the form which it had, even that which belongs to the spiritual world. For it is not possible to see it or be in harmony with it, while one is occupied with anything else. The soul must remove from itself good and evil and everything else,

(continued from the previous page) that it may receive the One alone, as the One is alone. When the soul is so blessed, and is come to it, or rather when it manifests its presence, when the soul turns away from visible things and makes itself as beautiful as possible and becomes like the One (the manner of preparation and adornment is known to those who practise it); and seeing the One suddenly appearing in itself, for there is nothing between, nor are they any longer two but one, for you cannot distinguish between them while the vision lasts; it is that union of which the union of earthly lovers, who blend their being with each other, is a copy. The soul is no longer conscious of the body, and cannot tell whether it is a man or a living being or anything real at all.... When in this state the soul would exchange its present condition for nothing, no, not for the very heaven of heavens, for there is nothing better, nothing more blessed than this.... All things that once pleased it, power, wealth, beauty, science, it declares that it despises; it fears no evil, while it is with the One, or even while it sees him; though all else perish around it, it is content if it can only be with him; so happy is it.' Let him who has not had this experience consider how blessed a thing it is in earthly love to obtain that which we most desire, though the objects of earthly loves are mortal and injurious and loves of shadows, which change and pass; since these are not the things which we truly love, nor are they our good, nor what we seek. But Yonder is the true object of our love, which it is possible to grasp and live with and truly possess, since no envelope of flesh separates us from it."

H.W.B. JOSEPH: "COMPARISON OF BERKELEY'S AND KANT'S IDEALISM."@@@

How much is said and written, and how little certainly is reached, on questions of philosophy. Great indeed must be the attraction of our problems, and the interest of our pursuit, to support us in

@@@ "PROCEEDINGS OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY." 1929.

(continued from the previous page) the endurance of so many disappointments.

When I was an undergraduate there were very few teachers in Oxford who did not regard the case for realism as finally disposed of; for realism, I mean, in the sense that the things, we perceive, with which science is concerned, are independent of any knowing mind. That things known are independent of mind is asserted on all sides to-day.

Some who assert it are primarily interested in maintaining what is rather different, that the object of any man's knowledge is what it is and what he knows it is to be, independently of any knowing of it. To maintain this, if mind is active in one other way than knowing, is not to maintain that the thing known is independent of mind in every way. Others are primarily interested in bringing the mind within the sweep of scientific, and particularly of biological, investigation; but that is an old story. Others, among whom are the so-called New Realists, take a more original position. They assert to be independent of mind the very objects of apprehension which in the idealist tradition were held most obviously dependent: sounds, colours, scents, and what we distinguish, as the shifting appearances of the same thing to different observers, from the supposed identical thing. These sense-data or *sensa*, they say, are no otherwise mental than a man is a French citizen, by membership of a particular aggregate. He can lose his citizenship but remain the same man; and a *sensum* can lose the relations to others which make it mental, and still remain the same item. What collects certain of those items into minds, and at other times or even at the same time into bodies, is not clear; and certainly is not made clearer by what we are told about processes of logical construction, since products of construction can hardly do the constructing. *Mutatis mutandis*, Bradley's question is still pertinent: 'Mr Bain collects that the mind is a collection; has he ever thought who collects Mr Bain?'

No philosopher has more uncompromisingly rejected realism, in the sense in which I am taking the

(continued from the previous page) word, than Berkeley, and none has claimed more confidently to have refuted Berkeley than Kant. Kant's refutation of Idealism in the second edition of the Critique of Pure Reason is notoriously at variance with much of his teaching elsewhere; particularly with passages of the first edition which he omitted from the second. Some find in it an abandonment of the fundamental doctrine that our knowledge is only of appearances, not of things by themselves; another sees in its 'realistic theory of the independent existence of material nature' the ripening of the germinal ideas which give to the critical philosophy its real originality and value. To me it seems that the argument of it is singularly weak. But if we reject it, what are we to say of the relation of Berkeley's thought to Kant's? That is the question which I wish to discuss, for it seems to me to have some points of interest which I have not found worked out.

The general character of the argument is this: that consciousness of one thing, A (my existence in time), is impossible without consciousness of another, B (things outside me);

The Refutation profess to be directed against the 'problematic idealism' of which Kant takes Descartes as spokesman, not the 'dogmatic idealism' of Berkeley; that, Kant says, is unavoidable, if space be supposed to be a property of things; but his doctrine, that space is a form of our sensibility, has removed the ground for it. The removal, however, of an assumption whose truth would make idealism necessary still leaves it possible that idealism may be established on other grounds; and the Refutation must have rather had in mind Berkeley, who explicitly rejected the reality of material substance, and is elsewhere by Kant taken as an outstanding exponent of idealism, than Descartes, who, though denying that we immediately apprehend bodies in

(continued from the previous page) space, taught that we had conclusive reasons for asserting their existence. Kant's Refutation professes to show that our apprehension of them is immediate; so far, therefore, it contradicts Descartes; but if sound, it would on the main point refute rather Hume and Berkeley, who did deny the reality of material substance, than Descartes who did not.) the consciousness of A being admitted, that of B, and therefore the existence of B, must be admitted also. This is why Kant concludes a proof of the existence of objects in space outside me with the statement that my consciousness of my own existence in time is at the same time an immediate consciousness of their existence. His procedure is reflection, and really dogmatic; but none the worse for that. But let us turn to the detail.

The statement that I am conscious of my existence as determined in time must mean, I think, merely that I am conscious that my states, or what Kant elsewhere calls the phenomena of my inner sense, are successive; time relation is a form of relatedness in which they occur. But the interpretation of the next sentence, 'All time-determination presupposes something permanent in perception', is more difficult. If, as Kant is trying to prove, there are real things outside me which my exist and change unperceived, their existence is also determined in time; but as their existence, and so the time-relatedness involved in their existence, do not presuppose perception, they do not presuppose anything permanent in perception. Of their relatedness in time, therefore, the sentence would not be true, and Kant must have meant here by time-determination perception or consciousness of time-determination. But what did he mean by saying that it presupposes something permanent perceived, or perceiving something permanent? The first alternative may draw support from empirical psychology. We are told that the apprehension of change in our states is possible only if there is some unchanging state with which their changes may be noticed to

(continued from the previous page) contrast. The somatic consciousness or coenaesthesia, is said to furnish the contrast required; and when anything occurs to interrupt the continuous qualitative identity of this state of feeling it is said that profound psychical disturbances arise. But whatever be the empirical facts about coenaesthesia, it hardly provides an unchanging state of feeling, nor anything with the permanence that Kant's argument on this interpretation of it would require. Moreover, not only had Kant denied, in the first edition, that any empirical state is thus unchanging, but the next sentence seems to exclude such an interpretation, for it says that 'this permanent cannot be something in me'; and 'something in me' should mean some state of myself of which I am conscious, some phenomenon of my inner sense. Kant must therefore be taken to have meant that the consciousness of the time-determination of my states pre-supposes the perception of something permanent; and this permanent is not in me — that is, it is not one of my states; for if it were, it would be merely one of the items, the consciousness of which presupposes that of something else. But why may not the permanent be the self which is not any of its states? Until this is shown, the argument cannot proceed. It is fair enough to say that the perception of this permanent is not possible through the bare presentation of a thing without me. For the bare presentation, or *Vorstellung*, would be a state in me; and when Kant argues that the consciousness of my successive states is only possible through something permanent in perception, i.e. (as we have seen) through being aware of a permanent that is none of my states. But why must it therefore be a thing without me? Why may it not be myself? This is the crucial point.

The "Refutation of Idealism" therefore, I think, fails. Kant has not succeeded here in dragging the root of his doctrine to light. Yet I believe we may discover the thought that guided him, and that we may be helped to this discovery by a comparison

(continued from the previous page) of his teaching with Berkeley's. I put aside any considerations which rest upon discarded passages of the first edition, as that whereas Kant says, in the Fourth Paralogism, that space itself, with all its appearances, as presentations, is only in me, Berkeley in his *Siris* says that 'those who would penetrate into the real and true causes' will 'speak of the world as contained by the soul, and not the soul by the world'. I shall take Kantian doctrine that it is unwithdrawn, and (as I think) for Kant fundamental. I wish to call attention to a remarkable agreement between their accounts of what the reality of things consists in, and again of their distinctions between reality and illusion within experience; and at the same time to call attention to certain connected differences in their doctrines.

Berkeley finds the reality of things in the order and connexion of our ideas. 'Mechanical laws of nature or motion direct us how to act, and teach us what to expect.' 'Natural philosophers excel, as they are more or less acquainted with the laws and methods observed by the Author of Nature,' but observed, if we would speak strictly, in causing men's ideas. For a spirit is the only real cause; what we call the relation of cause and effect in nature is properly a relation of sign and thing signified. 'Ideas are not any how and at random produced. But they are not produced by bodies. 'We are chained to a body,' says Philonous; 'that is to say, our perceptions are connected with corporeal motions. By the law of our nature, we are affected on every alteration in the nervous parts of our sensible body; which sensible body', he however continues, 'is nothing but a complexion of such qualities or ideas as have no existence distinct from being perceived by a mind; so that this connexion of sensations with corporal motions means no more than a correspondence in the order of nature between two sets of ideas, or things immediately perceivable.'

(continued from the previous page) This system of signs he calls the Language of the Author of Nature. But it should be noted that there is a certain confusion in the use of that metaphor. He first employs it in his New Theory of Vision, where speaks of a visual language. But tangibles are there treated as 'without the mind', and the metaphor, on this basis, is appropriate enough. Afterwards sign and thing signified are equally ideas; but in language words do not stand for one another. Hence he also treats the order of ideas; but in language words do not stand for one another. Hence he also treats the order of ideas in its entirety as a language in which the Author of Nature declares to us himself; and what they signify is not one another but their Author. The metaphor is now at fault; for it is the words of a language that have meaning, not a language in its entirety. This failure of the metaphor is, as we shall see, important. It betrays a failure to think out the necessities of his doctrine.

Meanwhile it is clear what answer Berleley held himself entitled to give to any one asking him how he distinguished between real and illusory perception. If I really see a man before me, the occurrence of my present visual idea is connected with that of other ideas in my own mind, such as I might name by saying that I heard the sound of his approaching footsteps, saw his footmarks, shook him by the hand, and so forth; it is connected again with the occurrence in other finite minds of ideas more or less like mine, and with the possibility of such ideas in other finite minds as might be named by saying that they saw the reflection of his body in the cornea of my eye. But if I merely have the illusion of seeing him, then the occurrence of the same present visual idea is connected with that of none of those others; but only perhaps with that of some past emotional ideas, hopes and fears, of mine, and with future ideas in other minds that might be named by saying that they saw marks of disease

(continued from the previous page) in my brain at a post-mortem. Now what is Kant's doctrine? 'To know the reality of things requires perception, and consequently sensation, of which one is conscious; conscious not indeed immediately of the object whose existence is to be known, but yet of its' connexion in an experience.' The analogies of experience require us to regard' our presentations as occurring in connexion with physiological conditions; these are events in nature; and nature we must conceive as a system of bodies in space, determining changes one in another according to laws or rules. To perceive something real therefore is to have a presentation or *Vorstellung* (the word is the equivalent here of Berkeley's 'idea'), whose occurrence is connected according to the order of nature with that of other presentations, our own or other people's. The illusory, as before, would be differently connected. If we ask what difference there is between the two doctrines in their cash value (to use William James's phrase), the answer is—none.

The function divided by Kant between mind working in us and the thing by itself is assigned by Berkeley altogether to the Author of Nature. It is a mistake to call God in his system as a *dues ex machine*, any more than is *Bewusstsein* *Überhaupt* in Kant's, or Spirit in Hegel's. Also it is true that Berkeley became a Bishop; but when he published his *New Theory of Vision* he had only just become a deacon, and he must have thought out his main position while yet an innocent layman.

There is, according to Berkeley, no cause but a spirit. Finite spirits can produce in themselves imaginations; but ideas or things sensible are produced in them only by God. This however not at random, but in a regular course, arbitrary indeed, yet consistent. Ideas in finite minds must be conceived therefore to occur in connexions which these rules require; and whereas each of us perceives only his own ideas, the complete system with which the several

(continued from the previous page) ideas of all finite conscious beings are connected is eternally known to God.

In any case they are agreed to so far as this, that our several ideas, or presentations, occur in such an order as they would, if their occurrence were connected according to laws with events in sensories which are themselves bodies along with other bodies in space and time, mutually affecting each other according to rules which we call laws of nature. I perceive something real, i.e. my idea or presentation is an idea or presentation of an object, not a mere state in me, if its occurrence can be thus interpreted. But if asked whether this object has a reality independent of mind, they both must answer no, Berkeley will reply that it exists in the divine mind; it belongs to a scheme conceived by God to guide him in producing the cash of our ideas. Kant, notwithstanding the Refutation of Idealism, will reply that it belongs to a scheme that mind in each one of us is bound to think, in order so to order his presentations that he can say that through them he has experience. To ascribe other reality to it than this would be to make it a thing by itself, no longer transcendently ideal. And this is really a remarkable extent of agreement.

We may now summarize the results of our comparison. Both Berkeley and Kant deny that there is a world of bodies in space independent of mind. Both affirm our sensible experience to be such as would arise if there were such a world, and to be only intelligible to us, only not a mere flux of feeling, when we think of it as connected with the events of such a world. Berkeley accounts for this by supposing that God, to whom the thought of such a world is eternally present, excites in finite minds those sensible experiences which a world, the scheme of which God thinks of, would require; But he leaves unexplained how this world becomes the object also of their thought.

(continued from the previous page) Kant imputes to the spontaneity of mind in finite beings both the fact that the scheme of such a world is an object of their thought, and an activity in ordering their sensible experiences accordingly; but he fails to explain how the material of these experiences is such as to admit of being so ordered. Kant, it may be said, asks of mind in us more than, on his theory, it could achieve; Berkeley, in a sense, asks too little. Kant should have allowed to the principle which is not in us more kinship with the intelligence which is; Berkeley to us more kinship with the intelligence which is not.

And there one is tempted to leave the matter, and say that these things are real and independent of mind, and that we come along and get to know them. Yet we cannot be so easily quit of the idealist. In the first place there are the difficulties (to be mentioned again) about the infinity and continuity of space, and what distinguishes a body from a geometrical solid; and secondly there is this difficulty. In that immediate apprehension, in which is involved the distinction between what is and how it appears to us, we seem to apprehend bodies of sensible magnitude and continuous surface. The figure of what looks differently to observers from different angles or at different distances is, we say, a cube when we look at a tea-chest, a disk when we look at a penny. But when we investigate the empirical conditions of our awareness of these real things without us, we are driven to give quite a new account of them. We seemed immediately aware of something continuous and cubic or discoid, appearing diversely from different points of view; and now we are told there is only a collection of separate minute particles, whose shapes are unknown, darting about with unimagined rapidity at intervals vast in comparison of their diameters, though like these minute in comparison of any length sensible to us. And when the physicists tell us that mass may disappear in radiant energy, material substance is

(continued from the previous page) wearing very thin. There is some plausibility in the distinction between space and the impenetrable body that fills a volume of it, so long as we think of mass as quantity of matter or of what fills space; but what is there extensive about energy? Is it not intensive rather?

Our common-sense realism is thus rudely shaken, and we cannot leave the matter where we were tempted to leave it. The bodies in space of which I seemed to be conscious in the same act of seeing or touching which involved the apprehension of something private to myself, some phenomenon of my inner sense, have been dissipated into something extraordinarily unlike them. I am left indeed with space, but with nothing in it that really has the real shapes of which I seemed to be conscious in that perception, wherein was involved the distinction of the real body and its shape from how they appeared. Even space is being as it were rebuilt by the physicists and mathematicians; with what justification cannot be discussed now. And space is an unsatisfactory thing by itself, and not made satisfactory by having bodies in it. For it is infinite and infinitely divisible, and therefore neither a genuine whole nor body occupying any portion, has a size that can be stated as being any fraction of the spatial whole or multiple of the spatial unit; we can only state its ratio to some other portion; and to such ratio size is indifferent. The intelligible ratio is displayed in something, the apprehension of which is bound up with sense, if not merely sensuous, and whose being, I confess, seems to be in severable from the being of sensuous or imaginative mind. Certainly the real things without me are not private like the pains I feel or the sounds I hear. But perhaps, as these are bound up with my feeling or hearing them, so are those with the being of knowing and perceiving minds. The empirical conditions of the apprehension of them by finite minds, and the development in finite minds of that apprehension, may depend together upon a reality or intelligence which shows itself in nature to itself in minds.

Jones: "PEOPLE OF THE MOSQUE".

The greatest possible stress is laid by the Muslim on this aspect of his belief in God, viz., His Unity. This is the doctrine known as tauhid. God "is singular, without anything like Him; separate, having no equal". The Quran is never weary of reiterating the formula which expresses this Unity.

His attitude to Islam can be gauged by the emphatic way in which he declared that no revelation is final. Other prophets will be sent as mankind progresses and requires fuller teaching. There is no real disagreement between the earlier prophets.

The Bab had really only intended a reform of the Shi'a Imamate, and Mirza Yahya aimed at nothing more than preserving the pure Babist doctrine, but Baha' ullah took an independent line and proclaimed himself the messenger of a new dispensation. He announced that he was the emanation of the Deity, the Apostle of the final revelation, no longer for the Shi'as or Islam alone, but for all mankind. He thus reduced the original Bab to the subordinate position of a forerunner of the final faith, Baha'ism. He too set forth his doctrines in a book, modelled on the style of the Quran.

Sufism is that mode of the religious life in Islam wherein the chief stress is placed on the activities of the inner self rather than on the performance of external ritual; in other words, it is the name given to Islamic mysticism. It owes its origin, on the one hand, to an effort to break away from the unsatisfying idea of a purely transcendent God, and, on the other, to an attempt to recover from the failure of the Mu'tazilis, or free-thinkers, to solve certain philosophical difficulties by the aid of pure reason.

Dissatisfied with the Qur'an and the sunna as guides to a knowledge of divine truth, and unable to accept the principle of the use of pure reason, the Sufis formulated yet another basis for the discovery of divine truth, viz. kashf, or "illumination." Kashf is that direct and immediate apprehension of divine things which the soul gains, not from an inspired

(continued from the previous page) book nor by some process of reasoning, but through experience. This principle of Kashf forms the basis of the teaching of the Sufis, whom we may call the mystics of Islam.

It is claimed that the system is not opposed to the Shari'at, yet in some respects it is. The two differ mainly in that the shari'at deals with the outward and visible profession of religion, whereas Sufism seeks to regulate the inner life of the soul. By way of explaining their separate functions, the Sufi says that knowledge of religious truth is of three kinds: that which is received from God, that obtained with God, and that acquired of God. The knowledge received from God is that based on the shari'at, the revealed law, made obligatory by God Himself. That which is obtained with God is the knowledge of the mystic path. Finally, that which is acquired of God called 'ilmul ma'rifat, or gnosis, is the knowledge of God possessed by prophets and saints. This last kind of knowledge cannot be acquired by ordinary means, but results from Divine guidance and illumination.

Zu-n-Nun Misri (860), of Egypt, is one of a number of famous Sufis of the period who contributed greatly to the system from their immense learning, and who superimposed a speculative element on the more practical ascetism. This man was renowned for his great learning, devotion, and communion with God. He would wander amidst the ruined monuments of Egypt, studying the inscriptions and endeavouring to decipher their mysterious hieroglyphics. He is held in high reputation also as a chemist. At length he was charged with heresy and imprisoned by the Khalifa Mutawakkil. When, however, the latter learned of his remarkable learning and sanctity he had him released and himself became his disciple.

It was this man who first introduced into Sufism the idea that the true knowledge of God is to be obtained by means of wajd, or "ecstasy." He used to say, "The man who knows God best is the one most completely lost in Him."

The entire system of Sufism centres round the twofold question: How is man to gain the experience of God's inward presence; and, what is God in relation both to the individual and to the universe?

The answer of Sufism to the first question is contained in the teaching concerning At-Tariqat, the Path, which will be dealt with in the next chapter. The answer to the second is contained in the doctrine of ma'rifat, or gnosticism, which describes God in terms of pantheistic and monistic philosophy, and not in terms of the monotheism of the Qur'an.

All the mystic teachers describe at length the organs of spiritual communication with which man has been endowed by God. These vary in number in the different "orders," but the following three are found in every list: qalb, the heart sirr, the soul; and ruh, the spirit. These are said to be located in the human body, but actually have no material existence. The first is on the left side of the breast, the second on the right, and the third between the two. The qalb, which, "knows" God, though mysteriously connected with the physical heart, is not a thing of flesh and blood and, contrary to the Western conception, is the seat of the intellect and capable of knowing the essence of all things. A tradition represents God as saying: "My earth and heaven contain Me not, but the heart of My faithful servant containeth Me." The function of the sirr is to "contemplate" God, and that of the ruh to "love" Him.

In regard to their speculations concerning God, Sufis may be divided into two main groups. The larger of these is composed of Pantheists, to whom everything is God and of the same essence. For these the creed, "There is no God but God," means that besides Allah there is no existence. They are called Ittihadiya, i.e., monists, or alternatively, Wahadatu'l-wajudiya i.e., pantheists.

Those forming the second group, in their anxiety to conform to the monotheistic teaching of the Quran, explain away the pantheistic expressions of mystic writers, interpreting them in the sense that the existence of the universe and all that it contains is so

(continued from the previous page) far transcended by the reality of God that these things count for nothing. Sufis of this class are called *Ilhamiya*, "inspired."

Generally, speaking, however, the Sufis regard God as pure Being, so that, from the philosophical point of view, they are nothing less than pantheists. "But this is not materialistic pantheism, which dignifies with the name of "God" the mere sum totality of the universe. Sufism is a spiritualistic pantheism which sees in the universe naught but a dim reflection, "as in a glass darkly," of the Infinite Attributes of that Invisible, Omnipotent, Omnipresent Spirit of whom alone reality and existence can be predicted." To the Sufi everything speaks of God; "There is nothing that does not celebrate His praise" (17: 46). He is everywhere and in everything; "We (God) are closer to him than his neck-vein" (50: 15). Said a Sufi, "Show what God is not, and I will show you what He is."

"From the philosophical point of view God is pure Being, from the mystical and devotional point of view God is Absolute Beauty, of which all earthly beauty, whether it be of form, or thought, or action, is but a dim reflection. Our finite minds cannot comprehend the Infinite: we can but speak in metaphors, according to one or another aspect in which the Infinite Being reveals it to us. Having regard to His power some call Him 'King'; meditating on His loving-kindness, others call Him 'Father'. Overwhelmed by His Beauty, the Sufi conceives of Him, above all things, as the eternally Beautiful. Hence Sufi hymns borrow the impassioned language of the lover. He is all-Beautiful, and the whole universe is the mirror of His Beauty."

In his progress his conception of the Absolute Being changes from that of an objective reality to One having identity with himself and with the universe. The changes in the position thus reached may be expressed thus: At the first the simple creed, "There is no God but Allah," implied three things: there is no agent but Allah, there is no object of worship save Allah, and there is no existence save Allah. In the later phase the creed took the form, "There is no

(continued from the previous page) god but Thou." In the final stage the creed becomes, "There is no god but I." This is the final goal of the Sufi's journey along the Path.

Sufism speaks of advancement in the spiritual life as a journey, and the seeker after Gods as a *salik*, or "traveller." Its teaching is intended to guide the traveller to the attainment of the perfect "knowledge" (*ma'rifat*) of God, the only Reality diffused through all things. Subsequently, the wandering soul is led onwards by slow "stages" (*maqamat*), and through the experience of certain "states" (*ahwal*), along a Path (*attariqat*), to the desired goal of union with God, called *fana f'il-haqiqat*, absorption (lit. "extinction") in Reality.

The first requirement for one desiring to become a Sufi is to place himself under a Shaikh, or spiritual leader, and to take the vow of obedience (*bai'at*). He thus becomes a *murid*, "aspirant," or disciple. The Shaikh is believed to possess secret power for the transmutation of the human body. Under his direction it becomes refined in the fire of spiritual passion (*'ishq*), the flame of which is fed by the fuel of *dhikr*, the act of "remembering" God, accompanied by prescribed breathing exercises.

The early "stages" for the Sufi have as their object his purification. These are repentance, abstinence, renunciation, voluntary poverty, and trust in God. Repentance must come first. This is described as the awakening of the soul from the slumber of indifference to awareness of his evil ways, and a sense of contrition for past sin. There are three elements in such repentance: remorse for disobedience; determination not to sin again; immediate abandonment of sin.

Rabi'a taught that sin was, in the highest degree, nurtful to the soul because it was the cause of separation between the soul and its Beloved. She held that contrition for sin as a barrier between the servant and his Lord, and not fear of punishment, could alone lead to true repentance. "Repentance,"

(continued from the previous page) she said, "is purely an act of Divine grace coming from God to man, not from man to God. Only God has power so to touch the sinner's heart that he will turn away from his wickedness and repent."

For the sincere penitent forgiveness is sure, since repentance is a sign of grace. Sin and grace are incompatible in the same soul. As Al Ghazali said: "Darkness cannot dwell with light, not filthiness with the whiteness of fuller's soap."

Finally, we may mention the necessity for trust in God. This in practice includes the cultivation of patience in face of the many ills of life. It is no passive virtue, but rather a "making war upon the passions and seeking after victory." There are three stages in the cultivation of this virtue; to cease complaining, the stage of the penitent; to be satisfied with what is decreed, the stage of the ascetic; to love whatever the Lord does, the stage of the friends of God.

The "stages" must be distinguished from the "states" (ahwal, sing.hal). The Sufis define a "state" as a condition, of feeling or disposition, which comes upon a man without his intention or desire, such as sorrow, fear, joy. The various "states" which the Sufi experience in his journey are variously enumerated, but it is generally agreed that they are the following ten. Meditation, Nearness to God, Love, Fear, Hope, Longing, Intimacy, Tranquillity, Contemplation, Certainty. These "states" are induced by God in the heart of man, who is unable to repel them when they come or to retain them when they depart.

The Path is not finished until the traveller has traversed all the "stages", making himself perfect in each of them, and has experienced all the "states" God is pleased to send. Then commences the higher ascent of the Path, Illumination, which the Sufis called ma'rifat, Gnosis, the haqiqat, Truth.

Besides these early "stages", the Path has a further "Seven Stages" (maqamat) marking the progress of the soul towards the final goal of perfect union with

(continued from the previous page) the Absolute Reality. These also are variously described by Muslim mystics, but in the general the "seven stages" are as follows:

1. 'Ubudiyat, the stage of "service" —in which the aspirant is exhorted to obey the Law and serve God.
2. 'Ishq, that of "love" —in which the Divine influence inclines the soul towards the love of God.
3. Zuhd, "renunciation" —under the influence of Divine Love all wordly desires are expelled from the heart.
4. Ma'rifat, "knowledge" —in which the aspirant contemplates the nature, attributes and works of God.
5. Wajd, "ecstasy" —in which mental excitement is produced through contemplation of the only existing Reality, God.
6. Haqiqat, "reality" —the heart is now illuminated with the true nature of God.
7. Wast, "union" —in which the mystic, as it were, sees God face to face. This "stage" immediately precedes the final experience of fana, absorption in the essence of the Eternal Being.

The final stage of the journey, absorption in Deity, is considered not to have been reached until the aspirants has "lost" himself in his pir.

The most significant contribution to Muslim thought at the present time is being made by Sir Muhammad Iqbal, the poet-philosopher of Lahore. He has studied philosophy in the West and seeks to combine the teaching of the Quran with the tenets of Western philosophical schools. The keynote of his teaching, which owes much to the ideas of Nietzsche, is the development of personality, with the "superman" as the ideal. On the one hand, he scornfully denounces the teaching and practice of such Sufis as advocate retirement from the world, and, on the other, derides in veiled language the ideal of self-sacrifice and the principal of non-retaliation. That it is the meek who inherit the earth is not a doctrine to which he can subscribe. There is something here that doubtless makes a powerful appeal to the educated youth of to-day, but it is not improbable that much

(continued from the previous page) of his thought is too subtle to be widely appreciated.

Islam produces in its adherents the profound conviction that there is only one God, a living God, the Creator and Ruler of all. That is a proposition the very simplicity of which has always proved restful amid the confusing claims of polytheism and saint-worship.

Another element of strength comes from the way in which the Islamic forms of worship stimulate into activity a man's religious nature.

The forms of utterance in the daily salat (namaz) are eagerly made use of as a channel for the expression of the mind's nobler impulses. Admittedly, the frequency of the repetition of these set prayers (five times a day) exposes the worshippers to the danger of formality, but, on the other hand, it tends to create a habit that has in it great possibilities for the good.

Not with standing the constant assertion that they respect and even reverence the name of Jesus, Muslims are quick to repudiate the high and unique claims which Christians make for him. Jesus, "Son of Mary" (the common title given to him in the Quran), is for them but one of the prophets, and not the last nor the best.

Naturally it is not to be expected that they should give to him a higher place than that which they assign to Muhammad, and in practice, as we have seen above (p.108), they do not give him as high. But such natural preference for their own Prophet is not the only or the chief reason why Muslims refuse to give to Christ a name that is above every name. It is rather their jealousy for God, as they understand Him, that provokes them to denounce as blasphemy any honour paid to Christ which, in effect, makes him to be more than man. (Islam) refuses to acknowledge the incarnation of the Divine Being.

It seems to Muslims that in so speaking of Jesus we appear to belittle, ignore, and even deny the supreme doctrine of God's essential Unity.

Perhaps the most familiar object of Muslim

(continued from the previous page) attack is the doctrine of the Trinity. A Muslim paper has been known to set it out in the manner of a formula, thus $1+1+1: 1$; and then hold it up to ridicule with the remark that even a schoolboy would not make so silly a blunder in his sums, and if he did he would be spanked.

In this case, too, we may trace the extraordinary influence of the Islamic doctrine of tauhid. It soon enters into the composition of the Muslim mind, for a baby is taught to respond to the word Allah by raising one finger.

There is nothing that counts for more in its influence upon Muslims than a holy life, lived among them and in their sight. We need to cultivate this not only that our own lives may commend the Gospel we preach, but also in order that we ourselves may be able to stand the strain on our faith and patience, on our sympathy and love.

One's home should be known to them as a place where prayer is wont to be made. No Muslim will be either surprised or offended if asked to wait until the "family prayers" are concluded.

H.A. Overstreet: "THE VOID OF PLOTINUS".@@

Upon a superficial view, Plotinus's repudiation of Thought and Being seems a fantastic attempt to escape the unescapable, to find rest in a fool's paradise of sheer nothingness. But a closer examination of his meaning leads one to see that his apparently suicidal denial of categories is entirely for the purpose of making an advance to a culminating category that Hellenic philosophy had long sought but had hitherto failed adequately to find. After Plotinus it has remained for modern philosophy to bring this category to conscious expression. Indeed, Plotinus's doctrine of the One, logically, and even in much of its actual detail, corresponds to Hegel's doctrine of the Idea; and the causes which led the modern thinker to his final category are, in large measure, those that were silently acting in Plotinus. Both men may be said to have been working themselves free of the mechanical, atomistic view of Reality, prescribed by

@@ University of California Publications in Phy.1909.

(continued from the previous page) a logic of analytic identity, to a view, demanded by the deeper logic of synthetic identity, of the Real as Spirit.

Surely such a chapter of paradoxes seems to accomplish only the complete stultification of thought. And yet, for the most part, the antithetic clauses have a sound far from unfamiliar in philosophical history. Plato's *Barmenides* is there, the *Sophist* and the *Philebus*, and the brilliant passage of the *Republic* where the Good is declared above even Thought and Being. The twelfth book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, where the First Being is held to be both immanent and transcendent, is there. Leibnitz, with his monads that are each itself, and yet, in a way, contains in itself the whole, speaks there. Hegel is there, with his resolution of opposite into its opposite, and with his culminating Idea, which, being the dialectical union of Subject and Object, Thought and Being, is beyond both. In the case of all of these men, widely different as they are in spirit and results, there is the recognition that formal identity, the identity in which each single being is solely itself, and excludent of all other beings, is not real or true identity. Plato is struggling to this thought when he tries to find some means to express the manner in which the Ideas are in the particulars; is it, he asks, as a sail covers many men so that a part of the whole is over each; or is it as the day is continuous with each part; or is it in some other manner? None of the proposed metaphors, he sees, will answer, for the operation of an Idea in the particulars is not by division of itself, by yielding itself to the participation of the particulars; nor is it by being the archetype which things other than itself copy. In short, the relation of the Ideas to the particulars must not presuppose a separate independence of the two. The sequent dialectic of the *Parmenides* in which the One is shown both to be and not to be, together with the further developments in the *Sophist* and in the succeeding dialogues, is simply Plato's attempt to express the dialectic

(continued from the previous page) principle that nothing, not even the Idea, has an identity which is in and for itself in the sense that it is essentially excludent of others. That all is in all and all is in each, is, in truth, the thought, less and less vaguely held, that in the stimulus of Plato's later logical endeavour.

The One, says Plotinus, is not one in a numerical sense; the numerical one is a *yevos*, and therefore not unique; it is but a distant image of the primal One. Hence when Plotinus declares that it is necessary there shall be a one before the many, because of which, or through which, the many are, he does not mean a one over against the many, numerically distinguishable, from them. Nor does he mean that the One, though not numerically distinguishable, is excludent of the many; for all the multiplicity of being, both primary and dependent, has its reality through the One.

Plotinus is struggling to express a relation that has one foot, so to speak, in a quantitative realm and the other in a realm non-quantitative. On the one hand, our world is a many; it has parts and whole; but neither parts nor whole, not both, are its final explanation.

Hegel finds the completion of these external meanings in a category, of absolute self-unity, the Idea. It is significant now to notice, that in the process of reaching this final category Hegel rejects as inadequate those categories that to most minds seem to be fundamentally expressive of reality,— Being, Essence, Cause, Thought, Will, etc. The Idea is beyond these categories. Thus he is declaring, with Plotinus, that the One, the Absolute, is. And yet, although the Idea is beyond the lower categories it is, too, their source and container. Hence he is declaring, with Plotinus, that the Absolute is not excludent of the lesser realities but is their source and embracing being. What Hegel, in this respect, expresses by means of the dialectic of opposites, Plotinus pictures by the inadequate metaphor of emanation. Both, as I shall try to show in the end, are striving after the same result, the expression of

(continued from the previous page) Reality as at once itself and its other. This is manifestly and professedly Hegel's aim, and that it is also Plotinus's will appear more clearly in the sequel.

Neither Being, nor Thought, nor Goodness, nor Beauty,—no qualities, in fact,—may be predicated of the One. At first blush, such a position would seem to involve the annihilation of all meaning, to be a lapse into pure nothingness; and so, indeed, it has in the main been interpreted. Carefully regarded, however, the view is seen to be of profound dialectical import. Plotinus is maintaining that the relation of predication is not expressive of perfect self-realization. The attribute is not of the rank of the substance in which it inheres. The One, however, cannot be expressed in terms that imply the possession of something other than itself; whatever is of the One must be the One. Hence it is an error to say that the One has goodness or love or beauty; the One is the Good itself and Love itself and Beauty itself. It will be noted that this is in exact consonance with the Christian doctrine that God is Love. That doctrine too places God, in this respect, above predication.

The Good, he says, needs not to look another, nor strive after that which is other than itself; at one with itself, it is the quietly holding source and principle of all activities. While all things strive toward it, it remains ever at one with itself.

In denying causality to the One, Plotinus, like Hegel, is reserving for it the higher character of self-activity. This will indicate how, instead of abstracting all fullness of content from the One, Plotinus takes from it simply the imperfect forms of being, reserving for it the riches of absolute activity.

We come now to the point in Plotinus's metaphysics that has seemed most indefensible, namely, that the One is above even thought and thinking. It is in this doctrine that Plotinus grounds his mysticism. The position certainly appears indefensible, because, by apparently making the One different in kind from rational beings, it removes the One from any possible realization by such beings.

Of all terms in philosophical use, probably no single one has been employed in more various senses than "thought" (vovs). Plotinus holds, and consistently maintains, a distinct meaning for vovs. It is a meaning, however, essentially different from that held by those idealists who use "Thought" as the highest category expressive of the Real. Hence when Plotinus denies that the Real is vovs, he is not denying it to be the "Thought" of these idealists. On the contrary, properly understood, his rejections of what he holds to be an inadequate category is rather in the service of a profound idealistic interpretation of Reality.

When the idealist declares that Reality is Thought, he means by the latter, not a knowing process distinct from and related to an objective something that is known: "Thought" in his sense, is the synthetic union of thinker and object thought. For Plotinus, however, vovs is not the embracing unity of subject and object (vontov); it is, rather, the subject over against the object. Nor is this contradicted by Plotinus's position that mind (vovs) knows its objects, not as perception does, indirectly and as "other," but as one with itself. The unity of itself with its objects is true of vovs only in its own "intelligible" sphere.

If this interpretation of Plotinus is correct, it would seem to point to no such disagreement as has ordinarily been supposed between his views and those of rationalistic idealists; for what philosophers mean when they say that Reality is Thought is not that it is subject, and not object; they mean rather that it is Spirit, the One which is both subject and object. Spirit, however, is for them not the mere aggregate of the two, but the sublation of them in a unity which, while it embraces them, is "above" them. Plotinus differs from this position, not in principle but in expression; Mind vovs, for him, expresses a lower, one-sided activity, while, for many idealists, the word "Thought" expresses Reality at its highest power.

Plotinus constantly reiterates that the procession or emanation from the one is not to be taken in a temporal, but in a logical sense, and further, that the One, in going forth from itself, remains ever with itself.

Hegel finds that thought as a cognitive activity must be transcended. He finds the same to be true of thought as practical activity; and he concludes in the Idea as that which is above and yet embrative of both. The position, in principle, is identical with that of Plotinus.

Plotinus rejects Quantity, Quality, Being, Essence Causality, Will, Thought, not because these, if predicated of the One, would disturb its serene and ineffable nothingness; but because no one of them serves adequately to express what is true of Reality in its own sublime nature. In other words, Plotinus is performing the service of clearing away conceptions that savor too strongly of mortality. Whether he is successful, further, in discovering the category perfectly expressive of Absolute Being is a question. Yet it must remain true that, although he may seem in his heroic rejection of categories, to have left Reality empty and formless, he has made each rejection upon grounds dialectically justifiable. If we speak of God as Being, or Ground, or Cause, or Thought, it must be in senses very different from those which are in ordinary vogue and which Plotinus makes it his business to disprove.

Is the One for which Plotinus has so royally cleared the way, itself but a vague phantom, a formless dream, the empty abstraction of a logic seemingly dialectic, but in stricter truth analytic? Plotinus himself anticipates the objection: "What, now, is the One? What is its nature? It is no wonder that we cannot easily say, in view of the fact that neither existence nor form is easily described. Yet our knowledge is based upon forms and conceptions. But the more the soul proceeds into the formless, the more she becomes unable to comprehend it, because it is indefinable and lacks the impress of variety. Hence she wavers and begins to fear that she has laid hold

(continued from the previous page) of blank nothing, and tires at such a height, and is glad to descend frequently and fall back from everything till she has reached the phenomenal world. There she rests from her labors as if on firm ground once more."

But it would be doing Plotinus gross injustice to ignore his effort to reach a positive characterization of the One. It may indeed be admitted that the effort is marked by grave obscurities; but in a region where human thought, if it is to be successful, must well-nigh forego the use of its entire range of ordinary conceptions, and, above all, of ordinary words, obscurity is not only to be expected, but indeed (if the paradox be not too shocking) to be welcomed, as, in a sense, the sign of a truth of which our ordinary powers are not susceptible. This doctrine may, of course, easily be distorted into the belief that obscurity is ipso facto the sign of truth; and Neo-Platonism has to a great extent, and indeed most often at the hands of its disciples, suffered from just such distortion. But stated properly, the doctrine is simply the corollary of the fact that the human person lives in the main and most vividly on a plane of consciousness below that of pure spirit. Just as the child can scarcely understand the joy of disinterested behaviour, or the save the blessedness of pity, so the human person, even at the best of his immersion in the sensuous and the discursive, can scarcely comprehend the life from which all egotism, all external separation, is absent. The human person, indeed, has predominantly a sense of himself; while he recognizes other persons, and, as his life reaches higher planes, sees them more and more as akin to himself, and more and more as deserving respect and love, it is a question whether, even at his best, he ever attains to that perfection of spirit in which he loves his fellow-men as himself. Always, consciously or unconsciously, his own self has a disproportionate interest, which, for him, is possessed by no other person. Always, therefore, he experiences himself as in some sense apart from others. What he sees, vaguely, to be the ideal after which he striving is a life free from

(continued from the previous page) all such preponderance of self, a life in which the self is not one among others, each unit knowing itself primarily, and the others as thoroughly external and secondary to itself, out a life in which each self is in and through the others, in which, in being the others, it is itself. The ideal is so obscure that he can express it only by paradox; he that loseth his life shall find it, or technically, as with Plato and Regal, the One is not barely one, it also is ipso facto other. Once having recognized the obscurity of the ideal, its paradox of distinguishing and yet uniting opposites, he thenceforth scorns to characterize perfect spirit crudely as Cause, or Substance, or Thought, or Will. All of these, as they are ordinarily understood, he sees, imply an externality of relation that is far too mechanical and separative to express Spirit. If we oppose cause to effect, substance to accident, thought to the object, will to conditions operated upon, Spirit, as the first term of the relation, is still, in a sense, external to the second. These categories, he sees, express, on lower or higher planes, the unresolved dualisms of our ordinary consciousness. They are therefore not truly applicable to perfect spirit. When, however, he undertakes to find an expression free from mechanical implications, he realizes with a sudden dismay, that he lives and moves and has his being in these lower categories. They are the dark cave to which his eyes have long grown accustomed. If, then, he turns his back upon the shadows, and looks upward to the pure light of Spirit, shall we blame him if, "dazzled with excess of light," he sees little and obscurely? The cave-dwellers, to be sure, will scornfully upbraid him for his vagueness, for they, worthy citizens, always see clearly? It is not an exaggeration to say that Plotinus is Plato's philosopher of the cave; he is turning; as we have seen from the deceptive shadows of mechanistic categories to the illumination of that supreme Idea in which external separations, limitations, antagonisms, have no place. And if his eyes too, blinded by the pure light, report to us but vaguely and in dim images, we should

(continued from the previous page) blame not them, but the darkness of that mechanizing life from which they are with difficulty turning.

Deism and pantheism, indeed, are the inevitable alternatives of mechanistic theology. But they are alternatives only where, as on such a plane of thought there is a refusal to advance beyond the quantitative conception of identity, that is, where the unit of identity is conceived as either a one excludent of all other units, or as inclusive of the sum of units.. A spiritual conception of identity, however, is one which can thoroughly comprehend the meaning of a life that is wholly at one with itself and yet is fundamentally in union with life other than itself. Indeed, it may be said that, for Spirit, identity has no meaning save as it involves in its very life the being of the "other". This is the essential secret of the whole dialectic movement from Plato to Hegel. It is, too, of the very essence of Jesus' doctrine of love. When, therefore, Plotinus speaks of the Good as ever sufficient to itself, as never going out of itself to that which is external and "other", at the same time that it is the very essential life of the "other", we recognize the paradoxical expression of the ideal of spirit, of the life that does not go out to its "other" and yet must go out, because love cannot dwell enclosed within itself, and yet, in going out from itself, it remains over with itself.

"Plotinus, on the other hand, is always bidding us look within. What we admire in the objective world is but a reflex of ourselves. Mind is the sole reality; and to grasp this reality under its highest form, we must become like it." It is important, too, to remember that Plotinus's most vigorous polemic was against materialism.

When we read of the One as the source of all life as the eternal spring out of which all being flows, we tend it once to drop to mechanistic categories, and to regard the operation of the One either pantheistically (quantitatively) or creationally (casually). Yet the very effort of Plotinus after a new metaphor—that of emanation—and his constant resort to paradox lead us to suspect that he is struggling to express an idea which the ordinary categories of causal production

(continued from the previous page) or quantitative inclusion are incapable of rightly expressing—the idea of a being that is at once “all and in all,” and yet is operative through free mutuality of response.

We are not here concerned with the question whether paradoxical expression of the life of Spirit is the most advisable or the only possible. This, however, may be said in passing. The human mind, bred in mechanistic categories, has no difficulty in fastening everywhere upon identities in their distinction from each other; its greatest task is to overcome its habit of regarding identities as mutually excludent atoms. Hence, it would seem, that the main emphasis of a philosophy of Spirit must be upon the mutual immanence of identities. It is for this reason, doubtless, that human endeavor, philosophical and religious, to express the unique mutuality of spiritual life has been so largely characterized by the use of paradoxical phrases.

From another point of view, he goes on to say, every being that strives after the Good would rather be the Good than itself, and it holds to be freer and more nearly realized the nearer it is to achieving the Good. The Good, on the contrary, since its will and its activity are its identical self, in itself and finds no need to go out to that which is other than itself.

All this, it will be seen, is of highest dialectical import. It indicates clearly the effort of Plotinus to express being that in every sense is its complete self, that involves no transition from potentiality to actuality. In his effort to express such being, nowhere perfectly realized in human life, he is compelled to deny the application to it of categories that imply the disjunctions and external dependencies of human life. Yet, by this denial he intends by no means to assert that the highest is pure emptiness; he allows it activities, will. What he does mean, and what he is emphatic in expressing, is that activities, will, etc., are assigned to it not in the human sense, where they indicate always a plurality

(continued from the previous page) unresolved, but in a supra-human sense, in which they indicate always a life in all its phases completely and thoroughly itself. This is the central point to be grasped in Plotinus's advance to the One. His whole philosophy, indeed, is the expression of the fact that as life develops to completeness, it becomes ever less and less an aggregatè unity and ever more and more an organic, an ideal, and finally, a perfect unity. Perfect unity is life which in every phase is its total self. From a mechanistic point of view, of course, such a unity is nonsense; but idealistic philosophy has long since come to recognize it as the essential character of Spirit.

Does such transcendence of consciousness mean the lapse into blank nothingness Plotinus undeniably holds that it is an advance to richer life. This is clearly implied in the foregoing. It is also indicated by his significant answer to the question how we can know that which is above thought. We can know it, he says, because it is like to that which we have in ourselves. It is like, that is, but infinitely more complete and self-realized.

To pass now from the fullness of God's being to his relation to the world of imperfect beings. Plotinus's expressions here are highly significant of his struggle to advance beyond mechanical categories. "All being," he says, "reaches out to it (the One) and longs after it by reason of the necessity of its nature, even as if it divined that without it could not be..... The knowledge of the beautiful—wonder at it and the awakening to the love of it—are present only with those who consciously know and are awake; the Good, however, always present as the object of striving dwells as an inborn nature, yes, even in those who sleep; and when we behold it, it does not set us in amazement (as beauty does), because it is always with us and is never merely an object of remembrance. We do not see it, since it dwells in us even while we are sleeping." So, in the sentences that follow, Plotinus expresses the relation as a striving, a longing after the ideal. And yet he is aware that the striving is much deeper

(continued from the previous page) than a conscious one. It is inborn, a natural effort after the Good, of which conscious effort is only a single form.

It might seem that, since the striving is but a natural necessity, it is not a spiritual or free striving. But Plotinus has some remarkable sentences upon this point. "God, therefore, as Plato says, is not far from each person; rather he is very near to all without their knowing it; they themselves flee him, or more truly they flee themselves. Therefore they cannot understand him whom they have fled, nor can they, since they have denied their very selves find any other, just as a child wandering in delirium does not know its own father." And again he says of beauty, that "it can estrange the ignorant as a beloved thing separates a son from the father." Again, "How then does the One generate the intellect? In this wise—through what is generated by it turning back to behold it. This vision is the intellect." There remains, however, the most remarkable passage of all in which the inwardness of the relation between God and other beings and the difficulty of expressing that relation is stated; Those to whom this heavenly love is unknown may get some conception of it from earthly love, and what joy it is to obtain possession of what one loves most. Let him then reflect that these objects of his love are mortal and perishable, mere shadows for his love to feed upon, and soon turned to loathly things, because they are not the true beloved, nor our good, nor what we seek; whereas in the higher world we find the true beloved with whom it is possible for us to unite ourselves when we have seized and held it, because it is not clothed with flesh and blood.

"He who has beheld this beloved knows the truth of what I say, how the soul then receives a new life when she has gone forth to it, and come to it and participated in it, so that in her new condition she knows that the giver of true life is beside her, and that she needs nothing else. Such an one knows also, however, that we must put all else away, and abide in the beloved alone, and become only it, stripping

(continued from the previous page) off all else that wraps us about; and hence that we must hasten to come forth from the things of this world, and be wroth at the bonds which bind us to them, to this end that we may embrace the beloved with all our soul, and have no part of us left with which we do not touch God. It is possible for us even while here in the body to behold both him and ourselves in such wise as it is lawful for us to see. Ourselves we see illumined, full of the light of the intelligible, or rather as that very light itself, pure, without heaviness, upward rising. Verily we see ourselves as made, nay, as being, God himself. Then it is that we are kindled. But when we again sink to earth, we are, as it were, put out....

"But why then do we not remain in this vision? I reply, because we have never wholly come forth from our earthly selves. But there shall come a time for us when the vision will be unbroken, and we are no longer disturbed by any unrest of the body. It is not the faculty of vision unaccomplished, but deserts not the knowledge which lies in demonstration and belief and the dialectical operation of the soul. The seer and his seeing, however, are no longer reason and reasoning, but superior to reason and prior to reason and extraneous to reason, even as is the object of the vision." "It follows that the vision is hard to describe. For how could a man report as something different from himself, what at that time of his vision he did not see as different, but as one with himself? This is clearly the intent of that injunction of the mysteries which forbids communication of their secret to the uninitiated. Since it was not communicable, it was forbidden to explain the divine secret to any one to whom it had not been vouchsafed to see it of himself."

While the best of Greek philosophy exhibits a constant approach to the concept of Spirit, it shows, always, an inability quite to escape expressing itself in terms of the category of Being. Hence, though much of the meaning which he attaches to the one urges him directly to the concept of pure Spirit, he cannot, in the end, escape the influence of the Greek tradition;

(continued from the previous page) and so he largely nullifies his meanings by taking refuge in the mechanistic category of Being. The metaphor of emanation clearly indicates his difficulty. That metaphor seems, in a vague way, to express what is true of Spirit—a passing out and beyond, that is yet all the while the retention of complete being. It even indicates a spiritual purpose: "How then should the most perfect and primal good stay shut up in itself as if it were envious or impotent?" But it is easy to see that however the metaphor may not be formulated, it never adequately expresses this spiritual meaning.

But the importance of Plotinus's work lies in the fact that he, of all Greek thinkers, makes the most persistent and serious effort to win the higher category of Spirit. Plotinus is frequently referred to as both the culmination and the downfall of Greek philosophy: he is the downfall in so far as with him the dominant category of Greek philosophy is almost displaced; he is its culmination in so far as he is almost in sight of that higher category in terms of which a new and more fruitful thinking begins. Thus he is indeed the end of the old and the beginning of the new. His, then, is no via negative leading to a blank inane, but that via dialectica over which all succeeding thinkers must pass if they are to attain to the truth of Spirit.

K.D. Sethna: "SRI AUROBINDO AND BODILY AGE".@@

M. Jean Herbert says: "The ground which was gained by Shankara, by Buddha, by Sri Ramakrishna and by all the great spiritual teachers is the port from which Sri Aurobindo sails for a new conquest for the benefit of mankind. His Yoga may truly be termed integral, because it makes use of all the ways already opened by other Yogas, not by piecing them together, but by melting them into a new whole. In the face of that amazing attempt, the most daring perhaps which man ever conceived, the only proper attitude is respectful silence."

Sri Aurobindo reaches the age of seventy-two. But immediately we state that fact our minds are filled

@@ All-India Weekly 1944.

(continued from the previous page) with a sense of contradiction. We used to speak of Tagore, advancing in years and we speak now of Gandhi growing old: nothing strange is felt by us in our utterances, Sri Aurobindo, however, makes any calculation in terms of age a falsity.

Fundamentally such a calculation errs because of Sri Aurobindo's mysticism. Both Tagore and Gandhi can be called great, but their greatness is of the human and not the divine type. The essence of Tagore is the poet, of Gandhi the moralist, of Sri Aurobindo the mystic. Though Tagore and Gandhi cannot be considered devoid of mysticism, the mystical Reality is in them an indirect power. The indirectness is shown by their predominant aims. The mystic in quest of the divine Spirit does not hold it his predominant aim to write a Gitanjali or to practise Satyagraha. Sri Aurobindo is a poet of the highest order and the moralist's effort at detachment from gross animal desires and egoistic motives finds fulfilment in him, but poetry and morality are not his ends; they are only the means of his master-passion. His master-passion is not brilliant poetic achievement for its own sake or the triumph of a human virtue: it is the sheer surpassing of the human level, the continuous union with the Supreme Being and the direct expression of that Being in all the ways of our nature.

Now, the Supreme Being is, first and foremost, a mighty transcendence of time and life, an infinite Consciousness and Bliss immutably seated above the waxing and waning of the world's years. A splendid stanza of the ancient Upanishads, translated with revelatory force by Sri Aurobindo, catches in words that sovereign status: "There the sun shines not and the moon has no lustre and the stars are blind: there these lightnings flash not nor any earthly fire. For all that is bright is but the shadow of His brightness and by His shining all this shineth". What the rishis in the past attained is present in Sri Aurobindo, and he stands, among things that vary and fade, a smiling Eternity unbarred by phenomena. To such a realisation how shall we apply our measure of moments and confine it within an age of seventy-two? Is it not incongruous

(continued from the previous page) to think of the Spirit's timeless plenitude that is Sri Aurobindo's deepest self as growing old as men grow old who live in the cultch of the temporal and the mortal?

But the Eternity that is above time and life is not the sole cause of the contradiction we feel. The divine Spirit is not utterly the opposite of time and life. When the Upanishads chant, "By His shining all this shineth", they do more than trace the source of our cosmos in the beyond. While opening our world-beglamoured eyes to the Truth whose infinity no light of earth equals, they do not cut off earth's light from that Truth. It is God who has emanated the world, the world is at bottom His own stuff of divinity: omnipresent, He pervades occultly all phenomena. The many-sided vision of the Upanishads no sooner found tongue in the splendid stanza about the supra-cosmic "There" than it followed up with another as splendid about the cosmic "Here" of the Divine. In Sri Aurobindo's vivid, vibrant and wide-sweeping English this Sanscrit mantra runs: "The Eternal is before us and the Eternal is behind us and to the south and to the north of us and above and below and extended everywhere. All this magnificent universe is nothing but the Eternal." A mystic part excellence, Sri Aurobindo is inwardly one with a Cosmic Consciousness supporting with a limitless peace a limitless activity, with an indivisible singleness a myriad variety of forms. Not this one body alone which we know as Sri Aurobindo is his reality. It cannot circumscribe the far-stretched continuity of his being and his becoming. In all quarters he feels his own self at work. He overflows the span of an individual life. The march of the centuries is not alien to him, the rising and failing and rising again of the endless energy around us is part of him in the union he has realized with the Beauty of ancient days that is ever new. Can seventy-two years in one particular physical form sum up such an existence?

When we have seen mysticism in its cosmic aspect as well as in its transcendental, we have still not

(continued from the previous page) said the last word about Sri Aurobindo. There is yet another aspect—the individual—rendering the concept of old age inapplicable to his seventy-two years. And here he brings a mystical achievement that goes further than any spirituality known in the past. Our universe is not merely the occult omnipresence of the Divine: it is also meant to be His manifestation. The immense unity and the immense multiplicity are pressing forward to express in the cosmic formula a divine life. An intricate evolution focussing itself in individuals and proceeding through rebirths of the individual soul is worked out from a beginning and a base that appear to be the opposite of everything divine. All mystics talk of evolving and manifesting the perfect Light: the perfect Light, according to them, can throw an aureole round life's hours and express sublimities and sweetnesses of a super-human kind in the human mould. Yet a bound has been felt by all mystics, an irreducible imperfection in our members that compels us ultimately to drop them and look for the end of our soul's journey in a plane that is not terrestrial—a Vedantic Brahmaloka, a Buddhist Nirvana, a Vaishnavite Gokul or Heaven. Sri Aurobindo says that if the universe is meant to be the Divine's manifestation, there must lie in the bosom of the Spirit the secret of the universe's fulfilment. In some hidden Consciousness must be waiting the arch type, the perfect ideality of our whole embodied nature. He calls that Consciousness Super mind or Gnosis. The gnostic plane has created the evolutionary process. Our evolving nature is upheld by a truth of its terms, a truth of its varied individuality, in the gnostic plane and it has been created for expressing fully on earth itself this prime perfection. To incarnate again and again in order finally to escape beyond for good does not justify the Soul's incarnating travail. And our terrestrial nature can have no divine rationale unless it be capable of being completely divinised. Have not our mind, our vital force and our physical form derived from God's self and substance? Surely then they are here for a Godlike existence and not simply to be used awhile and thrown aside: past yogis used them

(continued from the previous page) thus and threw them aside because the dynamics of the supra-mental Gnosis were not adequately possessed. A Godlike existence can signify nothing save living no longer on any level a victim to ignorance, incapacity failure. From top to too God must make us His habitation. From the highest peak of the mind down to the lowest chasm of the body we must live in the immortal's consciousness.

The implications of such a living are almost incredible: they posit as a last rapturous result a physical transformation, a change of our very stuff of matter, so that the mortal in us puts on immortality in the most palpable sense! Ever since man awoke to his own incompleteness and to a perfect Presence concealed behind phenomena the dream of a divine earth has haunted him. He has sought the elixir vitae along a multitude of paths. Disappointment has met him wherever he has searched, for the right mode of searching has never been found by him. Even his spiritual masters have told him that though the terrestrial scene can display the paradisal lustre he cannot hope for an integral manifestation. Now comes Sri Aurobindo and proclaims that the earth-scene would never have been set by the Divine except for an integral display and manifestation of Himself, and that, however strange it may seem to the disease-suffering, decay-enduring, death-accepting experience that has ours so far, a divinised body immune to "crass casualty" and harmonious with the undying Spirit that descends into it is a miracle inevitable in the long and arduous but all-consummating Yoga he is doing today and offering to all who follow in his footsteps.

It must be made clear that the Aurobindonian Yoga is not for selfish seekers of health and longevity. The physical transformation is the fifth act to a drama in which egoistic desire dies at every turn of the plot and only a vast aspiration for God goes from strength to strength. It is God and not the ego who, in answer to the aspiration, flowers in the mind, the elan vital and the body. No at the back of the body's change: the thirst for divine integrality alone is the alchemist.

(continued from the previous page) The body's change is insisted on as a grand finale because Sri Aurobindo deems it a slur on God's creative vision and a blindness to our *raison d'être* in a God-emanated cosmos to leave any part of our complex being as radically impotent to be perfect. And not just the philosopher of the Integral Yoga does Sri Aurobindo act: mystical realisation is his work and his philosophy is born from his experience. By mystical realisation he moves ahead of mysticism's glorious past to the most golden future our time-process can enjoy – a future in which his so-called old age will prove a prelude to a radiant renovation of the physical cells in a manner we can scarcely imagine.

Sri Aurobindo, therefore, is not only unlike a non-mystic advanced in years; he is also unlike any other mystic wearing grey hairs. To look at August 15 as bringing him to the dangerous ripeness of seventy-two is to forget this unique difference. His birthday is the symbol of a step forward in the complete birth of the Divine in the human.

Sri Krishna Prem: "THE YOGA OF THE BHAGAVAT GITA".

Let me say at once that I care nothing at all for these learned pronouncements. To anyone who has eyes to see, the Gita is based on direct knowledge of Reality, and of the Path that leads to that Reality, and it is of little moment who wrote it or to what school he was outwardly affiliated. Those who know Reality belong to a Race apart.

Those realities are the same now as they were thousands of years ago, and the texts of the Gita should be interpreted in words that refer to those realities here and now, and not merely in words which did refer to them in mediaeval India or, for that matter, at the time when the book was originally written. To think otherwise is to mistake words for realities.

By Yoga is here meant not any special system called by that name, not jnana yoga, nor karma yoga, nor bhakti yoga, nor the eightfold yoga of Patanjali, but just the Path by which man unites his finite self with infinite Being. It is the inner Path of which all these separate yogas are so many one-sided aspects. It is not so much a synthesis of these separate teachings

(continued from the previous page) as that prior and undivided whole of which they represent partial formulations.

It is a mistake to do as some expositors have done and expound the teachings with no reference to the place at which they occur in the general scheme. For instance, stress has often been laid on Gita XVIII, 66: "Abandoning all dharmas, take refuge in Me alone. Fear not, I will liberate thee from all sins," as though this teaching, which comes at the very end of the Gita, were capable of being practised in the early stages of the Path. All that results from such misplacing emotional pietism. There is no shortcut to the Goal. The whole course has to be run by each disciple, and though, through having practised in previous lives, the early stages may for some be but a rapid recapitulation, each chapter has to be lived through in its proper sequence.

The Path is not the special property of Hinduism, nor indeed of any religion. It is something which is to be found, more or less deeply buried, in all religions, and which can exist apart from any formal religion at all.

Recently the psychologist Jung, in the course of some sympathetic and interesting comments on a Chinese Taoist book, found occasion to animadvert against those Westerners who practise Eastern Yogas. It is quite true that much, probably most, of the so-called yoga practice indulged in by Westerners is foolish and misguided. That is, however, not because it is "eastern" in origin, but because it is not pursued for the right reason. Yoga is to be undertaken for the sake of Truth itself, for the sake of what the Buddha termed "unshakable deliverance of heart." To practise it, as many do, out of curiosity, in search of new sensations, or in order to gain psychic powers in a mistake which is punished with futility, neurosis, or worse. None should seek initiation into the mysteries from unworthy motives, or disaster will surely result.

