THE TRUTH ABOUT TIBET
A CASE OF CLEAR AGGRESSION

Tibet is the crucial test of the Indian Government's intelligence as well as integrity. There is hardly an Indian anywhere who doubts the right of the Tibetan people to autonomy. The logical implication of this right is that Tibet was never under the sovereignty of another country to claim on military operations against Tibet. Such operations would be a case of clear aggression and must be resolutely opposed by us with not only words but also deeds. That is the view of every thinking Indian who has not surrendered his mind to Communism. If our Government fails to reflect and express this view in toto, there is certainly something amiss with its capacity of being representative and of straightforward thought and of democratic intention.

These are hard words, but even the most cursory look at Tibet's past and present is enough to justify them. As far as history can be traced, Tibet was never within the sphere of either of the two belligerent powers in the world. It is a distinct unit—not indeed quite cut off from either Nepal and India on the one side and China on the other but still possessed of characteristics that make it a country on its own with a distinguishable nationality. The fact that it was invaded by the Chinese three times during the thirteenth century and made a part of Chinese territory by the Manchus in the seventeenth does not abrogate its separate existence any more than Tibet's own conquest in the eighteenth century of Western China, Chinese Turkestan and even of Chosu as the great city in the Tibet Province, makes those portions of China a Tibetan possession or the two Gurkha invasions of 1792 and 1854, and Golab Singh's ally in 1841 can incorporate it in countries this side the Himalayas. All that can be said about Indo-Tibetan relations in the Tibet was of an accord for quite a time to remain a sort of protectorate of China, sending a mission annually to Peking with tribute to the Chinese Emperor but—and this is noteworthy—receiving in return the personal visit of any Chinese Emperor to the country. The latter was regarded as the chief lay-supervisor of a religious head and there was neither a concordat between the two countries than any subservience of the one to the other. China was a kind of Big Brother who unimportantly raised the spectre of invasions against invaders, while Tibet in gratitude acknowledged a loose suzerainty.

How very loose the suzerainty was has been well pin-pointed by Dr. Balkrishna Gokhale in a recent survey of Sinuo-Tibetan complications. History records that, when the first Gurkha invasion took place and when Golab Singh marched into Tibet, Chinese troops helped the Tibetans but "so much help was rendered at the time of the Second Gurkha Invasion." This proves that Tibet was not defended as an integral part of Chinese imperial territory for then the help should have been forthcoming every time. Another proof is that the Ambans or diplomatic envoys appointed by China to represent its influence in Lhasa were never allowed by the Tibetans to interfere in their internal affairs in fact when they did try to obtain over-all control in the country the Tibetans rebelled against them and in 1749 actually massacred them. China's hold on Tibet was never accepted as one of lord-paissance. Any attempt to make it such had to be an act of aggression. There was an attempt from 1906 to 1912 by the durying Mancho Government and the Dalai Lama to have not to keep in India, but when the Chinese Revolution broke out the Tibetans in the advantage of the ensuing confusion and threw the Chinese out beyond the Salwen and brought back the Dalai Lama. Again in 1918 China tried to cross the Tibetan border but made scanty headway and the Upper Yangze remained roughly the dividing line between the two countries. In 1935 Chiang Kai-shek employed suble tactics to bring Tibet into the Chinese orbit but there was little success and even the Chinese mission was expelled, albeit with politeeness, by the Government at Lhasa as soon as the Kuenann attack was driven out of the Chinese mainland by the Reds. Tibet has never ceased to have a will to autonomy and, whenever possible, she has strongly expressed it in action, as is natural to a country which has had its own traditions and individual life.

The Sinia Convention of 1913 by which Britain sought in co-operation with both Tibet and China to establish the correct Tibetan status conceded China to the contention of both the outer zone which was ruled by Lhasa. In 1921 a memorandum sent by the British Government to China reaffirmed this position and further explained the possession of even nominal suzerainty was contingent on China's admitting Tibetan autonomy. This is an important clarification. Free India who has inherited Britain's definition of Tibet's status and has declared her adherence to it must keep this point in mind. The clarification that Tibet has only communal with the Chinese Commonwealth on the same footing as India herself within the British: the voluntary inclusion within a larger whole depends entirely on a total freedom, as regards internal and foreign policy, from being granted by that whole. The least move to exceed the arrangement would nullify the so-called suzerainty and be an act of aggression. Such an implication is also evident in Britain's informing both China and Tibet in 1945 that her relations with Lhasa would be directly through her own Government in India. Free India has continued this arrangement and her contacts too with Tibet have been direct and never through any regime set up in Peking.

No observer of pragmatic reality, much less a student of history and a theorist of cultural or political institutions, can have the slightest misgiving about Tibet's inherent independence of China. To consider any action on China's part vis-a-vis Tibet as a matter of domestic administration is to encourage an absolute falsehood. And to talk of a Chinese suzerainty in the teeth of its getting rendered null and void by infringement of Tibetan autonomy is to indulge in perverse logic. Least of all could India herself be the party to the annexation if, in her eyes, for has not been vacuously opposed to imperialism and she would have come to a conclusion that she never did for China to claim, especially by force of arms, Tibet as her possession? Even had Tibet once been altogether under China's thumb, the unmistakable desire that she has established throughout her history to be independent should enlist India on her side as a champion of national freedom against past imperialist traditions. Unless we wish to put aside our conscience, stamp upon our ideals and become favouring huckeys of Mao Tse-tung we must confirm in no uncertain terms the Red invasion of Tibet. Terms like "surprise" and "regret" are not truly enough: at least they do not do credit to the great spiritual nation and even words condemnatory of the invasion as unjustified belch, unless followed up with positive concrete counter-measures, the high-sounding declaration made not so long ago by our Prime Minister that though India will never start a war she will never fail to resist aggression or connive at any military trampling down of another country.

THE GENERAL SIGNIFICANCES OF THE ATTACK

What should be India's line of action in face of Mao's attack on Tibet? Before we answer this question let us note certain general significances of the attack. First of all, it reduces to absurdity Pandit Nehru's repetition that Mao is a beneficient liberty-loving leader who is bent only on clearing out Kuenannia autonomy from China and on living at peace with all his neighbours. He has shown himself to be an unsavours militarist casting greedy eyes outside China in order to spread Communism throughout the world. His avowed ideal that he will let Tibet's autonomy, provided her army is allowed to be integrated with the Chinese Red Army, is hypocrisy added to unsestructness. For this integration would mean China's complete military rule over weak Tibet: who does not know what a similar step has meant in his established throughout the Russian bloc.

Continued on page 3
or that it was in opposition to precisely such a step that Titoslov took final form in Yugoslavia?

The second significance we have to mark is that Mao's aggression un-
territorial allegiance to the throne of the Japan.

When India advised Mao not to be hasty over Formosa we were informed that our role as peace-maker had dissuaded him from even exercising his war-making power against that island. Shekow, we always knew that not our plea but Truman's bold decision to defend Formosa during the first months of the Korean war kept Mao in check: it was because Formosa could not be captured while the American Seventh Fleet was patrolling its waters that Mao held such an advantage over Tibet just because Tibet has no freedom of speech to prove this to the hilt. Nor is the neutrality that is hobbled by in any virtue in Mao's eyes. Nor has its expulsion of China's Ambassador in India that amicable discussion was ever held even now it went to Peking. Why was he giving it hope he knew very well what his country's intentions were and what was the attack on Tibet took place while the duped delegation was on the point of his Chinese empire? Perhaps the most cynical part of the whole business is this: the Indian States, and they have done as anything to save Tibet even if it had been in Mao's presence by mid-September. As has been recently revealed, the core of China's contention was the stationing of Chinese troops in Lhasa, a procedure which would spell the end of Tibetan autonomy. At no time did Mao intend to deal gently with Tibet as Pandit Nehru had expected; his idea of gentleness was only to achieve a military grip by asking the Tibetans to hand over their country to him without any fight.

The third significance is the close rapport between India's policy and the Russians.

Of course the rapport has been perfectly obvious to all who have been blindsided by the ostensibility of Ostrogoth.

