



SCIENCE AND SALVATION

THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE GREAT RELIGIOUS TEACHERS
IN RELATION TO THE SCIENCE OF CREATIVE PSYCHOLOGY

ROBERT S. deROPP

AUTHOR OF DRUGS AND THE MIND

SCIENCE AND SALVATION

ROBERT S. de ROPP

IN SCIENCE AND SALVATION Dr. de Ropp diagnoses our most desperate present-day ill: emotional immaturity in a world equipped to destroy itself. He believes man's character today is fundamentally that of his fierce, carnivorous, "bashing and bludgeoning" prehistoric ancestors, thinly overlaid with a system of moral controls. If man adhered to these controls they could lead him to a higher awareness and morality. As it is, he is drawn further and further into chaos resulting from his inability to adapt his primitive character to the conditions he has created.

As well as examining man's evolutionary background, Dr. de Ropp surveys the various philosophical and religious systems that mankind has produced. For out of these systems have arisen the controls that could be our salvation. In the second section of the book he therefore discusses the teaching of the great saviors or avatars: Krishna, Buddha, Lao-tse, Socrates, Epictetus, Zoroaster, Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed.

Dr. de Ropp believes that salvation from the anti-gospels that threaten us—Marxism, Nazism, materialism—lies not in the formalities and dogmas of religion, but in the acceptance by each of us of those aspects of the avatars' teaching which are a guide to "spiritual navigation, the formulation of valid aims, the exertion of appropriate strivings to reach these aims, the creation within the higher levels of the nervous system, of the navigator and the steersman, neither of which is provided by nature . . . Only by such individual exertion can a regenerative force be brought to bear on a noisy, glittering, gadget-intoxicated culture in danger of plunging headlong down the abyss created by its own unbalanced development."

Science and Salvation is a book for all with an inquiring mind. It will particularly appeal to readers who have been unable to accept formalized religion, but feel the need of a more eclectic program toward recognized goals.

KANSAS CITY MO PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 0292486 7

234 D43s

62-15045

234 D43s

62-15045

De Ropp \$5.00

Science and salvation

MAIN

MAY 20 1963			

kansas city



public library

kansas city, missouri

Books will be issued only
on presentation of library card.
Please report lost cards and
change of residence promptly.
Card holders are responsible for
all books, records, films, pictures
or other library materials
checked out on their cards.

Science and Salvation

MAY 20 1963

MSIPON

MAY 1963

not.

not.

Books by Robert S. de Ropp

IF I FORGET THEE
DRUGS AND THE MIND
MAN AGAINST AGING
SCIENCE AND SALVATION

Science
and
Salvation

A Scientific Appraisal
of Religion's Central Theme

Robert S. de Ropp

ST MARTIN'S PRESS, NEW YORK

Copyright © Robert S. de Ropp 1962
All Rights Reserved
Library of Congress Catalog Card number 62-11103
Printed in the United States of America

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*The author is indebted to Mr. Alan Watts
for his comments and criticisms.*

231
D-125

For permission to use selections from the following works acknowledged and thanks are extended to these authors or publishers:

Yale University Press: *Psychoanalysis and Religion* by Erich Fromm;

Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center: *The Bhagavad-gita* translated by Swami Nikhilananda;

Mentor Books: *Dialogues of Plato* translated by W. H. D. Rouse.

Random House: *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers* and *The Brothers Karamazov* by Fyodor Dostoyevsky, translated by Constance Garnett.

The Buddhist Lodge: *Tao-Te-King* translated by Ch'u Ta-Kao.

“My personal feeling is strong that the next step to take is to try to see the problem of religion and religious feeling stripped of all trappings, theological, creedal or ecclesiastical. Only through achieving such vision can we begin to understand clearly the real function of religion in the modern state, and also its equally real limitation. That one step is quite enough to occupy the intellectual and spiritual energies of our generation.”

JULIAN HUXLEY.⁽¹⁾

Contents

Part I: EVOLUTION AND ERROR

- Man and His Aims 3
A Parting of Ways 14
The Cerebral Explosion 19
Flesh, Fire, and Ferocity 27
The Two Moralities 33
The Two Technologies 41
By the Waters of Babylon 47
By the Banks of the Nile 52
By the Mounds of the Dead 59
Subman and Superman 66

Part II: THE HISTORICAL SAVIORS

- Krishna and the Cosmic Drama 77
Gautama and the Middle Way 93
Lao-tse and the Perfect Tao 114
Socrates and the Stoics 128
Zoroaster and the Dual World 145
Moses and the Prophets 153
Jesus and the New Commandment 176
Mohammed and the Sufis 196

Part III: ROADS TO THE FUTURE

- The Age of the Antichrist 209
The Five Degrees of Maya 212
Demons and Death Wishes 216

x Contents

The Treason of the Intellectuals	221
Pathogenic Ideas	226
Two Antigospels	230
All Is Permitted	235
Class War	238
The Master Race	243
The Road to the Ant Hill	248
Exiles and Existentialists	258
Allies of the Avatars	264
Sleep and Awakening	280
Conclusions	289
Bibliography	298
Index	305

PART I:

Evolution and Error

Man and His Aims

Man has always sought salvation.

His concern in the beginning was with salvation from physical enemies, carnivores fiercer and stronger than himself, frosts, plagues, hostile tribes of his fellow men. In his struggle against these opponents he managed surprisingly well, using his unique assets, his large brain, binocular vision, capacity for conceptual thought, ability to make tools. He survived and multiplied, becoming by degrees the most numerous of earth's larger mammals. Physical security, for which all living creatures seek instinctively, relying on a variety of adaptations from protective coloration to carapaces and prickles, was attained by man without any of these awkward aids. Naked and vulnerable though he was he yet outlived the cave bear and the saber-toothed tiger. Today he is safer, in the physical sense, than any other creature on earth, though it is within his power, if he so chooses, to destroy all this hard-won security with the same hands that created it.

But the word salvation implies more than delivery from physical danger, from plague, famine, war, and other such

material misfortunes. In different cultures and at different times the idea of salvation became linked with certain spiritual aims. Man's struggle with material dangers was envisaged as only one aspect of a greater war, a war waged inwardly rather than outwardly.

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

The waging of this struggle came to be regarded, both according to the Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition and according to the Hindu, Buddhist, and Taoist traditions, as the most important activity of human life. Only those who engaged in this struggle were regarded as having lived lives worthy of men. Those who refused to fight this spiritual war had lived in no way differently from beasts. To quote from a Tibetan work: *The Elegant Sayings of the Lamas*: (2)

"In eating, sleeping, fearing and copulating men and beasts are alike:

"Man excels the beast by engaging in religious practices.

"So why should a man, if he be without religion, not be equal to the beast?"

The Islamic tradition offers a similar concept, linked this time with a definition of the purpose of man's creation:

"Verily the most High God created angels and set reason in them, and He created the beasts and set lust in them, and He created the Sons of Adam and set in them reason and lust, and he whose reason prevails over his lust is higher than the angels, and he whose lust prevails over his reason is lower than the beasts. . . . Angels and beasts are at rest from war and combat, while Man is engaged in painful struggle between two adversaries." (3)

From the Judeo-Christian tradition comes an equally challenging statement:

“And the devil said unto him, if thou be the Son of God command this stone that it be made bread. And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.”

Thus speaks the voice of tradition, transmitted through the great religions of mankind. But we who live in the age of science, surrounded by all the magnificent, complicated, speed-giving, labor-saving, pleasure-giving, life-giving and death-giving devices that a rampant technology has thrust upon us, find the old religious traditions challenged by new concepts concerning the aim of man's existence. These suggest that the quest for spiritual salvation is an outmoded aim having no meaning for modern man. It is said that this whole concept of salvation was never more than a dream, a piece of wishful thinking on the part of a few visionaries who hoped to remold man closer to their heart's desire in defiance of the laws of biology. The quest for salvation was merely a reaction to the pain, danger, disease of the pre-scientific age, a comforting escape from an ugly reality, which offered joy in a hypothetical life-to-come to compensate for sorrows in the here and now. We, the lucky enjoyers of the fruits of a technological revolution, are entitled to smile indulgently over the struggles of our forebears to attain what they fondly considered to be salvation. We can sit back among our comfort-giving gadgets, fed, clothed, protected, amused and assisted by a host of ingenious mechanical devices, and conclude that contemporary science has made the whole concept of spiritual salvation meaningless.

This point of view, though by no means universal, is certainly exceedingly widespread. Centuries of religious fervor, much of it hypocritical, destructive, and misguided,

have ended in general skepticism. Besides, the entire worldview of modern man has been radically altered by scientific discoveries. The neat sandwich which was once man's universe with God on top, the devil below, and man in between is accepted as a working model only by the most naïve. The astronomers have thrown open a window on the cosmos through which comes an icy blast from infinite space. The size of the universe has become unthinkable. Objects have been detected at a distance of six-billion light years from the earth. The sun is a speck on the edge of the galaxy, the earth a mere dust mote circling this speck, the galaxy itself merely one of billions of other galaxies. As for man, what's so special about him? In our galaxy alone there must be billions of planets. Of these planets, we can safely assume that many are inhabited. Among these inhabitants we can guess that many have developed intelligence. We are not unique. We are not the chosen people or a chosen species, but only one of thousands, perhaps millions, of biological systems that have become sufficiently integrated to manifest what we call mind.

While the astronomers have thrown open this window on infinite space and put earth in its insignificant place on the fringe of the galaxy, the Darwinians have knocked out the props from under Jacob's ladder and put in its place a roulette wheel. Jacob's ladder, set up between earth and heaven, was a very important symbol in the ancient world. In a more sophisticated form it was represented by Aristotle's concept of the Great Chain of Being. This began at the inorganic level and rose steadily up through plant forms, animal forms, human forms until it merged with the Divine Being, God, the fount and origin of all things. The idea gave man an aim in life because it assured him that, by his

conscious strivings, he could progressively purify his soul and become reunited with the source from which it arose.

Modern biology has no use for the Great Chain of Being. The process of evolution is represented not as a gradual unfolding of a grand design to give an interrelated whole stretching beyond man to mingle with God. On the contrary the whole process is conceived as being the result of an enormously long series of accidents. No Creator, by divine fiat, set the process in motion and no God saw that the results were good. Instead, in the primeval seas, a completely random set of chemical reactions brought into being those proteins and nucleic acids out of which, in the course of millions of years, arose cells and organs and ultimately thinking beings. There is not, the Darwinians assure us, one shred of evidence to suggest that the process which gave rise to *Homo sapiens* was planned and directed. Random mutations passed through the sieve of natural selection. Those that aided their possessor in the struggle for existence became a permanent part of the stock in trade of the species. Possessors of harmful mutations were weeded out.

Thus the orderly chain of being conceived by Aristotle and incorporated more or less intact into the Christian concept of the universe was replaced by a roulette wheel operating according to chance.

“Natural selection, though like the mills of God in grinding slowly and grinding small, has few other attributes that a civilized religion would call divine. It is efficient in its way—at the price of extreme slowness and extreme cruelty. But it is blind and mechanical, and accordingly its products are just as likely to be aesthetically, morally and intellectually repulsive as they are to be attractive. . . . Not only is natural selection not the instrument of a god’s sublime pur-

pose, it is not even the best mechanism for achieving evolutionary progress." (4)

Thus writes Julian Huxley, expressing the now widely accepted post-Darwinian point of view. Professor Gaylord Simpson has made a similar comment on this problem:

"The evolutionary process is not moral—the word is simply irrelevant in this connection—but it has finally produced a moral animal. Conspicuous among his moral attributes is a sense of responsibility, which is probably felt in some way and to some degree by every normal human being. There has been disagreement and indeed confusion through the ages regarding to whom and for what man is responsible. The lower and the higher superstitions have produced their several answers. In the post-Darwinian world another answer seems firmly clear: man is responsible to himself and for himself. "Himself" here means the whole human species, not only the individual and certainly not just those of a certain color of hair or cast of features.

"A world in which man must rely on himself, in which he is not the darling of the gods but only another, albeit extraordinary, aspect of nature, is by no means congenial to the immature or wishful thinkers. That is plainly a major reason why even now, a hundred years after *The Origin of Species*, most people have not really entered the world into which Darwin led—alas!—only a minority of us. Life may conceivably be happier for some people in the older worlds of superstition. It is possible that some children are made happy by a belief in Santa Claus, but adults should prefer to live in a world of reality and reason." (5)

This passage formulates very vividly the skeptical attitude that has developed as a result of the Darwinian concept of evolution. There is much that is admirable about this spirit. It is forthright and courageous. It drives

man out from under his old comforting assumptions to face the world alone. No heavenly father sits up aloft to look after him or to help him from making an utter fool of himself. The new teaching leaves him shelterless to face the storm of life like old King Lear without even a Fool to comfort him. The prospect, however, is rather bleak and we can hardly be blamed for uttering the Fool's comment:

"Prithee, Nuncle, be contented; 'tis a naughty night to swim in. Now a little fire in a wild field were like an old lecher's heart, a small spark, all the rest on's body cold."

This "little fire in a wild field" can be looked on as a symbol. Man needs an aim towards which he can strive, a distant light on reaching which he can concentrate his efforts. The concept of the Great Chain of Being offered him such aim. By conscious effort and progressive self-purification man could ascend to levels of being higher than his own. To quote again from the great mystic of Islam:

"I died a mineral, and became a plant.
 I died a plant and rose an animal.
 I died an animal and I was a man.
 Why should I fear? When was I less by dying?
 Yet once more I shall die as man, to soar
 With blessed angels, but from angelhood
 I must pass on. All except God perishes.
 When I have sacrificed my angel soul,
 I shall become that which no mind conceived.
 O, let me not exist! for Non-existence proclaims,
 To Him we shall return." (6)

Such a concept of evolution, ending in extinction of the personal ego and its reabsorption into the source from which it came, could offer great consolation to the bewildered man, struggling to answer the question; "For what

shall I live?" It offered also the comforting concept of a Divine Intelligence of which our human intelligence is but a weak copy and of a Divine Law of which our human system of morality is also a weak copy. It put the universe on a solid moral foundation.

The modern view of evolution removes from man all these consoling concepts. Professor Simpson would lump these concepts together, define them as a part of what he calls the "higher superstition" and equate them to a child's belief in Santa Claus. Undoubtedly Professor Simpson and those who think as he does are performing their proper function as objective scientists. They are saying, in effect: "This is the conclusion we must draw according to the available evidence." And they might add, to justify their harshness in taking from children their faith in Santa Claus (or from adults their faith in God): "It is better to know the truth however terrible than to take refuge from it in a system of consoling delusions."

So when the scientist assures us that no God takes an interest in us and that man is only responsible for man we may accept his statement and still not feel satisfied. For we are likely, unless able to live as placidly as cows, to ask questions about the aim of our existence. It can easily be argued that we would be better off if we did not ask such questions and that, by asking them, we merely make ourselves miserable, constantly striving to reach some distant goal instead of happily sitting back and enjoying the present. Yet there is born in man this tendency to be dissatisfied with his present level of being and to strive toward a different condition which he vaguely perceives as being higher than his present one.

So, if the scientist takes away from us the old traditional

aim of attaining spiritual salvation, we are entitled to ask him what aim he will put in its place. This may embarrass him for he is apt to devote his energies to almost any problem except that of defining the proper aim of man's existence. If one blames him for this he will reply that defining aims is not his problem, for science studies things as they are, not things as they will be or should be or might be.

Little, however, is gained by such evasions. There is a need to study this problem of aim because so much that is dangerous in our present situation is the result of lack of definition in this respect. The present tension, which seems to increase from decade to decade and might end in disaster for the whole human species, results from a conflict of aims between two large segments of earth's human population. But, when one comes to examine the conflict, it appears that neither side really knows what it is after.

Ostensibly the quarrel is about human rights; shall man be free to pursue his personal aims or shall he be a puppet of the State. But the clear-cut opposition of a spiritual to a materialistic philosophy of life is lacking. Indeed it seems at times that the United States, leader of the Free World, vaunts her material wealth rather than her Declaration of Independence as a symbol of her glory, saying to Russians and Chinese: "See what riches! What an abundance of things!" To which these nations reply: "You have indeed abundance now but the time will come when we will be richer than you are." This reduces the great conflict to a mere competition in greed, with two huge power groups struggling to demonstrate which can squander more rapidly the dwindling resources of our planet. Of course there *are* spiritual elements involved but in so far as it consists of two

rival materialisms, the earth-shaking struggle that now imperils the human race is as senseless as the excesses of two small boys at a pie-eating contest.