If a man approaches it from the scientific or philosophic side that is all that need be said. But if his approach is through some particular religion he will have to be careful to discard any idea that his own

(continued from the previous page) religion is a unique one and any clinging to authority in the shape of inspired scriptures. Failure to do this will result in delusions and blocking of further advance. He must, as the Buddha said, be his own Light and his own refuge. The only authority is within the Soul itself, and the would-be disciple must be ready to test everything and abandon his most cherished conceptions if they prove inadequate. Superstition of any kind is a deadly foe and must be conquered at all costs.

Those who seek after strange experiences, psychic powers, or the sweet-sounding consolations of religion had far better leave the whole thing alone or they will wreck their lives, and perhaps those of others as well. The path of Truth is a hard one, and the Inner Ruler will exact the last farthing of karmic payment for dallying with error..

However close may be the connection between the ordinary waking consciousness and the brain, it is a sheer fact that when the true ego, or jiva, makes itself felt it is in the heart (or at least within the breast) that it is perceived as an actual experience.

There is a law, which may be termed the law of the degradation of spiritual concepts, by which terms originally used by Seers to express levels of super-normal spiritual experience become in the hands of later and purely scholastic exponents terms for elements in purely normal mental life. This law may be seen operating in most mystical systems, and its result is that further terms have to be invented or brought into currency from time to time to denote the higher levels. It is by this process that the word man has ceased to signify the individual soul and became merely a name for the faculty of discursive thought.

The human personality which so proudly says 'I' is the sport of a continual succession of involuntary desires and passions which are the real rulers of the body it calls its own.

The higher mind, though individualised, is pure and detached, and sees in its own clear light, while the lower mind is stained by its union with the principle of desire. Failure to understand this is at the root of those modern views which plausibly urge that the mind is but the slave of the hidden tides, quiet

(continued from the previous page) or tempestuous, of the so-called "unconscious." Of the lower mind (which is what most men know as their minds) this is only too true, but the higher stands firm in its own being and is a rock of refuge in the surging waves of desire. It is of this that Plotinus has written:

"Even our human soul has not sunk entire; something of it is continuously in the Intellectual Realm, though if that part (i.e. the lower manas) which in the sphere of sense be mastered here and troubled it keeps us blind to what the upper phase holds in contemplation....But there is always the other (the higher manas), that which finds no savour in passing pleasure, but holds its own even way."

(I.32-35) All alike having their real though unacknowledged source in the feeling of gloom which invades the heart at the prospect of a life in which all desire for self will have to be renounced and utterly slain.

Nor, at this stage, is the darkness lit by any ray of Light, and although the Divine Teacher is standing beside the Soul not yet His Voice been heard. Brought by its past evolution to the field of conflict, poised, as it were, upon the very edge of battle, the Soul loses heart and sinks back terrified at the desolate outlook, an outlook in which victory seems as cheerless as defeat.

The real source of this desolation is, as has been said, the prospect of a life in which all desire and ambition will be dead. We are so used to a life in which all action has its roots in desire that we can conceive no other, and sadly ask what would be the value of such existence. Not yet has the Soul learnt that, having Krishna, it has all;

(II. 2-3) Surrounded by desolation on all sides, the Soul has no alternative but to turn within Itself and seek there the Divine Teacher. Wherever else it looks it sees nothing but bitter emptiness, and even the appeal to a manly fortitude fails of its effect, for when all one's world is in ruins, manliness seems a mere posturing in the Void. Compare Bertrand Russell's Free Man's Worship. His appeal for a Promethean defiance of the universe "based on the firm rock of unyielding

(continued from the previous page) yielding despair," however thrilling it may be to the armchair agnostic, will scarcely nerve anyone who is actually in the abyss, and for all Russell's sincerity his glowing rhetoric rings false.

(II.9/12) Outer teaching may be effective in helping to give clear expression to what is at first only dimly intuited, but it can form no substitute for the latter.

(II.37) The Sankhya was a body of teaching designed to give a coherent intellectual expression to the intuition of the Unchanging one that arises at the proper time in the soul of the disciple when stimulated into activity by the words of the Teacher.

It is, as Shankara rightly maintains, a system of jnana yoga, of yoga by knowledge, and, like all such partial systems, it suffers from a certain one-sidedness that Krishna makes it his business to correct.

The first cry of the Soul when it awakens to a dim perception of the Eternal is for a coherent scheme of principles by which it may explain to itself its new knowledge. But there is a danger too in the demand for a detailed explanation, a danger that the original intuitive perception may be swamped by the clear-cut intellectual expression, a danger too that more knowledge, divorced from the love and activity that are the other aspects of the Path, may be considered as the whole.

In proportion as the inner vision fades, the disciple endeavours to recapture its fleeing spirit and to galvanise it into life once more by a violent effort. Separating himself more and more from the world of action and emotion, he withdraws into a realm of abstractions and, bending upon them the whole power of his psychic energy, he often succeeds in imparting a kind of life to them at the cost of an ever sterner and more forcible warping of his nature. This "life," however, shows by its very lack of balance that it is not the authentic life of the Soul.

(II.38, 39) The disciple is instructed in the all-important buddhi yoga which is necessary to supplement the static analytic technique, the pure Sankhya. The latter attempts to gain its goal of pure emancipation

(continued from the previous page) (Kaivalya) by a forced isolation from the whole of the manifested universe which, even if at all practicable, can only result in a strained and unnatural attainment. The true Path aims at a detachment from the lower manifestations by a progressive union with the higher, and is as different from the former method as is the natural blooming of a flower from the forced opening of the bud.

What is therefore emphasised is the buddhi yoga, the union with the buddhi as a preliminary step to the utterly transcendent state of the goal. The manas, or mind, must cease to be, as heretofore, united to the senses, but must become buddhiyukta, or united to that which is higher than itself, if the Path is to be really trodden and not merely talked about.

Nowhere does the purely intellectual nature of the later Sankya come out more clearly than in its account of the nature of buddhi, which it treats as simply one of the intellectual faculties, the faculty by which the mind comes to a decision after a period of doubt and hesitation. True it is that the buddhi is the faculty that gives determined knowledge (nichayatmika buddhi), but the knowledge that it gives is no mere collection of intellectual propositions, but a living knowledge, better styled intuition, save that it has none of the sporadic flashings that we associate with that term, but, in its own level, burns with a steady radiance. In the Kathopanishad, buddhi is termed the jnana atman, and it is atonce the knowledge of the Atman and the faculty by which that knowledge is attained.

This certainty-giving buddhi (Vyavasay atmika buddhi), which is one in all, is contrasted with the wavering and uncertain thoughts of the ordinary man.

(II.47-51) In order to attain this union with the buddhi, the method recommended is skill in action (karmasu kaushalay), the maintenance of a balanced attitude, the same in failure as in success. The disciple is to keep his mind perfectly indifferent to the results of his actions while yet, in a spirit of utter detachment, performing such acts as are his duty. Acting in this way the disciple's actions will be guided by the impersonal knowledge of the buddhi and

(continued from the previous page) he will then transcend the limits of selfish good and evil.

(II.56/58) Sri Krishna describes how the disciple, uniting himself with the felt Reality within, must detach himself from the desire-life of the senses as a tortoise withdraws its limbs from contact with the outer world. Mere withdrawal is, however, not enough, for though the sense objects lose their power over the man who habitually practises restraint, yet the desire for them remains in his heart and dies only when something higher than the sense life is actually seen.

In the last resort, nothing but the vision of the Atman itself can cause the utter dying-out of desire, and therefore, the disciple is instructed not to remain content with negative restraint but to centre his gaze upon the Atman within, unseen though yet it be.

(II, 62-63) The slightest wavering, the slightest turning back in thought to that sense world on which the disciple has turned his back, will energise anew the desires which he is striving to abandon, and as the tension increases in his desire-nature (what some psychologists term the unconscious) they will burst out in a great flash of anger utterly devastating to his spiritual progress, shattering his inner perception and causing a loss.

(III.1.) He aims, by setting forth apparently conflicting but actually complementary aspects of Truth, at forcing the disciple to transcend the ordinary levels of thinking by having recourse to the higher intuitive knowledge of the buddhi and thus bringing to birth in his soul a new and synthetic knowledge which shall be built into his very being.

If this is not sufficiently realised the reader is apt to make the mistake of thinking that the thought of the Gita is actually confused, or of picking out that aspect that most appeals to him and ignoring the rest. But the Gita is neither a confused eclecticism nor a one-sided sectarianism. It aims at setting forth the Yoga or Path to the Goal as a coherent whole, but, in so doing, it is inevitable that

(continued from the previous page) the mind, which loves to pursue one train of thought to its logical conclusion regardless of others, should be brought up sharply from time to time and made to grasp the other sides as well.

(III.3) Urged on by the lack of balance in their own natures, one-sided exponents always attempt to show that one of these is the chief teaching and the other only subsidiary. But the duality in the universe is not ultimate. In the end all is resolved into the unitary Brahman, and therefore no one-sided view can be the whole truth.

(III.4) Even on the ordinary levels of experience it is obvious that our destinies are largely shaped by our characters and they, in turn, by the sum-total of our past thoughts, and particularly those which have crystallised into actions. The man who thinks cruel thoughts usually proceeds to cruel deeds, and thus becoming an object of fear and hatred to others, is at least extremely liable to meet with cruelty in his turn.

All lives being interlocked in one vast whole. It follows that any act—nay, any thought—sets up a tension in the whole which, however delayed may be the response, with utter inevitability brings about an "equal and opposite" reaction. I repeat that this is no mere intellectual speculation fitting only into the structure of some Oriental philosophy, but is a profound truth of experience, which may, like other natural laws, be disregarded only at one's peril.

For them, action was but a necessary evil, inescapable while embodied, and they achieved peace only by making a desert, escaping desire by stifling it under tedium. To them, as to the typical follower of the pure Sankhya, this rich and wondrous life must have been no better than a ghastly mistake which had far better never have occurred.

This mean and ignoble view of action is by no means that of Sri Krishna. For Him, as for the Karma yogis, action is a sacrifice, but one far different from the formal ceremonies of the Brahmans. The lower or sense mind is to be sacrificed to the higher and that higher to be united with the buddhi.

(III.8) Between Arjuna, the higher mind, and Dhritarashtra, the lower, stands Sanjaya, the second charioteer, the voice of conscience speaking in the heart of the eternal values. Just as the buddhi, the Divine Knowledge, serves as a link between the individual ego and the One Life (Mahat Atman), so does Sanjaya on a lower plane serve as a link between the empirical personality and the true individual Self. By uniting with the buddhi the mind is raised into transcendence, and similarly, by making the empirical personality or lower mind the servant of the voice of Sanjaya, the personality is raised to union with its own true Self.

This is the reason for so much emphasis upon performing action as a duty. The lower self is not to be destroyed by self-mortification, but to be united with the higher by being trained to obey the voice of the higher under all circumstances. "Right action" is to be performed, the test of rightness being its accord with the commands of that voice and not with any outer scriptural injunctions. The disciple must always listen for that voice, and having heard it must always act in accordance with it. By this means the lower self will be purified of its attachment to desire and will in time become united with the higher. This must be achieved before the next stage, that of union with the buddhi, the dhyana paramita of the Mahayana Buddhists, becomes possible.

(III.10-16) Our intellects owe their every possibility of thought to those who strove to grasp new conceptions long ago, and even our eyes are what they are only as a result of long and, painful struggles of which no record now remains. No record that is, but the debt inscribed in the imperishable characters of the book of Karma, a debt that claims our actions in return and from which not the proudest yogi in a Himalayan cave is free, though he may choose to ignore it.

(III.17,18) The desire for fruits is an utter irrelevance which will fall away of itself, though only for as long as the disciple is thus centred in

(continued from the previous page) the Light. When at last, after long and persistent struggles, this centring of life in the Atman is permanently established, when the disciple rejoices in the Atman and is content with the Atman, there will remain nothing further to be accomplished for himself and "no object of his will depend on any being."

(III.22-25) He mingles in action unweariedly for the sake of the welfare of all. Note the word "unwearied." The Sacrificial Action, to a union with which the disciple aspires, is no tiresome carrying out of dull and spiritless acts such as are too often called up in our minds by the words sacrifice and duty. We saw how, at the beginning of the Path, the disciple was filled with despair at the thought of the joyless life which awaited him when all the desires which made life seem worth living should be slain. But this is an illusion which has to be dispelled. The glow which accompanies the desire-prompted actions of the worldly, the enthusiasm and zest of youth and the tireless energy of the ambitious, must all be preserved and transmuted into something higher and not allowed to drain away into desert sands. The true "vairagi" is not a dull, dired-up, "holy" person of the type that has made the very name of religion a thing of nausea to so many of us, but a tireless fountain of joyful and inspired life based on the eternal ananda of the Brahman which overflows into creation, out of Its own inherent fullness.

(III.27-35) Doubts will assuredly come tormenting the heart with the suggestion that the struggle is useless: All beings follow their own natures. The Atman is the impartial Witness of all: good and evil are but empty words and the fight against the latter is in vain. What shall restraint avail since actions flow inevitably from the workings of Nature and the Soul is but the passive witness of the phantom show? But these deceiving half-truths must be conquered. As long as the disciple does certain acts because he dislikes them, so long must he whirl helplessly upon the Wheel; for, though he may be of a "virtuous" disposition, and so perform but "virtuous" acts, yet is he none the less the victim of his own nature.

But the Atman, the One Self, is for ever free in Its own being; Its apparent bondage comes only from the self-identification with Its lower vehicles, the mirrors in which Its Light is reflected. The higher the disciple climbs up the Ladder of the Soul, the more the inherent freedom of the Atman will shine forth and dominate the play of Nature instead of blindly suffering it.

(III. 42) Bound as he is by his nature at any given level, yet is he free with the inherent freedom of the Atman to choose whether he will act from his lower nature or from his higher. True the "higher" will ever recede as he climbs, and what is "higher" now will become "lower" in time; but at each stage his freedom will increase.

(IV. 1) It has to be clearly understood that there is no ownership in the realm of ideas. Ideas are not the property of individual thinkers. Rather is it the fact, as Plato rightly taught, that when we entertain, a "new" idea we do but participate in something that is eternal, and that when two men "think" of the same idea they are united with each other by this very fact since both are participating in a particular facet of the Eternal Wisdom. Ideas are greater than any of the finite minds that think them and the Wisdom is greater than any particular teacher. Therefore it was that the Buddha made no claim to originality, being content to say that what He taught was but the echo of the teaching of all the former Buddhas, and therefore it is that Sri Krishna is careful to explain that the Yoga He is teaching to Arjuna is but a restatement of the Eternal Wisdom, for assuredly it was not as the personal Krishna that "He" taught it first to Vivaswan long ages before.

Let none suppose, however, that by the phrase "Eternal Wisdom" is here meant some body of teachings set down in intellectual form in any books however old. The Wisdom is the world less Truth itself as existing eternally in the Cosmic Ideation.

(IV. 3) Jnana yoga, Karma yoga, Bhakti yoga, Dhyana yoga, all are but one-sided glimpses, fragments of that mighty whole, the "imperishable Yoga,"

(continued from the previous page) the imparting of which in its all-sided beauty is the aim of Sri Krishna.

(IV.19-23) For certainly the instinct which leads so many to reject the idea of an actionless life in spite of all arguments is a sound one. To reject action is to create a dualism between the Brahman and the universe, which leaves the latter on our hands as a vast cosmic folly, worse than folly, a monstrous cruelty that stinks to the heavens. But it is not so. There is no ultimate dualism in the Reality. It is not action that binds, for the surging tides of the manifested cosmos are as truly the manifestation of the supreme Brahman as is the calm bliss of the stainless witnessing Self. What binds us is a wrong attitude to action, the "knots of the heart" which, springing from ignorance, makes us fancy that we are so many separate individuals, isolated from each other and "free" to perform actions for our selfish ends.

(IV.34) Some will wonder why, if the Teacher is already present in the heart, there should be need for an external Guru at all. True, the Teacher is there, but we are so used to listening only to the trumpet tones of desire that the still small voice in the heart passes unheeded. Too often does the disciple mistake the promptings of desire and of unpurified emotion for the intuition which is the Voice of the Teacher, and therefore is it that he needs the guidance of one who, because his whole being has become one with the Wisdom, can speak with the same voice as that Teacher in the heart and yet do so in tones which can be heard with the outer ear.

But it is not by wandering restlessly hither and thither, by searching out the remoter corners of the earth, that the Guru, outer as well as inner is an interior path, and only by treading the preliminary steps by oneself can one reach the outer Guide. It is only when this stage has been reached, the stage at which the disciple is ready to offer up his self in sacrifice to the Self in all, that the Guru can and does manifest himself: "When the disciple is ready the Guru appears." For him whose aims are selfish, however "refined" the selfishness may be, no

(continued from the previous page) teacher will be forthcoming, for he could be of little use, since his work is but to make more manifest the Voice in the heart, and until the disciple has learnt to listen always for that inner Voice a blind obedience to an external authority can do more harm than good, destroying self-reliance and so rendering fainter that which is too faint already.

When, however, the right stage of development has been reached and the disciple has found his Guru, he must, by the obedience of self-effacement, and the disposal of the Teacher, so unite his being with that of the latter that the Wisdom which shines in him may light up in the disciple too.

(IV.40) The disciple beware of doubt, that creeps in like a dark fog over the sea, blotting out the guiding stars and filling the soul with despair. From time to time as he tries to advance will this fog of doubt enwrap his heart. The Light by which he has hitherto been guided will fade and be eclipsed, and all that he has accomplished will seem vain and a delusion. Then must he show of what material he is made, for if he wavers and loses heart he is lost indeed. Clinging to the compass of the Wisdom, an intellectual memory of which is all that remains to him in this condition, he must press on in confidence that the fog will lift in time and the familiar stars shine forth once more. For, in the end, it is only the Wisdom which can silence doubt.

The doubt referred to here is not mere intellectual doubt, which is the usual precursor of any advance in knowledge; still less is it doubt of or the dogmas, for all clinging to dogmas must be destroyed, root and branch. It is the doubt of the reality of what has once been perceived, and springs from the inevitable pendulum swing of reaction after an advance has been made. If it is conquered further advance will come, but if given way to all progress is stopped.

(V.4-5) No one who has reached this stage can view the seated majesty of the Buddha without knowing in his soul that renunciation alone gives peace. But neither, when he contemplates the many-faceted figure

(continued from the previous page) of Krishna, warrior, statesman, lover, friend, can he refuse his soul's assent to that marvellous symbol of the Divine action, free and unfettered in the very midst of the cosmic whirl.

The interpreting mind asserts that these are incompatible ideals and with facile logic seeks to lead the disciple to one side or the other; but he must cling, instead, to the inner wisdom of his soul, which will teach him how these seeming irreconcilables are in reality two aspects of the same truth.

(V.15.) This is the great heresy of Satkayadrishti against which the Buddha directed so much of his teaching, the theory that there are permanent soul monads, eternally separate. What has here been described as the higher Self, the true Ego, constitutes no doubt a relatively permanent individual centre, but it is in reality only a focus of the One Self and not a separate entity. Its separateness lies only in its content, not in itself. Strictly speaking, even the One Universal Self (the Mahat Atman) is not permanent, since it is part of the manifested Universe and is withdrawn at the universal dissolution (pralaya) into the Parabrahman, which is alone eternal in the strict sense of the word.

(V.18,19) But that vision must not remain a mere private ecstasy. It must be translated into action, and so built into the personality before another range of vision can present itself to the inner eye and the way be opened for yet another cyclic advance.

(V.23) Sensations will still come and go as before, but the inner vision he has achieved will give him a new power of withdrawing from them even while experiencing their pleasure and pain. What characterises pleasure and pain is not any quality in the sensations themselves so much as the psychic attraction or revulsion that takes place within. When, through his grasp of the Light of the Eternal, the disciple is able to master this inner revulsion, he finds that the pain sensations, though unchanged in themselves, have, in some quite indescribable way, become "different", have lost their power to storm his being or to lead him to blind reaction;

(V.23) He has only to use his will to establish himself in the inner fortress, and for the time being at least, desires will drop dead before his eyes like butterflies killed by frost as they emerge from a warm house. True, they will rise again from the dead, and again have to be faced, but a great gain has been achieved in that, instead of the grim setting of the teeth of the personal will that was before necessary, only that relatively small effort of will is needed which may enable the disciple to take up his position in the fortress, and, once, he does so, victory is assured.

But any surging up of personal pride at this stage will ruin all. Great as is the achievement that has been attained, the power of slaying desire at will, much has yet to be accomplished before the Brahma-Nirvana, the utter "blowing out" of personal desire in the calm Light of the Eternal, is reached.

(V.26) For him who has not trodden faithfully the Path so far, it is quite useless to attempt to flash the consciousness into Enlightenment by any meditative yoga for, if anything at all results from his premature practice, it will only be in the nature of dangerous mediumistic psychisms, neurotic dissociations of the personality, perhaps even insanity itself.

It sets forth the technique of a mental discipline which is meant to transfer the consciousness unbrokenly from its ordinary waking condition to those higher levels which, up to this point, have been working, as it were, behind the scenes, glimpsed perhaps in occasional flashes of inspiration, but always as something beyond, something outside the dominion of the will, coming and going with the apparent caprice that veils an unknown law.

This technique is called "Dhyana Yoga," the yoga by meditation, and it corresponds, more or less, with the method systematised by Patanjali in his Yoga Sutras. But, at the very outset, it should be clearly understood for whom this practice will give results and for whom it will not. This is vitally important, since there are many who consider the practice of

(continued from the previous page) meditation as the yoga par excellence and eagerly seek to practise it without having trodden the all-important earlier stages.

This warning against the premature practice of meditation refers only to the deliberate attempt to scale the Ladder of the Soul by a meditative technique. Meditation on the symbol of the Supreme or on the figure of the Teacher, reflection on the eternal truths about the Soul and the world, and the calm analysis of one's character are practices which are useful and desirable at all stages of the Path.

(VI.5) Before the practice of meditation can be available to flash the consciousness now centred in the lower or personal self across the gulf which separates it from the Atman, or higher Self, it is essential that there shall be a harmony between the two. If the self is in harmony with the Self, if it ceases to exert its personal will, if its impulses are under control and it is able to offer itself as an instrument through which the Self can work, then the Atman is its friend, a source of inspiration and guidance, the Inner Teacher of whom mention has previously been made. But if the self is allowed to sink down in inert depression, if it pursues its own aims and stands proudly upon its own individual uniqueness, then, indeed, the Atman is felt as something hostile. No more a source of inspiration, It makes itself known as the mysterious source of misfortunes and sicknesses, of those "blows of Fate," in short, which are the teachers of the Law.

(VI.7) If the self is really controlled and harmonious, then the Higher Self will be felt always as a calm background to all the activities of the mind. The "pairs of opposites" that torment other men will have no power to disturb that inner serenity. The gratifications of honour and the death-like sting of dishonour, those infallible testers of claimants to the yogi's title, can have no effect on him whose only honour is the approval of his Teacher, whose only dishonour is the shame of having

(continued from the previous page) subordinated Self to self.

Now comes the time for the practice of meditative yoga and, accordingly, the Gita proceeds to give some teachings about the technique to be pursued. Essentially the method consists of gaining such control over the mind-processes that they can be stilled at will, thus enabling the consciousness to perceive the Truth like a calm lake reflecting the eternal stars above.

Only brief indications are given in the text because the full process cannot be set forth in writing. It varies for each disciple and must be learnt from the Guru, who, as explained before, is always available at this stage.

(VI.10,11) The first necessity is a quiet place in which he may practise meditation undisturbed by friends or visitors, whose presence would be apt to agitate the disciple's mind with thoughts of what so-and-so is thinking of him.

(VI.13) The direction of the gaze is another point on which there is often confusion. A wandering mind, and therefore the eyes are to be kept fixed in one direction. In practice it has been found that the best way to do this is to direct the eyes along the line of the nose and then to half-close the eyelids. This should not be confused with the fixing of the gaze between the eyebrows which is often referred to, and which means that the centre of consciousness should be transferred to the buddhi which is often symbolised by that spot.

(VI.13.) Elaborate processes of holding the breath and of breathing through alternate nostrils (pranayama) find no place in this yoga.

In truth all "worlds" are but illusions. All that exists, exists within the One, and what we see as a world depends upon the point of view from which we see; that which we see is One.

(VI.14) Two absolute essentials are brahmacharya, or control of the sex-impulse, and utter purity of aspiration. Brahmacharya must not be confused with mere ascetic celibacy. It is the control of the sex-impulses that is meant and not their mere

(continued from the previous page) inhibition, a control that will take varying forms under differing circumstances. There is no merit in the sexlessness of the eunuch, whether his castration be a physical or a mental one, and Hindu tradition is right in affirming that the householder whose sex-life is controlled is as truly a Brahmachari as the ascetic who observes the vow of total sex-abstinence. In any case it must be borne in mind that the inner world of sex-phantasy is as important as the outer one of procreation. Without control of sex, in both its inner and its outer manifestations, it is safer to play with dynamite than to practise the yoga of meditation.

Turning now to the other essential, the aspiration must be purely directed towards the One Self, as, under any other circumstances, the practice of meditation will give rise to visions and hallucinations which will mislead the disciple and plunge him into a whirlpool of psychic illusions that may even delude him into fancying himself an Avatara, or other great personage. Such delusions are common in India and elsewhere, and are by no means always due to deliberate imposture. Often the Avatara is his own first victim.

(VI.30) It cannot be too emphatically stated that no true yoga is possible by the unaided personal will. Thought may be stilled to the point of trance, but unless the self is surrendered to the Atman there can be no yoga in the true sense of the word. True, the preliminary effort at concentration is made, from the lower level, but the complete stilling of the mind by sheer will is like balancing a pyramid upon its apex, a feat of balance which, even accomplished, is so precarious that no useful result can be achieved.

(VI.19) The true process is certainly hard enough, but it is infinitely easier than the lower one, failure to achieve which is a source of depression to so many.

The point of this simile—evidently much older than the Gita—is often missed. It is useless to try

(continued from the previous page) to make the flame steady in a windy place. The mind must withdraw to a region where the winds of desire no longer play before it can become more than momentarily steady.

(VI, 25) This "disconnection" from union with all finite experience is the secret of successful yoga, or rather, it is half the secret, the other half being the *atma sanstha*, the abiding in the Atman. The two processes, negative and positive, go on side by side, as a man climbing a ladder loosens his hold on one rung while simultaneously attaching himself to the next.

These two processes are the "detachment and practice" referred to in verse 35. Without their aid there is no possibility of stilling the restless and fickle mind and of climbing up the ladder. For countless ages the mind has been turned outwards and has been given a free rein to attach itself to objects of desire, and it is not to be expected that it will be possible to wrench it away from them at once. A bamboo that has long borne a weight will not be straightened merely by its removal; strenuous effort will also be required to neutralise the acquired bend. So with the mind; long bent by the forces of desire, it must first be detached from them and then, by constant practice, united with that which is higher than itself.

This practice is not a matter of an hour, or even of several hours, of daily meditation. Throughout the day (and even, in a sense, throughout the hours of sleep as well) constant effort must be made to retain in the consciousness as much as possible of the detachment and insight that were achieved during the meditation period. Throughout the day the disciple must hold on firmly to whatever degree of realisation he was able to gain in those calm hours, for a short period of uncontrolled thought, an hour of despondency, or even five minutes of anger, will undo all that he has accomplished, and, like the web of Penelope, what was woven in the morning will be unravelled by next day.

It is a long and uphill struggle, and one

(continued from the previous page) which, to the disciple, will often seem hopeless. Progress is slow and attainment looms far away. The night of Death may come before the haven is reached, but he must not despair, for the Path is one that must be trodden through many lives, and he may repose serenely in the arms of Cosmic Law, knowing that not the slightest effort is ever wasted, and that, like a man completing on the morrow the unfinished task of to-day, he will be able to begin in his next life at the point where he left off in this.

(VII.3) At the very outset it is desirable to dwell for a moment on the extreme rarity of this Knowledge. The vast majority of men know nothing of its existence, and though a few by strenuous effort have succeeded in establishing themselves upon the Path that leads to it, yet at any given time, only one or two gain it in its fullness. This is not said in order to depress the disciple, but in order to keep him humble now that he is on the Path of Illumination. Let him not fancy himself a God because he has attained a measure of Light.

(VII.13,14) This Divine illusion is indeed hard to cross, because long ages spent in grappling with material things have taught our minds to dwell exclusively on what is without. A doctor, trained to view all bodies in terms of health and disease, cannot with ease see with the artist's vision, and we, who owe our mastery over nature to this fidelity to outward fact, cannot at once pass to the higher vision and reverse our customary modes of thought. This reversal is the jnana-yoga.

The Asurik path is the outgoing "pravritti" path.

(VIII.9) The use of the word "kavi," seer or poet (also applied to the poet-seers of the Vedas), shows how essentially the creative process is conceived as one of imagination.

(VIII.22) We see it there, drawing our hearts with beauty, and yet, for all our efforts, inaccessible, beyond our reach.

The best and easiest means to make the ascent

(continued from the previous page) is for the disciple to give himself in love and devotion to that which is above his present level. Loving devotion is the easiest way by which man can transcend his limitations. This is the great force which will carry the disciple out of himself.

(VIII.27) A good account of the after-death illusions is given in the Tibetan Book of the Dead, translated into English by Lama Dawa Samdup and edited by Dr Evans Wentz. In reading it allowance must of course be made for purely Tibetan imagery, and also for errors which have crept into the text through its having fallen into the hands of professional death-bed priests.

(IX.13-15) Those whose hearts may feel tempted to revolt at the idea of the free Self calmly watching the bound selves should remember that it is not any personal extra-cosmic God who is here spoken of, but our own true Self, seated within our hearts. Were He not ever free we could not break our bonds.

(IX.30) True, the self-assertive acts that constitute the evil of his past have left him with a legacy of tendencies that he will have to struggle hard to overcome, for nothing can annihilate deeds once they have been done. To seek to have their consequences washed away by any magic or by any prayers is merest superstition, but even so, no man is ever fettered utterly. A man may sin a thousand times, and by those acts so strengthen his lower self that it is almost certain he will sin again next time. Almost but not quite certain, for in everyone shines the free Atman, and where That exists no bondage can be absolute. Always a man can turn and climb the upward path, for the Divine Freedom that is in his heart can never be annulled, and even the very power by which he sins, traced to its source, springs from the Stainless One.

(IX.32) The word speedy must be interpreted relatively, since we know from chapter vii, verse 19, that the Path is one which takes many lives to tread. The process is called speedy here in contrast to the age-long wanderings in the wilderness of self.

The ordinary exoterically religious man has the same type of mind as the anti-religious materialist. Both have the same attitude to verbal propositions, the same childish conception of what constitutes reality. Their quarrels are family ones, hence their bitterness. Hence too their common dislike of the mystic, who moves in a world unknown to both of them.

(X.17) But though that eye is now available for the disciple he must first learn to open it and to habituate himself to its use. Just as a man, though having as his birthright mind with all its powers of thinking, yet has to learn by slow and arduous steps how to unfold those powers, so the disciple who has now united mind with buddhi must slowly and with effort open up its powers of vision. The mental life in which he is still is, for the most part, rooted must be transmuted by the higher vision. A man born blind, but who has gained his sight, finds for some time the new sense unfamiliar and rather trusts his highly cultivated sense of touch with all its limitations than this strange power of sight which now has opened.

Anagamin literally means one who does not come again (to birth). The common view is that the Anagamin attains Nirvana direct from some higher world after death. Actually the meaning is that having attained to the Alaya Vijnana (the Mahat Atman) he is one with all and thinks no more "I die or I am born."

(XI.25) But there is terror in the Vision too, for in that Light all forms are seen to pass. Only the Divine can live in the Divine: all that is human dies upon the threshold. All that in us which fears the so-called cruelty of nature, which trembles at the ruthless ocean waves, all that which clings to form and personality, sees Doom approaching it on flaming wings.

As in an earthquake men are filled with panic terror, not so much by the actual physical dangers as by the feeling that the solid earth, unconscious

(continued from the previous page) symbol of stability, is rocking shudderingly beneath their feet, so in this Vision, self is seized by terror, seeing its old familiar landmarks vanish in the Void. Nowhere can self find any standing-place; all is dissolved into an ever-changing fiery flux.

It has already been pointed out that the Vision of the Cosmic Form is not the same as the attainment of the final Goal. To interpret this or the Beatific Vision of Western mysticism as the Goal would be to ignore the whole structure of the Gita. The vision, is what it purports to be, a vision, not the attainment, and we have seen that at its end the disciple, returns to the lower level, the level of form, once more. Before the Goal is reached he will have to learn to live entirely in the Reality, so to transmute his whole nature that not an atom of the lower shall remain unredeemed.

(XII.5) Certainly it is not by turning one's back on all activity and refusing any commerce with form of any kind that the Unmanifest is reached, for such a process is impossible. It may be possible to toy in thought with such a path but in reality it is scarcely a path at all. The Homeward Path must be a gathering-up of all the cosmic Fruits, not a retreat, negating all experience, as if the cosmic process were a cosmic blunder which never should have been.

(XII.4) Not by attempting an impossible rejection of the world of sense-experience but by "restraining and subduing the sense," not by trying to turn his back on all forms but by "regarding all forms with an equal vision," not by achieving a stony indifference to the joys and sorrows of the world but by being "devoted to the welfare of all beings," does the true worshipper of the Unmanifest Eternal attain his Goal.

(XII.5) If, the, both Paths are essentially the same, wherein lies the special difficulty of the Path of the Unmanifested? It lies in the fact that the worshipper of the Unmanifested has nothing to which he can fasten his mind, for that One is

(continued from the previous page) beyond all objects of sense, beyond even all concepts of the mind.

(XII.6,7) If guided by knowledge and aspiration, there is no force which will so powerfully bear the soul upwards as that of love.

(XII.9) The power to centre all the being in the Eternal Mind will not, however, be attained at once. Abhyasa, or constant practice, is required. The process is described in shwetashwatara Upanishad with the aid of anmetaphor taken from the production of fire by the friction of two sticks: "Having made one's body (the lower self) the lower fire-stick and the Pravara (the symbol of the Light of consciousness) the upper, by the friction of continued practice (abhyasa) of meditation, one should see the God hidden within."

In plain words, the practice is one of constant withdrawal from the desire-nature and constant self-identification with the higher levels. This effort is twofold. In the first place there must be the effort to churn out the fire, as it were, the attempt to isolate by analytic meditation on experience the watching Self from the participating self. In the second place there must be the effort of the will to identify one's being with the former and from there to rule the latter. If this twofold practice is persisted in it will inevitably culminate in the ability to centre oneself permanently in the Eternal Mind.

(XII.12) Renouncing fruits, the heart will fill with peace and in that peace the yoga of practice will be possible. From practice follows knowledge of the Truth and that unchanging state of meditation in which, waking or sleeping, in action or repose, the inner Self will live in the Eternal.

But some will ask why, at this stage, is all talk of inability, why this insistence on the earlier path? Surely the earlier stages have been long ago accomplished; has not the glorious Cosmic Form been seen? Such a question shows a lack of knowledge about the way of climbing on this Path. Great heights, indeed, have been attained, but not by the whole being.

(continued from the previous page) A climber on a mountain face first reaches for hand-hold on the rock above him and, that having been securely grasped, pulls with great effort his whole body upwards. Just so the climber of the Path aspires with all that which is best in him, attains a hand-hold on the heights of vision, but then must pull his lower nature upwards till his whole being stands firmly on the summit.

Plotinus too asks the questions how it is that the soul cannot keep the level it has achieved, and answers that it is "because it has not yet escaped wholly: but there will be the time of vision unbroken the self hundered no longer by any hindrance of body. Not that those hindrances beset that in us which has veritably seen; it is the other phase of the soul that suffers, and that only when we withdraw from vision and take to knowing by proof, by evidence, by the reasoning processes of the mental habit."

Hence all the recapitulation in the teaching. That which was done for part must now be done again for the whole being that all may be regenerate.

(XII.16) His acts are expert, passionless and pure. Note the word expert (daksha). There are some who in the name of devotion give up their grip on life and muddle through all things, making spirituality an excuse for unpracticalness. The true disciple is no mere ecstatic dreamer, one so dazzled by the white eternal Light that he sees not his way among the shadows here. Rather, since "yoga is skill in action," he shows by the fact that he performs all actions better than other men, that this Path leads to mastery of the world, not to a weak withdrawal.

(XII.17,18) If skill in action is one of the definitions of yoga, balance of mind (samatwa is the other. The ordinary man is ruled by the pairs of opposites, cold and heat, pleasure and pain, friendship and enmity, attraction and repulsion. His life is one perpetual oscillation between these pairs, but the yogi is one whose mind is balanced beyond their away and whose life is guided, not by the blind forces of attraction and repulsion, but by one deep

(continued from the previous page) seated urge to give himself in service of the one great Life of all.

Even ideas of good and evil, as those words are understood by men, no longer away his acts. Those two great words, which all invoke so freely to justify their acts or to condemn their enemies, are, at the best, constructions of the mind, and he now lives rooted in realms beyond. He thus transcends them both and knows but one great Law, to help the play of the Eternal Life as It shines forth or hides Itself in forms.

(XII.19) Whether his actions bring him praise or blame, whether they harmonise with men's ideas of moral law or, as may sometimes happen, they depart entirely from what most men, even most good men, think right, is a matter of indifference to him. This may seem dangerous doctrine but it is the truth. What most men call ethics is an affair of actions and their consequences and, as we have seen, the disciple is one who has renounced all concern with personal consequences. He is not lawless for he knows one all-transcending Law – obedience to the voice of the Great Teacher of his heart.

This should not be taken as supporting ordinary amorality: these words apply solely to the disciple who is selfless enough always to hear the Voice of the Teacher, balanced enough always to discriminate it from other voices, and devoted enough always to obey its commands. Till then, no merely intellectual insight into their limitations should justify a man disregarding the accepted moral laws. The fate that overtook Nietzsche stands as a solemn warning.

The first thing that has to be understood is the division between consciousness and the objects which that consciousness observes. If we examine our experience we find that it is composed of a number of concrete forms all lit up by the light of consciousness. This is the distinction between the Field—that is, the field of consciousness—and the Knower of the Field, the clear light of awareness itself. Reflection will show that the physical body which the

(continued from the previous page) ignorant foolishly suppose to be the self is but the focus in which the forms or data of our sense-experience are, as it were, collected. The materialist's idea of the body as standing in its own right, as a collection of flesh, bones, nerves and so forth, is an artificial mental construction obtained by abstractions from conscious experience, useful, like many other abstractions, for purposes of scientific understanding but an irrelevance in the realm of metaphysics.

But the analysis of experience does not stop here. If the disciple abstracts the light of the witnessing consciousness from all the witnessed forms, the forms of sense, of feeling, or of thought, he will perceive at once that the light is not something like the sunshine which is the same whether illuminating the blue sea or the red earth. That light of consciousness, though associated with an individual point of view, is something which can only be described as all-pervading.

Unfortunately, just as some people mistake the restless urge of rajas for Divine Activity, so others mistake the dull indifferentism of tamas for spirituality. Mealy-mouthed cowardice is called "turning the other cheek," lazy inefficiency is termed indifference to material circumstances, shallow fatalism is confused with wise acceptance of the karma of one's past, cold indifference to one's fellows becomes a rising above love and hate, and that dull poverty of spirit that ignores all art and literature becomes transcendence of the lures of sense. All is Maya! All is Shunya! All is the Play of God! What does anything matter? This is not spirituality but tamas.

(XV.19) The highest type of Bodhisattva in the Mahayana, one who knows that all things are the Void, that there are in reality no beings to be served and no sorrows to free them from, and yet, though knowing this, does not merge his being in that Void but, perfect in love and compassion, serves on till all can attain Nirvana. Without the knowledge that there is in reality neither server nor served, service is apt

(continued from the previous page) to degenerate into a sort of egoism.

(XVI.6) Such mental states as aid or manifest the outgoing movement are also called dark, and those that express the movement of return are termed bright.

This is the real basis of the ethical dualism that we find in the world. It is a great mistake, however, to set up an ethical dualism as absolute and then to rack one's brains to account for "the origin of evil." The dualism of the Cosmic Tides is inevitable in any universe whatever. It is no more possible to have a universe based on one movement alone than to have a gun that will fire without a recoil. Action and reaction are the conditions of all manifestation and not even the great Machine of the Cosmos can escape the operation of this law.

(XVI.6) Dana, for instance, must be divested of its associations with almsgiving, charitable institutions and sanctimonious merit-mongering, while "study of the scriptures" (swadhyaya) has little connection with the Bible classes of the West or with the futile mechanical intoning of the Gita that is so popular in orthodox circles in India. Dana is the process whereby the good things of the universe are made to circulate and penetrate the whole instead of being locked up in stagnant individual centres, and is thus obviously a means of breaking down the barriers of egoism, while swadhyaya signifies the pursuit of knowledge by study, not necessarily the study of "holy" books. The task of thinking out the real meanings of these qualities and of divesting them of the accumulated holiness of centuries is a useful and important exercise for the disciple of this Path. Only he who has made the attempt knows what valuable results it yields and what a profound ethical enlightenment comes from the discarding of the copy-book conceptions. Above all, the disciple will be cured of the almost universal habit of judging by appearances, for he will learn that apparently identical actions performed by two different men have very different values from the inner point of view.

(XVII.1) Those who on hearing, perhaps for the first time, of higher truths at once give themselves up to them. They are able to do so because of this irradiation of the lower mind of the knowledge of the higher, an irradiation which gives a sense of certainty akin to that which a man feels on understanding a geometrical proposition, the only difference being that, in the case of faith, the grounds for that certainty have not entered the brain-consciousness.

The lower mind is treacherous and many things which have a soul of truth within them may not themselves be true. The mind translates its knowledge in terms of its own concepts. Thus the true faith that there is fundamental justice in the Cosmos may lend its certainty to erroneous notions of a personal God and final Judgment Day in cases where such concepts fill the mind.

Occasionally, though not often, a man is able to keep his faith uncontaminated by his mental furniture. For instance, the Catholic mystic, Juliana of Norwich, worried about the fate of the heretics and heathen, received from a vision of Christ the assurance that she seems simply to have accepted to have accepted although it was at utter variance with the teachings of her Church which, doubtless, formed the concepts of her mind. Much more typical, though is the case of St. Teresa, whose Catholicism made her mould the revelations of her vision into the ridiculous statement that in the case of a heretic the mirror of the Soul was irretrievably shattered.

Truth must be all-inclusive and harmonious. It cannot form into little eddies and closed systems. If it be asked in what way this differs from the procedure of the so-called rationalist, it must be answered that the latter accepts only the data of the senses and the logical conclusions of the mind upon them, while the follower of the Fair Faith accepts the data coming from above and then proceeds to work over their interpretation until he can express them in a form consonant with reason.

(XVII.2, 3) If a man can rise to his true Self he is no more concerned with faith for he has knowledge, but as long as that knowledge has to be reflected in the lower mind it is inevitable that it should take on the colours of that mind.

When the knowledge has to show itself as faith that faith is as much of the true Man as is able to manifest within the limits of his personality. That is the reason why those who have accomplished great deeds, whether like Joan of Arc they possessed what is called religion, or whether like Napoleon they believed but in their own "destiny," have always been filled with faith. Their deeds have been accomplished by the power of their higher Selves, and that power was available to them because those Selves were reflected in their hearts in the form of faith.

(XVII.5, 6, 19) The body is the field in which we have to work and, later, will be needed for the service of the One. To weaken or destroy it by injudicious austerities is to destroy a valuable instrument. It is sometimes urged that the body is unreal and transient and that the man of knowledge will not care whether it functions well or badly, whether it lives or dies. But such a view is based on misunderstanding. Those who are practising self-discipline are not men of knowledge but, rather, men trying to gain knowledge. A weakened body, as the Upanishad has taught, means a weakened mind, and if the body, is unnecessarily abandoned before the Goal is reached, it only means that valuable years will have to be spent in educating a new one and in bringing it to the point at which the Path was left. The true attitude to one's body should be to treat it as one treats a riding horse, something to be intelligently disciplined, adequately cared for and properly used, and not as something either to be allowed to wander off at its own free will or else to be beaten to death or uselessness.

The disciple must bend all his energies to the task of controlling his unruly mind, and when that is

(continued from the previous page) accomplished he may be sure that the outer senses will offer no serious obstacles to being brought under control. Trying to control the senses without having first subjugated the mind is like trying to bail water out of a sinking ship without first stopping the leak. Even in cases of definitely inappropriate sense-indulgence, the inner phantasying about the objects of enjoyment does far more damage to the inner life than the actual outward gratification.

Another point that must be noted is that the mind cannot, under ordinary conditions, be treated as something separate from and independent of the body. It is true that the mind is the crux of the whole discipline, but it is also true that the ordinary disciple is quite unable to rise to the level of functioning in his true or higher mind and that the mind in which he does live is very closely bound up with the physical body. It is easy to talk about being indifferent to bodily sensations, but nevertheless, to say nothing of severe pains, a few hours in a stuffy room will destroy almost anyone's power of clear thinking, and a few days of overwork or loss of sleep will cause self-control to vanish in gusts of irritability. This being so, it is obviously foolish for the ordinary disciple to attempt a fine disregard of the bodily and external aspects of life when, all the time, his mental life is intimately bound up with them.

(XVII.14) The last word connotes control and not suppression of the sex-forces. A neurotic celibacy with the so-called unconscious mind full of thwarted sex, issuing in a welter of more or less disguised phantasy, is the very worst condition to be in for one who seeks the inner life.

It is important to note that a mere renunciation of sex by the conscious mind and will is not enough. Many would-be sanyasis in India, and I suppose some people in the West, having heard or read of the virtues of brahmacharya screw up their wills to a renunciation of all sex. The inevitable result

(continued from the previous page) is that the unsatisfied sex-desires are repressed into what psychologists term "the unconscious". From that point of view here adopted the term unconscious is a misnomer, for nothing exists that is not supported by and floating in the consciousness. What is really meant is that the mind-consciousness ceases to pay attention to them. However we may phrase it, the fact remains that these desires, with the psychic energy that is locked up in them, prevent all peace of mind, and if denied attention, manifest as disturbing dreams and in other ways, such as bad temper. The only remedy is to bring them once more into the focus of attention; but in such cases – namely, where sex-desires have been repressed – this is usually impracticable, since to do so involves tormenting the mind with thoughts of having fallen from the Path or with division in the will.

A mind at peace with itself and a unified will are absolute essentials on the Path. The disciple should therefore be content to grow harmoniously as a flower grows, and not try to force his development by renunciations which spring from the will alone and not from the whole being. The sex-desires must be de-energised by withdrawal and not pushed away by mere will. Only when they are drained of energy is it safe to "renounce" them and then, indeed renunciation is no longer needed.

The above should not be interpreted as urging a free yielding to sex-desire. That too is fatal for the Path. As always, it is the Middle Path which is to be followed. What is meant is that the desires should be kept in the field of attention, there to be dealt with by detachment of the Self from them and consequent de-energising of them. To push them out of sight into one of the lumber-rooms of the mind is not to deal with them at all. One of the absolute essentials of the Path is that the disciple should face fearlessly whatever is in him, no matter how much his higher nature resents its presence, Self-ignorance and self-deceit are absolutely fatal.

(XVIII.6) Some there are who object that such helping of others is mere illusion and would involve

(continued from the previous page) an infringement of the law of Karma. It will be time to listen to that objection when the objectors themselves deny ever having received any help through the medium of books or living teachers. Others there are who are kept back from this Path by a false humility. It will be enough, they say, to think of such service when we ourselves are liberated and it becomes a real possibility. But that is a mistake. It is only he who, from the very start, has accustomed himself to the idea of treading the Path for the sake of all who will be able when face to face with the actual bliss of the Brahma Nirvana to be certain of being steadfast in sacrifice and of giving up his bliss to serve his suffering brothers.

(XVIII.6, 7, 8) This is the luminous sattvik tyaga as opposed to those other types of renunciation which spring from laziness, sense of inferiority, or desire to avoid the pain and suffering of life. Such "sour-grapes" renunciation is definitely inferior.

(XVIII.23, 25) It is true that there are certain verses in the Puranas and elsewhere which represent liberated souls while still on earth as going about laughing and crying and behaving irresponsibly "like children or idiots." But these verses must not be taken literally. The man of Knowledge is not an idiot, nor does he manifest his liberation by childish behaviour. It is true that personal thinking will have come to an end in him, but in its place the Cosmic Ideation manifests through him, and though his acts may not accord with established social conventions they are in harmony with the great Cosmic Order.

(XVIII.56) The word *prasad* means grace and also tranquil clarity. In using the former meaning one must guard against the introduction of any of the theistic sentimentalities that cluster round the term. It is not in any way like the capricious favours of a Maharaja, but more like the power inherent in a magnet to make magnets of any bits of iron that adhere to it.

(XVIII.61) However much the man may proclaim himself an independent ego existing for and in himself, the Ruling Power of Spirit is within him and will not let him rest. Man is, as it were, bound to the Centre of his being by an elastic cord; the more he strains at it, the greater will be the reaction. This why an exaggerated movement of materialism is followed by an equally exaggerated religiosity, an age of licence by an age of Puritan restraint.

If any experience is analysed—say, for example the visual experience of a blue disc—two aspects can be distinguished. There is the content, a round blue shape in this instance, and the “awareness” of that shape. The content is what I have termed form and the awareness consciousness.

It should be clear from introspective meditation that all forms are sustained in consciousness, and that, apart from consciousness, we know nothing and can know nothing of forms. It is in fact meaningless to talk of forms as existing apart from consciousness. The objects supposed by some to exist behind the forms are mere mental constructs devised for dealing with experience in practice. No one knows them, no one can ever know them; to believe in their existence is a pure and quite uncalled-for act of faith.

It should not be supposed that by the forms are meant sensations, camera pictures of reality located somewhere in the brain. The brain itself (as an “object”) is one of the constructs of which mention has just been made. The usefulness of such constructs in certain realms of thought and study is not at all denied, but they are irrelevant here.

The primary bedrock of experience is not sensations in the eye, ear, or brain, but visual and other forms in space. All the rest is inference and construction. Materialistic science begins by abstracting consciousness from the forms in order to deal with them more objectively and impersonally and then, when analysis fails to reveal any life or conscious principle

(continued from the previous page) in those forms, triumphantly exclaims that all is mechanism, nowhere is there anything of a spiritual nature. Behaviorist psychology is an example of the same procedure applied to mental life. If you start by abstracting consciousness from phenomena it is obviously absurd to expect to find it as a term in your concluded analysis. For this reason no one should feel disappointed that science (as nowadays practised) does not know anything of the existence of "the soul." It is the old story of looking for one's spectacles when they are on one's nose.

The position must by no means be confused with that of subjective idealism. The consciousness spoken of is not "your" or "my" consciousness, in fact, "you" and "I" exist only as constellated form-sequences brought to foci in that consciousness which, in itself, is neither human nor individualised, but a pervading Light.

The word Soul as used in this book does not refer to a separate entity within the body but to the inner centre of the linked streams of experience that make up a personality. That centre is a focus in consciousness, not any individual's consciousness but the all-pervading sea of Light. As such it is not a separate "entity" any more than the focus to which light is brought by a lens is a separate entity. That focus primarily exists on the level of the higher or pure manas, but a projection of it is to be found functioning as the desire-mind or personality lower down. It is that lower or projected centre that is the core of the empirical personality. It does not exist in any objective way, but comes into being as a centre to which our experiences are referred. That is why a very young child has no sense of self and that, too, is why, when in certain pathological states the experience-content gets organised into two instead of one constellation, we get two selves instead of one—the so-called dissociation of a personality.

As for the higher Self, the true ego, that too is not a "thing-in-itself". It is however a focus which lasts through ages. Itself not born, it yet

(continued from the previous page) emanates that projection which forms the self of any given life. Its own content when outward-looking is the accumulated fruit of the experiences gained by its repeated projections, and when inward-looking the universal knowledge of the buddhi.

Where the word matter has been used in this book it is in the sense of objectivity, of content standing over against the Light, of self-projection into that content and of the Self-loss, separation and pluralism that result. The descent of the Soul into the Matter signifies the going-out of the Light into its content, its self-identification with it and the consequent increasing objectification of the latter.

All avatars are descents of Vishnu. The general doctrine is that Vishnu, conceived as a personal God, from time to time takes birth among men in forms which are sometimes considered material ad hoc creations, sometimes as beneficent illusions created by Him (cf. Docetism), sometimes as eternal, spiritual forms projected into the ken of ordinary mortals on special occasions.

The first theory is altogether naif and is that of the unreflecting man in the street. It involves an arbitrary interference with the laws of causation and postulates a psycho-physical complex with no karmik antecedents whatever.

The third theory was evolved to meet the emotional requirements of devotees but is also exposed to various difficulties. First, it assumes the existence of eternal forms; second, it assumes that such forms exactly resemble familiar material forms except in the undefined adjective "spiritual"; thirdly, it has to fall back upon mystery to explain why such forms should be perceptible at some times and not at others.

The "Docetism" of the second theory is apt to repel both the common sense of the man in the street and the emotions of the devotee. Nevertheless it conceals profounder doctrines than appear at first sight, for the real Krishna, Buddha, or Christ is

(continued from the previous page) not the outer form which, like all other forms, is illusory, but the birthless and invisible Atman within, known to Buddhist tradition as the Dharmakaya.

Where the tension in the inner worlds becomes sufficiently acute, a manifestation would take place. Just as the lightning strikes the highest object so, in the absence of a man who has climbed to the top of the Ladder, the spiritual flash will strike the most spiritually evolved man of the time and so produce, according to his stature, one of those partial manifestations known to Hindu tradition as ansha avataras.

I am quite aware that most Buddhists would not accept the idea of the existence of the higher self. This is not the place to go into the reasons for such non-acceptance but it should be pointed out that what the Buddhists object to is a permanent self-entity, while what has in this book been termed the higher Self is not a permanent entity, not, in fact, an entity at all.

It must not be supposed that the Mahabhutas, the so-called five elements, are elements of matter in the sense of the chemist's elements (though even the latter have now vanished as ultimate entities). Indian philosophic thought is concerned with the analysis of experience, not of "matter."

Sanskara: An impression or memory-trace. These impressions of past acts and thoughts serve as causative forces for bringing about further developments. A man's knowledge of a foreign language is not always manifested in his mind, but it is always there in a latent form and will issue in actual words under suitable circumstances. Such latent knowledge is a sanskara. There are also sanskaras in the higher Ego and in the Cosmic Mind.

Sri Krishna prem: "THE YOGA OF THE KATHOPANISHAD."

He who has come face to face with the Higher self and has become, as it were, that self's disciple will never, should he need it, lack wealth. The state of our pockets as well as the state of our health is governed by the intentions of that Higher self who is

(continued from the previous page) in fact the dispenser of Karma – subject of course to the all-ruling Cosmic Order in which he himself has his being. We think of the outer world of sense and of its various happenings as something separate from the inner worlds, But it is not so. As a bubble depends upon man's breath, as ash depends upon fire, as a poem depends upon the poet's heart, so does this outer world depend upon and hang from the inner. Not by mere chance does anything whatever happen in this world. The "bad luck" which pursues some men, so that nothing they undertake ever prospers, but is always wrecked by unforeseen accidents, that bad luck is but the displeasure of their own Higher Selves, which like Thompson's Hound of Heaven, bring it about that "all things betray Thee who betrayest Me." Conversely he who serves his Higher Self as a true disciple, listening for its lightest word and faithfully carrying it out, will never lack whatever means are necessary. Nachiketas' statement only echoes the words of Sri Krishna in the Gita:- "To those who serve Me (the Higher Self) alone, thinking of no other, to those, ever united (to me), I bring all that they need."

Nachiketas having shown his determination to attain the ultimate Knowledge, having refused to be tempted aside from his path by lure of desires, the Initiator proceeds to impart the teaching which will enable his pupil to find in and for himself the answer to his question.

This stage too has been passed: for the pupil successfully resisted all the blandishments of desire and that, too, not by the mere asceticism of the will which forcibly tramples them under foot, but by the surer light of discriminative knowledge before which they fall in lifeless disintegration.

Though exceptional men, or, to speak more truly, men who have advanced far on the Path in previous lives and are now but recapitulating stages already achieved, appear sometimes to have scaled the Peaks with the aid of the inner Guru alone, the ordinary aspirant needs an embodied Teacher, one who,

(continued from the previous page) though seeming 'other' than the disciple himself, can make manifest on this plane the voice of that Self which is in truth the Self of all and has sometimes accordingly been spoken of as Vaishvanara, the Universal-in-all-men. To such a voice obedience, as always, must be with the free-will of the disciple, for there can be no coercion on the Path. Addressed as it is, however, to our physical ears, it must at least be heard. It follows that those (and they are many) who seek for a Guru who will spirit them along the Path with a wave of the hand are seeking for what does not and cannot exist. As one such Guru Plotinus has said: "out of discussion we call to vision, to those desiring to see we point the path: our teaching is a guiding in the way; the seeing must be the very act of him who has made the choice."

The marvellous living omnipresence of the Atman has to be experienced to be grasped. If we say that it resembles akasha or space we shall get a wrong idea, since, to our thought, the omnipresence of space is a dead or static one and there is nothing static about the Atman. Yet when we say there is nothing static we are again wrong for it is essentially that which stands for ever. With us when a thing stands it is not moving and vice versa, but the Atman is beyond these opposites.

We must not suppose that the doctrine of Grace which the later theistic commentators read into the verse is utterly without foundation. It is a dangerous, a two-edged doctrine, because it almost inevitably leads the aspirant to wait idly on the pleasure of a higher Power; in doing which he resembles the man, who, wishing to cross the Ganga, sat down by the bank waiting for it to finish flowing by. The doctrine is apt to strike at the very root of all effort, to lead to doctrines of special 'election' and in general to an anthropomorphic, sentimental and altogether dubious conception of the Power which, as Sri Krishna tells us, is "the same to all beings."

Nevertheless there is a fact which we shall do well to remember, namely, that, as the Upanishad has told us several times, the Teaching, to be effective,

(continued from the previous page) must come from one who is madanyah, other than 'myself' This is natural, for the self is the very central focus of all separation and therefore, as we have seen, can be of no use to us in our quest. The Teaching must come from the Light beyond the mind and therefore be from a source other than self. Any idea that may come to the disciple, that 'I have attained thus far, I will attain further' will inevitably result in his falling back again into the sense of separateness. Hence, though we must disagree with any doctrine which attributes, or even tends to attribute, attainment to the 'favour' of a personal or quasi—personal deity, yet the stress laid on love and bhakti by the 'gracious' schools is a true one for the simple reason that loving as opposed to thinking is the great unitive mode. The separative mind must die and be transcended before we can pass beyond. The wings of love will carry us moth-like, straight through the dead-centre of self-hood to the Divine Flame beyond, the Flame that will consume all separateness.

We can concentrate quite efficiently when our feelings are sympathetically aroused. Does not a lover concentrate on his beloved, a business man on his beloved accounts? When, however, we seek to concentrate our minds in Yoga, our feelings suddenly thwart us and a thousand desire-born images and fancies invade our minds just when we want to still them.

Here again we see why Bhakti is so important, not as a separate path of its own, but as one side of the one Path which all must tread. Until there is inner psychic unity, there will be no concentration of mind. We must harmonise the opposing forces in our selves. Then and only then will the knowledge manifest in our hearts. Till then, no process of knowing will lead us where we have to go, beyond the mental vision which sees the world as the arena of endless strife between the opposites.

Light is thus permanent focus, the Higher or individual Ego, that which endures on its own plane of being throughout the aeons of cosmic duration, sending forth shadow after shadow, the transient

(continued from the previous page) personal selves that manifest in our world of birth and death. On this scale the shadow is the empirical self of waking life, our conscious personality, the ignorant and petty self of daily life, a self which comes disintegrates sometime after bodily death, its garnered experience, or such of it as is of any value, returning to the Light which sent it forth.

After the death of the body, the self enjoys such portions of the Great Harmony as its deeds down here have placed it in touch with, enjoys them in a state that is to us subjective or dream-like but which is perfectly objective to him who enjoys it and is, indeed, the Heaven of exoteric religion. As for the Divine Self, that, of course, exists and partakes for ever in the Harmony.

"Whoever is a true Philosopher,
Remain nameless,
Trust no one but God.

For loyalty flew from earth heavenwards and left all men whose mind is upon earthly matter." — Secret Symbols of the Rosicrucians.

The word used is Vijnana, a synonym of buddhi. It may also be loosely translated as wisdom. Compare Gita IX.1. where Jnana and Vijnana have, according to sridhara, the significance of knowledge and Experience respectively. We may also note the Vijnamaya of the Taittiriya Upanishad which is equivalent to buddhi. Perhaps discriminative knowledge would be a good rendering if it did not suggest the separative analytic discrimination of manas whereas here the discrimination is the power of referring the given act or event to the pattern of the whole.

Manas and buddhi are the two powers of that Light, the former the power of seeing things as separate (and so of bringing about their apparent separation) and the latter of seeing things as a unity, all being related to all.

Under these circumstances, as the Gita tells us, Self is the enemy of self. That higher Half of his being that he has turned from pursues him with

(continued from the previous page) all the fury of a woman scorned. He is on the point of success and is stricken down by illness; power comes within his grasp but something intervenes, perhaps a scandal of his long-past youth which comes to light 'by chance,' destroying men's confidence and so his chance of power over them. Even in the arms of what he knows as love he is not safe, for always something comes to thwart the happiness that seemed about to come. "All things betray thee who betrayest Me." And all the time the baying of the death-hounds grows louder while slower and slower fall his tried feet.

'God' stands for ever before us. We do not see him because we shut our eyes, preferring the so-called freedom, which is really enslavement to the senses, to the real freedom which is service of the one Divine Harmony. This is seen everywhere today for manas is the keynote of the present age with its so-called modern civilisation.