It has been in fact cleared by every known reason: Chinese leader and is written large in the whole sickening tale of Russian and Chinese contention of North Korea's aggression—a contention which also has the basis of aggressive designs of both Stalin and Mao. In the instance of our Prime Minister to try and find a rationale for Peking's attack said to our Reuter's Diplomatic Correspondent in Srinagar: "The current Chinese policy is perfectly in accordable to the fact that although Peking's policy may not be dictated by Moscow much of the influence upon which this policy is based comes through Soviet sources. For example, Moscow repeatedly said that Anglo-American 'intrigues' in Tibet aim at bringing that country into the anti-Communist bloc or sphere of influence. How unfounded these accusations may be in the case of China I am unable to say whether this has not influenced the Chinese decision to move into Tibet." These words were not too isntent, still coloured by the wishful thinking Pandit Nehru has known how to interpret them. For, there is no room left for more wondering. Peking has unequivocally declared that India, and Sino-Polish has been ordered to march into Tibet because imperialist powers are planning to take over that country. If Russia has set rolling the story of Western designs on Tibet, then China has made herself altogether an instrument of Russia and accomplished what the latter had done if she had been in a position to check the supposedly ambitious West in this quarter of the world and to advance Communism. Whether the picture painted by Russia is true or false seems depending on the facts. China: she acts as Stalin desires because her interests and Stalin's coincide.

It is difficult to understand by what peculiar mode of reasoning can the statement of a policy or policy may not be dictated by Moscow. Every fact of the present posture of India is shown up in the Russian propaganda on statement in the same interview, attempting to analyse possible motives of China's aggression in Peking that the United States was being bent on destruction of the anti-Communist bloc or sphere of influence. Nehru himself believes that the apprehension is being genuine in the grip of fear. Does he not realise that he is being told that the Russians are making a deliberate bogey of America? The only thing they have to fear is that the United States and China's occupation of Manchuria. As Dr. Grodsky has observed, guerrilla fighting and brigandage will be continued by the Red armies and there will be to proctected and cumbered political activities. Both Tibet and China having a meager capacity to resist the tiny subversive subterfuges are offered by an extensile advance of both military and ideological powers with regard to India. With Tibet incorporated in China, we shall have Mao touching Tibet; they would be nebulous, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Assam. Our physical frontier with China will lengthen by
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This leads us to the fourth, and India's own standpoint, the most important significance. No extraordinary powers of analysis are required to discern the part of a下属d nationalist designs on Tibet. It is pure make-believe to speak, as Mao has done, of China having only the U.S.A. and Britain in mind. What is the exact position of these countries in relation to the territory now invaded? How many direct acts of aggression against military purposes? None whatsoever. Everything they may do has to be in the interests of India. Without India knowing, they cannot expect to make any manoeuvres. And for their manoeuvres to be successful they must have India's compliance. Unless India be taken to be in absolute league with the Western powers, unless India herself be understood to have full sympathy with so-called imperial designs and to be acting against the interests of Red China, the excuse lure through herself on the side of the Western powers. We have to realise that this excuse boils down to a reiteration of the same in any sense, in any sense by Peking Radio at Pandit Nehru, calling him a running dog of the Western Im.

The invasion of Tibet is fundamentally an act of hostility against the Indian Government. There is no escaping this conclusion.

But let us not imagine that even such an act is inspired by a genuine surge of India. Mao was not an element of world-politics that India persistently goes out of her way to make things worse of herself over Red China. To suspect and to blackguard her can have only one effect: to make her stronger. Mao cannot tolerate any country which is not one hundred per cent Communist. He cannot put every such country on what Mr. Masani once termed with profound piquancy his "menus". The murder of a racket will be that he is friendly with Russia and China without yet aligning himself with their materialistic and murderous ideology. In consequence she is an enemy, no matter how much we may attempt to be. Sooner or later, whether she be really an ally of the West or not, she must be kept in check. Internal tactics are not bearing good fruit—the local Communists are in disgrace and the Indian Government is able to deal with them more or less successfully. So, aggravative steps must be prepared. And what step would be more opportune than taking possession of Tibet which is a backdoor to India?

Yes, the basic significance of Mao's Tibetan adventure is to advance China's frontiers right down to India and stand poised there to strike at the right moment and with the right strategy—unless India precipitously decrees her own side the Russian bloc. But to go over to Mao and Stalin in order to avert their wishes is not in any sense, in any sense by Peking's view a measured gesture. It is a gesture spelling the utmost ruin to all our ideals and to China's own. In the gesture that can save is to take a firm line with China, denounce openly her nefarious intentions, stand without reservation by the U.S.A. and make every possible arrangement consistent with them to facilitate an American intervention in our favour and, what is of still greater moment, an American prevention of Mao's evil designs on India. Militarily, China is of no account to us, as we are, but India as the spearhead of an American defence of democracy and the U.S. of their mechanised millions. And the hour is upon us of constituting ourselves a strengthening and saving not only our own dear country but also all South-East Asia whose bulwark we are. But India's present position most forcibly is to make the primary motive of Mao's attack on Tibet to be as strong as possible. The time-table set for Communism's world-conquest has been badly jolled by the complicated failure in Korea. Communism must regain prestige in Asia and put itself in a position to which it is growing "attitudes of strength"—especially it must wear a frightening face at not easily provocative of Western intervention and likely to be automatically advantageous in view of the complete opposite movements of the policies of the countries immediately concerned. Tibet is one such point per excellence. Were she not so, it is difficult to explain Mao's invasion at particularly the present moment. The weather in this season is hardly propitious for military operations and, politically, the Red armies by reason of all the ominous depositions of the United Nations. But she counts on America's hands being full with Korea and on the British Government and on India's Government. We, however, should be glad to see India in a state of goose-flesh and to secure a base for Commis.

Really Mao would also from the fact that apart from providing a backdoor to India Tibet cannot whip the tail of itself. As Dr. Grodsky has observed, guerrilla fighting and brigandage will be continued by the Red armies and there will be to proctected and cumbered political activities. Both Tibet and China having a meager capacity to resist the tiny subversive subterfuges are offered by an extensile advance of both military and ideological powers with regard to India. With Tibet incorporated in China, we shall have Mao touching Tibet; they would be nebulous, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Assam. Our physical frontier with China will lengthen by
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"CAPITALISTS, IMPERIALISTS AND WAR-MONGERS!"
By A. L. CRAMPTON CHALK

Perhaps the most frequent, popular and presumably successful of the Words of Power used by the Russians and their allies against people with whom they disagree is to exclaim: them as "Capitalists, Imperialists and War-mongers!" As the incantation seems always be used as a whole it makes it abundantly clear that capitalists, imperialists and war-mongers are ipso facto and indisputably one and the same. The implied division of the human race into neat groups of Capitalists and Communists is not only an obvious over-simplification, it is a thoroughly silly business which ought not to be indulged in by intelligent people.

The facts may be established with some profit, especially if they can be considered in the light of a little open handedness and just a shade of a sense of humour. To take the magic rune apart, let us deal first with the Capitalist. It seems to be one of the peculiarities of the Left that its thinking is always a generation or more ahead of the capitalist world; in other words, it tries to show the world that they have thrown it into relief against later conditions. In any case it does remain a fact that most of the abuses against which Communism and Socialism fulminate passed out of existence many years before the attack. By contrast, the diligence of its politicians and its technique is no better than the problems that face it at the moment. All gentlemen of the Left are passionately eager to right wrongs that occurred a couple of generations ago. With a little capacity when in power to produce more individual freedom, more peace, or even more wealth for more people, is not, therefore, surprising that the fearful charge of being Capitalists is obviously based on old Nineteenth Century notions of a capitalist class scrofulous, wasteful, wasteful, with an aim for the destruction of the workers' wealth and power by every means within the laws. The pictorial symbols used by Communists to label these enemies of humanity are, quite appropriately to their theme, the top-hat and morning-coat—articles whose use has been almost entirely discontinued in the Western world for a couple of generations. As a matter of fact, intelligent people whose minds are open and who are able to study the facts of life in the West to-day know quite well that only the capitalists of the old Nineteenth Century Bogeyman and bogeywoman are to be found in Russia, in the person of a gigantic, powerful, and despotic personalities of the Commissars. Capitalists in other Western countries, within the conception of them as wielders of power, have long ceased to be liquidated by democratic society and politics; they have been brought under State regulation, their power has been curtailed by labour unions, and they have largely been obliterated by taxation. Their latter-day power is little more than a legal shadow, and is largely reduced to the financiers responsibility for operations which are formulated by state authorities other than their own management. Profits are taken over by the State, except for the vestigial remnant handed back as interest or dividends. This picture is not so true in America as in Socialist Britain. Who can make it true in the U.S.A. or anywhere? It is not even possible in the U.S.A. or anywhere to be a capitalist, whether in the U.S.A. or anywhere. It is not even possible in the U.S.A. or anywhere to be an American capitalist-

True to the text of this article, i.e., that Communist thought is always fifty to one hundred years behind the times, it is true that there used to be almost such capitalists as he old-tattered variety now burnt in effigy. England, of course, became the very symbol of the power of capitalist around the middle of the last century. In these days also there were Imperialists, for, quite apart from the sheer spirit of adventure that was characteristic of that very virile race, it is a matter of fact that one of the few outstanding successes in accumulating wealth was by securing control of the raw materials and markets of foreign countries. In which case it now appears that the dark and forbidding times of the Industrial Revolution in England the doctrine of the Economic Man was the reigning secular belief in the Western world, and it seemed that everything had to give way in the sacred name of Trade and Progress. Because of the abolition of all free-royalty, their money and genius and their enterprise the English were widely successful in their search for wealth, new dominions, and new colonies for their children's descendants. Mohammed and Russia, for example, was now for Russia, and the civilized world, that Britain was able at that time to pile up enormous investments all over the world—for it was precisely those assets and funds that were to be expended in towards buying time and materials to fight to a successful finish the world-wide renewal of the age of decadence and Russia. If it had not not have done it—The world to-day would have been a reservation parcelled out to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the Russians would have been taken over as serfs by the Germans.