So the scientist, being largely responsible for the structure of our modern world, both for the comforts we enjoy (greater than any other people has ever known) and for the perils we confront (also greater than any other people has ever known) can hardly avoid studying this question of aim. In the course of such a study he is bound, as an impartial student, to reflect that the attainment of spiritual salvation is an aim which has been ardently pursued by men in the past and which still affords to many people today a guiding light toward which they can steer. Nor would the scientist be justified in assuming that all who steer toward this light are deluded fools.

"To no one type of mind is it given to discern the totality of truth. Something escapes the best of us." (7) Thus wrote William James in his study on the powers and limitations of science which should be required reading for every scientist today. Something escapes, that is certain. But if the scientist is performing his function properly he will constantly try to extend his net in order to reduce the escapes to a minimum. To do this he must examine carefully other points of view and not be too ready to conclude that, because they do not seem to fit into the model which he has constructed of the universe, those other points of view are necessarily wrong. Thus, when Professor Simpson lumps together both primitive and more evolved religions and labels them "the lower or higher superstitions" he is being almost as dogmatic as were those church dignitaries who labeled every belief other than their own an abominable heresy. No one can deny that there are elements of superstition in all the great religious traditions. In every

instance the original teachings have become the nucleus for formalized religions. The more formalized these religions the more obscured the original teachings have become. Like moss growing over a stone a proliferation of dogmas, rituals, theological speculations, myths, and miracles have concealed the basic psychological ideas until the whole religion has come to appear a mere collection of empty forms and ceremonies.

But to dismiss the religious traditions as mere superstition because they have become overgrown with dogmas and rituals is unjustified. It is far more scientific and much more useful to try to remove these encrustations and to examine the psychological ideas which lie beneath them. For these are the vital essence of the religious traditions, the dogmas and rituals being merely by-products of the labors of theologians who, like industrious cocoon builders, have always enveloped every great truth in a maze of speculations as unprofitable as they are unprovable.

A Parting of Ways

“I look out into the world of men, and see a sight that fills me with unspeakable distress. The world seems simply to give the lie to the great truth, of which my being is so full. I look into this busy living world and see no reflection of its creator. To consider. . . the defeat of the good, the prevalence and intensity of sin, the dreary hopeless irreligion. . . all this is a vision to dizzy and appal, and inflicts upon the mind the sense of profound mystery which is absolutely beyond human solution. And so I argue: ‘If there be a God, the human race is implicated in some terrible, aboriginal calamity.’ ” (8)

These words of Cardinal Newman were written at the end of the last century. Today, with two World Wars and all their attendant horrors behind us and with the prospect of total thermonuclear destruction ahead, we can echo the Cardinal’s words with a good deal of feeling. “Some terrible aboriginal calamity. . .” Or, if we wish to express the same idea in language more congenial to the scientist, we can say that there occurred a failure in adaptation—an evolutionary error which rendered the species that made it

incapable of realizing its full promise and which may finally bring about its decline and extinction.

This concept of an evolutionary error provides a clue which, like the thread of Ariadne, can lead us through the labyrinth of the religious traditions and enable us to study scientifically the concept of spiritual salvation. For there is one thing about which all the religious traditions agree. *An error occurred.* They do not, for the most part, speculate as to when it occurred and few of them try to describe why it occurred. They are concerned rather with describing the consequences of the error in terms of human suffering and in detailing the means whereby the error can be corrected. For they all hold that such correction is possible, otherwise man's position would be hopeless and there would be no point in striving for salvation.

So what was the error? Speaking in general terms we can say this. In the course of man's evolution, owing to certain peculiarities in the structure of his nervous system, there became incorporated into man's psyche a *delusion-creating mechanism*. This mechanism became an integral part of his ego and has worked at all times and in all cultures to sever his contacts both with nature and his fellow men, to isolate him in a web of ego-centered errors and incite him to various forms of harmful and destructive activity. The religious traditions called the mechanism by different names. In the Hindu-Buddhist-Jain tradition it is called *maya*. The Chinese Taoist tradition called it being "out of harmony with Tao." The Judeo-Christian-Islamic as well as the Zoroastrian traditions personified the mechanism calling it Satan, Iblis, Ahriman or the Father of Lies. The Platonists referred to it simply as delusion, illustrating the situation by that famous parable of the prisoners in the cave.

To discover when the evolutionary error occurred which later placed such obstacles in the way of man's harmonious development we must go back along the spiral of earth time to that point at which the hominids parted from the pongids. These two branches of the primate stock probably had a common ancestor, *Proconsul africanus*, who appeared in South Africa during the Miocene and gave to both lines of his descendants certain features they have in common. Today the *pongid* branch of the primates is represented by three species of apes, the gorilla, the chimpanzee, and the orangutang. The *hominid* branch, of which there have been several species, is now represented by only one, earth's dominant mammal and major trouble-maker, *Homo sapiens*.

Let us glance for a moment at the pongids and compare their characteristics with those of *Homo sapiens*. Judged by the standards which man uses to measure success the pongids are all failures. Their numbers are small, they are confined entirely to tropical habitats, there is every likelihood that they are headed for extinction, crowded off the planet by their more aggressive relatives.

Why does this fate await them? The blind process of evolution has equipped these creatures with considerable advantages. They have large brains, quite adequate hands, great muscular strength. They have, however, a preference for a quiet life, and their passion for keeping out of trouble seems to have prevented them from using to the full any of their natural assets. As a dwelling place they have chosen tropical jungles in which life is easy and foes few. Strict vegetarians, eaters of shoots, fruits, and nuts, they have never acquired a taste for slaying their fellow creatures either for food or for fun. Content with little and devoid

of ambition they dwell in their tropical hideouts as innocent and inoffensive as Adam and Eve before the Fall.

Man, whose built-in mechanism for creating delusions causes him to see almost everything upside down, has endowed at least one of these pongids, the mighty gorilla, with the quality of ferocity and aggressiveness. How untrue! How unfair! This hermit of the high forests asks only to be left in peace. Wrote Alan Moorehead, who climbed unarmed up the lost volcanoes between Uganda and the Congo, to pay a friendly call on these huge pongids: "The gorilla is a gentle, kindly creature, a most forgiving ape who lives at peace with all the other animals, and his reputation for savagery and belligerence is nothing but a myth." (9)

A most forgiving ape. His enormous strength would make it easy for him to seize a man and pull off his head with one tug. But he does not use this strength. Although he is not progressive in the human sense and has never invented a plough, a wheel, or a spindle, neither has he devised an atom bomb and roasted, in one searing flash, 30,000 of his fellows, nor chased and harassed the other creatures of the earth until he can justly be regarded as the greatest bully that ever existed. The savage qualities with which men have endowed him are but projections of those all too human qualities, cruelty, destructiveness, and love of violence which are so much a part of the make-up of the genus *Homo*.

A forgiving ape indeed! He has much to forgive.

But amoral and indifferent nature has little use for the qualities of gentleness and harmlessness. So these hermits of the forest are headed almost surely for extinction. By contrast, *Proconsul's* other descendants, neither gentle nor

harmless, seem on the point of overgrowing the planet like a veritable cancer, assuming that they do not first exterminate themselves with their own inventions. What enabled these creatures to gain such spectacular predominance?

The Cerebral Explosion

One thing can be said for the other line of *Proconsul's* descendants which gave rise to the hominids and ultimately to man. They were adventurers from the start and approached the business of living in a do-or-die spirit which has remained with them ever since. Abandoning the security offered by the trees these gangling, awkward, ill-protected creatures had the temerity to come down and fend for themselves on terra firma standing on their hind legs.

Imprudent beasts! Walking on one's hind legs had not been used as a means of locomotion since the Age of Reptiles, except of course by the birds, but the birds had solved their security problems by modifying their forelimbs to enable them to take to the air. The ill-shaped prehuman had no wings. His dangling arms ended in weak, poorly armed hands, feeble structures indeed compared with the ferocious claws of the great predators. The world into which this adventurer emerged was open and sunny with grassy savannas replacing the former jungles. In it were herbivores who relied on swift feet to carry them

out of danger and savage carnivores with outsized fangs and claws to match. A dangerous world. By all the laws of uncompromising nature that gangling pre-human who had neither swift feet, cruel claws, nor protective coloration should have suffered early extinction. For all we know (the fossil record tells us almost nothing about this stage of man's existence) he may have been on the verge of extinction on several occasions. Almost certainly he was never abundant, was barely able to hold his own against his enemies, his life one long struggle to capture food for himself and to avoid becoming a meal for something else.

It is quite probable that this adventurous primate would not have survived at all had there not occurred, sometime in the Pleistocene, an event that radically altered the evolutionary prospects of the hominid line. We can call this event "the great cerebral explosion." It is an example of one of those extraordinary evolutionary spurts that take place from time to time and which represent one of the most tantalizing aspects of the evolutionary puzzle. We do not know, nor are we likely to discover, what force it was that triggered this sudden development. All the evidence suggests, however that in about 500,000 years* (a mere moment by the geological time scale) the brain of man doubled its size. By the time of the Second Interglacial (about 300,000 years ago) it had attained its present magnitude since when its dimensions appear to have remained about the same. (10)

This explosive expansion of man's cerebral cortex had

* Dr. Leakey's recent discovery of *Zinjanthropus*, the "Nutcracker Man," appears to demand a revision of this time span. This very early hominid was a toolmaker and existed about 1,750,000 years ago.

about it an almost pathological quality. The huge new cerebrum (neopallium) rose like a massive tumor to fill the capacious cranium of *Homo sapiens*. It was not a malignant growth in the true sense of the word, the neopallium being composed of perfectly normal nervous tissue. It did, however, represent a very unbalanced development of the nervous system which, though it bestowed on its possessor certain very real advantages, contained within itself weaknesses that later came to constitute a threat to the welfare or even the survival of *Homo sapiens*.†

We would, perhaps, be guilty of exaggeration if we declared that the over-rapid expansion of the cerebral cortex was an evolutionary error for which man will have to pay the same price as did Brontosaurus for erring in the opposite direction. But we can, with some confidence, assert that here, in the great cortex, the trouble started. The roof brain grew too far too fast, and the older, more primitive regions of the brain failed to keep up with its development. The result was a disharmony which man, collectively, has so far been unable to correct.

There is in man a hierarchy of brains. They range from the spinal brain in the central column which initiates only the simplest reflex actions, through medulla oblongata, cerebellum and midbrain to the cerebral cortex or roof brain that co-ordinates the whole. Of special importance is the mesencephalon, the midbrain, which lies in man right underneath the great cerebral hemispheres at the point at

† Lancelot L. White has also expressed this concept: "The proper differentiation of the nervous system thus was converted into the conflict of cortex and hypothalamus, of reason and instinct." (*The Next Development in Man*, The Cresset Press, London, 1944)

which they are connected. The enormous importance of this midbrain stems from the role it plays in the elaboration of emotion and the arousal of that state which we call consciousness. The midbrain is primitive and ancient, in the sense that it evolved long before the great roof brain, the cerebral cortex. Within it are centers which regulate the oldest and most primitive urges, the desire for food and drink, the desire for sexual activity. Here also lie the roots of the primitive passions, fear and rage, anger, hatred, the primordial patterns of spitting and snarling which have played and which still play so large a part in the shaping of human destiny. Here also lies the pleasure center, that source of the generalized sense of well-being which, when it operates adequately, makes life seem worth living even when it fails to offer any specific rewards. Both sin and salvation seem to have their roots amid the tangle of neurones which constitute this ancient midbrain and from which they emerge like orchids on a tropical tree, the flowers of evil and the flowers of good.

The midbrain by itself is sufficient to maintain an animal's vital functions. A cat with its entire cerebrum removed does not die. Milk put into its mouth is swallowed; acid is rejected. Prick its foot and it will withdraw the limb. It can stand and walk, may even purr. It is, however, a complete automaton. In the words of the great neurophysiologist, Sir Charles Sherrington, this decerebrate animal has no "thoughts, feelings, memory, percepts, conations. . . . The mindless body reacts with the fatality of a multiple penny-in-the-slot machine to certain stimuli." (11)

What applies to the cat applies equally to man. Accidents which destroy the upper brain but leave the midbrain undamaged result in the production of a human automaton, a mindless creature incapable of real thought

or real feeling. For the manifestations of that elusive entity we call mind, the presence of the roof brain, the cerebrum, is essential.

It was precisely this cerebrum, or "new mantle," that exploded so dramatically in *Proconsul's* hominid descendants. In other mammals the cerebrum evolved with the distance receptors, that is to say the organs of smell, vision, and hearing. But in man the hugely expanded cerebral cortex supplied brain power far in excess of that which is needed to cope with the impressions these senses transmit. These vast areas of the cerebral cortex crowded the sensory and motor areas down into the fissures of the brain convolutions. It was from these new areas that man derived the special capacities that set him apart from all other animals in the biosphere. By these he was endowed with a capacity for creation or destruction, for moral sense, questioning, goal-seeking, beyond the immediate needs of his physical body.

That the midbrain did not enlarge after the fashion of the roof brain is a natural result of its position, packed as it is into the depths of the cranial cavity and wedged between the two cerebral hemispheres. Failure of this part of the brain to evolve would, one might confidently predict, give rise to an unharmonious being. The magnificent "new mantle" or neopallium spread out over the body of a naked savage lurking in the old brain whose patterns of behavior were not merely Neanderthalish but positively Australopithecine. And this primitive brain, harboring as it does all manner of murky residua from savagery, distorts and disturbs the workings of the cortex, converting this fine instrument into a menace to its possessor.

These distortions particularly affect the part of the cortex concerned with speech. The capacity for speech and for

writing is confined to very definite cortical regions, particularly the area of Broca that lies in the brain by the third convolution of the frontal lobe. This area and others concerned with speech and writing are the anatomical bases of man's civilization. All the pongids lack these areas. They can neither speak nor write. (12) For this reason they cannot "bind time" (to borrow a phrase from Korzybski). They cannot hold on to past experience and supplement it with present experience. Nor can they distill from daily events their conceptual essence and store those essences in the form of words, in a capacious recorder (memory) from which they can be taken as required.

The innocent pongid, lacking the cortical areas that organize speech and writing, can never build up a collective intellect. Man can and does. His collective intellect is a gigantic framework within which the brains of countless individuals constantly interact through the media of speech and writing. Moreover, because of the time-binding quality of writing, this interaction includes not only living brains but the products of the brains of men long dead. Within the pattern of our modern thoughts are elements derived from long-forgotten Sumerians, from Babylonians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Indians, Chinese. We reach out in thought and, in a fraction of a second, pass back in time as far as the third millennium B.C. The finest abstractions of the Athenians, the most practical inventions of the Romans, the metaphysical speculations of the Hindus, the astronomical discoveries of the Bablonians are all instantly available to our minds.

Constantly, day after day, without even realizing it, we send out feelers into the collective intellect drawing from it ideas, inspirations, methods, guiding principles, laws. Severed from contact with the collective intellect our in-

dividual brains, however highly developed, would be severely limited as to what they could know. Connected with it even a mediocre brain can become well stocked. A fairly bright high-school student in a modern society can know more than did Aristotle, not because he has a better brain than had the great philosopher but because his links to the modern collective intellect have provided him with pieces of the world puzzle that were not available to the learned Athenian.

Speech and writing, capacities man acquired as a direct result of the cerebral explosion, were certainly instrumental in shaping his destiny. They were not unmixed blessings, however, and their power over man was as likely to lead him down into new depths as up into new heights. The great new cortex created the words, but the old primitive savage in the midbrain reached out for those words and endowed them with emotional content. Thus the words took on lives of their own, became freighted with all manner of terrors, and capable of exerting hypnotic effects on those who used them, of provoking varieties of more or less insane behavior of which the innocent and wordless pongids were quite incapable.

Thus at a very early stage in his development, the word-forming capacity in man's brain became converted into a potential danger to its possessor, a mechanism for the creation of delusions capable of inducing attacks of collective insanity during which men, simply because they had become hypnotized by certain emotionally overcharged words, would start killing each other and destroying each other's cities, their contact with reality cut off by the potent distorting mechanism in their own psyche.