The result of this unbalanced integration is of course that a stress is set up and is always pulling on the self and being resisted by it. This pull is what is known as the pull of Fate, the resistance, the 'instinct' of self-assertion and self-preservation, the urge to preserve the integration at all costs. Hence the false ego attempts to rush outwards, away from the true centre of its being which becomes an object of fear to it, something that menaces its very existence, something whose pull must be counter-acted in every possible way. This is the reason for that fear of the inner life which is so often found among us, who are clinging with all their being to the outer circumference, are apt to apply the term morbid to all inward-turning. They are right; morbid means that which leads towards death and for them the pull to the centre is the pull of death. As long as the self succeeds in maintaining its resistance to the central pull, so long it continues to live its separate life.

Of that Dark Zero, nothing can be said, nor

(continued from the previous page) indeed can any reach it during the Cosmic Day. Those who have reached the Goal have gone to the Father-Sun of the Shanta Atman. Beyond it none have gone and none shall go till the coming of the Night. It is the Goal, we need talk of no other.

This task, however, can only be accomplished if we call to our aid the great power of Love, in some form or other, usually that of butter devotion to the Guru. Naturally the self resists its disintegration and only by the help of and for the sake of 'another', as the Teacher has already told us, can the work be successfully carried through to the next stage.

The slightest loss of balance at the dizzy height at which he now stands will have disastrous consequences undreamt of at lower levels. Moreover, at those heights, there is a great Wind that blows perpetually, and, though unlike the gusts below, its pressure is a steady one, yet it is only too easy for the disciple to lose his head and be whirled away from the knife-edge ridge he treads, back to depths from which he will have painfully to climb again.

The tension is terrific and constant. One outburst of anger that would scarcely be noticed in the dense air below will give rise in that rarefied atmosphere to an explosion which will shake the very depths of his being and undo in a few moments the painful efforts of months or even years. One longing gaze towards the safety of the valleys he has left will provoke a dizziness of the head which may send him headlong to rejoin them. "Kill in thyself all memory of past experiences. Look not behind or thou art lost."

The ordinary rules of ethics, those mass-produced books of words that are adequate enough as guides in the populous valleys, are quite useless or even misleading at these lonely heights. Within himself the disciple must find the harmony which alone can guide him and any mistake will be a cash transaction, a thing for which he must pay then and there.

The 'something else' that prevents our seeing the Atman is of course the content of experience, the vivid images of sense and even of thought. These are what we attend to and to which we give ourselves. Hence we fail to feel the Atman in ourselves, or, to speak more correctly, we forget to identify our being with it.

For the Atman is here and now in all experience, even the most trivial. Its full realisation may be a "far-off divine event" for us who think in terms of time, but it is present now; without it we could neither write nor read nor understand these words or any others. At the very back of our being, now at this moment, its Light is shining and by that Light we see and taste and touch and feel and think. It is of the very utmost importance that now we should turn back to what we have forgotten, for in that alone is our true being.

It is a withdrawal or reversal of the flow of the flow of Consciousness and not any squinting of the eyes as practised by some hatha yogis. Our consciousness normally flows outwards through the senses to the objects which it illumines and then proceeds to lose itself in those objects. Thus it forgets even its own existence and we have the extraordinary sight of learned thinkers actually denying that any such thing as consciousness exists at all.

Were it not for this inner Sun there could be no light in the world at all. After it and not before it comes all the business about electro-magnetic waves and whatnot, after it and not before it the lenses, optic nerves and brain structures. By that Light one sees, hears and touches, by that Light one thinks, by its rays, even, one questions its own existence. "The fool saith in his heart there is no God" and yet it is by the power of God that the thought is framed.

By that Light we perceive the world of waking experience and by that same Light all the objects of our dreams. All that we see, waking or dreaming, are but images floating in that sea of Light, images that have no substantiality at all. Nowhere is there any true solidarity in the worlds of sense, outer or inner. Thinner than the surface of the thinnest soap

(continued from the previous page) bubble is the world which confronts us. Its apparent solidity is but borrowed from the soul.

It is to protect the idolised ego from the consuming fires of that Atman that we erect all sorts of barriers, the barrier of social convention, the barrier of science and philosophy, the barrier of a religious creed, anything in fact that will serve to ensure that the daemonic and elemental Powers of the universe, inner or outer (and they are the same), the Power of Fate in short, shall only impinge upon the ego after being tamed or disinfected by having to pass through the 'recognised channels.' This is the reason why the bureaucrat erects a fence of red tape around himself, society, a wall of conventions, the materialist, one of scientific dogma and the exoterically religious man a protective creed which will bar out all daemonic visitants except such as bring with them the certificate of orthodoxy.

As we have said before, the path to the Atman is the Path of Death, a Path that begins and ends in Fire; it is no wonder that the ego shrinks away with all its childish might and seeks to hide its head under the bed clothes of use and wont. To pass those Gates is death to the unpurified ego which clings to its limitations and would remain forever fixed in its present one-sidedness.

Mulaprakriti and all its derivative branches is in a very real sense "such stuff as dreams are made on" and it is in that sense that the word is used. Let those who would understand its nature seek out that of which are composed the fleeting images of dream for the Dreaming State has well been called the Hall of Learning.

The traffic through the Gates, however, can be restricted to what is essential and even that can and must be carefully scrutinised on its way out and in. This is the process known to the Buddhists as right recollectedness, the only real way of mastering the sense-life. This is the type of watchfulness that must be constantly exercised. Even in sleep a night watch must kept—at least on the later stages of the Path—and we read of the Buddha

(continued from the previous page) that "calm and self-recollected" he lay down to sleep.

It will be asked whether all this self-examination is not liable to become a neurotic habit, one, moreover, which will dry up and sterilise the springs of action. Certainly it can become such and indeed often does. This is, as we have already been told, the Razor-edged Bath, and those who are frightened by its dangers had better leave it alone. Dangerous or not, it is the only method (except perhaps one of which we shall not speak here and in which it is really also included) by which the sense-life may be mastered and brought under control.

The one-sided integration of the lower self produces a strain which results in the distortion of all the psychic processes, thus bringing it about that our ordinary consciousness is vakra, bent or distorted by the stresses of desire.

What is required is not repression but watchfulness, through watchfulness understanding and through understanding control. The disciple must (robed always in the Waters) watch the activities of his senses and understand why they seek to act as they do and what results follow from such action. On this point the teachings of the Buddha are quite clear. Having watched in this way the disciple will find himself able to understand the sense life, inner as well as outer, and, having understood, he will be in a position for the first time to master it.

We must observe carefully the nature of the sense life, not with any foolish idea that we can dispense with it altogether, but in order that we may gain that understanding of its laws that is the prelude to bringing it under complete control. Ordinarily we do not and cannot see our sense-life because we have identified ourselves with it. It is part of us and can no more be clearly seen by us than can our own bodies. Only when we can stand back and see it as something separate from ourselves can we see it as it really is. Established in the mental being, we must observe the coming and going of sensations as we would observe the coming and going of insect life in our houses, noting carefully its

(continued from the previous page) various sorts, which sort is useful and which harmful, which is attracted by what and by what repelled. Then indeed we are on the high road to control, and, ceasing to identify ourselves with our sensations, cease to grieve as they come and go.

Only in the recalling of the projected life, in the withdrawal of our Centre to a more inward level of our being, is there mastery, freedom and peace, for only in such withdrawal are we able to separate ourselves from our thoughts and calmly contemplate the silent revolutions of their heavens.

It is quite impossible to still the senses by any setting of the teeth as long as power is being transmitted to them from the heart, the source of all power. As in the car, power is transmitted by what is quite literally a 'clutch'; that clutch must be opened, broken or released and then the wheels of the senses will in a short time sink to rest of themselves. A common notion, especially in the West, is that the yogi stills his senses by entering a hypnotic trance and that for this purpose he practises certain tricks with his eyes etc., in order to induce autohypnosis. Admittedly in such a trance the senses are stilled every night when we enter the state of dreamless sleep. But such stilling is only temporary and when the would-be yogi emerges from his trance his senses awake once more in precisely the same condition as before trance supervened. Mere trance accomplishes nothing.

Compare also the saying of Lalla, the 14th century Kashmiri Yogini: "Slay thou desire; meditate on the nature of the Self. Abandon thou thy vain imaginings for know thou that that knowledge is rare and of great price. Yet is it near by thee; search for it nor afar. It is naught but a void; and a void has become merged within the Void."

And in any case, what exactly is desire? Desire is a movement of the psyche towards or away from (for aversion is only the negative form of desire) some object thought of as outside itself. It is thus essentially a movement of ignorance, for there is

(continued from the previous page) nothing that is in truth outside the Soul. The imagination creates an image and then, following the Path of Forth-going and projecting that image 'outside', we strive towards it or away from it in ignorance of the fact that its true being is within the Soul. Thus arises the outer world of desirable objects and thus arises our bondage to that world.

As regards the Knots of the Heart mentioned in verse 15, Shankara states that they are the formations of Ignorance which bind us fast by causing us to assert 'I am this body, this wealth is mine, I am happy or sorrowful.' This statement is perfectly correct but its effect upon most modern men who read it will be to suggest that the knots in question are so many false intellectual beliefs which a proper knowledge of Vedantic 'metaphysics' will correct. Such a view, however, is far from adequate. Intellectual beliefs are only a part, and, in some sense, one of the least important parts of the contents of the psyche. They are symptoms and not causes, for they are rooted either in the desire-nature below or in the Buddhi above. Let us not forget that the mind is a mirror, a tool in the hands of either the 'evil daemon' below or the 'good daemon' above, or, more usually, the battlefield for these contending forces. It is, however, a living battlefield, one which itself takes the side of one or other of the combatants, assisting it by every means in its power by altering its configurations to suit the favoured side. No man has ever had the slightest difficulty in dealing with his intellectual opinions, modifying and reversing them with the utmost ease—provided he really wished to. Hence the sterility of mere courses of 'metaphysical' study, Vedantic or other. The actual Knots of the Heart are something far deeper and more difficult to untie than any mere intellectual beliefs.

There is another school of yogis who practise what is known as Laya Yoga (a misleading term since all yoga is laya yoga) or more popularly Kundalini Yoga. This school, which is a branch of the Hatha Yoga, works primarily on the physical body. On the

(continued from the previous page) principle 'as above so below', they find all the higher principles manifested in that body and seek by physical means to act upon them there. Thus, for example, the union of the higher Manas and the Buddhi is localised in the Ajna chakra between the eyebrows. The seven principles or levels of being are represented in a special sense in the seven 'Lotuses' or centres, five of which are in the spine. The Bower, the one Power that manifests in all life, is held to reside in the centre at the base of the spine in the form of the Goddess Kundalini, the Coiled One. If hence by a technique consisting in the main of postures designed to bring pressure upon the nerves and of very special breathing processes, into the theory of which we cannot go here, she is led up the Sushumna Path to the so-called Thousand Petalled Lotus in the head where Samadhi is attained. Its chief attraction appears to be in the vividness and the sense of concrete reality that arises through the pre-occupation with physical processes and at least quasi-physical sensations. It is also in this that its danger lies. It offers little to counteract our already excessive tendency to think of the physical as the only real, at least in any vivid sense of the world, and of only too many of its followers it is true that what begins with the body ends there also. That which commences with abnormal physiological practices is only too apt to end at mere abnormal psychic powers. Actually this belief outline has been given because this verse and also the subsequent one are sometimes interpreted in this sense and it is important to realise that such a view, though true within its limitations, is only an aspect of a much wider truth. The gross body and its subtle counterpart are only the lowest concretisations of our attention, for it is there and not in the spine, gross or subtle, that the fundamental knots are found.

Raja Yoga which, making use only of a few simple physical preliminaries in order to clear the table as it were, starts its work directly upon the mind which is the master-key of the whole process.

(continued from the previous page) The mind, as befits its central position, is to be trained to perform two functions, to control the senses below and to be controlled by the Buddhi above. The average man's mind is itself dragged hither and thither by the unruly horses of sense. On such a mind the Buddhi can only manifest in the form of an all-controlling fate whose dark compulsion is the inevitable counterpart of such irresponsible, sense-directed careering. Yoga is balance; he who would command must also obey and it is only by submitting itself to the commands of the Buddhi in all matters, by listening at all times to the Inner Voice, the voice of the Cosmic Harmony, or Rita, that the mind can gain the power of imposing its commands upon the senses. Then and then only can the process of laya be achieved and in the words of our text, the senses be merged in Manas, Manas in Buddhi, Buddhi in the Great Self and that in the Peace beyond. It is that ascent that is the fundamental, the archetypal Ascent of the Coiled One, an ascent of which all processes taking place in the spine or elsewhere are but outward manifestations, partial expressions on their own limited scale. Water the root of the tree and the whole tree will flourish.

The second Knot is the Knot of Vishnu, that by which we are bound to the desire world, the world of feeling, and on account of which we say, in Shankara's words, 'I am happy or I am sorrowful,' and then proceed to move towards or away from the fancied causes of our happiness or sorrow in desire or aversion.

The third, the tightest Knot of all, is the knot of the mind, that which binds the Spirit to the world of thought, the rooting place and ultimate fortress of separate selfhood. All things may pass and be taken from me but in my thoughts I live for ever.

The sparks are the lightning-like flashes, the preliminary perceptions which herald the rising of the mystic Sun in all its fulness.

The Chaldaean Oracles say plainly: "believe thyself to be out of the body and thou art." It is

(continued from the previous page) necessary to add, however, that such 'believing' is not the pious wishing that commonly passes as such and, which in fact, is seldom more than a game of 'make believe'. It is by believing that we find ourselves embodied and the 'belief' which liberates from embodiment must be one of equal power and vividness if it is to be effective. Such a belief is only possible to a mind which has been purified by long and arduous preliminary training in yoga. It is only in such a mind that the knowledge of the Buddhi can be reflected, such reflection being, as we have said before, the true and only real faith.

That, it is true, is not the final End, for as the symbolism again reminds us, the Soul thus freed is still a thing-in-itself, ('pure and deathless' but still separate from other Souls. The Path leads on beyond all separateness, beyond all self-existing monads whatsoever, but the further reaches of the Way are, as Hermes says, "Not taught." The journey through the Darkness is ended: only the Journey through the Light remains. Within that Light which now surrounds it, the Soul must seek the power and wisdom for its further self-annihilating progress: as our Upanishad itself observes, "Up to this point proceeds the Teaching." The rest is Silence.

Mohemmed Missree: "MYSTICAL MEANING OF SUFI TERMS"@

When, like Hafiz, the Sufis mention wine, they mean a knowledge of God, which, extensively considered, is the love of God. Wine, viewed extensively, is also love: love and affection are here the same thing. The wine-shop, with them, means the murshid i kiamil (spiritual director), for his heart is said to be the depository of the love of God; the wine-cup is the telkin (the pronunciation of the name of God, in a declaration of faith, as: There is no God but Allah), or it signifies the words which flow from the murshid's mouth respecting divine knowledge, and which, heard by the salik (the Dervish, or one who pursues the true path) intoxicates his soul, and divests his mind (of passions), giving him pure spiritual delight. The sweetheart means the excellent preceptor, because, when any one sees his beloved, he admires her perfect

@ "On the Tasavuf." (Turkish)

(continued from the previous page) proportions, with a heart full of love: the Dervish beholds the secret knowledge of God which fills the heart of his spiritual preceptor (murshid), and through it receives a similar inspiration, and acquires a full perception of all that he possesses, just as the pupil learns from his master. As the lover delights in the presence of his sweetheart, so the Dervish rejoices in the company of his beloved preceptor. The sweetheart is the object of a worldly affection; but the preceptor, of a spiritual attachment. The curls, or ringlets, of the beloved are the grateful praises of the preceptor, tending to bind the affections of the Dervish pupil; the moles on her face signify that when the pupil, at times, beholds the total absence of all worldly wants on the part of preceptor, he also abandons all the desires of both worlds—he perhaps even goes so far as to desire nothing else in life than his preceptor; the furrows on the brow of the beloved one, which they compare to (verses of) the Koran, mean the light of the heart of the murshid: they are compared to verses of the Koran, because the attributes of God, in accordance with the injunction of the Prophet: "Be ye endued with divine qualities" are possessed by the sheikh (or murshid).

E.H. Palmer: "ORIENTAL MYSTICISM". (contd. from p.35)

But with all his perfection the Perfect Man cannot compass his desires, but passes his life in consistent and unavoidable self-denial: he is perfect in knowledge and principle, but imperfect in knowledge and principle, but imperfect in faculty and power.

There have indeed been Perfect Men possessed of power; such power as that which resides in kings and rulers; yet a careful consideration of the poor extent of man's capacities will show that this weakness is preferable to his power, his want of faculty preferable to his possession of it. Prophets and saints, kings and sultans, have desired many things, and failed to obtain them; they have wished to avoid many thing and have had them forced upon them. Mankind is made up of the Perfect and the Imperfect, of

(continued from the previous page) Wise and the Foolish, of Kings and Subjects, but all are alike weak and helpless, all pass their lives in a manner contrary to their desires; this the Perfect Man recognises and acts upon, and, knowing that nothing is better for man than renunciation, forsake all and becomes free and at leisure.

I have said that the Perfect Man should be endued with four things in perfection: now the Perfectly Free Man should have four additional characteristics, viz. renunciation, retirement, contentment, and leisure. He who has the first four is virtuous, but not free: he who has the whole eight is perfect, liberal, virtuous, and free. Furthermore, there are two grades of the Perfectly Free—those who have renounced wealth and dignity only, and those who have further renounced eldership and teachership, thus becoming free and at leisure. These again are subdivided into two classes; those who, after renunciation, retirement and contentment, make choice of obscurity, and those who, after renunciation, retirement and contentment, make choice of submission, contemplation, and resignation, but the object of both is the same. Some writers assert that freedom and leisure consists in the former course, while others maintain that it is only to be found in the latter.

"Renunciation is necessary to the real confession of faith; for the formula 'There is no God but God', involves two things, negation and proof. Negation is the renunciation of other Gods, and proof is the knowledge of God. Wealth and dignity have led many from the right path, they are the gods the people worship; if then you see that one has renounced these, you may be sure that he has expelled the love of this world from his heart, and completed the negation; and whosoever has attained to the knowledge of God has completed the proofs. This is really confessing that 'there is no God but God'; and he who has not attained to the knowledge of God, has never really repeated the confession of faith.

"Two conditions are therefore imposed upon the Traveller, first, to attain Humanity, second to acquire capacity.

"There are three developments of character that must be suppressed before man can attain to Humanity; the animal, the brutal and the fiendish. He who only eats and sleeps, and gives way to lust, is mere animal; if besides these he gives way to anger and cruelty, he is brutal; and if in addition to all these he is crafty, lying, and deceitful, he is fiendish.

"If the Traveller is moderate in his food, rest, and desires, and strives to attain a knowledge of himself and of God, then is the time for acquiring capacity by freeing himself from all that is evil and base, and adorning himself with the opposite qualities; after that by prayer he may obtain the Spirit of Humanity.

"When Man has become assured of the truth of Revelation, he has reached the stage of Belief, and has the name of Mumin, 'Believer.' When he further, acts in obedience to the will of God, and apportions the night and day for earnest prayer, he has reached the stage of worship and is called an A'bid, or 'Worshipper.' When he has expelled the love of this world from his heart, and occupies himself with a contemplation of the might Whole, he reaches the next stage, and becomes a Zahid, or 'Recluse.' When in addition to all this he knows God, and subsequently learns the mysteries of nature, he reaches the stage of Acquaintance, and is called 'A'rif, 'One who knows.' The next stage is that in which he attains to the love of God, and is called a Weli or 'Saint.' When he is moreover gifted with inspiration and the power of working miracles, he becomes a Nebi, 'Prophet' and when entrusted next with the delivery of God's own message, he is called an 'Apostle,' Rusul. When he is appointed to abrogate a previous dispensation and preach a new one, he is called 'Ulu'l'Azz, 'One who has a mission.' When this mission is final, he has arrived at the stage called Khatm, or 'the Seal.' This is the Upward Progress of Man. The first stage is the 'Believer.' the last the 'Seal.'

The chief school of Arabian philosophy, that of al Ghazzali (A.H.505), passed over to Suffism by the same reasoning which led Plotinus to his mystical

(continued from the previous page) theology. After long inquiries for some ground on which to base the certainty of our knowledge, al Ghazzali was led to reject entirely all belief in the senses. He then found it equally difficult to be certified of the accuracy of the conclusions of reason, for there may be, he thought, some faculty higher than reason, which, if we possessed, would show the uncertainty of reason, as reason now shows the uncertainty of the senses. He was left in scepticism, and saw no escape but in the Sufi union with Deity. There alone can man know what is true by becoming the truth itself. "I was forced," he said, "to return to the admission of intellectual notions as the bases of all certitude. This, however, was not by systematic reasoning and accumulation of proofs, but by a flash of light which God sent into my soul."

T. Hughes' "DICTIONARY OF ISLAM."

Faqir: The individual who desires to enter an order is received in an assembly of the fraternity presided over by the shaikh, who touches his hand and breathes in his ear three times the words, "La ilaha illa 'llah" ("There is no god but God"). The recipient, faithful to the orders of his chief, obligates himself to spend his time in perfect retirement, and to report to the shaikh the visions or dreams which he may have during the course of his novitiate. These dreams, besides characterising the sancity of his vocation, and his spiritual advancement in the order, serve likewise as so many supernatural means to direct the shaikh. The full complement of this exercise is called Chilleh, or "forty days," a period sometimes even longer, according to the dispositions, more or less favourable of the candidate. Arrived at the last grade of his novitiate, he is then supposed to have fully ended his career, called Takmilu's Suluk, and acquired the degree of perfection for his solemn admission into the corps to which he has devoted himself. During all his novitiate, the recipient bears the name of Murid, or "Disciple" and the shaikh who directs him in this pretended celestial career takes the title of Murshid or "Spiritual Guide."

"I was conducted to his presence. During the whole of that night he concentrated his thoughts on me, whilst I gave myself up to inward meditation. Three nights passed in this way. On the fourth night the shaikh said:- 'Let Mullah Sanghim and Saih Beg, who are very susceptible to ecstatic emotions, apply their spiritual energies to Tawakkul Beg.

"They did so, whilst I passed the whole night in meditation, with my face turned toward Makkah. As the morning drew near, a little light came into my mind, but I could not distinguish form or colour. After the morning prayers, I was taken to the shaikh who bade me inform him of my mental state. I replied that I had seen a light with my inward eye. On hearing this, the shaikh became animated and said: 'Thy heart is dark, but the time is come when I will show myself clearly to thee.' He then ordered me to sit down in front of him, and to impress his features on my mind. Then having blindfolded me, he ordered me to concentrate all my thoughts upon him. I did so, and in an instant, by the spiritual help of the shaikh, my heart opened. He asked me what I saw. I said that I saw another Tawakkul Beg and another Mulla Shah, the master. The bandage was then removed and I saw the shaikh in front of me. Again they covered my face, and again I saw him with my inward eye. Astonished, I cried: 'O, master! whether I look with my bodily eye, or with my spiritual sight, it is always you I see.' After three months I entered the cheerless region in which the figures appeared no more. During the whole of this time the shaikh continued to explain to me the mystery of the doctrine of the Unity and of the knowledge of God; but as yet he did not show me the absolute reality. It was not until a year had passed that I arrived at the true conception of unity. Then in words such as these I told the shaikh of my inspiration. 'I took upon the body as only dust and water, I regard neither my heart nor my soul, alas! that in separation from Thee (God) so much of my life has passed. Though

(continued from the previous page) wert I and I knew it not.' The shaikh was delighted, and said that the truth of the union with God was now clearly revealed to me. Then addressing those who were present he said:-

"Tawakkul Beg learnt from me the doctrine of the Unity, his inward eye has been opened, the spheres of colours and of images have been shown to him. At length, he entered the colourless region. He has now attained to the Unity; doubt and scepticism henceforth have no power over him. No one sees the Unity with the outward eye, till the inward eye gains strength and power."

Prayer: At the time of public prayer, the mu'azzin, or "crier," ascends the minaret, or stands at the side of the mosque nearest the public thoroughfare, and gives the azan, or "call to prayer," as follows:-

"God is great! God is great! God is great! God is great!
 I bear witness that there is no god but God!
 I bear witness that there is no god but God!
 I bear witness that Muhammad is the Apostle of God!
 I bear witness that Muhammad is the Apostle of God!
 Come to prayers! Come to prayers!
 Come to salvation! Come to salvation!"

In the early morning the following sentence is added:

"Prayers are better than sleep!"

Any wandering of the eyes, or of the mind, a coughing or the like, answering a question, or any action not prescribed to be performed, must be strictly avoided. The Muslim may say his five daily prayers in his home, or shop, or in the street or road.

Salatu 'l-Istikharah—Prayers for success or guidance. The person who is about to undertake any special business performs two rak'ah prayers and then goes to sleep. During his slumbers he may expect to have "ilham," or inspiration, as to the undertaking for which he seeks guidance!

Divination: Kahanah, or fortelling future events is unlawful in Islam.

Mu'awiyah ibn Hakim relates: "I said to the Prophet, 'O Messenger of God, we used to do some things in the time of ignorance of which we are not sure now. For example, we used to consult diviners about future events?' The Prophet said, 'Now that you have embraced Islam you must not consult them.' Then I said, 'And we used to take bad omens?' The Prophet said, 'If from a bad omen you are thrown into perplexity, let it not hinder you from doing the work you had intended to do! Then I said, 'And we used to draw lines on the ground?' And the Prophet said, 'There was one of the Prophets who used to draw lines on the ground, therefore if you can draw a line like him it is good, otherwise it is vain.'"

'Ayishan says "the people asked the Prophet about divines, whether they spoke true or not. And he said, 'You must not believe anything they say.' The people then said, 'But, O Prophet! they sometimes tell what is true?' The Prophet replied, 'Because one of the genii steals away the truth and carries it into the diviner's ear; and the diviners mix a hundred lies to one truth.'" (continued on page 496)

R. Krishnamachari: "FAITH-HEALING IS POSSIBLE."@

"Faith-healing" is slowly being accepted by the medical profession as a useful aid to ordinary treatment, but only as an aid. Drugs, injections and the surgeon's knife are the chief equipment of the doctor's outfit, all three of them representing a mechanical interference with the ways of Nature.

Nevertheless faith-healing in its most elementary form is now admitted as serving a useful purpose in "functional" diseases and orthodox medical men are getting over their prejudice against the investigation of psycho-therapy.

What this means in plain words is that our thoughts our temperaments, our minds can directly influence the bodily functions. Indigestion, which represents the upsetting of a normal function, can be brought on by an over-concentration of the attention on, say, business affairs.

Doctors know that. Everybody knows it. But how few people have ever seriously considered what it implies. For instance, how many of us, including those

@ Mysindia Annual 1943.

(continued from the previous page) who practise the art of healing, have paused to wonder whether, if the mind can directly influence the working of the body in one particular, it may not influence it in many others—whether, in fact, we can definitely assign any limit to its influence?

At present the average orthodox medical man has assigned that limit. He affirms that the action of the mind upon the body is confined to functional, and cannot include organic, diseases. That is to say, he admits that the mind can directly influence the working of the bodily organs, but denies that it can influence the organs themselves.

Is that true?

Let me take a simple example. It has been demonstrated beyond all question that the body cells of a patient under deep hypnosis can be drastically influenced at the suggestion of the hypnotist.

For example, a cool bar of metal laid on the patient's arm with the suggestion that it is red hot, has produced actual blisters, corresponding in every detail to the blister that would have been produced by a real burn, and taking just as long to heal.

This is only one example out of many which show that a belief in the mind, if it is sufficiently deep seated, can act directly and almost instantaneously on the cells of the body, those cells of which every organ is built.

Do not be misled in this connexion by supposing that there is any particular magic in the practice of hypnotism. A patient under hypnotism does not cease to be a representative human being.

Certain conditions of normal life are changed, that is all. And the conditions of normal life must also be temporarily changed in the practice of faith-healing. What we have to learn is how to change them.

I know case, told to me by the doctor who was the ansesthetist, of a girl about to undergo a surgical operation for malformation of the foot.

The girl limped into the operation room, was put on the table, given an anaesthetic, and was then found to have been instantaneously cured of her deformity. The patient must have gone to the operating table

(continued from the previous page) happy in the firm belief that she was going to be cured and desiring that cure with every element of her personality.

These are just as much "faith-cures" in the general acceptance of the term as are those in which the action of a healer is involved.

At Lourdes, also, which has produced, over a period of many years, evidence beyond all criticism of many "miracles" still more marvellous than those I have just cited, there is no healer to whom we can attribute spiritual or "magnetic" powers.

Nearer home we have the example of the stationmaster who is popularly believed to have the power to cure cases of snake bite all over the south from where he is on receipt of telegraphic or other intimation.

The common factor in all is the condition of faith, an exalted belief amounting to certainty present in the mind of the patient. That belief, however, is exceedingly difficult to obtain especially among the educated.

I doubt if anyone can obtain it by the power of will. For the exercise of the will automatically sets up a reaction within the self which is absolutely fatal to the effect desired. No, the more simpleminded and credulous the individual, the better subject he, or she, is for faith-healing. The ideal state is that in which we have "faith as a little child."

It is for this reason that the healer with a powerful personality is able to effect so many cures. With all his experience behind him he has necessarily complete faith in his own ability to achieve striking results now and again; and the subject, impressed by the healer's personality, yields himself to it.

That yielding implies an act of submission, the submission of the intelligence and the critical judgment. And this, also, is unquestionably a necessary condition to the winning of that powerful emotional faith which makes the cure possible.

This also explains why a deep religious belief is responsible for the overwhelming majority of what we call "miracles." Those who have an unquestioning

(continued from the previous page) faith in the power of God should have no difficulty in believing that they can be instantaneously cured of any ill.

Unfortunately, even with them, there is often an obstacle interposed by their doubt as to whether it is God's will that they should be so cured. So it is necessary that we should believe not only in God's omnipotence but also in His compassion for our weakness, His readiness to help in this way

When I first became interested in this subject a few years ago I was as great a sceptic as any reader of this article may possibly be. But as a reasoning man I had to admit the facts. What we have now to do is to discover how to obtain the right conditions in which such cures are possible.

C. Pellizzi: "GENTILE'S IDEALISM AND RELIGION." @@

Positivism had an influence on Italian thought, an influence not perhaps easy to be detected and defined in our days, but certainly very lasting and deep. It was a theology without God, a sort of crusade against the Catholic Church (also prompted by the political motives of those times), and, as such, it brought a large majority of the educated class of the country to free itself from all dogmatic and traditional ideas about religion.

The original spiritual motive of Croce was therefore chiefly of a philologic nature, and he first came to philosophy because he could not otherwise make his own philology clear and conclusive to himself. Given a definite subject of intellectual work, to which Croce had set himself, he felt that the existing conceptions did not provide him with any definite principle judgment, or with any clear system of values. He had to do this work by himself, and he did it. His task was there, prompted by the special work he was interested in; his intellectual interest was confined to that task, such as it happened to be. Philosophy, therefore, means to him clearing away absurdities and superficialities, bringing precision and neatness of thought into the dark and dusty regions of the mind, putting order among clear and definite concepts. Religion has no special place in such a spiritual world; the mind is a kingdom that suffers neither alternatives nor rival

(continued from the previous page) powers; whatever falls within its borders belongs to it; all that may be imagined to be outside is nonsense or irrelevance. Of course, by mind he does not mean the brain or the nervous system, nor the human individuals as such.

Everybody is a philosopher, and some kind of philosophy is implicit in all acts of the mind; philosophy itself lives and changes through the motion and change of life., of our consciousness of life. Croce's personal distrust (though this word may be somewhat exaggerated in the case) of all types of professional philosophers is nowadays one of the popular features of his personality. Philosophy, he would say, cannot be the Privilege of any definite set of persons; it is not a sect which can have its priests and its liturgy.

He attaches to the word mysticism a most general meaning, and says that the so-called "religious experience" falls within its borders. For, either the principles and teachings of religious life are very clear and definite, and then they belong to history, they are history, and our consciousness of them is nothing but a philosophical one (and, therefore, having nothing transcendental about it); or else they are not clear and definite, but mere shadows or embryos of experience, and we cannot speak of them as data of the mind. They are only such experiences as our dreams consist of; they are definite and unquestionable experiences for us, but they are dreams.

Thinking along Croce's lines, one would say that religion and its problems are confined to the field of the "pratica." Religion is a matter of will; it is generally an arresting and impressive way of imposing moral and ethical canons on the people; its dogmas are the result of numberless accumulated experiences of practical life. Religion may also be a social substitute for that "will of the universal" which is the essence of morals, and can work well with all those who are not strong and broadminded enough to feel and find out the universals by themselves. But the aim of every self-conscious

(continued from the previous page) mind ought to be to set itself free from such an indirect and fictitious way of facing its own moral responsibilities in life. If God is to be the all-embracing spirit of things and life, then He exists and is the most certain of things. He is mind itself. And all of us are immortals, in so far as we are conscious and self-conscious; for death itself comes within the range of our experience, and it may only mean anything to us as such; history, then, never drops any of our deeds, but gives them an everlasting effect; for the world is all full and continuous, and nothing can be lost in it. A Church will then be the community of all believers in a definite practical creed, of all those who want to submit themselves entirely men of a splendid morality; yet Croce does not conceal that, to him, the perfect moral man is the man who draws all his canons out of his own consciousness and reason.

As Gentile's chief concern is that the minds of men should be entirely conscious of their own creativeness and therefore of their all-inclusive responsibility, he finds a progress towards this end in all those doctrines which aim at ridding us of intellectualism, or of any conception that draws a sharp division between knowledge and what has to be known, or between consciousness (or knowledge) and will. He finds that Christian inspiration has been a turning point in the history of the mind, because it has made men participants of divine power and perfection, and it has suggested that such power and perfection, are not in a definite place, but everywhere, and always in the making.

The mind that gives rise to an overchanging infinity of forms must be a unique activity; being one and active, it must ever go forward, it must ever aim at a realization of itself which stands beyond its actual completed attainments, its own actual (circular and self-enclosed) self-consciousness. To the mind there must always be, and there always is, a "something else" that has to be attained, or constructed, or reduced within the limits of clear and definite self-consciousness. There is always an ideal

(continued from the previous page) which has to be carried into practice: and one may very well say that such everlasting and everchanging ideal is God.

The objective idea of God, therefore, as any definite conviction of ours, has to live through our experiences and actions, in order not to become a lifeless and empty abstraction; it has to stand the continuous dialectic test of concreteness. This amounts to saying that it has to be an actual source of actions, an actual impulse.

The mind first creates its own limits, then overcomes them, and so realizes its own liberty. Every liberty has its boundary, but beyond every single boundary we must look for a greater liberty. In the same way, nature is always to our actions a limit, which we frame from time to time according to the actual powers and breath of our consciousness; but there is a divine inspiration peculiar to the mind, which compels it to try and get always beyond that limit; such inspiration will be the basis of human action both in ethics and science, and, taken in itself and isolated in its abstractness, it is the object of the religious man's worship; viz., of the worship of any real man.

Gentile would admit that there are, in a sense, such things as revelation and grace, but would be firm that they come from within; there is no revelation of anything existing out of the world of mind, and there is no grace coming from outside our moral conscience. It would urge further that the tradition of Catholic thought is all against revelation and grace from within, because an "outside world in itself" has always been admitted till recent times. Catholic writers thought that moral principles of religion, having to be founded on the most solid ground, must have their foundations on the existing world in itself, and not on the wanderings and psychologic adventures of subjectivity as such. But if the Ego is no longer for as the mere source and basis of intellect and egoism, but simply the concrete home and milieu of all "transcendental aims of life," then revelation and grace may come to us, from

(continued from the previous page) within, much in the same sense, and with the same moral significance, as for the Catholic theologians they used to come from without.

Albert A. Cock: "PRAYER: PSYCHOLOGICALLY AND METAPHYSICALLY CONSIDERED."@@

Vocal prayers assist in forming habits of recollection, special devotions or litanies assist in developing the power of concentration, and systematic meditations are forms of mental prayer, discursive or compressed in which memory, imagination, intellect, emotion and will are all successively or concurrently engaged and exercised, with whatever bodily postures and control of breathing may be prescribed by the director or found serviceable by the meditator.

All such states are supernatural in character; are, in differing degrees, contemplative, as frequently for awhile in opposition to or hindered by discursive or directed thinking (the opposition is technically known as the *ligature*), and culminate in union, ecstasy and spiritual marriage. The prayer of quiet (St. Teresa's fifty "mansion") comes at first spasmodically and is subject to distractions—"the soul had died to this world, to live more than ever in God." The state called spiritual marriage, consummated union or deification is described in St. Teresa's seventh mansion. In this state the ecstatic excitation disappears and an almost permanent union (deification) is formed so that activity and abiding contemplation now aid one another; *ligature* has disappeared. There is also in the spiritual marriage a high degree of consciousness of God's compresence.

The *ligature*, however, is a phenomenon of extreme psychological interest and it needs a fuller reference here. It is described by St. Teresa (Relations and sixth "Mansion"), by St. John of the Cross (annotations to his poems), by Blossius, by Blessed Margaret Mary, by Bossuet and others. The term *ligature* does not signify suppression of the understanding or even of the will, but rather interruption of these faculties in their ordinary application, diversion God wards and rivetting there to. "One thing only can be done; to receive what God gives. We are bound with regard

@@ Aristotelian Society, Proceedings, 1923-24.

(continued from the previous page) to all beside." St. Catherine of Siena could not complete the Lord's Prayer without falling into a trance; for Blessed Mary of the Incarnation the divine attraction was so great that, at the age of twenty-two, she could neither continue in reading nor say a single Ave without difficulty; Blessed Margaret Mary used every effort to escape from this state but in vain, St. Teresa says that some people cannot discourse as they did before.

Poulain gives three rules of conduct in regard to the ligature: (1) not to attempt violently to produce the obstructed acts; (2) to accept those acts which are practicable (thus avoiding quietism); (3) to utilize to the full the moments when the ligature is less binding, less obstructive, i.e., when released, even for a transient spell, hasten to acts of vocal discursive, reflective prayer of worship. These rules, he says, enables us to reconcile the powerlessness of the mystic state with the duty of honouring and loving our Lord.

But in Buddhism, according to Sir Charles Eliot, meditation ranks above sacrifice and prayer. It is an effort the object of which is isolation or detachment and calm. In its early stages meditation is aided by the strict observance of the eight-fold way including regulation of the breath, bodily postures, and retraction of the senses. In its later stages, concentration upon an object leads to identity therewith, rising to a trance. Attainment of miraculous powers sometimes follows, and emancipation from the world is made permanent by death. Eliot finds in this a strong affinity to aesthetic contemplation. The dark night of the soul, so prominent in some Western mystics, is he thinks, much less so in the East but it is known and recorded in poetry. On the other hand there appears to be a great likeness between the spiritual marriage described by St. Teresa and the *pratibha* or sudden illumination of Eastern mystics, and corresponding to the locutions and revelations of mystical prayer in the West are the "heavenly music," "thought reading" and *iddhi* or marvels of Buddhist meditation in its more exalted forms. The remembrance of previous lives and

Albert A. Cock: "PRAYER: PSYCHOLOGICALLY AND METAPHYSICALLY
CONSIDERED."

(continued from the previous page) of others, has, however, no parallel in Christian ecstasy and locutions.

Philosophers in their metaphysical speculations closely scrutinize fundamental concepts in everyday use, as time, space, cause, effect, substance, attribute. I ask myself why it is that prayer does not equally attract their scrutiny? Is not the practice world-wide, is it not abiding, century after century, is it not a fundamental notion however crudely expressed and practised in any religion? Why should it be left to the sociologist to observe in its rawer manifestations and for the psychologist to describe from his own or recorded experience?

Claud Field: "MYSTICS AND SAINTS OF ISLAM".

How great was the influence exercised in general by those ideas for which Hellaj died a martyr's death we learn most clearly from the pages of Ghazzali, who wrote not quite two hundred years later. He says: "The speculations of the Sufis may be divided into two classes: to the first category belong all the phrases about love to God and union with Him, which according to them compensate for all outward works. Many of them allege that they have attained to complete oneness with God; that for them the veil has been lifted; that they have not only seen the Most High with their eyes, but have spoken with Him, and go so far as to say "The Most High Spoke thus." They wish to imitate Hellaj, who was crucified for using such expressions, and justify themselves by quoting his saying, "I am the Truth." They also refer to Abu Yazid Bistamy, who is reported to have exclaimed, "Praise be to me!" instead of "Praise be to God!" This kind of speculation is extremely dangerous for the common people, and it is notorious that a number of craftsmen have left their occupation to make similar assertions. Such speeches are highly popular, as they hold out to men the prospect of laying aside active work with the idea of purging the soul through mystical ecstasies and transports. The common people are not slow to claim similar rights for themselves and to catch up wild and whirling expressions. As

(continued from the previous page) regards the second class of Sufi speculation, it consists in the use of unintelligible phrases which by their outward apparent meaning and boldness attract attention, but which on closer inspection prove to be devoid of any real sense."

These words of the greatest thinker among the Muhammadans at that time afford us a deep insight into the remarkable character of the period.

In the endeavour to break through the narrow bounds which confine the human spirit pious and credulous natures are only too easily led astray.

The net result of these strivings has been an endless series of self-delusions, and yet humanity takes on a grander aspect in them than in all its other manifold efforts and successes.

Whose minds are closed to everything except God. Such and one is wholly denuded of self, so that he no longer knows his own experiences and practices, and, as though with senses sealed, sinks into the ocean of the contemplation of God. This condition the Sufis characterise as self-annihilation (Fana).

But he who is bereft of self-consciousness is none the less aware of what is without him; it is as if his consciousness were withdrawn from everything but the one object of contemplation, i.e. God. While he who is completely absorbed in the contemplation of the object seen is as little capable of theorising regarding the act of contemplation as regarding the eye, the instrument of sight, or the heart, the seat of joyful emotion. Just in the same way a drunken man is not conscious of his intoxication, so he who is drowned in joy knows nothing of joy itself, but only knows what causes it.

Rabia, The Woman Sufi: On one occasion she was asked, "Does thou see Him Whom thou servest?" "If I did not see Him," she said, "I would not serve Him."

Once when Rabia had immured herself for a long while in her house without coming forth, her

(continued from the previous page) servant said to her, "Lady, come forth out of this house and contemplate the works of the Most High." "Nay," said Rabia, "enter rather into thyself and contemplate His work in thyself."

'Thou knowest well, O Hasan, that the Most High gives daily bread even to those who do not worship Him; how then will He not give it to those whose hearts are aglow with love to Him?'

One day Abdul Wahid and Sofian Tsavri went to see Rabia in her illness. They were so touched by the sight of her weakness that for some moments they could not speak a word. At last Sofian said, "O Rabia, pray that the Lord may lighten thy sufferings." "O Sofian", she answered, "who has sent me these sufferings?" "The Most High," he said. "Very well," she replied, "if it is his will that this trial come upon me, how can I, ignoring His will, ask Him to remove it?"

One of the learned theologians of Basra, once visiting Rabia, began to enlarge upon the defects of the world. "You must be very fond of the world", said Rabia, "for if you were not, you would not talk so much about it He who really intends to buy something keeps on discussing it. If you were really disentangled from it, what would you care about its merits or its faults?"

Rabia died A.D. 752, and was buried near Jerusalem. Her tomb was a centre of pilgrimage during the Middle Ages.

Ibrahim Ben Adham: "When I saw my son," he answered, "my paternal tenderness was aroused. But immediately I heard a voice, 'What, Ibrahim! Dost thou pretend attachment to Us while all the while thy heart is engaged with another person? How can two loves coexist in one heart?' On hearing this, I prayed to the Lord and said, 'O my God, if my love to this child makes Thee withdraw from me, take his soul or mine.' My prayer was heard, and He has taken the soul of my son."

Fudhayl Ben Azaz: Sofian Tsavri relates the following anecdote. "One night I was talking with Fudhayl, and after we had been conversing on all kinds of subjects, I said to him, 'What a pleasant evening we have

(continued from the previous page) had, and what interesting conversation.' 'No', he said, 'neither the evening nor the conversation have been good.' 'Why so?' I remarked. 'Because,' he said, 'you sought to speak words which might please me, and I sought to answer so as to gratify you. Both of us, pre-occupied with our talk, had forgotten the Most High. It would be better for each of us to sit still in his place and to lift up his heart towards God.' "

A stranger coming to Fudhayl one day was asked by the latter for what purpose he came. "I have come," he answer, "to talk with you, and to find in so doing calm of mind," "That is to say," broke in Fudhayl, "you wish to mislead me with lies, and desire me to do the same to you. Be off about your business."

Bayazid Bastami: One day the thought crossed Bayazid's mind that he was the greatest Sufi of the age. But no sooner had it done so, than he understood it was an aberration on his part. "I rose immediately," he said, "and went some way into the desert of Khorassen, where I sat down. I took then the resolution of not moving from the spot where I was seated till the Lord should send me someone who would make me see myself as I really was. I waited thus for three days and three nights. On the fourth night a rider on a camel approached. I perceived on his countenance the marks of a penetrating mind. He halted, and, fixing his eyes on me, said. "Take care, O Bayazid, to place a curb on thy heart, and not to forget the road; else shalt thou infallibly perish."

One day, when Bayazid was walking along the road, a young man who followed him closely, setting his feet in his tracks, said to him, "Tear off a piece of thy cloak and give it me, in order that thy blessing may rest upon me." Bayazid answered, "Although thou strip Bazazid of his skin and clothe thyself with it, it will profit thee nothing, unless thou reproduce the actions of Bayazid."

Zu'n Nun of Egypt: Ibn Khalliqan, the historian, calls Zu'n Nun "the first person of his age for learning, devotion and communion with the Divinity." His father, who was a native of Nubia, was a slave, enfranchised and adopted by the tribe of Koraish. (Z.N. investigated inside the Pyramid: P.B.)

Zu'n Nun related once the following. "when I was making the circuit of the Kaaba, I saw a man with a pale face and emaciated frame. I said to him, Dost thou really love Him? Yes, he answered, Does the friend come near thee? Yes, assuredly, Is He kind to thee? Yes, certainly. What! I exclaimed, the Friend approaches thee, He is kind to thee, and look at the wretched state of thy body." He replied, Simpleton! Knowest thou not that they whom the Friend approaches most nearly, are the most severely tried? "(Z.N. delayed into ancient Egyptian occultism: p.o.2)

He died 860 A.D., and his tomb is still an object of popular veneration at Cairo.

Mansur Hallaj: (D 922 A.D.) Mansur himself however was of an enthusiastic temperament, and took no pains to guard his language. One of his extraordinary utterances, "I am the truth," led at last to his execution, "the Truth" being one of the recognised names of God in Muhammadan nomenclature.

Ghazzali, shelters Hellaj from the charge of blasphemy by construing his exclamation "I am the Truth" in a pantheistic sense, and excuses it by ascribing it to an excess of love to God and to mystic ecstasy. In another place he says:

The first veil between God and His servant is His servants soul. But the hidden depth of the human heart is divine and illuminated by light from above; for in it is mirrored the eternal truth completely, so that it encloses the universe in itself. Now when a man turns his gaze on his own divinely illumined heart he is dazzled by the blaze of its beauty, and the expression "I am God!" easily escapes him. If from this stage he does not advance further in knowledge, he often falls into error and is ruined. It is as though he had allowed himself to be misled by a little spark from the light-ocean of Godhead instead of pressing forward to get more light. The

(continued from the previous page) ground of this self-deception is that he in whom the Supernatural is mirrored confuses himself with it. So the colour of a picture seen in a mirror is sometimes confounded with the mirror itself.

He is said to have taught the doctrine of the incarnation of the Godhead in a man and to have uttered the exclamation:

"Praise to the Most High Who has revealed His humanity and concealed the overpowering splendour of His Deity. Whoso purifies himself by abstinence and purges himself from every trace of fleshiness, unto him the Spirit of God enters, as it entered into Jesus. When he has attained to this degree of perfection, whatever he wills, happens, and whatever he does is done by God.

Ibn Ata sent someone to say to him, "O Sheikh, withdraw what you said, so that you may escape death." "Nay, rather he who sent you to me should ask forgiveness," replied Mansur.

On his son asking of him a last piece of advice "While the people of the world," he said, "spend their energies on earthly objects, do thou apply thyself to a study, the last portion of which is worth all that men and Jinn can produce—the study of truth."

When they cut off his hands, he laughed and said, "To cut off the hands of a fettered man is easy, but to sever the links which bind me to the Divinity would be a task indeed."

Habib Ajami: Hasan then asked Habib how he had arrived at such a high degree of sanctity. "I spend my time," he said, "in purifying my heart, while you spend yours in blackening paper" (Hasan having written many theological works).

Avicenna (Ibn Sina): When he was sixteen years of age, physicians of the highest eminence came to him for instruction and to learn from him these modes of treatment which he had discovered by his practice. But the greater portion of his time was given to the study of logic and philosophy. "When I was perplexed about any question," he says in an autobiographical fragment, "I went to the mosque and

(continued from the previous page) prayed God to resolve the difficulty. At night I returned home; I lit the lamp, and set myself to read and write. When I felt myself growing tired and sleepy I drank a glass of wine, which renewed my energy, and then resumed reading. When finally I fell asleep I kept dreaming of the problems which had exercised my waking thoughts, and as a matter of fact often discovered the solution of them in my sleep."

Avicenna presented the rare spectacle of a philosopher discharging the functions of a statesman, without injury to either statesmanship or philosophy. His great physical energy enabled him to spend the day in the service of the Sultan and a great part of the night in philosophical discussions with his disciples.

He derives his origin from a Being higher than himself, Who is always awake and has no need of repose.

The bad companions of man which hinder his intellectual progress are unregulated imagination, irascibility and carnal concupiscence. Death alone delivers him and transports him to the celestial country of true repose.

The man who is refreshed by the flowing waters of philosophy will grasp the scheme of the universe without losing himself in the confusion of details; he will scale the heights of science (the encircling mountain of Kaf) without being held back by worldly entanglements.

A few days before his death Omar Khayyam was reading in the "Shifa" of Avicenna the chapter treating of the One and of the Many.

Al Chazzali: Intimately acquainted with all the learning of his time, he was not only one of the numerous oriental philosophers who traverse every sphere of intellectual activity, but one of those rarer minds whose originality is not crushed by their learning.

The more earnest spirits, weary of the political confusions of the time, devoted themselves all

(continued from the previous page) the more fervently to cultivating the inner life, in which they sought compensation and refuge from outward distractions.

"By the fear of God," he says, "I do not mean a fear like that of women when their eyes swim and their hearts beat at hearing some eloquent religious discourse, which they quickly forget and turn again to frivolity. There is no real fear at all. He who fears a thing flees from it, and he who hopes for a thing strives for it, and the only fear that will save thee is the fear that forbids sinning against God and instils obedience to Him. Beware of the shallow fear of women and fools, who, when they hear of the terrors of the Lord, say lightly, 'We take refuge in God,' and at the same time continue in the very sins which will destroy them. Satan laughs at such pious ejaculations. They are like a man who should meet a lion in a desert, while there is a fortress at no great distance away, and when he sees the ravenous beast, should stand exclaiming, 'I take refuge in that fortress,' without moving a step towards it. What will such an ejaculation profit him? In the same way, merely ejaculating 'I take refuge in God' will not protect thee from the terrors of His judgment unless thou really take refuge in Him."

"The proper work of reason is to confess the truth of inspiration and its own impotence to grasp what is only revealed to the prophets; reason takes us by the hand and hands us over to the prophets, as blind men commit themselves to their guides, or as the desperately sick to their physicians. Such are the range and limits of reason; beyond prophetic truth it cannot take a step.

"Another man giving himself out as a Sufi said that he had attained to such a high pitch of proficiency in Sufism that for him religious practice was no longer necessary. An Ismailian said, 'Truth is very difficult to find, and the road to it is strewn with obstacles; so-called proofs are mutually contradictory, and the speculations of philosophers cannot be trusted. But we have an Imam (leader) who is

(continued from the previous page) an infallible judge and needs no proofs. Why should we abandon truth for error?' A fifth said, 'I have studied the subject, and what you call inspiration is really a high degree of sagacity. Religion is intended as a restraint on the passions of the vulgar. But, I who do not belong to the common herd, what have I to do with such stringent obligations? I am a philosopher; science is my guide, and dispenses me from submission to authority.' If we further ask them why they drink wine, which is absolutely prohibited in the Koran, they say, "The only object of the prohibition of wine was to prevent quarreling and violence. Wise men like ourselves are in no danger of such excesses, and we drink in order to brighten and kindle our imaginative powers.'

"Such is the faith of these pretended Moslems and their example has led many astray who have been all the more encouraged to follow these philosophers because their opponents have often been incompetent."

Although intensely in earnest, he was diffident of his powers as a preacher, and in a surviving letter says, "I do not think myself worthy to preach; 'When is the stick crooked and the shadow straight?' And God revealed to Jesus (upon whom be peace). Preach to thyself, then if thou acceptest the preaching, preach to mankind, and if not, be ashamed before Me."

Suhrawardy. Heretical books were suppressed by stronger measures than being placed on the Index. To express views openly at variance with the established religion was to imperil one's life. The Persian Sufis, therefore, who in their mystical works generally used Arabic, veiled their views in a sort of technical language which was quite unintelligible to the uninitiated.

The Sheikh Suhrawardy, who was a martyr to his convictions, must be regarded as the chief representative of this freethinking tendency in Sufism. He founded a sect who bore the name Ishrakiyya—"The Illumined." For them he composed a work, "Hikmat al Ishrak," i.e., "The philosophy of illumination," containing mystical and fantastic teaching. In Aleppo, where he finally took up his abode, he seems to have exercised a powerful influence on Prince Malik Zahir,

(continued from the previous page) the son of the famous Saladin. The orthodox party persuaded the latter to pass sentence of death on him as a heretic. Suhrawardy is said when he heard the sentence, to have quoted a Persian verse:

"It is not worth while to draw the sword."

By his own consent, he was then shut up in a separate chamber and deprived of meat and drink till he passed into the world for which he longed. His tomb is still preserved in Aleppo.

The following is an abridged translation of the preface to the "Hikmat al Ishrak": "Leng have ye, O Worthy friends and companions—may God protect you.' —prayed me to write for you a book wherein I should describe what has been revealed to me by way of inspiration in my lonely contemplations and soul-combats.

"The complete mastery of both philosophic and theosophic science is found in one man, this man is the representative of God on earth. Failing such a person, the title devolves on him who is complete in theosophy, though he may be mediocre in philosophy. Failing him, the representative of God is he who is complete in theosophy without possessing any philosophy at all. There never fails to be in the world one great theosophist."

"It is nobler to aim at a high attainment at theosophy and philosophy alike than to confine one's effort to one or the other. This book is intended for those who devote themselves to both, and not to the latter only; in it we address ourselves only to the untrammelled thinker in the reign of theosophy; the lowest step which the reader of it should have attained, if he would derive any benefit there from, is at any rate to have felt a flash of the divine light reach him, and in some measure to have made it his own. Whoever merely wishes to study philosophy, let him attend the school of the Peripatetics; for that purpose it is good and sufficient. Just as we form certain sense-perceptions and recognise their conditions with certainty, and base further scientific investigations upon them, so in the spiritual realm we form certain perceptions

(continued from the previous page) and build upon them; but he who does not adopt this method, understands nothing of philosophy."

"Know that souls in whom the heavenly illuminations are lasting, reduce the material world to obedience. Their supplication is heard in the Upper World, and fate has already decreed that the supplication of such a person for such an object should be heard. The light which streams from the highest world is the Elixir of power and knowledge and the world obeys it. In the purified souls is reproduced a reflex of God's light, and a creative ray is focussed in them."

Jalaluddin Rumi: The reed flute is one of the principal instruments in the melancholy music which accompanies the dancing of the Mevlevi dervishes. It is a picture of the Sufi or enlightened man, whose life is, or ought to be, one long lament over his separation from the Godhead, for which he yearns till his purified spirit is re-absorbed into the Supreme Unity. We are here reminded of the words of Novalis, "Philosophy is, properly speaking, home sickness;"

Though a pantheist, Jalaluddin lays great stress on the fact of man's sinfulness and frailty and on the personality of the Devil, as in the following lines:-

"Many a net the Devil spreads, weaving snare on snare, We, like foolish birds, are caught captive unaware; From one net no sooner free, straightway in another We are tangled, fresh defeats aspirations smother;.....Help us then, O Lord! What with gin and trap and snare, pitfall and device, How shall we poor sinners reach Thy fair paradise?"

However much individual Sufis may have fallen into Antinomianism and acted as if there was no essential difference between good and evil, the great Sufi teachers have always enjoined self-mortification, quoting the saying, "Die before you die."

As Ghazzali had done before him, Jalaluddin sees in the phenomena of sleep a picture of the state of mind which should be cultivated by the true Sufi, "dead to this world and alive to God":-

"Every night, O God, from the net of the body
 Thou releasest our souls and makest them like blank tablets;
 Every night thou releasest them from their cages
 And settest them free: none is master or slave.
 At night the prisoners forget their prisons,
 At night the monarchs forget their wealth:
 No sorrow, no care, no profit, no loss,
 No thought or fear of this man or that.
 Such is the state of the Sufi in this world,
 Like the seven sleepers he sleeps open-eyed,
 Dead to worldly affairs, day and night,
 Like a pen held in the hand of his Lord."

The work of man in this world is to polish his soul from the rust of concupiscence and self-love, till, like a clear mirror, it reflects God. To this end he must bear patiently the discipline appointed:-

"If though takest offence at every rub,
 How wilt thou become a polished mirror?

He must choose a "pir," or spiritual guide who may represent the Unseen God for him; this guide he must obey and imitate not from slavish compulsion but from an inward and spontaneous attraction, for though it may be logically inconsistent with Pantheism, Jalaluddin is a thorough believer in free-will. Love is the keynote of all his teaching, and without free-will love is impossible.

Sharani: The doctrine of the Sufis attached no importance to any of the formalities of the ceremonial law, the strict observation of which was considered by the orthodox as binding on every good Moslem. Thus, the reading of the Koran, with rhythmical intonation, as practised in every mosque, had in their eyes no value. To adore God with a pure heart, according to them, was infinitely more important than all outward observances.

Such ideas could not be acceptable to the Ulemas, who saw the absolute authority in religious matters slipping from their hands. Only a moderate power of perception was needed to understand what dangers for the official hierarchy lurked in the ideas

(continued from the previous page) of these enthusiasts who claimed to derive divine wisdom from a source so different to that of which the Ulemas believed themselves to be the sole dispensers.

It is true that Arab mysticism had never taken such a bold flight as Persian theosophy, which proclaimed openly a Pantheistic system, in which the authority of the books revealed to different prophets was displaced by a poetic belief. According to this faith, the universe was an emanation of God, the human soul a spark of the Divine Essence gone astray in this transitory world, but destined to return finally to God, after having been purified of its earthly stains. The Arab Sufis did not go so far; for them the Koran was always the Word of God, and Muhammed was His prophet. They conformed externally to the precepts of Islam, but claimed at the same time to understand God and His law better than the theologians, and that not by the study of large volumes of exegesis and traditions, but by celestial inspiration. The orthodox mullahs understood the danger, and did not conceal their growing irritation against these audacious heretics. The government and the great majority of Moslems were on the side of the Ulema, but the mystics found sympathy among the people, and their ideas spread with incredible rapidity.

In the eleventh century, a man of great ability, of whom the Muhammadans are justly proud, made a vigorous effort to reconcile orthodox Islam with the Sufi doctrines current in his time. This man was Ghazzali. He consecrated the labour of a lifetime to this task, and his chief work, "The Revival of the Religious Sciences," is a veritable encyclopaedia of Islam. He did not work in vain, but succeeded in erecting a system in which dogmatic theology is cleverly combined with the theosophy of the Arab school of mysticism.

The reconciliation, however, of the mystics with the theologians was only apparent, and could not be otherwise. At the bottom of the question

(continued from the previous page) there were two incompatible principles. For the theologians the letter of the Koran and written tradition contained all religious knowledge. For the mystics the dead letter was nothing, and the inspiration of their own hearts was the sole source of all knowledge. Of these two principles, one subordinates reason to tradition and tends to the almost complete abdication of thought in favour of absolute faith; the other results in enthroning imagination, spiritual hallucination and mystic ecstasy.

Egypt has always been a soil favourable to the development of mystic tendencies. Christian asceticism took early root there, and during the first centuries of our era thousands of anchorites inhabited the deserts of the Thebaid, and carried on there religious exercises of extreme austerity. We do not know what secret connection may exist between the climate of the valley of the Nile and the character of its inhabitants, but if the Arab chroniclers deserve any credit, Arab mysticism originated in this country. The celebrated theosophist Zu'l Noun is known as the first who introduced into Islam visions and mystic ecstasies. Some centuries later the famous poet Omar Ibn Farish saw the light at Cairo, and since then Egypt has produced a long series of Muhammadan ascetics more or less famous. Sharani is one of the last of this theosophic school of Egypt, the doctrines of which he expounds in his numerous works. His memory is religiously preserved at Cairo, where a mosque still bears his name. The natives revere his memory as that of a saint.

He felt deeply the general uneasiness of the time; he understood that Islam was entering a period of decadence, but he had, as far as we can see, no clear plan for its regeneration. Mysticism, in which he was such a fervent adept, here hindered him. But this mystical tendency, which was in one respect his weakness, was his glory in another.

As a religious reformer, Sharani endeavoured to restore Islam to its primitive unity. Many sects existed in its from the earliest times four of which

(continued from the previous page) preserved the title of orthodox. Sharani sought to unite these sects on a common basis, and numerous passages in his writings attest that this idea remained with him all his life. His efforts apparently had no success, but for those who have faith in the power of ideas, it is certain that Sharani has not lived in vain.

He belonged to the order of the Shadiliyah dervishes, and that his instructor in mysticism was the Egyptian Sufi, Ali Khawass. He died at Cairo, A.D. 1565.