All this exemplifies, in passing, the beautiful economy of Nature who uses all forces for her unfoldment and development, and makes the sins and crimes of one generation the corner-stones on which to build the virtues and know how to make use of the solidarity of freedom-loving and democratic peoples is now being fought in the effect of Russia's intransigent and violent attacks on human rights and decrees throughout the world.

Now, as to the imperialism of the Western powers. In the face of recent history perhaps this fabulous image can be more the most astonishing of all those in the Russian collection of Medical Mediums. They dance to frighten and mislead the primitive minds to whom they appeal. It is, of course, a classic example of the technique of the Lie Inversion, one of the oldest, most powerful, and most effective devices of demagogy—and it is certain that such lies and demonstrable lies—success by the late Adolf Hitler. The identity of the Russian and Nazi aims makes inevitable the use of Nazi technique by the Russians, and there is no more striking instance of the use of the Lie Inversion than when the anti-impirealists of Moscow address the American and Washington imperialism. It is not necessary to labour the contrast of the facts of the steady—and amicable—liquidation of the British Empire, which has been taking place simultaneously, with the cynical and relentless conquest of all contiguous and/or otherwise available empires by the United States. This is the perfect setting for the Lie Inversion; in fact, it is the only possible thing for them to use in the circumstances. (In passing, it is interesting to note that Russia has a very large appearance of obliteration which, fortunately for them, does not apply to the Russians or to their friends. It is simply that it cannot be used successfully and whoever has a name of any sense of humour whatever, as in this case the protagonist cannot keep a straight face when he is intellectually complete with a full Order of Bigness and a fact worthy of serious scientific study that a sense of humour is invariably absent in severe cases of Communism.)

Similarly, the Lie Inversion is used to great effect in what might be called the "Masque of the War-mongers: a Most Tragic Comedy of the Betrayal of By the Comrades of the Western World." The Russian Communists—which, of course, is despotism—is war, and it has no other place of consumption. It is nurtured on the destitution and miseries of simple and weak people, and its babul is produced and ripened by war. But though an able, if vindictive, in its attack on war and violence its reality and utility must be hidden from its own unthinking ranks who, by nature, adore war; so—as in the Hitler technique—it is always given out, with whatever brassy impudence is necessary, that it is its victims who are the aggressors.

By contrast, how does the Capitalist—or what is left of him or has taken his place—lives. Since the wretched and Washington of imperialism. It seems most odd that he should ever want or ever have wanted wars. Especially since he is he himself who is going to have to pay for them. The only vestige of justification for thinking that investors like wars is the fact that certain industries do inevitably flourish as a result. For example, industries that exist to supply war material. But even these also supply products of peace, and that would obviously prefer the peaceable stability of settled prosperity with a full Order of Bigness and a fact worthy of serious scientific study that a sense of humour is invariably absent in severe cases of Communism.)

What is the real rub behind such allusions as seems to have come from Khwaja Ahmed Abbas who, in the reply article—"Sri Aurobindo and the Korean War" in Mother India for September 30th, 1950, is quoted as having said: "This is not the voice of Aurobindo. It is the voice of the State Department in Washington, it is the voice of Wall Street, it is the voice of Churchill and of the most rabid war-mongers of Europe and America!" The answer is probably that such muddle is the result of a genuine and spontaneous application of the results of a successful application of the ideas of the philosophy of the Lie Inversion. Churchill, whose heroic mood saved civilization in 1940—as well as the Russians—knows, like Atjana, that we must arise and fight as soon as the enemy attacks. But he has always been, the eternal vigilance of a spirit ready for the fray. It is, of course, usually the very deep, to see his marked-down victim reach for weapons of defence, so no wonder he gets annoyed and says stupid things.

War has become much less likely by reason of the rearming now in train by the free nations of the West. When this armament comes near to matching our old arsenal of weapons and trained men already laid up by Russia it will be even less likely. Yet Khwaja Ahmed Abbas does not worry him into any loss of sleep—we shall not go to war until we see any more than we did in Korea. But the simple knowledge that we shall inevitably go to war if attacked, is the best restraining influence on the arch-Capitalist-Imperialist-War-mongers of the world who are ceaselessly on the watch for whatever and whenever they can devour.
THE MEANING OF EAST GERMAN "ELECTIONS"

By CHRISTOPHER DILKE

An election may be defined as "the choice by popular vote of the members of a representative assembly." This definition, however, cannot be applied to the elections held on October 15 in the Soviet Zone of Germany.

In the first place, there was no choice. The whole thing was a farce. It was a扫黑除恶 campaign, a political spectacle made up of Communists and the remaining 50 per cent of collaborators with the Communists.

No Popular Vote

In the second place, there was no popular vote—nothing, indeed, which could be called a vote at all. The East Germans were simply forced by the Soviets to go to the polling booths and make a demonstration of their submission to the regime.

Finally, it was not a representative assembly which was being elected but a government set up by the Soviet authorities under the leadership of President Potschke, who has no votes in the Bundestag.

Early in the evening, the Berlin Philharmonic gave a farewell concert in the Gendarmenmarkt. It was before a packed audience and was as much a gesture of defiance as the deputation to the Soviet military commander. The music was the best the Berliners could do, and the performance was well received.

The authorities had no control of the ballot boxes. They were very co-operative and when the announcement of the result was made, there was no rioting or disturbance. The Communists were blamed for the poor result, and the Nazis were blamed for the lack of enthusiasm.

The Nazi Method

The Nazis were not satisfied with the results of the elections. They were determined to make a clean sweep, and they were determined to make a clean sweep. They were determined to make a clean sweep of the whole world.

Hundreds of miles. Ideological infiltration will increase enormously. An independent Tibet was the best physical barrier for the Indian mind against the Communist's tenets from upper Asia. She was also our Maginot Line of military protection. Once our frontier with her became a point of contact with a Stalinist Mao, we shall be left naked to a cold cutting wind from the north which, unless we boldly may blow out the light of lights extinguished and cherished for ages in India's heart for the good of the whole world.

OUR COURSE OF ACTION

Our course of action should be pretty clear. It is understood that the Tibetan Government, besides urging Delhi to render every possible help in maintaining freedom in Tibet, has suggested that the issue of invasion be referred to us by the Security Council. The suggestion is sound, and we should carry it out immediately. We have a natural right to do so, since Tibet has very friendly ties with us on the level both of culture and commerce and the Chinese invasion is a rude slap in our face and affects our security the most. But our charge against Red China of attacking without provocation a country whose autonomy is vital to its own people and to us must be accompanied by a definite renunciation of our sponsorship of the attacker's case for a seat on the U.N. This is a very important point. We must not let our friendship with China blind us to the fact that it is not only a country which we have a right to protect, but also one which we have a duty to help. The Chinese have a right to be independent and to determine their own future. We must not let our desire for peace blind us to our duty to stand up for justice.

If we take our courage in both hands and stand by the Tibetan people we shall strike a blow in the cause of freedom and start our country at last on the road. We need no mitigating force to America will gladly lend her. It is wrong to think, as some do, that America unreservedly turned down the appeals made several months ago by Gaylo Tsepad, brother of the Dalai Lama, to the President of the United States for arms aid and for protection against the Chinese threat. Nothing substantial seems to have resulted from the S.O.S.'s. But America had to ascertain whether mere arms aid would be sufficient and also whether the arms supplied would not fall, as in Chiang's China, into enemy hands. When all was said and done, there was the question of India's attitude when a country so closely connected with her was threatened by a new force which already has access to her territory. India must be fully a party to any scheme of supporting Tibet against the Chinese Communists. Facilities of transit along Indo-Tibetan lines must be protected at all costs.