The lack of harmony between the overexpanded cerebral cortex and the relatively primitive midbrain produced

other disastrous results. Whereas the collective intellect developed explosively, the collective conscience (emotional equivalent of the collective intellect) remained on a rudimentary level. This explains why man of the twentieth century, despite technological achievements of considerable magnitude, has been guilty of collective atrocities which might have brought a blush to the hairy features of *Australopithecus*. It explains the extraordinary casualness with which contemporary man discusses, among the cocktails and canapés at his afternoon jabberfests, the prospect of total thermonuclear war and its attendant horrors. They will roast us, we will roast them. A bombs, H bomb, N bombs . . . all discussed without a blush, without a grimace, without shame or any impulse to resign from the human race as if roasting the entire population of a large city were the most natural thing in the world. A curious phenomenon, demonstrating once again that the expansion of man's cerebral cortex took place without any corresponding development in the midbrain, a primordial hell's kitchen in which are brewed the crude patterns of emotional behavior that, though they may once have aided man's survival, now merely serve to imperil his very existence.

Flesh, Fire, and Ferocity

Compare again the innocent unsuccessful pongids with those hominid descendants of Proconsul whose successes have been too spectacular for their own good. Observe another difference that has developed between these two groups of primates. It is an important difference and consists in this. The hominids, quite early in their headlong career toward triumph and tragedy, acquired a taste for meat.

They *acquired* the taste. Nowhere else among the primates will you find meat eaters. The pongids are vegetarians to the last ape. Monkeys relish meat only when their brains have been damaged. Thus Klüver, after removal of a large portion of a monkey's temporal lobe, observed that the creature, besides acquiring an insatiable appetite for sexual intercourse (both homo and hetero) also devoured with every sign of relish "ham, bacon, ground beef, broiled lamb chops, smoked whitefish and other kinds of meat." (12a)

These, however, were very abnormal monkeys who had certainly departed from the dietary pattern characteristic of

primates in general. The hominids also departed from this pattern without the excuse of having damaged temporal lobes. Their acquisition of a taste for meat had far-reaching consequences for their descendants. It injected into the breed that strain of carnivorous ferocity which distinguishes the aggressive hominid from the gentle pongid who stuck to a diet of fruit and nuts. One can argue that, had the hominids not acquired this pathological taste for meat, they might have evolved into a very much pleasanter creature than is their last surviving representative, *Homo sapiens*. On the other hand they might not have evolved at all. Their acquisition of a taste for meat was fully as influential in shaping their destinies as was their acquisition of an overgrown cerebral cortex, converting them from relatively harmless retiring vegetarians into aggressive, restless, violent, ruthless carnivores. It stamped them with the mark of the killer and they have worn that badge ever since.

When did the change take place? We cannot say for certain. The fossil record is fragmentary. The evidence obscure. It would seem, however, that that breed of African man apes whose remains Dr. L. S. B. Leakey unearthed in the Olduvai Gorge and who bear the name *Australopithecus* were definitely hunters. Bones of rats, mice, frogs, pigs, and antelopes have been discovered associated with the Australopithecine remains. Furthermore all the evidence suggests that these precursors of man did not rely on their bare hands. Even at this early stage, more than 500,000 years ago, these precursors of the genus *Homo* had learned the art of making tools. A creature that lacked both claws and fangs but which had flexible hands, a large brain, and binocular vision had at that time already discovered one of the less edifying facts of life—that the surest way to

prevent one's prey from escaping is to bash in its brains with a rock, a bone, or a club.* (13)

Tools. Tools for destruction. The hominids, as they progressed, were to learn to make many tools. And man, the last of the hominids, was the greatest toolmaker of them all. But tools for killing came first, were man's first love, for they were intimately concerned with his leading pre-occupation which was how to find wherewithal to fill a ravenous stomach.

So earth was confronted with a new phenomenon, Man the Toolmaker. Life was destined never to be quite the same. A meat-eating semi-ape with a top-heavy brain and an unlimited capacity for self-deception had started to reconstruct its environment. Earth's crops and creatures were destined to conform to the pattern he imposed. In a mere instant of geological time the meddlesome toolmaker would unlock such energies that he himself and all other forms of life would find themselves threatened with fiery annihilation.

No inkling of such distant perils troubled the naked savage who fashioned his crude hand axes near what is now Abbeville. It was eat or be eaten. Slaughter or perish. These were the only laws he knew. For this creature had chosen a rough road, breaking once and for all with his innocent pongid cousins. Those amiable apes stuck to tropical habitats. But man, the tough predatory hominid, dared Nature to do her climatological worst. He even stood his

* For a lively account of some of the qualities of *Australopithecus* and their possible consequences for *Homo sapiens* the reader should consult Robert Ardrey's recent book, *African Genesis* (Atheneum, 1961).

ground before the Fourth Ice Age though there seems no reason why he should not have taken the easy way out and retreated before the glaciers into the tropics. But he stood his ground. Whatever other accusations the offended Immortals may level against the last hominid they cannot say he lacked courage. He faced the ice. He lived with the ice, wrapping himself in the skins of beasts he had slaughtered, warming himself by the fire, the method of making which was one of his supreme discoveries.

A shivering episode! One can hardly help thinking, when one reflects on man in the Ice Age, that a splinter of that cold substance lodged in his heart which all the warmth since then has not sufficed to thaw. Nature's unmitigated harshness evoked a corresponding harshness in man. Whereas he had formerly been a meat eater from choice he now became one from necessity. During those cruel millennia of glacial time, in a frozen world of the hunter and the hunted, he rapidly developed into the fiercest killer of them all. From the moment he awakened until the moment he slept his thoughts were concerned with killing. It was to kill that he emerged from his rocky shelter, it was to kill that he organized his tribe. His main preoccupation was how to fashion instruments that would kill more effectively, axes that would cleave, spears that would pierce, arrows that would fly and extend his killing power. His art, when he developed art, concerned itself with the beasts he hunted. His religion, when he developed a religion, was designed to bring, by magical means, the desired beast within reach of his spear.

His slaughterings, often vast in scale, were apt to be wanton and wasteful. In France a huge graveyard of wild horses containing the bones of perhaps 100,000 beasts marks the spot where Cro Magnon man made a yearly

practice of stampeding herds of these animals over a conveniently placed precipice. What could he do with such huge quantities of meat, without refrigerators or any other storage facilities? He ate what he could and left the remainder to rot. Such were his habits. A wasteful killer.

So killing formed the center of the existence of those early men who, as the Ice Age gripped the continent of Europe and conditions grew increasingly harsh, slashed and clubbed and bludgeoned their way through the centuries of prehistory. *Homo ferox*, man the ferocious, was the name by which he should have been known, for he was certainly more *ferox* than *sapiens*, more fierce than wise. There is no point in blaming him for this. He was a victim of circumstance. Having made his decision to remain in the North and face the ice he had no alternative but to kill in order to eat, for agriculture had not been discovered and the earth in those glacial regions did not bring forth enough fruit to keep a man from starving.

There can be no doubt, however, that those countless centuries of harsh experience left a mark on the psyche of man which nothing that followed has been able to eradicate. To apply to the theme of a latter-day poet a Paleolithic variation:

He liveth best who basheth best,
Both man and bird and beast.

This was the grim lesson which nature dinned into his head as the fourth glacial period gripped the earth in a seemingly interminable winter. This was the challenge and man responded to the challenge. One can say, if one wishes to moralize, that it brought out the worst in him, it engraved the habit of killing in his psyche until it almost attained the status of an instinct. In fact, if one wishes to be

fanciful, one might even label man's meat-eating propensities as the biological basis of original sin which entices him further and further from the innocent existence in the trees still being enjoyed by his distant relatives the pongids, leading him along a slippery path which has ended in bloodshed, murder, and total war. It would hardly be accurate, however, to talk about sin in this connection. Man had very little alternative. Having abandoned the shelter of the trees and decided to remain in the frozen North he had to become a hunter and a killer or face almost certain extermination. Then as now man had a fierce appetite for remaining alive.

The Two Moralities

Two major components have now been defined, both of which contributed to the formation of man's built-in mechanism for generating dangerous delusions. The first is the lack of harmony between old brain and new. The second is man's departure from the vegetarian primate diet in favor of one more suited to a carnivore. The latter modification placed a premium on skill in killing. It insured the selection, over the ages, of the most aggressive, ferocious, cunning, and merciless types. It weeded out milder, gentler sorts of men, except, perhaps, in those more tropical environments in which survival was not so dependent on the skill of the hunter. Had this selection in favor of ferocity not occurred the disharmony in man's brain might not have proved so dangerous to its possessor. But given this ingrained tendency to bash and bludgeon plus a delusion-creating mechanism in the nervous system and clearly one has the ingredients of a tragedy.

This tragedy began to take its familiar form as soon as the moderating climate made possible more intimate social

intercourse between human groups. Man of the Old Stone Age did little socializing. The very rigors of the frozen landscape kept families separate and prevented their fusion into larger groups. But the fourth and last Ice Age drew to a close about 20,000 years ago. With imperceptible slowness the ice sheets withdrew. A thousand lakes and rivers were left behind and forests crept northward over the frozen tundra. Man in northern Europe reacted to this change. During the period known as the Mesolithic which began in Europe about 8,000 B.C. men gradually ventured out of the caves in which they had sought shelter during the bitter age of ice. A brighter more cheerful world invited them to enjoy its larger bounty. There were forests filled with game. The newly formed lakes and rivers teemed with fish. After surviving the frozen harshness of the Paleolithic Period the adventurous descendants of *Proconsul* faced pleasanter prospects.

So they moved into the open and, by way of shelter, built huts for themselves by the edges of sparkling lakes whose abundance of fish offered a safeguard from famine. The skill of man the toolmaker, *Homo faber*, now swiftly expanded in response to the challenge offered by his altered surroundings. The tools of the fisherman supplemented those of the hunter. Some Mesolithic genius, twisting the slender willow wands that grew in profusion by those ancient lakes, discovered the art of making traps for fish. Another primitive genius invented the net. Yet another, stretching the skins of animals over a wooden frame, devised a convenient boat, light enough to be carried by one man.

Community life, community effort, both became possible during the Mesolithic period. The tribe began to replace the family as a social unit. And with the emergence of the

tribe, of tribal loyalties, tribal symbols, tribal mysteries, came a new challenge, the challenge of territorial rights.

This is an ecological problem which confronts every living creature, plant or animal. On a given square mile of land only so many living things can exist. A square mile of forest or prairie will support just so many vegetable eaters (rabbits, deer, etc.) and a proportionally smaller number of meat eaters (ferrets, foxes, coyotes, men). Of course, if man changes the cover of this square mile, plows up the land, plants crops to suit his needs, the entire picture changes. But Mesolithic man had no knowledge of agriculture, and depended on hunting and gathering of seeds, nuts, berries, roots, and fruits. The size of his tribe depended on the size of his hunting ground. He did not own the land but he used the land, and his territorial rights were vital to his survival.

The marking out of territory is not a special characteristic of man. Several other mammals and many birds have developed this trait. On the whole, however, they manage to guard these territories without the wholesale ferocity which man has come to regard as permissible in this connection. The prairie dog (*Cynomys ludovicianus*) which builds its underground towns in the Great Plains is a very clannish creature with an intense awareness of its territorial rights. The clan is the basis of the town's social organization. Members of the same clan meet with lavish displays of affection. Whenever they meet they kiss, and this kiss, according to Dr. John A. King, who has devoted much time to the study of these little creatures, is primarily a means of distinguishing friend from foe. When a clan member, foraging on the edge of its own territory, passes into an adjoining territory, a resident of that area will rush up to drive it away.

“The invader may be only a few feet outside its own territory and, failing to recognise that it is trespassing, may refuse to yield. The ensuing struggle is a stereotyped ritual that consists more of threat than fight. The animals rush towards each other, stop short and freeze face to face. Then, in a kind of reverse kissing encounter, one of the disputants turns and spreads its tail, exposing its anal glands, and waits for the other to approach. The latter cautiously draws near and sniffs. Then they exchange roles; they alternate in this way until the stalemate is broken by an attempt of one to bite the rump of the other. The ‘bitten’ contestant (prairie dogs are rarely scarred) backs away a few feet and then returns to the fray. The dispute is often accompanied by much rushing back and forth and repetition of the smelling encounters. Finally some arbitrary boundary is established and the antagonists return to their foraging. Such disputes rarely result in boundary changes of more than a few feet and rarely in injury to the contenders.” (14)

Sensible beasts! How much more dignified would have been man’s “ascent from the ape” had he been able, at some early stage of his evolution, to devise a mechanism for settling territorial disputes as innocuous as that developed by these little rodents of the Great Plains. In fairness to man one must admit that such mechanisms have been devised occasionally in more or less isolated human societies. One of these was the Morioris of New Zealand of whom James Michener has written in *Return to Paradise*: “Profoundly peaceful, they outlawed war and settled arguments by play-duels, the mock battle ending whenever a contestant cried ‘Behold! I bleed!’ For centuries they lived in quiet peace. Then the warlike Maoris fell upon them, killed the

men, carried off the women. In 1930 there was only one Moriori left alive." (15)

This sad little story points to a lost opportunity. Man, the meat-eating primate, *might*, early in his evolution, have learned to settle territorial disputes at least as sensibly as does the prairie dog. Might have but did not. For the kind of restraint shown by the prairie dogs (and also by the Morioris) did not appeal to members of the genus *Homo* in general. An innate ferocity, acquired as a result of the adoption of a carnivore's diet without a carnivore's justification, compelled these unbalanced, delusion-plagued hominids to adopt the double standard of morality which has bedeviled them every since.

This double standard relates to the morality of killing members of one's own species, a practice not generally engaged in by mammals. Man of the Mesolithic Age had probably already adopted one standard of morality relating to killing within his family and tribe. He learned that such killing was not profitable, that it weakened the tribe, that it broke down the basis for social cohesion on which so much depended. There was, after all, an instinctive basis for non-killing in the family. The impulse to protect and cherish the helpless young, common to both birds and mammals, was particularly strong in man. It had to be for a very obvious reason. In no other species are the young born so utterly helpless. In no other species do they remain helpless for so long.

This kindly impulse to protect the young certainly did much to offset the innate ferocity which man acquired when he abandoned his vegetarian diet and took to hunting for a living. The milder pattern of behavior at least prevented him from devouring his own offspring (as did

Australopithecus if Dr. R. A. Dart is correct in his surmising). It even extended to include other members of the tribe so that well before the Neolithic Revolution one moral rule had been widely accepted. You shall not kill members of your own tribe. Such killing is evil. It is taboo. It is murder.

But what about members of other tribes, especially those whose hunting grounds abut one's own? What about killing them?

Here the innate ferocity of the hominid, coupled with the delusion-producing mechanism in his psyche, led man to a fateful and possibly fatal error. His more generous impulses failed to extend into the next territory. He feared and hated the stranger. He cast all moderation aside in dealing with his neighbors. Far from being satisfied, like the prairie dog, with a more or less standardized ritual in the course of which boundary disputes could be settled without resort to anything more dangerous than a nip on the rump, man early concluded that no fate less than torture or death was bad enough for members of other tribes who dared to intrude.* This infliction of death on intruders was not condemned. It was not called murder and he who in-

* Some authorities maintain that man's reliance on unlimited violence for the settlement of territorial disputes originated not in the Mesolithic societies but was acquired later. "Paradoxically the cruel belligerence that is popularly considered the epitome of human nature reaches its zenith in the human condition most removed from the pristine." (15a) But whenever this behavior pattern evolved few would deny that it early became ingrained and that it seems to form an integral part of what is loosely called "human nature."

flicted it was not guilty of an outrage. Far from it! He was a hero, a mighty warrior, entitled to praise and honor and to have his deeds immortalized in epics.