Mullah Shah: Mullah Shah was born A.D. 1584, in the village of Erkesa in Badakshan, a mountainous and inaccessible country to the north of the Indian Caucasus. His family, which was of Mongol origin, held a certain position, and his grandfather had been judge of the village. At the age of twenty-one the young man quitted his relatives and his country, and went back to Balk, then a centre of learning in Central Asia. He made great progress there, especially in the knowledge of Arabic. After some time he left Balkh, and turning his steps southward, arrived at Kashmir, where he continued his studies, but an irresistible thirst after truth made him feel the necessity of seeking a spiritual guide, and he resolved to go to Lahore, where there lived a celebrated saint, Sheikh Mian Mir.

The reception he met with was not favourable. Mian Mir at first repulsed him, but allowed himself at last to be overcome by the perseverance of the young man, and taught him Sufi exercises according to the rule of the Qadiri order of dervishes. The stifling heat of Lahore did not suit the health of Mullah Shah, who accordingly resolved to spend the summers in Kashmir, returning to Lahore for the winter. He led this life for several years, till he had passed through all the stages of asceticism, but his spiritual guide would not lead him to the supreme goal of mystical science, which is termed "Union with God," or "knowledge of oneself."

Mian Mir only spoke to him of it in an enigmatic

(continued from the previous page) way and said, "Do not cease to study thyself and thine own heart, for they goal is in thyself."

In the year 1626 A.D. he returned again, as usual, from Lahore to Kashmir, and practised his austerities without relaxation, when one day, by the special favour of the Divinity, and without the assistance of any spiritual preceptor, "the desired image" revealed itself to him. By this expression is understood, in mystic phraseology, union with God, and the conception of Absolute Being, which is equivalent to the knowledge of one's self. When Mullah Shah thus attained the goal of his mystical aspirations he was in his forth-seventh year, and had been engaged twenty-seven years in the spiritual exercises of the Sufis. When he returned to Lahore, he informed his spiritual guide that he had attained union with God. The latter advised him not to divulge the fact, and not to give up his ascetic practices. In Kashmir Mullah Shah had collected round him a little circle of devoted disciples. The strong emotional condition into which Mullah Shah's new spiritual experience had brought him did not prevent him from doing his best not to offend against the religious law, and he was in the habit of saying to his friends, "Whoso does not respect the precepts of the religious law is not one of us."

Mullah Shah had always been of a retiring disposition, but in his present mood he carried his self-isolation so far that he closed the door of his house and only received his intimates at fixed times, when he dropped his habitual reserve. The spiritual power of Mullah Shah had become so great that every novice whom he caused to sit in front of him and to concentrate his mental faculties on his own heart, became clairvoyant to such a degree that his internal senses were unfolded, and the unseen world appeared to him.

Mullah Shah expressed himself in very bold terms regarding the manner with which he conceived God and His relation to humanity. Thus he said, "Since I have arrived at understanding the absolute Reality and that I know most positively that nothing

(continued from the previous page) exists besides God, existence and non-existence are in my eyes the same thing."

In the meantime the number of his adherents daily increased; persons of all classes in society became his adherents; even women became capable of mystical intuitions by the effect of his prayers and without having seen him. However, the increasing number of those who wished to approach him commenced to be inconvenient, and he said, "I am not a sheikh of dervishes who receives novices and builds convents."

"Neither the mosque nor the dervish-convent attract me,

But the purity of the desert and the freedom of the open country."

In the year 1634 A.D. a certain Mir Baki, a descendant of the prophet, attached himself to Mullah Shah, and experienced in a short time ecstatic states; he then preached the doctrine of union with God without any reserve. At the same time he claimed to be free from the precepts of the religious law. "Why should I pass my life sadly on in self-maceration and austerity? I prefer to anticipate now the delights which they speak of as belonging to the future life." This is epicureanism, pure and simple, such as we find it in the odes of Hafiz and the Quatrains of Omar Khayyam. When Mullah Shah heard of these extravagant utterances, he caused Mir Baki to be expelled from the town.

The friends of Mullah Shah were in despair, and used utmost endeavours to persuade him to fly. But he answered, "I am not an imposter that I should seek safety in flight; I am an utterer of truth; death and life are to me alike. Let my blood in another life also redden the impaling stake. I am living and eternal; death recoils from me, for my knowledge has vanquished death. The sphere where all colours are effaced has become my abode."

"Once," he added, "I used to bar the door of my house with a bolt in order not to be disturbed by anyone, but now I will leave it wide open, in order that whoever wishes to make me a martyr may enter at his pleasure."

Mullah Shah, thus awaited death in an attitude of imperturbable calm, but fate had decided otherwise.

No sooner had they been initiated into the mystical doctrines than they believed themselves privileged to dispense with the prescribed fast of Ramazan and the obligatory prayers, considering that the religious law no longer applied to them. Being informed of these irregularities, Mullah Shah prayed the governor to have them removed from the town.

One night, accompanied by a single servant named Mujahid, he left his palace and directed his steps towards the dwelling of Mullah Shah. The latter had in his courtyard an ancient plane-tree, and was in the habit of sitting at the foot of it during the night, lost in meditation. Having arrived at the house, the prince ordered his servant to wait near the door, and entered the courtyard alone. Seeing the Sheikh seated at the foot of the tree, he stopped and remained standing till the master should speak to him. The latter knew very well who the new-comer was, and that little persuasion was needed to make him one of his disciples; but he made as though he did not see him. A long time passed thus, till the Sheikh broke the silence by asking the Prince "Who art thou?" The Prince did not speak. Mullah Shah then said again, "Why dost thou not answer? Speak, and tell thy name."

The Prince, filled with embarrassment, replied, "My name is Dara-Shikoh." "Who is thy father?" "The Emperor Shah-jehan." "Why has thou come to see me?" "Because I feel drawn towards God, and seek for a spiritual guide." On this Mullah Shah exclaimed sharply, "What are emperors and princes to me? Know that I am a man devoted to asceticism. Is this hour of the night the time to come and trouble me? Go, and do not show thyself here a second time."

Deeply wounded by this reception, the Prince withdrew and re-entered his palace, where he spent the whole night weeping. But in spite of all his disappointment, he felt himself drawn the next night by an irresistible attraction towards the saint's dwelling, but the latter this time did not even condescend to speak to him. Mujahid, the servant who accompanied the Prince, became angry, and said to his

(continued from the previous page) master, "What miracles has this crabbed dervish shown you that you should come here every night and expose yourself to such indignities? Ordinary dervishes are cheerful folk, not uncivil and morose like this old man. For my own part, I set no great store by this asceticism, and the only thing that makes me uneasy is your putting faith in it." The Prince answered, "If Mullah Shah was an imposter, so far from treating me as he has done, he would, on the contrary, have prayed God to bring me to him. It is precisely his independent spirit and irritated manner which proves him to be an extraordinary man." That same night when Mujahid returned home, he was seized by fever and carried off in a few hours. Dara-Shikoh, when informed of this terrible event, was profoundly moved. He reproached himself bitterly for not having at once punished his servant's insolence, and considered the death of Mujahid as a divine punishment which menaced him also.

The Prince saluted the holy man with profound respect, and the latter bade him enter and be seated. The cell was lighted by a single lamp, whose wick was smoking; in his eager desire to discern the venerable features of the Sheikh, the Prince dressed the wick with his own fingers. This simple action gained him the Sheikh's affection. At the end of some days he bade him to blindfold himself, then he concentrated his attention upon him in such a way that the invisible world was revealed to the view of the Prince, who felt his heart filled with joy.

Dara-Shikoh had a sister, the Princess Fatimah, to whom he was deeply attached. As soon as he had become a disciple of Mullah Shah and his heart had been opened to the intuition of the spiritual world, he hastened to inform his sister. This news made such an impression on the mind of the Princess that she wrote to the Sheikh several letters full of humility and devotion. He read them all, but made no reply for more than a month, till he was convinced that Fatimah was animated by an invincible resolution. At last he accorded his sympathy to her also, and admitted her to the circle of the initiates. The Princess persevered

(continued from the previous page) ardently in these mystical studies, and received the instructions of her spiritual guide by correspondence. She attained to such perfection that she arrived at intuitive knowledge of God and union with Him. Although the Sheikh was full of affection for all his disciples, he had a particular regard for her, and was in the habit of saying that "she had attained to such extraordinary degree of knowledge that she was fit to be his successor."

Mullah Shah was now old and infirm; he had passed several winters at Lahore, surrounded by the care and attention of his friends and pupils. In the year 1655 A.D, the Emperor wrote to him to invite him to pass the winter with him at Shahjahanabad, his ordinary residence, but the Sheikh was beginning to suffer from weakness of the eyes, and did not feel strong enough to undertake the journey. For some years he remained in Kashmir, and would often say, "The theosophist ought to profit by length of life. My life is approaching its end; let us then enjoy our stay in Kashmir, and not leave it."

Round Mullah Shah gathered persons of every condition; poor peasants as well as princes were seized with the same enthusiasm for his doctrines; the same ascetic training produced the same results in the most varying temperaments. The Master seems to have exercised a kind of magnetic influence over his neophytes. He fixes his gaze upon them for a longer or shorter time, till their inward senses open and render them capable of seeing the wonders of the spiritual world. All the accounts are unanimous in this respect, and they carry such a stamp of sincerity that their veracity is indisputable.

Under the apparent stagnation of the East, there is continually going on a collision between two opposing forces—the official hierarchy of the Ulema, conservative to the core, and mysticism in its early phases, pietistic and enthusiastic, but gradually tending to scepticism, and finally to pantheism and the negation of all positive religion. The Mussalman hierarchy, which in its own interests desired to maintain the prestige of dogma and of the revealed law, combatted

(continued from the previous page) this tendency to mysticism, but, as we have seen, without success. The orthodox mullahs made fruitless efforts to obtain the condemnation of Mullah Shah, who had on his side the members of the imperial family of Delhi and the Emperor himself, all more or less imbued with mystical ideas.

Mullah Shah of ten insists that individual existence counts for nothing, and that nothing in reality exists outside of God, the Absolute Beings; every particular life dissolves in this universal unity, life and death are mere changes in the form of existence. The individual is only in some way a part of the Infinite Being who fills the universe; a particle which has been momentarily detached therefrom, only to return thither. To know oneself is therefore the equivalent of knowing God. But in order to acquire this knowledge the pupil must submit to long and painful self-discipline; he must pass through all the tests of the severest asceticism; only after he has thus prepared himself will the spiritual master open his heart and render him capable of perceiving the mysteries of the spiritual world.

But this great secret must not be divulged; it is only permissible to speak of it to the initiate, as Mullah Shah says, in the following verses;-

"We must say that only One exists,
Though such a saying excite astonishment;
The universe is He, though we must not say so openly,
Such doctrines must be kept secret."

The passage from atheism to epicureanism is not a long one. If the human soul only possesses a transient individuality, and after death is merged like a drop in the ocean of divinity, why, many will argue, not have done with asceticism for good, and enjoy the pleasures of existence as long as possible during the little while our individuality endures? A mocking cynicism has been, up to modern times, a common characteristic of the great majority of Sufis and dervishes. The dangerous consequences of theosophical ideas and of oriental spiritualism in general became at an early date so apparent that Ghazzali, although a fervent partisan of Sufism, did not hesitate

(continued from the previous page) to avow that if these doctrines were generally accepted society would necessarily fall into a state of anarchy.

It is indeed strange to see Prince Dara-Shikoh this son of a Muhammadan Emperor in a path strewn with pitfalls he kept a name without stain and without reproach, thanks to the austere moral principles instilled into him by his master. He faced death with calm resignation, and knew how to die as a prince and as a philosopher.

This transformation of a notional into a real belief has proved the crisis in the lives of many of the saints and mystics of Islam.

A third example is that of Ghazzali himself, who, in his work 'The Deliverance from Error', has left one of the very few specimens of Eastern religious autobiography, and one bearing a certain resemblance to Newman's *Apologia*. He was professor of theosophy at the University of Bagdad in the eleventh century. In his autobiographical he says: "Reflecting upon my situation, I found myself bound to this world by a thousand ties; temptations assailed me on all sides. I then examined my actions. The best were those relating to instruction and education; and even there I saw myself given up to unimportant sciences, all useless in another world. Reflecting on the aim of my teaching, I found it was not pure in the sight of the Lord. I saw that all my efforts were directed towards the acquisition of glory to myself." After this, as he was one day about to lecture, his tongue refused utterance; he was dumb. He looked upon this as a visitation from God, and was deeply afflicted at it. "My heart no longer made any resistance, but willingly renounced the glories and the pleasures of this world."

These four cases, the highwayman, the prince, the theologian, the poet, the sufficient to show that the Recognition (*anagnorisis*) and Revolution (*peripeteia*), to use Aristotle's phrase, which turns life from a chaotic dream into a well-ordered drama, of which God is the Protagonist, may receive as signal though not as frequent illustration in the territory of Islam as in that of Christianity.

(Footnote to above by P.B.) The order of Quadiriyah mystics to which Mulla Shan belonged was founded A.D. 1165 by Abdul Qadir Gilani, whose shrine is still a place of pilgrimage in Baghdad. Most of the Sunni Maulawis on the northwest frontier of India and many fishermen in Egypt are members of this order. They wear long hair, in memory of the usage of Muhammad but some tie it up under their turban so that it is not visible.

I have given an account of initiation into this order during the nineteenth century by Tawakkul Beg, from the Journal Asiatique, on page 463 of the present volume. It is, in the East, considered one of the most ancient and best reputed of mystic orders of ascetical Faqueers)

(continued from the previous page number 465) (See present vol. pp 463, 489 & 502 for Qadirya initiation)

Hughe's: "DICTIONARY OF ISLAM."

Sufis: The following is an succinct account of the doctrines of the Sufis:-

1. God only exists. He in all things, and all things in Him.
2. All visible and invisible beings are an emanation from Him, and are not really distinct from Him.
3. Religions are matters of indifference: they however serve as leading to realities. Some for this purpose are more advantageous than others, among which is al-Islam, of which Sufism is the true philosophy.
4. There does not really exist any difference between good and evil, for all is reduced to Unity, and God is the real Author of the acts of mankind.
5. It is God who fixes the will of man: man therefore is not free in his actions.
6. The soul existed before the body, and is confined within the latter as in a cage. Death, therefore, should be the object of the wishes of the Sufi, for it is then that he returns to the bosom of Divinity.
7. It is by this metempsychosis that souls which have not fulfilled their destination here below are purified and become worthy of reunion with God.

8. Without the grace of God, which the Sufis call Eayazanu'llah, or Fazlu'llah, no one can attain to this spiritual union, but this, they assert, can be obtained by fervently asking for it.

9. The principal occupation of the Sufi, whilst in the body, is meditation on the wahdaniyah, or Unity of God, the remembrance of God's names and the progressive advancement in the Tarqah, or journey of life, so as to attain unification with God.

Human life is likened to a journey (Safar), and the seeker after God to a traveller (salik).

The great business of the traveller is to exert himself and strive to attain that perfect knowledge (marifah) of God which is diffused through all things, for the Soul of man is an exile from its Creator, and human existence is its period of banishment.

Houses: The injunctions of Muhammad regarding the seclusion of women have very greatly influenced the plan and arrangement of Muhammadan dwelling-houses of the better class throughout the world, all respectable houses being so constructed as to seclude the female apartments from public view. In cities such as Cairo, Damascus, Delhi, Peshawur, and Cabul, the prevailing plan of dwelling-houses is an entrance through a blank wall, whose mean appearance is usually relieved by a handsome doorway and a few latticed windows. A respectable house usually consists of two courts, the first being that used by the male visitors and guests, and the inner court is the harim or zananah reserved for the female members of the family. Facing the outer court will be an upper chamber in which there will be a diwan, or raised seat or sofa, upon which the inmates can sit, eat or sleep. This is the usual reception room. Within the first enclosure will be the stables for horses and cattle, and its centre a raised dais as seats for servants and attendants. It should be noticed that there are no special bed-rooms in Eastern houses. Male visitors and friends will sleep in the verandahs of the outer court, or on the diwan in the upper court.

The harim or women's apartments in the inner court is entered by a small door. It is a quadrangle with verandahs on each of the four sides, formed by a row of pillars, the apertures of which are usually closed by sliding shutters. The back of the rooms being without windows, the only air being admitted from the front of the dwelling-place. The apartments are divided into long rooms, usually four, the extreme corners having small closets purposely built as storerooms. On festive occasions these verandah rooms will be spread with handsome carpets, carpets and pillows

(continued from the previous page) being almost the only furniture of an Eastern dwelling, chairs being a modern invention. The roofs of these rooms are flat, and as the top is fenced in with a barrier some four feet high, the female members of the household sleep on the top of the house in the hot weather.

In no point do Oriental habits differ more from European than in the use of the roof. Its flat surface, in fine weather the usual place of resort, is made useful for various household purposes. In a large court, of a wealthy person, there is usually a raised dais of either stone or wood, on which carpets are spread, and on which the ladies sit or recline. In the better class of dwellings, there are numerous courtyards, and special ones are devoted to winter and summer uses. In Peshawur, most respectable houses have an underground room, called a tahkhanah, where the inmates in the hot weather sleep at mid-day. These rooms are exceedingly cool and pleasant on hot sultry days.

Over the entrance door of a Muhammadan dwelling it is usual to put an inscription, either of the Kalimah, or Creed, or of some verse of the Qur'an.

Muhammad: Muhammad seems to have employed himself in such meditations as find expression in these Surahs, some years before he assumed the office of a divine teacher, for it was but slowly and by degrees that he was led on to believe that he was really called of God, to preach a reformation both to his own people and to all mankind.

Bewildered by his own speculations amidst uncertain flickerings of spiritual light, Muhammad spent some time in retirement, and in the agonies of distress repeatedly meditated suicide.

Ayishah relates; "The first revelations which the prophet of God received were in true dreams. He never dreamed but it came to pass as regularly as the dawn of day.

The first vision was followed by a considerable period, during which no further revelation was given and during which Muhammad suffered much mental depression.

"During this period," al-Bukhari says, "the Prophet was very sorrowful, so much so that he wished to throw himself from the top of a hill to destroy himself."

But after a lapse of time, as he was wrapped up in his garments and lay stretched upon his carpet the angel is said to have again addressed him.

"When Ayesha was questioned about Mahomet she used to say: 'He was a man just such as yourselves; he laughed often and smiled much.' But how would he occupy himself at home?' 'Even as any of you occupy yourselves.'" When seated with his followers, he would remain long silent at a time. "Mahomet hated nothing more than lying; and whenever he knew that any of his followers had erred in this respect, he would hold himself aloof from them until he was assured of their repentance." "He did not speak rapidly, running his words into one another, but enunciated each syllable distinctly, so that what he said was imprinted in the memory of every one who heard him. When at public prayers, it might be known from a distance that he was reading by the motion of his beard. He never read in a singing or chanting style; but he would draw out his voice, resting at certain places. Thus, in the prefatory words of a Sura, he would pause after bismillahi, after al Rahman, and again after al Rahim.

Qur'an: The Prophet was not allowed to remain in any error; if, by any chance, he had made a wrong deduction from any previous revelations, another was always sent to rectify it. This idea has been worked up to a science of abrogation, according to which some verses of the Quran abrogate others. Muhammad found it necessary to shift his stand-point more than once, and thus it became necessary to annul earlier portions of his revelation.

"Thus in various ways was the revelation made known to Muhammad."

Resignation: The literal meaning of Islam is a state or condition in which a believer becomes "resigned" to the will of God, a "Muslim" being one who is "resigned". But in the Qur'an, the grace of resignation is more frequently expressed by the word sabr,

(continued from the previous page) "patience", e.g. Surah i.150: "Give good tidings to the patient, who when there falls on them a calamity, say 'Verily we are God's and verily to Him do we return.'"

The word Taslim, which the compiler of the Kitabu'ts-Twrfat says means to place one's neck under the commands of God, seems to express the English word "resignation."

It occurs in the Quran Surah iv.68: "They submit with submission."

The author of the Akhlaq-i-Jalali says Taslim is to "Acquiesce in and receive with satisfaction (although, perhaps, repugnant to the inclination) the commands of God."

Sikhism: In the Adi Granth, we read:-

"In sleeping, the One; in walking, the One; in the One thou art absorbed." "Youth is passing, I am not afraid, if love to the Beloved does not pass"; and still more pointedly, "Full of sins I wander about; the world calls me a Darvesh";

The final incident in the life of this enlightened teacher is in precise accord with all that has been said of his former career. Nanak came to the bank of the Ravi to die—in conformity with Hindu custom—by the side of a natural stream of water. It is expressly said that both Hindus and Muslims accompanied him. He then seated himself at the foot of a Sarih tree, and his Assembly of the faithful (Sangat) stood around him. His sons asked him what their position was to be; and he told them to subordinate themselves to the Guru Angad whom he had appointed as his successor. They were to succeed to no power or dignity merely on the ground of relationship; no hereditary claim was to be recognized; on the contrary, the sons were frankly told to consider themselves non-entities. The words are: "Sons even the dogs of the Guru are not in want; bread and clothes will be plentiful; and should you mutter 'Guru! Guru!' (your) life will be (properly) adjusted."

"None, though he be very learned, will remain,
he hurries onwards.

He is a Qazi, by whom his own self is abandoned,
and the One Name is made his support."

The soul of man is held to be a ray of light from the Light Divine; and it necessarily follows that, in its natural state, the soul of man is sinless. The impurity, which only too apparent in man, is accounted for by the operation of what is called Maya, or Delusion; and it is this Maya which deludes creatures into egotism and duality, that is, into self-consciousness or conceit, and into the idea that there can be existence apart from the Divine. This delusion prevents the pure soul from freeing itself from matter, and hence the spirit passes from one combination of matter to another, in a long chain of births and deaths, until the delusion is removed, and the entrained ray returns to the Divine Light whence it originally emanated. The belief in metempsychosis is thus seen to be the necessary complement of pantheism; and it is essential to the creed of a Hindu, a Buddhist, and a Sufi.

In Sikhism, as in Buddhism the prime object of attainment is not Paradise; but the total cessation of individual existence. The method by which this release from transmigration is to be accomplished is by the perfect recognition of identity with the Supreme. When the soul fully realizes what is summed up in the formula so ham, "I am that," i.e. "I am one with that which was, and is, and will be," then emancipation from the bondage of existence is secured. This is declared by Nanak himself in the Adi Granth in these words —

"Should one know his own self as the so ham,
he believes in the esoteric mystery.
Should the disciple know his own self, what
more can he do, or cause to be done?"

The principles of early Sikhism give above are obviously too recondite for acceptance among masses of men; accordingly we find that the pantheistic idea of Absolute Substance became gradually changed into the more readily apprehended notion of a self-conscious Supreme Being, the Creator and Governor of the universe. Here Dr Trumpp himself admits the influence of Muhammadanism, when he says: "It is not improbable that the Islam had a great share in working silently these changes which are directly opposed to the teaching of the Gurus."

(continued from the previous page) has become the most backward in the world, and now look at them reading books in different languages and conversing on different serious subjects. Propaganda on paper is absurd. Hundreds of respectable people whose integrity cannot be questioned have testified that Soviet Russia as a great human experiment is succeeding at last.

Ouspensky: Finished late last night Ouspensky's Tertium Organon. The arrogance of the title at first repelled me, yet whetted my curiosity: Who was this man that dare bring out a third organon, after Aristotle and Bacon? But the book was overwhelming by its profundity of thought and lucid presentation. Ouspensky is a formidable mathematician who has turned mystic. Though connected with the Theosophists he has gone far beyond the mumbo jumbo of that society. He proves that there is anew kind of Man being evolved, one who has a more heightened consciousness and can move freely in the fourth dimension. As a passionate and serious lover of art, I am especially drawn to Ouspensky when he defines art as important in revealing a glimpse of reality.

Mysticism is not the monopoly of the chosen few, there are certain aspects of nature, for instance a spring day, or the first fall of snow, or resonant sunsets in autumn, that awaken in us a mood that makes us feel one with the universe. Even sex, as some of the Oriental mystics declare, can give one that exalted mystical oneness. Apart from such lucid and simple deductions, he brings in a lot of mathematics and physics that is beyond a layman. I wish some competent mathematician would review this serious book, written by one who is acknowledged a profound thinker, and whose intellectual integrity cannot be questioned.

Wassermann: Finished The World's Illusion by Jacob Wassermann, one of the greatest of novels.

Its beauty like all great writing is in the deepest sense moral, its morality beautiful.

In this book the hero Christian Wahnschaffe, rich and pampered, living a licentious life, has a sudden conversion while removing the shoe of a woman.

(continued from the previous page) In a flash the scales fall from his eyes, and he sees the vileness of his life. He renounces his old way of living and goes into the world, and lives amongst the most sordid specimens of humanity, returning good for evil, feeling a sense of responsibility for every deed done by his brothers. For Wassermann like Dostoievsky believed that man cannot be isolated from this world, that every sin or act of virtue committed by another is also his own.

This one theme of man's identity with all things in nature and man's individual responsibility for the whole of humanity is worked out with infinite variations. Wassermann was the spiritual conscience of Europe made articulate.

Fear of the machine: The most notable haters of the machine are Lawrence in the West and Gandhi in the East. I cannot understand it at all. As long as man is the master of the machine there is no fear. The machine was made for man, and not man for the machine.

It was Richard Aldington who speaking for the modern man "As for working, our machines can do that for us." And why not? The old biblical injunction of man labouring in the sweat of his brow is exploded. Both Gandhi and Lawrence, are atavistic in their thinking. There is no return. We cannot go back to nature or escape civilisation. Man must fulfil his destiny. Think of the arduous climb up from the depths and think what the first machine, probably the invention of the wheel, did for us.

It is time someone debunked this notion of the spirituality of the East and the materialism of the West, because one is machine-minded and the other is not. This spirituality of the East, which makes a slave of the human being pulling a rickshaw or doing other degrading kinds of labour, makes me sick. On the other hand it is the West which is spiritually minded when it shakes off the shackles of man wedded to sordid labour, when it canalises human energy into something more worth while, when it can give human beings joy and dignity and leisure.

The East is materialistic when it cannot transcend matter and is powerless against nature, when it fails to make full use of this divine faculty of intelligence to improve the living conditions of sweating man. The West is spiritual because it makes the fullest use of the mind in order to control nature and harness it for the service of mankind, and to alleviate needless degradation and labour, to liberate the human spirit from slavery, and to live with dignity and leisure.

These people who would destroy the machine are putting the clock of civilisation back. Undoubtedly the wearing of a G-string and spinning and digging the earth with a stick would bring contentment, but where would mankind be if it be had been satisfied with this pigsty comfort? No, the true spirit was sounded by Spengler, who said that man must fulfil the commands of the *Zeitgeist*, and go through with his inexorable destiny. "Our whole culture has a discoverer's soul. All the great inventions slowly ripened in the deeps to emerge at last with the necessity of destiny. We advanced from the muscle force of the savage, to the organic reserves of the earth's crust. Horse powers run into milliards. This growth is the product of the machine which insisted on being used and to that end centriples the forces of each individual. For the sake of the machine each individual human life becomes precious."

Chinese Music: Over the radio I heard a programme of Chinese music. I was ravished by the exquisite old-world melodies. There are two kinds, one melodious and the other a crescendo of discords, as if composed by a Berlioz gone mad. I have yet to acquire a taste for the latter, but the simple yet intricate, delicate the brittle melodies, like coloured pieces of glass, always enchant me.

Their music is like their painting—exquisite lines that are lyrical in quality. It follows closely the tones of speech, rising, falling and broken with delicate rhythms. Just as there is no epic in Chinese poetry there is no symphony in their music. Each tune is short. And the very names are

(continued from the previous page) evocative of the melodies: "Tangled Silk Floss", "Broken Blossoms". Their music is the music of a few strokes. Its subtle gestures, brief delicate phrases, soft tones, and languid sensuousness surprise and enchant the ear. The gurgling flutes and the brittle brilliant coloured notes of the lute weave an arabesque that is delicate and delicious.

Mannheim on Society: Before a society is to change one must first realise that nothing is eternal or infallible. The reactionary always hides behind the phrase "human nature" which he thinks is rigidly unchangeable. But everything human, everything man-made can be changed by man. Langdon Davies, in his fascinating and heartening book 'The Relativity of Human Nature' says, "Relativity has shattered the idea that you cannot get away from human nature. The motives for human behaviour are not eternal and unchanging, but are called forth by the particular social milieu surrounding the particular peoples we are studying." To change society one must transform man's thought and action. "Anyone," says Karl Mannheim in 'Man and Society' who would know how the world can be changed by changing man must first carefully observe how the present world has made us into the men we are at present. The history of autobiography is in this connection one of the most valuable sources of information, for in the introspective attitude unconsciously fulfil certain social functions. Changes in the nature of thought are intimately and directly bound up with changes in the nature of conduct and action. Our problem today is to organise human impulses in such a way that they will direct their energy to the right strategic points, and steer the total process of development in the right direction. If these are the problems, then a static psychology which conceives of "man in general" is one wrong track. Many thinkers take an eternal human nature for granted. In doing this they unwittingly confuse Man with the man as he is found in the present social order."

Beauty in woman: I was grateful for the spectacle, and absorbed for more than an hour the beauty and grace embodied in that form. It was purely a

(continued from the previous page) detached contemplation. I am sick of the Christian puritans who think it is a sin to look at a woman with admiration. Beauty always cancels lust. It is well, these puritans say, to view with appreciation a landscape or a flower or a mountain, but it becomes a sin to look at another of God's masterpieces.

Tcheyov: Even Katherine Mansfield who absorbed Tcheyov in her very marrow could not come anywhere near him. Tcheyov is a most deceptive writer to imitate. His stories are so simple and sometimes sketchy that every high school girl thinks she can write like him. They forget that behind even his most fragile story, a profound philosophy lies buried, and the common reader may be delighted and pass on without being struck by the meaning which is latent. For to understand Tcheyov you must have his stature. His wisdom permeates his slightest and almost evanescent creations. Even his subtlest stories have at the core some of his solid wisdom. Tcheyov suffered terribly in life but out of this suffering came sweetness and light. In his plays and stories the plot is often not striking, because he concentrates on his characters, and he is the first writer to use his characters, and he is the first writer to use his characters as plot. Edward Garnett has written the most penetrating criticism of Tcheyov: "There is an element of sweetness and understanding that forms the spiritual background of so many of Tcheyov's tales, and dominates invisibly the coarse web of the human struggle and the petty network of human egoism. There is a spiritual aura about his stories that hovers and enwraps the gloomiest and most sardonic facts of life." Tcheyov does not soothe and lull us. Being a physician he saw through life, and tries to make us strong by contact with the truth.

Stefan Zweig: The world was shocked when Stefan Zweig, one of the greatest writers of the time, committed suicide recently in Brazil. Yet before he died he left behind his autobiography, 'The World of Yesterday' one of the supreme human documents of our time. "Actually, it is not so much the course of my destiny that I relate, but that of an entire generation of our time, which was loaded with a burden of

(continued from the previous page) fate as was hardly any other in the course of history."

Zweig was a master of one of the most difficult languages of Europe, his prose though weighted with serious thinking soars effortlessly in its lyrical flight. One remembers one of his earliest bits of prose which was first published in the "Neue Freie Presse," the banner of the most advanced intellectuals of the time. It was called "Nietzsche's Swan Song." With infinite pathos he described the twilight of that great intellectual Titan. It created a tremendous sensation among the young writers of Europe. Zweig's incomparable short stories rank very high in world literature. He has put into them the same verve, the scrupulous integrity, and that iridescent style that have gained for his major works such high praise. Zweig loved life, and all its misery and happiness, its splendour and squalor are interpreted by him with a clarity, intensity, and sympathy that are unparalleled in modern literature. "The most customary trait of an artistic character," said Zweig, "is the irresistible desire to understand, the constant, never satisfied curiosity, the demoniacal urge to see, to know, to live every life, thus making the artist a "Flying Dutchman", a passionate pilgrim."

'The World of Yesterday' is not only an autobiography, but a living palpitating history of our times. The whole book is written as if life was a joyous, a glorious adventure. It is the Odyssey of a man who lived in Vienna, that dazzling city of culture and refinement, lulled into an ominous security by the Blue Danube and the syrupy waltzes. Here he lived in ecstatic contemplation, interrupted by the brilliant concatenation of ideas that played about the cafe tables. But fate willed otherwise, and rudely shattered his golden bowl of security. "before the war I knew the highest degree and form of individual freedom, and later its lowest level in hundreds of years. All the livid steeds of the Apocalypse have stormed through my life—revolution and famine, inflation, and terror, epidemics and emigration. I have seen the arch plague of fascism poison the flower of our European culture. I was forced

(continued from the previous page) to be a defenceless, helpless witness of the most inconceivable decline of humanity into barbarism. Each one of us has been shaken to the depths of our being by the eruptions of our European earth. Three times have they overthrown my house and my existence, and hurled me with dramatic force into the void. But paradoxically in the same are, when the world fell back a thousand years, I have seen the same mankind lift itself, in technical and intellectual matters, to unheard-of deeds, surpassing the achievement of a million years with a single beat of its wings." All this terrible holocaust is set down by him with great honesty and impartiality, all the characters, including himself, are interpreted and described without taking sides for good or evil, in the way that characterises his best stories.

He met Rainer Maria Rilke, whose transcendently beautiful poems definitely expanded the bounds of human consciousness. His pen-picture of this great poet is like some delicate etching. "Rilke joined rhyme to rhyme, creating an indescribable stir, softer than the fall of a leaf, that vibrates to the most distant soul. Every line is saturated with music, flaming with colour, glowing with images. Of all the poets living in exile none lived so gently so secretly, so invisibly as Rilke. He spoke naturally and simply, it was wonderful how, listening to him, even the most insignificant subject became picturesque and important. All that was vulgar was repugnant to him, and his aesthetic sense of perfection and symmetry entered into the most intimate and the most personal details."

Once Zweig visited Rodin in his studio. The artist greeted him and spoke a few words, and suddenly filled with inspiration, turned his back on the visitor, and with chisel and hammer went on perfecting some piece of sculpture. "Rodin was so engrossed, so rapt in his work that not even a thunder-stroke would have roused him. In that hour I had seen the eternal secret of all great art, of every moral achievement: concentration, the collection of all the forces of the senses, that ecstasies of every artist.

(continued from the previous page) I had learnt something for my entire lifetime." Zweig has scores of such sketches of the great men he met, and he makes them live before us, and we are grateful for such intimate glimpses.

On his fiftieth year taking a stock of his life Zweig had a lot to be grateful for to the gods. Within a few months Hitler trampled the beautiful grove of thought and culture that he had built, and he had to flee for his life. "Homeless and pursued as a refugee, I wandered from land to land, across oceans, and the achievements of forty years of perseverance were extinguished without a trace."

In London he meets Freud, a hunted refugee like himself, and the noble bearing of this genius gave him back courage and confidence. He gives an unforgettable picture of this man who created a new epoch of thought in this world, "Sigmund Freud, that great and austere spirit, deepened and broadened the soul of man. A more intellectually intrepid person could not be imagined. When I search for a symbol of moral courage, the only earthly heroism that can be performed solo I always see before me the face of Freud."

After London Zweig landed in Brazil. He was revived and came to love this beautiful land. The old zest for life came back. He began a novel and started a biography of Balzac that would have startled the world. But suddenly this splendid lover of life committed suicide. Before he and his wife shuffled off this life he wrote a parting letter which is published in the last page of his autobiography. It makes painful reading after the irresistible gusto of that book. "Before parting from life of my own free will and in my right mind I am impelled to fulfil a last obligation: to give heartfelt thanks to this wonderful land of Brazil which afforded me such kind repose. But after one's sixtieth year unusual powers are needed in order to make another wholly new beginning. So I think it better to conclude in good time and in erect bearing a life in which intellectual labour meant the purest joy on earth. I salute all my friends! My it be granted them yet to see the

(continued from the previous page) dawn after the long night. I, all too impatient, go on before."

So passed a noble soul, whose works still have a place in the highest realm of creation.

Emily Bronte: The dark mystery of her personality has not been unravelled, but we can read between the lines and catch a glimpse of the soul of Emily Bronte. From her letters and poems, from the revealing saying of Charlotte, one knows that she was like one of the figures in Aeschylus's tragedies. Though implicated in the inevitable consequences that fate had spun for her, yet she never gave in—

No coward soul is mine,

No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere. Her resignation drove her into uncompromising mysticism.

Emily Bronte is an enigma. How did she, living in that damp and dim parsonage, come to know so much about the deep tragedy of love? It is creative imagination and a deep empathy with her characters that enabled her to write one of the greatest novels in the English language. Life battered her, but she did not allow it to conquer her indomitable courage. She mastered life as she mastered her material. In all that gifted family she was the most formidable, and the least sentimental.

Creative imagination: The old idea that great writers and composers were inspired from above or through occult sources is absurd. However high man soars he is still bound to earth, the loftiest creations of man have come from within him, and Aristotle's dictum that everything ideal has a natural basis, and everything natural has an ideal development, still holds good.

The hidden source of creative imagination lies in the unfathomable well of the unconscious mind. Into this well have dropped all the images and ideas that we have read or thought of, and these mingling with the other myriad images have been transformed, and suffer a strange sea change. Images and impressions converge and blend, and the creative genius down, diving comes up with marvellous and beautiful

(continued from the previous page) combinations that have coalesced and fused by a strange association.

The ordinary man also has this faculty but to a lesser degree. How often have we through a flash of association fished out same startling image. But before the stroke of intuition or creation, the well must be stored with images, there must be some active thinking and brooding over the subject. Poincaré the mathematician said that "These appearances of sudden illumination are obvious indications of a long course of previous unconscious work. This unconscious work is not fruitful unless it is first preceded and then followed by a period of conscious work."

Beauty has strange and often unlovely origins; radiant and beautiful flowers spring out of dung, the most gorgeous sunsets are merely refractions of light on the low-lying dust of the horizon, and probably the finest flowers of the imagination may be as utterly remote in nature from their metamorphosed state as an iridescent butterfly from the chrysalis. All that Coleridge had read dissolved into a strange concatenation of images in his brain, and later in the focus of concentration the mind became luminous and scraps of remembered facts or lines he had seen on the page flashed into vivid spectra, and words sprang into pictures as he wrote.

Japanese Poetry: There is an amazing compression of language and a deep symbolism in these fragile poems, and yet they are pregnant with meaning that can be meditated upon for hours. It is not what is said but what is unsaid or suggested that is the quintessence of these hokkus. The poem is said to be completed in the hearer's mind. Thought and emotion that lie too deep for words are suggested.

It is not much more than an attempt to express an emotion which he thinks is inexpressible, but the person hearing it would recollect his own rapture.

The peace and tranquillity of the temple pond and all its beautiful surroundings leap to the mind, the sudden plop of the frog which brings to the Zen Buddhist the idea of Satori or sudden illumination.

The image of the moon below the reflected mountain brought to his mind the Reality that lies hidden in the soul of man.

They are like some of the masterpieces of painting that are found in China or Japan. Just as a few strokes, but like the sound of a bell the meaning reverberates in the mind of the listener.

To the Western mind many of these will sound absurd and meaningless, but to the Japanese and to others who have acquired a taste and feeling for these evanescent creations they seem to be the quintessence of all the mysticism that lies in beauty and in Nature, and the hearer is suddenly thrown into rapture.

Poetry cannot be analysed, one hears or reads it with a shock of delight just as one hears a song bird or enjoys the beauty of the rose, without asking the meaning of it. Every real artist knows, that art is not representation, and there is an astronomical difference between the photographic painter and the creative artist. Many philistines are aghast at the distortions of modern artists, but an artist has the right to distort his drawings if thereby he expresses to his own satisfaction the vision he sees. The plain man and the artist see differently.

Only the pure of heart can see reality, that is one who is perfectly detached and disinterested. In this the artist and the contemplative mystic follow the same path. "The artist contemplates with desire to make, the mystic with desire to be the other. Purity of heart and singleness of eye have this in common, that both give insight into the real, both have concern with the ineffable."

Heine: Heine was a curious blend of Mephistopheles and Christ. The most brilliant satirist of his time and the most exquisite of lyrical writers, and added to this one of the greatest of humanists. His whole life was like a tragi-comedy. In the beginning he was worshipped by all the young bloods of Germany, and he was always surrounded by a garland of women, who alas in the end were his undoing. He was exiled from Germany and at last went to die in Paris.

It is here that we watched with sorrow the terrible death which the Great Joker reserved for him. He was suffering from a terrible spinal disease, yet in all the history of letters there is no one so heroic as Heine in his living death.

A man of sorrows indeed, but meek and broken never. A pious friend rushed in when he was dying and asked him if he had made his peace with God, and Heine whispered, "God will forgive me—that's his business."

Gamaliel Bradford: Finished Gamaliel Bradford's Bare Souls which is a sort of impressionistic biography of great writers. How few of us read these American masterpieces. There are some great critics there—Edmund Wilson, Van Wyck Brooks, Spingarn, and Woodbury, to mention just a few. Bradford is better than the pretentious Emil Ludwig, but does not approach anywhere near the devastatingly brilliant Lytton Strachey.

Bradford's life was one long heroic struggle with sickness, yet he has managed to write a few worthwhile books. All his best mellow qualities are to be found in his 'Journal of a Man of Letters' and his 'Bare Souls'. He had a superb command of the language and a penetrating mind that probed beneath the skin of the various personalities he wrote about. By indefatigable research and a kind of empathy with his subject, he has revealed the hidden drama of passion and suffering, of joy and hope, of various great writers like Flaubert, Voltaire, Keats, Lamb, Walpole and others. About Voltaire he says, "All through his novels there is the finest, the subtlest, the profoundest observation of life. But though he insisted it was abstract, detached and impersonal, the stamp of his own bitter disillusion was upon it. He liked to surge out into great thoughts; to toss and tumble the problems of the universe with swift burning fingers." The whole book is like a collection of cameos carved by a master artist out of the most stubborn precious stone.

Morality: I can't bear rigid formulas for conduct. Steeped in the traditions of the Chinese I am unashamedly Homo Aestheticus. I believe with Rodo and Shaftesbury that "Virtue is a kind of art, an aesthetics of conduct". It was Havelock Ellis who first brought together the aesthetic of conduct which is implicit in the philosophy of Shaftesbury, and Rodo, in his brilliant and lucid essay "The Art of Morals."

In China and China alone we find that art animates the whole of life, even its morality. Everything there was a matter of technique, the technique of exquisite balancing which permeated even their morals and character. The only parallel with the Chinese are the ancient Greeks, for to them also life was a fine art. The good was the beautiful, and ethics and aesthetics was inextricably mixed up in the blithe Greek spirit. Aristotle said, "If we wish to ascertain whether an act is or is not morally right we must consider not merely the intrinsic quality of the act, but the person who does it, the person to whom it is done, the time, the means and the motive." In short it must be aesthetically and inevitably the right action, in the circumstances. This is a most dangerous and a difficult doctrine, for the beautiful in any sphere of life is as the Greeks said, "Hard to judge, hard to win, hard to keep." This is not a hedonist's doctrine. "Those who try to make life as an art have entered upon a difficult path," says Havelock Ellis; and further, "For the artist life is always a discipline. Abstract moral speculations culminating in rigid maxims are sterile and vain. In so far as we infuse it with the spirit and methods of art we have transformed morality into something beyond morality." All of the above scandalised a dear old lady who wants to pluck my soul from flaming hell. But I'd rather burn with Shaftesbury, Nietzsche, and Lao Tze, than freeze with Spurgeon and General Booth.

Pirandello: Luigi Pirandello has become a world figure since he won the Nobel prize, and had the doubtful honour of having one of his plays, *As You Desire Me*, filmed by Hollywood with Greta Garbo in

(continued from the previous page) the leading role. The intellectuals flock to the theatre whenever one of his plays is put on and applaud with delight the brilliant dialectical skill and the metaphysical pyrotechnics of this master who stands on the shoulders of Shaw. The term "Pirandellism" has been coined to define an attitude to life which cannot be expressed by any other word. One has to acquire a new sense in order to be able to share Pirandello's peculiar vision. It is like taking some rare dry wine which is biting and astringent and clears the film from the eyes and makes us see clearly the antics of human beings swayed by their ideas and appetites, and above all by the masks they wear called personalities. His sudden revelations turn inside out the artificial make up of our lives, and disclose the truth that few are able or dare to see. The Pirandellian satire is the apex of alertness, the climax of wide-awakeness. He strips the human puppets and reveals the subconscious strings that make them dance.

Pirandello shows the dual personality that struggles in one man, and that each man has his own private universe and his own reality in which what he does however unconventional it may appear to others is right.

His one theme, which he later weaves into many elaborate variations, is the multiplicity of the human personality. To him a man is a collection of various personalities, and he wears them as he wears a mask.

To Pirandello an individual has a number of these personalities jostling each other at the threshold of the subconscious, and one never knows which one escapes to dominate and oust the others.

The ideas that obsess the man at a given moment condition his action, and it is impossible to expect consistency when we do not know what set of ideas may dominate.

To Pirandello character is an illusion. G.A. Borgese in a critical essay on Pirandello's ideas on personality says "We pronounce the little word "I" with a slight emission of voice, and we regulate ourselves as if each one of us were a monad. But when we consider the question carefully, how many discordant elements do we find making up this apparent unity!

(continued from the previous page) How many different aspects does a man present to himself and to others! What deep gulfs separate our lyrical and intimate self from our social and practical self, our self of today from ourself of tomorrow!"

Pirandello is an uncompromising solipsist; there are as many realities, as many logics as there are individuals. "What makes life is the reality which you give to it." The lunatic may act ludicrously in the eyes of others but he follows his own logic consistently. Another one of his theories around which he has written plays and novels is that Life is the great enemy of Form, that there is always a struggle between the two and a man can never settle down and make permanent one aspect of his character.

All his plays are nothing but the dramatisation of these ideas.

Walter Starkie sums up Pirandello in his brilliant book: "Pirandello analyses ruthlessly the conventions and beliefs of his compatriots. When we watch these characters harshly grimacing on the stage, grotesquely exhibiting their writhing personalities, it is difficult to avoid thinking of a puppet show. For Pirandello man wanders about aimlessly in life; he clutches at everything he sees, to stay the current which is sweeping him on. All effort is vain, for life is ruled by chance. Pirandello looks upon his characters as merely symbols of some hallucination that is inwardly devouring them, they become merely grotesque and arouse no emotion in us except horror."

There is no catharsis in the Aristotelian meaning when we see Pirandello's plays. A great tragedy by Shakespeare or Aeschylus, though it harrows us, liberates our spirits and we leave the theatre purged of all the dross, and puts us in rapport with the heroic spirit of the universe. But a play by Pirandello, though it trickles us to uncontrollable laughter, makes us infinitely sad. It is like seeing the world through the eyes of a malevolent god who roars with laughter at the antics of these planetary lice.

Chinese Yoga: Finished *The Secret of the Golden Flower* by Wilhelm and Jung. This is a very ancient treatise on Chinese Yoga, translated by Wilhelm, with

(continued from the previous page) a brilliant and profound commentary by Jung. I am not a believer in the diffusion theory, first propounded by Elliot Smith. The diffusionists believe that all culture, religion etc. spread from one centre. One believes that Egypt was the first centre, another that India was the mother of all these cultures. It is of course amazing when one finds mystic cults having almost the same technique in different parts of the world, as Scandinavia, Africa, India and China. But the human body and brain are the same everywhere and it is not at all astonishing that these different races came to the same conclusions and practised the same rituals. Jung has conclusively pointed out that this is possible on account of the collective unconscious. Jung says, "I am so profoundly convinced of the homogeneity of the human Psyche that I have actually embraced it in the concept of the collective unconscious, as a universal and homogeneous substratum whose homogeneity extends even into a world-wide identity or similarity of myths and fairy tales; so that a negro dreams in the motives of Grecian mythology, and a Swiss grocer repeats in his psychosis the vision of an Egyptian Gnostic."

Here is a passage in The Secret of the Golden Flower that is identical with the teachings found in the Sat-Chakra Nirupana, especially the part dealing with the Kundalini. I quote the Chinese text:- "Man's heart stands under the fire sign. The flames of fire press upward. When both eyes are looking at things it is with vision directed outward. If one closes the eyes and, reversing the glance, directs it inwards that is the backward flowing method. The power of the sexual organs is under the water sign. When the instincts are stirred it runs downwards, and is directed outwards and creates children. If in the moment of release it is not allowed to flow outward but is led back by the force of thought so that it penetrates the crucible of the creative and restless heart and body and nourishes them, that also is the backward flowing method. The meaning of the Elixir of Life depends on the backward flowing method."

The whole technique of Raja Yoga and Kundalini

(continued from the previous page) Yoga is given in this Chinese text. For example here is one passage on contemplation: "By concentrating the thoughts one can fly, by concentrating the desires one falls. Only through contemplation and quietness does true intuition arise. For that the backward flowing method is necessary."

Here is another on the importance of breathing which is also the central pivot of Indian Yoga. "When one looks at what is within in this way, the wonders of the opening and shutting of the gates of Heaven will be inexhaustible. But the deeper secrets cannot be effected without making the breathing rhythmical."

Finally I cannot resist quoting one passage which sums up the central doctrine of the Mystics of both the East and the West. "Within our body we must strive for the Form which existed before the laying down of Heaven and Earth."

"What is the use of your blasted Yoga?" said a ribald English friend of mine, and pointed out that when Young husband pushed his punitive force into Tibet, the Lamas came in thousands and repeated mantrams and japas but the machine-guns went through the Lamas and so proved the superiority of Western science. But a one-sided concentration on Science can lead one into the terrible cul de sac from which the West is vainly trying to escape. On the other hand a one-sided concentration on the inner world can also lead one into catastrophe. It is the task of the coming New Man to balance these two worlds.

Jung, the most profound of all the psychologists, one who has scaled the vertiginous heights and delved into the abysses of the human mind, says, "Who ever seeks to minimise the merits of Western Science is undermining the main support of the European mind. Science is not indeed a perfect instrument, but none the less it is an invaluable and superior one which only works harm when taken as an end in itself. Scientific method must serve. It errs when it usurps a throne. It is part and parcel of our understanding and only clouds our insight when it lays claim to being the only way of comprehending.

(continued from the previous page) But it is the East that has taught as another, wider, more profound and a higher understanding, that is understanding through life. This Eastern realism is completely misunderstood. The wisdom of the East is based on practical knowledge coming from the flower of Chinese intelligence which we have not the slightest justification for undervaluing. When I began my life work in the practice of psychiatry, I was completely ignorant of Chinese Philosophy, and it is later that my professional experiences have shown me that in my technique I had been unconsciously led along that secret way which for centuries has been the preoccupation of the best minds of the East."

Anonymity of the Ancients: Sometime ago I stood inside a famous temple. Some of the sculptures were so ravishing, they were aesthetically inevitable, yet curiously I never bothered to ask who created them. And this I thought is the same with all great works of art. The modern with his craze for notoriety and his mistaken reading of the word personality will never understand the anonymity of the ancients. When for example we read those immortal sonnets of Shakespeare do we not forget the author? Only the sonnets remain, all else fades or is made dim by the radiance of these poems. While the words reverberate in the corridors of our brain the poem cries out "Only I exist."

No one cares two hoots, while reading Shakespeare's poems, that he married a woman older than himself and left his second best bed to his wife. Who cares how Keats liked his porridge or that Shelley was a vegetarian? These questions do not arise when we read those enchanting poems of theirs. Most biographies are a sort of glorified gossip; they only tell us of the surface personalities of these great artists, but of the deeper one that lies below the surface the most meticulous biography can tell us nothing. For that we should read and absorb their works.

The greatest masterpieces of ancient times were all anonymous. The amazing artists who painted those vital bison in the caves of prehistoric Spain, those

(continued from the previous page) who carved those exciting and virile bas-reliefs in Assyria, the astonishing sculptors of Egypt, the superb artists of Chartres, the painters of the Ajanta frescoes, never thought of scribbling their names to their masterpieces, because they knew, as D.H. Lawrence said later, that the work of art is apart from the artist, that it only remains, while the artist who created them fades away into dust.

A work of art is absolute, it points to nothing but itself, and it happens that many times even the artist has not understood the full implications of his creation and may have to wait for a generation to understand his work. There are many artists whose names are scribbled all over their works, writers like Lamb, and Stevenson, and a host of other writers of "middles" and "columns". These have written with their superficial personalities. They entertain for a little while, but unlike the great writers, deep does not call to deep.

For when we read the masterpieces of the great artists we are sucked down below, and are in a world of creative imagination that is common to all great artists, and not only common to them but to all of us, and we are only made aware of this fact when we are transformed to the same condition as the artist who created the work of art.

Action versus Contemplation: As usual my friend J.C.S. and I were at it hammer and tongs till three in the morning discussing action versus contemplation. My friend is a man of action: in season and out he preaches the gospel of action. I by temperament am a contemplative, as I have been soaked in Taoist quietism. I quoted Aldous Huxley: "The imbeciles who rush about bawling that action is the end of life, and that thought has no value except in so far as it leads to action, are only speaking for themselves. There are thousands of paths and the purely contemplative has a right to one."

There are always two types of men in this world: the man of action, the ambitious who are tied to the galleys of fame or gain, of whom Leonardo da

(continued from the previous page) Vinci said, "To the ambitious, whom neither the boon of life nor the beauty of the world suffices to content, it comes as a penance that life with them is squandered, and that they possess neither the benefits nor the beauty of this world." And there is the other type who live like the gods serene, to whom life is an aesthetic spectacle.

The Chinese quietist is the supreme example of the latter kind. He never allows himself to be forced into action, because his settled aim in life to live in such a way that a minimum of action will be required from him. He does nothing on principle, not because he is afraid of doing something but because he prefers the inner life of the mind to the outer life of satisfying bodily wants. He does not want to dominate circumstances, because he is not at war with them but at peace. In China such a man is respected and is accented with awe and reverence. In England he would be called a tramp if poor or contemptuously dubbed as a dilettante if he had means. In the West it is assumed if a man has nothing it is because he does not know how to get it. If a man chooses to go without the nice things of life the West calls it self-denial but self-liberation. Charles Morgan in his beautiful book *The Fountain* has said the last word in modern times for the contemplative life. "Life does not consist in outward acts and is little affected by them. It is the inward and secret experience which those who become aware of it seek to intensify, for to intensify is to protect and sustain it. In this encircled consciousness, wisdom flowers from the seed of the mysteries of which the most fruitful are love and death. Here they yield their immortal fruit, but in the field of action, which men call life, they yield only pleasure and fear, emotions that perish. Therefore they who dwell in the outer field, aware in a sick distress that though they seem to be alive, seek always to drive contemplative spirits to corruptible action, using every instrument of pride and desire to goad or allure them." I have copied the above, and have asked my friend to hang it in his bedroom but alas I know that nothing will convert

(continued from the previous page) this incorrigible man of action. He, conversely quotes Anthony Ludovici

“Don’t stop to meditate or pray!
The day holds triumphs to be won
Come out! Come out! The sky is bright!
Truth glistens on each blade of grass.”

French Culture: People are horrified by the open licentiousness of Paris, but Paris is not France. The majority of French families are models of right living and their girls are protected by chaperones. In England and America where they make a parade of national purity, their underground life is all the more sinister and terrible.

What is it that has made Paris the mecca of all artists and intellectuals, what is it in the French mind and culture that has been the envy and delight of other peoples?

The greatest herald of the French Renaissance was undoubtedly Rabelais, who was really the father of the French tradition of independent thinking and the embodiment of that nation’s realistic vision of life. Later came Montaigne who crystallised in his essays that lucid and penetrating wisdom. His essays were the constant companion of Shakespeare, and what good use he made of the book can be seen in the tintured platitudes and acrobatic paradoxes scattered throughout his plays. Still later Rousseau started the spark that flamed into the Revolution; he also affected the mental climate of Europe, that even now we breathe to some extent. Voltaire prinked the vast bubble of religious tyranny by the rapier of his wit and ushered in that exhilarating epoch of free thinking that has been so great a boon to modern man. In the arts especially in painting France has led the world; all the innovations of modern painting were first created in Paris to reverberate round the world.

Lucidity is the keynote and the quintessence of the French mind. “What is not clear is not French,” Perre Maillaud says. “Physically and morally the most permanent attribute of the French is clear-sightedness, clarity and lucidity of vision. To see “things as they are” is the great French preoccupation.

(continued from the previous page) These qualities of true vision, of realism and of precision in analysis and description, carry with them a deep rooted hostility to any form of confusion in thought and expression."

In no other country are ideas taken so seriously and discussed so passionately even on the boulevards. France must live again to leaven the world with that sparkling quality called "spiritual" which cannot be translated. Resurgam—the cry rings through stricken France. From this terrible crisis she will spring up once more, chastened by her sorrow into something new and indomitable. By the deliverance of France the Zeitgeist though it has plunged her into the bloody holocaust shows that it is still on the side of sweetness and light.

Myth: Last night as I was browsing, I came across this passage in my commonplace book: "Without myth," says Nietzsche, "every culture loses its healthy creative natural power. It is only by myth that all the powers of the imagination are freed from their random roving." This started a train of meditation on Myth. In the childhood of man the creative imagination of man produced myths, but in his adolescence science has petrified and suppressed this sort of play. Life is a shuttlecock that is battered between these two opposite poles of myth and science. The greatest creative and imaginative artists of ancient and even modern times are those who have relearned the art of myth making. "It is difficult," says Aino Kallas, "to return to the paradise of the childhood of mankind. Yet know and then are spirits born in whom in some inexplicable and secret manner one discerns a connexion with those distant artists who with their unbridled fantasy encompassed heaven and earth."

Ortegay Gasset said that the man of antiquity before he did anything took a step backwards and searched for a pattern into which he could slip. There have been great artists in arts as well as in action that have fulfilled their destiny, inexorably urged on by the daemon with which they have identified themselves. Cleopatra died and fulfilled herself, consciously or unconsciously identifying herself with Ishtar. Alexander identified himself with Mitiades. Napoleon

(continued from the previous page) was enflamed in greater and greater glory by identifying himself with Caesar and Charlemagne; and Jesus, obsessed with the Messianic myth, fulfilled to the bitter end the prophecies of the Old Testament. Many Christians are puzzled and depressed by the last cry on the cross, "Eloi Eloi lama sabachthani." But it was not a cry of disappointment, it was a supreme paean that was rung out by a man who had triumphantly lived out the Messianic myth. If his vitality had not given out so soon he would have repeated the whole of the 22nd Psalm, which begins with his quotation, and which foretells the life and death of the Messiah.

To be wholly absorbed by the myth is a damnably dangerous pursuit. It led one woman to the sting of an asp, one world-shaker to reflect in St. Helena, one naive and innocent spirit to the cross;—and one wonders where Hitler will spend his well earned rest, after being possessed by the demon of the great Aryan Myth?

Drugs: Why is it that man from time immemorial has used and searched for better drugs and intoxicants? There is probably an instinct in man that drives him to enlarge and heighten his consciousness, so that all his senses are made more acute, and he feels like a giant refreshed with wine. William James once said that alcohol takes you away from the periphery of things to the centre of life, or words to that effect. (What a text to be hung up in every dipsomaniac's room!) But seriously there must be a perfect somewhere that could make one like the Gods.

Aldous Huxley finds no fault in this search for the ideal drug that has no after-effects. But it is dangerous: Adam tried it and was kicked out of Eden. Scientific curiosity has made me experiment with many drugs. The curious distortion of time and space after taking hashish is an adventure that one can never forget, but it is dangerous; there may be a sudden splitting of the personality, that is tied by a slender thread to reality, so that many believe that they are beyond space and time—in an asylum.

Mathematics and a Mystical Universe: There are some books with an unassuming title, like some unpretentious facade of an English house, but open the door, or turn the cover, and one is overwhelmed with its richness, and is delightfully surprised.

E.M. Rowell's *Time and Time* again is a brilliant and suggestive book. Miss Rowell is a mathematician, and she has pondered deeply on some of the most exciting problems of art and reality. Reading this book was an exhilarating experience. One's mental lethargy disappeared, and one had to be mentally alert, and bring all the faculties of one's critical intelligence to follow all the intricate and brilliant swordplay of this critic. E.M. Rowell's

All human art and thought seems to me a search after reality, that otherness that confronts the self. Many scientists in their arrogant way think that only science can ultimately discover that reality by probing with more delicate and precise instruments. But art, and love, and religion too have discovered aspects of reality that can never be touched by the clumsy methods of science. In three essays, "Self and the Other", "Actuality and ubiquity" and "The Scepticism of the mathematician" Miss Rowell has gathered all her brilliant analytical reasoning, and focussed her burning thoughts on metaphysical problems, in a language that is precise and lucid.

The Hindus from time immemorial have pondered on the question of the Self, the "I" which is in the "I". But one need not go to the Hindu scriptures for proof of the self. Every one of us at certain moments has felt the presence or has known intuitively that there is a self that transcends our personality, that Paul Claudel in a beautiful fable called "Animus and Anima" has personified self and the other self. The self cannot be identified by the body and senses because it is above and beyond them. "The body is not the self; it is there to do duty, as it were, for the self. That self is not in our personalities. Personality is fluid and escapes through the meshes of that character which education and experience have so carefully constructed. Personality adapts itself to persons. We react unconsciously to the

(continued from the previous page) person or persons with whom we find ourselves, and so strangely different are we with one and another that a friend might be hard put to recognise us, if one day he found us with another friend. Indeed the self seems almost to be this permanent possibility of intercourse. The self often appears as a monad, the being of which consists in its reflection of other monads."

Bertrand Russell from the snowcapped Mount of Olympus says "Remote from human passions, remote even from the pitiful of nature, the generations has gradually created an ordered cosmos where pure thought can dwell as in its natural home and where one at least of the nobler impulses can escape from the dreary round of the actual world." Miss Rowell has bearded the mathematician in his rarefied atmosphere, and in a witty and profound essay, "The scepticism of the mathematician", tries to define his place in the worlds of thought and reality.