If India co-operates with the U.S.A., President Truman will never hesitate to rush to Tibet's rescue. Britain, because of her interest in India's security, cannot lag behind, and with these three democracies marching in step the mysterious lands of Tibet may once again be free from Communist domination.
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भारत बच्चे के साथ हरे मोटे।

देश रहा कर मेरा सोना
पानी खों कुंडे के हे दुर्गोहोस।

"एक का एक मार"

से हैं भीसी विद्या पानी,
मुझे मेरे क्षणों के रहा मोटे।
माल पोटे के हे दुर्गोहोस।

"पानी करो" के जिस बिना सीता
रविकुल दर में बनाई गईं कोई
कार्य का भाणता होना
माल पोटे के हे दुर्गोहोस।

कहना है कि मनुष्य कर मार
बाण खोट बना बाण खोट,
बाण कर खोट खोट खोट
पीते हुए कोई मोटे।

—महाराजप्रसाद की 'किंदु'
उर की क्रम (कैसे—महापरिप्रेय उपाय)

सरस्वती से हमें पता चला है कि उन सारे भाषाओं के वर्णन, व्यंजन, स्वर लगभग समान थे। हमें नहीं ध्यान दिया कि वे सरस्वती से होने ही थे। उन्हें आगे बढ़ते हुए उनका वर्णन नहीं किया गया। इसलिए हमारा प्रयास उनका प्रतीक्षण करना है।

प्रथम अध्याय: उर की व्याख्या

सरस्वती के सामग्री का उद्देश्य बाहर रखना है। उर का संग्रह नहीं करना है। हम उर को ज्ञात करना है। उर की व्याख्या को हमें आगे दिखाती है।

उर का संग्रह नहीं करना है। हम उर की व्याख्या को हमें आगे दिखाती है।

उर की व्याख्या को हमें आगे दिखाती है।

उर की व्याख्या को हमें आगे दिखाती है।
हमारा युग

—आरोह-अवरोह—

निविदेश खादमनस्ती। भाषक के प्राप्ति में एक धारा उत्कृष्ट होने वाली थी। भीतर १९१० में युद्ध आर्मेड- प्ूर्व के उपस्थिति में ही समाप्त होगा तब जो हमारा निविदेशक था। 

हाल ही तक धाराओं के साथ-साथ साहित्यक नहा युगान्तिकता थी। भीतर के दो नाटक की ओर और कोई अग्रसर का ठुकरा था। ये दो के लोग तो हैं, जो भी फिर भी वे साइन वेलिक का ऐतिहासिक नाम होता है। अब साहित्यिक वर्णन पर तो मेरे दोनों ही पत्रकारों का नाम दांव न उठाना देता है। 

संगीत संगीत हमें संसार के क्षेत्र में नाना संगीतक देखा जा रहा है। निविदेशक की ओर संसार के क्षेत्र में नाना संगीतक देखने के लिए गुरु- निविदेशक का माध्यम से वे भी वहाँ जा रहे थे। 

संगीत का माध्यम से हम अपने साहित्यक का नाम पुरोहित का हो जा रहा है। निविदेशक माध्यम में संसार का नाम है वहाँ जा रहा है। 

संगीत की ओर संसार के क्षेत्र में नाना संगीतक देखने के लिए गुरु- 

निविदेशक का माध्यम से हम अपने साहित्यक का नाम पुरोहित का हो जा रहा है। निविदेशक माध्यम में संसार का नाम है वहाँ जा रहा है।
ग्रामालय स्त्रिकिरण

(हिंदी पत्र पर लिखा)
SRI AUROBINDO, THE LEADER OF THE EVOLUTION

PART II OF "THE WORLD CRISIS AND INDIA"

By "Synergist"

SECTION III: THE NEW WORLD-VIEW
(a) THE SPIRITUAL METAPHYSIC
(b) KNOWLEDGE OF THE DIVINE REALITY

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE

TOWARDS THE HIGHER KNOWLEDGE

In the essay The Nature of Man's Ignorance and its Causes, we saw that human ignorance has, according to Sri Aurobindo, seven aspects. The first is 'the original ignorance'—man is ignorant of the source of his being, the Absolute; the second is 'the cosmic ignorance'—he is ignorant of the Spaceless and Timeless Immortal Self behind the cosmic flux; the third is 'the egotistic ignorance'—he takes his limited ego-personality for his true self; then there is 'his temporal ignorance'—he has no knowledge of his eternal becoming in Time, and thinks that he is just a transient and transient form, made to be his beginning, middle, and end; even in this temporal becoming he is unconscious of his total personality—the inner and higher as well as the nether regions of his being; this is his psychological ignorance. The fourth is 'his ignorance of the becoming' says Sri Aurobindo. He mistakes the mind, life or body, or any one of these or all three for the true principle of what he is and is unaware of that which is meant to determine their operations by its emergence, this is his 'constitutinal ignorance'. Because of these six forms of ignorance man cannot satisfactorily govern his existence, and stumbles through life always hoping and planning but never realising—this is his 'practical ignorance'.

In our search for the higher knowledge then, we must bear in mind the real nature of human ignorance, for it will determine the kind of knowledge we must seek. Only a revelation within our consciousness annihilating this ignorance can possibly be the higher knowledge.

We have seen that the epistemological cause of man's ignorance is the separate and indirect basis of his knowledge, that the psychological cause is the narrow focus of his consciousness in the ego, making him oblivious of its inner and higher ranges and of his inmost soul, and that the ontological cause is the evolutionary level of his being—the mental-vital-physical level; the fourth principle, the Supramental, has yet to emerge in earth-nature and integrate into it the three that have already emerged.

Sri Aurobindo sums up the real nature of human ignorance and limitation in a line when he says that its distinctive character is "a separation of the being from its own integralty and entire reality." This separation is the root cause of the ignorance and unhappiness of man. Therefore the remedy cannot be anything short of a complete and total reunion with the integral Divine Reality, which is the source and essence of the being—or as Sri Aurobindo says, "A return or progress to integrity, a disappearance of the limitation, a breaking down of separativeness, an overpassing of boundaries, a recovery of our essential and whole reality must be the sign and opposite character of the inner turn towards Knowledge. There must be a replacement of a limited and separative by an essential and integral consciousness identified with the original truth and the whole truth of self and existence. The integral Knowledge is something that is already there in the integral Reality: it is not a new or still non-existent thing that has to be created, acquired, learned, invented or built up by the mind; it must rather be discovered or uncovered, it is a Truth that is self-revealed to a spiritual endeavour; for it is there veiled in our deeper and greater self; it is the very stuff of our own spiritual consciousness, and it is by awakening it in our surface self that we have to possess it. There is an integral Self-knowledge that we have to recover and, because the world-self also is our self, an integral world-knowledge. A knowledge that can be learned or constructed by the mind exists and has its value, but that is not what is meant when we speak of the Knowledge and the Ignorance.

"An integral spiritual consciousness carries in it a knowledge of all the terms of being, it leads the highest to the lowest through all the vis-à-vis-terms and achieves an indivisible whole. At the highest summit of things it opens to the reality, ineffable because superconscious to all but its own self-awareness, of the Absolute. At the lowest end of our being it perceives the Inconscience from which our evolution begins; but at the same time it is aware of the One and the All self-involved in those depths, it unveil the secret Consciousness in the Inconscience. Interpretative, revelatory moving between these two extremes, its vision discovers the manifestation of the One in the Many, the identity of the Infinity in the multiplicity of things finite, the presence of the timeless Eternal in eternal Time; it is this seeing that illuminates for it the meaning of the universe. This consciousness does not abolish the universe; it takes it up and transforms it by giving to it its hidden significance. It does not abolish the individual existence; it transforms the individual being and nature by revealing to them their true significance and enabling them to overcome their separateness from the Divine Reality and the Divine Nature.

"An integral knowledge presupposes an integral Reality; for it is the power of a Truth-consciousness which is itself the consciousness of the Reality. But our idea of a truth of reality vary with our status and movement of consciousness, its sight, its stress, its range of things; that this stress can be intense and exclusive or extens, inclusive and comprehensive. It is quite possible—and it is in its own field a valid movement for our thought and speech the absolute Brahman must remain absolute knowledge. In opposition to the view we have put forward or in completion of it—the view of the Ignorance itself as only either a limited or an involved action of the divine Knowledge, limited in the partly conscious, involved in the unconscious, we might say from this other end of the scale of things that Knowledge itself is only a higher Ignorance, since it stops short of the absolute Reality which is self-evident to itself but to mind unknowable. This absolute ignorance corresponds to a truth of thought and to a truth of supreme experience in the spiritual consciousness, but by itself it is not the whole of spiritual thought complete and comprehensible and it does not exhaust the possibilities of the supreme spiritual experience.