So the fateful double standard was set up and has persisted to this day. Killing within the tribe is murder and execrable. Killing in the name of the tribe (or nation) is praiseworthy and heroic. We cannot tell when this double standard first arose but, by the Mesolithic Age, the path man followed was already slippery with the blood of his own kind. The hunter was turning into the warrior and the weapons of the hunt were evolving into the weapons of war. In addition to indulging in warfare there is evidence that Mesolithic man was developing a taste for still more sinister activities. The neatly cracked human bones found in Mesolithic camp sites near Erdbollen in Jutland leave little doubt that the people who inhabited those sites indulged in cannibalism. Not content with slaughtering their fellow men they also devoured their bone marrow and brains, thereby enlivening a monotonous diet which consisted almost exclusively of shellfish. Farther south, at about this time, members of the Tardenoisian culture near what is now Bavaria, were indulging in the questionable practice of collecting human heads. (16)

Destruction for its own sake, cruelty for the sake of cruelty, monstrous superstitions, crude magical practices, cravings for prestige based on the pride of the warrior . . . already at that early date the nastier potentialities of *Proconsul's* second line of descendants were beginning to reveal themselves. Man, the meat-eating primate, after boldly abandoning the security offered by the trees, stood up on his hind legs, freed his hands for tool-making, endured hideous privations during the last of the Ice Ages, emerged with tools, knowledge of the use of fire, clothes,

and an appetite for meat as the most destructive and most effective of all predators, a predator which, not content with preying on other species, also turned his weapons against his own kind in deliberate, socially organized forays known as wars.

The Two Technologies

The Neolithic Age, or New Stone Age, which started about 6000 B.C., saw far-reaching changes in man's mode of living. During the Neolithic Revolution Man the Hunter turned into Man the Farmer. It was one of the most dramatic events in the history of life on earth, equaled or exceeded in importance only by the Industrial Revolution which began in the eighteenth century.

Security, the jewel for which all living things seek, was largely assured to man as a result of the Neolithic Revolution. No longer utterly dependent on nature's casual bounty, liable to surfeit one day and starve the next, he now could tell from what source his next meal would come. The fruits, the berries, the wild grasses with their nourishing grains were no longer left to grow at random. Some genius, man or woman, having observed that seeds cast out on the refuse heap would, in due season, give rise to plants which bore more seeds, hit on the expedient of burying a few seeds in some patch of ground previously broken and prepared.

Agriculture dawned. In the Fertile Crescent that lies

between the Caspian and the Jordan, the march began which ended in a full-fledged civilization. Here there were unravaged uplands rolling to the foothills of the Zagros Mountains, open and fertile park lands studded at intervals with clumps of shade-giving trees. Here were natural meadows golden in harvest time with expanses of primitive grain, borne by the grasses that later gave rise to our cultivated wheats and barleys. Wild sheep were here, and goats and cattle and swine. All the ingredients of agriculture were waiting here for the hand of man, the organizer.

The hand was applied, uncertainly at first, later with more assurance. Soil, previously unturned, yielded to the crude stone mattock. Patches of grain, mingled with weeds and wild flowers, spotted with a patchwork of gold the Mesopotamian highlands. Ceres, goddess of the harvest, began to take over from Diana the huntress. Man the harvester, or perhaps woman the harvester, for much of the early work was done by women, entered the fields armed with sickles of hard-baked clay, gathered the grain in baskets of woven straw, rubbed off the husks in corrugated vessels of clay.

The art of cookery was expanded at about the same time. Previously a crude affair of broiling over a bed of coals it now attained refinements as vessels of baked clay made possible the stewing of meat or grain. Now too the art of the baker began to emerge as the crushing or milling of grain between two stones presented those early cooks with coarse flour which, moistened with water and baked in brick ovens, gave man his first taste of bread. Nor did the brewer's art follow far behind that of baker. It was soon found that the same grains which could be made into bread would, if permitted to sprout, yield a sweet malt which, left in water, fermented to form beer.

Cakes and ale and some leisure to enjoy them . . . these were the ingredients necessary for civilization. Milk as well as meat soon became available. Perhaps the playful kid or the frisky lamb was originally brought home to the village as a pet. Domestication took place. Herds, watched over by children to keep them out of the fields, added new wealth to that already being enjoyed by these Neolithic men whose stone implements had acquired polish and whose users stood on the fringe of civilization. The wild ox, the fierce unco-operative pig, and the swift horse were added one by one to the list of man's associates, trading their previous freedom for the rule of a foreign species. Man the predator no longer had need to hunt for prey. The tameness of these domesticated beasts made the art of the hunter obsolete.

Here too there developed a division in man's way of life leading to trouble and strife in times to come. Domestication of beasts created conditions suited to a wandering as opposed to a settled mode of life. So there arose at this time communities of nomads, dwellers in tents, who followed their flocks from place to place. Hardy, uncluttered, contemptuous of the settled life, they posed from the outset a threat to the permanent settlements. Between wandering herdsmen and the settled tillers of the fields there developed enmity, which flared at intervals into orgies of destruction, culminating in the ravages of the Moguls whose cruelty and destructiveness were unequalled until men of the twentieth century set new records.

So Proconsul's adventurous offspring, after surviving the perils of a million years of evolution, solved his central security problem. He did it without growing a carapace like an armadillo, without developing fangs and claws like a tiger, without putting all emphasis on swift movement like

an antelope or covering himself with prickles like a hedgehog. He managed, through no conscious choice of his own, to avoid all the pitfalls that lie in wait for the specialist, faced raw nature with bare hands and clumsy feet, clawless and fangless, a gambler who had left the sheltering trees to take his chances on the ground. Now his gamble was about to pay off. On the Neolithic horizon the sun of civilization was about to dawn.

Homo sapiens may be said to have exploded into civilization, much as a stack of ill-cured hay may burst suddenly into flame through the hidden reactions which lead to spontaneous combustion; or like some slow chemical reaction which, through the addition of a catalyst, begins to proceed with explosive rapidity. If we accept the period of one million years as representing the span of man's existence as a species and regard civilization as dating from 3000 B.C., then all man's major technical advances may be said to have occurred in less than one per cent of his temporal span.

A technological explosion. . . . And like most explosions it had a destructive aspect. This aggressive meat-eating primate, who had bashed and bludgeoned his way through a million years of prehistory, did not, on emerging into the light of civilization, leave his nastier patterns of behavior behind him in the jungle. Scarcely had it been born before his civilization reflected the inner disharmony of its creator, a disharmony rooted in the very structure of the human brain. All the technical achievements of civilization, the wheel, the loom, the spindle, the kiln, the arts of the metallurgist and the smith, were products of that great roof brain, whose rapid expansion had given to man his technical ingenuity. But still, beneath the great cerebrum, lurked the primitive midbrain, little affected by the arts

of civilization, deeply imprinted with the behavior patterns of savagery impressed upon it by all those centuries of bludgeoning.

So, from the very start, the creative technology of civilization was linked to a second destructive technology which, like some strangling creeper clinging to the branches of a young tree, developed parallel with the technology of civilization, impeding the growth of the latter and tending to bring it to a halt. The existence of these two opposed technologies threatened, from the very start, the foundation of man's newly discovered security.

"The culture of barbarism," wrote the philosopher, P. D. Ouspensky, "grows simultaneously with the culture of civilization. But the important fact is that the two cannot develop on parallel lines indefinitely. The moment must inevitably arrive when the culture of barbarism arrests the development of civilization and gradually, or possibly very swiftly, completely destroys it. . . ."

"The root-cause of the evolution of barbarism lies in man himself, in him are innate the principles which promote the growth of barbarism. In order to destroy barbarism it is necessary to destroy these principles. But we can see that never since the beginning of history as we know it has civilization been able to destroy these principles of barbarism in man's soul, and therefore barbarism always evolves parallel with civilization. Moreover barbarism usually evolves more quickly than civilization, and in many cases barbarism stops the development of civilization at the very beginning." (17)

A pessimistic conclusion? Certainly. But one which has the support of historical facts. For the technology of destruction has flourished from the very beginning and has turned the story of civilization into a gory melodrama,

noisy and bloody like the last act of the *Götterdämmerung*. However splendid the dwellings men have built for themselves or their gods they have always sooner or later pulled them down in ruins. The air has resounded with shrieks and lamentations, the sky has glowed with fire, the earth dripped with blood. Between the ruins of Ur (destroyed by the Elamites in 2025 B.C.) and the ruins of Hiroshima (destroyed by the Americans in A.D. 1945) stretches an unbroken chain of ruined cities, mute memorials to the strife between the technologies of civilization and of barbarism.

By the Waters of Babylon

That potent mechanism for generating illusions which had become an integral part of the psyche of man proved a threat to his civilization from the very beginning. To see how this destructive force operated we can look at the history of three early civilizations. One arose in Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates, one in Egypt along the banks of the Nile, and one in India in the valley of the Indus. Each set a pattern to be repeated again and again of a flowering civilization blighted by the parasitic growth of the technology of barbarism.

Consider the Sumerians. It would appear from the earliest records that they made a fine start. To begin with they avoided the trap of excessive social stratification. In the protoliterate period which lasted from about 3600 to 3000 B.C. their social organization was essentially democratic. There were no leisure classes and no native slaves. Each citizen had certain obligations, to work in the temple fields and on the irrigation canals and dikes. Each citizen had his allotment of land and received rations in return for his services to the city god. At seed time and harvest

everyone combined to work on the land, whether they were merchants, craftsmen, soldiers or priests. The soil was rich and there was no real poverty. Even the slaves, mostly prisoners of war, could engage in business, borrow money and buy their freedom (price about ten shekels, less than the price of an ass). So far as the citizenry were concerned everyone lived more or less alike.

During this phase of primitive democracy the technology of civilization flourished. From the standpoint of science and invention it was probably more fruitful than any other period of human history prior to the Renaissance. It gave us the wheel, introduced what is known as the Bronze Age, engendered arithmetic, writing, representational art and monumental architecture. It was a time of lively creativity when the technology of civilization flowered in a bland democratic climate, when the darker aspects of the human psyche remained more or less in the background.

This harmonious state of affairs ended all too soon. That delusion-producing mechanism in the human psyche, which tends to make each individual consider himself superior to his fellows, worked in the souls of these early Sumerians. "I am better than you. My city is better than yours. My gods are more powerful than yours." This old, sad song was heard in the Mesopotamian plain as the formerly more or less unified culture began to fragment into separate city states. There was Ur and Uruk, Nippur, Umma, Lagash, Enlil and Kish; each a walled city, each dominated by its temple, each convinced of its superiority. As conflicts grew more frequent the organization of the city states grew more militaristic. The old democracy was replaced by tyranny as chiefs and rulers struggled for more power. The whole

Mesopotamian plain resounded with the clash of arms. The technology of barbarism grew swiftly and began to overtake the technology of civilization. (18)

There was worse to come. In a fertile highland country in the region where now stands the city of Mosul a Semitic-Akkadian people calling themselves Assyrians had evolved a military state. Ferocity and love of cruelty were innate in the temperaments of these Assyrians. They bear the questionable distinction of being the most brutal people that have ever demonstrated to a shuddering earth just how revoltingly the genus *Homo* can behave. Devoting their entire energies to developing the technology of destruction they created in their standing army one of the most terrible instruments of war the world has known. Their soldiers were the first to be equipped with weapons of iron, the first to recognize the full potential of cavalry, the first to employ siege machinery. Their battering rams and fighting towers were as high as city walls. Armored in metal they were almost as invulnerable as modern tanks.

These devotees of the technology of destruction swept into the Mesopotamian plain, there to write a new chapter in the story of human ferocity which, even at that early date, was quite sufficiently long and gory. Far from being ashamed of their cruelty the Assyrian kings boasted of their deeds, describing their favorite methods of torturing their foes with a relish worthy of the Marquis de Sade. There was no modesty about them either. Witness this inscription from the pavement slabs at the entrance to the temple at Calah.

“To the giver of life, the god Abu who dwells in the city of Calah I, Assur-nasir-pal do pray, the mighty king, king of the universe, king without a rival, king of the whole

quarters of the world, the sun of all peoples, favorite of Enlil and Urta, the beloved of Anu and Dagon, the mighty hero who treads on the neck of his foe. . . .”

As for the way in which he treated that foe, Assur-nasir-pal spared the reader no details.

“I flayed all the chiefs who had revolted. I covered a pillar with their skins. Some I walled up within the pillar, some I impaled upon the pillar on stakes. Three thousand captives I burnt with fire. Their corpses I formed into pillars. Their young men and maidens I burnt with fire. From some I cut off their hands or fingers, from others I cut off the noses and ears. Of many I put out the eyes. I made a pillar of the bodies and another of the heads. I devastated . . . I destroyed . . . I carried off spoil . . . I burned with fire. . . .”

The document becomes a trifle repetitive at this point but the reader will get the general idea. Sennacherib, scourge of the Israelites, was still more inventive.

“With the bodies of their warriors I filled the plain like grass. Their testicles I cut off and tore out their privates like the seeds of cucumbers in June. I raged like a lion. I stormed like a tempest. The chilling terror of my battle overcame them and they voided their dung into their chariots in fear.” (19)

Here was *Homo ferox* at his savage worst. To call him bestial is to insult the beasts for nowhere in the animal kingdom does one find this wanton pleasure in destruction and cruelty. A cat will play with a captured mouse before devouring it but it does not impale other cats or tear out their testicles. This is the special peculiarity of *Homo ferox*, the outward and visible expression of the inward and psychological disharmony between an immense cerebral cortex and a primitive midbrain, not much more highly

developed than was that of *Australopithecus*. Nor can modern man console himself by reflecting that Assur-nasir-pal performed his atrocities a very long time ago and that times have changed. Times have indeed changed, but they have not halted the progress of the technology of destruction. Besides the burnings, blastings, atomizings, and wholesale exterminations of the twentieth century even Assur's worst efforts seem rather amateurish.

By the Banks of the Nile

Should one conclude from the sorry story of Sumer that civilization must inevitably be strangled by the parasitic development of the technology of destruction? Must the growth of the latter always outstrip that of the technology of civilization? Must it always bring down in ruins all that men have created? The bloodstained story of the Mesopotamian plain is certainly not reassuring. Babylon lies in dust to this very day. Sumer, but for the labors of archeologists, would not even be remembered. And the ruin of this culture was the work not of Nature but of *Homo ferox*, the supreme destroyer.

The story of Egypt's civilization is different from but hardly more reassuring than that of Sumer.

In the beginning Egypt found its unifying principle in the god-king concept, a social device which several civilizations found convenient for promoting unity in an otherwise divided population. It worked. From the time of King Menes, who founded the First Dynasty around 3100 B.C., to the time of Pepi II, who ruled for ninety-four years and died about 2280 B.C., tranquillity was the rule. The Old

Kingdom, which included the whole of the Nile Valley from the First Cataract to the sea, remained throughout this period united, prosperous, and at peace. This peace resulted, in part, from the natural protection afforded to the Nile Valley by its surroundings. To the east and west lay the burning deserts of Sinai and Libya. To the south rose the fortress-like ramparts of the six cataracts. To the north lay the blue expanse of the Mediterranean Sea.

Though it may not appeal to members of a culture obsessed with the importance of democracy, the Old Kingdom of Egypt must be regarded as one of man's most distinguished productions. Assured of stability this people expended a minimum of energy on the technology of destruction, exerting themselves instead to advance the useful arts. By the beginning of the Third Dynasty (2700 B.C.) they had developed a highly organized state complete with central government, taxes, and an annual census. Daring, creative, and resourceful they strove to increase their control over their environment. From the papyrus plants that grew in the marshes bordering the Nile they made the first paper and, to go with it, invented ink. In complex hieroglyphics they wrote the earliest books; they invented the first calendar, made the first advances toward scientific medicine ("In medical knowledge," wrote Homer, "the Egyptian leaves the rest of the world behind"). Their exquisite statues were wrought in media as various as alabaster and granite-hard diorite. Lovers of line and color, they portrayed in their paintings the details of their everyday lives. As for their architecture, never before or since have such monuments been raised as the Great Pyramid or the Sphinx, the gaze of which seems to look beyond time into the depths of eternity.

The social cement provided by the concept of the god-king

did not prove strong enough to hold the Old Kingdom together indefinitely. Nearly a thousand years flowed peacefully unmarred by strife. Then, about 2200 B.C., the fateful human tendency toward separatism shook the entire structure of the Egyptian civilization. The godlike majesty of the king no longer sufficed to control the primitive taste for bashing and bludgeoning which, despite nearly a thousand years of civilization, still persisted in the psyches of these very cultured Egyptians. Suddenly the ancient order was replaced by chaos. Trade ceased, temples and tombs were ravaged, wealth melted away. Throughout the Nile Valley nobles and priests fought and slew one another. Such was the confusion that at one time there were seventy kings in seventy days. The agonies of anarchy, long familiar to the Sumerians, now descended on the inhabitants of the Nile Valley, plaguing them with every variety of self-inflicted grief.