"Give me matter and motion and I will construct the universe," cried a scientist. But matter has now been refined and attenuated almost to nothing and it is mathematics that has done this conjuring trick. "The seive through which matter has been strained is a mathematical one, and it is the fluid abstract forms of mathematics which are ousting the solid elements from the field of science. Matter is in a parlous state, and though there is motion there are no things to move; in this realm though there is structure, there are no constructions of any sort. In mathematics you are dealing with forms whose formulations can in no wise be represented by models or illustrated by diagrams. It is structure and not substance that you have in your head. But then how can you build without bricks? How make a world, even a mathematical world? Mathematical reasoning is in the last resort logical reasoning; it is logic that gives mathematics its solidity."

In a very witty paragraph Miss Rowell compares the world of mathematics with the world of Alice in her Wonderland. "I am inclined to think that the mathematical bearing and value of Alice in Wonderland

(continued from the previous page) have not been clearly grasped, and those who aspire to a sound knowledge of mathematical principles would be well advised to follow Alice into Wonderland.

Space does not permit me to deal with all the multitudinous ideas that Miss Rowell's book deals with. One is grateful for such stimulation. After finishing this book the mind takes a leap, and with the light from her torch, a thousand dark corridors are illuminated, and one wanders with added insight, and discovers newer facets on subjects that have and will be discussed time and time again.

Editor: "A CRITIQUE OF THEOSOPHY".@@@

It is usual to send books to reviewers who sympathise with them. In this case the Editor has made an exception, and an apology is due to an author and publisher. But it is hardly necessary to praise Mme Wadia's writings, nor the quality of her publications. She writes well, earnestly and with learning; her magazine *The Aryan Path* is by far the best in India for literary and technical excellence; the publications of her firm maintain in the same high standards and a number of them have been very favourably reviewed in these pages.

What the reviewer deplores is that this literary and typographical skill, and deep learning in religion and anthropology, should be wasted, or worse than wasted, devoted to ends which are largely bad. They are devoted in part at least to propagating opinions which are not known to be true and are probably false, and belief in which is harmful. It will be agreed that the doctrines set forth in this book are the characteristic doctrines of the school.

This is the doctrine usually called Vedanta (I am speaking roughly, as a layman) which identifies some mysterious entity in each person, called the spirit, with the universe, which accordingly is side to be "spiritual" (mental?) and is sometimes asserted to have admirable ethical qualities, but is also sometimes asserted to have no qualities at all.

@@@ "*Mysiddia*" 1944.

This doctrine cannot be disproved. It may be true. But there is no reason whatever to think it is so. Our knowledge, so far as it goes, suggests that the universe has a quite different nature. Some philosophers have believed doctrines of this sort, their arguments do not prove them.

It is generally agreed to be a bad thing to believe false propositions, and to believe propositions to be provable which are not; but in the case of matters of this degree of remoteness from ordinary experience no great harm would be done, if they stood alone. But they do not. Deductions are drawn, or other doctrines are associated with them, and some of these are harmful.

Thus the emphasis on antiquity. It is implied that in ancient times men had greater wisdom than now. We are miserable epigones, only to be saved by a return to the ancient ways. In particular the modern civilisation, "the machine", the West, is consistently and strongly attacked. Indeed it is roundly stated; as if it were a generally accepted truth, that the Western civilisation is a failure, and we are asked in the usual strain to contemplate the horrors of the machine age.

The horrors of the pre-machine age are of course forgotten. It would indeed be unfortunate if the Western civilisation were a failure, since it is the only existing civilisation with any life in it, and the others, which had survived in a petrified form, are reviving only by imitating it.

Of course smoking is disgusting, and machines enable people to do all sorts of frivolous things, but they are not a monopoly of our age: silly girls used cosmetics and had a good time in the very midst of the Ancient Wisdom of Egypt and Chaldea. Why not mention the hopefulness and the responsibilities of our age, the great things men can expect to do with science and machines? This fear of knowledge and power is poisonous.

But fear is very near the core of the beliefs set forth in this book. The Buddha, for example, is

(continued from the previous page) held up to special admiration, with his injunction "Be not a friend of the world". This, it is explained, is a reference to Maya. The apparent stability of the phenomenal world is only apparent: it is really in incessant motion. So (it is said to follow) we must seek beyond it to the Nirvana which will give us Stability, Repose, which "when one has obtained it one is safe". Is that not a doctrine of fear? What is wrong with motion and change?

And what are the practical implications? If the Buddha came among us now, we are told, He would not concern Himself with political action, or with social service. He would try to change people's hearts.

False, as well as heartless! It is much less important to improve people's consciences than to improve their brains, and their social organisation. People don't want slums; they merely don't know how to avoid them, or if they do, they have not the kind of social order which can get rid of them. Many rich men are profoundly disquieted at the suffering of the poor – witness their charities and bequests. But beyond that there is nothing they can do. A conscience-stricken landlord is just as firmly in the grip of the land-tenure system as the tenant or the labourer.

This doctrine of a change of heart is misdirected, away from the acquisition of knowledge and the changes in the social structure which we want. It is a doctrine of quiescence, of doing nothing. The Buddha would take no part in politics or social service. The same negative policy is taught by Theosophy.

What will be the effect of reading this book on a man of the modern world? "Sickening stuff," he will say, "silly stuff." This would not matter, indeed it would be good, if what this book teaches were wholly false. But of course it is not. It is on the right side over most moral questions. But it repeats the age-old mistake of making morality depend upon religion. And this is a pity. For a

(continued from the previous page) religion we can probably dispense with, but morality we cannot; and the association of the two leads many people to try to throw over both of them. I have within the last few weeks heard two very intelligent and good-hearted friends of mine assert that they rejected all morality and based their conduct on pure egoism.

People's hearts are better than their heads, and they believe in morality and act on it even when they fancy they despise it. But even intellectual error is dangerous, and there are many signs that the hold of morals upon us is not strong enough. It is highly important that people should realise that there is in human nature and human association a perfectly adequate and in fact compelling basis for our ethical beliefs, and that religion has nothing to do with it. The effect of books of this type is to obscure that fact and so to lead people like my two friends, to throw out the baby with the bath water, and accept absurd and possibly dangerous beliefs.

That is a difficulty all religions face today. If you begin quoting the scriptures nine out of ten men turn away in disgust. It is not that they do not want the truth; they want it, but in an acceptable form, and to the modern man that means a scientific form. If there is truth here – and Theosophy claims to be "the fountain-head of Truth" – prove it in a matter-of-fact and unemotional way by reference to evidence and with the aid of logic, that is scientifically Men in our times will accept it in no other way, and on that point they are right.

K.D. Sethna: "THE WAR BEHIND THE WAR". @@

Now that we are nearing the end of the war and victory is within sight, we are apt to forget what the real nature is of the conflict that has raged for five years and how tremendous is the achievement of beating Nazism to its knees.

The truth about the war will not be grasped simply by looking at the material surface of things nor even by examining the ideological forces at work.

(continued from the previous page) The New Order of Hitler, in the aid of which his panzers and his luftwaffe went out to battle and the Gestapo and the Fifth Column spread everywhere their tentacles, is not a mere man's conception. Its origin is occult, lying in the mystery that the world has always felt vaguely as the background against which the mundane drama is enacted. The truth, therefore, about the war will best be grasped if we consider the support given to the Allied cause from the very outset and in its darkest hours by one who stands today as the greatest explorer of the occult background—Sri Aurobindo.

This support was given with an extreme decisiveness that cut down to roots deeper than a difference between one human way of life and another, between even a human civilization and a human barbarism. That extreme decisiveness coming from a master of spirituality like Sri Aurobindo pointed to a vision of Hitlerism as the arch-enemy not just of the Allies' outer dominion and of their type of culture but also of all that Sri Aurobindo himself was out to accomplish. He saw much more at stake than a political, social or cultural issue. He saw an issue beyond the human, the growth of God in man opposed from regions occult to our normal consciousness. And he saw that secret opposition as the most colossal in history and not confined to a brief outbreak.

Many people have believed that Nazism would be a temporary phase and its enormities would pass and the true Germany rise to the fore and there would again be lovely music and great literature, and towering philosophy. Sri Aurobindo never subscribed to this sunny view. On the contrary, he held that Nazism in its present form was, in spite of its terrible ugliness, no more than a small and slight beginning of a darkness of which we have no idea! It was to him the spearhead of an all-out offensive from the Pit. Its success would not be a passing phenomenon which would exhaust itself and let human life return to its old way of understandable frailties relieved by admirable strengths. Its success

(continued from the previous page) would herald the beginning of an age in which the diabolic would reign over the human and make the advent of divine forces impossible for untold centuries and render the fight for the Spirit, whenever the fight did manage to come, a far more difficult and doubtful Armageddon than anything we could know during these days. Nazism, in Sri Aurobindo's opinion, had to be struck dead: there could be no complacency about it, no sitting on the fence comparing it to the savageries of past times and hoping for a swing-back to normal humanity.

From the occult stand point, Nazism is the exact opposite pole to the Aurobindonian inspiration. It is no brief outbreak touching the superficies of material life or a few domains of it but an attempt at total supremacy because the Aurobindonian inspiration is also bent on an all-comprehensive integrality of effect on earth. Sri Aurobindo's spirituality is not a grand escape from life's riddle: it is a radical solution of it. If his work were meant to be nothing more than a going inward and upward from the material plane to a hidden soul-status unborn and unmanifest, he would not have bothered about the Hitlerite colossus striding over mankind. Sri Aurobindo is for creating lebensraum for the Spirit here and now. And what is finally determinative of his being the upper pole to Hitler's nether is that he is for divinising the material consciousness and substance and form no less than the subtle parts of our nature—a transformation unrealised by the saints, sages and prophets of the past and not even envisaged clearly by them despite their intuition that the material world has come originally from the Divine. The Yoga of those saints, sages and prophets, though not thoroughly escapist, would not be completely balked if its function of manifesting the Divine on earth were checked or nullified, for its ultimate goal was still a fulfilment in some Beyond at the end of earth-life. But a unique yoga insisting on fulfilment by an integral divine manifestation in matter itself and not proceeding to an unearthly hereafter, a Yoga aiming to lay hands on

(continued from the previous page) every side of us for the creation of a new race would have its bottom blown clean away by the triumph of Nazism. Conversely, if the Aurobindonian New Order were allowed to make headway, the powers embodying themselves in movements like Nazism would suffer a defeat and their hold on earth be fundamentally loosened. So, against this divine march upon the terrestrial plane with the purpose of basing there for good the Truth-consciousness, there is the counter-march from the occult home of Falsehood to gain a permanent grip. Because Sri Aurobindo knew what he himself was luminously labouring at, he perceived in one flash the whole character and menace of Nazism.

To gauge that character and menace we must look through Sri Aurobindo's eyes at Nature and her evolution towards the Spirit. Nature on earth starts with an involution of the Divine, an immense "Inconscience." Out of this, life and mind and soul emerge, by slow purblind groping through the potentialities of life and mind and soul involved in matter and by a strong guiding pressure of these things from the planes above the material, where they have their own occult organised activities. Spirit and Supermind are the highest terms involved, holding in themselves the key to an entire fulfilment of all the others in a perfected physical frame. The difficulties of evolution lie, in the first place, in the pervading unconsciousness which is our base in Nature and the separative half-consciousness which crystallises out of it. These are undivine factors, posited at the beginning of a special form of manifestation of the Divine, the working of a particular possibility, the possibility of the Divine's emergence from what seems at the outset the very negation of Him. But there is another factor at work which derives from beyond material Nature. This is not merely undivine: it is also anti-divine. The undivine resists by sheer inertia, the anti-divine by a various strategy of attack. And the attack comes from occult dimensions of being.

Behind the evolutionary earth-scene there are typal worlds fixed in a certain order and harmony of their own. These worlds are of darkness as well

(continued from the previous page) as of light. There is no progress on their own levels, they are content with their own types, possessing fully-expressed their peculiar nature and deploying it in diverse fashions. But that contentment with full self-play does not preclude their desire to extend the play of their satisfaction from the occult to the material. They make the earth-scene their battle-field. Now, as the earth-scene starts with an involution of the Divine, a concealment of spirit, the occult worlds of darkness find an easier role than those of bight. "On the black rock of the Inconscience" they build their edifices with greater immediate success. That is why evolution is not only aeonic but chockful of stupendous setbacks, demolitions of half-achieved good, perversions of delicately established beauty. That is why man in spite of his Godward urge makes so little advancement and centuries see him but grandiously shifting from tweedledum to tweedledee, a remaining pitifully the same in his heart under all camouflages of outer form. That is why every truth gets "wonky" in the long run and becomes actually a species of untruth, religion grows an obscurantist blight and art a decadent saturnalia, philosophy a riot of sophisms and politics a huge machinery for exploiting the many in the interests of the few. O so slow is the journey of the Gods! Always the path is cluttered and broken by destructive masses of influence from mysterious worlds where brutality and blindness are the principles on which existence is founded in a non-evolving immutable mould.

Three kinds of beings dwell in the hideous harmony of those worlds. The Indian terms are: Asura, Rakshasha, Pisacha. In English they may be translated: Titan, Giant, Demon. Each has his special function. The Asura is a being who comes with great powers of thought, not a beautiful and systematic thought but a formidable vehemence of it. He has also great "moral" powers, he can be self-controlled, ascetic and chaste in his own life, a sort of inverted Yogi, but all his gifts of tapasya he uses for selfish and violent ends. His aim is to

(continued from the previous page) pluck civilisation from the roots, destroy all humane and progressive impulse, regiment the spontaneous diversity of life into a ruthless movement of robots, drink the exultation of triumph by breaking with an iron heel the dreaming heart of man. The Rakshasha is a devourer without brains, the ravager who builds nothing save a pyramid of skulls. He ploughs up the world into a myriad graves and leaves it a chaos of corpses. He is pure greed run amok. The Pisacha fouls and pollutes all things, he is the wallower in dirt and the necrophage, the inventor of obscene tortures, the mutilating maniac. The Asura is the General, the Fuhrer of the army of the darkness; the Rakshasha is the lieutenant, the henchman; the Pisacha is the private, the storm-trooper.

They are no symbols or imaginary figures by which man visualises his own imperfections and evil instincts. Rather the evil instincts are the signs in him of the subtle presence of powers and personalities that have their habitat in non-human and preternatural spheres. are of a perverse bliss in which the cruel, the wry and the filthy are hideously harmonised for ever to yield enjoyment, that man feels a pleasure in his own basenesses, an attachment, to his crookedness and suffering, a reluctance to give up his blindness and lust in spite of all the misery his higher self sees and feels in them—a reluctance as if blindness and lust were things to be cherished, precious components of the life-drama, indispensable art-elements of the cosmic scheme. But man's love of the base and the torture some becomes not just one part of his nature but almost his whole being when the Asura, with his attendant Rakshasha and Pisacha, so clutches human nature that it becomes one with that occult and rigid reality. Then we have an incarnation of adverse forces, the dark deities, and they shape out a collectivity, a nation, a State with the purpose of goose-stepping on the world and smashing the entire fabric of civilisation. Such a catastrophic invasion has taken place in our own times and with a thoroughness with which the spiritual Light has sought embodiment and outflowering.

(continued from the previous page) Hence this war has not been like any other war and Nazism is not a recrudescence of man's ignorance but the beginning of a new era of changeless horror and terror, the most monstrous onslaught made from Preternature to found here the empire of Satanism. The human consciousness has well-nigh died in those who embody the preternatural hierarchy—for the simple reason that the human has become as good as possessed. And because the possession is so extreme, the task of defeating the Asura and his band was so imperative and has been so arduous. It is no wonder a large number of combatants as well as neutrals kept asking: can Hitler be defeated? Yet the very enormity of the invasion has called forth the hidden powers of Light from behind the veil. And though it is harder for the human instrument to be a channel of the Divine than to be a medium of the Diabolical, we must remember that the Divine is the infinite while the Diabolical is nothing save the immense. If the Diabolical finds an easier role, the Divine brings a vaster capacity—and slowly, step by step, the forces of Light have been mobilised and trained and hurled against the foe. There could be no parleying, no compromise, no appeasement. The Asura cannot be converted: he has got to be broken.

However dimly, this truth was seized by the Allied nations. Churchill gave it the most dynamic push possible, short of direct occult and spiritual vision. When France lay prostrate and Hitler announced that on the fifteenth of August that year he would address the world from Buckingham Palace and the endless luftwaffe over Britain seemed a goddess of winged victory for him, Churchill knew that there could be neither turning back nor knuckling under. Whatever his defects in colonial policy, he was magnificent under that day-to-day rain of high explosive, and his instinct of the superhuman truth at stake marks him out as an instrument par excellence of the Divine in this war. In far-away India was raised a voice guided not by instinct but by a shining insight. Strangely enough, the voice

(continued from the previous page) was of one whose day of birth was the fifteenth of August, the exact day on which Hitler hoped to celebrate the death of all that mankind valued. It was the sole clear and clarion-like voice amidst a chaos of political quarrels that was confusing India's mind vis-a-vis the occult conflict which had made our world its stage. India who had known God as no other country in the past was weak, fumbling and hesitant, obsessed by her political animosity against Britain and oblivious of the wider and deeper call to which Churchillian Britain had responded. Sri Aurobindo stood alone in his sun-bright seeing of this war's inner significance. He declared his unrestricted sympathy, his unconditional support—"no matter what the consequences." as his words have it in his message to the Viceroy. At the back of those words was the whole mystical puissance of an integral Yoga, a puissance that works secretly like a dynamo sending out world-currents, driving a vast invisible inspired strength into the armies and navies and air-forces ranged against Hitler.

When history-books are written, these armies and navies and air-forces together with the men at the head of the Allied governments will figure large in them. The praise they will get is amply deserved by their idealism, courage, perseverance and skill. But whoever understands the profound meaning of the war and senses the incorporeal clash of which it has been the outer reverberation will surely recognise, as the active antithesis to the occult evil that threatened utterly to engulf mankind through Hitler, the occult good that promises to lift mankind utterly to the heights through Sri Aurobindo.

K.D. Sethna: "A PLEA FOR SPENSER". @@

Among great English poets the one who has suffered in these days of jangling nerves and psychoanalytic aberrations the utmost neglect because of his matter, mood and manner is Edmund Spenser. To the modern mind with its personal and introspective bent he seems quite useless, especially as he expended his imagination on themes which do not interest us any more, the age of chivalry and Un being more irrevocably gone than even that of the Canterbury Pilgrims.

(continued from the previous page) In fact, whatever customs and figures of Chaucer's time may have fallen into obsolescence, the main stuff of his creation still corresponds to life's play around us, and that is why Spenser is as good as forgotten, while Chaucer with his generally less poetic temper persists. But to the true lover of poetry who is not altogether lost in the whirlpools of the life force the Faerie Queene must always remain delightful despite its allegorical remoteness and its structural ambiguity. For there are so many individual scenes and episodes rich in the poetic vein that to skip Spenser completely would be a considerable loss, larger at least than that entailed by missing to study how our ultra-moderns recoil from the Elizabethan romantist's so-called sugary vagueness to pen doggerel about spermatozoa!

It is true that Spenser does not deal with problems immediately facing us, but after all there must be some "time to stand and stare" — particularly when such staring puts us in contact with beauty. The aim of poetry is not primarily to provide a guide to practical self-adjustment or even intellectual growth; it is to touch us with the magic and power of some absolute beauty whose image it tries to transmit by means of expressive word-music made as faultless as possible. That magic and power has a large variety of heights and depths, and I dare say if I had to choose between Spenser's perfection and Dante's I would not hesitate a minute, because Dante gives a far more intimate touch of the absolute beauty which great verse must draw close to us by its patterned inspiration, its unimpeachably expressed and rhythmmed mood-gay, grave, subtle or vehement.

With such passages cropping up in the Faerie Queene, it is critical perversity to regard it as worthless. When, however, we are asked to weigh its total coinage of fancy there need be no prejudice in its favour to prevent its very unequal intensity from being acknowledged no less than the limitations of its creative range.

His was a descriptive imagination which could cast a spell of iridescence or of grim shadows, but the sudden metaphorical surprise by which psychological poignancies can be intimately revealed we do not encounter in his works; and for the simple reason that his poetic excellence is for the most part divorced from personal emotion.

The remarkable point about him is that his music is never absent, thin as the matter it supports may sometimes be. This invariable command over equisiteness of sound equips a poet for a place in the front rank; for, if he can bewitch by his choice language and cadence in the teeth of a trivial substance, how perfect must the expressive flowering be from a significant soil!

Very few artists come anywhere near the exquisiteness Spenser achieves by an ever-varying technique of recurrent harmonies.

Modern psychology would say that Spenser achieves in his art a sublimation of his discontent with life's contradictions, but that Virgil carries an unresolved complex, the fighter in him bearing always an open wound which is too deep for his natural strength and can be endured only by a willed fortitude. Both, however, turned their moods into music of a rare order, though both had to face languages recalcitrant to rhythm.

Spenser revived obsolete terms for the sake of their music and colour, arrested word-beauties about to fall into desuetude and boldly added to the extant vocabulary by coinages of his own with some pretext of old analogies and even without any if he saw the pure artistic need.

We moderns, even when free from the paroxysmal influence of our sure lists and keeping our senses sweat with the old sober ecstasies, may imagine ourselves independent of it since we do not require to worship him, having Shelley and Keats as our first guiding stars: but our independence is unreal—Shelley and Keats are the two poets whose affinity to Spenser is the deepest and in their own manner they have distilled a new

(continued from the previous page) his musical attar for us. His stamp on the language is as permanent and unmistakable as Shakespeare's and Milton's, and it is the surest test of critical judgment to find amidst contemporary excitements an impartial hour for appreciating the languid greatness of the Faerie Queene.

K.D. Sethna: "HAVELOCK ELLIS'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY".@@

What is here left behind is a sense of rich plenitude – an achievement splendid in its calm completeness. Yes, the two characteristics of this man as embodied in his work were an unassuming poise and a thorough-going wide-sweeping efficiency. That combination gave him a strength which did not exhaust itself, however enormous the job it undertook. The several volumes of his studies in the psychology of sex were written with an undiminished confident vigour: the grasp over each topic was masterly and the feeling of the importance of the labour never flagged, so that in spite of severe opposition the writer's mind proceeded from start to finish without hurry, fear or weariness.

Havelock Ellis's efficiency is not mechanical, nor even merely scientific. He is no soulless collector of facts. Beginning his career of authorship as a man deeply interested in the fountains of creative art no less than the springs of creative sex, he never loses the imaginative touch, the gift vision, that is the privilege of the poet. In fact, he has written poetry, some of it unusually felicitous, most of it bearing the stamp of profound feeling though not always of expressive intensity. But his was not the vocation of the direct poet. It was through a fine balanced prose, casting clear glances in many uncommon directions, that he exercised the penetration and quick sympathy his nature possessed. And he was drawn to explore, with the eye of a scientist, regions which poetry plumbs only through a rapture of brief hurting flashes and sudden engulfing shadows – the regions of abnormal sex. To this exploration he devoted a large number of years; but

@@ All-India Weekly 1944.

(continued from the previous page) even then he never lost contact with the experiments and adventures of art. No new genius in any sphere of art but found in Havelock Ellis an understanding that was deep as well as enthusiastic, the depth preventing the enthusiasm from being effusive, the enthusiasm saving the depth from heaviness of expression.

It is no easy task to bring a correct critical insight to the quick of one's own life. But Ellis's natural bent as well as his long psychological and analytic training helps him a good deal. So in spite of unavoidable defects his autobiography makes illuminating reading. A frankness that lacks no dignity and an emotional power that is no enemy to intellectual vision constitute its essence. Whether it will rank with the confessions of past times I cannot definitely say; I am no authority on autobiographical literature and must admit to my shame that I have not even read in full the one book which weighs so much with Ellis himself—Rousseau's. Rousseau was indeed the more dynamic genius and also the more talented artist, and I think he was a more significant figure too in the history of the human mind: according to Ellis, he was the most significant influence in the west after Jesus. I therefore dare say it would be demanding too much of Ellis to ask him to play Rousseau. But he was no mean maunder of the positive side of what has come to be known as modernism. He aided to bring sex into the sunshine, to blow the fresh air of health upon the morbid privacy into which sex had degenerated. If there is more sanity and tolerance and understanding in the world today, Havelock Ellis is responsible to a marked degree. And as man and artist he cannot be denied a substantial position—a position neither vast nor supercharged with the meaning of personality nor creatively pre-eminent, yet striking home to our sense of values with a revealing weight, intimacy and grace. His autobiography, quintessencing him, is sufficient proof of his genuine worth. Judged by the story it lays bare of a rich and serious soul in a style of varied force, it comes as a document of considerable light.

The story is unusual. The relation between Havelock and his wife Edith is far, from being a conventional love-affair. Edith's soul is as complex as Havelock's, though set in a different key, and the entangling of their hearts follows the extraordinary curves of their character. Sex is not the insistent strain in the accords and discords of their emotional lives. By sex I mean here the physical act. They married without any vehement desire of body for body, and after a certain period the physical act had no place in their relationship. They felt no necessity for it—in fact, it seems to have been discarded as something slightly disharmonious for both. This is not to say that they never lived passionately. Theirs was a love more intimately moving than simple affection—and Havelock actually found that the absence of sex in the narrow sense made no whit of difference of his attachment of difference in his attachment to his wife in the most intense man-and-woman way.

"Passion transcends sex", he writes; "that is a discovery with a significance for life and for the institution of marriage which has not yet been measured." It is of course unlikely that so eminent an authority on the psychology of sex should have an utter aloofness from it. Ellis was not an unnatural man; but he had an instinctive turn for lifting the elemental urge to a high level. There seems to be a restraint in the midst of strong emotion. Both were free-minded to an extreme degree and yet they appear to have been lovers with a reservation. All this as well as his later sex-transcendence without any loss of true passion demonstrates the subtle stuff of which he was made: he was no gross animal as so many great men—like Goethe Victor Hugo—are in spite of their lofty intellects.

But in one point Ellis fails in subtlety of spirit. The failure is associated with his having other women than his wife to minister to his emotional needs. Edith's nature—impetuous and excitable—was not quite what Havelock needed: there

(continued from the previous page) was in him a cry for restfulness, for a touch that would not merely kindle his mind and body and make them burn but also give them a calm soothing glow—a dawn-gleam and a sunset-shine no less than a moon-flush. No such profound griefs and high exultations as with Edith remains, when all is said and done, the core of his autobiography—the years of his growth and the fulfilment of his literary and scientific destiny came with her and through her, for she was a woman of genius and the genius in him rose to full flowering under her radiance. It is a pity, therefore, that she could not satisfy all the cries of his heart. Was it because she was partly homo-sexual and consequently divided in her response to him? It is fact that the first disappointment in their married lives fell to Havelock when he found her under the spell of another woman. Not that she grew cold to him; the same heat of attachment remained on her part but he discovered for the first time that she was two-natured and that side by side with the heat her being could feel for him she could carry on a warm self-devotion to a woman. He did not get anything fundamentally less than he had done before; but he found himself not the sole lord of her heart for the reason that her heart had two compartments of emotion, or rather, to put it more correctly though more paradoxically, there were two distinct hearts in her. In short, he saw that he could not have the whole of her, though what he had was more powerful and lasting than what women took from her.

That she rose in her heart high above it and let Havelock follow the path of his nature and did not permit the pain caused by her wound to prompt her to break inwardly with him, shows her to be an extraordinary person.

If Edith became capable of the subtle grace she showed, it was because she realised how great a man he was. He gave her something which she felt it would be foolish to throw away in peevish resentment over his emotional complications. These complications had so little of the base and the gross about them that they weighed little against the magnanimity of

(continued from the previous page) his being, the primacy he gave her in his heart, the superb sympathy and solicitude he brought her. If her genius helped him, his genius did the same to her. She knew that no man she came across wrapped her round with such warm depth. Others sought her out and even loved her but no gift came to her from so mighty a nature. Even his defects left him a finer man on the whole than any she knew in her entire life.

Havelock emerges from his book with a grand stature—powerful and calm at the same time, erring yet magnificent—and for all his failure a great lover and a sensitive artist. The blend of lover and artist turns the last portion of his autobiography—the portion covering Edith's death—into a most moving testament. Every sentence rings true and beautiful, a restrained intensity of genuine love strikes again and again a Dantesque note. It is really a grand finale of golden feeling.

There is a wide store of wisdom scattered in the autobiography. Life's vicissitudes, art's complexities, problems of the individual and problems of the race are lit up by flashes of genius. I could make quite a substantial compilation of highly enlightening extracts. But the book is at bottom a *liber amoris*, a story of love's heart. So as a fitting illustration of the wisdom of that heart I shall pick out a passage.

"It seems to me that a critic who is not keenly aware of all the defects of a lovely thing which ravishes him is but a crude critic, whose opinion hardly counts. My attitude is the same even in love. The women whom I have loved and almost worshipped are women of whose defects I have been precisely and poignantly aware. The lover who is not thus aware seems to me a crude sort of lover, scarcely even a lover at all, merely the victim of a delusion, of which to rob him would be to rob him of his 'love'. I feel contempt for the 'love' that is blind; to me there is no love without clear vision, and perhaps, also no vision in the absence of love."

C.T. Srinivasan: "WHAT IS THE MEANING & FUNCTION OF REASON?" @@

Monsieur Masson Oursel's book entitled "History of Philosophy in the Orient" (1939) in French says: "The writings brought forward by the Orient lists do not belong to a class comparable to the Western Philosophy. They resemble much more those with which the historians of religion are concerned. Our Western Methods of research have sought to find a value apart from the practical i.e., the value of Truth. Their worship of reason has created a philosophical literature to which there is no corresponding one in the East. The problem of the relations between Reason and Faith is an unknown problem in the East."

Let me offer the following remarks on these statements. "Worship of Reason indeed! Here, the East and the West have undoubtedly fallen apart. For, they differ fundamentally both in their standpoints and in their conceptions of the meaning and function of Reason. Is it a wonder then that one does not understand or appreciate the other? In the West all philosophical enquiries take their rise from the standpoint of an independent objective world, i.e., the scientific concept as it is termed. The standpoint of the Vedanta is altogether different, even startling to all commonsense. This standpoint is clearly stated by Sankara in the very first sentence of his commentary on the Vedanta Sutras: Here we are, You and I." The 'You' stands for the entire objective which includes all other selves and beings. The 'I' stands for the self of the enquirer. "I am the sole subject, and the whole world of organic and inorganic creations stands for me as an object only." If this viewpoint is not grasped at the outset even the most rational expositions of Vedanta will appear solipsistic, dogmatic and what not. Who could have been more rational than Sankara, and why is that he is not understood by these champions of Reason in the West? But judging the Vedanta from his own standpoint the verdict of the western thinker is justified in holding that in the East, Philosophy, Religion and Mysticism are forever commingling in most

@@ In a letter to P.B.

(continued from the previous page) in a most alarming way. Therefore the task of enlightening the mind of the West to the supreme truths of the Vedanta means literally the superhuman task of attempting to get rid of their inveterate obsession of an independent objective. Next, comes a greater difficulty. To conduct any genuine philosophical enquiry Vedanta imposes two necessary qualifications. One, a spirit of extreme sacrifice of some or even all of our dearest and opinions and prejudices. Second, a daring and courage to face and accept the consequences of the standpoint. Is there one more brilliant than Bertrand Russell and yet he is prepared to abandon philosophy rather than face the consequences of his own sincere investigations! According to Vedanta, these two qualifications are most essential to every sincere seeker of knowledge either in the East or West. This explains also why in India, the home of Vedanta, only a few are attracted towards it. Of course, in itself Vedanta is meant to be universal and within the easy reach of everybody. A profound mystery that it should be otherwise! In the words of the Upanishads, a wonder is he the knower of Brahman and a greater wonder he who understands it as taught by the teacher!

What is the meaning of function of Reason? Herein also the East and West have come to loggerheads. In Vedanta Reason is led up gradually to Brahman or Reality which becomes its meaning, fruition, and realisation. In the West reason remains purely speculative revelling in its own worlds of abstract concepts. God or Reality is the lost word in the western systems while in the East it remains the first and last word. The answer to the western criticisms had long ago been stated in the Upanishads: "He who is devoted to mere action passes into darkness; but he who is devoted to mere knowledge (speculative) passes into greater darkness". What is this reason so loudly talked of and what does it prove? The questions need serious investigation. No use of starting with a prejudice in favour of reason! As everything else reason also can be questioned. (But is not Reason itself the questioner? – P.B.)

(continued from the previous page) Every attempt to investigate is to be done only by the aid of reason! Are we getting into a vicious circle? This reason which attempts to prove everything else including God or the Ultimate Reality cannot prove itself. We are caught inextricably between the unpleasant horns of a dilemma! Either we accept the indefinite regress of a reason for a reason or a full fledged scepticism or its worst substitute mysticism. None of the things could we relish to accept. But when we begin to question directly reason itself it disappears completely and merges into an absolute silence. We remain where we are none the wiser for all trouble. Is reason to be possessed that it may be dispossessed for good? No, Sir. Reason does not die out completely. It appears again in the form of Conviction when reason is thoroughly thrashed out. This conviction that is born of reason is alone entitled to be called Faith. And this Faith which is born of rational conviction is neither religion nor theology nor mysticism or any other damned isms. What is it then? It is the self-revelation of God or Reality appearing as reason and faith or conviction. What is this self-revelation about? It explains the meaning and function of reason viz., to know and understand God or Reality. Even the wisest and greatest thinkers are under a constraint to think and why not they accept this Fact instead of uselessly disputing about reason, faith etc. Wherefore should it be surprising to any one that reason justifies what the heart has truly accepted and what reason can justify the heart can very well accept? In the Ultimate Reality the two are the same. It is ignorance only that differentiates reason from faith. It is not the fault either of reason or of faith that they are misinterpreted and misrepresented. But God or Reality includes in itself both reason and faith and transcending overflows them both. It is this Reality alone that acts as the Urge to reason and the Urge itself becomes the ideal of reason. Therefore the fear that reason or faith will ever get dispossessed is groundless and most 'irrational'. When there is absolutely no room for doubt, fear or ignorance in the nature of Reality where is the room for mysticism unless it be in the constrained imagination of the human mind? So on and so forth....."

Shankaran: "THE SCIENCE OF LIFE" @@

Settled views regarding man, the universe and God with a finished outlook on all the problems of life, are a hindrance than help for living a busy life. Jesus had no metaphysics; To had no theory of the Universe; to live a good life a programme of life is not essential. One can live the good life even without "systems" or first principles. It is possible to get through life even without a philosophy of life.

The ancient philosophers promised what was impracticable; they despised what was practicable; they filled the world with long words and long beards; and they left it as wicked and ignorant as they found it. Ditto for modern philosophers. Progress in Philosophy should always be suspect.

It is time that humanity get rid of these pertinacious illusions of reincarnation, karma, Hell, Heaven, Purgatory, post-mortem existence etc. If Re-incarnation be fact, we may assume that a philosopher may be born again as an ass! The chances are cent per cent. Let benevolent Providence grant also the power for us identify in the ass the quondam philosopher! The ass may be born again as an apple! Anyway, the author wishes him every success in his future life, though it is not unlikely that the "Wise man of the East" may very well become in a subsequent birth the "Wise Man of Gotham"!

Even if future life be a fact, its desirability is questionable. There are enough of joys and miseries in our world to claim out attention and enough of duties etc. to perform while still on this side of the grave, for us to waste time in contemplating what we would be like in a life beyond the grave. For idle dotards it may be pleasing to map out their future lives, but for the Religion of Man, we need not go beyond the drama of life here on earth. We do not know what is going to happen the next moment; the uncertainty of life in this planet and the quest for life ever-lasting give birth to the disciples of philosophy. Torn by conflicting desires and tortured by

(continued from the previous page) disaffection and doubt, 'tender-minded' man attempts to find a meaning for his life midst the scheme of things. The search for the meaning of the cosmos is the beginning and content of all philosophical systems. Philosophy, if anything, is a 'world-view'..... Saving knowledge is necessary for liberation of the self from its bewilderment.

Sooner or later, at some time or other during our mortal existence, the cardinal experience comes when we are tortured and distracted by internal crisis and external chaos, at the sight of misery and unmerited suffering and grave social injustices – and man turns philosopher with a divine discontent... When the means are denied to usurp a good life from the unwilling hands of contentious society, when the avenues to earn a decent living are blocked, when a career is not open for talents, and when personality has no chance to make itself felt, man turns philosopher, or scoundrel, or both. When constrained to obtain a living and a status in the scale of existence, a place under the sun and a fair measure of life's happiness, from the hands of hostile society a 'philosophy of life' becomes absolutely essential. Similarly to attempt to maintain status without the means is the cause of sin, pessimism, despair and philosophy... To see underpaid, undernourished amanuenses writing learned editorials which direct governmental policy and scribes alone and unaided, 'cabined, cribbed, confined' in dingy metropolitan offices, preparing lectures for their sebaceous bosses who draw salaries of four digits, is sufficient exercise for a reflective and philosophic cast of mind. The 'cancer in the rose', the reversal of fortune, the risk of marriage, domestic disharmony, oscillations of temperature in the affections of comrades and even too much or too little sugar in tea are sufficient to make a man a philosopher.... To see fools, favoured by fortune and the circumstances of "time-space", filling-responsible positions, to see the dyspeptic millionaire in his mansion and the starving beggar at his gate, added to the denial of the legitimate satisfaction of the

(continued from the previous page) primary necessities of life and the amenities of civilised existence, will affect any one with a delicately posed and philosophic turn of mind. When the pecuniary employments have been monopolized by good-for-nothing Jackasses, when outrageous fortune dominates politics, and when the avenues of an honest livelihood are closed, Mr Everyman will turn philosopher. And above all, it has been established beyond all reasonable doubt that there is an organic inseparable, indispensable and indisputable connection between philosophy and a bad stomach. One is not possible without the other. To philosophize it is necessary that the stomach should be either empty or over-loaded.

Certainly there ought to be philosophy in our blood, and when one's pile is made up it is easy and pleasant to indulge in the game of Philosophy, and it is indeed a 'dear delight'. Philosophy is Poetry, said Plato, and according to Socrates, it is simply music. Even the Father of Philosophy turned ultimately a materialist by too much speculation about life. Beware of abstractions and pass by the eternal questions eternally discussed by the academic philosophers. Philosophy has become largely intellectual gymnastics and the world has become surfeited with class-room philosophy. We are indebted to our philosophizing forebears for this evil inheritance! Plato alone had left enough for posterity to discuss for two thousand years. When tragedies happen and youthful ambitions are shattered, or when a dear relative kicks the bucket, philosophies vanish and a sense of reality dawns. No wonder, in the crisis of life, buffeted by fortune and outraged by circumstance, men have despaired of a philosophy of despair. The necessity for an art of affixing labels disappears.

Values are not same for all individuals nor is it necessary that they are necessarily experienced or that they are universally operative, except the historical trinity by a linguistic concession. Judgements of value are necessarily one-sided as they are

(continued from the previous page) only expressions of individual preferences. Every one has his own private world of values, and there is no absolute criterion to measure even ultimate values. Values, which are as many and as varied according to human and individual viewpoints do not permit of reduction to a trinity. Prof. Joad, has observed in his "Commonsense Philosophy" that since the publication of his essays and those of his contemporaries on Realism, Value has become eventually the central problem of Philosophy, that the philosophical world has taken a new interest in Value. At the first blush one would have thought that Joad and his colleagues had themselves initiated the discussion on value; but had Joad said so explicitly, he should be pinched in the helix of his ears, striped on the buttocks, and shown the volume of literature on the phenomenology of value for the past thousand years.

Even God has been pigeon holded in the hierarchy of values. The gods have been deprived of value by our modern theories of value. The old conceptions of God have lost all value, and the Kingdom of God has been replaced by the Kingdom of Values. There is no room for faith in a personal God in the purely impersonal kingdom of values. It seems, there is no place for God, the Ultimate Value, in the realm of meanings and values, and that even God in His struggle for existence, and if He is to survive at all and justify His existence, has to reduce Himself to a Value! The God religion is no more than a Value for value-philosophers. In short, God, the matrix of all reality and values, has been outlawed from the Kingdom of Values.

TRUTH is not one, absolute and indivisible, but necessarily many, as viewpoints are many. It is never absolute and certain, but provisional, a relative and subjective. There are, and there would be, ever new formulations of Truth, as Truth is coloured inevitably by the variety of perspectives. Judgment, even if true, deals only with a fragment of truth as there is no absolute criterion for the recognition of valuation of truth. Truth is not the sum-total of judgments even if true.

REALITY is One and indivisible; we infer that sugar is sweet, and is logic; we experience that sugar is sweet, and is knowledge; we doubt whether sugar is sweet, and is speculation; we verify by experiment and is Science; we taste, experience and enjoy the thing, and is Art. The philosopher gathers from books, the author from quill-driving, the scientists by observation and experiment, the logician by argument and proof, the intellectual by haunting libraries, the mystic by intuitive insight, the religious enthusiast by prayer, the metaphysician by endless speculations and logomachy and the masses by the lessons of experience and living contact with nature, refer to Reality but they are all aspects of the same Reality. Each in his own way is correct.

Maharaj Sahib: "A SOLACE TO RADHASOAMI SATSANGIS."

The sudden departure of Huzur Maharaj has no doubt been a great shock to all of us and taken away the apparent prop we were all resting on. But He has not totally severed His connection with us. This is the time for internal devotion and whoever does so attentively and with fervour will receive palpable help from Huzur Maharaj within.

You need not apologize for the questions you asked me. It is my duty to reply to them as far as I know and I shall render this service to the best of my ability, but as I am only a Satsangi, you need not put too much weight on my answers. It gives me considerable satisfaction if my replies in any way prove of any service, inasmuch as I consider this as an acceptance of my service by the most gracious and kind Father Radha Soami Dayal. As we are travellers of the same path and the goal is also the same, we cannot but derive benefit by the exchange of our ideas and prove of mutual help to each other.

These letters were written by Maharaj Sahib in reply to enquiries made by out-station Satsangis during the period immediately following the departure of Huzur Maharaj.

Nothing definite can be said yet about Huzur Maharaj's successor. Eventually, no doubt the necessity

(continued from the previous page) of a Sant Satguru is indispensable for the continuance of Radhasoami Faith, but some spiritual benefit is intended even until His appearance, the object being that all followers of Radhasoami Faith should exert themselves internally for spiritual advancement. He, as before, is showering Grace and Mercy on all of us and the only course open for us is to continue our devotional practice with patience, trust and regularity.

When the Supreme Being Radhasoami again manifests Himself as Sant Satguru then His image should be contemplated in lieu of that of the former Satguru, provided the latter's form has not manifested itself internally within the devotee. But if there is such manifestation, then no change in contemplation is needed.

There are two streams in creation, the one ascending and the other descending—so along with the regeneration of spirits, others will enter into the material regions and these regions can not altogether disappear.

Such of the Satsangis as can get internal Darshan of Huzur Maharaj and hear the sound as described above, do not stand in indispensable necessity of another Satguru.

The main Spiritual Current being in the eyes and forehead, the proper internal vision of the image of Sant Satguru takes place only when those portions are clearly visible. These are the only parts which the Evil Spirit can not fully assume for the deception of a devotee, whereas the other parts of the Satguru's image or body he can assume. You should therefore try to contemplate the eyes and forehead of Huzur Maharaj in your devotion, just as you used to look at Him during the Arti ceremony, and need not pay special attention to the lower part of the image; but I would remark here that be it the lower part of Huzur Maharaj's face, or His eyes or forehead or any other part of His Holy Body, if a true glimpse of any of them is caught internally, it instantaneously produces great internal concentration of mind and spirit accompanied with

Maharaj Sahib: "A SOLACE TO RADHASOAMI SATSANGIS."

(continued from the previous page) feelings of ecstatic joy. This is the true test of the manifestation of Satguru's form within a Satsangi.

The spirit can be elevated both by the sound current and the form of Satguru. The latter is however more efficacious specially because the disturbing influences of Kala and Maya are instantaneously removed by His image.

The superiority, spiritually, of the contemplation of the form of the living Satguru (provided there is a Satguru) over that of the previous Satguru lies in the fact that the form of the living Satguru is the kinetic form of the Supreme Father, while the previous form in consequence of the withdrawal of the spiritual force has become non-active excepting in those cases where its internal impression within the devotee has by practice been developed to such an extent that the spiritual force has made it a groove for internal action within the practitioner.

If you are sincerely repentant over your shortcomings, the Supreme Father will certainly overlook them, and also gradually bestow upon you strength to curb the vagaries of your mind to some extent.

Huzur Maharaj's form and features should be contemplated in any way they easily come up before your mental vision. If His form &c. at any time struck you specially, and you can remember those best, preference should be given to them in contemplation and to the form observed during Arti ceremony, which need not forcibly be contemplated if it does not manifest itself so easily as the other one. But whatever form of Huzur Maharaj appears within, the attention and sight should be gradually fixed on the eyes thereof. A devotee should contemplate Huzur Maharaj's image before his mental eyes. It is not necessary that the Agra association should indispensably be kept in view. It may at times be resorted to, to help in the appearance of the image. The image should be contemplated at the focus midway between the eyes.

It is better to contemplate with shut eyes in the beginning. When the image has manifested itself within, even with eyes open, it could be contemplated. But when concentration is great, the eyes will be closed of their own accord, without any desire to do so. Of course if the devotee's spirit is more or less concentrated at all times, he can have the above experiences with eyes open. Whichever likeness of Huzur Maharaj has impressed itself most and can most easily be brought before the mental vision, should be contemplated.

Devotees who can neither hear sound nor get darshan, stand in need of another Guru, but they should patiently await His advent.

A spirit is said to be elevated when its seat is changed from the sixth Chakra to a higher sphere. Relaxation of, and liberation from bondages, acquirement and experience of higher bliss, and development to some extent of supernatural powers, are symptoms of spiritual elevation. But these symptoms will be understood by the devotee himself and not by others. To the latter, such a devotee would not present any extraordinary features outwardly but his company will clearly show that the greater portion of his time is devoted to practice and other religious observances enjoined, and that all his dealings bear unmistakeable stamp of sincerity, honesty, toleration and mildness. Such pure and upright conduct will not fail to impress all who come in contact with him, and in a short time only, he will be loved and respected by his friends, associates and relations.

It all depends upon Huzur Maharaj's Grace, as to when His eyes and forehead might clearly appear during contemplation. Prayers might be offered for this mercy.

If the devotee finds that he can successfully listen to the sound while lying down he may do so. But for the daily practice the prescribed posture will be better.

Any form of Huzur Maharaj which appeared most attractive should be contemplated. It is preferable to gradual tracing of the lineaments by the devotee.

(continued from the previous page) But if the devotee is able to fix the image by this process, there is no objection to his doing so.

When the spiritual currents flowing through the body tend towards their focus, concentration may be said to have occurred. The symptoms of concentration are enjoyment of bliss in devotion and an experience of withdrawal of vitality from his limbs. Yes, when the spirit currents converge into sixth Chakra, concentration has taken place. As in devotional practice the concentration in the beginning is not so intense as to result in the complete withdrawal of the spiritual currents, the states of dream, deep slumber and Turia are not felt to have been passed through, but none the less bliss is experienced to some extent, its intensity increasing with the degree of intensity of concentration; and when the practice has advanced so far that the devotee can achieve complete withdrawal of the spirit currents, all the states mentioned above will be traversed during his devotional concentration.

By the contemplation of Guru mental picture, spirit can be easily concentrated. There is no easier method for concentration.

The spiritual currents in the pupil of the eyes are withdrawn in sleep and concentration.

The guru's image which comes of its own accord, is manifested by his special Mercy, and it is, therefore, certainly more efficacious in imparting spiritual benefit and bliss than the image which is fixed by the efforts of the devotee. With regard to the fixing of the latter, one has been endowed with some power to do so, while over the former no such control is possessed.

A devotee should therefore always use his efforts to fix the image and leave the unsolicited visions to the grace of the Supreme Father.

A devotee who has by his practice dispelled the internal darkness, traverses the states of dream and deep slumber in the full possession of the uses of his senses, whereas ordinary people recede to these in unconsciousness.

The non-experience of internal spiritual help produces, no doubt, at times, great mental dejection and it appears as if emancipation will not be gained; but correctly observed, it is a step towards the attainment of that end, as these mental perturbations represent the commotion concomitant with the process of internal purification. Without these, the effect of past actions cannot be eliminated (the removal of mental impurity is a necessary condition for the manifestation of Spiritual Bliss) and the regeneration and development of the latent force of spirit cannot take place. The refuse of mundane desires has accumulated from time immemorial through innumerable births, and an accusation of impatience may fairly be made if complete purification is expected or insisted upon within such a short time as 6 or 8 years. But assurance based on experience may be safely given that feelings of internal unrest and dissatisfaction are the precursors to showers of spiritual Bliss and Mercy, and as such their acrid results should not be made the ground of despair.

All should take warning that they should not drag in worldly feelings in their devotional relations and be blinded by the materialist ideas that have degenerated other religions. This consists in asking for or desiring any worldly object or sensual pleasure or name and fame, other than that necessary for carrying on ordinary avocation and livelihood, and mixing such thoughts, whether expressed or implied, with the devotional prayers. If such feelings are not guarded against carefully, they will constitute a mental habit and over-ride true devotion in which the only desire should be to approach the Supreme Being, for His sake only, and to love Him for Him alone. The mental evils are subtle and unperceived; lulling religious vigilance with plausible justification, they divert the true devotional current in other directions, and thus frustrate the practice of true internal devotion. All motives of actions and thoughts should therefore be carefully examined

(continued from the previous page) constantly, and the various defects inherent in the mind, carefully noted. Such vigilant analysis will, Supreme Father helping, gradually eradicate the evil tendencies of mind and develop true devotion with its attendant ineffable bliss. An absence of such watch has degenerated other religions.

Sickness and other attendant difficulties or other troubles are no doubt the outcome of our past actions, but the Supreme Father's Grace and Mercy are present when they overtake His children and considerably mitigate their severity, and even in the event of the worst faking place, viz. death, the last moment is specially illumined by the Grace of the Supreme Father, which leaves its perceptible traces on the countenance of the dying person.

In the hour of calamity, grief naturally gives rise to such thoughts, but if reason is allowed to prevail it will soon appear that the cause of despondency is not well founded and that we can not accuse the Supreme Father for want of protection of our welfare. The Radhasoami Faith certainly declares that the Karmas of its devotees will be eradicated and that their effects will also be mitigated, but the Supreme Father would certainly render Himself liable to the accusation of inconsistency and partiality, if in the case of Satsangis He suspended the action of Karmic laws which otherwise were allowed to have their free course. The past Karmas will have, therefore, to be undergone before they are eliminated, but their effects, although it may not be apparent to us for the time being, will be mitigated. Just as Radhasoami Faith and the Sant Satguru do not promise affluence to persons who may accept that Faith, similarly it is a misapprehension to consider that all accidents and ups and downs of life will be prevented. They have also their necessity for good results, otherwise all animate beings who are also the particles of the Supreme Father would not have been subjected to them.

As to your worldly affairs, I would only observe that the life of a pleader is a very busy one and not suited to devotional practice. However, if you consider

Maharaj Sahib: "A SOLACE TO RADHASOAMI SATSANGIS."

(continued from the previous page) that you will be able to straighten and smooth temporal matters by the adoption of this profession, you may do so.

Do not be dejected. The Merciful Supreme Father will gradually help you and purify your mind. It is a good sign although painful, that after going in bad ways, you feel contrition. Always do so. Sins are ever pardoned by sincere and true compunction.

Sorry to hear of the illness you are suffering from, and the great pain you have to undergo in consequence, but, as you already remark, this is due to past Karma, which cannot be eliminated without giving some trouble. But you may rest assured that what would have been intolerable sufferings, and would have been spread over a protracted period, have been much mitigated and considerably reduced in duration, not to mention the great spiritual benefit that is resulting from concomitant purification. On these considerations, it seems desirable that you should patiently bear your sufferings with trust.

You may firmly rest assured that nothing but spiritual advantage would accrue from your present condition of bodily ill-health but it is, of course, for the time being, very dejecting and in some instances unbearable. However, considering the Mercy of Supreme Father witnessed in innumerable cases, you should prop up your failing courage and, abiding by His grace patiently bear what He is pleased to ordain. Whatever is happening, is to your eventual spiritual interest, and nothing will hinder your spiritual progress, although it may not be apparent to you. Do not exercise yourself, if, on account of delicate health, you cannot perform devotional practice or get spiritual pleasure. The Supreme Merciful Father will recompense you for this apparent loss.

Mrs Anne Aucott: "TRANCE, EVOLUTION, LIFE & SUBJECTIVITY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES"@@

In your book "In search of Secret India" page 310, you mention a spiritual trance—I am curious

@@ In letters to P.B.

Mrs Anne Aucott: "TRANCE, EVOLUTION, LIFE & SUBJECTIVITY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES"

(continued from the previous page) about this. From my own personal experience I have proved it possible to focus my mental forces on one or more persons in a room, and without a word, produce a state of hypnosis-while under my control the subject is receptive to my thoughts. Do you not think you were hypnotised while sitting before the Maharishee?

On two occasions I have produced self hypnosis for a few minutes—but believe me, it is a very uncomfortable sensation—a sort of creeping paralysis of the brain and nerve centres and queer constriction of the throat. In each case it has been a complete "blank", as before hand, I have willed that the subjective mind would create no hallucinations. What I am curious to discover is this—Does one really acquire spiritual affinity with the "One"—or does the sub-conscious create the afflatus, or spiritual bliss? I am almost positive that in the case of self-induced hypnosis (or trance), one consciously or unconsciously seeks a state of animation, and the subjective mind (while the objective mind is dormant) creates the necessary illusions.

Another interesting thing I find with my subjects is that their sub-conscious, while they are in a state of hypnosis, can probe time and space—but not the future nor too distant past. I am not able to hypnotise everyone. So far I have been unable to ascertain whether my subjects are in harmony with me or otherwise. At times I rather fancy their vibrations are lower than mine.

I was extremely interested in your meeting with the adept in Egypt. Whence come these extraordinary powers? I too have seen and heard some extraordinary things in my travels—sometimes they have left me in a flat space—wondering!! —However, I usually endeavour to reduce everything to a purely subjective experience of the human mind. Cannot most experiences be explained as a mere matter of intellectual chemistry and physics?

There have been moments of idealistic dreaming and sublimation of natural desires—then clear perception

Mrs Anne Aucott: "TRANCE, EVOLUTION, LIFE & SUBJECTIVITY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES"

(continued from the previous page) of the inwardness of the impulse to expression – the inadequacy of that expression to give full embodiment to the idea – analysis!

Life appears to be an eternal quest after the "Truth" – sometimes I wonder if I am any nearer – or was the blind faith of childhood (when I knelt at my mother's knee) a more direct path and that which must ever remain comprehensible. Of Life, I asked "Knowledge" – fully prepared to pay the price with "Labour" – but as I look back through the years I find I have bartered "Faith" and the capacity for accepting those things that I held so dear in childhood.

Theism or Atheism? – When at 15 I toyed with the idea – the Church no longer satisfied me. Christianity, Hinduism, and Buddhism, each have taught me much, but they are inadequate and fall short. I am definitely a theist for I think we can always find intellectually valid proof of the existence of the Ego – Soul – Freewill – and the reality of the existence of an "Inscrutable Absolute", behind phenomena – beyond that I am unable to venture. Do we contact the Infinite in meditation or do we merely create illusions – Take the Roman Catholics and the "Stigmata". It has been proved that the stigmata is not due to divine causes but purely psychological. In years to come, scientists, will realise the importance of having "Laboratories" devoted purely and unselfishly to the study, testing, and understanding of the great metaphysical laws pertaining to the human mind. Will the human mind be turned to such a pitch that each man will be his own transmitter and receiver? Shall we see thought-forms in a sort of mental television?

As we have outgrown the days when devils inhabited stones and gods dwelt on mountains, – when witch doctors performed all sorts of feats to exorcise the demons that possessed once – will we not in like manner outgrow the beliefs and traditions of the present era? When we examine the human mind carefully we find it in a transitional and amphibious condition – we lie between two worlds, the aspirations of creators and the propensities of animals. We have souls! – but –

Mrs Anne Aucott: "TRANCE, EVOLUTION, LIFE & SUBJECTIVITY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES"

(continued from the previous page) when did we acquire them? With the dawn of intellect when ape merged into man? (possibly the pleistocene age). The next question is—supposing this to be so—why was man suddenly endowed with a soul at this stage of evolution—was he very different to the great apes who were responsible for his origin and whom he so closely resembled? If they had no souls, why should he suddenly find himself possessed of one?

You say "wherever there is life there is mind, and life extends from the mineral upwards". I agree that all matter is inhabited by mind and that when the matter is simple in composition, the mental tendencies are proportionately simple. As the atoms merge and become more complex, so the mental tendencies become more varied, more numerous, and more complex. Viewing humanity we find that animal desires and propensities, elevated by the other tendencies which inhabit the human mind, are metamorphosed into ambition, religion, Love etc. If we are to accept the theories of Dr Alexis Carrel and others—the way people act and think is largely a matter of glands and their secretions. The physical influences the mental, and the mental the physical. Existence appears to be a stream in which everything moves towards its inevitable destruction. Every object at any moment is but a cross section of the process of becoming something different. In the process of evolution our intellect changes hour by hour. What then is permanent? If "Intellect" be "Soul" can soul then really be said to exist? Existence surely must mean endurance and permanence.

Our whole physical and mental make-up is nothing but cells —each cell having a life and a function of its own to perform—the collective function of these cells gives us our intellect. Every thought is a "creation"—matter thrown off causing a displacement of ether and ensuring vibrations. What is the ultimate end of these "creations"? If we are to accept vedanta —that no atom is ever "created" for atoms are eternal within the material causative womb of the world (Jagad Yoni), we are

Mrs Anne Aucott: "TRANCE, EVOLUTION, LIFE & SUBJECTIVITY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES"

(continued from the previous page) faced with other problems. If all matter be imbued with life—thoughts must have life—then what is their ultimate end? If everything is evanescent and subject to transmutation, what then remains? According to Vedanta the protyle atom passes on to a plane which is no plane, but the eternal state beyond the planes of illusion. Can there be such a plane? If all matter is life—life is energy and life is soul, so soul must be Energy, the "all-permeant" (sarvaga). Can we reconcile Energy with an eternal state—Energy is constant change, hence we come to time—If we are conscious of Time—whence comes Eternity?

If we turn to mathematics as did some of the greatest philosophers, we discover a world of "Ideas" which survive the passing of time. If we believe that ideas have an existence independent of the minds that gave them birth, we lose illusions of time and space and face Eternity. We get so far, and then find we are back at Platonic Idealism—or mere "Intellectuality" and flee from the realities of existence. It is at this stage that we reach ascetic mysticism—"The Soul".

You say that by proper preparation and purification a "pure experience" is possible and that in such a condition we face the eternal verity. I admit that true knowledge is drawn from within—it is the turning of the eyes inward toward the world of "Idea"—and as some philosophers would have us believe—"the spiritual world"—but what I want to discover is this. Does a spiritual world really exist? Believing in reincarnation or the survival of the mind, do we not, when we look inward, awaken "Ideas" acquired by the mind in some previous existence? Is this not more logical than the belief in a spiritual world. The sun is the vital force which is the noumenon of electricity—it is from the sun's unfathomable depths that issue the life currents which thrill through space, and all organisms and every living thing in the world. Does not science point an index finger in the direction of the sun. If we are to seek the solution of our metaphysical problems, must we not look in this direction

(continued from the previous page) for the answers?

I am deeply interested in so-called spiritual experience and phenomena and am seeking concepts which are not contradictory to Ratiocination. Most of the concepts we have had handed down to us are merely abstractions. I want something to tie to—I want to discover, if possible, the reality of "Pure Being". The philosophers of all time have endeavoured to construe the world according to principles of abstract thought—apparently "idea" is the ultimate reality—but I find this insufficient—I am unable to accept the popular beliefs of the herd. I even distrust conscience which is supposed to be an infallible guide—for which careful analysis I have discovered this to be merely a reflection of herd opinion. It is also unstable for like all mental conditions it depends largely upon physical conditions.

I have been experimenting with self-hypnosis lately. The results are interesting as I tried projecting my sub-conscious through time and space. Interesting but not convincing for I suspect the subjective mind of creating the illusions. On two occasions someone felt my presence 32 miles away—but that no doubt was telepathy. If I could project my subconscious to someone like yourself whom I had never seen and in the state of hypnosis sketch you and discover the likeness was correct. I would then be satisfied. In the meanwhile I hug my doubts.

N.G. Bhattacharya: "ON SIDDHA YOGA".@@

Our master predicted many things about the Britishers, of course not to flatter their vanity, but to help them in the future reconstruction of the world-order which has been upset by the diabolical satanic forces. He always entertained a very high opinion of the British people. I am as enterprising as you are, and I was duped by many so-called 'Sadhus and Saints' of India in-search of truth.

Indians are emotional and credulous by nature. But as a matter of fact true spirituality has nothing to do with emotionalism or blind faith.

If we have true mental affinity we are sure

@@ In letters to P.B.

(continued from the previous page) to be drawn close together some time or other; meanwhile I want to put you on guard against certain exaggerations that have gathered round the names of the saints and the yogies of Modern India. To tell the truth, when I came to this Ashram for the first time, I was hissed and looked down upon by my fellow brothers because of my brutal frankness and relentless questionings to my Master, who, I think was not a humbug like most of his disciples. Probably you will agree with me if I were to say that India of today is a hot-bed of pseudo-spiritual monstrosity. Before I came to this Ashram I submitted, like a child to many spiritual-guides in my quest of Truth and at last I had to revolt against their knavery and hypocrisy. To talk glibly of Transcendental-Self or Bliss-Absolute is easy enough. Even a parrot talks philosophy, in India, and the disciples make much of their Master just to force their way to eminence. I was forced to become a spiritual-revolutionary because of my bitter experiments with many so-called Gurus in India. I would always like to estimate a man at his proper worth.