"The absolutist view of reality, consciousness and knowledge is founded on one side of the earliest Vedantic thought, but it is not the whole of the ancient thinking. In the Upanishads, in the inspired scripture of the most ancient Vedantas, we find the affirmation of the Absolute, the experience-concept of the cosmic Self and the becoming of Brahman in the universe. Equally, we find the affirmation of the Divine Reality in the individual: this too is an experience-concept; it is seized upon not as an appearance, but as an actual becoming. In place of a sole supreme exclusive affirmation negating all else than the transcendent Absolute, we find a comprehensive affirmation carried to its farthest conclusion: this concept of Reality and of Knowledge enveloping in one view the cosmic and the absolute coincides fundamentally with our own; it implies that the Ignorance too is a half-seen part of the Knowledge and world-knowledge a part of self-knowledge. The Isā Upanishad insists on the unity and reality of all the manifestations of the Absolute; it refuses to confine truth to any one aspect."

The integral knowledge of Brahman is a consciousness in possession of itself together, and that which closes the vision to one side of the truth of the omnipresent Reality. The possession of the Being who is beyond all belongings, brings us freedom from the bonds of attachment and ignorance in the cosmic existence and brings by that freedom a free possession of the Becoming and of the cosmic existence. The knowledge of the Becoming is a part of knowledge; it acts as an ignorance only because we dwell imprisoned in it, avidyāyuktam antare, without possessing that of the Being, which is its base, its stuff, its spirit, its cause of manifestation and without which it could not be possible.

"The higher self-knowledge begins therefore as soon as man has got beyond his preoccupation with the relation of Nature and God to his superficial being, his most apparent self. One step is to know that this life is..."
PART 1

It is said that when the light of knowledge (buddhi) descended on Buddha at the close of his long meditation, the very first words he uttered were: "I have caught thee at last, thy name is thirst (desire)." No more shall thou make me wander from birth to birth, from suffering to suffering."

With an unerring intuition, Buddha thus laid his finger on the prime cause of terrestrial suffering and the greatest enemy of man's spiritual evolution. Renunciation of desire, he taught, was the elimination of all evil and ignorance and the surest means to the extinction of the egotistic human personality, which is a not-self, a mere ephemeral construction of Karma. The Gita affirms the same truth of desire with a repeated and hammering insistence: desire is the arch-enemy of man, the eternal foe of the wise and the origin of obscuration and suffering. Therefore, lay desire, root it out of your nature once for all and desirelessly act in God and for God in the world. In the Upanishads, though the didactic method of the Gita and the Buddhist scriptures has not yet so much developed, the renunciation of desire is woven into the very grain of their teaching, as the following references amply testify:

(1) In the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, in the course of his elaborate reply to Janaka's questions, Yajnavalkya says that when the desires that are even lodged in the heart are eliminated, then the mortal becomes immortal, and even here realizes the Brahman.

(2) In the Chandogya Upanishad (IV—10) Upakoshala says to his preceptor's wife who was importuning him to break his fast, "Is this Purusha (ie, in me) there are many desires running in various directions. I am full of many diseases (maladies of the mind)... I shall not eat."

(3) In the Kaitopanishad Yama says to Nachiketa, "Hardly a wise man here and there desiring immortality swears his eyes inward and seeth the self within him. The rest childishlly follow after desire and pleasure and walk into the snare of Death who gapeth wide for them. But calm souls, having learned of immortality, seek not permanence in the things of this world that pass and are not."

In the words of Christ, "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink: nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on; there is an implicit denunciation of desire and an ardent advocacy of a complete dependence on God.

We find, therefore, that, whatever its spell on deluded minds, under the spotlight of spiritual knowledge, desire stands thoroughly unmasked as the prolific parent of most of life's evils. The progressive rationalistic mind of to-day, if it is searchingly honest, will readily admit this truth; but it will ask in amazement, as Boscott asked Madame Guyon, "If the desires are renounced, how will the springs of life function? Will not life come to a dead stop?" The satienced interrogation is not so naive as it may appear to a hide-bound religious mind; it is perfectly legitimate and merits a straight and serious consideration. Life, as it is normally lived, is apparently geared to desire, and if the desires are reined in, it may be reasonably contended, how can life get on? Is there not a desire or the drive of a purpose (as the Purposivists in modern psychology maintain) behind every human action, as its instigating and impelling force? Will not the stifling of desires mean the stifling of life itself and its motor forces? The Buddhist gospel or the Gita's may be a counsel of perfection, but how in this work-a-day world, in practical life, in this grim struggle for existence, can one renounce all desires and not sink into inertia and stagnation and eventual disintegration? Will it not spell a total defeat and frustration of life's purpose?

The answer, usually advanced by the spiritual man, is that this very defeat of life's purpose is the crowning victory of the soul. You lose the kingdom of the earth in order to gain the kingdom of Heaven. You cannot surely have the best of both worlds, serve two masters at the same time. But the answer falls flat on the modern mind, for, first of all, it cannot believe that life which has brought it to its present state of evolution will stop short at a half-result and betray a sudden bankruptcy of all its resources to carry evolution to any higher perfection. And, besides, it is fired with a synthetic idealism, a supreme gift of the Time-Spirit, which insists on the discovery and realization of unity and harmony in life and

* In the Isa Upanishad we have, however: "Lost not after anyone's possession."
which worked as a lever appears now as an insufferable fever, a futile spell and a mounting frustration. It is more and more clearly perceived by the individual that desires are endless, and endless the uneasiness they cause—uneasiness and anxiety in the pursuit of them, uneasiness and anxiety in the intermittent achievement of their satisfaction and uneasiness, exasperation or corroding grief in their frustration. They allow no respite or peace or a calm, dispassionate view of the meaning and goal of life. They lash and drive man on in a vicious circle. They bar his passage into the eternity and infinity of the Spirit.

What should man do at this juncture? If he gives up all his desires, he fears he may lapse into an inert passive quiescence, the springs of life cease to function, its wheels come to a standstill. A further perfection in terms of life may be barred out for ever. He may slip out of life, if he is so inclined, and merge in some infinite Void or indefinable immutable Existence, but that would be a flight and not a conquest. How to conquer desire and lead a divine, desireless life of joyous freedom, richly and resplendently creative, is the problem man must solve if he is to achieve his highest perfection on earth.

We have seen that desire is an evolved, mentalised form of the hunger which characterises both organic and inorganic Matter, but we have not traced hunger to its ultimate source and watched its primal genesis. If we do that, we shall know what hunger or desire represents in the material world and what it is in its eternal essence. A clear perception of this essence will tend to liberate us from the tormenting yoke of desire and make us revert to the source which is a perennial frost of forms for a manifold fulfillment in life. Once this source is seen in the light of knowledge re-nunciation of desire will cease to be an arduous and painful endeavour, but because, instead, a glad and natural sacrifice offered to the Supreme.

Desire—a Distorted Splinter of the Divine Will

It is said in the Upanishads that in the beginning there was the One without a second. That One desired to be many. This, then, is the first birth of desire; but it is better to call it Will than desire, for, desire, in its ordinary acceptation, means a longing for something which we lack. The Divine lacked nothing: He willed to reproduce Himself in numberless forms, to explore the infinite possibilities of self-formation inherent in Him, to enjoy variously, manifoldly, even in the contrary terms of 'pain and suffering, the eternal, invariable delight of His unconditioned self-existence. This flowering out of the divine Will to self-creation or rather multiple self-realisation and self-expression is an eternal fact of the omnipotent Reality, as much as its immobility and silence. The Will to create argues no want or deficiency in the One who is Absolute, but is a spontaneous play of His Conscientious-Force (chit-tapas). Its purpose in our evolutionary process is a progressive self-manifestation of the Divine in terms of unity in diversity. But in the material formula diversity or division seems to be its primary objective. It creates a myriad centres of the one indivisible consciousness; a myriad units of the one, unitary Existence; countless waves and ripples of the one infinite ocean of Power and Delight; and, breaking itself into splinters, emerges as the dark, blind hunger which we have envisaged as the motive force behind every little movement of organic and inorganic Matter. This hunger is a fragmentary impulse of the one universal Will, but a fragment darkened and deformed in the conditions of the inconscienceness of which it springs. Its business is to organise and consolidate the individuality of each unit, to mark it off from others, so that the original intention of the One to be many may become a concrete fact of terrestrial existence. Passing through a long process of evolution, this hunger turns into conscious desire in man. Based on division, it signifies a pronounced demarcation of the ego and itsetary separation and clear-cut dis-tinction from other egos. This ego is the desire-soul, a dark reflection of our delight-soul, which is a spark of the emperial Fire. When the separative development of the ego is complete and its individuality well formed, its consciousisation tends towards universal immeasurability and infinity. Evolution registers now a new turn. The ego-centric stress gives place to a growing tendency towards self-giving—desire melts into love.