"The land spins round as does a potter's wheel," lamented the prophet Ipu-wer. "The robber is now the possessor of riches. The children of nobles are dashed against the wall. A man may be slain on his own roof."

Egypt's Age of Innocence was over. She had entered, to use Toynbee's phrase, on her Time of Troubles. And to cure these troubles no other remedy was available but the very violence which had engendered the trouble in the first place. As Sumer's quarrelsome cities had been forcibly reunited by the conqueror Sargon so Egypt's unruly princes were subjugated by the Theban kings, ambitious, powerful and conscientious men who restored to Egypt her unity and her ancient glory.

Once again Egypt enjoyed peace, prosperity, and order, a condition which continued for about 200 years when she confronted the second curse of civilization, the threat of the

Outer Barbarians. The barbarians, in this case, were the Hyksos, a restless horde of Asiatic tribesmen who, according to the historian Josephus, were the forefathers of the Jews. Temporarily overwhelmed by these invaders, the Egyptians hastened to devote their attention to increasing their mastery of the technology of destruction. The Hyksos introduced into Egypt the horse, the chariot, and body armor, examples of the technology of barbarism which the Egyptians were not slow to adopt. Soon, with the very weapons the Hyksos had taught them to use, they drove the invaders from the land. Determined not to suffer again the humiliation of foreign domination they applied themselves to mastering the arts of war. They abandoned their old isolationism and adopted a concept of national security based on distant frontiers. Conquering their neighbors they surrounded themselves with a ring of satellite states.

The leaders of the new militaristic Egypt were Thebans. They were not quite as wantonly savage as their Assyrian counterparts, but were none the less lively students and practitioners of the technology of destruction. Like the Assyrians they endowed their god with the same bloodthirsty characteristics as they themselves had developed. Sang Thutmose III in a hymn to Amon:

“I have come, giving thee to smite the princes of Zahi.
I have hurled them beneath thy feet among their highlands.
Thou hast trampled those who are in the district of Punt.
I have made them see thy majesty as a circling star.
Crete and Cyprus are in terror.” (20)

They were indeed. Thutmose had no doubts as to what was the best means of pursuing his foreign policy. He harassed his neighbors with such enthusiasm that the Egyptian empire became the greatest in the world, extending

from the Nile to the Euphrates. Thebes became the center of the ancient world. Homer, centuries later, was to sing of the gleaming treasures of "hundred-gated Thebes."

At about this time, in the middle of the fourteenth century B.C., there occurred in Egypt an event of enormous significance. For the first time in recorded history a ruling monarch consciously attempted to alter the pattern of human behavior and to discover a less violent means of uniting men. The man who tried this bold experiment was Akhnaton, great-great-grandson of Thutmose III who had been the founder of Egypt's empire and her material greatness. Born of a line of fighting kings, this strange being had few of the physical attributes of his ancestors. His body, flabby and deformed, combined narrow, sloping shoulders with a swollen abdomen. His face, preserved for posterity in a lifelike statue, had a thin ascetic cast with narrowed eyes which seemed to gaze at some distant vision of perfection, eyes which contrasted strangely with the thick sensual lips.

What was this vision of Akhnaton?

Though it is easy to read into Akhnaton's story more significance than it really contained, one thing seems certain. Akhnaton was fired by the idea of uniting mankind not by fear or by force of arms but rather through proclaiming man's dependence on a single god. This god was the source of life in the universe, creator and benefactor, giver of light and love, the blessed Aton, golden disk of the sun. It was a noble idea, and biologically sound. Not a creature that moves in the biosphere, be it a worm, insect, fish, reptile or mammal, but does so with energy taken indirectly from sunlight via the chemical mechanism in green leaf. And since we are one and all dependent on Aton, should we not join in worshiping his golden disc?

And if we can thus unite in worshipping one god can we not also unite in sharing his gifts instead of fighting over them like hyenas over a corpse?

This was the message of Akhnaton to the Egyptians:

Lay down your spears and swords, abandon your armor and chariots. Unite like happy children in the worship of Aton and leave your menagerie of ridiculous gods which are half beasts and half men. Unite in worship and, being united, share the gifts of Aton in a manner worthy of beings endowed with the light of reason. Cease to be puffed up, conceited, arrogant. One and all we are children of Aton, dependent on his light for our life. Why then should one man place himself above another?

A startling teaching, and one not at all in accordance with the spirit of the times which was anything but democratic. In the enormously complex hierarchy of ancient Egypt everyone had his place on the pyramid, ranging from the slaves that formed the base and were regarded as less than animals to the god-king at the apex. But Akhnaton believed in his vision and planned to put his theories into practice. He repudiated all the old gods, Amon in particular. He decreed the dissolution of the priesthoods and the temple estates. Forsaking Thebes, the ancient home of the god Amon, he built a new capital 300 miles to the north. The new temples, dedicated to Aton, contained none of the old Egyptian gods, those comical hybrids of man and beasts, jackal-headed Anubis, hawk-headed Horus. There was no human image in the new temple. Aton was portrayed as a golden disk, his diverging rays reaching to earth like outstretched hands holding the symbol of life.

Akhnaton did not hesitate to practice what he preached in matters of daily living. He set aside the pomp of the god-king, refused to clothe himself in awful majesty, or to

veil himself from the eyes of the people. On the contrary, he let himself be portrayed just as he was, enjoying his family pleasures with his wife, Nefertiti, kissing, eating, playing with his children, for all the world like a President of the United States. All of which would have seemed quite natural to the inhabitants of modern America but was fearfully shocking to ancient Egyptians brought up to regard their kings as gods incarnate, the sacredness of whose blood was such that they had to marry their own sister to avoid polluting the godly fluid which flowed in their veins.

Alas poor Akhnaton! What hope of survival had his frail boat of visions in the turbulent ocean of the ancient world? While he dreamed of the glory of Aton and of the universal brotherhood of man his empire crumbled. The dispossessed priests revolted. The Hittites, cruel and crafty, invaded Syria. Fierce tribes from the desert attacked the cities of Palestine. Akhnaton, paralyzed as visionaries often are by the formidable difficulty of translating theory into practice, made no move. Abandoned and discredited, his power taken from him, his lovely queen driven into exile, he died alone, a disillusioned dreamer. His hymn to the sun has come down to us as his last memorial.

“Beautiful is thine arising on the curtain of heaven;
O living Aton, giver of light.” (20)

By the Mounds of the Dead

Far from Akhnaton's kingdom, both in space and in time, was that unique civilization of the Indus Valley located in what is now Pakistan near Mohenjo-Daro (The Mounds of the Dead). This nameless empire of antiquity stretched from a 600-mile seaboard near present-day Karachi back all the way to the Himalayan foothills nearly a thousand miles inland. Two great cities, Mohenjo-Daro on the Indus and Harappa on its tributary the Ravi, stood like twin capitals 400 miles apart. Between them along the course of the Indus stretched a series of sixty to seventy towns and villages with many more still to be discovered by the archeologists. This ancient civilization covered an area seven times larger than the kingdom of Sumer. According to the archeologist, Stuart Piggott, each of its two great cities had about 20,000 inhabitants and the whole population of the Harappa empire was between 70,000 and 100,000. (21)

The outstanding feature of the Harappa civilization was its amazing stability. About 2500 B.C. it attained a state of maturity and from that point on for about 1000 years

there was virtually no change in its material structure. Its script, pottery, architecture, seal engraving, and metal tools all remained the same. Products were remarkably uniform as though a central standard had been set up. Pottery was mass-produced always in a few simple designs. Bricks were of standard sizes. Weights and measures were regulated with a degree of accuracy unknown elsewhere in the ancient world.

In the design of the two cities, Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro, evidence of conscious planning can also be seen. Enough is known about their structure to indicate that they were laid out from the start according to a well-defined plan in much the same way as New York City was laid out on a grid system above Washington Square. At Mohenjo-Daro the grid divided the city into areas measuring about 1200 x 800 feet, nearly six times the size of a typical block in New York. There were twelve major blocks in the city, separated by streets which were often thirty feet wide, the whole covering an area of about one square mile. The houses, built of kiln-baked bricks to resist the monsoon rains, faced inward on courtyards, offering to the street blank walls embellished only by the front door. They were solid, well-built structures, their walls plastered and painted inside and out. Bathrooms with paved floors communicated with a system of sewers beneath the streets, where manholes covered by large tiles gave access for cleaning. Rubbish chutes in the walls opened into brick bins. The whole arrangement shows that in this forgotten civilization there existed a concern for cleanliness and sanitation the like of which has rarely been seen in the East.

Dominant over these ancient cities were the great walled platforms faced with burnt brick which rose about fifty feet above the streets. On the top of these great structures

stood granaries and temples. With their monumental walls, gateways, approach ramps, and special buildings these great platforms must have been the seats of the centralized power that governed the Harappa civilization.

What was the source of the extraordinary power wielded by these rulers? Clearly they did not rely on violence to maintain order. Not a sign of distinctively military equipment has been found in the ancient ruins. Nevertheless order was maintained. Unlike the Mesopotamian valley, the valley of the Indus never resounded with the clash of arms. The two great cities Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro never developed that fateful local egotism that set the Sumerian cities at one another's throats and finally brought ruin on the whole civilization. Though spread over a larger area than that of Sumer, the Harappa civilization never fragmented into a host of squabbling city states. Mohenjo-Daro was often destroyed by flood but was never destroyed by revolution or war until that final fateful inrush of the "Outer Barbarians" destroyed the culture forever.

A thousand years of tranquillity, undisfigured by war, revolution, or civil strife; tranquillity which might have continued indefinitely had not the Outer Barbarians intruded! How was it done? How did this ancient people, whose very name is now forgotten, achieve that stability which had evaded both Sumerians and Egyptians? How were the bloodthirsty inclinations of *Homo ferox* brought under control and kept under control for a time span as long as that which stretched between the Norman Conquest and our own time?

We stand here face to face with one of the most tantalizing riddles of antiquity. "All the archeological evidence," writes Stuart Piggot, "suggests that the Harappa polity was a theocracy ruled by priest-kings from sacred citadels, as

Tibet is ruled today from the Potala at Lhasa and from Shigatse."

But priest-kings were nothing unusual in the ancient world. All rulers tended to clothe their authority in religious garments, either calling themselves servants of gods or incarnations of gods as did Egypt's Pharaohs. Which did not in the least prevent them from behaving like men, and like very savage men at that. Even the Kings of the Old Testament, who often did their best to behave virtuously, never imagined that a show of violence would be displeasing to the Lord, provided the folks they slaughtered worshiped another god, like Dagon or Moloch. So the mere fact that the rulers of the Harappan civilization were priest-kings, does not explain their extraordinary ability to rule a large land without recourse to violence and to sustain their culture's unity for a thousand years. To wield such power they must have possessed a profound understanding of human nature, an understanding so complete that they could restrain man's primitive impulse toward destruction and prevent the growth of the technology of barbarism which, in all other cultures, proved the blight of civilization.

There is probably no treasure buried in the ruins of the ancient world which would be more precious to us than this secret knowledge of the rulers of Harappa. It seems improbable that the archeologists will ever be able to recover this knowledge. Though the people of Harappa had an advanced form of writing, a stiff hieroglyphic script with about 400 characters, they did not leave behind them a copious literature as did the Sumerians. The known samples of Harappan writing are mainly in the form of engraved stone seals which were apparently used to identify personal property. The longest inscriptions discovered do not exceed twenty characters. For all we know these Harap-

pans may have had a literature fully as copious as that of Egypt or Sumer, written on some form of paper or bark or even on leather. But the climate of the Indus Valley is very different from that of the Egyptian deserts which preserved the fragile papyri of that ancient civilization as surely as if they had been sealed in a scientist's desiccator. Torrential monsoon rains which yearly sweep this part of India, saturating the air with moisture, would insure that any documents, unless actually carved on stone tablets, would swiftly disintegrate into slime and mildew.

So we are forced to guess the secret of Harappa, helped by such fragments of evidence as the archeologists have unearthed. One of these fragments consists of a seal which portrays a human figure seated in the cross-legged posture. A trident and two animals also figure in the picture. Though it might seem rash to try to reconstruct the spiritual life of an ancient culture from one stone seal this little figure is none the less highly suggestive. Those familiar with the Hindu pantheon will at once recognize the prototype of the god Shiva. The attending animals indicate that he is Lord of the Beasts and, by analogy, ruler over the beast-like passions in the soul of man. The trident indicates that Shiva is Lord of the Yogis and the master of yoga. It is this symbol which can guide us to the secret of Harappa and reveal to us the basis of its incredible stability.

Mastery of yoga means mastery of man. This is the essence of this remarkable teaching, the origins of which are lost in antiquity. For yoga, both in theory and in practice, has only one aim, to liberate the individual from that meshwork of illusions in which, owing to the errors inherent in man's psyche, he becomes entangled. Would we be going too far beyond our slender supply of facts if we represented the rulers of Harappa as adepts in this supreme

art? Perhaps we would, yet there is no other way to explain the source of their power. The systems of yoga are certainly incredibly ancient, handed down from teacher to pupil, practiced by a long series of adepts some of whom, like Patanjali, wrote books about it but none of whom claimed to have invented the techniques.

So, despite the rather slim evidence, we can put forward the hypothesis that those ancient Harappans somehow developed this knowledge. Armed with yoga, rather than with swords and spears, they were able both to foresee and to forestall the inward, psychological upheavals that damaged the civilizations of both Sumer and Egypt. By simplifying the material concerns of the people (Harappa never produced huge temples, huge images, elaborate art works or vast and costly monuments) they left energy available for spiritual strivings, establishing a rule of spiritual law so powerful that no one dared to rebel against the sacred edicts. So these rulers could dispense with the technology of destruction and could maintain order without bloodshed, threats, or violence, holding the bloodthirsty passions of *Homo ferox* on a spiritual leash which, despite its insubstantiality, proved stronger than steel. If this picture really portrays the state of affairs in Harappa and is not merely an example of wishful thinking then the rulers of this ancient civilization were indeed men like gods, qualified to bear the proud title, *Homo sapiens*, which Linneus, in a moment of overenthusiasm, bestowed on the last surviving species of the hominids.

Alas for Harappa! Ruled by wise men who had substituted the power of the spirit for the power of the sword this people forgot the existence of an outer world in which very different rules of conduct prevailed. Having outlawed the technology of barbarism and eschewed the manufacture

of weapons of war this noble civilization was powerless to resist the onslaughts of the Outer Barbarians. These arrived, as they always arrive sooner or later, in the form of tribes of cattle-driving nomads who trampled the Harappa civilization into the mud of the Indus Valley and brought in its place a Dark Age of barbarism which began somewhere around 1500 B.C. and lasted until the emergence of the Hindu civilization.

Thus was brought to an end the first and perhaps the only civilization in which the technology of destruction was outlawed and the government of men based solely on spiritual power. Its history is reassuring in that it suggests that men *can* create a stable civilization without recourse to violence. But it proves once again, as did the story of the Morioris in New Zealand, that any society which neglects the technology of barbarism will suffer destruction the moment it encounters another society which has continued to rely on violence to attain its aims.

Subman and Superman

The evolutionary ascent from *Proconsul africanus* to *Homo sapiens* can be represented as a journey in four stages. Each stage presented its own problems to the traveler, who wended his way over the obstacles which nature placed in his path as if driven on by some obscure sense of destiny, a pilgrim journeying to a shrine he has never seen to worship a deity he does not know.

In the first, pre-human stage the problems were mainly anatomical. The creature had just learned to stand upright, had shifted its center of gravity thereby rotating its pelvis, erecting its spinal column, bringing the whole weight of its body onto the sole of its awkward, modified foot and the whole weight of its internal organs onto its pelvic floor. There were many adjustments to be made, adjustments which have not been perfected even to this day.

Then came the subhuman stage. At this stage the outlines of man could be clearly discerned, coarsely drawn as if some demiurge were groping for the right form in which to clothe this strange new being. *Australopithecus*, *Sinanthropus*, *Pithecanthropus* . . . all these forms had features

which suggested the shape of things to come. These creatures had established their upright postures and were chiefly concerned with problems of food gathering. It was at about this time that the early hominids developed that taste for meat which was to play such a fundamental role in shaping human destiny.