The Yoga imparted by our master is natural in the sense that it demands no artificial restraint or previous preparations on the part of the disciple. The "Kundalini-Sakti" is latent in all and the gate is only to be knocked open, which may be done even by you when you have practised this Yoga for a few years. This natural process of knocking open the door was known to the ancient Yogi-philosophers of India and our Master recovered this Yoga in this age. The modern psycho-analysis would profit a lot if they take to this Yoga-practice, in as much as, it unveils without the least effort, all the hidden tendencies and the latent desires in man, they cannot possibly pry into. To unravel the deep-seated tendencies and desires in the unconscious mind is beyond the power of the modern psycho-analysts because they have not as yet fathomed the abysmal depth of the unconscious mind by analytical process without being backed up by practical, natural Yoga. The latent desires and tendencies should not only be brought to the conscious-surface

(continued from the previous page) but must be worked out before one realises Atman (Transcendent-Self). The Atman is always with us, but we do not realise it because it is covered up with desires. Sub-conscious and unconscious desires are more dangerous than the conscious ones. The beauty of this Yoga is that it destroys all kinds of desires either by actual enjoyments or "Vichara", till the mind gets calm and is fit to be rooted in the Transcendent-Self. False restraint and repression of desires will veil the Atman instead of unveiling it. Hence we are not afraid of working out our desires through actual enjoyment and work. False spiritualism or artificial asceticism has done more harm than anything else in India. Desirelessness is synonymous without omniscience. When we have no desires, — either good or bad — all the veils of the Atman will be torn asunder, and we are sure to be one with the Absolute-Self, and thus attain omniscience. Personally speaking, I am not a believer in Santi (Bliss), which may be born of dullness and inertia. Besides the word 'Bliss' is a vague term, which may connote any amount of folly under the Sun. What I crave for is, light, true light, till I reach omniscience. My only contention is that everything should be put to rigorous test before it is accepted as true. A seeker of Truth, should proceed with scientific precision and honest doubt, otherwise there is every chance of being misled. To be frank, I cultivate no geographical-idolatry, because I have fascination neither for the East, nor the West. I belong to Truth, matters little whether it comes from the East or from the West.

Sister Pavita: "ORDEALS OF THE PATH"@@

V. Subramanya Iyer could never have helped you towards anything real. Of course I knew that you had severed connections with Tiru... That is good too- I think it is better for you to follow what you term yourself "a lone path", that seems to be your way.

As regards myself, it is true that I am deeply happy, but I do not yet claim to have found "solid peace" or the truly divine ananda that goes with it.

@@ In letters to P.B.

(continued from the previous page) But I can say without any shadow of doubt that I have definitely entered the path which leads towards those things. It is a path of radical purification which in many respects is trying, but which is at the same time full of hope because I feel so clearly the Divine Hand at work, the divine guidance in what has to be done.

You say: "You have made such sacrifices as to deserve a large measure of success and satisfaction." That is not true. I have only put behind me the ordinary life and surely that cannot be such a "sacrifice" since the ordinary life is made of deceptions, disappointments and inferiorities of all kinds. It is only now that I am beginning to learn what the true sacrifice means—the sacrifice of all in the being which stands in the way of the Divine—the sacrifice of all the hundred-and-one false and faulty movements of mind, life and vital which hinder and obstruct the descent of the Light. That sacrifice is, from the spiritual point of view, the only one that really counts. Anything else is but a beginning, a small step. And that spiritual sacrifice of the old nature is very hard to make, for it must be continuous and backed by a truly dynamic sincerity which is prepared to face up to false hood in every part of the being and reject it strongly. That sacrifice can only be made if there is a dynamic will towards absolute purity and self-giving. And how few have that will and that aspiration in the degree required! It is the lack of that will that has plunged the world into the conditions we see to-day. It is only a powerful re-awakening of that will to purify that can save the world, since it is only the "pure in heart" that are protected, immune from the Asuric forces that are trying once more to get the whole world into their clutches. Of the "war" as such, from the occult point of view we know it means a battle against dark forces; from the spiritual point of view we know that it is the purification of the "earth body" to render it apt to receive the New Force and Light. I am "au courant"

(continued from the previous page) of the material details because I am taking the Radio News for Sri Aurobindo everyday.

If you have renounced the quest of happiness as an end in itself, that is very good. For to pursue "happiness" for its own sake is futile and can only lead one further away from it. But if you have found, as you say, "solid peace" you must also enjoy that "divine joy" which goes with true peace and which is independent of all outer circumstances. It is a construction of the mind to say that we cannot be happy whilst others suffer. We can be happy with the true happiness in spite of everything and what is more, it is our "duty" more than ever before to try and achieve that happiness in order to send out into the world vibrations of a kind that in their very nature will combat the adverse forces. I think it is true to say that the reason why Mr Churchill is a "God-sent man" at the moment is precisely because, among other things he possesses that naturally "happy" and joyous temperament which has the power to lift people out of the gloom and despondency into which they would tend to fall inevitably in the face of present events. The world needs "happy" people more than ever before and so the quest for true happiness must never be given-up - rather it must be pursued with an ever-increasing ardour and aspiration.

The two final volumes "The Life Divine" are the finest and contain the essence of Sri Aurobindo's mission on earth. Yes, the whole world is heavily in His debt, but it does not know it yet - the time is not quite ripe but the work that is being done in the silence is immense and soon the whole world will see the visible results.

One has to be prepared to put all personal plans aside at this hour and be ready for any sacrifice for the issues at stake are tremendous.

Perhaps you are right that "tout est un reve"; something in me revolts strongly against this attitude which I feel is not spiritual wisdom, but an unconscious admission of spiritual defeat, spiritual bankruptcy which has "given in" to the illusory appearances

(continued from the previous page) of things which are certainly unstable and unreal. However I am not going to argue any further about these things. I think it is quite obvious that we are all being "guided" (whether we admit or feel it consciously or not) along the path most suited to our present stage of development and further progress- perhaps the greatest illusion in this world is the illusion of "free will", the conviction that we all have that it is "we" who are doing this, that and the other, "we" who are taking action or abstaining from action - all these things are "willed" by a Force other than our own and no matter how we try to escape from that Force, we cannot do so, it has the last word in the end.

The bird goes on indefinitely beating its wings against the bars of the cage, thinking that by doing so it will eventually become free-but a day comes, must come when the wings become utterly exhausted with this senseless action; they sink down and finally become quite quiet. At first I suppose the bird feels a sense of sadness and desolation, that it is a prisoner for ever, but then I think it begins to realise little by little that "iron bars do not a prison make" and it begins to realise that "freedom" which transcends the bars, which is never gained by beating one's wings against them-one has to accept the irrevocable nature of the "bars", but one's acceptance must be positive and not merely negative and passive.

Well, I will end here with Mother's words: "To know how to wait is to put Time on your side" – perhaps that is the final point to which we all have to come and it is at this point that humanity is divided into two clear parts - those who know for what they are waiting and those who do not know. All depends upon the category to which one belongs.

Well, this time it is "good-bye" - your role in my destiny has been fulfilled and now I believe the time has come when as an "individual" you will pass out of it - "the moving finger writes and having writ....moves on" (He who wrote those words

(continued from the previous page) was certainly one of those who "knew").

There will always remain in my heart a profound and inexpressible gratitude to you for having brought me to something which I know is great enough to save me from myself. It has so saved me and for once I have an irrefutable "proof".

I am sorry to hear that conditions in the Raman Ashram are so bad, but one has to go direct to the fountain-head and leave aside all the rest, for it is the outcome of ignorance and a closed heart and mind; as such it can only be met by tolerance and compassion until the time comes for the consciousness to open to the light. Although the Maharishi himself was not destined to become my "guru", I firmly believe that it was he who opened something in me and enabled me to recognise my true Master.

I have suffered profoundly during the last four months; there has been a severe and prolonged attack from the hostile forces with all that that implies (to you I need not go into details, you know); I think during this period I have experienced every doubt, every temptation, every agony that a human being can know, physical, mental and spiritual I have been absolutely closed to Mother and Sri Aurobindo, but they have fought for my soul just as a physician fights for the life of a patient who is desperately ill, plunged in the darkness of delirium and entirely oblivious to the Powers battling for his recovery. It is only afterwards that he knows that a Power not his own has saved him. During this period, all the old nature rose again to the surface with great violence together with a number of hereditary taints and weaknesses. Severe as the ordeal has been (the forces tried in every possible way to drive me away from the Ashram) it was necessary and the purification that it has brought about is profound. So much so, that Sri Aurobindo has given me a new name, to mark the end of this crisis and the beginning of a new stage in my sadhana - I am now no Longer Margaret but "Favita", which means "the purified one" - there is also a certain plant which is used in the sacred ceremonies

(continued from the previous page) and when it is entirely purified it is called "pavita" and when its juice is drunk it gives the peace, purity and ananda of the gods, like the Soma wine of the Vedas. So with the Divine's help, I shall one day be worthy of all that is being done for me here.

This supreme test has proved to me without any shadow of doubt that all the demons in hell have not the power to draw me away from Mother and Sri Aurobindo. I am bound to them now by ties that nothing human or material can ever break and the whole of my life is now dedicated to the sadhana. I have found at last the Supreme Anchor; I have found the true centre of my being where I can stand firm and unmoved.

I would very much like to see you, as you know, but I shall make no attempt to come to T.....Mother would not like it and it is not really necessary - the link between us is of the kind that can subsist without any physical contact for our interest is not in "each other" as individuals, but in the spiritual goal we are both pursuing - our human destinies and lives are very different - but our spiritual destiny is the same and it is on that plane that we shall continue to meet.

Perhaps only you can understand the nature of the "something" that holds me here, I cannot describe it in words, I only know that I cannot go anywhere else, even for a short time, the "Vairagya" as regards the outer world is deep and real, the only true life is here. This does not mean that I overlook or minimise the many and great difficulties of life in an Ashram - to live in a small community harmoniously at peace with oneself and others, to pursue one's sadhana calmly, quietly, firmly, unruffled and undisturbed by the pettiness, antagonism and hostilities of others, is one of the greatest disciplines one can impose upon oneself - it finds out and exposes ruthlessly all one's own faults and weaknesses and tests one to the utmost in all directions - but for the difficulties and trials of the spiritual path, there is a compensation which surpasses words. Once one has felt, even for an instant, the reality of communion

(continued from the previous page) with the Divine, once one has felt and lived in the Divine Presence, then nothing else matters at all, everything can be borne and finally conquered.

All my life, right from a tiny child, I have wanted to "transform myself in the Divine image". Sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously; at times with clear and conscious effort, at other times vaguely and gropingly, but always persistently - even in the hours of the greatest darkness and apparent abandon, I have never completely lost sight of the goal—I always knew what I wanted - When the deepest and truest part of us goes out in sincere aspiration to the Divine, the Divine never fails to answer our call - It has answered mine beyond all expectations -It has led me into the direct path, where I need not seek and stumble and flounder any more - where I have nothing to do but follow the Light shining clearly in front of me, certain with a certificate that is not human, that the goal is there and can be reached.

They cannot understand to what I am devoting my life: I am afraid in my case they are doomed to continual disappointment for they can only appreciate a "life-work" which brings worldly success and honour: The arduous spiritual task of transforming one's nature, seems "waste of time" to them: But then the greatest things in the world are always misunderstood by the ordinary mind and consciousness, for the time being, it cannot be otherwise.

I was naturally very sorry, but not altogether surprised, to learn of your breakdown in health - the outer "defaillance" is always a sign of some inner disharmony, unrest or tension. And I know that your last months in India were not very happy and that for some time you had been subject to various "worries" which, whilst they do not touch the fundamental peace of the inner being, do affect the frail, still untransformed outer instrument.

During the last few months there has been a very strong and pronounced revolt in the earth consciousness against Sri Aurobindo and a determined

(continued from the previous page) attempt made by the adverse forces to stop the decent of the Force. We had all felt this in a general way as a profound oppression and foreboding hanging over everything. I myself had a series of very unpleasant experiences of adverse entities, etc. Such as I have never had before. Then about 15 days ago, a very powerful hostile force entered the Ashram and attacked Mother; but Sri Aurobindo was able to protect her from the full assault and it only resulted in a kind of "blow" on the face which swelled badly and gave great pain; pranam and meditation had to be suspended. The force was so strong that Mother and Sri Aurobindo thought it might do some damage in the Ashram or attack some sadhaks. However, they managed to deviate it and partially dispel it.

At 3.30 a.m. on Darshan morning, Sri Aurobindo himself was violently attacked by this same force; he was in the bathroom and was thrown violently to the ground; the right leg was completely twisted and the bone above the knees broken. We do not know whether he lost consciousness or exactly what happened but he did not call Mother immediately and when she went in to the bathroom later she found him lying on the ground unable to move. You can imagine what this meant for Mother! However, she rang for sadhaks and Sri Aurobindo was placed in his bed and doctors sent for at once. He was naturally in great pain and the Darshan had to be cancelled at the eleventh hour - 500 visitors were here and you can also imagine what consternation this caused among them. There were a number of well-known people here who had come from distant places for the first time. In spite of the shock, Mother managed to give us just "pranam" in the afternoon, so that the visitors should have some "contact" but a terrible atmosphere of sadness hung over everything and it is impossible to put into words what we were feeling.

Sri Aurobindo is of course progressing satisfactorily - the bones have been set and the specialist says it will heal perfectly, leaving no trace or defect.

(continued from the previous page) The hostile forces are always very active just before the Darshan.

Do you know, I am becoming more and more disillusioned regarding Ashram life, any ashram life, for a multitude of reasons with which you yourself have had direct experience. We naturally made some excuse for a very undesirable state of affairs at Ramanashram because Maharishi is not concerned with the manifestation and is not trying in any definite way to guide influence or transform his sadhaks. But here, we naturally thought things would be different, but in reality it is not so - they are covered with a greater veneer of refinement and intellectuality, that is all. Of course what happens everywhere is that some kind inner spiritual experience and illuminations comes, but the outer physical consciousness is so dense, obscure and ignorant that the inner realisation cannot as yet, in the vast majority of sadhaks, pierce this outer crust, with the result that in the outer personality there is every kind of pettiness, falsehood, deception, etc. etc.

All this has been accompanied by a profound and overwhelming longing for perfect silence and solitude; to meet and talk with people became literal torture; for a few weeks I felt an agonising "pull" from Tibet, snow-capped inaccessible mountains and hidden hermitages peopled by dreams. So strong was this that I had the greatest difficulty in resisting the desire to leave everything and hide myself for ever in some Buddhist monastery far away from mankind. I nearly wrote to you to ask you to return to India and take me to the Himalayas! I could not have gone to live there alone, being a woman, and you are the only person with whom I could live harmoniously since you are the only one who really understands the imperative need of silence and solitude if one is really to do anything serious in Yoga! Sometimes I get every dissatisfied here for that reason because I am busy teaching all the time, everything is going outwards, I never really have an opportunity, even here, to go really deeply inwards. Of

(continued from the previous page) course, you know that Mother and Sri Aurobindo are very much opposed to any kind of "retirement" and isolation - they insist on the "Work" being a very integral part of the sadhana and all higher experience must be capable of coming in and through the work, otherwise it is no good. They are right I know, it is only the petty mind that is always dissatisfied like this - I know that if one wants to really bring down the Divine consciousness into the world and transform things there, one must live in the world and not escape from it - but there comes a point in the sadhana when this desire to escape, this intense and painful "vairagya" comes over one.

In my own case there is another reason also why I would like complete solitude for a time; I feel the need now to do something specific towards the development of the psychic faculties (clairvoyance, etc.) and to do this it is imperative that one has long periods of uninterrupted meditation and contemplation. But as I am living now that is utterly impossible. Of course, Mother would say again that all occult development of this kind will come in its own time, when the being as a whole is ready as that it is undesirable and even dangerous to deliberately try and awaken these forces. I suppose again they are right, what do you think? But I am always haunted lately by this feeling that my sadhana is somehow too "loose" that the sadhana as a whole is too loose, not disciplined and concentrated enough to bring the real "siddhi" of the yoga - many people of course get various kinds of visions and minor experiences on the inner physical, vital and mental planes, but all this is very fluctuating and does not seem to lead anywhere very definite.

How terribly ignorant people are who think that living here is "easy"; only those who definitely take up a yogic sadhana can realise the colossal difficulties one has to face, difficulties that would turn one aside at once from the Path were it not for the constant and inspiring presence of the Guru. Now I realise how absolutely imperative a "guide and teacher" is, without Him one can do nothing, when even

(continued from the previous page) with Him so many difficulties occur.

We have here now a rather distinguished guest, Miss Margaret Wilson, daughter of the former President of U.S.A. She has read all your books and was very impressed by Secret India and thinks you have a real "message" for the West as regards meditation and the initiation into yoga.

I often think it is strange what a swift, brief and yet profound role you played in my life...and yet it is only strange to our limited vision...destiny does not always think fit to reveal her movements to that limited vision - she acts outside it and give us only knowledge of the "fruit" of her action, not how the fruit is being prepared.

At no other time in my life have I ever experienced such a devastating sense of spiritual isolation as I do at present - this may seem strange to you; you will think that among the people here there are some with whom a satisfying spiritual communion is possible. But again that is not so - I feel lately, that is for the last 6 months, that a gulf has suddenly opened up at my feet as regards all things "Indian" - I can no longer get to grips with the Indian conception of things, I feel like an utter stranger in a strange land - with this feeling (which may be nothing real, but an illusion produced by other conditions) has come, also for the first time in my life, an awful doubt as to whether India is really my spiritual home, the place where my "destiny" will be fulfilled. And this doubt has caused me a torment that I cannot put into words; I have had to thrust it ruthlessly from me because if it once gets a "hold" in my being, it will cause the whole edifice to totter and perhaps to fall, because all my life it has been the corner stone of all my hopes, all my aspirations, the foundation as it were of all future self-realisation. If that goes, then I shall indeed be a wanderer upon the face of the earth, an exile cut off in time and space from that inner "anchorage" which is essential to real growth.

When I came here, I felt so sure that it was

(continued from the previous page) the goal, that at least I had found where I belong, and yet I still have this agonising feeling that even now, I am not where I truly belong, that I am not doing what I ought to be doing—Why does this feeling continually haunt me? Is it merely the diabolical antics of a restless mind or does it contain a true "intuition" of a destiny not yet fulfilled, a mission not yet accomplished, to which my "sadhana" here is but a path and a preparation.

Now I see the goal so very clearly, whereas before I only saw it dimly and sometimes lost it altogether amid the darkness of illusion and ignorance. What I feel now is so exactly similar to a feeling I have experienced so often when mountaineering in Switzerland - I used to see a wonderful, gleaming snow clad peak towering above me, luring me onwards with an irresistible fascination, and yet I could never see how the immediate path I was treading could possibly lead to that sublime summit. Then when I reached the summit and looked back, I could not see the path by which I had come! The summit was the only reality, all else was blotted out. That is how I feel now.

But terribly vague all this is! Now that I have voluntarily put aside the limited intellect and the logical reason and am endeavouring to get to a truth behind them, all seems so incoherent, so undefined, so formless! I understand now why the vast majority of human beings are so reluctant to "let go" the fictitious anchorage the "mind and reason" seem to provide, and launch themselves into the wide, trackless sea of the "intermediate zones" beyond mind and below "Overmind".

I think perhaps this is the most difficult stage in the whole sadhana, when one has cut all the old moorings and yet the True Light, the True Knowledge is only coming as yet in flashes, brilliant and sure enough to intensify immeasurably one's aspiration and yet not permanent enough to give one a real sense of "security" in the utterly new world they open up.

This sense of insecurity in the "new world" is accompanied by an overwhelmingly intense "vairagya"

(continued from the previous page) for everything concerning the old world,. Nothing there has any meaning - human relations, even the best and highest, become utterly empty, the contents of all books seem like meaningless cyphers (that is one of the most disturbing symptoms of my present state, that I can read absolutely nothing, when I pick up a book, even those concerning the Yoga, I feel an intense weariness, a nausea which makes me throw it down as useless) - and the realisation comes terrible and sublime at the same time, that no spoken or written word, nothing that has "form" in the objective world can ever give me what I yearn for now, a yearning which is now sufficiently conscious, sufficiently enlightened to know that it is not a yearning in the void, that what it seeks does exist, but so far away in the distant reaches of Infinity as to seem inaccessible to the striving human entity one calls "I"....

I stop now because I must...the pen has become paralysed by the immensity it envisages and can never express, by the agony of a soul which would live in the Eternal Divine and yet is confined to the appalling limitations of the bodily form.....

What greater tragedy in life is there than this? Thank God the majority of beings do not know it yet, otherwise I think the very walls of life would burst asunder under the pressure of this mighty, inarticulate aspiration which at present is sleeping under the fictitious "pleasures" of the Ignorance.

But when the "day of awakening" comes in a sufficient number of beings, then humanity will take a gigantic step forward, impossible to contemplate at present.

Nolini Kanta Gupta: "PHYSICS OR PHILOSOPHY".@@

What is the world that we see really like? Is it mental, is it material? This is a question, we know, philosophers are familiar with, and they have answered and are still answering, each in his own way, taking up one side or other of the antimony. There is nothing new or uncommon in that. The extraordinary novelty comes in when we see today even

(continued from the previous page) scientists forced to tackle the problem, give an answer to it,—scientists who used to smile at philosophers, because they seemed to assault seriously the windmills of abstract notions and airy concepts, instead of reposing on the terra firma of reality. The tables are turned now. The scientists have had to start the same business—the terra firma on which they stood as on the securest rock of ages is slipping away under their feet and fast vanishing into smoke and thin air. Not only that, it is discovered today that the scientist has always been a philosopher, without his knowledge—a crypto-philosopher,—only he has become conscious of it at last. And further—*mirabile dictu!*—many a scientist is busy demonstrating that the scientist is, in his essence, a philosopher of the Idealist school!

Physical Science in the nineteenth century did indeed develop or presuppose a philosophy of its own; it had, that is to say, a definite outlook on the fundamental quality of things and the nature of the universe. Those were days of its youthful self-confidence and unbending assurance. The view was, as it well-known, materialistic and deterministic.

A fundamental question is now raised in the very methodology of the scientific apparatus. For science, needless to say, is first and foremost observation. Now it is observed that the very fact of observation affects and changes the observed fact. The path of an electron, for example, has to be observed; one has then to throw a ray of light—hurl a photon—upon it: the impact is sufficient to deflect the electron from the original path. If it is suggested that by correction and computation, by a backward calculation we can deduce the previous position, that too is not possible. For we cannot fix any position or point that is not vitiated by the observer's interference. How to feel or note the consistency of a thing, if the touch itself, the temperature of the finger, were sufficient to change the consistency? The trouble

(continued from the previous page) is, as the popular Indian saying goes, the very amulet that is to exorcise the ghost is possessed by the ghost itself.

So the scientists of today are waking up to this disconcerting fact. And some have put the question very badly and frankly: do not all laws of Nature contain this original sin of the observer's interference, indeed may not the laws be nothing else but that? Thus Science has landed into the very heart—the bog and quagmire, if you like—of abstruse metaphysics. Eddington says, there is no other go for Science today but to admit and declare that its scheme and pattern of things, as described by what is called laws of Nature, is only a mental construct of the Scientist. The "wonderful" discoveries are nothing but jugglery and legerdemain of the mind—what it puts out of itself unconsciously into the outside world, it recovers again and is astonished at the miracle. A scientific law is a pure deduction from the mind's own disposition. Eddington goes so far as to say that if a scientist is sufficiently introspective he can trace out from within his brain each and every law of Nature which he took so much pains to fish out from Nature by observation and experiment. Eddington gives an analogy to explain the nature of scientific law and scientific discovery. Suppose you have a fishing net of a particular size and with interstices of a particular dimension; you throw it into the sea and pull out with fishes in it. Now you count and assort the fishes, and according to the data thus obtained, you declare that the entire sea consists of so many varieties of fish and of such sizes. The only error is that you could not take into account the smaller fishes that escaped through the interstices and the bigger ones that did not at all fall into the net. Scientific statistics is something of this kind. Our mind is the net, and the pattern of Nature is determined by the mind's own pattern.

Eddington gives us absolutely no hope for any knowledge of an objective world apart from the objectification of mind's own constructs. This is a position which a scientist, qua scientist, finds it difficult to maintain. Remedies and loop-holes have been suggested with what result we shall presently see.

Einstein's was, perhaps, the most radical and revolutionary solution proposed. Indeed, it meant the reversal of the whole scientific outlook, but something of the kind was an imperative need in order to save Science from inconsistencies that seemed to be inherent in it. The scientific outlook was vitiated, Einstein said, because we started from premises; two assumptions mainly were responsible for the bankruptcy which befell later-day Science. First, it was assumed that a push and pull—a force (a gravitational or, more generally, a causal force) existed and that acted upon isolated and independent particles strewn about; and secondly, they were strewn about in an independently existing time and independently existing space. Einstein has demonstrated, it seems, successfully that there is no Time and no Space actually, but times and spaces (this reminds one of a parallel conception in Sankhya and Patanjali), that time is not independent of space (nor space of time) but that time is another co-ordinate or dimension necessary for all observation in addition to the three usual co-ordinates (or dimensions). This was the explanation he found of the famous Michelson-Morley experiment which failed to detect any difference in the velocity of light whether it moved with or against a moving object, which is an inconsistency according to the mechanistic view. The absolute dependence of time and space upon each other was further demonstrated by the fact that it was absolutely impossible to synchronise two distant clocks (moving with different speeds and thus forming different systems) with perfect accuracy, or determine exactly whether two events happened simultaneously or not. In the final account of things, this relative element that varies according to varying particulars had to be eliminated,

(continued from the previous page) sublated. In order to make a law applicable to all fields—from the astronomical through the normal down to the microspic or sub-atomic—in an equally valid manner, the law had to divest itself of all local colour. Thus, a scientific law became a sheer mathematical formula; it was no longer an objective law that governed the behaviour of things, but merely a mental rule or mnemonics to string together as many diverse things as possible in order to be able to memorise them easily.

Again, the generalised law of relativity (that is to say, laws governing all motions, even accelerated motion and not merely uniform motion) that sought to replace the laws of gravitation did away also with the concepts of force and causality: it stated that things moved not because they were pulled or pushed but because they followed the natural curve of space (they describe geodesics, i.e. move in the line of least distance). Space is not a plain surface, smooth and uniform, but full of dimples and hollows, these occurring in the vicinity of masses of matter, the sun, for instance, (although one does not see how or why a mass of matter should roll down the inclined plane of a curved surface, without some kind of push and pull—the problem is not solved but merely shifted and put off). All this means to say that the pattern of the universe is absolutely geometrical and science in the end resolves itself into geometry: the laws of Nature are nothing but theorems or corollaries deduced and deducible from a few initial postulates. Once again, on this line of enquiry all the universe is dissolved into abstract and psychological factors.

Apart from the standpoint of theoretical physics developed by Einstein, the more practical aspect as brought out in Wave Mechanics leads us into no less an abstract and theoretical domain. The Newtonian particle-picture, it is true, has been maintained in the first phase of modern physics which specialised in what is called Quantum

(continued from the previous page) Mechanics. But waves or particles—although the question as to their relative validity and verity still remains open—do not make much difference in the fundamental outlook. For in either view, the individual unit is beyond the ken of the scientist. A wave is not a wave but just the probability of a wave; it is not even a probable wave but a probability wave. Thus the pattern that Wave Mechanics weaves to show the texture of the ultimate reality is nothing more than a calculus of probabilities. By whichever way we proceed we seem to arrive always at the same inevitable conclusion.

So it is frankly admitted that what Science gives is not a faithful description of actuality, not a representation of material existence, but certain conventions or convenient signs to put together, to make a mental picture of our sensations and experiences. That does not give any clue to what the objective reality may or may not be like. Scientific laws are mental rules imposed upon Nature. It may be asked why does Nature yield to such imposition? There must be then some sort of parallelism or commensurability between Nature and the observing Mind, between the pattern of Nature and the Mind's scheme or replica of it. If we successfully read into Nature things of the Mind, that means that there must be something very common between the two. Mind's readings are not mere figments, hanging in the air; for they are justified by their applicability, by their factual translation. This is arguing in a circle, a thorough-going mentalist like Eddington would say. What are facts? What is life? Anything more than what the senses and the mind have built up for us?

Jeans himself is on the horns of a dilemma. Being a scientist, and not primarily a mathematician like Eddington, he cannot very well acquiesce in the liquidation of the material world; nor can he refute successfully the facts and arguments that Science itself has brought forward in favour of mentalism.

(continued from the previous page) He wishes to keep the question open for further light and surer grounds. In the meanwhile, however, he is reconciled to a modified form of mentalism. The laws of Nature, he says, are surely subjective in the sense that astronomical or geographical concepts, for example, such as the system of latitudes, longitudes, equator and axis, ellipse and quadrant and sextant, are subjective. These lines and figures are not drawn physically upon the earth or in space: they are mental constructs, they are pointers or notations, but they note and point to the existence of real objects in a real world.

In other words, one tries to come back more or less to the common sense view of things. One does not argue about what is naturally given as objective reality; whatever the mental gloss over it, it is there all the same. One accepts it, takes it on trust, if you like—one can admit even that it is an act of faith, as Russel and the Neo-Realists would maintain.

But Jeans' position is remarkable and very significant in one respect. When cornered in the process of argument, feeling that the world is inexorably dematerialised and mentalised, he suggests an issue which is natural to a philosopher a mystic philosopher alone. Well, let him state his position in his own words the passage, I repeat is so remarkable and significant;

"When we view ourselves in space and time, our consciousness are obviously the separate individuals of a particle-picture, but when we pass beyond space and time, they may perhaps form ingredients of a single continuous stream of life. As it is with light and electricity, so it may be with life; the phenomena may be individuals carrying on separate existence in space and time, while in the deeper reality beyond space and time we may all be members of one body. In brief, modern physics is not altogether antagonistic to an objective idealism like that of Hegel". (p.204)

A la bonne heure! That runs close to Upanishadic knowledge. It means that the world is objective

(continued from the previous page) —it is not the figment of an individual observer; but it is not material either, it is consciousness in vibration. (Note the word "consciousness" is Jeans' own, not mine).

Jeans is not alone to have such a revolutionary and unorthodox view. He seems to take courage from Diarc also. Dirac too cannot admit an annihilation of the material world. His proposal to save and salvage it follows a parallel line. He says that the world presented or pictured by physical science may not be and is not the actual world, but it posits a substratum of reality to which it conforms: the pattern presented by subjective laws is so composed because of a pressure, an impact from an analogous substratum. There is no chain of causal relation in the pattern itself, the relation of causality is between the substratum reality and the pattern that it bodies forth. Here again we find ourselves at the end of physical inquiry driving straight into the tenuous spaces of spiritual metaphysics. We have one more example of how modern physicist is metamorphosed into a mystic. What Diarc says is tantamount to the very well-known spiritual experience that the world as it appears to us a vesture or symbol of an inner order of reality but of which it has been broadcast—sah paryagat—and the true causes of things are not on the surface, the so-called antecedents, but behind in the subtler world called therefore the causal world, karana jagat.

Even Eddington is not so absurd or impossible as it may seem to some. He says, as we have seen, that all so-called laws of Nature can be discovered from within the mind itself, can be deduced logically from psychologically given premises; no empirical observation or objective experimentation is necessary to arrive at them: they are found a priori in the subject. Now, mystic experience always lays stress on extrasensory knowledge: it declares that such a knowledge is not only possible, but that this alone is the right and correct knowledge. All things—matter and mind and life and all—being but

(continued from the previous page) vibrations of consciousness, even as the colours of a spectrum are vibrations, electro-magnetic waves of different frequency, mystic discipline enables one to enter into that condition in which one's consciousness mingles with all consciousness or with another particular consciousness (Patanjali's term is *samyama*), and one can have all knowledge that one wishes to have by this inner contact or concentration or identification, one discovers the knowledge within one self, no external means of sense observation and experimental testing, no empirical inductive process is needed. We do not say that Eddington had in view anything of this kind, but that his attitude points in this direction.

That seems to be the burden, the underlying preoccupation of modern physical science: it has been forced to grope towards some kind of mystic perception; at least, it has been put into a frame of mind, due to the crumbling of the very fundamentals of the past structure, which is less obstructive to other sources and spheres and ways of knowledge. Certainly, we must admit that we have moved very far from Laplace when we hear today a hard-boiled rationalist like De Broglie declare:

"The idealisations more or less schematic that our mind builds up are capable of representing certain facets of things, but they have inherent limitations and cannot contain within their frames all the richness of the reality."

The difficulty that modern Science encounters is not, however, at all a difficulty: it may be so to the philosopher, but not the mystic, the difficulty, that is to say, of positing a real objective world when all that we know or seize of it seems to be our own mental constructions that we impose upon it. Science has come to such a pass that it can do more than take an objective world on trust.

Things need not, however, be so dismal looking. The difficulty arises because of a fundamental attitude—the attitude of a purely reasoning being. But Reason or Mind is only one layer or vein of the

(continued from the previous page) reality, and to see and understand and explain that reality, through one single track of approach will naturally bias the view, it will present only what is real or immediate to it, and all the rest will appear as secondary or a formation of it. That is, of course, a truth that has been clearly brought out by the anti-intellectualist. But the vitalist's view, is also likewise vitiated by a similar bias, as he contacts reality only through this prism of vital force. It is the old story of the Upanishad in which the seeker takes the Body, the Life and the Mind one after another and declares each in its turn to be the only and ultimate reality (Brahman).

The truth of the matter is that the integral reality is to be seized by an integral organon. To an integralised consciousness the integral reality is directly and immediately presented, each aspect is apprehended in and through its own truth and substance. The synthesis or integration is reached by a consciousness which is the basis and continent of all, collectively and severally, and of which all are various formations and expressions on various levels and degrees. This is the knowledge and experience given by the supreme spiritual consciousness.

N. Briggs: "SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE IN MYSTICISM."@@

I would like to see the present dichotomy of outlook between educated and mystical resolved the latter being usually regarded as superstitious and doubtful. You have done so much to overcome this for which I am myself immensely grateful.

The book "East and West" by Rene Guenon has given me a great jolt into an awareness much clearer than I have had before. It is very apposite both to the present tumultuous days, and to thought of possible teaching and organisation later. It lays very great stress on the responsibilities incurred by the gaining of even some understanding of Truth, and contains warnings which have a similar ring to those said to have been given to the French Court by the Comte de St. Germaine. The phrasing and the cumbrous sentences remind me very much of the writings of H.P.B.

@@ In letters to P.B.

I am very grateful for your appraisal of R. Guenon's writings. Since I have not travelled in the East, and my knowledge of the Orient is limited to academic people who have come to Cambridge I cannot assess their value myself. Another book has now appeared "The crisis of the Modern World" and the 'return to Tradition' is therein specifically defined as a return to the Catholic Church. This view is widely divergent from your own, and one upon which I feel more competent to think for myself. I think it is not wholly true. Science, in parts, may have degenerated into what Guenon calls 'scientism', but it cannot now be excluded from any view of life as a whole. Moreover the scientific attitude, accurate and impersonal, is one of our greatest assets in any field of endeavour.

My problems seem to be largely due to an irresistible urge to stretch my mind to grasp the scheme entire. I have read and discussed modern philosophy fairly widely with my husband, and he says his mind will not grasp ultimate verities, and he is content to leave them, and says I am a mystic which is probably true. But the age-old questions arise—is the awareness of the mystic really knowledge? I look forward to the yogic disciplines which you promise wherein the whole man may gather himself together, heart and mind, in the effort to penetrate into the cloud of unknowing.

I find them rather difficult to master, and I have no one with whom to check and discuss what I think I learn, but I try to maintain the view of transposing them into terms of consciousness, as you reminded me H.P.B. herself suggests. The concrete mind alone will not fully grasp the mighty concepts involved, and one can see why professional philosophers are forever digging themselves into verbal pits and then laboriously climbing out again. At present I could not possibly commit to words what I feel I know, but I am very much aware of the responsibilities I am incurring, but whether this life or another will yield opportunities for discharging them

(continued from the previous page) I do not know. I think, however, it must be of value to humanity that some members make efforts to understand and to fulfil in their lives what they can of life's meaning, although no doubt it is of more value if such understanding is clothed in words and written or spoken.

Of Jeans' new book "Physics and Philosophy", Professional philosophers here complain that the philosophy is amateurish, and scientists complain that philosophy is not the proper sphere of a scientist, but a few people see the immense potential implication of such ideas. I think it is perhaps one of the first faint cries of the age which is struggling to birth.

I am grateful to you beyond words for "The Wisdom of the Overself. It opens up such vistas and in itself stimulates thought and beyond thought.

I am very interested in this philosophy's setting in modern thought and in its immense implication and in the exquisite assessment of values and relative values which is so fundamentally a part of fine living, which insight may give.

Several people has asked me why and from whom the criticism has come to which you refer in the first part of the book "The Wisdom of the Overself". I could wish from the point of view of students who are seeking a true philosophy that your last two books presented just this, with no reference to anybody's criticisms. I could also wish from the point of view of interpretive scholarship that you had added a bibliography, although realize this would have made the writing of the books a far harder and longer task. They are valuable, and in essence so true and necessary to this age that I feel some anxiety about their being bogged among the welter of the less valuable stuff pouring from the press just now. The world in which I live, of higher education, seems to be without firm bridges or even any communication with the world of mysticism and occultism in which say, Beach lives. A few words of real scholarship, or clear scientific

(continued from the previous page) or clear scientific thought demolish her wordy castles completely, yet her wordy castles are very good and near to truth in their foundations. I find myself endlessly trying to establish these bridges. Often I feel the need for terse clear well written essays on the various aspects and approaches to this new angle on life. I am personally immensely indebted to you for this presentation of Truth in a modern dress. I think you have blazed a trail in thought perhaps even more for generations to come than for this one.

I was in a mood of quiet but very real exaltation. It seemed distinctly odd to come away from a friend's funeral service exulting as I did. The enquiring part of my mind was puzzled and just a little amused. Of course it faded. The apropos of nothing at all with a tiny catch of the breath the "golden mood" began to come over me, rising suddenly but fading imperceptibly. I have no conscious control of it, nor any sense of finding truth. But I have a sweet feeling of belonging, of being at home, in the world, and of a deepening of my relationship with people and things. A sense of being on tip toe before some great event. Looking back over the years I see that this mood was always in the offing and wee scraps of it came up when I walked in mountain scenery or enjoyed a golden autumn day, but I feared it as I have perhaps always feared very strong feeling the store philosophy for me every time. It has never been my lot to walk in the company of those who understood or even liked the mystical streak in me, so I have suppressed it.

Now am I being a self deduced fool. And what comes next. Am I to have no conscious control. If I yield fully, as I know I must where shall I be in regard to the ordinary affairs of life? I cannot become a recluse. But can I keep practical and clear headed with a sort of spiritual descant sung over my normal moods. I feel it could withdraw into solitude I might resolve it into a wholeness, but I

(continued from the previous page) cannot withdraw anywhere. I put questions like these a little hesitatingly to Mr Bolt but came to a blank in him. He gave me much occult metaphor etc., when I needed a clear answer. Here our ways seemed to diverge, or else I misunderstood. Is it to this my questing and aspiring and prayers have brought me? Yes I must concede to it all but not any systematic scheme of analysis or even meditation. It is rather as Rhadakrishnan disciples - a gathering together of all ones powers and then a leap into the unknown. Must I now learn something of the mechanics of the spiritual life, some perhaps occult technique for managing it all or is it all a passing delusion, or will it convey me into some strata of consciousness that I shall know recognise and be able to grasp and bring into my ordinary life for practical purposes?

Yes, perhaps it is more difficult for a woman to subjugate emotion and feelings to reason, but if that is the only extra hurdle I think I can manage it.

It seems likely that Sir Arthur Eddington is venturing a little beyond the limits which most scientists of my acquaintance impose upon their thinking. I am deeply interested in the approach of modern scientists to that which apparently lies beyond laboratory technique and becomes a subjective search. For nineteen years I have lived in the university town amongst the great scientists and again and again I have observed that although they may have great knowledge, they often display very little wisdom. And more than once, I have seen a brilliant man reach the limits of knowledge in his particular sphere, and then begin to close in on himself smaller and smaller until he breaks down. A chemist whom I know very well is lying heavily drugged at this moment, for no reason whatever. I believe, except that his knowledge pallid and he could not make a further step. I hope I may be able to help him through his wife, who has a strange regard for my imperturbability, although so far she knows nothing of the long thoughts behind it. I am often led to wonder if the forces of nature are urging these men to launch out into the unknown, and if they cannot or will not they are broken, or break themselves

(continued from the previous page) in the effort to keep on well known ground. I scarcely think it is true to say that Eddington and Jeans are in fact leading scientific thought, except in the popular opinion. I doubt if it will ever be lead in a rational way. Jeans is a musician and Eddington is a member of the Society of Friends and a mystic.

I startled John Cockcroft one day by quoting the prophecy (Bacon's I believe) that the present age of civilization draws to its close when man has split the atom. His work here in the Cavendish laboratory brought this about. I told him yesterday that it would be a kindness if he would desist from any further efforts as we have all got our hands pretty full in consequence of his earlier ones.

Surely there will be many ready to listen to you when this turmoil ceases.

Your remarks on H.P.B. do put her work into an understandable perspective. I was never quite happy in the Theosophical Society, partly I think because I didn't feel free to criticise. It is a very great task to which your hand is set, awesome in its immensity. There are a few things I know deep in the flesh of me, from experience to be true and your writings made these articulates for me who seemed unable to bring them into expression.

I have pondered your statement that the West is ready for a plain statement of the Secret Doctrine and tried to think how true this appears to me of the small circle in which I live. Just after war broke out the Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University called a little private party of his more thinking students together and said, "Gentlemen, the time are difficult and heavy responsibilities lie before you. Can you tell me in what ways this university can serve you further. The leader of the group made the reply "Sir, you teach us many things, the structure and mechanism of our bodies and of the earth as known to science but can-no one tell us the why and wherefore of life—its goal and meanings." I have no authority to make this public. It was told to me by Professor S.M. Wadham of Melbourne University, who was home on leave and the guest of Mr Priestly at the

(continued from the previous page) time and present at the party. He said it brought tears to his eyes, so sincerely was it asked. I know you need no such verifications, but I offer this for your interest.

I understand and I know the "presence" now. It is true to say I can turn inwards to a love and peace untellable. And I have seen the power of it. It was recently my task to go to one of my evacuee mothers whose 14 year old son had just died by a strange accident. A colleague went with me. The poor woman was almost in a state of collapse through shock and grief. I sat down beside her and took her hand in mine, and almost before I could speak she was quiet and composed. In my heart I knelt in humility before the mother's sorrow and the love which was comforting her. As we came away my colleague (a classical scholar turned social worker during the war) said "what a lovely peacer there was in that room."

I see the necessity for training for service of this kind, which should be utterly sincere and sound as well as sincere. One should be able to show parallels in thought in the philosophy of East and West and in different religions. One should avoid the bad error of claiming scientific evidence for theories which it doesn't fit. One should be honest enough to say "I do not know" when such is the case. One should be willing to give freely and see no result. One should make no personal claims of any kind.

Perhaps there are some dangers in complete freedom of this kind and I remember the troubles of the Free Churches when any one was allowed to teach as they liked.

I am genuinely terrified of getting into the position of a teacher before I have knowledge of my own. The local Theosophical Society have honoured me from time to time with invitations to be their president, or speak in any way I fancy, but I always refuse. For one thing there is so much spiritual materialism to be cleared out of modern Theosophy before any true teaching can gain a footing, that it seems hopeless to begin. The writings of Arundale are so silly they can only be treated hilariously.

(continued from the previous page) Mrs Langdon-Davies could not accept the involved symbolism and the lack of sequence and clarity of Mr Bolts way of teaching. The fact being, probably, that they are both educated women, whereas Mr Bolts provincial groups, having been nurtured in the old Theosophical way of teaching and not being used to sequential logical ordered lectures have come to understand Mr Bolt and are not puzzled by his methods. I must confess it being very happled until I grasped that he was trying to impart the incommunicable by ordinary words. Nevertheless I believe that the Theosophical way of almost mystery-mongering is of no use any longer and that we all cry out for clarity, directness and clear sharp truth. In my view the establishing of contact with a teacher and the acceptance of his help, constituted, perhaps, the most delicate and lovely of all human relationships, but carried with it responsibilities commensurate with its beauty.

It is not a way of escape one must look for, but a way of transcending by understanding.

One of the evacuated mothers still in my care is a bus conductor's wife from Islington. She came to us direct from hospital after a nervous prostration following the birth of her fourth child. She is a grail timed woman but thoughtful and intelligent. I have been very sorry for her and one day was moved to pray in my heart that something of your great gift to me might reach her, something definite to comfort her. A day or two later she tole me she was quite sure she had seen the figure of Christ with two little children in his arms and she was not going to be afraid any more. Last week we had three air raid alarms and on Tuesday in my garden with a group of other Londoners, this woman was heard to say, "And when the siren went I seemed to turn all calm like and none of the children cried at all." I read this to mean that something did reach her and her mind interpreted it in a symbolism familiar to her. And since I believe you to be a focussing point of great spiritual forces perhaps the implication from this small incident is greater than the incident. I think

(continued from the previous page) the people of this country as a whole must have a faith and a certitude of the right kind far beyond their powers of expression, in many cases only needing a touch to bring into focus. The events of the past week or two have been taken with great calmness, which is the more remarkable because the churches seem to have little or no influence. (written in 1940 before Dunkirk—P.B.) One is compelled to wonder what it is that upholds people. To one man who seemed anxious about his children I quoted Goethe's words "Man is immortal till his work is done", and he replied warmly "Yes, I do believe that."

It seems to be that the thought struggling for expression in Mr Bolt's monthly circular is magnificent, but I should welcome your views both on the value to your journal of the material and whether to leave it as it is or to try to edit it into clearer and better English. I am suggesting that he rearranges the letters into some kind of sequence and omits the purely personal and topical parts with a view to publication at some time.

My longing to reach the ultimate truth is almost searing at times and I turn to the inner link which you say remains unbroken. Always with a lifting of the heart and a little ripple of joy that somewhere some when I may reach the goal. Not that I want to leave the human scene. The hard and difficult evacuation work has deepened my love for my fellow men. I get tired to the point of exhaustion but I never get disheartened. I feel sure that great spiritual changes will be brought about by this enormous moving and mixing of people, lamentable though the cause of it may be.

What has become of all the people who like my husband have set foot tentatively within the T.S. and then been repelled by unsound and fallacious teaching. I doubt if there is anyone with a clear mind and sound judgment left in the T.S.

He gave me the idea of being a little more systematic and less desultory in my choice of books and of bending me through a set course of reading for

(continued from the previous page) students towards possible postwar usefulness.

"The Hidden Teaching beyond Yoga" is so wide in scope and so great in conception that I foresee a good deal of work before I can say I really understand it in detail. But I am au fait with the subject generally to realize the magnitude of what you have done—you have lifted the teaching of H.P.B.'s Secret Doctrine right out of the morass of occultism sentiment and general misunderstanding into the purer air of intellectual apprehension and established it upon the foundations laid by Western Science. Personally I am immensely grateful. In the domain of clear har thinking I am at home, in the domain of mysticism I am also in a measure at home and one of my unspoken question has been "Where do these things meet if ever and which lies before and which after?" In other words which verifies which? You have indiveated lines of thought in answer, wider and greater than I could have reached unaided. I have had a good deal of drilling in verbal accuracy and in clear thinking. My husband prefaces his lecture courses by one on the nature of accurate scientific thinking and as all his lectures and scientific papers are tried out on me first I have to do some stiff work at times. This has been invaluable connective against accepting uncritically all that I have read in metaphysics and occultism, mysticism etc. In fact it has most likely saved me from being swamped by any of them. I have always had to come up for a breath of good straight thinking at frequent intervals.

You have aimed your book at the scientifically minded. This is a much wider public than the professional scientists amongst whom I live. In unguarded moments I have said that amongst them there is in my opinion, a great deal of knowledge but very little wisdom. A person intellectually overdeveloped tends to become that most tiresome of snobs the intellectual one and to be generally unbalanced. The residue of wise and balanced people with open generous minds is perhaps as small in a university as any where else. I am wondering how and to whom

(continued from the previous page) your novel and very remarkable book will appeal. A society formed to think and study along these lines and composed of people who were sufficiently all round to know the value of self-discipline, the lovely depths of peace from deep introspection, the surpassing interest of life when viewed from a little off the personal standpoint, with keen clear intellect, a sense of humour and able to enjoy the fun of laughing at themselves would surely be an influence in gathering up all the loose and confused thought into something dynamic. When you wrote of post war work I couldn't quite see where it would lead except into almost direct opposition to the T.S. Moreover mystics had to be very individualistic and when brought together to be unable to hold to a steady course. The T.S. is full of every kind of error of judgment especially erotic ones.

I encouraged Mr Bolt to go through the circulars to his students and try to pull them into shape for a wider public. The meaning to me was quite clear because I knew the writer and what he was trying to express, but in all other ways the letters were a tangle of false analogies, mixed and had metaphors, ungrammatical English and so on. I could do nothing with them. I couldn't even reshape them. The interest in them really lies in the development of the writers mind and this is considerable. I don't think he finds it easy to write simply and plainly and sequentially.

I am very glad indeed to have your appraisal of H.P.B. I have often thought that although the Society she founded somehow missed the point she did succeed in shaking up the West to an interest in what might be called the mechanism of the Universe lying just below ordinary awareness. I suppose one might attribute to her work the present vast interest in spiritualism, Spiritual Healing, Christian Science and so on. To many people it is their first glimpse that life is not altogether what it appears to be on the surface. Even mysticism got a new direction from her teaching and the Christian gnosis a revival. We owe her a great debt.

The field comprehensively covered by the term philosophy as you use it is no less than life in its wholeness and its relationship with all else, and that as you are bringing your teaching to a close concentration upon the final truth, the goal, the aim the final meaning, so do I want to hold to what someone has called the "knife edge" of a path, and to roam no more. I deny nothing more seek to destroy anything. I am struggling to get a whole view. I cannot express in words the depths of feeling aroused in me when I read your words "when intellect had discovered what emotion glimpsed when it had established that discovery upon an irrefutable basis of fact for ever proved....." and recognised that alone, obscure and in my own strong inner life I had puzzled on all parallel lines. I could never make Mr Bolt see that somehow some when such a synthesis is inevitable or man can never say "I know", but only "I feel".

I am very glad of the experience this war work has given me. It has given me a great insight into the complexities of human behaviour and an opportunity to see in practice some of the fruits of the mental and emotional discipline to which I have subjected myself so long. One is free to give better service to people almost in proportion to the degree to which one is able to observe compassionately without making any emotional or mental reaction personally.

I am trying to grasp the non-duality the ignorance of which is the cause of all our sorrows and the endless round of births and deaths. I am using my spare time to study your book "Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga" and Manduky Upanishad together, and am lost in admiration of the depth of insight and the flexibility of mind which has enabled you to bring these subtle teachings within the compass of the understanding of ordinary folk and to point out how firmly they fit on to the basis of Western Science. Mr Bolt is eager to have the opinions of scientists and would like me to do something about it, but as I tell him the opinions of most that I know, deeply as I respect these intellectual powers are of very

(continued from the previous page) little value unless they are much more balanced rounded spiritually mentally emotionally than they appear to be. I note that you have approached Einstein with the kind of result I should expect. The mathematician nearest to him in work and outlook in England is Professor Paul Dirac, who is world-renowned and was a nobel prize winners sometime ago. When opportunity arises I will try to talk to him but he really is the least articulate person I know, and I doubt very much if he has attempted to bring his mathematical findings into any sort of relationship with anything else.

Intellectually objectively I can see the truth of the doctrine of mentalism. I can see the immense far-reaching implications into every part of life. But I am still a suppliant for the grace to me realise in full.

I can understand the bewilderment of those of your students who were putting all their effort into meditation as a means of reaching Truth, but I do not feel you have cut any ground from under my feet but rather that you have indicated a surer foothold and confirmed my own dim peerings. It does seem however that with each of your books you have widened the mesh of your net so that your final catch may be small numerically. Before the deep sincerity of purpose which has prompted this I kneel in reverence.

I try to think of life endowed with true insight. Life for all of us consists of relationship with our fellow human beings, a relationship which may be trivial or sublime and every graduation in between all the daily transactions of life are caused by the many and varied needs of this relationship and somehow the whole pattern of life is made up of our conduct of these transactions. When the true fabric of life is seen and realised to be a mental one and that at some point above normal consciousness all mankind is one consciousness. The Golden Rule is seen to be just commonsense. One still requires wisdom-insight in its application. You say insight cannot be dragged down to the level of material circumstances. Material circumstances

(continued from the previous page) are in the last analysis just the expression of life. One needs a sure insight into how to live, how to spend ones time and money, how to invest ones money if any, how to deal with employees or employer, and all the rest of it. It is one thing to recognise and accept the responsibility for giving service to ones fellows, it is a deeper thing to know how and when to give such service. Psychology tells me that in common with all the rest of humanity I am given certain primary wants – none of which are in themselves good or bad – but my conduct and character become good or bad according to which of the myriad possible ways I choose of fulfilling these wants. Will insight guide in my choice finally - after education, environment cultivated tastes and so on have done their share? I shall no longer follow the personal likes or dislikes I shall see the immediate need of each situation as it truly is. The implications are very vast. I might conceivably cast conventions to the wind, and so strange things. One would need to be very sure of such insight.

This is bringing insight to hear on just single motives in the pattern of life. Will it also show me the beginning and the end - the grandeur of the whole conception the why and the wherefore, as well as the how?

With regard to how, is it right to say that it was primarily with this that Blavatsky was concerned. If it from this hidden mechanism view of life that you have carried the teaching on a further stage? In your opinion is it necessary to know in detail that which Blavatsky taught? It is very difficult to pick ones way alone through the mass of stuff written by H.B.P. and by her followers. It is much more difficult to decide unaided what information is accurate and what is mere speculation. Throughout your writings there are hints of this knowledge, and you say much will come to the surface of my mind. I should be very grateful for a little clear guidance here not for myself alone. B for instant is full of occult theories which I can neither confirm nor deny except from the view point of philosophy - using the

(continued from the previous page) word as you do—when I can make a shot at evaluating them. Ought I to make an effort to get clearer detailed knowledge?

I sympathise with your desire to found no organisation and avoid forming groups if possible. The only drawback is the small number of people with whom any one of us can deal individually although fully realize that individual help is the only way. After all there are plenty of organisation to help beginners and one cannot make philosophy into slogans, nor does it lend itself to propaganda. There is always the danger of putting the organisation first — what really counts is the understanding, the realization and then the application of philosophy. Will that brings us into kinship with those who live for self no longer but only for the service of humanity and in that company are the lies of the spirit so fine and strong and lovely that a physical organisation would be more encumbrance than help?

I note you do not wish me to approach professional scientists regarding your work. I agree completely. I know from long experience that giants in intellect though many that I know are. Some of them are in other ways. I am beginning to understand truth is only to be apprehended by man in his wholeness. Prof. Eddington in his book "Philosophy of Physical Science" refers to Einstein's reply to Dr Davidson who asked what effect he thought the theory of relativity would have on religion. "None" and points out that Darwin might have given the same answer to a similar query about natural selection whereas he points out the compartments into which human thought is divided are not so watertight that fundamental progress in one is a matter of indifference to the rest. "I sometimes feel dismay when I see the high wall of opposition, ignorance prejudice and suspicion which exists between what one might call scholastic and academic thought, scientific, philosophic as well as religious and the vast and very mixed field of psychic occult and transcendal thought. I think it is true to say that the various sects and

(continued from the previous page) cults which have poured out their speculative writings on the world have often done much harm to the cause they sought to serve, and nothing is more needed than the metaphysical discipline which you lay down and the winnowing of grain from chaff which you indicate.

H.P.B. had no such means of publicity as a series like the "Penguin" and was compelled to form an organization for spreading what she wished to say. But the west seems quite tired of organisations. Perhaps the time for them is past. I would like to see just a fellowship gathered together which imposed no obligations of any kind made no extravagant claims or offers and did not wander into by paths but tired sincerely and simply to reach Truth only, whenever it might found and wherever it might lead. I would have no propaganda and no large meetings or conferences no imposing headquarters, no subscription except the bare cost of the journal and postage. I would offer no pay to the writers of articles for this particular journal, it would be an honour to write for it and nothing would be accepted which did not bear the imprint of understanding and deep sincerity. I would make the Fellowship so tenuous and flexible that the winds of opposition would find nothing to beat against and would blow through impotent. And opposition would be sure to arise. Is all this too idealistic to be possible. I expect host of difficulties would arise when one came to the practical part of working out the details. The essential thing is that a few people should be able to stand like rocks around which the rest could surge. There is always strength in comradeship, and I think some fellowship with others who are striving in a similar way is very helpful to most people. I think I never felt so lonely in my life as when honesty of purpose compelled me to leave the T.S. (I was a member for about 3 or 4 years) and although there were no frustrations in my life and I lived amongst family and friends whom I loved. I feel somehow that in a

(continued from the previous page) deep spiritual sense I was alone and stranded and quite forlorn. Outwardly no one's life could have been pleasanter or happier, but the inward ordeal was very great.

The attitude of meditation never leaves me, but it is nearer to reflection. Perhaps than utter stillness. I know the tears and the flooding joy, the moods of trembling expectancy and the leap of a wordless understanding. The circumstances of my life make it almost impossible to plunge in deep meditation. And I have accepted that as an indication that for the present it is not my way. I can see that any efforts to slip into a contemplative life always failed and circumstances have flung me back into a life of activity.

As I walked in the gate one Spring afternoon, my eyes fell on a clump of primroses in full bloom. The sun shone on them and their pale yellow beauty suddenly caught my heart, and I wept for joy of the loveliness they reflected, and the pain of the longing they aroused in me to understand.

Clearly the experience had no validity for anyone but to me it was like a veil being lifted upon joy beyond expression in human words. The ratiocinative part of my mind wanted to reason it out, and said if the Earth can show forth such glory then she must be herself all glorious, and if she is a reflection of the mind of her Maker upon what vistas of wondrous beauty am I being privileged to glimpse. And if I can see and feel the beauty then somehow it is also in me. When the more analytical part of my mind came uppermost it told me that the experience contained in itself no premises from which anything could be properly deduced, and that such experiences are probably common to everyone who stirs the mind sufficiently. Moreover since the pathological condition of fatigue was present on this occasion the experience was perhaps akin to hysteria.

Lifted from the context of my life and isolated from all other experience this particular one seems almost meaningless, but set upon the background of searching and striving, aspiring and praying, the

(continued from the previous page) moods of tremulous hope and expectancy, and the deepening sense of awareness extending even to the physical senses, which have gone before, and considered in the light of what mystics of all times and many Faiths have recorded of their experiences it falls into place as an almost classic instance. Recently I read an account of a book written around a very similar experience by a man who made vast and far reaching deductions from it, and found in it sure foundations for all the tenets of the Christian Faith. The memory remains with me, pale now but still lovely, and I think I shall always regard primroses with special affection.

I would like to take this experience into my hands and examine it objectively in the full light of day with all my faculties. But I cannot. Nor can I repeat it at will. I cannot even communicate it, much less explain it. Is it right to expect that when insight is awakened fully these mystic experiences will cease to be because knowledge of Truth will be always fully in command and these uncontrolled and fitful glimpses be superseded as the dawn is superseded by the day. Must I become like finely tempered steel, strong and resilient, to bear the joy of such knowledge? Must brain and heart be in perfect poise, thought and feeling in exquisite balance?

The Times Literary Supplement Reviewer seems to have been overcome by the tremendous concepts involved in "The Wisdom of the Overself". He notes as I did, the absence of a bibliography. I find that I am unable to cope with such subtle ideas unless I can ponder them from various angles, and have them presented to me in different ways, and I need some direction for further reading. It is, however, quite true that the argument of the book as you have presented it stands in no need of support, it is just the frailty of my mind which is in fault. I am puzzled by the question of "insight" —into what it sees, how it is recognisable how controlled and how applied.

It would appear that insight when applied to

(continued from the previous page) mundane affairs must be coloured with the mind through which it works, and inevitably be subject in its expression to that mind's limitations. Therefore although insight may be of immense value to the individual, it is no more valid for another person than the mystic's intuition. I am really puzzled. In "Art of Reading" Q. writes of this University "The man we are proud to send forth from our schools will be remarkable less for something he can take out of his wallet and exhibit for knowledge, than for BEING something, and that "something" recognizable for a man of unmistakeable intellectual breeding, whose trained judgment we can trust to choose the better and reject the worse." It seems that nearly all our striving is to better assessing of values and relative values. Is it possible that somewhere here we touch on Life's deep meaning, this learning to choose and discriminate? Haven't I partly answered my own question?

A few notes herewith jotted down during some recent reading of "The Wisdom of the Overself."

The world as we see it in waking consciousness therefore is that Void in some part of its manifestation. The void must contain within itself all that we regard as good as well as evil. Why do we regard some things as good and others evil?

In tracking the Ultimate to its unmanifested state of No-thing-ness have we really solved the enigma of existence? Isn't there another enigma in why and how the void in its unfolding manifestation unfolds us and presents the material world to our minds as apparently other than ourselves, thereby itself creating the duality which so bewilders us, and seemingly demanding of us collaboration in the drama. Really we have no option being ourselves of the drama, and it would seem fighting all the time for awareness of its significance. Is it really true to regard our individual existence an illusion; isn't it an illusion only relative to the Whole. The Whole must include all its parts, which being the same substance and nature are of the same reality and value. Isn't

(continued from the previous page) the supreme business of life living? If the parts seek continual escape back to the Whole by means of meditation or in any other way are they not defeating the supreme purpose of the Whole, which seems to be for ever becoming and for ever changing in ceaseless activity and unfoldment to what and we know not.

P. 201. Para beginning, "The reason why in the utter stillness—Is this really a reason? The individuals and their thoughts and imaginations must be that Void mind itself. In the utter stillness of its quiescent state it must contain all in potentiality. The question is why this display in manifestation, why manifestation at all?