Two Stages of Life

Terrestrial life can then be divided into two stages: the first is that at which the chief preoccupation of Natural life and rigid ego, the dynamic centre of every constructed individuality. Her stress is on multiplicity, on the creation of inextricable genuses and species with distinctive traits and characteristics, on sharply differentiated individualities. From the formation of the atom to that of the full-fledged human in man, the whole stage is marked by a sub-conscious trend or a conscious desire, impelling the growth of the individual unit. The universal Will is stationed between, controlling and co-ordinating the giant interaction of the multifarious hungers and desires of the evolving units, but not obstructing on the surface. It is through the unconscious drive or the sub-conscious urge or, as in man, through desire and a delusive free-will, in each individual unit. Hunger or desire is the distinctive stamp of this first stage.

At the second stage the stress shifts on to unity. The fully-fledged ego in man, smothered under the slavery of desires, yearns to transend itself and attain to freedom and mastery. This new yearning does not originate in the ego, though the ego seems to be its immediate medium of expression, but in the soul—it heralds the replacement of the desire-soul by the delight-soul in man. An increasing unity, harmony, order, loving and joyful mutuality mark this stage at which, in proportion as the individual being is purified of desire and enlightened and widened in consciousness, the divine Will, the sovereign creator and ruler of the universe, unveils itself and takes up the charge of nature. Life does not stop, because desire is dying, but is, on the contrary, immeasurably heightened, widened, quickened, it is the soul of the organism.

It is evident from the foregoing consideration that desire is not the real and ultimate motive force behind the movements of individual and universal nature, but is only an overt incentive to action, a concomitant of ignorance, entailing conflict and struggle and suffering, which are inevitable, even necessary in the egoic phase of evolution. The real motive force is the Will of the Supreme Being, which emerges from behind the confusion and anarchy of individual desires and cravings, as man surpasses his ego and recovers his unity and solidarity with all—with the All and the One in all and beyond all.

Two Attitudes Towards Desire

In spiritual life there can be only two attitudes towards desire: one is that of the ascetic, whose attitude towards all desire is conditioned by sheer will-force and rigorous self-denial, and in straggling desire, struggling or sterilises life itself. He bruises the motor springs of life and inhibits all expansive faculties, cripples all will and initiative till he finds himself sitting upon his own corpse. It is true that the Gita advises the slaying of desire, desire only as the immediate and overt cause of delusion and suffering, and not of the Will behind it, but, certainly, of life itself. The ascetic's dealing with desire, and for the matter of that, with his whole nature, is remorselessly repressive, drastic and destructive. If he succeeds in it, he returns, when his body drops, to the Imine or the Beyond; but if he fails—and the majority fail—there usually results a violent upheaval in his nature, or an obnoxious mixture and disorder, a quasi-psychic state of unresolved anomalies, or a steep fall from the noise and purity so laboriously attained. The Gita deprecates this strenuous, short-sighted, cavalier attitude of the ascetic and gives preference to the second attitude, which is one of equality, detachment and a quiet and persistent rejection of desire as non-existent or as unimportant, to one who believes that God is not only transcendent of life, but also immanent in it; and that it is His unblemished manifestation in terrestrial life that is the object of the soul's descent into birth. A calm and integral rejection of desire for the discovery of the divine Will and its creative play in life, constitutes the cardinal principle of the second attitude, which we shall consider at some length in the next article.

To be concluded in the next issue.
not all, to get at the conception of his own temporal eternity, to realise, to become concretely aware of that subjective persistence which is called the immortality of the soul. When he knows that there are states beyond the material and lives behind and before him, at any rate a pre-existence and a survival on earth which is the necessary element of his identity and life, he becomes, by enlisting himself beyond the immediate moments of Time into the possession of his own eternity. Another step forward is to learn that his survival is not of his only a small part of his being, to begin, forgetting the abyss of the Inconscient and depths of the subjective and subconscious and scale the heights of the superconscient; so he begins the removal of his psychological self-immortality. A third step is to find out that there is something behind the sense of his own life, his Isa, life and mind and soul, and that there is an eternal unending-developing individual soul that supports his nature but an eternal immutable self and spirit, and to learn what are the categories of his spiritual being, until he discovers that all in him is an expression of the spirit seen to the same large revelation, between his lower and higher and his eternal and this existence, thus he sets out to remove his constitutional self-immortality. Discovering self and spirit he discovers God; he finds out that there is a Self beyond the temporal; he comes to the vision of that Self in the cosmic consciousness as the divine Reality behind Nature and this world of beings; his mind opens to the thought or the sense of the Absolute of whom self and the individual and the cosmos are so many faces; the cosmic, the universal, the eternal, the cosmic and the universal becomes the basis of his being... In his attempt to cast his existence into the mould of this enduring self-knowledge his whole view and motive of life, thought and action are progressively modified and transformed; his practical ignorance of himself, his self, his life, his existence, his spirit, he has set his path which leads out of the falsehood and suffering of a limited and partial into the perfect possession and enjoyment of a true and complete existence.

"In the course of this progress he discovers step by step the unity of the three categories with which he started. For, first he finds that in his manifester, his spirit, in the cosmos and Nature, life, mind and soul and self, in the succession of Time, the conscious, subconscient and superconscious, --these in their various relations and the relation of their relations are cosmos and are Nature. But he finds too that in all which stands behind them, on which they depend, he is one with God; for the Absolute, the Spirit, the Self spaceless and timeless, the Self manifest in the cosmos and Lord of Nature,—all this is what we mean by God, and in all this his own being goes back to God and derives from it; he is the Absolute, the Self, the Spirit self-projected in a multiplicity of itself into cosmos and existence and Nature. In both of these realisations he finds his unity with all other souls and beings,—relatively in Nature, since he is one with them in mind, vitality, matter, soul, every cosmic principle and result, however various in energy and set of energy, disposal of principle and disposition of result, but absolutely in God, because the one Absolute, the one Self, the one Spirit is ever the Self of all and the origin, possessor and enjoyer of their multitudinous diversities. The Unity of God and Nature cannot fail to manifest itself to him; for he finds in the end that the Absolute who is all these realisations; he sees that it is the Spirit of whom every other principle is a manifestation; he discovers that is the Self who has become all these becoming; who is the Primal Power of the Self who by her becomes all becomings, of the Absolute who by her manifests all realtivities. He knows her, in other words, not only as material Energy, Life-Force, Mind-Energy, the many faces of Nature, but as the power of Knowledge-Will of the Divine Life being, the essence of all, becoming Infinite.

"Equally, by virtue of this unity, the knowledge of the universe must lead the mind of man to God. For he cannot know Nature as Matter and Force and Life and being brought into consciousness as the relation of mental consciousness with these principles, and once he knows the real nature of mind, he must go inevitably beyond every surface appearance. He must discover the will and intelligence secret in the worlds of Force, operative in material and vital phenomena; he must perceive it as one in the waking consciousness, the subconscient and the superconscient—endless, inconceivable, in the material universe; the world of Nature through these categories in which he recognises his unity with the rest of the cosmos, he finds a Supramind behind all that is apparent, a supreme power of the Spirit in Time and beyond Time, in Space and beyond Space, the sovereignty Power of the Self who by her becomes all becomings, of the Absolute who by her manifests all realtivities. He knows her, in other words, not only as material Energy, Life-Force, Mind-Energy, the many faces of Nature, but as the power of Knowledge-Will of the Divine Life being, the essence of all, becoming Infinite.

"The quest of man for God, which becomes in the end the most ardent and enthralling of all his quests, begins with his first vague conceptions of Nature and a sense of something unseen both in himself and her. Even, if as modern Sciences insist, religion started life on earth as a conception of on-worship and the delusion of natural forces, these first forms only engender in primitive figures a veiled intuition in the subconscient, an obscure and ignorant feeling of hidden influences and incalculable forces, or a vague sentirality which seems to us incomprehensible, in which the invisible behind the visible, of the secretly conscious spirit in things distributing itself in every working of energy. The obscurity and primitive inadequacy of the first perceptions do not detract from the value or the truth of this great quest of the human heart and mind, since all our seeking, including Science itself—must start from an obscure and ignorant perception of hidden realities and proceed to the more and more luminous vision of the Absolute, and this is the way in which the man of knowledge, veiled by the mists of the Ignorance. Anthroposophy is an imaged recognition of that truth that man is what he is because God is what He is and that there is one soul and body of things, humanity even in its incompleteness the most complete manifestation of the Godhead, at least in Nature and the universe, and that the Absolute and the Being are one, that is a partial realisation of the Absolute and the Being. Is it not an imperfect one. That he sees himself everywhere and worldships that as God is also true; but here too he has laid confusedly the groping hand of Ignorance with the faith of Truth—that his being and the Being are one, that is a partial realisation of the Absolute and the Being. Is it not an imperfect one..."
Yeats once wrote to Dorothy Wellesley: "Shaw has written a long, rambling, vegetarian, sexless letter. Disturbed by my concealing 'bad blood' between the nations."