Next came the protohuman stage of evolution. This stage is vague, the paleontologist lacks the needed fossils to fill the gap between such forms as *Australopithecus* and *Homo sapiens* (*Homo neanderthalens* will not serve this purpose. He was contemporary with *Homo sapiens* and cannot be regarded as his ancestor). In the protohuman stage true man was molded from some earlier form. The molding process involved a series of mutations (all entirely random if we are to believe the neo-Darwinians) which resulted in a mushroom-like expansion of the cerebral cortex accompanied by perfectly synchronized expansion of the skull to provide a cranial cavity large enough to hold this new brain. The heavy brow ridges of such subhuman forms as *Pithecanthropus* disappeared. In their place emerged the human brow, rising steeply above the orbits and arching back to form the splendid dome beneath which man's thoughts for good or for evil could be woven on the loom of his hugely multiplied neurone connections.

We can only guess what sort of problems occupied these protohuman forms. Apart from the obvious ones of gathering food and escaping foes these protohumans probably were concerned with communication. Language, made possible by the development of Broca's area in the cerebral cortex, was probably developed in the protohuman stage of evolution. True man, even in his most primitive forms, always possesses a language, often a very elaborate one.

Finally, in the human stage of evolution, man emerged

fully formed with a brain capacity which has not changed significantly since the days of Cro-Magnon man.

Only one species of hominid has survived this hazardous journey through space and time. This one, *Homo sapiens*, has compensated for the lack of success of all the others. His rise has been phenomenal, almost explosive in its swiftness and his present dangers result from his too rapid ascent. He simply has not had time to adjust to the changes which he himself has made in his environment. His big brain, unreliable and maladjusted, acts like a system of distorting lenses, giving to its possessor a twisted picture of the world, isolating the ego, exaggerating the importance of the self. His ferocity, which doubtless had survival value during Paleolithic times, is completely inappropriate for a dweller in a highly mechanized civilization. His double standard of morality, which justifies any atrocity so long as it is carried out in the collective name of the tribe, has become a menace to all as improvements in the technology of destruction place weapons of increasing deadliness in the hands of the warrior.

In short, man has burst onto the stage loaded with so many residues from savagery that his technical successes have exposed him to greater dangers than those which he has confronted at earlier stages of his history.

His position might be regarded as hopeless were it not for one peculiarity of the human psyche. It contains, apparently built into its structure, a mechanism which we call conscience or the "moral sense." The process whereby this moral sense originated has caused many a good Darwinian to scratch his head in bewilderment. It would not, on the face of it, seem to offer the individual possessing it any advantage in the struggle for existence. The idea that

there is something morally wrong in destroying or oppressing the weak goes directly contrary to the law of survival of the fittest. And yet there is, in man's psyche, a real quality of mercy, a tendency toward compassion and loving-kindness, which, by all the laws of crude survival, *ought* not to have evolved there at all.

The moral sense has never been equally distributed among men. Some possessed a great deal, some had practically none. In a few rare beings, whom we will call Avatars or Saviors, the moral sense was so highly developed that they may be regarded as members of a different spiritual species. These Avatars, appearing from time to time on the stage of history, have all undertaken the same task. Possessed of exceptional insight, they realized that man is not what he should be, that he lives in darkness and confusion, that his values are false, his ambitions often criminal or childish, and his moral standards a disgrace.

But they all believed that the situation of man is not hopeless. Man can escape the trap into which evolutionary errors have lured him. This is the basis of the teaching of all the Avatars. We have devoted some time to an analysis of these evolutionary errors and established beyond reasonable doubt that they occurred. Now the fundamental question must be considered. Were the Avatars right in believing that man can correct these errors or did they over-estimate his capacity for self-modification?

We must first consider just what the Avatars taught. The essential teachings relating to man's salvation must be extracted from considerable accumulations of extraneous material in which the fundamentals have become buried. Organized religions, based on the teachings of the Avatars, have all become cluttered to some extent with myths,

dogmas, mysteries, miracles, and theological speculations. In some cases these extraneous elements have attained such size as to conceal almost completely the original doctrine.

Historically speaking, the message of the Saviors can be compared to the course of a river. Arising as a pure spring in the uplands of the human spirit it flowed down into the plain of everyday human existence, becoming in the process more and more polluted and sluggish. Sometimes the river disappeared almost completely or ran for a while underground. Sometimes a new Savior appeared and purified the polluted stream. Sometimes, after such purification, the stream flowed on in two different beds, the old and the new.

So far as our own historical period is concerned we can see still flowing, in a more or less polluted condition, three streams all having separate places of origin. The first probably arose in the Indus Valley, disappeared underground when the Harappa civilization was destroyed, reappeared later in the form of Hinduism associated with the Avatar Krishna, who may or may not have been a historical personage. This stream branched, to give rise to two other streams, Buddhism and Jainism, initiated by the Avatars Gotama and Mahavira, which separated from Hinduism at about the same time.

The second great stream arose in Sumer, was transported along with its myths of the Flood, the Garden of Eden, the Tower of Babel, to Egypt where it received an infusion of monotheism possibly via the teachings of Akhnaton. This stream was channeled into its defined form by Moses, and purified in varying degrees by a series of later Avatars collectively known as the prophets.

For nearly a thousand years the stream of Judaism flowed through the ancient world in a narrow channel, prevented

from spreading by that unfortunate conviction, which became virtually an obsession of the Jews, that they represented the Chosen People and so possessed a monopoly of God. This incurable clannishness prevented the Jews from providing the ancient world, burdened by an absolute plethora of gods and desperately seeking a new source of spiritual strength, with the unifying religion it badly needed. So it happened that the Avatar Jesus, who not only purified the ancient stream of Judaism of its accumulated pollutions but also had no use for the religious exclusiveness of his fellow Jews, created, without in the least intending to do so, a separate stream. This stream of faith, Christianity, all too soon became polluted. The wranglings of theologians obscured the original teachings and set that pattern of vituperative verbosity which has remained characteristic of the Christian Church to this day.

So the great river of Judaism branched and two streams flowed where one had flowed before. But whereas the splitting off of Buddhism had a revitalizing effect on its parent Hinduism; the splitting away of Christianity only left Judaism still more isolated. The Jews clung more stubbornly than ever to their belief that they were the Chosen People. The Christians, bigoted and fanatical, made nonsense of the lofty ethics of their religion by persecuting the Jews.

The turbulent stream of Judeo-Christianity split yet again in the seventh century A.D. when the prophet Mohammed proclaimed his doctrine of the one god, borrowing his inspiration from both Judaism and Christianity. No impartial student of the history of ideas can place Mohammed in the same category with the great Avatars Jesus, Krishna, or Buddha. The Koran lacks the spiritual profundity which characterizes the Torah, the Gospels, the

Upanishads, and the Buddhist Sutras. It consists of a collection of precepts suitable for the guidance of a savage people. The crude doctrine taught by the prophet was later purified by such Sufi mystics as Jallaludin Rumi, an Avatar in his own right, whose enormous poem, the *Mathnawi*, is one of the profoundest commentaries ever written on the enigma of man.

One other stream branched off from the great river which gave the world Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. This was Zoroastrianism founded by the Avatar Zoroaster (Zarathustra) probably some time in the fifth century B.C. (a great century for Avatars, which produced Gautama, Maravira, Lao-tse, Socrates, Pythagoras, Confucius, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah). The religion Zoroaster founded flourished mainly in Persia and coexisted peaceably with Judaism (in Isaiah the Lord addresses the Zoroastrian King Cyrus as his Shepherd). It also hailed with gifts the dawn of Christianity (the wise men from the East who came to worship at Bethlehem are generally thought to have been Zoroastrian priests). Later it was wiped out in Persia by the Mohammedan Arabs who also stamped out Christianity in Egypt. Zoroastrianism survives now only among the Parsees in India.

In Greece, which presented so many gifts to humanity, another great stream arose, at first in the form of mystery religions centering about the concept of death and rebirth. The Greek religion was picturesque, rich in mythology and cluttered by an overabundance of gods whose behavior often left much to be desired. Out of this rather crude starting material Socrates (assisted by his great disciple, Plato) created a noble and enlightened religion centered about the Delphic inscription: Know thyself. This, in the hands of Epictetus, was forged into a system of spiritual

discipline, Stoicism, harsh, abrupt, and uncompromising, but splendid in its own way.

It has been the custom to regard Socrates, Plato, and Epictetus as philosophers rather than religious teachers, which merely proves that there is no clear point at which philosophy ends and religion begins. Socrates, like Gautama, was concerned with the freeing of men from their illusions and his teaching was just as much a religion as was that of the Buddha. It did not, however, give rise to a separate religion. Christianity, with its greater emotional appeal, displaced Stoicism, absorbing many of its teachings in the process.

Finally, far removed geographically from these streams of religion, the separately engendered civilization of China produced its own Avatars. Confucius is generally regarded as the founder of the official religion of China, and though somewhat excessively preoccupied with external forms, problems of etiquette and of ancestor worship, none the less found time to concern himself with the basic causes of man's unrest. More profound in his insight than Confucius was the Avatar Lao-tse, distinguished for having packed more wisdom into fewer words than any other sage who has ever existed. His teachings were elaborated upon by his disciple Chuang-tse whose delightful stories are not only gems of wisdom but also treasures of literature.

Such were the founders of mankind's surviving religions. Their aim was to give to their fellows a scale of values different from that which they had inherited from the Paleolithic forebears. Stop killing each other. It is not necessary. It is displeasing to God. It is unworthy of beings endowed with a spark of divinity. Learn the difference between men and mere beasts. Learn new values. Apply yourselves to spiritual tasks. Emerge from the prison of

your delusions and enjoy the liberty which is your birth-right. Only in this direction will you find peace, joy, and salvation.

Such was the message. To the student of history, looking back across centuries of carnage, in the course of which millions have perished at the hands of their fellows, it is painfully obvious that the message was not acted upon. But why? Were all the great Avatars hopelessly deluded in their estimate of man's potentialities? Did they perhaps teach their message in the wrong form? Did they fail to take into account the biological limitations of the last of the hominids, whose development has been so tragically unharmonious? What was their approach in any case? What exactly did the great Avatars (we speak here of Krishna, Gotama, Mahavira, "Moses and the Prophets," Jesus, Jallaludin Rumi, Zoroaster, Socrates, Epictetus, Confucius, Lao-tse and Chuang-tse) have to say on the subject of man's problems and their solutions? And what have our modern commentators, psychologists, sociologists, biologists, social scientists, philosophers to add to the teachings of the Avatars? Has modern science, with all its glitter and gadgetry, anything new to say on the ancient subject which is none the less a very modern subject also having a bearing on the happiness and perhaps the survival of us all?

PART II:

The Historical Saviors

Krishna and the Cosmic Drama

No one knows who he was. The Avatar Krishna, like the historical Jesus, shows dimly through the mist of history, so dimly that we cannot tell whether he was a real man or a legend. In that great Indian epic, the *Mahabharata*, he appears as a heroic figure, a God-man, an incarnation of the divine spirit. It was in this guise of the God-man that he offered the teaching that forms the substance of one of the world's greatest religious books, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, "The Song of the Lord." (22)

Tradition declares that Krishna was born in northern India. It was an India very different from that peaceful land that had been ruled by the enlightened priest-kings of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro. That civilization had already been forgotten. Its cities were buried under the silt of rivers. Its language was dead. The inhabitants of the new India were the Aryan conquerors whose Vedic hymns glorified other gods and whose taste for fighting manifested itself in an interminable series of big and little wars. If the rulers of Harappa had really learned how to tame *Homo ferox* the lesson had certainly been forgotten by the

time Krishna appeared on earth. Nevertheless, the treasure of that earlier civilization had not been entirely lost. By holy men, hermits and sages, the secrets of yoga had been preserved, handed down from teacher to disciple. It was these secrets which Krishna expounded.

The scene of Krishna's teaching was a battlefield. On the plain of Kurukshetra, two great armies were drawn up opposite one another. On the one side stood the army of the Kurus led by the wicked King Duryodhana who, by fraud, had become the ruler of a kingdom not his own. Opposing them stood the army of the Pandavas led by Bhima and Arjuna, brothers to whom the stolen kingdom rightfully belonged.

So the armies confronted one another as armies always have since man first developed this habit of settling his differences by organized reciprocal destruction. Right, undoubtedly, was on the side of Bhima and Arjuna. The kingdom had been stolen from them by Duryodhana. All attempts to find a peaceful solution had failed. There seemed no other way of settling the dispute but by armed conflict.

This organized bloodletting, however, seemed to Arjuna a poor method of settling a dispute. The warrior Arjuna, one of the noblest characters in the *Mahabharata*, had a well-developed capacity for independent thought which is always a source of embarrassment to a soldier. Instead of shouting, "My country right or wrong," or "Ours not to reason why," or other more or less imbecile slogans considered appropriate for the military mind, he soberly mounted his chariot and rode between the opposing armies, trying to decide for himself whether any real justice could be obtained by wholesale slaughter. The issue was complicated for Arjuna by the fact that this was not a war

against some foreign invader. The Kurus and Pandavas were closely related. In the hostile ranks under King Duryodhana Arjuna could see many of his own relatives, including his reverend teachers, Bhishma and Drona. So, should he fight this battle, he would be violating the ancient code that underlies man's double standard of morality, which declares that killing outside the tribe is permissible and even praiseworthy but that killing within the tribe is a crime worthy of death.

These misgivings Arjuna confided to Krishna who, in the role of charioteer, was in the chariot beside him.

“O Krishna at the sight of my kinsmen, eager for battle,
 My limbs fail, my mouth is parched, my body is shaken.
 I perceive no good in slaughtering my own people.
 I desire neither victory, nor empire, nor any pleasure.
 Though they, their understanding clouded by greed,
 Perceive no sin in the destruction of a family,
 Should not we, who perceive the evil, turn away from such sin?
 Better for me that the sons of Dritarashtra
 Should slay me unresisting and unarmed.
 Better for me that I should eat a beggar's crust
 Than gain a kingdom by destroying my own teachers.
 How can we tell which is better,
 That we should conquer them or that they should conquer us?
 I see nothing to remove the grief that is drying up my senses,
 Having thus spoken Arjuna said,
 ‘I will not fight,’ and fell silent.”

Arjuna's statement represents a supremely intelligent commentary on the futility of warfare as a means of settling disputes. He emphasizes also the moral stain which the warrior inflicts on himself by killing others, which may more than outweigh any material gain he may derive from

the war. By declaring "I will not fight" he has taken up that extreme pacifist position to be advocated, many centuries later, by Mahatma Gandhi. He did not, however, feel certain of the rightness of this decision and earnestly appealed to Krishna for help and guidance.

Krishna's reply to Arjuna, which occupies the rest of the *Bhagavad-Gita*, represents a complete analysis of the duties, capacities, and ultimate significance of man. It is probably one of the most intellectually satisfying statements ever made on this subject. To understand this statement, however, it is necessary to grasp a certain number of key ideas, some of them relatively simple, others exceedingly evasive.

Consider first Arjuna's immediate problem. Granted that our cause is just, that we have been swindled out of our kingdom by Duryodhana, does that justify our using violence to regain it? May we employ bad means to attain good ends? Are we justified in doing evil that good may come?

Krishna's reply is emphatic. Arjuna must fight. By failing to do so he would be violating the laws of his own being. He is a *kshatriya*, bound by his being-duty to fight in a just cause to uphold law, justice, and righteousness. Failure to perform one's being-duty is a source of shame and confusion.

This concept "being-duty"* is one of the key ideas of the *Bhagavad-Gita*. A man's being-duty is imposed by his type, and in ancient India, in which the caste system had not become rigid, four types were recognized. The first type, the *brahmin*, was roughly equivalent to the modern con-

*Being-duty is an approximate rendering of the meaning of two Sanskrit words, *svadharma* and *svabhava*, literally "own-function" and "own-being."

cept of the intellectual, artist, scientist, or priest, whose concern is with the attainment of knowledge or with spiritual matters. "Control of the mind, control of the senses, forbearance, uprightness, knowledge, realization and faith, these are the duties of the brahmin, born of his self-nature."