K.D. Sethna: "SRI AUROBINDO'S TEACHINGS" @@

In the book I am sending you, "The Secret Splendour" I have attempted modes of speech and qualities of rhythm which I believe to be new in their cumulative suggestion. Not that English poets haven't had these particular expressive effects but they haven't employed them en masse, for the simple reason that English poets have not tried to practise Yoga and to draw deliberately their inspiration from innermost sources in a sustained way.

To be more accurate, I should qualify the word "innermost", for poetry has come to me not only from "deep within" but also from "high above". The former type has "innermost" sources as its origin, the latter as merely its channel. I don't say I have always succeeded in catching these "planes" pure —quite a deal of the usual poetic afflatus is there, mixed with the new stuff —and, moreover, the Muse has not uniformly embodied herself in my work. But when I have succeeded, my experience has been of vision and word and rhythm caught from either intuitive, occult and mystic regions of the inner being or some large and luminous ether of consciousness above the mind. Poetry of the second variety Sri Aurobindo calls "overhead",

@@ In letters to P.B.

(continued from the previous page) because in spiritual experience it descends from over the head and, when successfully received, brings a kind of immensity of unfathomable suggestion. There is an ascending scale in overhead poetry, and the highest reaches are most difficult to sustain. The best examples of these highest reaches are in the Vedhas, the Upanishads and the Gita - in the last-named the famous Cosmic Vision has the most authentic ring.

In English poetry, you have it in rare utterances like the line -

"Voyaging through strange seas of thought, alone." I don't presume that, as poetry, this line is superior to Shakespeare's

"In cradle of the rude imperious surge," but a spiritual quality moves through it, a wideness of vision, a profound overtone and undertone in the word, and an analysable suggestion borne on the ample and intense rhythm, which is not in the sovereign life-quiver of Shakespeare's language. In that line of Wordsworth's the poetic experience takes a value and a figure drawn from some consciousness which is superhuman.

To catch this spiritual quality in as large a quantity as possible seems to me the goal of every yogi writing in the poetic medium. It is, as I have said, a most difficult capture—but the lower ranges of overhead inspiration can be drawn upon with more successful frequency. Even then, the poetry will be something new, since flights in those "stratospheres" of consciousness are only a few degrees less rare than in the supreme "ionospheres".

What impact will my attempt at poetic expression from deep within and from high above on the best minds around me? Even if I prove to be no mere versifier and fulfil the true aim of poetry - the marshalling of words that are moving and precise and vision-lit, the creation of rhythms that breathe fresh life into metre — if I bring a vivid and concrete expression of the spirit, there is still bound to be an obstacle in my way, for the new element I have attempted will call for a readjustment, a re-tuning, of the

(continued from the previous page) reader's consciousness. But luckily for me no such effort will be necessary on your part when you read my poems.

A certain point has been raised by a reviewer. She says that one experiences a vague feeling of inadequacy on reading this book, as on reading the work of any writer who uses a foreign tongue, because, as Middleton Murry observed on being shown the work of a young Indian poet, English words are used to convey ideas foreign to their own basic genius and tradition. Do you agree? Do my poems strike you as not completely crystallised? – the inspiration failing to grip the language and to create a genuinely responsive body for its self-expression?

The reviewer further says: "Mr Sethna's imagery is sometimes inclined to be a trifle obscure, is laid on too heavily and has a cliché'd flavour." Well, if one's imagination moves in clichés one can't be called a poet. I don't know whether Sri Aurobindo is like to have missed clichés if they did run riot in my work. He has never rested until he spurred me to bring everything up to what he regarded as a certain level of spiritual suggestion and poetic vividness. I have rewritten in part so many poems – and rejected or kept aside for future consideration as many because I failed to lift them to the necessary level. An absolute adequacy of spiritual expression in poetry has been Sri Aurobindo's constant demand on me. Is it possible that in spite of all this the cliché has come out supreme?

I must tell you that the reviewer is a Parsi, but she is quite cultivated and knows English very well. All the same, it is possible that she does not have a deep insight into poetry or mystical values. Her comments, however, have put me on guard, so to speak; others may feel as she does and I should like to have an Englishman's reaction to my work.

Sri Aurobindo has asked me not to broadcast those letters lest they should be thought to reflect upon the Maharshi's greatness and so hurt his admirers.

(continued from the previous page) In point of fact they don't at all detract from his greatness as a true example of the old-world mukti realisation, but sometimes misunderstanding is caused, so I have shown them only to a few people to whom they might be really helpful. I have not the least hesitation in showing them to you and I should like you to write to me on the points discussed in them, for these points are rather important and bring into relief the difference Sri Aurobindo draws between spiritualisation of the traditional passive type or even of the larger active kind such as you advocate, and what he calls Supramentalisation. For an integral dynamic manifestation of divinity which would radically and lastingly change life and mankind he considers the most effective spiritualisation or experience and active inspiration of the Atman, the Overself, insufficient. To realise the Supermind it is not enough to let the mind be suffused with the light of the Overself be purified and spiritualised: the spiritualised mind turned dynamic is not Supermind—Supermind is a creative consciousness far above the thousand-petalled lotus which has been regarded in other yogas as the acme of God-realisation: to rise consciously and wakefully to the Supermind level and at the same time to call that dynamic and creative light into all our members and establish it there to the extent of completely transforming our very flesh and bone and the whole limiting system of so-called natural law under which matter lives — this is the ultimate aim of Sri Aurobindo's supramental yoga.

The only tongue I have felt at home in is English and I attribute this fact to something in the inner being carried over from an English birth in the past. People, however, are not inclined to countenance such an occult feeling.

Within a short space your review have covered a great many points. I feel that this has been possible by your having caught them in a critical vision rather than by intellectual analysis. I give the epithet "critical" to "vision" with a purpose. You

(continued from the previous page) have not written a sort of prosepoem extolling my poetry: you have soberly focussed yourself on it, taking in detail with a quick sharp insight, and the result is a string of crystallised comments, judgments that are brief but clear and keen like small finely-cut diamonds.

The letters from Sri Aurobindo bring up a point which is not fully discussed in them nor, on purpose, anywhere by him but which seems to me absolutely basis. I realise, of course, that, as he himself says, there are various modes and methods of yoga to suit various minds and natures and aims. But if an integral dynamic manifestation is accepted as the ideal thing, must not such a manifestation mean that the whole outer being, even to the outermost physical, should live under the law of the divine immortal consciousness? What would a divine immortal consciousness do if manifested integrally in the physical? There is, to my mind, only one answer possible: the very substance of matter constituting our bodies would be divinised and immortalised by it! Physical immortality would not necessarily consist in a rigid adherence to one form: there could be a voluntary discarding or dissolving of it, but there must be no mortal defect in the form entailing an unavoidable dissolution or discarding in the long run. In other words, if one so willed it, one should be able to keep the same form for ever and that too not by a Hathayogic reinforcing of it with pranic energy – a reinforcing which merely vitalises without divinising the body – but by a change in the essential stuff of it, a divinisation of its basic cell-consciousness. Logically, anything short of such a change would not be an integral dynamic manifestation of the Spirit; and logically also, the path which aims at that change is the right evolutionary one. You will perhaps protest that evolution must embrace all mankind and not a select few perfecting themselves in an Ashram; but for that matter the ideal of the sage as you have formulated it is not within the reach of all mankind – “sharper than a razor’s edge is the path to

(continued from the previous page) the Brahman and no more than a handful can walk it." Besides, I don't suppose there is any conscious evolution without an initial nucleus and a careful stabilisation of new powers. In any case, it is difficult to understand how you can accept the necessity of a dynamic manifestation that is INTEGRAL, without attempting to provide a process for complete transformation culminating in a physical "super nature", a luminous godlike freedom from pain and precariousness, from death by disease and decay or by unforeseen accident.

In course of time even that portion of Sri Aurobindo's "Life Divine" which you find hard to digest at the moment— the argument for physical immortality — will prove natural if not necessary to your soul's hunger, a hunger which through its various widenings seems to be not for this or that extreme but for an harmonious blending of all absolutes, an all-round perfection. Once you begin to see what Sri Aurobindo has to show, you run the risk of total conversion to his view—there is such an integrality about that any one who has an open and receptive and many-sided mind like yours is bound sooner or later to feel the force of his realisation.

I take it that you agree in general with Sri Aurobindo that spiritual endeavour has three aims: liberation, ascent, descent. You differ only with regard to the scope of the descent. But I wonder how the Buddha can throw any light on this scope when it is clear that he was as little concerned as Sri Raman Maharshi with either ascent or descent in the sense given to these terms by Sri Aurobindo. To break out of the ego and its burning thirst into the ineffable wideness of Nirvana or the static Atman is not necessarily to know in a dynamic manner the super-cosmos which is not a half-lit eneless revolving of ego and ignorance but a luminous play of Truth holding in itself the divine realities of which Mind, Life and Matter are stumbling images. Within that super-cosmos resides the power of a divine body as there is a power of divine life-force and a power of divine mind-energy. Logically, such a power must be admitted unless we say that Matter has no truth-counterpart

(continued from the previous page) in the Divine — in which case there is no escaping the conclusion that Matter is an unthinkable maya superimposed upon the Spirit. The Shankerites regard as maya not only Matter but Life and Mind and the individual Soul as well and even the Ishwara, the personal God: realise for them is a single featureless imitable existence: this to me seems a more consistent position than merely shutting Matter off from the transforming grace of the Spirit. The point, however, which I am submitting is that any dichotomy of the eternally Immortal and eternally Mortal must tend towards some sort of Illusionism. The sole alternative is to accept the possibility of a total divinisation of our Nature and say that it can be actualised some day or other, although for the time being the master-key may be missing.

If you declared that such a possibility struck you as very remote, almost as if the Divine could yet never would actualise it, if you said this because no sage has come anywhere near its actualisation, I should understand the natural scepticism that is unable to shake itself free of the onus of so much negative evidence. But I believe that philosophically you cannot uphold the Buddha's standpoint without pressing on to the outcome of both Buddhism and Shankerite Monism — the illusionist theory. Besides, I am puzzled by the suggestion the words of the Buddha quoted by you yield in themselves a philosophic standpoint. They yield a standpoint which is not philosophic but merely naturalistic: they accept without giving any reason the state of things obtaining in Nature so far. In philosophy don't you want an argument from the essence of a thing? What is in the essence of Nature that precludes physical immortality? What you have quoted just states that the body is subject to old age, decay and death and so will grow old, disintegrate and die. If the conclusion here is really derived from the premiss, it is argument in a circle, for there is no reason given why the body should be inevitably subject to mortality. Is it only because it is the body? What is there of

(continued from the previous page) mortality inherent in bodily existence? Unless such an inherence is demonstrated, the conclusion rests on nothing save past evidence. I do not deny the weight of such evidence, but logically and philosophically it cannot be averred that because a thing has been thus and thus in the past it must be the same in the future. In the midst of a world of constant becoming, of so surprising an evolution as a living and conscious body out of apparently inert and lifeless matter, it would be difficult to make such a statement. I recollect only one reason put forth by the Buddha: "That which is compounded of parts cannot hold together for ever." This is akin to the argument of the Schoolmen that the soul, to be immortal, must be among other things simple—for any composition would imply a tendency to fall apart. Well, all that philosophy can uphold against physical immortality is this "tendency". But if the life-force can hold together the physical components of a tree for over 800 years, I do not see why a spiritual force cannot keep together the human body for ever and ever by counteracting that tendency and not only keep it going but keep it young by a subtle chemistry beyond that of the mere life-force. By the way, to keep it going for ever without keeping it young is impossible: if age creeps in, however slowly, there is no real immortality—longevity would then be the sole thing possible. In Sri Aurobindo's yoga, the full descent of what he calls the Supermind will bring about, step by gradual step, a complete rejuvenation, because Matter will unite with and realise the truth-counterpart of itself, the radiant and ageless counterpart, in the Divine from which it has derived for progressive fulfilment in the terms of an evolutionary cosmos.

Of course rejuvenation and physical immortality are not per se spiritual aims: immortality in spiritual experience is what the vedas and the Upanishade mean—not mere perpetuation but Amrita, the nectar of divine light which is the true elixir vitae. To get this immortality in the body is not

(continued from the previous page) within the power of Science: what Science recognises is the possibility of the body continuing to hold together if a constant stream of vitalising energy can be brought into play so as to check the process of disintegration due to wear and tear on germ-attack. Science does not dream of a consciousness immune even to accident because of a divinity in it greater than the forces which bring about the "crass casualties" of life. Sri Aurobindo says that even spiritual realisation cannot rise to an absolute immunity inherent in a transformed body if as has happened so far in the world's history, that realisation is confined to the static Atman or extended only to the active universal Consciousness or uplifted at most to the dynamic Overmind plane, the plane of the great Gods which is something combining the static and the active infinite consciousness and transcending it by a certain "paradisaal" play of unity in multiplicity. This "paradisaal" play confers remarkable powers of protection—life can be lengthened and accidents foreseen and avoided to an extraordinary extent, but there would not be that sovereign security, that absolute power to which all accidents are impossible because the forces that make for accidents become null in its presence. To gain such a kingship over Nature one must consciously reach and possess and bring down into the very cells of the body of the Supermind. Because the Supermind was never possessed and brought down and organised in the waking state of mind, life and body, there was never in the past any full-fledged attempt to immortalise in the spiritual sense the physical being. An intuition of a divine physical body the idea of the Avatar; it is perhaps also behind the Christian idea of the Resurrection. In the Vedic days there was some talk of finding the Sun hidden in the darkest cave, the cave of the most material unconsciousness and there was an attempt to establish the Gods in every part of man's nature, but the master-key to interval transformation and supramentalisation

(continued from the previous page) was not found. It eluded even the tremendous grip of the Tantras on the Shakti. I believe it was not found because the time was not ripe and the physical consciousness was not developed and widened enough on its own outward plane to be able to house the subtle immensities and complexities of the divine Presence. Strange as it may seem, this materialistic age of ours has that wide and complex development: the progress of Science has cut down the barriers of Space and Time, electricity and wireless have brought the ends of the earth closer and put the brain into contact with the uttermost horizons, thus evoking a sense of subtle immensity in our daily world-view. So the ground is ready for the Spirit to descend and the Spirit to emerge and the Spirit to blow in from all quarters. But the immortal Spirit cannot be supported by mere medical props—the Steinach technique, the Woronoff-graft, the therapy of hormones. These are indirect attempts to bring about the unageing, the undying, the immortal. The fact, however, remains that the Spirit has a field ready for its use and can use it if only the field co-operates by a direct Godward aspiration.

It does not at all reflect on the Sagehood of the Buddha that he did not envisage the Aurobindonian ideal. Much depends on the Time-spirit, the traditional atmosphere, the general evolutionary ground-work. The Buddha was the Sage, the Saviour par excellence, of his day, but every age has its own needs and the age of Science with its undeniable stress on Matter and on life's fulfilment in the body must draw from the secret Spirit a new response, call forth new powers of consciousness, incarnate a new Saviour who shall give Matter the perfection it gropes for.

I have tried to explain and argue Sri Aurobindo's standpoint. But explanations and arguments go only a little way —it is life and realisation that matters. I feel that you took look at things with a mind on the alert for facts. Otherwise, in spite of your own pro-Buddha view, you would not say about Sri Aurobindo's experiment: "Personally I hope such an experiment

(continued from the previous page) will be successful and I will be the first to welcome the news of such success." It is so refreshing to find you ever ready for a tomorrow greater than all todays and yesterdays.

We had come to a sort of stand still as regards the questions we were discussing. I had expressed certain views which you were not intellectually willing to assimilate to your philosophy though you never closed your pragmatic mind to unforeseen possibilities. Perhaps the particular slant so to speak, of your line of experience was responsible for your unwillingness. Not that my experience is so revolutionary as to make these views their automatic outcome: I was just stating what the superb amplitude of Sri Aurobindo's realisation had brought to light.

What hard and solid work you must be putting in to produce books of such depth and bulk? I too wish we could meet and lay bare to each other our profoundest thoughts and ideals and visions: It is all right carrying on a discussion in writing, but some how personal contact brings about finer understanding and the discussion becomes much more concrete because the touch of actual life and the warmth of sincerity are greater then, not to mention the quick elucidation of small yet important points that rise at each step out of the general argument.

Sri Aurobindo is very positive about taking sides in this war. He says that the whole physical foundation rests on an Allied victory. And "Adverse or dark forces" stand in general for the powers of occult planes trying to precipitate such influences on earth as would hamper man's evolution towards the Spirit. When humanity appears clutched too firmly by the dark forces there is created the necessity of an Avatar, a special descent of the highest Divine. But even the Avatar has to work in the terms of evolution established from of old and all he does is to give a definite turn lightwards in one part of Nature or another and leave the rest to man. Rama brought in the supreme ethical consciousness with a face towards

(continued from the previous page) the Spirit. Krishna woke up the emotional and vital being to the Divine's call.. What the Avatar after Krishna has to do is to grip the very physical with heavenly hands. His work will be the surest, the most radical, for he will not rest with merely the mind and the life-force and touch them with soul and spirit; he will also transform the body itself to stuff of divinity. And this he will accomplish by the descent of a dynamic consciousness as high as the material being is low. To illumine the mind what is required is the Atman the infinite impersonal Self, and an influence from the Buddhi poised in the thousand-petalled lotus. To illumine the emotional and vital nature, what is required is the Overmind, the world of the great Gods living in a mighty concord of multifarious bliss. What is required to illumine the physical is the highest archetypal plane, the supreme zenith corresponding to the extreme nadir —the plane which Sri Aurobindo calls the Supermind, the perfect and integral creative Truth-Consciousness. When a descent of such a consciousness is being brought about, we must expect the most terrific resistance from the forces which seek to found on earth a new order of darkness: we must expect an anti-Avatar, a desperate attempt to incarnate in full the hideous worlds. Need we doubt the ultimate consequence? When the full spiritual being of Sri Aurobindo is behind the movement—a being that does not rest only in the impersonal peace of the Atman and a partial enlightenment of the mind-life-body complex, but acts from the creative dynamic of the Truth-conscious Supermind with its master-key of integral transformation—can there be any failure? However long and weary the road because of the manifold weakness of the human material that has to be used, the goal is sure.

I spoke of Rama as come to bring the supreme ethical consciousness suffused with the Spirit's light and of Krishna as the bringer of the Divine's call to the emotional and vital being of man. Well, this is correct in general —but we must not forget that Krishna did not confine himself to the emotions and the kinetic vitality. The irresistible Wizard of

(continued from the previous page) the Flute is not the whole of Krishna —the Gita shows him as the maker of a grand synthesis of all realisations. Still, it must be noted that the last word of the Gita is not "Be fixed in the impersonal Atman and have peace" but "Deliver thyself into my hands, surrender thyself to me who am thy lord and fight life's battle." Though this cannot be, coming as it does on top of the grand synthesis, a mantra of bhakti pure and simple, it has certainly a strong personal-emotional tone, leading us to think that the central hold of Krishna was in the heart-region. I use the term "heart-region" rather than the "heart" because the heart is the centre of purely emotional bhakti, while that Krishna seized was what Sri Aurobindo calls the psychic being and the Upanishads the chaitya purusha or the Antaratman seated behind the emotional heart and working upon it in order to purify and transform the emotions. The psyche a'la Sri Aurobindo is a calm intensity of God's presence as a person within us, a keen flame in a windless place, as the Gita somewhere pictures it.

As regards the illumination of the different parts of our nature, I do not mean that a full mind-illumination comes about through the Atman and the sahasrara chakra above the head. The Atman is the background of being, the substratum, —and the wakeful mind can only reflect it and act spiritually by living in its aura, unless it is able to sit wakefully in the thousand-petalled lotus. When it sits thus, it is no longer a consciousness with a chasm between itself and the realised Atman shedding light across the chasm: there is no longer static Knowledge and enlightened Ignorance but one whole of Knowledge with two aspects; static and dynamic. This true illumination. I must not, however, be understood to mean that this is complete illumination. Only the general essence of the illumination is here—the integrality can come only when the Supermind has taken possession of the mental consciousness. Similarly, the complete illumination of the emotional and vital nature can be brought about by the Supermind alone. The general essence

(continued from the previous page) is got when the Antaratman, the psyche in man, connects up with the Overmind as Krishna intended when he synthesised all realisations (the Overmind is a mighty global holder of many truths) and took the Antartman as his most potent point of dynamis in the human being. Perhaps you will question why the sahasrara chakra is not enough and why the Overmind which is far beyond it is needed to give the general essence here. The answer is: the thousand-petalled lotus is the plane of luminous spiritual thought—and thought, no matter how spiritual and luminous cannot effectively grip the emotional and vital nature. Beyond the Sahasrara a more puissant light comes into play, a more intense and intimate light which reaches its most global vibration, so to speak, in the Overmind presided over by the Trimurthi whose Vishnu-aspect was incarnated by Krishna. That is why the general essence of illumination here has to be drawn from a higher region than that from which it can be drawn for the mind. The utter perfection, of course, in this case as well as everywhere else can come from nothing short of the Supermind, the true hidden Gnosis which is more than global and which Sri Aurobindo calls integral.

Though greetings and good wishes are welcome from everybody, they are most beautiful from those who have gone deep into their own souls and are in a position to make their thoughts somewhat of a blessing.

Not that the years in Sri Aurobindo's Ashram have been in vain: they are more than a mere memory, they are part of my very life-stuff—but unfortunately there is also a great deal else in me that I have not been able to bring into harmony with their presence. And I have lived the dying year as most men live, but there has also been a secret living, mostly a dim haunting background, yet on occasion too a flame in the forefront. Looking back, I think the year has been most precious for the vividest of these forefront experiences. I was lying in bed at night and telling myself how vain were all things of ordinary life, with death as the blind terminus of

(continued from the previous page) their groping. I reflected on the complex forces at play in my personality and the uncertain future they were working out. To know God by intimate mystical experience seemed to me the sole worth-while business on earth. "O that I might one day know God wholly!" As soon as I uttered these words, a powerful tug was felt in the middle of my chest and, like a stream of wind or rather a wind of fire, there rushed from the chest an cry that had nothing to do with my conscious mind. It went on and on for several minutes, an intense aspiration for the Divine, like a thousand prayers gathered into one but prayed by something that was not my own self as I commonly knew it but a deep dweller within, who had suddenly come out and uttered his luminous hunger. I was afraid no less than astonished, as that soar of soul was like a bright knife cutting through all the small desires of my being. I did not know what dear delight of the human heart in me it would slay if I let it move on its relentless path, without any check or control. All my little longings like shape after shape with fingers pressed to each ear and eyes averted, stood round that up-flying and upflashing voice. So pure was the aspiration, with not a single reserve in its cry, that I hesitated to interfere with it; it seemed sacrilegious to put anything in its way, and I hung by, letting it go undisturbed, no matter what the consequence to my cherished frailties. I yielded to its steady sweeping self-consecration my whole consciousness, and the conviction dawned on me that this experience was definitely moulding my future. I realised that there was waiting for me an inevitable day when I would lie for ever at the feet of the Eternal Mystery. It is not easy to catch in words the exact reality. Something in you must intuitively respond—and how few there are who can give that response.

A few such reviews from sensitive discriminating minds can make me assured that my book is a success. I shan't care if the larger public fails to respond. The New Age is still in the making and the light of the Spirit has not yet come into full view.

I believe that the Spirit will never have a permanent and truly fruitful hold on life until self-realisation is two-sided and fulfils the whole heaven-high and earth-deep hunger of man—the hunger for a divine immortal being, realised both in body and mind. When I try to touch the essence of me, the elemental urge within myself, I feel as you also feel that a cry of tremendous delight is waiting to be released by the success of Sri Aurobindo's experiment. That cry which hopes and hopes is wiser than our "reason" and knows that all that reason constructs as so-called barrier to and "metaphysical pit-fall" for the possibility of such a success is at bottom due to an instinct developed through many ages to give an intellectual excuse to ourselves and console us for the historic failure of human spirituality to achieve a complete divinisation of the body.

Indeed, death can be made equally a friend as an enemy by the Soul, but the body takes it as a friend merely because it is the last and severest blow numbing the sensation of all possible severities. We can face it with equanimity and heroism, even with enthusiasm, but that is because the mind is great and not because death in itself is glorious. The Zeitgeist may have given a particular direction and a particular shape to the Buddha's solution of life's riddle and the Vedas before and the Gita after him and Sri Aurobindo today may see and act differently; still, in common with all other sages he saw with realistic clarity, as the charioteer-episodes indicate, that that riddle is propounded to us in the first place by physical suffering, the incapacity of the outer consciousness, the body's old age and decrepitude, the death of the material organism; in other words, the first spur to spiritual realisation is the undeniable wretchedness of our insecure life on earth which strikes us as a subversion of the divine immortality we instinctively crave for.

It seems to me that we accept death because it

(continued from the previous page) has been a necessity forced on evolution at a certain stage of life's development. As soon as we begin to reflect, we feel that life desires perpetuation and unfailing health and can never hug death as a luxury. Why should it be the sole door of "escape now and again from a world of horrors and terrors such as ours"? Why should immortality in the radiant and god like sense in which alone Sri Aurobindo makes it a desideratum be a bar to that escape? Sri Aurobindo has access to fill the beatitudes of the Beyond—he can any time escape into them by a withdrawal of the focal point of consciousness into the inner being, but such an escape is not needed by him because he does not lead his conscious life as men commonly do in merely a focal point in the brain. The beatitudes are tasted by him all the time and not as a mere background fully realised only in samadhi but as a dynamic presence simultaneous with his waking self, and what he is trying to do at the moment is to make even the most outward bodily sense taste and absorb and assimilate and hold and manifest them for ever, even as his inner being does. The world's horrors and terrors cannot oppress a dynamic Ananda, much less a divinised body; they will not even exist for such a body except as objects outside it, absolutely harmless to it—objects which it gradually irradiates with bliss and slowly transforms into beauty. That is how I see the matter, though, no doubt, I can scarcely see it in all its tremendous implications until Sri Aurobindo deems it fit to take it up and thrash it out intellectually as he does most other topics of Yoga in his books. The immortality-theme he has refrained from working out—he has so far hinted only the broad general grounds for it: probably he thinks that sufficient empirical proof must be brought into play in order to back clinchingly a discussion which carries the Spirit's war into the very centre of agnostic Science. (I recollect the Mother once telling us that when complete physical transformation takes place it will be something so concrete that even a sceptic will have to accept the evidence. Three outward characteristics I think she mentioned; subtle

(continued from the previous page) luminosity, infinite adaptability to physical demands, and invulnerability by a power to open up and let hurting agents pass through and, on their removal, close up in an automatically healed texture.

As regards the Illusionist world-view and the Aurobindonian, what you write is true in a certain sense. The first overwhelming experience of the Atman renders our ordinary "realities" most shadowy and insubstantial by comparison and they appear to be mere illusions which resolve into emptiness and practicable non-existence when the Atman draws us deeper and deeper into itself and the individual self is totally, lost in the one static Infinite. From the escapist standpoint of the Shankerite Monists the world must be ultimately an illusion because their ultimate goal is absorption in the Absolute, and absorption which entails a complete unconsciousness of the normal organs of experience to which the world is "real". This absorption is part of the inner realisation of an Aurobindonian yogi, but he does not aim at residing for ever in that passive Extreme—he aims at integrality wherein the passive Extreme is always open to him but he poise he chooses is one that accepts the world as an aspect of the Divine just as real and legitimate as the featureless Atman and holds the One and the Many, the Transcendent and the Universal and the Individual in a single realisation. To this realisation that is dynamic and static at the same time the world cannot be an illusion and it regards the other experience as partial and lop-sided and not integrally divine. In such a sense the Aurobindonian view which aims at integrality is opposed to the Illusionist. A consciousness divinely awake on all sides—that is the Aurobindonian ideal. If driven to choose between utter Illusionism and unmitigated Materialism, no evolved mind should hesitate in "plumping" for the luminous ecstatic Extreme, the rapt Atman; but that does not alter the fact that both these are just the bright obverse and the dark reverse of the same lop-sided sleep which the disciple of the Integral Yoga has to outgrow. He wants harmonisation, no blinding cleavages.

All difficulties in the realm of philosophy can be insuperable: if this were not so, then there would be a universal consensus of philosophers instead of Aristotle at loggerheads with Plato, Kant going hammer and-tongs at the schoolmen, Bertrand Russel spitting fire at Bergson. The spectacle, though extremely fascinating, is a trifle ludicrous too. Seeing that all these men possessing first-class minds cannot agree, one is inclined to think that the heat of utter self-certainty with which they fight is rather a defect. The history of thought shows that there is endless argumentation possible: the mind can take up any standpoint and plead plausibly about it or, conversely, reason against any standpoint and reject it. To philosophise is one of our instincts, but no philosophising can arrive at indisputable truth. Certain aspects of the ultimate reality appeal to certain types of mind or chime in with certain types of experience – and these we erect into a system by means of logical reasoning which seems cogent to us but which others with equal cogency for themselves put aside as erroneous. The only system which is likely to be accepted in the long run is one which satisfies all the sides of our nature. The acceptance will not be merely by intellectual argument; it will be by a deep instinct which wants harmony and integration rather than the apotheosis of one side at the expense of another.

You declare with Berkeley that we can know only our own minds and that what we call matter is really a form of idea. I shall not for the present try to argue against Berkeley. Any history of philosophy will provide you with the traditional counter-attack and the work of the neo-realists of our own day will show the modern technique. I shall not try, because it is pretty futile until your penchant for Berkeley is weakened; you will be able to argue back and the neo-idealists of our own day will help you to return the blitz of neo-realism. What I want to say is simply this; there is no sense of rest in the Berkeleian philosophy for that in us which strives

(continued from the previous page) for harmony. It leaves something in us unconvinced, for, opposed to Berkeley, we have the very strong feeling that, instead of matter being a form of mind, mind seems often to be a form of matter. Most of our practical life is based on what appears to be the independent existence of matter. And when we ask ourselves: wouldn't matter be more amenable to mind if it were just an idea?—the answer makes us doubt very much Berkeley's position. Matter does impress us as a power in itself which we contact by means of mind. Mind does not bring us perfect harmony and fulfilment: it struggles and gropes, it is not the master-magician of life. Nor does matter as conceived by Science and known in practical experience hold the secret we are vaguely aware of. There must be something else. Matter and mind seem to be two forms of some other reality which contains the archetypes of them both, archetypes from which they have derived or deflected.

Only when the mind is stilled, there emerges a deeper and higher consciousness which bears golden within it the harmony we are hungering for. Yes, it bears it within itself, but for us to get that harmony we need profound progress in the supra mental domain. The limitation of Sri Ramana Maharshi, as one of the whole superb school of Atman-knowers, is that he stops with pure infinite Self beyond our narrow human selves and makes no attempt to realise a divine dynamis to replace the dynamis that is human and discordant. At most there is some light reflected in the ordinary workings of the mind—a degree of intuition comes into play—but where is the divinisation of which we dream? The mind must be completely divinised after being stilled and a new faultless activity initiated to substitute the old stumbling one. Mind must begin to function according to the archetype of it which must exist in the ultimate reality and without which we would never feel in ourselves that urge for perfection which is the mainspring of all our mental life. But can mind realise wholly its archetype without the other parts of our being doing the same? No: if, as experience

(continued from the previous page) teaches us, we cannot rest finally in mind and, for the sake of harmonious sense of life, grant matter a separate status, we must strive after another an archetype of matter too. Here also the perfection we are seeking cannot be got out of matter itself. Not by material progress – though that is useful in its own way just as mental progress is – can we attain the perfection our bodily being desires. Again we must tax the Beyond, the supra mental which is at the same time the supra-material. In that Beyond are powers that transcend Nature. Many Yogis catch snippets, so to speak, of these powers, but the real and final miracle to work on Nature is what Sri Aurobindo calls transformation – the utter divinisation of the physical body so that it becomes a form of the Consciousness that is luminous and immortal.

Remember that Sri Aurobindo's teaching is Integral Yoga. That word "integral" denotes the Aurobindonian search. Sri Aurobindo says it is no use denying that man is in quest of an all-round harmony of perfection. If that is so, there must be in the unknown depths of the Divine the secret of an all-round fulfilment. Once you feel this, you will not stress intellectually your differences with his teaching. He is not primarily arguing out a system. With his instinct towards harmony he is pressing on in spiritual experience. His is not an integral philosophy for the sake of philosophy, his is an Integral Yoga, and all his philosophising is a statement in mental terms of what he has realised. The Life Divine expresses nothing except his experience, his realisation. Having attained in constant waking life and not merely in a sealed samadhi the reality which he terms Gnosis he has but laid out in intellectual exposition what the gnostic consciousness is and what yogic possibilities it holds and what the results of its full descent into our earth-existence will be. And Sri Aurobindo does not proclaim to the world: "Read my book and I shall argue you into my beliefs." His call is: "Read this book in which

(continued from the previous page) I have elucidated in philosophical language my actual experience and if you feel in you heart the urge towards the integral realisation I have pictured and propounded, come to me and I will give you every living and glowing bit of it."

I ask you to feel in your heart that the essence of all our human endeavour is the thirst for perfection and that there can be no true perfection unless it is integral, all-round, top-to-toe. It is not very easy to have this feeling. In a weak form it can never be escaped: what I am asking for is not such a form; I want you to have it like a fire—keen and clear. In the path of it there is the whole burden of failure after failure cumbering human history. "Man is finite, man is mortal" this has been the cry through the ages. "Something indeed is infinite and immortal" the religions say, "but there is a residue of finitude and mortality which is irreducible." And this contention is not based only on argument: it has behind it a lack of realisation. The great prophets have all striven to their utmost and come short. It is the concrete coming short in actual spiritual experience that has created the tremendous obstacle to a keen and clear recognition of the elan to wars harmony. Yet the elan is there. "Thou art THAT"—"Brahmaloka is here and now"—"The Kingdom of God is within you"—"I and my Father are one"—all these words are trying to let that elan find voice. The Vedic search for the Sun lost in the cave of Earth, the Vaishanava worship of the Incarnate Divine, the Word become Flesh of neo Platonic Christianity, the belief in the resurrection of the body—these too are the same elan seeking an outlet. And an outlet is sought in all our straining towards perfect beauty in art, perfect truth in philosophy and Science, perfect conduct in ethics, perfect health in day-to-day living. The mind yearns to immortalise its products and find means to transcend the limits of space and time, the body longs for blissful perpetuation, seeks it vicariously through the process of child-birth, ransacks the entire realm of Nature and of chemistry for the

(continued from the previous page) conquest of disease and for the elixir vitae. We are labouring to deliver some perfect all-embracing Godhead. Alas, we have laboured and failed—even Sri Krishna came and went without delivering the hidden Divine in a complete form. Is it any wonder that we do not see keenly and clearly the hunger for perfection? It is natural that we should envisage it vaguely: veil on veil of disappointment and defeat has covered it. These veils have to be pierced and drawn aside, so that the true secret may shine out.

If you hold naked before you this secret and contemplate Sri Aurobindo's teaching in its light, you will perceive how sublimely, how exquisitely, how accurately that teaching answers to every little nuance of aspiration in this secret. If like a flame you enshrine it in your mind you will put yourself in the right receptive mood to follow Sri Aurobindo's philosophy to its ultimates. The Berkeleian penchant, the anti-Avatar bias, the shying away from the doctrine of Absolute Union will slowly dissolve and the intellect, inclined to move along other tracks, will fall in line with the Aurobindonian teachings. Does not perfection imply the human according to Absolute Union with its own secret origin, the Divine? Can there be perfection unless the Divine descends into the human mould—and that is the Avatar except the most centrally creative of the descending splendours? Is perfection possible if only the mind's idea and experience be the last word on matter and no evaluation be made of the material in terms of a supreme spiritual consciousness? My impression of you is a man of great mental plasticity and breath, a man capable of meeting the challenge of many unknown directions: there is no incapacity, no blind rigidity in you to check any movement towards new horizons.

There is a mighty intellect in The Life Divine which we at once feel to be no whit less than Plato's or Spinoza's or Hegel's but none of these giants was a full-fledged Yogi. Sri Aurobindo's intellect

(continued from the previous page) is an instrument used by a spiritual realisation: not one sentence anywhere is inspired by the intellect alone. If one's realisation is poor and fragmentary, the philosophy will seem narrow in spite of the intellect being gigantic. In some respects Plato, Spinoza and Hegel seem very narrow, they do not cover our full sense of things: the cause is that each of them elaborated in terms of the intellect a one-sided intuition or a limited set of intuitions. The elaboration was stupendous, the root-sense of the real did not feed on wide intuitive experience. Even where, added to intuition, there is in philosophy actual spiritual contact with the Unknown, we often get the impression of narrowness. Buddha and Shankara and Plotinus are powerful intellects, yet their lop-sidedness is apparent. Nirvana, the featureless Brahman, the absolute Alone are indeed grand and no Yoga can be complete without them, but as known and presented by the three arch-transcendentalists they cast on much of our nature a blank of unfulfilment. Though they are grander than anything in ordinary life, something in Nature weeps and weeps, the clinging clay of us feels torn, Mother Earth stands defeated and baulked. The hidden instinct of integral harmony is not satisfied, even as it is not satisfied by the mere vicissitudes of Time, however colourful and varied. Does Sri Aurobindo's philosophy strike us as narrow in any such sense? The trouble here is quite the opposite: Sri Aurobindo is too broad for most minds, he is too comprehensive, he posits things which seem too good to be true, too far-reaching to be believable, too gloriously integral to be realised by human capacity. We are led to say, "Yes, yes, all this is exactly as it should be, it is precisely what the age-old hunger for perfection and harmony wants, but can we really have the moon?" Sri Aurobindo's reply is: "That hunger in you exists because the moon is just what you are, made for: in fact, you have the moon, you are the moon—only you don't know it. Do the Yoga which I have done and you shall know."

First, bring forward into the utmost brightness and with all its facets before you the fiery gem of our secret elan towards perfect harmony, so that you may move with ease along thoughts put forth by one who plunged into the Unknown with that occult diamond for his guide. Then, across those thoughts reach out for the concrete spiritual experience, the actual harmonious realisation which the integral Yoga of that master-explorer is bringing to the world's view.

K.D. Sethna: "THE MUSE AND THE MYSTIC".@@

A bright young man, wrote to me about my own poetry, appreciating certain pieces of a bold and pungent type, but deploring my general mystical trend as unmodern, divorced from hard facts like slums and brotels, flying away from the delights of sense, out of tune with the Develations of science, unhelpful towards "breasting" life's miseries.

Why should mystical emotion and vision stand in the way of a reader's appreciation of my poetry as poetry? What does it matter if he does not agree with that emotion or vision? He is not asked to sit in judgment on their ultimate truth. They are to be approached through the poetic body they wear and are to be valued according to the beauty of that body. If people had the genuine aesthetic sense, all authentic poetry would come alive to them, whether the theme be mystical or no. The blank and befuddled face with which he generally looks up from the pages of mystical poetry can very well be his own fault—unless it be a fact that mysticism and poetry are born enemies, the latter refusing ever to embody the former. They would indeed be irreconcilable if mysticism could never inspire a man to feel strongly and to see vividly—or else if the feeling were so strong and the seeing so vivid that his faculty of expression got quite upset. I do not think anybody who has undergone it, will mark in it a lack of feeling or seeing.

(continued from the previous page) Expression, however, depends on the presence of the artist in a man's nature: a non-mystic will come a cropper just as hopelessly as a mystic if the artist in him is ill-developed and proves inadequate to hold in significant form the stuff of experience. No doubt, the mystical experience is more difficult to capture, but difficulty is one thing and impossibility another. To read the ancient Upanishads or, in our own day, Sri Aurobindo is to render all talk of impossibility ridiculous.

The aesthetic approach puts in the right perspective most of the demands laid on the poet by my friend. I agree that no art should be entirely divorced from life, but the use of it should not be merely to help one to "breast" any one particular kind of misery. If poetry helps a person rotting away in a slum or working his way towards a scientific vision of the universe, there is nothing to be said against it. Still, if it does not give nourishment to a man sitting in a palace of pleasure or stirred by inexplicable longings for the Eternal and the Infinite or groping through labyrinths of dream towards the ecstasy of Krishna's flute-call – if poetry is meant for only this, that or the other kind of man but has no value for all the moods of the human heart, then its essence remains ungrasped and unutilised. The correct way of making use of poetry is to get from it an influence of perfect beauty that gives one's consciousness an intensity, a subtlety, sublimity, no matter what the contents and the style. All sorts of contents, all varieties of style can be poetically used and made fruitful for the growth of consciousness. To demand from poetry anything except that keen growth through the enjoyment of flawless and absolute expression is to miss its essence and impoverish its flowering.

Let us face slums and brothels by all means, but let us get poetry out of them and not mere poetry and prostitution. Let us feel them like a whip of flame across our minds and not turn them into grist for the mill of an economic theory. Let us also

(continued from the previous page) not fix our eyes on slums and brothels only. Life has many other manifestations. Let us face too the "dark night of the soul" in search of the Divine and the excesses of the "star-struck debauchee of light". There are men who live in our own difficult age and are at the same time mystically inclined.

Yeats is acknowledged universally as the greatest English poet of our age. What does his poetry consists of? In his youth, a good amount of the most exquisite love-lyricism woven into patterns of Irish myth and mystic symbol; in his old age, a vigorous utterance on the one hand of a zestful, inquisitive, flesh-accepting, death-confronting realism touched by what seems a scientific attitude, and on the other hand of an occult and esoteric vision that regards all things here as a faint representation of some secret Spirit within us, of archetypes and archimages that are beyond the physical universe. Yeats was a many-sided genius and in his poems he focused all those sides, with an underlying mystical sense which was somewhat ivory-towerish in his young days but altogether life-gripping in the days of his maturity.

We must not make fetish of the scientific and social-reformist angle nor deem mysticism a flight from the concrete world of the senses. Technical development cannot argue a higher stage of essential consciousness.

There must be progress not horizontally alone: a vertical line must be struck, a movement leading from our present level of humanity to a superman-hood, a change from the mental grade to a super-mental. A defect, a limitation resides in the very quality and stuff of our present consciousness.

Mysticism steps in here—either as a grand escape to a luminous Beyond or as dynamic surcharging of the human with the Divine.

We who live in the age of Sri Aurobindo cannot be escapists. There is really nothing in mysticism to compel us to renounce earth and not attempt a radical reshaping of it. For, between Spirit and

(continued from the previous page) Matter no gulf yawns as between abstract and concrete. The Spirit is described by all who have realised it as more dense, more powerful, more actual to all our faculties than the table at which I am sitting and the typewriter at which I am banging away. It has a concreteness and substantiality which makes our flesh-contacts pallid and passionless in comparison. What we call the world of sense is not foreign to the Spirit. Doubtless, the senses are given a new mode of action, a hidden Godhead becomes real to them in every cosmic phenomenon even as to our ideative and emotional nature. This recasts our habitual desires and activities—we have no longer the narrow selfish grab, the small jealous clutch: our greediness and our grossness are lost, but we are not "sicklied o'er" with an impoverishment of the essence of sensuous rapture. Where in the whole literature of love is there a description more electric with concrete personal sensation than those of the mystical ecstasies of St. Teresa and Mirabai? Where in Nature-Poetry is a stronger sense of substantial being invading all our powers of perception and meeting us everywhere and infinitely and in a million forms than in the spiritual intensities of the Upanishads and the Bhagwad Gita? Neither life nor art grows anaemic through the mystical experience. And my bright young friend's apprehension that the mystic cuts himself off from sense-delight is founded on a very superficial idea which obscures the natural affinity of the mystic to the poet. Poetry's keenly passionate sensuousness is not vitiated but illumined and fulfilled by the keener passion and sensuousness of mysticism.

Hugh Ross Williamson: "THE NEW CLERGYMAN" @@

The shortcomings and faults of the Church of England and its apparent failure to cope with contemporary conditions have been the burden of so many exhortations and analyses that one hesitates to add to their number. The clergy are anybody's Aunt Sally

(continued from the previous page) and they have suffered so much from the criticisms of the ignorant in these days when anti-clericalism is a cardinal point in the Intellectuals' Charter that one is doubly reluctant to say anything that might be construed as a slight. And yet—as everyone in touch with the life of the Church would admit—the position is dangerous (and is likely to become more so); and, although it is true that the clergy are not the Church, the attitude of the clergy does constitute a large part of the problem. The final report of the Archbishops' Commission on Training for the Ministry, which was published last week, is concerned with measures for "producing a clergy more able to bridge the gulf which exists today between the presuppositions of the ecclesiastical world and those of the ordinary man": and though the proposals as a whole appear to reach a high level of fatuity even for an Archbishops' Commission, they at least suggest that those in authority are aware of the problem.

Much of the emphasis on inadequate remedies is due, it seems to me, to the ignoring of very simple principles and to the making of false assumptions; and my object is merely to suggest a line of thought which may make the real issue more easily seen.

The basic fact, which no one disputes, is that the Church is living in a non-Christian Society. Whether the number of practising Christians of all denominations is 15 per cent or 30 per cent of the population is not of great moment. It is certainly a minority, probably a very small minority; and it is—according to Mass Observation—getting even smaller during the war. Though the country is officially and traditionally Christian and though there are still resources of Christian capital to be drawn upon, the vast majority neither knows nor cares about the truths of the Faith.

From this fact, two conclusions are commonly drawn, both of them false.

The first is that the Church ought to regard the non-Christian British in the same way that it

(continued from the previous page) regards the unconverted heathen to whom it sends missionaries. The second is that it ought to concentrate on a "social gospel", as being the most obvious point of contact between the Christian and the non-Christian.

As regards the first point, the reason for and justification of missions is that those who do not know and have no means of knowing the truth should be given an opportunity of learning that "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." That, and nothing else, is the message of the missionary.

It is obvious nonsense to pretend that anywhere in this country such a situation exists. The modern couple, for example, who live next door to a church, but never think of visiting it; or the pagan listener who switches to dance-music if a religious item obtrudes itself on his wave-length; or the rationalist intellectual who reads his Bible for the purpose of picking holes in it are not living in enforced ignorance. Their heathen darkness is entirely self-induced.

In a country where anybody can enter a church for prayer or instruction, any day of the week, at the end of ten minutes' walk or less, it is absurd to think or talk in "missionary" terms.

As in the secular sphere, ignorance of the law is not held to be a valid excuse for breaking it, so, in the religious sphere, it is the absentees who must be held responsible for not going to church, not the Church which must be blamed for not going to them.

This may seem to some a hard saying, but it is emphatically in line with the teaching of Christ. It is the point 6 the parable of Dives and Lazarus. When Dives asks to be allowed to warn his five brothers of the fate awaiting them, Abram refuses with the words: "They have Moses and the prophets let them hear them If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

And Christ's commission to the Twelve included the admonition that, if any community would not listen

(continued from the previous page) to their preaching, "when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city."

I do not mean to imply, of course, that the clergy have no doubt towards the lapsed. They have an overwhelming duty—to fit themselves to deal adequately with those who return to their Father's House. And it is precisely here that so many of us fail; and fail mainly because we have misconstrued our office. We have been so busy doing the thing that is not required of us that we have had no time to prepare ourselves for the thing to which we were called and for which we exist.

If this mistake arises, on the whole, from an excess of idealistic enthusiasm (though its origin does not make it any the less disastrous) the second error—that of trying to meet the world on its own terms by preaching a "social gospel"—has a less reputable reason. For it involves a surrender to the world's standards, an amiable effort to compromise. Non-Christian secular society is willing to tolerate what it is pleased to label "Christianity" as long as that "Christianity can be defined as socially acceptable behaviour, leavened by a lively interest in the comforts of civilisation. The Church, however, exists to save the souls of sinners, not to provide the State with an unpaid army of welfare workers. Because one of the manifestations of the Christian character is a *caritas* towards all sorts and conditions of men, it is very easy for the "man in the street" to blur this distinction; but there is no excuse whatever for representatives of the Church to attempt to enlist the sympathy of the non-Christian idealist by pretending that this is, in fact, Christianity.

The essence of the Christian message, in this connection, is Christ's "My Kingdom is not of this world". The opposition between the world and the Kingdom is fundamental; therefore the Church is bound to preach the antithesis of secular Utopianism. The

(continued from the previous page) The type-figure for the Church and the World is still Noah's Ark; and if the New Dispensation modified it by making the Ark large enough to include everybody, it even more emphatically confirmed the division between those who took advantage of it and were saved and those who, of their volition, were lost.

The Church's failure to insist on this has led, among other things, to considerable confusion among quite well-intentioned people about the relation of Christianity to Socialist and Communist ideals of social amelioration. It is, especially on the Left, a common and honest opinion that Christianity and Socialism are almost interchangeable terms. Socialism it is often said, is nothing but "practical Christianity". And it comes as an unpleasant and disillusioning shock to find that, when it comes to the point, the Church teaches nothing of the kind. The only known result of the Church's early and short-lived experiment in Communism was Ananias and Sapphira.

The Divergence may perhaps be simply expressed by an example. The first of the temptations which Christ overcame in the wilderness was precisely that of gaining allegiance by providing for the physical needs of the people—"Command that these stones may be made bread." As a recent commentator has put it: "The force of the temptation lay in the great human sympathy of Jesus. As an artisan living with comparatively poor people, he must often have longed to answer in a concrete way the questions he had so often heard: 'What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewithal shall we be clothed?' Again, as a student of Israel's great history, he must also have chafed at the political oppression which was added to the iniquity of a thoroughly bad economic system. 'The tempter came to him and said, If thou art the Son of God command that these stones become bread.' How naturally the suggestion arose out of his knowledge of hungry people!"

This idea, with its full implications, is in fact the goal of all social planning—and, it should be to add, as a secular ideal it is impeccable. It is also a crying scandal—and an evidence of the fallen nature of man—that it has not been achieved

(continued from the previous page) centuries ago. When it is realised that the Communist Utopia is, literally, the first and easiest of the temptations rejected by Christ even before He began to preach, the opposition of Christianity and Communism can, perhaps, be more easily understood. That there should have been any confusion at all is due to the apologetic timidity of certain spokesmen of the Church who are prepared to wheedle instead of to warn the world.

The two major mistakes I have outlined are, taken together, responsible for producing a type of clergyman entirely unfitted for his true work, whose failure is in large measure responsible for the much-publicized "failure of the Church in the modern age." It is not his fault, but the fault of ecclesiastical authorities who, acting on these two false assumptions, dictate his training. Instead of producing a trained doctor of souls, they produce an amateur sociologist with a smattering of "modern" theology and turn him loose as a "missionary" to a cynical world which, if it notices him at all, is inclined to judge his worth, as he implies that it should, by his attitude to the soup-kitchen.

I would suggest three simple remedies. First and foremost, no man should be accepted as a candidate for Holy Orders who has not earned his living in some secular occupation for at least five years. In this matter, which I consider of cardinal importance, I would go further than the Rev Joseph McCulloch who, in *We Have Our Orders*, has written: "We must look for candidates among young men who are already in the professions and trades of the community, and call these from the receipt of custom or from the use of the stethoscope, or from whatever trade they ply. We want Matthews and Lukes and Johns, and we must look for them where they were originally found." It is not merely a matter of looking for them in the world, but of sending them, if necessary, into the world, before allowing them to withdraw from it.

The first and obvious reason for this is that

(continued from the previous page) it is the only sure way of testing their vocation. It is impossible to renounce the world if you have never experienced it. The average ordinary who has gone straight from school to the University and from the University to a theological college has not renounced the world but merely taken refuge from it; and there is no class of human being more utterly out of touch with the ordinary life, desires, temptations, pleasures and sins of the men and women to whom he has to minister than the average Anglican deacon. The result is that, from the very beginning, he is in a false position, both in regard to himself and in relation to society.

The five years' probation would, however, not only safeguard himself; it would safeguard the Church. If at the end of it, he returned and took Orders, it might be reasonably presumed that his vocation was genuine. But many would not return; and their failure to do so would be to the Church's advantage.

A cynic has remarked that the young have four main reasons for "going into the Church", even though they are usually, sub-conscious. The men want either to write or to speak or to act, but are too uncertain of their powers to risk themselves in the competitive jungles of journalism and authorship or politics or the stage and consequently prefer the safer pastures of religious belles-letters and the pulpit and elaborate ritual. The fourth reason adduced is that they are so unfitted to cope with life that they instinctively choose the most sheltered of all sheltered occupations.

This judgment is, I think, much too sweeping; but it contains a residue of truth. All of us have unfortunately met the type of cleric who justifies Wyndham Lewis's famous MOT that, if the Church did not exist, it would be necessary to invent it in order to segregate the defeatist undevitality of the community.

But the five-year-rule would change all that.

(continued from the previous page) The Church would no longer be an alternative for potential writers, politicians and actors; though it might still be—and, in the cases of true vocation, would be—a sequel.

To this rule, I would add one important qualification. As a method of earning one's living in the probationary period, school-matering would not count. This is not intended as a slur on a worthy and necessary body of men. A schoolmaster's life, cannot however be any stretch of imagination be construed as meaning "gaining experience of the ways of the world", which is the purpose of the probation.

It is perhaps worth adding that, inevitably, the new generation of clergymen will have conformed to this rule by the mere force of the circumstance of a five-years' war. Nor should it be forgotten that Christ worked as a carpenter till He was thirty.

The priest's surgery is his church. If he is known to be in his place there—either in the confessional or in a more informal consultative capacity—people will come to him. The intervals between their visits he will spend in prayer, meditation and study, which is his proper work and which alone will enable him to meet the demands that will be made on him. What is more, such a priest will have no time for that has become the conventional "parson's life" and which makes of him a cross between school-attendance officer and tea-party tattler. There is no need to "take the Church to the people" when the people see the point of going to the church.

If the prohibition of visiting would force the clergyman back into his right place in the church, the abolition of the clerical collar would precipitate him into a natural and healthy relationship with secular society around him. It is safe to asset that the collared cleric in a bus, train, tube, restaurant, or pub, never sees the people around him as they are. There is an immediate and instinctive creation of an atmosphere of false modesty or pseudo-respectability. The saying that

(continued from the previous page) "a person seen men at their best, a lawyer at their were, and a doctor as they are" is unfortunately true; and yet unless it is the person who has the surest sight he has altogether failed.

For a variety of reasons, some siological and psychological, but most deriving from faulty religious instruction, the clearly have become a kind of third sex, treated by the ordinary man with a combination of the deference he pays to femininity and the kindly tolerance he displays to the mentally deficient. And this state of affairs reacts disastrously on them.

Aware of the falseness of their relationship, they take refuge exclusively in the company of their own kind and become increasingly estranged – in the wrong sense – from the world which they should serve.

These two suggestions, therefore, reinforce each other. The uncollard cleric would, in his necessary travels and contacts, keep in touch with the life around him as it is and would be so much the better fitted for his work in dealing with individual souls.

The effect of the proposals of the Archbishops Commission, I may add, is the exact opposite of what I am advocating here. They wish to segregate the potential cleric from the world in an educational establishment for an even longer period than is the custom already and to make a sine qua non of ordination a knowledge of Greek.

S. Vandecarr: "VEGETARIANISM NO PANACEA" @@

I look upon vegetarianism as an ideal, but I believe that ideals are best served when the promulgators tell only those truths with which they are fully acquainted. Half truths and wild theories do the cause more harm than good.

To write of "the benefits of a vegetarian life," is one thing. To give reasons therefore, is another.

Please stop citing the monkey as the best example of vegetarianism. He isn't. Also monkeys are the only animals in the jungle that fight incessantly. There are many other and better examples, such as elephants, rhinocerii, hippopotamii, ruminants, etc.

@@ The American Vegetarian, 1943.

Vegetarianism is an ideal and a better way of life. That is an accepted fact, accepted that is, by those who taken the trouble to study the human body and diet. We acknowledge that a vegetarian is better fitted for self control and the control of others, than is a meat-eater. But vegetarianism will not do away with conflict. That is not a good method of advocating the ending of wars. Few of us are desirous of seeing the planet torn apart every generation by these combats which have never solved one of the problems that cause them. But diet will not solve them either. True, a person who eats moderately and only of beneficial foods will be a better thinker and will find better methods of solving his problems than by slaying his opponent. But inviting the adversary to sit down and eat a lettuce and tomato sandwich, will not deter him from killing you if he thinks that that is the best way to attain his desires. Even the ruminants fight for mates, and leadership of the herd. We, with our capacity for thinking, should soon pass out of the stage that started when we assumed the upright position. The savage in us will some day lay aside his shield and sword, but, that day is still in the future. It is one of the incongruities of human society that we make most progress through conflict. During wars, there is more scientific development, than is accomplished in many years of peace. Strife seems to compel the scientists to put forth their best efforts, while during peace times, they take their time. Still, we will all agree that we would rather see slower developments and fewer slayings.

But vegetarianism is not the solution as some seem to think. There have been as many meat-eaters in favor of universal disarmament and world peace, as there have been vegetarians. A vote taken among the men in the fighting forces, most of whom are meat-eaters, would show that the majority are opposed to war and killing.

I believe that vegetarianism is a more healthful manner of living. But I do not think that alone will bring about any millenium. Man needs more than

(continued from the previous page) diet in order to raise himself above the lower orders of life. He has that within his cranium which will eventually free him from the need to compete with his fellows. We are still in the early stages of development. We use a great deal more of our mental capacity than do any other animals. Still, we, the majority, use only a fraction, some claim two fifths of our available potentialities. There is no doubt that humanity will give up the habit of living on the dead bodies of lesser creatures and will use for sustenance only those things that grow from the soil without any intermediate steps.

So hereafter, when one feels the urge to work a story out of his typewriter, showing how much better off the vegetarian animals are because of their greater ethics and refusal to live off the lives of smaller, weaker, or inferiorly equipped creatures, let him make sure of the facts. Leave the monkey in his arboreal paradise where he can eat his fruits, vegetables and whatever insects he can find and fight with his fellows. It is sufficient to show and prove that a vegetarian lives that sort of life because he thinks it is the more natural and healthy mode of existence. I am a lover of animals, which is the reason I will not keep one of them in my home. I refuse to keep a bird in a cage, I refuse to keep a dog or cat in a city apartment, I refuse to keep any form of animal life in unnatural surroundings.

Vegetarianism seems to be associated with these other ethics. So if one be a true ethical vegetarian, if he will not eat of the flesh of the lesser creatures, do not make prisoners and slaves of them either. Let's write about the benefits of vegetarian life as one has discovered it, but let's stick to facts and act factually.

Swami Ramdas: "EDITORIALS"@@

The Name Practice. Man often is like a sacred animal in the midst of dangers. He is lacking the inner peace and joy of his immortal life as he has failed to probe the depths of his being in which

@@ "THE VISION" 1944.

(continued from the previous page) dwells the radiant Truth who is absolute existence, consciousness and bliss. He gropes merely on the surface without realising his true and divine nature and existence. Hence he is full of fears, doubts and anxieties and believes that he is merely a mental and physical being subject to change and ultimate dissolution. To free himself from the bondage of this degrading ignorance, he ought to contemplate on the indwelling Divinity and experience his union and identity with Him. His restless and uncontrolled mind has cast a mantle upon his real being and made his life fitful and discounted.

It is admitted by all votaries of the Divine Name that the practice of chanting the sweet name of the eternal Beloved arrests distracting thoughts, subdues unregulated desires and enlightens the intellect. The Divine Name after enabling its devotees to achieve thorough concentration of mind, helps to draw the mind inward and attain complete absorption in the eternal Reality, which in its turn takes him to the supreme goal of self-surrender. Self-surrender is not merely a mental attitude but it a beatific state born of the union of the soul with God.

Man tries various methods to dispel ignorance and obtain divine knowledge, but he does not follow the easiest path by which he can divinise his life fully in all its aspect. The Divine Name is the way, the means and the goal, for it stands for the highest Truth—the supreme Godhead.

Awakening spirituality: A spiritual aspirant can awaken and purify his heart for the realisation of God within and without him by the society of saints and the second, repetition of the holy name of God.

It is in the company of a saint that the aspirant becomes conscious of the existence of God and a yearning to attain Him is created in his heart. This contact also grants him a foretaste of the divine bliss born of such an attainment. Just as a lotus blooms in the rays of the morning sun, so

(continued from the previous page) the aspirant's heart opens and receives the subtle influence which a saint exerts on him giving him the experience of immortal peace and joy. Moreover, the saint's contact slackens the aspirant's attachment to the objects of the senses, thus enabling him to easily concentrate his mind upon the indwelling Divinity. So, it is essential for the aspirant to seek the company of a saint and bask in the sunshine of his grace.

As the mind has been allowed to roam about as it liked from a long time, to curb its nature and to engage it in continued remembrance of God becomes in the early stages of the aspirant's struggle extremely difficult. In spite of the aspirant's possessing a spirit of dispassion towards the attractions of life, his mind refuses to be easily guided towards the eternal Reality who is the source of the world and all creatures in it. Hence, the adoption of a method of steady discipline for achieving concentration is necessary. The sovereign way for the aspirant is to take to the repetition of the powerful Name of God with all faith and devotion. God's Name is invincible. The Name is the bestower of peace, power and knowledge. It can remove all the impurities of the heart and fill it with the joy and radiance divine. Very few seem to know the greatness of the Divine Name. The wonders that the Name can work is realised only by those who have made proper use of it. The troubled mind gets peace and rest by taking refuge in the Name. The weakened and the diseased mind regains its strength and health by chanting the Name. The mind in which sweep the blasts of unbridled passions, can be freed from them by the power of the Name. The soul whose vision is clouded by ignorance can be made aware of God who is existence, consciousness and bliss through the constant utterance of the Name. In short, victory over the lower nature and perfection of the higher spiritual life can be gained by the aspirant's unwavering reliance on God's Name.