It is curious to find any act of the most efficient fighter of our day described thus. The very efficiency of Shaw's fighting seems to have missed Yeats. Measured against Shaw, Yeats on the war-path can be nothing except quivering rage, with a quizzical sword which he waves about but mostly to cut thin air. Shaw is like a fencing expert, parrying blows and delivering death-wards with such smooth ease, such effortlessness, such absence of violent waste that he appears to many eyes "vegetarian" and "senseless." But you have just to look around and you will see the corpses mounting up. It is also a certain intellectual impersonality in Shaw, a freedom from pseudo-romantic fog, that creates that impression and hides from Yeats the clean supple strength. Shaw may not strike out of sheer feeling; he lifts everything to the cerebral plane—above mere meat and sex, so to speak—but that does not make his activity anemic and impotent. He sublimates his elemental nature into idea-force; that is all. The force is superb and intense—only, it issues through the channel of thought.

"Long" and "rambling" are another pair of inept and superficial adjectives. If Shaw is "long," it is because he is both inexhaustible and many-angled—he has much to fight and plenty of energy to go on fighting. "Rambling" is a misrepresentation of his intellectual fecundity; he has everywhere the fencing expert's skill that never fails to touch the right spot, but he has a multiplicity of strokes and a delight in complex movements and gestures—parrying here, prancing there, driving at the midriff, thrusting at the heart, striking into the jugular. He loves to play with his opponents in an intricate all-rounding manner; he does not want merely to kill, he wants also to expose on as many sides as possible the rottenness of which his opponents are composed; he "rambles" over their whole bodies and attacks them from every quarter and with his entire repertory of strokes either fiercely pointed or furiously sweeping.

And then there is the laughter running through each rapier-flash. Such confidence is Shaw's that he pokes fun with his deadly jabs and cuts cephas while slashing at people's foibles. The cephas-cutting has another aspect too: he acts a bit of a clown while making his antagonists look fools, because he wishes to relieve the duel of overbearingness on either side and to save himself from pompous pretentiousness and the pride that may render him forgetful of his own humanity.

Yeats makes no mention of this double-edged humour. Just as he missed the Shavian ideal of art and ingenious gusto, I suppose he would have dubbed the Shavian laughter lack of seriousness.

Yeats's "blind spot" towards Shaw is regrettable. However, we must not conclude he has less valuable things to give us than Shaw. The two men are different and bring us different treasures. Shaw is the analyst mind and the ironic spirit taking art as their instrument; Yeats the mind of insight and the spirit of aristocracy, fused with the artist. Yeats is certainly more artistic and has in his work a closer touch with inner realities. Shaw does not know these realities intimately even when he champions some mode of them like the Life Force as conceived by him, a vast urge in the world to attain through trial and error a delis conscioussness. The occult, the visionary, the hierarchic are not truly his domain; he can probe them but without getting to their heart, for to get to their heart one needs a glowing intuitive faculty plucking words out of one's depths and not just a sharp intellect with a gift for imaginative rhetoric. Yeats in his own sphere cannot be equaled by Shaw: there is much more food for our souls in a few "Celtic" or else "Byronic" poems of Yeats's than in all the forceful argumentation set to drama in Man and Superman or Back to Methuselah. The same holds good between Yeats's essays and Shaw's preface.

But when Yeats impinges on the field of the intellect, with its demand for an argus-eyed acuteness, he must suffer by comparison with the Shavian genius. Political science, whether concerned with national or international affairs, is not, generally speaking, a poet's matter, what though the poet may have passed from reveries and wizardries to "passionate masterful personality." The early Yeats was a rapt whisperer of enchantments, the later Yeats a man of intense will dabbling in ideas and handling many matters besides au-d-secrets. Still, "passionate masterful personality," go as it may through a noticeable thought-process, does not tend to a satiety-fying play of the intellect proper if made the keynote not merely of poetry where it is quite in place but also of all the departments of one's life. It leads to a marked self-grooved condition, not caring to enter into the skies of those who hold a vision dissimilar to one's own; it encourages neither an open mind nor a real detachment—states that are requisite for genuine intellectual activity.

Shaw too is full of personal penchant: he, nonetheless, works them out like a logician, capable of seeing all the points of his antagonists and therefore capable of cutting them if they are weak or of readjusting his own case to make it more strong. Yeats's temper as well as method is unShavian: even outside poetry he feels like a pontiff and the reasons he brings forth have an air of as of revelation, a tincture of poetry, but he is morally blind to the merits or demerits of a case from the standpoint of the pure intellect which has to preserve a calm dispassionate centre amidst the whirl of personality. A certain intolerant heat and a leaning towards Fascism were characteristic of Yeats in old age. The latter came from a confusion of Fascism with aristocracy and the ignorant strength, the former from that strain in him which developed as a reaction against his early dreaminess and which insisted on the "vigour of blood" and which even made him ridicule in his last writings. Shaw does not lack zest and energy but they are more of the nature than of the blood and his penetratin

Bernard Shaw On Hinduism
From A Letter To Enson Walters

I am writing this in the Gulf of Siam after inspecting a remarkable collection of religions in Egypt and India. The apparent multiplicity of Gods is bewildering at the first glance; but you soon discover that they are all the same God in different aspects and functions and even sexes. There is always one uttermost God who defies personification. This makes Hinduism the most tolerant of religions in the world, because its one transcendent God includes all possible Gods, from elephant Gods, bird Gods and snake Gods right up to the great Trinity of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, which makes room for the Virgin Mary and modern Feminism by making Shiva a woman as well as a man. Christ is there as Krishna, who might also be Dionysos. In fact Hinduism is the oldest and so noble that the profoundest Methodist and the crudest idolater are equally at home in it." (Feb. 1933).

(First published in the "All-India Weekly").
Exhortation

The light that sleeps within, O soul, Awaken till it attain The summit of your consciousness Where only sky-thrills reign.

You see around what you have nursed, No ghosts can loam outside But be the soul withineward. Within their shadows hide.

Fatality subsides but those Who choose not to be free. Who aspire to soul's high courage—bear Joy-bells of liberty.

This birthright claim, unfaltering: If proud you still must be, Be proud of bowing to His will Who outwits destiny.

DILIP KUMAR ROY.

Blue Dawn

I have glimpsed the white and gold of an ultimate Peace— Yet now a blue sun mounts the flaming sky, A blue dawn pressages the soul's release Into the breathing vast of a cosmic sigh.

The earth is ari with desire, the oceans alive To the wind and sun clothed as his, Within their hearing breast— A Constancy, an inexorable drive Urges the life-fires to a wonder crest.

Mind, visioned as an ultimate, crumbles away Leaving a naked Love in splendid hours, And man's beginnings enter the birth of day: Earth to awake, while heaven salutes the Dawn.

A fallen star lies thrilling in the deeps, Though bathed in night it now no longer sleeps.

NORMAN C. DOWSETT.
**THE SCRIPTURE SAYS—**

*By SURESH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTY*

(Translated into English by the author from his original Bengali)

I

The king Dharmakatu was reigning then.

One day the wisemen of the kingdom came and said—"Your Majesty! The Scripture says—this is the Holy Land." The king said—"Yes, this is the Holy Land."

So the wisemen going round and planting stakes put a clear demarcation line all along the frontiers of the kingdom and declared—"This is the Holy Land and beyond this all else is unholy—all are untouchables."

The king said—"Yes, all else are untouchables."

The city-people said—"All else are untouchables."

The village-folk said—"All are untouchables."

The righteous and ambitious king of the Huns of the north had come out with his army to conquer the other kings of the earth. After subjugating all the other sovereigns to the north he was fast approaching the northern frontier of the Holy Land. The people, alarmed, rushed to the king and said—"O King, in your Majesty! where is our army?"

"We have lifted their eye brows. "Go and conquer, graceless!" they exclaimed—"Army! The Huns do not die. They are a different stock. They are now the master of the world."

The king turned to his general and said—"General, make these fools prisoners."

The news reached the king of the Holy Land that his wisemen were made prisoners and the king of the Huns with his army had crossed the frontier. There was panic and confusion everywhere.

The king of the Huns with his army entered the Capital without any opposition anywhere. For full seven days the Hun soldiers plundered the city. Their king said to the king of the Holy Land—"King Dharmakatu, I am thy Ligea Lord, thou art my vassal."