The second type, the *kshatriya*, equivalent, again very roughly, to a combination of executive, administrator, and officer of the armed forces in our modern world, was concerned with the maintenance of order in society, by permission if possible, by force if necessary. "Heroism, firmness, resourcefulness, courage, generosity and the strength to rule, these are the qualities of a *kshatriya*, born of his self-nature."

The third type, the *vaisya*, would correspond in our society to the businessman or merchant, concerned with trade and making money. The fourth type, the *sudra*, would correspond to the humblest type of manual laborer. "The duty of the *sudra* born of his self-nature, consists of service."

So Krishna's advice to Arjuna, regarding his immediate problem, is based on this concept of the four types of being and the duties which correspond to those types. Arjuna is a *kshatriya*. It is his duty to maintain order and uphold justice, by peaceful means if possible, by force if need be. If he fails in this duty the whole structure of society will crumble.

But the *Bhagavad-Gita* could hardly claim to be a divinely inspired document if this were the only advice Krishna had to offer. Actually, the discussion of Arjuna's practical problem, to fight or not to fight, occupies only a small fraction of Krishna's teaching. After briefly outlining the duties of the *kshatriya* Krishna quickly raises the whole

conversation to a higher level. Arjuna, he declares, has misunderstood the whole problem by confusing spirit and matter, soul and body, the transitory and the permanent.

“You mourn for those for whom one should not mourn, though you speak words that seem to be wise. The wise man grieves neither for the living nor for the dead. . . . He who looks on the Self as the slayer, he who looks on the Self as the slain—neither of these knows the truth. The Self slays not nor is it slain. *This* is not born nor does it die, nor having been does it cease to be; unborn, perpetual, eternal, ancient, *this* is not slain when the body is slain. As a person casts off worn out clothes and puts on others that are new, so the Self casts off worn out bodies and enters others. Weapons cut it not, fire burns it not, water wets it not, wind does not wither it. Certain is death for the born and certain is birth for the dead. Over that which is inevitable you should not grieve.”

The Self is the *atman*. It is difficult to convey the meanings of this Sanskrit word. That which men feel to be the self, that small ego on behalf of which they fear, hope, labor and, all too often, rob and kill, is not the true self at all. It is a small fragment, an artificial entity, the *jiva*, a by-product of the play of illusion. But the greater self is one with that reality which underlies the web of illusion, that *one* out of which the many arises. “It slays not nor is it slain.”

But what is the relation of the *jiva* to the *atman*? To understand this we must consider the Hindu concept of the process of creation. From this standpoint, the phenomenal world is a play, the result of *lila*, the play of God. This play is not only performed by God, it is also observed by God. He is at once all the actors and all the audience, the props, the prompter, the playwright, and the producer.

The days and nights of Brahma determine the length of each performance. During the night of nonmanifestation Being is replaced by Nothingness. Brahma withdraws within himself. All is potential, nothing actual.

Day comes, the Day of Creation. Brahma stirs. The One becomes Three, symbolical of the three forces whose interpenetration creates the manifest universe. Ceaselessly interacting, the three *gunas* generate world within world. Nebulae swirl and blaze, suns form within nebulae, planets rotate about suns and moons about planets. And on these planets themselves the interplay of the three forces gives rise to beings whose lives and deaths are governed by the law of action (*karma*), each action producing its fruit, agreeable or unpleasant according to its nature.

In the theater of the universe the Dance of Shiva is enacted. For how many millions of years does that drama last? The Hindu sages offer us a figure; 4,320,000,000 years is the duration of one day of Brahma. At the end of that time evolution changes to involution just as sleep follows waking, inbreathing follows exhalation. The worlds collapse on themselves, the suns explode, the nebulae are scattered into the primeval void. Actuality returns to the state of potentiality. The curtain falls, the cosmic drama is over, actors and audience, props and producers are alike enfolded in the sleep of nonbeing.

But only for a while.

The night of Brahma ends and a new performance begins. Once more the divine *lila*, the play of God, evolves through the chain of a myriad separate dramas as nebulae, suns, planets, inhabitants of planets pass through the cycles of their individual lives and deaths.

A stupendous concept! And one not at all at variance with the findings of modern science, at least that segment

of it which depicts the universe as coming into being at a definite time. For if it comes into being at a definite time and expands for a period is it not logical to assume that the reverse process must occur, that it will cease to expand and begin to contract and thus return to its primordial state? Whence it will once again enter on a phase of expansion.

But in this vast cosmic drama what place has mere man? Is he not dwarfed into utter insignificance? What is his fate compared with the fate of suns or galaxies? Can God be concerned whether this tiny being lives in joy or perishes in sorrow, acts wisely or foolishly, develops or degenerates? Why should God care?

Why not?

For to ask why should God care is, from the Hindu standpoint, to slip into the morass of dualism. God is audience and actor, he both performs on the stage and sits back to watch the play. Man? But why isolate man? God manifests in man as surely as he manifests in the galaxy. Why draw this artificial line between man and God? All is in God. There can be nothing outside of him.

Nothing at all.

Does not this force us to attribute evil to God? For if all man's activities are part of the play of God, has not a great deal of that play been destructive and hideous? Did God drop the Bomb on Hiroshima, did God stoke the furnaces at Belsen? Did God send millions of men at each other's throats in an orgy of destruction? Is God responsible for every atrocity with which men have defiled the earth from the Paleolithic to the present? What manner of God is this that performs for his own amusement so horrible a drama?

What manner of God? A god of destruction to be sure.

The Hindu sages have never shrunk from this conclusion. They had no use for that sickly creation of Victorian sentimentality, the being who made "all things bright and beautiful" but who, apparently, had nothing to do with all things dark and hideous. Does not Shiva the Creator have for his counterpart the black goddess Kali, whose image is ornamented with a necklace of human skulls, who dances on the corpse of her own husband? And did not the worshippers of Kali (or Durga) shock the British in India to the depth of their Anglican souls by ceremoniously strangling their fellow men (Thuggism) because they thought this act would be pleasing to the goddess?

No. There is nothing in this concept of the manifesting God that rules out manifestations which we call evil. *This* is beyond good and evil, for the good and the evil have no absolute existence, are qualities superimposed on the divine play by the minds of men. The interaction of the three forces may produce destructive effects under one set of conditions, creative in another. As for the divine play it is just as likely to be a tragedy as a comedy or a farce. They are different facets of the same performance.

What follows from this? Shall we throw all restraints aside and satisfy our every appetite? If all is the play of God, and good and evil are figments of the imagination, what point is there in self-discipline or self-restraint? Why call one man evil and another good when both are puppets on the end of strings manipulated by forces outside their control? Who would demand of a puppet that he respect moral standards?

But is man a puppet?

In one sense he is and in another he is not. "The Lord dwells in the hearts of all beings, O Arjuna, causing them to move as if they were mounted on a machine. Entrenched in

egotism you think: I will not fight. Vain is your resolve. Nature will constrain you. Bound by your self-nature, even that which you do not wish to do you will none the less helplessly perform."

Then what hope is there for man? Forces act upon him from outside and from within. He has no control over either. His self-being compels a certain pattern of action. Priest-nature or warrior-nature is born within him and not by him selected. In accordance with his nature are his actions. In accordance with his actions is his fate. What hand can he have in shaping his own destiny? A vessel drifting on the water obeys the wind and currents. Would it not be laughable for such an empty vessel to proclaim with the poet, "I am the master of my fate: I am the captain of my soul."

Certainly this would be laughable, but the situation is not as bad as it seems. So long as man thinks of himself as the doer and refers the results of his actions to himself he will be hopelessly entangled in the veil of *maya* and quite unable to distinguish realities from delusions. But by proper training and effort a man can develop a different attitude, one which removes him from the endless flux of events and gives him the status of a spectator of the drama.

"'I do nothing at all,' thinks the yogi, the knower of truth; for in seeing, hearing, touching, smelling and tasting, in walking, breathing and sleeping, in speaking, emitting and seizing; in opening and closing the eyes, he is assured that it is only the senses busied with their objects."

The secret, then, lies in the discipline of yoga. But what is yoga?

The word is Sanskrit and its root is similar to that of the English word to yoke. A yoke unites two beings. This is the secret of the meaning of yoga. It is the process whereby

the separated self (*jiva*) becomes reunited with the origin (*atman*). It is the process whereby the veil of illusion is penetrated, the One seen behind the many, the delusion of separateness overcome, the flow of phenomena seen as the *lila* or play of God. In this sense, yoga is the way to God, for God is in man and man is in God. But man, blinded by egotism and the power of *maya*, thinks I do, I am, I this and I that.

Yoga, by the discipline it imposes, enables man to escape from the illusion of I. Though he continues to act, though he may still be busy in the world, he remains apart. His innermost self is untouched by these activities as the lotus which grows in the mud is unspotted by the mud. To him all things are given precisely because he does not desire or need them.

Man in his ordinary state, ego-intoxicated and immersed in the pleasures, pains, worries, hopes, fears of his personal life, can be compared to an amateur actor who has become totally absorbed in his role. He never, for one moment, even suspects that this is only a play, a tiny part of a greater drama. If ever such a suspicion enters his mind he hastily thrusts it out, for the very existence of what he calls "himself" depends on his total identification with his day-to-day role. He takes the mask of the actor, the *persona* as the Greeks called it, for his real self. Remove the mask and he has nothing left.

The adept in yoga, on the other hand, is like the highly skilled professional actor. Even though he is plunged in the whirl and noise of the drama he never for one moment forgets that it is only a play. In all the comings and goings, agonizings and exultings, pleasures and miseries that the drama may impose he recognizes the workings of the three forces which between them weave the fabric of being on

the loom of time. He does not identify himself with the *persona*, the actor's mask, whose expressions must conform to the nature of the drama. He holds the mask before him, changes it when the play demands a change. But never does he call the mask "I." Never does he call his body the doer. "I did this, I did that. I created. I destroyed. I conquered. I was defeated." Such phrases as these are only for the ego-deluded, who confuse *atman* with *jiva*, who consider themselves to be the doers instead of the instruments.

So, in the fullest sense of the word, the adept at yoga who has achieved inward liberation from the fetters of self-delusion, is one with God. For, like God, he is simultaneously actor and audience. Like God he manifests and yet has his link with the unmanifest. He has emerged from his little individual self, the *jiva*, and centered his being in the greater self, the *atman*, which is none other than the divine spirit present in man as it is in all things, but recognized only by a few.

What bearing does all this have on Arjuna and his problem? It has a very practical bearing, which Krishna goes to great pains to explain. *Action* (*karma* in Sanskrit) is an inescapable condition of corporeal existence. But toward action two completely different attitudes are possible. By the ignorant, blinded by the veil of illusion, action is regarded as an end in itself. They are convinced that they are the doers. And the material fruits of action, in the form of name, fame, possessions, etc., are considered ends in themselves. Happiness, that fugitive condition whose *pursuit* is conceived in some quarters to be the proper end of life, is also identified with action and its fruit.

But to those who have truly mastered the art of yoga action can never be an end in itself. It is a condition imposed by the laws of corporeal being. So long as one is in

the manifested state action surrounds one as the water surrounds the body of a swimmer. So action must go on all the time, a ceaseless jugglery in which the three forces play with matter, changing one form into another, creating, destroying, separating, reuniting. But all this display, fascinating as it may seem, has no more ultimate significance than have the tricks of a magician performed to astonish a gathering of children.

Behind the incessant change of the world of action the yogi sees the steadiness of the unmanifest; behind the whirl and dance of the many he sees the stillness of the One. Herein lies the secret, but how does one apply it to life? In the words of Krishna one must consider all action as a sacrifice to God, avoid all temptations to hanker after its fruits, regard one's physical body as an instrument only and follow the way imposed by one's being-duty.

"All work is performed by the play of three forces of nature, but he whose mind is deluded by egotism thinks: 'I am the doer'. O mighty Arjuna, he who knows the truth about these forces holds himself unattached. Surrender therefore all your action to God. With mind intent on the *atman* free yourself from longing and selfishness. So fight, considering yourself an instrument only. The Lord dwells in the hearts of all beings, O Arjuna, and by his *maya* causes them to revolve as though mounted on a machine. Take refuge in him alone with all your soul. By his grace you will obtain supreme peace and the everlasting abode."

What are the qualities of one who has attained such spiritual excellence? To begin with his aims are inner, not external. He is not perturbed by what passes for adversity, nor does he long for what passes for happiness. He is free from attachment, fear, and wrath. He is alike to friend and foe, unaltered in honor and dishonor, the same in cold and

heat, pleasure and pain, content with whatever he has and firm in mind. He does not identify himself with wife or child, home or possession, but sees the Self in all things and all things in the Self.

“He who never hates any being and is friendly and compassionate to all, who is free from the feelings of ‘I’ and ‘mine’, even-minded in pain and pleasure; he who is forbearing, content, steady in contemplation, self-controlled and possessed of firm conviction, who has consecrated his mind and understanding to God, he is dear to me.”

Krishna, however, makes no secret of the fact that this harmonious condition is very difficult to obtain. From the prison of *maya* it is not easy to escape. Few men even suspect that they are in prison and those who know it rarely make enough effort to escape. “Among thousands of men, one here and there strives for perfection; and of those who strive perhaps one reaches the truth.”

The cause of the trouble, of course, is the incessant battering which the mind receives from the senses, which romp and play and shriek and cavort across it like a gang of unruly schoolboys in a playground.

“The turbulent senses, O Arjuna, violently carry off the mind even of a wise man striving for perfection. When a man’s thought dwells on objects he feels attachment. Attachment gives rise to desire, and desire breeds anger. From anger comes delusion, from delusion the failure of memory, from the failure of memory the ruin of discrimination; and from the ruin of discrimination the man perishes. The man whose mind is not under his control has no Self-knowledge and no contemplation. Without contemplation he can have no peace; and without peace how can he have happiness? He attains peace into whom desires flow as rivers flow into the ocean, which is filled with water and

yet remains unmoved. He who forsakes desires and walks free from yearning, devoid of the sense of 'I' and 'mine' he finds the way to peace."

Steadiness of mind, mirrored calm, tranquillity which cannot be shaken by external events, these are the treasures which reward the serious practitioner of yoga. But before the fruit can be enjoyed how long and how difficult the preparation! It is akin to ploughing a hard compacted soil, or to catching and taming some unruly beast.

"The equanimity you have described, O Krishna, I do not see how it can endure because of the restlessness of the mind. For the mind is restless, turbulent, powerful and obstinate. I deem it as difficult to control as the wind."

And suppose, Arjuna continues, that a man does attempt to follow the way of yoga but cannot develop the needed control over the mind. What happens to him? Will he not fall from the high path he has tried to tread and, completely confused, perish "like a riven cloud"?

Krishna is reassuring on this subject. Sincere effort, he declares, is never unrewarded. After death and rebirth he comes into touch once more with his former knowledge, he is led once again to seek for truth, to continue the struggle where he left off before.

As for the way, it is not one but many. Many roads lead to the same goal. Yoga, accordingly, can be practiced in different ways. One way suits one type, another suits a second. There is the yoga of devotion, *bhakti* yoga, which draws upon and disciplines the religious emotions. There is *jnana* yoga, centering about the discipline of the intellect, *hatha* yoga, concerned with the discipline of the body, *karma* yoga which utilizes the activity of everyday life. So each can follow the way best suited to his temperament.

Yoga, therefore, represents the way to liberation. So

long as a man mistakes the play for reality he will be helpless as a puppet. And as long as he clings to his own sense of separateness, thinks in terms of "I" and "mine," he will never attain real peace or genuine happiness. Salvation can indeed be attained by man and this salvation consists in an escape from the narrow shell of egotism. It is an emergence from one state into another, a resurrection from a tomb, a breaking forth as the butterfly breaks out of the confining shell of the chrysalis. Yoga gives the power by which this escape is accomplished.

Yoga is not a collection of vague theories or theological arguments. Its methods are practical and realistic. It takes man for what he is, a psychophysiological entity possessing powers he knows nothing about. It shows the way in which these powers can be used for the attainment of inward liberation, that genuine freedom compared with which all other forms of freedom are merely bondage. For he alone is free who has escaped from the prison of the self.

Gautama and the Middle Way

He was not the first nor will he be the last. Just as Krishna represented only one of a series of incarnations of the Logos so the being now generally referred to as the Buddha represented only one of many Buddhas. It is, however, a historical fact that we have no record of the teachings of a Buddha *before* the birth of Gautama nor has any other being appeared calling himself Buddha in the 2500 years that have elapsed since his birth.