A man's life however high-placed it may be

(continued from the previous page) from the material or worldly standpoint, is far away from real peace and happiness. The soul can be released from its miseries only by living in the divine consciousness. Man's desires for sense pleasures cast a veil over him denying the joy of his union with the Divine. It is for this reason that he lives like an animal only to fulfil the cravings of his lower nature. His association with the body and the senses is the cause of his sorrow and bondage. When he directs his vision inward and communes with the immortal Soul and beholds the world about him and all creatures and things in it as the expression of the Self, it is then that he achieves the supreme fruition of human life. Now he becomes a pure, exalted and illumined vehicle of God through whom rays of all-embracing love and beneficence spread everywhere in the world. In this state he feels a rare perennial joy by giving himself away for the good of others.

The first requisite for a spiritual aspirant when he is on the divine path is faith in the existence of God. This faith comes through contact with saints. It is in their presence that he is awakened to the awareness of the eternal life. It is there that a real longing for this supreme Life is created in his heart. Here for a time the restless spirit finds peace and solace born of the Absolute. This experience thereafter becomes the basis of the aspirant's spiritual discipline.

Without faith nothing can be achieved and this is eminently true also in the life of an aspirant—a faith that sustains and strengthens his devotion to the ultimate Truth. As the rudder is to the boat so faith is to him. Faith leads him to an implicit dependence upon God who is held by him as his sole Guide and Protector. He feels assured that the Divine is watching over him with all love, just as a mother over her child.

Such a dependence ever fills the heart of the aspirant with His remembrance. Now he realises a state of nearness and union with Him and resultant purity, peace and joy. In all moments of dejection

(continued from the previous page) and despair, whenever he loses contact with Him, he throws himself on His compassion and mercy and through dedication of his entire life to him regains the lost communion with Him.

So faith evolves into implicit trust which again develops into complete self-surrender.

Whenever the continuity in the flow of God-thought in the mind is broken, doubts and fears creep into it and darkness seeks to envelop the awakened soul again. The mind is a great player of tricks.

Spiritual Hypocrisy: True devotion of the seeker consists in making a free, open and unreserved confession of his frailties to God and possess an earnest and sincere longing to realise Him. It signifies also a thorough dependence upon Him at all times in weal or woe. God is held by the devotee as his all in all. His remembrance always dwells in his mind and when he attains the God-vision, his eyes behold Divinity everywhere and his inner and outer life is filled with divine light. He becomes totally a transformed being infused with highest love, wisdom and joy.

Of all the vices in the field of religion the worst is pretension and hypocrisy. Truly, there is hope of redemption to a repentant wrong-doer but not to one who poses to be pious and devout, but not really so. Hence it is enjoined upon every spiritual aspirant to develop the nature of a child in his attitude towards God and all beings and creatures in the world. Man can deceive man, but he cannot deceive God that resides in him. God is the inner witness of all that he feels, thinks and does. To take complete refuge in Him means to realise the divine presence with him in all conditions of life. So, let him keep his heart always pure and enlightened through sincere devotion to Him.

You know life is a precious gift of God. For the momentary achievements such as worldly name, fame, power and wealth, you should not swerve from the path of righteousness and rectitude. If you have to suffer, suffer nobly. If you meet with failures, meet them bravely, but keep the flag of Truth and Love always

(continued from the previous page) flying before your inner vision. For petty gains, do have recourse to unworthy and low means and methods. Every action has its reaction, for good or ill. Let your path be cleared of all undesirable and degrading ambitions and aims.

Serve God in the Distressed: Prayer and devotional practices accompanied by selfless service awaken divine love in the heart. As the mind gets purer and purer through the constant thought of the Divine a spiritual radiance permeates the entire being of the devotee making him an embodiment of the supreme Love. His manifest life now burns like a flame spending itself for the good of all.

Our real welfare, enlightenment and happiness solely depend upon our achieving this attitude to the existing state of things around us. God can be ours only when we become His through utter self-surrender. Surrender signifies the substitution of the divine consciousness for the individual sense; the transformation of the narrow egoistic vision into the all-enveloping cosmic vision.

God—The Supreme Person: God is at once personal and impersonal. He is the supreme Reality who pervades the worlds as a changeless, static and infinite existence. He is also a vibrant, active and all-enveloping Presence. Having these two aspects He is also a transcendent Person who is the intimate companion, friend, master and parent of His devotee. The devotee realises Him in his own heart and holds constant communion with Him. He draws light, inspiration and guidance from Him through utter dedication of his life to Him.

It is this God who is all love and mercy that is the object of worship and adoration by devotees in all faiths and religions. It is the consciousness of this God that is awakened in the heart of the devotee when he goes into the presence of a saint. It is with this God that the devotee strives to unite his life and achieve eternal freedom and peace. It is by surrender to this great Truth that he aspires to become a vehicle for the manifestation of divine power and glory.

The qualities to be developed for attaining the exalted state described above are – to sublimate thought into divine knowledge and tune feeling with divine love and joy. It is in fact by the complete divinisation of life in and out that the devotee becomes the flaming expression of his adored ideal – God. As all his actions are based upon an universal consciousness they assume the nature of spontaneity in which even the least reflection of the self is absent. His petty individuality has given place an all-embracing, genial and blissful personality.

The New Birth: There is a stage in the evolution of the soul when it takes an upward turn and rapidly marches towards the fullness and perfection of its inherent state of divinity. The soul is essentially divine and to realise this it should, by a conscious process, return to its native spiritual greatness and glory. When this transformation takes place the soul experiences a new birth, as it were, since it is imbued with a consciousness whose nature is eternal and infinite. It dawns on the soul that it is not a relative, limited and changing individual but that it is an minipresent, imperishable and immutable reality.

Now the soul undergoes such a change in its outlook that its valuation of life and its objects becomes entirely different from what it was before the spiritual enlightenment. Its life thereafter is lived in the terms of the absolute and all its activities are based upon the highest spiritual knowledge and experience.

Such a new birth and consciousness come to every soul in the world. Some may attain this blessed state earlier than others, but all human beings are inevitably progressing towards this ultimate sublime consummation in their life-journey through the field of time and space.

The spiritual awakening of the soul is nothing but God revealing Himself in the heart. It is His omnipotent will prevailing over His lower nature behind the mask of which the supreme grandeur of the

(continued from the previous page) Divine is hidden. It is by a double process that the soul realises its spiritual sovereignty—God's assertion from within and the vehicle's submission to Him from without. The dominance of the former brings about the complete surrender of the physical, mental and vital aspects. It is like a brilliant light newly lit within a perforated screen permitting its radiance to spread out in all directions converting even the screen itself into a mass of splendour.

The Great Ones inspire by contact, by teaching and by their thought power. So to quicken the soul with the longing for the Divine and to cause it to evolve steadily until it realises the fullness of its spiritual glory, the goodwill and blessings of a saint are absolutely necessary. The soul caught in the toils of its lower nature hungers for true freedom and happiness. This quest can easily and in the shortest time possible be fulfilled when it draws light, inspiration and grace from a saint.

Be Dynamic: It is not a correct assumption that the highest spiritual attainment means complete detachment from the world and its activities. Detachment is, of course, there in the inner realisation of the immutable and unaffected spirit of your being. Sadhana is performed with the object of achieving your totally divine nature by self-control, self-illumination and self-surrender. It is for the enjoyment of the highest Brahmic bliss for yourself and through the exercise of the divine power within you impart that bliss to others also.

You have, of course, latent in you an infinite power which ever strives to reveal itself. When favourable conditions are provided, this power is set free and you become a radiant instrument in God's hands for carrying out His scheme in the world. What a wonderful thing human life is: How beautiful and glorious it becomes when it is purified and made to live in accordance with the divine will and attune itself to the cosmic harmony and peace. It is now that life reaches the acme of perfection and releases its creative energy for bringing into being a new

(continued from the previous page) vision and a new world.

Man should feel conscious of his great destiny by knowing that he is the very expression of God. A narrow outlook of petty ambitions, a living of a life of self-centredness vitiated with a sense of separation have been the cause of his bondage. His heart, mind and soul should be illumined with the light of God so that they may all work in harmony for producing divine ecstasy and thus enable life to flow spontaneously for awakening and guiding humanity towards the supreme goal.

Be, therefore, dynamic, imbued with the power and glory of God. In the name of religion do not aim permanently to live the life of the recluse and say all activities are wrong. Activity that fulfils the divine purpose is God's own activity. Be creative. Waste not your powers over trifling things. Conserve them through utter dedication to the great Giver and Possessor of infinite energy and lay it at His feet for His service. This is why you are here. Devotion by itself is not the whole thing. Knowledge by itself is not the whole thing and also action by itself is not the whole thing. Combine these three in your life and manifest the all-round magnificence of your being.

Mission of Human Life: Mainly, there are three functions of human life, namely, thinking, feeling and acting. If you manipulate these functions from your lower nature, they create only discord for yourself and for those round about you, whereas if they are inspired by your higher divine nature, they make for the attainment of a state of harmony conducive to your own felicity and also for the delight of others.

The main condition for the revealment of God within you is the elimination of your ego-sense and the complete surrender or dedication of every part of your part of your being to the omnipresent, omnipotent and omniscient God. Instead of the ego, God should hold away over you. God's light should illumine your mind. God's love should permeate your heart. God's power should control your activities.

(continued from the previous page) In short, you should be so fully imbued with the God-consciousness that your life inside and outside is fully divinised and the world is seen by you as the blissful expression of your regenerated life.

The lower human nature is brought under control so that the divine nature may be released and thereafter life may think, feel and act from a new and universalised, eternal vision and experience. There is delight in the progress that you are making to this beatific state, there is bliss in the attainment of it and there is the spontaneous outflow of joy in the life that succeeds it.

Sages Eight Dark Forces: The ways of a saint are mysterious. He is a glorious embodiment of divinity shedding light and grace on all who come in contact with him. The saint is no doubt all-powerful because he is a vehicle through whom the divine Shakti reveals itself. Still in the task of uplifting mankind and bringing unity and harmony in the world he invites help and co-operation of all aspirants and devotees who have faith in and love for him. The great Masters and Teachers of the world, past and present, are shining examples. Krishna fought against forces of darkness with the help of his intimate devotees and friends. Buddha preached his religion of ahimsa and emancipation with the aid of his innumerable disciples. Jesus Christ carried the light of his Gospel of Love to all the nations on the earth through his faithful followers. Rama conquered the great Asura, who was a source of terror to all peace-loving people of the time, assisted by monkeys who were devoted to him.

A saint's dependence upon God is always entire. God protects him and provides him with all the materials to carry out his mission through human agents. Whenever a saint receives any assistance from any quarter he takes it as coming from his eternal beloved. All his transactions are with Him. He is the giver and He is the receiver. When people take part in any task which a saint undertakes they do

(continued from the previous page) so for their own material on spiritual advancement. They do not grasp this and think that they are all important and nothing would happen without them. They forget that God by His inscrutable methods carries on this earth. Man in his conceit thinks that he is the doer, he is wise and that his ideas are correct however narrow and imperfect they may be.

It has become a vogue with many so-called spiritual aspirants to go on visits to saints not to draw light and inspiration from them for their upward progress but to compare and judge them. They think they are very clever but their cleverness is nothing. You may be sure all worries and difficulties, on any account, which cross the life of a sadhaka are necessary for his spiritual growth. So you should know that they are sent by God. The mind runs to God only when it is goaded by the cares and anxieties of the world. You have read the lives of saints. Do they not teach you this great lesson? The path that leads to God is not easy and smooth. It is after you walk over thorns and brambles and meet with obstacles and difficulties that you reach the supreme Goal. So do not be daunted by the ordeals of life. Face them all boldly with the name of God on your lips.

The Greatest Gains When you have thus experienced everlasting peace and bliss, the hankering after the objects of the senses automatically ceases and your life becomes selfless. This is the supreme release of the soul from bondage for which it has been struggling from life after life.

When you dwell in God-consciousness, when your mind, heart, senses and body are filled with divine radiance, when you know that you are the deathless Spirit, one with all existences, and manifest as all that is visible, when your life is gifted with the universal love and vion, whatever be your external condition and circumstances there is no end to your inner joy and tranquillity. The impact of external things does not disturb you. You have now risen to

(continued from the previous page) a state where the pairs of opposites cannot affect you. This is so because you have achieved a peace and joy the nature of which is eternal and therefore not dependent upon the acquisition of mundane objects.

Hence saints rightly insist upon every human being to walk on the path that leads them to this supreme goal. Man's natural craving for happiness cannot be satisfied until he realises his unity with God. Pursuit after the pleasures of the senses being disappointment, pain and misery; while the quest for God within takes the soul to the realm of immortal peace and freedom. Fear, doubt, worry and grief now leave him entirely. This mental fever caused by insatiable desires is now abated.

Do not therefore still live in your lower nature and clutch at the shadows of life. Do not be harassed by unreal sorrows by becoming victim to wrath, hate, malice and greed. Reveal your divine existence and diffuse always the rays of love, joy, power and knowledge.

Life is for Service: To become an illumined vehicle for the manifestation of God in you is the sole purpose of your existence.

Let your trust in God be complete. Feel His presence in and out everywhere. Live always in the consciousness that He alone is real and that He has become all. Know that His will only works in the world and that you are merely His servant obeying His command.

The impersonal is not the whole truth about Him. He reveals Himself as form and action. It is His Power alone that causes all movements in the world. If man submits to this Power, he becomes a magnificent instrument in His hands. Otherwise, he is a cramped, narrow and darkened creature seeking the petty satisfactions of the mere physical and sense desires.

The goal is God and His service. The chief thing required for an aspirant who aims at a divinised life is that he should be meek. It is in the absence of the ego that God's light, power, love

(continued from the previous page) and joy manifest in a human being. Keep your intellect bright and your heart pure by dwelling in God.

Religion does not consist in external forms of worship and ceremonial. It is the installation of God in your heart and permitting Him to rule over your intellect, mind, senses and body. It is like a skillful driver controlling and guiding a chariot drawn by horses. When Lord Krishna became the Charioteer of Arjuna, victory was assured. So when you live and act in this world be calm and brave, realising the presence of God within you and delivering every part of your being into His hands, so that He may wield them as He wills for His service and to fulfil His plan in this world. Otherwise, the so-called spiritual states you may have achieved mean nothing.

T.N. Ramaswamy: "A CRITIQUE OF ROY'S WRITINGS"@@

"These lectures were not meant to be platform oratory, but a study of history," claims M.N. Roy for his brochure under review. "Planning a New India". In spite of the apology claimed for his lectures by Mr Roy, a study of the lectures makes it abundantly clear that the thesis developed by Mr Roy could undoubtedly have been improved by clever editing. Mr Roy himself, who is so anxious that his lectures should be considered an authoritative document of current history, could have spared some time and pains to improve these lectures by subjecting them to the scissors and the pasts.

The first lecture starts with a sketch of British decadence and America's mounting supremacy in shaping the post-war policy of the United Nations. The author tells us "Europe will be reduced to the state of capitalist feudalism". There seems to be obviously some confusion about the connotation of "freedom" here; and we need not digress into the logical absurdity of Mr Roy's thesis. Mr Roy is patently obsessed by the phantasmagoria of "feudal capitalism" and imagines himself the self-elected

@@ Mysindia 1944.

(continued from the previous page) crusader out to save India from the postwar economic disaster threatening the country under the economic plutocracy of the Birlas and the Tatas:

It is with this 'scientific' frame of mind, 'free from prejudice or emotions' that the author proceeds to consider "Post-war Reconstruction".

The other remedy is by replacing capitalist economy by another economic system which "adjusts production to need", instead of to a profitable market. Such an economic reconstruction can only be planned by a People's Government, as any other kind of government will only sponsor an economy of scarcity under which a few industries may flourish at the expense of the poor millions of this country. He appeals to the middle classes to join him in this crusade for a People's Government.

Such in brief is the main line of thought that runs through the brochure under review. There is much to be said for some of the ideas sponsored by Mr Roy, particularly when he stresses the urgency of rescuing the economic system of the country from the profit-seeking motive and the elevation of economic endeavour to the pedestal of social service and emphasises that "the right of the peasants must be clearly formulated; so also must the right of everybody to employment, education, leisure and civil liberties". Yet there is, in the brochure, a certain obvious confusion, a patent vagueness, a desire to play the game of loyalties to certain pre-conceived notions, and prejudices. There is nothing that Mr Roy has contributed, in this brochure to any constructive appreciation of post-war problems. The one idea which Mr Roy could have worked out to the profit of his country is that India cannot aspire to any degree of economic stability in the post-war world without a process of evolution which lifts the economic system out of the framework of individualist, profit-seeking, quietist scheme of economic and cultural relationships.

R. VisweswarRao: "SUGGESTION IN EVERYDAY LIFE".@@

It is an everyday experience that ideas are accepted, or rejected, without adequate critical thought. It may in some cases be due to lack of leisure; in some it may be due to lack of capacity to think for oneself. The phenomenon of uncritical acceptance or rejection of ideas or assertions is called suggestion. At the present time, mass suggestion has become the order of the day. It is therefore desirable that we should know the technique and principles by which suggestion operates so that we may guard against its undesirable forms.

Suggestions may be classed under several heads. We have to distinguish between waking and hypnotic suggestions. A person who is hypnotised, or sleeping, is subject to all kinds of beliefs. Even when we are awake, suppose a person for whom we have high respect suggests that we do a particular thing, then we generally act upon his advice. Similarly if anything appears in print we generally take it as true.

Suggestions in waking life may be further subdivided into auto-and hetero-suggestions. That suggestion which arises from within one's own mind, as in scientific research, is called auto-suggestion. But hetero-suggestion comes from outside, or some external authority.

Hetero-suggestions may be of two varieties. They may be personal or impersonal. Personal suggestions can be subdivided into prestige and herd suggestions. Prestige suggestions come from individuals who are considered to be our superiors: as suggestions by parents to children, teacher to pupil and preacher to audience. There is an accepted superiority in all these cases.

Herd suggestions come from the whole group: a crowd or a body of organised society.

Thus it will be seen that suggestions can be classified from the point of view of the sources from which they emanate.

Here one sees the need to guard against a

(continued from the previous page) hasty condemnation of suggestion. Suggestion may be used by a leader to secure freedom from bondage unanimity in times of national crisis, and the like. The leader plays upon mass suggestibility for national purposes. Similarly the child, whose range of knowledge is limited, requires some guidance. It is of course wrong to suggest a course of action to a child who is capable of investigating and thinking about the problem for himself.

Anger also plays an important part in the working of suggestion. On account of this feeling unreasonable beliefs are often induced. Apart from emotional "rapport," there are other sources for the acceptance of ideas uncritically.

Hitherto I have discussed the impulsive background. The second background, which arises from past experiences. People accept new experiences in relation to previous experiences in the matter. That is why sometimes we are suspicious and ungenerous in our interpretations of others' actions. If we are working under unfavourable conditions, we are not well disposed towards others.

The manner of presentation of suggestions also must be taken into account, in addition to motivation and retention. We have to consider the manner of coming of the incoming stimuli. Suppose an Insurance Agent a tenth time, we try to satisfy him. Similarly, suppose a student reports time the authorities may attach little importance to the report. But when repetition is properly spaced, it leads to uncritical acceptance.

The case of advertisements may also be referred to. Sharpness or crispness or a short catch-phrase or a reference to a familiar proverb have a great suggestive value.

Relaxation is a favourable condition. Sometimes a pleasant background also helps a suggestion to have its full effect. When a thought is conveyed through music, it may make a deeper appeal. That is the reason why, in India, many religious thoughts

(continued from the previous page) are expressed in the form of talks.

Per contra, where there is an unpleasant background, suggestions are liable to be summarily rejected. Suppose a person comes to us with a request when we are not feeling well. We at once say, "No". In either case acceptance or rejection is uncritical, irrational.

Generally we associate suggestion with the inculcation of false beliefs. It may be argued that it is the business of the teacher to develop the critical faculties of the pupil, and that he should not impress his personality upon his wards.

To the extent that he encourages right thinking among his pupils he can make use of suggestion. In ordinary life we have to take many things on trust. It is not improper if the teacher makes use of suggestion to a limited extent.

Whether we like it or not, in our social intercourse we cannot escape altogether from suggestion. Sometimes it may give rise to right beliefs rather than false beliefs. We have to distinguish between desirable and undesirable suggestion. In politics and religion we make use of suggestions; but it does not mean that all beliefs on these subjects are false. Thus suggestions can be utilised for the propagation of right ideas, ideals and attitudes.

In moral and character training, suggestion from the teacher is of great importance because he has to form the pattern on which the child will grow. Many teachers protest that they are helpless to improve a backward student, saying that all was determined even before his birth. But environment also plays a very important part in the improvement of the child, whatever his original instincts.

Suggestion is however capable of being easily abused, and exploited for vicious purposes. We should not make children victims to slavish beliefs even in simple matters. We must train the rising generation to think for itself and if need be to pronounce its opinion, without any interference

(continued from the previous page) from external authority.

Group action is necessary, and suggestion is part of the mechanism of group action; it is essential to the existence of societies. We must not so train children that they are unamenable to group suggestion in right causes or to right leadership. What is fundamental is the discrimination of what is right. It is legitimate therefore to use suggestion for the inculcation of the basic moral principles. Beyond these simple social needs, suggestion is easily misused.

V. Bhattacharya: "NOTES ON GAUDAPADA MANDUKYA KARICA".**

Not being satisfied with the interpretation offered by Sankara and his followers, or some other teachers I have attempted in the following pages to present to the readers my own interpretation of the work as I have understood.

The philosopher Vasistha claims to have received his doctrines directly from the cosmic mind (Brahma) and to have realised their truth in his own experience. The philosophy of Vasistha includes almost all the views held by Gaudapada.

It is the mind that appears in the form of the external world which has, in fact, no reality.

The experiences in waking and dream are equally unreal, both of them being the creation of the mind. Here arises a question (II.11): If in both the states the things are unreal, then who is it that cognizes them? Who is it that imagines them? The answer is given (II.12-15) according to the decision of the Vedanta that it is the Self that imagines himself as the Self through his own illusion, and it is he who cognizes the things. He creates some things in the mind which are not fixed and as such they vanish at once; and he creates also some other things in the mind which are outside and fixed. There is, however, no difference between these two sorts of creation of those inside which exists as long as exists the thought (citta), and the creation

** otherwise known as "Agama Shastra"

(continued from the previous page) of those outside, which exists as long as exists the (notion of) the two, i.e., the perceptible (grahya) and the recipient (grahaka); both of these two creations are only imagined and there is nothing for their difference. Again, the things which are within and not-manifest, and the things which are without and manifest are all imagined, indeed, the only difference there being that the latter are cognized by different organs of the sense. As to the creation of the internal and external things he tells us (II. 16) that first one imagines oneself as a personal self and then various things, internal and external, following the recollection of one's experience.

Therefore, one should meditate on non-duality, and having realized it, one should behave as a fool among the people becoming an ascetic, and realizing the truth inward and outward, should remain unmoved from it.

As in dream so in waking there is only the mind, yet it appears in the form of the duality of the percipient and the perceptible. The duality is perceived by the mind, but when it becomes non-mind, i.e. when its function of thinking (manana) ceases, there is no duality. The author says here (III. 33-36) that the mind which becomes non-mind, and as such is free from the states of dream and deep sleep and has no determination (nirvikalpa), is identical with Brahman. This state of the suppressed (nigrhita: niruddha) mind is different from that in the deep sleep, because while in the latter it falls into a condition of stupidity (mudha avastha), it is not so in the former. This is attainable (III. 37-47) through an intense abstract concentration, called Asparayoga 'contactless concentration,' which, though very difficult, can be realized gradually by the means suggested by the author. When by that process the mind is completely suppressed being free from the states of stupefaction and distraction, not moving at all and having no sense-image whatsover, it becomes Brahman.

(continued from the previous page) Gaudapada begins Book IV, unlike the first three ones, with his homage to the 'Greatest of men' and the teacher of the yoga known as Asparsayoga, whom the present writer thinks to be no other than the Buddha.

It is true that the Buddhas have sometimes spoken of origination, but it is the instruction meant only for those who are afraid of the doctrine of non-origination.

When the mind becomes non-mind, i.e., when it ceases from its function of thinking, no duality is experienced (III. 31). The cessation of the function of thinking, of the mind, or, in other words, the state of non-mind is reached when the mind through its knowledge of the truth of the Atman does not think anything being non-cognizant owing to the absence of the things to be cognized.

He says again (IV. 63-66) that as animals seen in dream are visible to the mind of the dreamer and do not exist apart from it, and as such they are the mind of the dreamer, even so the animals seen in wakefulness are visible to the mind of the waking one and do not exist apart from it, and as such they are the mind of the waking one.

It is said that the mind becomes non-mind and Gaudapada is definitely of opinion that Brahman is nothing but the mind that has become non-mind. He says that the mind in the state of *susupta* 'deep sleep' falls into a sleeping state (*laya*), but it does not do so when it is suppressed (*nigrhita*: *niruddha*), and indeed that is Brahman above fear and radiant with the light of *jnana*. He expresses the same thing in other words saying that when the mind is completely suppressed (*niruddha*) and as such is free from all movements and does not perceive anything else it becomes Brahman (III. 46).

In this state the mind rests in itself. This Brahman of Gaudapada then points on one side to the state of *kaivalya* 'the state of being not connected with anything else, or the resting of the *Drastr.* or *Purusa* 'Self' in himself (*svarupa*, i.e. *cinmatra* 'pure thought') as described in *YS*, I.3, and on the

(continued from the previous page) other to the resting of the citta in the vijnapti-matrata of the Yogacaras or Vijnanavadins. According to the latter citta, manas, vijnana and vijnapti are synonyms. And this is in their opinion mukti 'deliverance'.

Theorisers about creation assert dogmatically that the creation (of the world) is (his) expansion, while others imagine that creation is of the nature of dream and magic. This view is held by some of the Vedantists including our teacher (see II. 31) and the Buddhists, Madhyamikas and Yogacaras.

As regards Turiya there being nothing except himself he is all-seeing and thus in the absence of all ignorance he is not bound in any way.

There are two kinds or stages of samadhi. In the first the mind is concentrated on its object, but not uninterruptedly, for now it is so and the next moment it is not so, simply moving near (upacarat) the object just like a bee sitting gently inside a lotus in search of its honey. In the second, the mind is firmly and uninterruptedly fixed on the object.

What are we to understand by the statement that jnana is like the sky? One characteristic of jnana, according to both our author and the Vijnanavadins, is that it is asanga (IV. 72, 96) 'having no attachment, contact, or relation,' i.e., it does not relate itself to its object, it does not cognize any object (agraha III. 32), there being no object whatsoever.

The word asparsayoga literally means the yoga in which there is no contact, or the faculty of perception by touch. The author himself (III. 37) it is a samadhi 'profound or abstract concentration,' it is very difficult to realize. It points to what is asamprajnata samadhi (YS, I. 2, 18, 51 with the scholiast Vyasa), or nirvikalpa samadhi (PD, II. 28) of yogins. But nowhere in their systems, so far as my information goes, it is called asparsayoga. Why is it that the word asparsa is used here?

I am inclined to think that it refers to the

(continued from the previous page) ninth or the last of the nine dhyanas or meditations called anupurvavihara (Pali anupubbavihara) or the successive states of dhyana which the Buddha taught and are found frequently in Buddhist texts. The ninth is the cessation or complete suppression of consciousness and sensation. We read in the present karika that this yoga conduces to happiness of all beings (sarvasattvasukha).

It is said (III. 39) of the asparsayoga that yogins or rather untrained ones shrink back from it, imagining fear where in reality there is no fear. But what is the cause of their fear? Sankara rightly says that the so-called yogins think that it will annihilate the very self. Indeed, there is hardly any difference between a yogin in this state and a dead person, their respiration being completely stopped. So when the Blessed One entered that, state, i.e., sannavedayitanirodha before his parinirvana. Ananda took him to be dead. But the venerable Anuruddha said to him that was not the case, the Blessed one only having entered the stage of the dhyana called sannavedayitanirodha. After a short time, however, He passed away. It is therefore quite natural that an untrained yogin should be afraid of it, as of death.

Yet there is a real difference between death and asparsayoga or sannavedayitanirodha, and Buddha-ghosa has explained it in his VM, p. 558, quoting a passage from the Suttapitaka. It says that all the conditions in both of them are one and the same excepting this that in the latter the heat of the body is not lost, that life does not come to an end, and that the organs of sense are not destroyed, while in the former all these are annihilated.

We have seen in the present karika that this yoga is taught by the Buddha. It cannot be denied that up to the eighth of those successive states of dhyana (anupurvavihara) already explained, viz., 'neither-consciousness-nor-unconsciousness', there is nothing particularly Buddhist. For it is evident from Buddhist literature, both Pali and Sanskrit,

(continued from the previous page) that the Buddha's two teachers Alara Kalama (Adara Kalepe) and Uddaka Ramaputta (Rudraka Ramaputra) knew the seventh and eighth of the dhyanas, respectively. The Buddha was, however, not satisfied with what he had from his teachers, and he started thereupon to seek after a still higher state and succeeded in realizing it. It is this state which is called sannavedayitanirodha or briefly nirodha.

There is one thing more which suggests that the asparsayoga was not originally taught in the Brahmanic system of yoga. It is said in the karika that this yoga is 'not disputed' (avivada and 'not opposed' (aviruddha). It is implied, as said before, from these two words that in the acceptance of the asparsayoga by the Vedantists, among whom the author himself is included, there cannot be raised any dispute or opposition, for there is nothing to be opposed even from their own point of view.

Thus it is clear from what we have seen above that the real instructor of the asparsayoga, who is saluted here by the author, is no other than the Buddha.

In different systems of Indian philosophy it is held that things around us have their origination; in other words, they are produced; they have their causes, they themselves being their effect. But it is the Buddhists who held quite a different view emphatically denying the origination of anything in the world. Thus the first sentence of Nagarjuna's MK begins with anirodham anutpadam 'having neither origination nor suppression. This anutpada is thoroughly discussed and established in that work.

Let us now make an attempt to understand the significance of such passages as cited above saying that the Buddha said nothing.

This statement is on two grounds, (i) pratyatmadharmata, i.e., the nature of (the highest truth) which is realized in one's own self, and (ii) pauranasthitidharmata, i.e., the nature of the elements of existence that remains from the past. This requires some explanation. As regards the first it is held that the transcendental truth (paramartha) springs up only

(continued from the previous page) as an inward conviction (pratyatmavedya), it cannot be attained through instruction from another (aparapratyaya: paropadesagamya), for it cannot be expressed by any speech or word. So we are told that for the noble the transcendental truth is silence. This is well-known also in the Vedanta.

Al Ghazzali: "CONFESSIONS".

Losing his father in early life, he was confided to the care of a Sufi, whose influence extended through his subsequent career. On finishing his studies he was appointed professor of theology at Bagdad. Here he achieved such splendid success that all the Imams became his zealous partisans. So great, indeed, was his renown, so ardent the administration he inspired, that the Muhammedans sometimes said: "If all the books of Islam were destroyed, it would be but a slight loss, provided Al Ghazzali's work on the Revivification of the Sciences of Religion were preserved."

He was forced to pronounce philosophy incompetent, and to seek in some higher faculty than reason the solution of his doubts.

The following account of his death as related by his brother Ahmed: "On Monday at dawn my brother performed the ablution and prayed. Then he said, 'Bring me my grave-clothes,' and he took them and kissed them, and laid them on his eyes and said, 'I hear and obey the command to go into the King.' And he stretched out his feet and went to meet Him and was taken to the good-will of God Most High."

You wish to know my experiences while disentangling truth lost in the medley of sects and divergencies of thought, and how I have dared to climb from the low levels of traditional belief to the topmost summit of assurance.

I have interrogated the beliefs of each sect and scrutinised the mysteries of each doctrine, in order to disentangle truth from error and orthodoxy from heresy. I have never met one who maintained the hidden meaning of the Koran without investigating

(continued from the previous page) the nature of his belief, nor a partisan of its exterior sense without inquiring into the results of his doctrine. There is no philosopher whose system I have not fathomed, nor theologian the intricacies of whose doctrine I have not followed out.

Sufism has no secrets into which I have not penetrated; the devout adorer of Deity has revealed to me the aim of his austerities; the atheist has not been able to conceal from me the real reason of his unbelief. The thirst for knowledge was innate in me from an early age; it was like a second nature implanted by God, without any will on my part. No sooner had I emerged from boyhood than I had already broken the fetters of tradition and freed myself from hereditary beliefs.

Struck with the contradictions which I encountered in endeavoring to disentangle the truth and falsehood of these opinions, I was led to make the following reflection: "The search after truth being the aim which I propose to myself, I ought in the first place to ascertain what are the bases of certitude." In the next place I recognised that certitude is the clear and complete knowledge of things, such knowledge as leaves no room for doubt nor possibility of error and conjecture, so that there remains no room in the mind for error to find an entrance. In such a case it is necessary that the mind, fortified against all possibility of going astray, should embrace such a strong conviction that, if, for example, any one possessing the power of changing a stone into gold, or a stick into a serpent, should seek to shake the bases of this certitude, it would remain firm and immovable.

All forms of knowledge which do not unite these conditions (imperviousness to doubt, etc.) do not deserve any confidence, because they are not beyond the reach of doubt, and what is not impregnable to doubt cannot constitute certitude.

"Who can guarantee you that you can trust to the evidence of reason more than to that of the senses? You believed in our testimony till it was contradicted by the verdict of reason, otherwise

(continued from the previous page) you would have continued to believe it to this day. Well, perhaps, there is above reason another judge who, if he appeared, would convince reason of falsehood, just as reason has confuted us. And if such a third arbiter is not yet apparent, it does not follow that he does not exist."

To this argument I remained some time without reply; a reflection drawn from the phenomena of sleep deepened my doubt. "Do you not see," I reflected, "that while asleep you assume your dreams to be indisputably real? Once awake, you recognise them for what they are—baseless chimeras. Who can assure you, then, of the reliability of notions which, when awake, you derive from the senses and from reason? In relation to your present state they may be real; but it is possible also that you may enter upon another state of being which will bear the same relation to your present state as this does to your condition when asleep. In that new sphere you will recognize that the conclusions of reason are only chimeras."

Such thoughts as these threatened to shake my reason, and I sought to find an escape from them. But how? In order to disentangle the knot of this difficulty, a proof was necessary. Now a proof must be based on primary assumptions, and it was precisely these of which I was in doubt. God at last deigned to heal me of this mental malady; my mind recovered sanity and equilibrium, the primary assumptions of reason recovered with me all their stringency and force. I owed my deliverance, not to a concatenation of proofs and arguments, but to the light which God caused to penetrate into my heart—the light which illuminates the threshold of all knowledge. To suppose that certitude can be only based upon formal arguments is to limit the boundless mercy of God. Some one asked the Prophet the explanation of this passage in the Divine Book: "God opens to Islam the heart of him whom He chooses to direct." "That is spoken," replied the Prophet, "of the light which God sheds in the heart." "And how can man recognise

(continued from the previous page) that light?" he was asked. "By his detachment from this world of illusion and by a secret drawing towards the eternal world," the Prophet replied.

"Having once surrendered blind belief, it is impossible to return to it, for the essence of such belief is to be unconscious of itself. As soon as this unconsciousness ceases it is shattered like a glass whose fragments cannot be again reunited except by being cast again into the furnace and refashioned."

A method of argumentation like this has little value for one who only admits self-evident truths. Scholastic theology could not consequently satisfy me nor heal the malady from which I suffered.

It is true that in its later development theology was not content merely to defend dogma; it betook itself to the study of first principles, of substances, accidents and the laws which govern them; but through want of a thoroughly scientific basis, it could not advance far in its researches, nor succeed in dispelling entirely the overhanging obscurity which springs from diversities of belief.

I do not, however, deny that it has had a more satisfactory result for others; on the contrary, I admit that it has; but it is by introducing the principle of authority in matters which are not self-evident. Moreover, my object is to explain my own mental attitude and not to dispute with those who have found healing for themselves. Remedies vary according to the nature of the disease; those which benefit some may injure others.

He says to himself at the same time that, if there was truth in religion, it would not have escaped those who have displayed so much keenness of intellect in the study of mathematics. It does not follow that a man who excels in one branch of knowledge excels in all others.

The second evil comes from the sincere but ignorant Mussulman who thinks the best way to defend religion is by rejecting all the exact sciences.

Logicians demand in reasoning certain conditions

(continued from the previous page) which lead to absolute certainty, but when they touch on religious questions, they can no longer postulate these conditions.

Such, however, is the tendency of weak minds: they judge the truth according to its professors instead of judging its professors by the standard of the truth. But a liberal spirit will take as its guide this maxim of the Prince of believers, Ali the son of Abu Talib: "Do not seek for the truth by means of men; find first the truth and then you will recognise those who follow it." This is the procedure followed by a wise man. Once in possession of the truth he examines the basis of various doctrines which come before him, and when he has found them true, he accepts them without troubling himself whether the person who teaches them is sincere or a deceiver. Much rather, remembering how gold is buried in the bowels of the earth, he endeavours to disengage the truth from the mass of errors in which it is engulfed. The skilled coin-assayer plunges without hesitation his hand into the purse of the coiner of false money, and, relying on experience, separates good coins from bad.

If we adopt this method and reject every truth which has chanced to have been proclaimed by an imposter, how many truths we should have to reject! How many verses of the Koran and traditions of the prophets and Sufi discourses and maxims of sages we must close our ears to because the author of the Treatise of the Brothers of Purity has inserted them in his writings in order to further his cause, and in order to lead minds gradually astray in the paths of error! The consequence of this procedure would be that impostors would snatch truths out of our hands in order to embellish their own works. The wise man, at least, should not make common cause with the bigot blinded by ignorance.

Such is, however, the whimsical way of looking at things found in nearly all men. Every word proceeding from an authority which they approve is accepted by them, even were it false; every word proceeding from one whom they suspect is rejected, even

(continued from the previous page) were it true. In every case they judge of the truth according to its professors and not of men according to the truth which they profess.

The second danger threatens those who accept the opinions of the false philosophers. When, for instance, we read the treatises of the "Brothers of purity" and other works of the same kind, we find in them sentences spoken by the Prophet and quotations from the Sufis. We approve these works; we give them our confidence; and we finish by accepting the errors which they contain, because of the good opinion of them with which they have inspired us at the outset. Thus, by insensible degrees, we are led astray. In view of this danger the reading of philosophic writings so full of vain and delusive utopias should be forbidden, just as the slippery banks of a river are forbidden, to one who knows not how to swim. The perusal of these false teachings must be prevented just as one prevents children from touching serpents.

At last I left Bagdad, giving up all my fortune, only. I obtained a legal authorisation to preserve as much as was necessary for my support and that of my children; for there is surely nothing more lawful in the world than that a learned man should provide sufficient to support his family. I then betook myself to Syria, where I remained for two years, which I devoted to retirement, meditation, and devout exercises. I only thought of self-improvement and discipline and of purification of the heart by prayer in going through the forms of devotion which the Sufis had taught me.

However irregular the intervals which I could give to devotional ecstasy, my confidence in it did not diminish; and the more I was diverted by hindrances, the more steadfastly I returned to it.

This state, then, can be revealed to the initiated in ecstasy, and to him who is incapable of ecstasy, by obedience and attention, on condition that he frequents the society of Sufis till he arrivess, so to speak, at an imitative initiation. Such is the faith which one can obtain by remaining among them.

God, wishing to render intelligible to men the idea of inspiration, has given them a kind of glimpse of it in sleep. In fact, man perceives while asleep the things of the invisible world either clearly manifest or under the veil of allegory to be subsequently lifted by divination. If, however, one was to say to a person who had never himself experienced these dreams that, in a state of lethargy resembling death and during the complete suspension of sight, hearing, and all the senses, a man can see the things of the invisible world.

Inspiration is a special state in which the inner eye discovers, revealed by a celestial light, mysteries out of the reach of reason. The doubts which are raised regarding inspiration relate (1) to its possibility, (2) to its real and actual existence, (3) to its manifestation in this or that person.

F.E. Keay: "KABIR AND HIS FOLLOWERS".

Once, when people began to flock in great numbers to Kabir, so that his meditations were interrupted, and he had little time to spend in devotion to God, he resorted, it is said, to a strange plan to keep people away from himself. He pretended to be drunk, and went round the city with his arm round a courtesan's neck. The pious were scandalised and people ceased to come to him, thinking he must really be a wicked man.

The raja had built for himself a beautiful palace at Jaunpur, and when it was completed he invited many friends to a great feast. All admired the new building, except a sadhu who was present, who said that it had two serious defects. When asked what these were, he said that the first was that the building would not last for ever, and the second was that its owner would pass away even before the building. The raja at first was angry, but eventually recognising the unknown sadhu as Kabir, he fell at his feet and acknowledged him as his guru.

He was very much impressed by the simplicity and directness of Kabir, which contrasted very favourably

(continued from the previous page) with the hair-splitting of the pandits and their pedantic quotations from the Vedas and other books. Being convinced of the truth of Kabir's teaching, he requested Kabir to accept him as his disciple, but was told to wait. Later on at Muttra he was one day cooking his food and saw the wood for his fire was full of ants. While he was grieving that one meal must mean the destruction of so many living creatures: Kabir came up and addressed him in the following *sakthi*:

"Life cannot be sustained but at the cost of life; life preys on life; How can mercy be shown to all living? O man, consider!"

Again Dharm Das asked to be initiated as a disciple, but was again told to wait. A third time Kabir met him in Bandhogarh, and the faith of Dharm Das was still further strengthened. Kabir now bade him sell all his possessions and keep only a blanket for his covering.

For Muhammadans there is no difficulty in regarding him as a married man; for their sufis are married; but Hindus, convinced that a celibate and ascetic life is of greater sanctity, have taken great pains to explain the circumstances in such a way as to show that Kabir was unmarried.

"I know that reading is good, (but) better than reading is meditation" (*jog*).

Sometimes Kabir was the victim of slander, which he takes, however, in good part, realizing that it would in the long run do him good rather than harm, and that evil would recoil on the slanderer's head.

It was the Brahmans especially who opposed Kabir: and even the legends support this. In rejecting the ceremonial practices of Hinduism and teaching his own doctrines, he was running counter to their prestige and influence, and naturally incurred their displeasure.

"He whose Name 'is the breaker of pride';
How can he tolerate your pride?
They who give up pride of race and attachment
and search for the Word alone."

We can hardly wonder that the outspoken rebukes of Kabir stirred up many enemies against him. According to the legends, Hindus and Muhammadans joined together to persecute him.

Kabir realized that it was not the place where a man dwells, but the relationship which he has to God, which is the all important thing.

They seem to him to be too insistent on the externals of religion and the weary round of ritual and ceremony, which he despises as a hollow sham. But he finds rest for his mind by meditation on God:

"Saith Kabir, My attention is directed to that place whose God dwelleth night and day,
His secret he himself fully knoweth; he is ever imperishable."

In many verses Kabir shows a deep self-a basement: and whether these were composed before his spiritual awakening, or (as it seems more likely) were dictated by the passing mood of the moment, they are very striking. They show us Kabir with a deep consciousness of sin within him, and a profound sense of his unworthiness before God:

"How shall I cross the sea, O master? How shall I cross the sea? I am full of many sins."

My possessions are lust, wrath, covetousness, pride and envy.

Mercy, honesty, and service to the guru (have) not (come to me even) in my dreams."

Like Socrates of old amongst the Greeks, he tried to penetrate behind the conventionalities of speech and popular ideas to the reality of things.

There are a number of Hindu ideas which the influence of Islam led him to condemn distinctly, such as idolatry, polytheism, mythology, divine incarnation, asceticism and severe austerities.

"Kabir says, To whom shall I speak? All the world is blind.
They keep away from one who speaks truth, and are the bond-slaves of liars."
"If union with God be obtained by going about naked

"All the beasts of the forest shall be saved!
 What mattereth it whether man goeth naked or weareth a deerskin,
 If he recognize not God in his heart?
 If perfection be obtained by shaving the head,
 Why should not sheep obtain salvation?
 If, O brethren, the continent man is saved,
 Why should not a eunuch obtain the supreme reward?"
 "Who of men did not die? O pandit, speak and make this plain to me.
 Kabir says, He alone dies not who is not held in coming and going.
 You waver and know not the Supreme God, (wherefore you worship gods and
 goddesses."
 "In the first beginning there was thought:"
 "How can I describe the condition of the unconditioned, who has neither village nor
 resting-place?
 He who must be seen without qualities; by what name shall I call Him?"

The Supreme Brahma of the Vedanta is an abstraction; for he is said to be
 nirguna, or without attributes. But man cannot worship a God who is without
 attributes; and wherever this doctrine is held, it has been found necessary to recognise
 God as being also saguna, or possessing attributes.

"If God dwell only in the mosque, to whom belongeth the rest of the country?"

The Yogi ascetics, who seem to have been numerous in Kabir's days, also come
 in for his condemnation.

"Studying Yoga, Vedas, rites and astrology, they are demented.....

Yogis with plaited hair or shaven head, with sealed lips or matted locks – where
 did these find wisdom?

In error though wanderest in a (Yogi's) garb.

Put away thy demotional attitudes and thy suspension of breath;

Abandon deception, and ever worship God, O fool!"

"Unless you remove evil from your hearts, how shall you find (God) by dwelling
 in the forest?

They who deem their own homes equal to the forest are perfect (among) men.”

(continued from the previous page) "When I was proud, Thou (wert) not (in me); now that Thou art (in me) I am not proud."

He speaks often of repeating the name of God especially the name of Rama. To Kabir, however, this was not a mere magic formula. The mere repetition of the name of God would not bring salvation any more than a man can taste sweetness by repeating the word 'sugar'. The repetition of the name of God with Kabir, seems rather to be a means by which he reminds himself of God's reality and brings to recollection all that the name connotes, and so it helps him to realize his union with God.

Kabir uses the word guru to mean God whom he calls the Sat Guru, or True Teacher. God is himself the Great Teacher to whom Kabir would resort for guidance. Still he also believes that the instruction of an earthly guru is valuable, one who himself has experienced enlightenment and union with God, and who wishes to pass on to others the blessings he has himself received. Great care must be taken in choosing a guru, so that a false teacher may be avoided; but when a true one is found, he must be treated with great reverence. In other sects, as well as in the later Kabir Panth itself, the guru is regarded himself as divine, and worshipped with divine honours. But Kabir always stops short of this, just as he rejected all divine incarnations.

The doctrine of the power of the Sabda, or Divine Word, is not so much in evidence in the verses of Kabir himself as in the later writings of the Kabir Panth; but still it is to be found there. This also is a doctrine found in other phases of Hinduism, and can be traced back to early times. It seems to be connected with the idea of the mystery of language as a means of expressing thought. Only as thought is expressed in teaching, can men find salvation; and hence even the letters have a mystic significance. But he hind the letters and the words is thought; and the plurality of words must not obscure the unity of thought from which they proceed.

(continued from the previous page) But behind this is also the conception of God as 'the Letterless One,' which we find in later Kabir-panthi thought. There is little of all this in Kabir's verses, but he does speak of the power of the Sabda, or Divine Word, as expressed through the guru, without which salvation cannot be obtained.

It does not seem therefore that Kabir was actually a Sufi, though he held some ideas in common with them, and may possibly have come to a certain extent under their influence.

The Gorakh Gushti or Gorakhnath Ki Goshti. — This is an imaginary conversation between Kabir and Gorakhnath, who was a celebrated Yogi, or ascetic. As it is mentioned by Wilson in his *Hindu Sects*, is probably to be dated somewhere in the eighteenth century. It is not a very long work, containing less than 150 couplets. It is written in chaupais and samais.

Kabir first speaks and says that, though many are seeking for God, few find Him. Yogis, ascetics and sannyasis have been, deceived by Maya. The pandit is proud of his knowledge of the Veda, but does not know God. He appeals to Gorakh to enjoy the blessing of fellowship with God. Though he has performed yoga he has not obtained union (yukti) but has sold himself into the hands of Yama, the King of Death. God has manifested Himself in the soul of man; and, through not having known this secret, gods, men and sages — all have been deceived.

Gorakh replies that, while God indeed pervades the heart He cannot be known without the practice of Yoga; for all have been deceived by Maya. The five elements and the twenty-five prakritis have to be overcome. As long as Maya holds the mind, the root of happiness cannot be obtained.

Kabir answers that Gorakh is in error, and asks how he is going to overcome his senses. Where does God dwell? Whence has He come into Being? Who has created the five elements and twenty-five prakritis? Whose is this created world?

Gorakh says that few know God as nirguna. The Creator is always free from Karma. He has no form nor parts. He has no eyes nor ears. He has no

(continued from the previous page) elements nor Maya. He has no righteousness nor mercy, and so on. All is under him and he pervades all.

Kabir asks, If God has no attributes, how can He be known? and presses his point at great length.

Gorakh expresses his astonishment at this teaching, and Kabir makes a great appeal to him to forsake error and accept the truth. Gorakh asks for further instruction, which Kabir gives to him, showing that the complete Deity (Purna Brahma) dwells in every soul.

There may be passages even in his genuine works here and there which might countenance some of the present teachings of the sect; but taken as a whole it certainly differs greatly from what Kabir taught. Not only has the sect now elaborate rites which are binding on its members, but the use of the rosary, and other practices which Kabir condemned, are now recognised as not only lawful but important. Moreover a sacramental system has been developed which is far removed from the ideas of Kabir.

Kabir recognised the value of the guru, and often spoke also of God as the Sat Guru, but he never regarded the human guru as equivalent to God, as is now done in the sect. Intoxicating drink, and other intoxicating things, ought to be renounced, as well as the eating of flesh. He who is a slave of intoxicants can never meditate; and without meditation spiritual knowledge cannot be obtained, and without knowledge salvation cannot be obtained.

Kabir teaches the doctrine of the Sabda, or Divine word; and this has many striking analogies with the doctrine of the Logos as given in the Johannine writings, as well as with the Hebrew conception of the Memra, or Divine Word. This doctrine is not confined to Kabir, but is taught in many Hindu sects. It can be traced right back to the Vedas, where Vach (Speech) is personified. The mystery of speech as the vehicle of thought has often impressed itself on men, and the religious ideas arising out of this are found in many parts of the world even in ancient times. That this doctrine

(continued from the previous page) may have developed amongst the bhakti sects through the impetus of Christian influence is not at all unlikely. Kabir placed much value upon the Sabda or Divine Word. Yet though he makes it clear that he does not mean the Vedas or the Quran, we do not find anywhere that he indicated what the Sabda was. It seems to have meant with him a subjective impression received by individuals, rather than any objective Divine revelation, and contrasts with the Christian view of the Scriptures as being the living oracles of God.

(continued from page 184)

D.B. Macdonald: "THE LIFE OF AL-GHAZZALI".

With the time came the man. We was al-Ghazzali, the greatest, certainly the most sympathetic figure in the history of Islam, and the only teacher of the after generations ever put by a Muslim on a level with the four great Imams. The equal of Augustine in philosophical and theological importance, by his side the Aristotelian philosophers of Islam, Ibn Rushed and all the rest, seem beggarly compilers and scholists. Only al-Farabi, and that in virtue of his mysticism, approaches him. In his own person he took up the life of his time on all its sides and with it all its problems. He lived through them all and drew his theology from his experience. Systems and classifications, words and arguments about words, he swept away; the facts of life as he had known them in his own soul he grasped. When his work was done the revelation of the mystic (kashf) was not only a full part but the basal part in the structure of Muslim theology. That basis, in spite, or rather on account of the work of the mutakallims had previously been lacking.

If all the categories but substance and quality are mere subjectives, existing in the mind only, what can we know of things? An ultra-rational basis had to be found and it was found in the ecstasy of the Sufis.

From his youth he had been a sceptical, ambitious student, playing with religious influences yet unaffected by them. But the hollowness of his life was

(continued from the previous page) ever present with him and pressing upon him. Like some with us, he sought to be converted and could not bring it to pass. His religious beliefs gradually gave way and fell from him, piece by piece.

The philosophers in their intellectualism might picture God as thought – thought thinking itself and evolving all things thereby. Their source was Plotinus.

Philo: "ON THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE OF THE THERAPEUTAE".

"Now the purpose of our wisdom-lovers is immediately apparent from their name. They are called Therapeutae and Therapeutrides (men and women) in the original sense of the word; either because they profess an art of healing superior to that in use in cities (for that only heals bodies, whereas this (heals our) souls as well when laid hold of by difficult and scarce curable diseases, which pleasure and desire, and grief and fear, selfishness and folly, and injustice, and the endless multitude of passions and vices, inflict upon them)."

Philo here indulges in a digression, contrasting the unintelligent worship of externals by the misinstructed in all religions with the worship of true Deity by those who follow the contemplative life. Those who are content to worship externals are blind; let them then remain deprived of sight. And he adds significantly, that he is not speaking of the sight of the body, but of that of the soul, by which alone truth and falsehood are distinguished from each other.

Now they who betake themselves to (the divine) service (do so) not because of any custom, or on some one's advice or appeal, but carried away with heavenly love, like those initiated into the Bacchic and Corybantic Mysteries; they are afire with God until they behold the object of their love.

"Then it is that, through their yearning for that deathless and blessed Life, thinking that their mortal life is already ended, they leave their possessions.

(continued from the previous page) Nor do they emigrate to some other city (like illused or worthless slaves who, in claiming purchase from their owners, only procure for themselves a change of masters and not freedom), for every city, even the best governed one, is full of innumerable tumults, forms of destruction, and disorders which would be insupportable to a man who has once taken wisdom as a guide.

"But they make their abode outside the walls in (shut in) woods or enclosed lands in pursuit of solitude, (and this) not to indulge any feeling of churlish dislike to their fellow-men, but from a knowledge that continual contact with those of dispositions dissimilar to their own is unprofitable and harmful.

The dwellings are not close together as those in towns, for neighbourhood is irksome and displeasing to those who are seeking for solitude; nor are they far apart, because of the intercourse which is so dear to them, and also for mutual help in case of attack by robbers.

"Thus they preserve an unbroken memory of God, so that even in their dream-consciousness nothing is presented to their minds but the glories of the divine virtues and powers. Hence many of them give out the rhythmic doctrines of the sacred wisdom, which they have obtained in the visions of dream-life.

"Twice a day, at dawn and even, they are accustomed to offer up prayers; as the sun rises praying for the sunshine, the real sunshine, that their minds maybe filled with heavenly light, and as it sets praying that their soul, completely lightened of the lust of senses and sensations, may withdraw to its own congregation and council-chamber, there to track out the truth.

"The whole interval from dawn to sunset they devote to their exercises. Taking the sacred writings they spend their time in study (lit. Philosophise).

"Now this general sanctuary in which they assemble every seventh day consists of two enclosures, one separated off for men, and the other for women. For women too habitually form part of the audience,

(continued from the previous page) possessing the same eager desire and having made the same deliberate choice (as the men).

"The division, however, between the two halls is only partly built up, some three or four cubits from the floor, like a breast-work, the rest of it, to the roof, being left open, and this for two reasons; in the first place for the preservation of that modesty which so becomes woman's nature, and in the second that sitting within earshot they may hear easily, since there is nothing in the way of the speaker's voice.

"Now (our Therapists) first of all lay down continence as a foundation, as it were, for the soul, and then proceed to build up the rest of the virtues upon it. Accordingly none of them would think of taking food or drink before sundown, for they consider that the practice of philosophy deserves the light, while the necessities of the body (may content themselves with) darkness; hence they assign the day to the former, and a brief portion of the night to the latter.

In everything they practise simplicity, knowing that vanity has falsehood for its origin, but simplicity truth, each of them containing the innate power of its source; for from falsehood stream forth the manifold kinds of evils, while from truth come the abundant blessings of good both human and divine.

"The seniors sit down to table, following the order of their election. For they do not regard as seniors merely those who are advanced in years and have reached old age (nay, they regard such as quite young children if they have only lately fallen in love with the higher life) but such as have grown up and arrived at maturity in the contemplative part of philosophy, which is unquestionably its fairest and most divine portion.

"Nor are they waited upon by slaves, since they consider the possession of servants in general to be contrary to nature. For nature has created all men free; but the injustice and selfishness of those who strive after inequality (the root of all

(continued from the previous page) evil), have set the yoke of power on the necks of the weaker and harnessed them to (the chariots of) the stronger.

"So in this holy banquet there is no slave, as I have said, but it is served by free men who perform the necessary service, not by compulsion, or waiting for orders, but of their own free-will anticipating the requests (of the guests) with promptitude and eagerness. For they are not chance free men who are appointed for such service, but juniors of the order who have been selected in order of merit with every possible care, who (as those noble and well-born and anxious to reach the summit of virtue should) with affectionate rivalry, as though they were their legitimate children, wait upon these fathers, and mothers of theirs, regarding them as their common parents, bound to them with closer ties than their parents by blood; since, for those who think, there is no closer tie than virtue and goodness.

Just as right reason bids priests make offerings free from wine and blood, so does it bid these sages live. For wine is a drug that brings on madness, and costly seasonings rouse up desire, the most insatiable of beasts.

He who is the senior most skilled in the doctrines comes forward and discourses, with steadfast eyes and steadfast voice, with reason and thoughtfulness, not making a display of word-cleverness, as the rhetoricians and sophists of to-day, but examining closely and explaining the precise meaning in the thoughts, a meaning which does not merely light on the tips of the ears, but pierces the ear and reaches the soul and steadfastly abides there. The president searches out some passage in the sacred scriptures, or solves some difficulty propounded by one of the members. The president for his part employs a somewhat leisurely method of imparting instruction, pausing at intervals and stopping for frequent recapitulations, impressing the ideas on their souls. (For when, in giving an interpretation, one continues to speak rapidly without pausing for breath, the mind

(continued from the previous page) of the hearers is left behind unable to keep up the pace, and fails to comprehend what is said). While they, on their side, fixing all their attention upon him, remain in one and the same attitude listening attentively, showing their understanding and comprehension (of his words) by nod and look.

"Now the interpretation of the sacred scriptures is based upon the under-meanings in the allegorical narratives; for these men look upon the whole of their law-code, as being like to a living thing, having for body the spoken commands, and for soul the unseen thought stored up in the words (in which thought the rational soul (of the student) begins to contemplate things native to its own nature more than in anything else) — the interpretation, as it were, in the mirror of the names, catching sight of the extraordinary beauties of the ideas contained in them, unwrapping and enrobing the symbols from them, and bringing to light the naked inner meanings, for those who are able with a little suggestion to arrive at the intuition of the hidden sense from the apparent meaning.

They take their stand at dawn, when, catching sight of the rising sun, they raise their hands to heaven, praying for sunlight and truth and keenness of spiritual vision. After this prayer each returns to his own sanctuary, to his accustomed traffic in philosophy and labour in its fields.

"So far then about the Therapeuts, who are devoted to the contemplation of nature and live in it and in the soul alone, citizens of heaven and the world, legitimately recommended to the Father and Creator of the Universe by their virtue which procures them His love.

"I too have of times left my kindred and my friends and country, and have gone into the wilderness (or into solitude) in order to comprehend the things worthy to be seen, yet have profited nothing; but my soul was scattered or stung with passion, and lapsed into the very opposite current."

Philo: "ON THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE OF THE THERAPEUTAE"

We learn from this interesting item of autobiography that Philo had himself enjoyed no success in the contemplative life. This accounts for his great reverence and high respect for those who had succeeded in comprehending the things "worthy to be seen".

As was the case with the Pythagoreans and Essenes, the Therapeuts had lay-pupils who lived in the world and who perhaps resorted to the community now and again for a period of "retreat", and then returned again to the world.

GARRETA BUSEY: A REVIEW OF SOROKIN'S "CRISIS OF OUR AGE":::

Its main thesis is that the cause of the present crisis in human society is man's dissociation from God. Sorokin divides human progress into periods which he calls ideational, idealistic and sensate. In the ideational period of a culture—the European Middle Ages, for instance—all things are referred to an absolute value, or God, and revealed truth is the only truth which is recognised. In such a period the principle emerges that true reality is discoverable only by means of the senses. The sensory approach to truth becomes synthesised with the ideational, or religious, to form an attitude called idealistic. Such was the culture of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. and the 13th and 14th A.D. In the natural course of the cycle, however, the sensory elements become more insistent until they predominate and we have a sensate culture, in which all the departments of man's activity are based on the principle that knowledge is to be obtained only by the senses. Since about the 16th century, our culture has been mainly sensate.

Today it has exhausted itself. Truth has become relativistic, temporal and materialistic. Man is regarded, not as a child of God, but as a system of reflexes, like any animal. Sorokin shows that crises such as this have always occurred when the predominant culture shifts from an ideational to a sensate stage, or vice versa, but today we are in the greatest crisis

(continued from the previous page) of them all. A similar shift was the beginning of the Christian era. The shifts are inevitable, as also the violent disturbances which accompany them. Man must turn to thinner liberty provided by Christianity. More and more people will seek it. The tools provided by the sensate age will thus come to be used for the service of God.

In the Bahai teachings not all sensate knowledge is despised, however. Man may achieve knowledge through his senses, his reason, by tradition or thru the bounty of the Holy Spirit. Asceticism is condemned. The 'world' is naught but that which prevents us from loving God. Material goods are for man's benefit, for this is to be His Kingdom on earth. Even the truth as perceived by the senses is of use, not as an absolute criterion of value, but as an instrument for the establishment of such a Kingdom. Man must know and use the laws of nature, but he must obey the laws of God. Thus sensory knowledge and achievement are recognised and given their proper evaluation.

There is a shift from godlessness to godliness now taking place in the world. An increasing number of men and women are turning to a more spiritual interpretation of value. This is true, not because man on his own initiative turns back to religion, but because a fresh spiritual impetus has been given to human faith. Sorokin leaves one with the impression that the shifts of culture are mechanical and originate in man. He neglects the fact that the existence of Christ, coinciding with the great impotence of Graeco-Roman culture, gave disillusioned man the center to which he could turn and provided him with a more than human power with which to rebuild his world. This impact provided the creative basis for great achievements.

But today is the greatest crisis in human history. Has no magnet been provided for the spiritual impulses of man, bewildered as never before? Sorokin says: "Sensate culture created no great new religion. It yielded only a spiritless distortion or an atrocious mutilation of Christianity, producing the religious monstrosities of hundreds of different sects, each one more bizarre than the last."