King Dharmakatu said meekly—"O king of the Huns, I am thy obedient vassal."

The king of the Huns with his army went back to his Capital. Before going he said to the general—"Set free the prisoners. They have no use for us."

The wisemen of the Holy Land were set free.

II

King Dharmakatu was sitting on the throne. The wisemen came and with lowered heads stood before him. The king looked mournfully at them. They said—"O king, we have made a mistake."

The king said—"Yes, we have made a mistake."

The city-people said—"We have made a great mistake."

The village-folk said—"Yes, a mistake."

The wisemen then said—"No demarcation line any more. Demarcation line means narrowness. Narrowness means denial of life. Denial of life means denial of its further possibilities. So the seven seas are our demarcation line, the blue sky and our frontier. The whole world is our kith and kin."

The king's face brightened up—"Yes, yes, the whole world is our kith and kin."

The city-people said—"The whole world is our kith and kin."

The village-folk said—"The whole world is our kith and kin."

The Chief of the Barbarians of the south had left his land with his horde for plunder. After plundering many lands he led to the north he was approaching the southern frontier of king Dharmakatu's kingdom. The Wisemen hastened to the king and said—"Your Majesty! The chief of the Barbarians is coming with his horde for plunder. Get an army ready to drive him away."

The king called on the city-people and said—"Citizens! The Barbarians are approaching—come and defend the Motherland."

The citizens in astonishment exclaimed—"Motherland! Where is the Motherland? The whole world is our kith and kin."

The king said—"Your wealth will be plundered."

They replied—"With our wealth we shall go and take shelter under the powerful king of the Huns."

The king went straighteners to the village-folk. They went to the village-folk and said—"Village-folk! the Barbarians are coming—come, take up arms and fight the Barbarians."

The village-folk were puzzled and said—"Why fight? Whom to fight? The whole world is our kith and kin."

The messengers pointed out—"Your wealth will be plundered."

"Ha ha ha, ha ha ha, ha ha ha!" hilariously they laughed to their face. Then after exhausting their laughter they spoke.

"The artisan said—"My wealth is my skill in craft, how can they plunder that, me?"

"The peasant said—"My wealth is my land. How can he steal it?"

The labourer said—"My wealth is my physical fitness. Who can rob me of that?"

In the meanwhile the Barbarians came and plundered the king's treasury and went away.

III

The king Dharmakatsu was sitting on the throne. Crestfallen the wisemen came and stood before him. The king reproachfully looked at them and said—"Your Majesty! we have made a mistake again."

"Yes, we have made a mistake again."

The village-folk said—"Made a mistake again."

The wisemen then said—"A new device has to be discovered—a device in which the demarcation line will not kill the freedom of mind and the freedom of mind will not efface the Motherland."

The king enthusiastically said—"Ah! Yes, I am on the right track.

The city-people and the village-folk in one voice cried out—"Ah! yes, that indeed is the thing."

The new device is still going strong.

---

**White Flame—11 November 1949**

Two minutes of silence reserved for the dead:

Up from the one ground where soldiers bleed

Hons the Mother.

The sweet world-Mother

Of men and of earth,

Trailing her white robe, smiling,

Tenderly reconsoling

The living and dead,

Dying and birth.

Like a flame

On the deep she rose fanned by the breath

Of myriad mouths calling in death

Her face.

Living white incense ascending

Out of a brazier of battles inflaming.

Deep from the heart of the seeing came

The all-knowing—transparently knowing the dead,

The myriad dead are not dead.
One of our chief aims will be to provide authentic guidance in regard to the many important questions which arise in the minds of thoughtful persons all over the world. This cannot be better done than by considering these questions in the light of the writings of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the Master of Yogi in possession of the Eternal Spiritual Truths, but also a Guide and Helper of mankind in various spheres of life and thought. To bring home the light of this guidance and to make it directly available to the people, a series of conversations of common interest along with precise answers directly taken from Sir Arthurcon Doyle's writings will regularly appear in these columns.

Q: A number of thinkers, both ancient and modern, attach considerable importance to the purifying effect of art. Aristotle, for example, speaks of the purifying effect of tragic poetry. Does art exercise a purifying influence?
A: "Aristotle assigns a high value to tragedy because of its purifying force. He describes its effect as katharsis, a sacramental word of the Greek mysteries, which, in the strict discipline of the ancient Greek Theorists, answered precisely to our chitdhah, the purification of the chitta or mass of established ideas, feelings and action habits in a man either by samsara, rejection, or by bhoga, satisfaction, or by both. Aristotle was speaking of the purification of fear, passion and emotions in the heart through imaginative treatment in poetry but the truth the idea contains is of much wider application and constitutes the justification of the aesthetic side of art".

Q: What is the value of beauty in life?
A: "It purifies by beauty... It creates and purifies conduct by instilling a distaste for the course desires and passions of the savage, for the rough, uncouth and excessive in action and manner, and restraining both feeling and action by a striving after the decent, the beautiful, the consistent. It makes real in the sense of which we speak, the manners in the manner of cultivated European society, the elaborate ceremonious life of the Confucian, the careful scholarly and etiquette of Hinduism. At the present stage of progress this element is losing much of its once all-important value, and, when overthrown, tends to hamper a higher development by the obstruction of soulless hypocrisy and formalism. Its great use were to discipline the savage animal instincts of the body, the vital instinct and the lower feelings in the heart. Its disadvantage to progress is that it tends to transmute the prey into the higher feelings of the heart and the workings of originality in thought. Born originally of a seeking after beauty, it degenerates into an external uniformity, to precedent, to dead authority. In the future development of humanity it must be given a much lower place than in the past. Its limits must be recognised and the demands of a higher truth, sincerity and freedom of thought and feeling must be given priority. Mankind is apt to bind itself by attachment to the means of its past progress forgetful of the aim. The bondage to formulas has to be outgrown, and in this again it is the sense of a higher beauty and finest which will be most powerful to correct the lower. The art of life must be understood in more magnificient terms and must subordinate its more formal elements to the service of the master civilisers, Love and Thought".

Q: What is the true relation between the aesthetic sense of beauty and the moral sense of Good?
A: "The good is ordered to the form of the aesthetic sense, but it must be beautiful and delightful, or to that extent it ceases to be good. The object of existence is not the practice of virtue for its own sake but amends, delight, and progress consists not in rejecting beauty and delight, but in rising from the lower to the higher, the less complete to the more complete beauty and delight".

Q: Many thinkers consider the beautiful and the good to be the same. How far is this idea widespread?
A: "Though the idea may be wrongly stated, it is, when put from the right standpoint, not only a truth but the fundamental truth of existence. According to our own philosophy the whole world came out of amanda and returns into amanda, and the triple term in which amanda may be stated is Joy, Love, Beauty. To see divine beauty in the whole world, man, life, nature, to love which we have seen and to have pure unalloyed bliss in this love and that beauty is the appointed road by which mankind as a race must climb to God. That is the reaching to Vidya through Avidya, to the One Pure and Divine through the manifold manifestation of Him, of which the Upanishads repeatedly speaks. But the bliss must be pure and unalloyed, unalloyed by self-regarding emotions, unalloyed by pain and evil. The sense of good and evil, beautiful and ugly, which afflicts our understanding and our senses, must be replaced by akshara rasa, undifferentiated and unalbried delight in the delightfulness of things, before the highest can be reached. On the way to this goal full use must be made of the lower and abridged sense of beauty which seeks to replace the less beautiful by the more, the lower by the higher, the mean by the noble".

Q: What is the effect of the divine good on the mental and the spiritual development of man?
A: "These epigrammatic sentences are difficult to understand. The divine good no doubt seeks only the beautiful, hence on a higher plane good and beauty and all else that is divine in origin meet, coalesce, harmonise. But what men call good is often ugly or evil or unattractive, for nothing is not of the most dyed, deplayed, deplumed, degraded of human instincts. We can see the largeness of the element if we study the ideas of the Greeks, who never got beyond the aesthetic stage of morality. There were four gradations in Greek ethical thought,—the epur, which that is somely or out- narrowly decorous; the dikaz, that which is in accordance with diké or sōnos, the law, custom and standard of humanity based on the sense of fitness and on the codified or uncodified mass of precedents in which that sense has been expressed,—in other words the just or lawful; thirdly, the agathos, the good, based partly on the somely and partly on the just and lawful, and reaching towards the purely beautiful, then final and supreme, the holos, that which is purely beautiful, the supreme standard. The most remarkable part of Aristotle's moral system is in that he classifies the parts of conduct not according to our idea of virtue and sin, but and pures, but by a purely aesthetic standard, the excess, defect and golden, in other words correct and beautiful, mean of qualities".