He was born in the fifth century B.C., that extraordinary century in which a sudden upsurge of spiritual force produced six Avatars in places as widely separated as China and Greece. Concerning his birth there are the usual legends, colorful and somewhat improbable as these legends usually are. The facts, as far as they can be ascertained, are that the future Buddha was born in 560 B.C. His father was Suddodhana, a ruler of the Sakyas, his mother was Maya-devi. He was named Gotama Siddhartha, was married to his cousin, Yashodhara, and had a son called Rahula. Up to his twenty-ninth year he apparently lived the life prescribed for a young ruler of the warrior caste. Then, quite abruptly, he abandoned wife, child, possessions, duties, and comforts, retired into the forest to live the life of a

solitary ascetic. He practiced all the prescribed austerities, ate so little that his body was little more than a sack of bones.

After seven years of such practices he became convinced of the uselessness of mortification. He was, by that time, practically dead from exhaustion. When he went to bathe in a nearby river he could scarcely pull himself out of the water. The struggle left him exhausted and he fell to the ground where he might have died. But Nanda, the herdsman's daughter, happened to pass by and, seeing the emaciated man lying in a swoon, she fed him on milk. Refreshed, the future Buddha found his mind had become clear again. Nothing, he decided, was to be gained by the mistreatment of the physical body. He left the place in which he had been practicing austerities, ate normally once again. His strength restored he set out on a great spiritual journey. Near the village of Uruvela, the present-day Bodh Gaya to the south of Patna, he seated himself under the holy Bo tree vowing not to rise from his seat until he had grasped the ultimate secret.

About this great spiritual struggle that took place under the Bo tree legend has woven its flowery wreath of stories. Mara, also called Kamadeva, lord of the cravings, enemy of the good law, seized his flower-made bow and his infatuating arrows. Advancing on the sage with his three sons, Confusion, Gaiety, and Pride, and his three daughters, Lust, Delight, and Thirst, he spoke these words, "Up, up, thou *kshatriya*, follow your duty and abandon this quest for liberation. Having conquered the lower worlds by your arrows, proceed to gain the higher worlds of *Indra* (heaven). That is a glorious path, which has been followed by former leaders of men. This mendicant life is ill suited to one born of a noble family." (23)

This advice, offered by Mara the tempter, seems curiously similar to that offered by Krishna to Arjuna. The future Buddha should perform the being-duty of a warrior, help govern his kingdom, concern himself with worldly affairs. But whereas Krishna aimed to teach Arjuna the secret of action without attachment (*karma yoga*), Mara had no other aim than to turn the future Buddha away from the path to liberation. His first attempt at persuasion having failed he summoned up his army of demons, all the delusions and dreams which can distract, distort, and disturb the human mind. All these he now hurled against the seated Gotama in a desperate attempt to prevent the sage from attaining enlightenment.

Mara's efforts, however, were wasted. Neither the lovely daughters, Lust, Delight, and Thirst, nor the hosts of hideous demons symbolizing all the terrors that can assail the mind had any effect on the meditating sage. After long hours of meditation the last veils concealing the great secret were torn away. Gotama Siddhartha had ceased to be an ordinary man and became, by virtue of his insight, "the perfectly wise, the Bhagavat, the Arhat, the King of the Law, the Tathagata, the Lord of all Science." In short he had attained Buddhahood, the state of complete enlightenment.

But having attained it what next? At this point the Buddha confronted that thorny problem which faces every great religious teacher at the beginning of his career. He had attained, by prodigious efforts, understanding of the way to liberation. Should he now try to give that knowledge to others?

"These sin defiled worlds will not understand this most excellent law. The unenlightened will shamelessly censure both me and my wisdom."

Under the circumstances would it not be wiser to leave the world to wallow in its own ignorance like a pig in a trough? Would he not do well to treasure the knowledge he had won and remain aloof, solitary and silent?

Mara, Lord of Delusion, was not slow to take advantage of these hesitations. Having failed to prevent Gotama from attaining Buddhahood he now tempted the Buddha to enter Nirvana without handing on his knowledge to others. Flattering and subservient he thus addressed the Tathagata: "O holy one, be pleased to enter Nirvana. Thy desires are accomplished." But the Buddha thrust Mara aside, resolving: "I will explain the doctrine for the sake of delivering the world." Mara fled shrieking and the Buddha set off for Benares, to transmit the truths he had found.

What were these truths? How does Buddhism differ from the Hinduism from which it sprang? Is it a new religion or merely a reinterpretation of an old one? How does it propose to tame and civilize *Homo ferox*, to aid this blood-thirsty killer to become worthy of the title *sapiens* which he has so mistakenly bestowed on himself? What was the Buddha's concept of salvation and what was the way to salvation?

It is not easy to answer these questions. The truths of Buddhism have not been concentrated in a single book as have those of Hinduism in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, those of Christianity in the Gospels. Buddhist literature is voluminous and often verbose. And the stream of Buddhism divided early into two, the Hinayana and the Mahayana. When the Mahayana teachings reached China and Japan they blended with Taoism to produce that distinct teaching known as Zen Buddhism, in which there has recently been a sudden upsurge of interest. All of which leads to the conclusion that it is no easy task to interpret and analyze

the teachings of Buddha as they bear on the central problem of man's salvation.

But what was the doctrine?

To begin with, the Buddha, as Krishna had done before him, taught that man, in his ordinary state, is totally ignorant about his true nature. This ignorance (*avidya* or non-seeing) makes it impossible for man to realize who he really is, where he really is, or why he really is. It also creates the conditions for suffering. Man in this state is like a being groping about in the dark who has stepped on a rope but thinks he has stepped on a snake. He is in mortal fear, though actually there is no reason for fear. In this dim state of unseeing, men are always mistaking ropes for snakes, tinsel for gold, filth for food, poison for water. In such a state how can man be happy?

This concept of man's condition is the basis of the Four Noble Truths, the essence of the doctrine, accepted by all schools of Buddhism, which Buddha first preached at Benares immediately after his enlightenment. These noble truths concern suffering, the origin of suffering, the cessation of suffering, and the way to cessation of suffering.

This emphasis on suffering has led many critics of Buddhism to define it as a pessimistic religion, excessively pre-occupied with the gloomy side of life. Is this criticism justified? Only if one takes the First Noble Truth out of context and refuses to consider it in relation to *avidya*, the state of nonseeing. For the first truth applies only to man in this state, and as long as he is in this state the first truth continues to apply.

So what is the First Noble Truth concerning suffering?*

* "Suffering" is the word which most translators of the Pali texts have used to convey the meaning of *dukkha*.

Birth is suffering, decay is suffering, sickness is suffering, death is suffering. To be joined to what one dislikes is suffering. To be separated from what one likes is suffering. Not to get what one desires is also suffering. In short all grasping of any of the five aggregates involves suffering.

Next, what is the Noble Truth concerning the origin of suffering? It is that craving which leads to rebirth, accompanied by delight and greed, seeking its delight now here, now there, craving for sensuous experience, craving to perpetuate oneself, craving for extinction.

Next, what is the Noble Truth concerning the cessation of suffering? It is the complete stopping of that craving, the withdrawal from it, the renouncing of it, throwing it back, liberation from it, nonattachment to it.

Finally, what is the Noble Truth concerning the way that leads to the cessation of ill? It is the Noble Eightfold Path consisting of right views, right intentions, right speech, right conduct, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, right concentration.

Such are the four foundation stones of Buddhism. They are, the reader should note, completely unconcerned with theology. They do not declare that God is three in one, that he made man, that he cares about man, that he will save man or damn him. They are concerned exclusively with psychological facts, with man's inner state, and means by which it might be improved.

According to Alan Watts this translation misses the real meaning of the word which might be better rendered as "frustration." "Or, if we were to translate *dukkha* as 'sour' we might say that the Buddha's doctrine is that life is soured by man's grasping attitude towards it—as milk turns sour when kept too long." (24)

Is Buddhism then an atheistic religion? In a sense it is. The Buddhist will admit that gods exist but he regards them merely as beings whose past actions have entitled them to occupy one of the pleasanter levels of the Round of Existence. These levels, six in number, are occupied by gods, *asuras*, humans, animals, ghosts, and demons. There is nothing permanent, however, about the status of any being on these six planes of sentient existence. A dweller in the highest heaven or the lowest hell is there simply as a result of the law of cause and effect. He is enjoying (or suffering) the fruits of his own actions. It is perfectly possible for an inhabitant of one of the heavens to rush down to hell. It is equally possible for an inhabitant of one of the hells to ascend to heaven. The only permanent thing about the round of existence (*samsara*) is its impermanence. To a Buddhist such ideas as Eternal Damnation or Eternal Salvation (in the sense of staying eternally in hell or in paradise) are totally nonsensical.

Equally nonsensical to a Buddhist is the concept of forgiveness of sins. This idea, from the Buddhist point of view, is an example of wishful thinking, a blend of sentimentality and faulty logic. Sins cannot be forgiven. In the first place there is no god to do the forgiving. The round of existence operates according to the laws of cause and effect. Evil actions produce evil fruits. Good actions produce good fruits. It is fantastic to suppose that this law can be changed by groveling before some god. The law of cause and effect in human behavior is as factual as the laws of chemistry and physics. It is as ridiculous to expect "forgiveness" of sins as it is to set fire to one's house and expect that it will rise from its ashes.

Equally fruitless, from the Buddhist point of view, is all that argumentation which delights theologians concerning

God's relation to nature, to man, to himself and so on and so forth. To concern oneself about such things is a waste of time. They are "questions which tend not to edification." Similarly arguments about such problems as whether the world is eternal or not eternal, whether the world is finite or infinite, whether the soul and body are the same or different, whether a saint exists after death or does not exist after death, are all dismissed as fruitless. Such discussions, declared the Buddha, are "as if a man wounded by an arrow thickly smeared with poison were to say: 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learned whether it was shot by a *brahmin* or a *kshatriya*. I will not have it taken out until I know whether it is an ordinary arrow, or claw-headed, or calf-toothed, or made of iron.' Such a man would die before he could learn these things." (25)

Thus did the Buddha save his followers from losing themselves in that maze of verbiage and useless speculation that forms a trap for philosophers and theologians alike. The Buddha's teaching was harshly and uncompromisingly practical. Life is short, opportunity is fleeting, to obtain birth in human form is difficult,* to obtain the true doctrine harder still. Would it not be a shame and a

* Awakening is only attainable from the human state. "This doctrine is common to both Hinduism and Buddhism. In the scheme of the six worlds—angels, titans, animals, purgatories, ghosts and men—men occupy the middle position analogous to equanimity (*upeksha*), and all the other worlds may be understood as representing various states of consciousness. Thus the angels (*deva*) are ecstasy, and the purgatories (*naraka*) are agony. Only in equanimity can yoga be undertaken." (Alan Watts)

disgrace to fritter away this opportunity in mere verbal wranglings? Let us go to the heart of the matter and concern ourselves with essentials.

But what is the heart of the matter? The heart of the matter is to formulate one's highest aim and then to set off and try to reach it. So far as Buddha's teaching is concerned the aim is formulated in the Third Noble Truth, the cessation of suffering. As for the way, this is described in the Fourth Noble Truth, the way to the cessation of suffering via the Eightfold Path.

Escape from suffering . . . Expressed in this form the supreme aim may easily be interpreted as a purely selfish craving. The aim can be better stated in positive terms, not as an escape but as a gain. The prize to be gained is liberation from the inward fetters, from delusion, lust, stupidity, selfishness, and all the evil fruits these conditions produce. Salvation? Yes, if one wishes to use this word. "Just as the great ocean has but one taste, the taste of salt, so my doctrine has only one flavor, the flavor of salvation." But the word salvation must be correctly understood. It is not deliverance from any fanciful state of damnation. It is salvation from delusion, the replacement of ignorance by knowledge, blindness by clear vision.

How is the goal to be reached? According to the Four Noble Truths the way to cessation of suffering consists in following the Noble Eightfold Path, consisting of right views, right intentions, right speech, right conduct, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, right concentration.

What does this mean in practice?

It means, to begin with, a severing of wordly ties, a leaving of wife, home, children, duties, possessions. "How difficult is it for the man who dwells at home to live the

higher life in all its bright perfection." So, forsaking his portion of wealth be it great or small, forsaking his circle of relatives be they many or few, he cuts off his hair and beard, clothes himself in the orange-colored robe, goes forth from the household life, into the homeless state.

So he becomes a beggar, his food any scraps or leftovers which others choose to put in his bowl. He must go from house to house making no distinction between the poor and the wealthy. He must be satisfied with whatever he gets. If a woman gives him food he must be careful not to look at her or speak to her. Women are a deadly danger to the recluse. "Better far with red-hot irons to bore out both your eyes, than encourage in yourselves sensual thoughts, or look upon a woman's form with lustful desires." Sexual activity of any kind is absolutely forbidden.

So what comes next? He is a beggar, a celibate, a wanderer without a home. Is this by itself sufficient to give liberation? Far from it, declares the Buddha. These are merely the outward trappings of a *bhikshu* (monk). The inward development is what really matters. And what is this inward development? First the monk must master the minor moralities and avoid the ten evils. 1) He must put away the killing of living things and hold aloof from the destruction of life. 2) He must not take anything not his own. 3) He must abstain from exploiting the passions. 4) He must speak only the truth. 5) He must never invent evil reports, indulge in criticism or backbiting. 6) He must speak little and only with decency and dignity. 7) He must waste no time on gossip. 8) He must neither covet nor envy. 9) He must cherish no hatred even against an enemy but must embrace all living beings with kindness. 10) He must free his mind of ignorance and cultivate a hunger for truth. (26)

But this mastering of the minor moralities is also only a beginning. To obtain true liberation the monk must go further than this.

First, he must be guarded as to the doors of his senses. Never should he allow the impressions brought by his senses to take possession of his mind, to romp and jabber and riot there like a herd of apes. When he sees an object with his eye he must not be entranced with its general appearance or details. He keeps watch over his faculty of sight and he attains mastery over it. In like manner when he hears a sound with his ear, smells an odor with his nose, tastes a flavor with his tongue, feels a touch with his body he is not entranced either with the general appearance or with the details of the impression.

Second, he must be mindful and self-possessed, not plunged and immersed in whatever he happens to be doing but detached at all times and objectively aware of his action. Whatever he does, whether he goes or comes, whether he is eating or drinking, chewing or reposing, sitting, standing, lying down, obeying the calls of nature he is objectively aware of what he is about. Whatever he does he keeps clearly before his mind's eye all that is wrapped up in the action, its immediate object, its ethical significance, whether or not it is conducive to the attainment of the lofty aim he has set before him. Such is the state of mindfulness and self-possession.

Third, he must cultivate contentment. He must be satisfied with sufficient robes to cover his body, sufficient food to keep him from starvation. His robe, his begging bowl are his sole possessions. These he takes with him as he goes just as a bird with its wings flies wherever it will.

Fourth, he must meditate on the physical body to rid himself of the delusion of self. Reflecting upon it from the

soles of the feet to the crown of the head he must regard it as a sack of skin filled with various impurities. "Here in this body are hair and down, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bones, marrow, kidney, heart, liver, membranes, spleen, lungs, stomach, bowels, excrement, bile, phlegm, pus, blood, sweat, fat, tears, semen, saliva, mucus, synovial fluid, urine." Further—he must reflect that this body is ceaselessly changing, that it is not the same as it was yesterday, will not be the same tomorrow, just as a candle flame changes from moment to moment. Moreover he must reflect, calling to mind the corpses in the charnel field, swollen, putrifying, turning black and stinking: "This body too is even so constituted and sooner or later will suffer such a fate."

Reflecting further he must consider the nature of the self, that it has no permanence, no reality. That there is neither self in the body nor self in the mind, that thoughts are not self, feelings are not self, sensations are not self. That self is an error, an illusion, a dream. That those who are slaves to the illusion of I are like prisoners in a dungeon, suffering all manner of miseries for the sake of a delusion. And from this he must proceed to a consideration of the Twelvefold Chain of Dependent Origination, namely ignorance gives rise to motivation, motivation to consciousness, consciousness to name-and-form, to the six senses, to sense stimulation, to sense experience, to grasping, to possessiveness, to being, birth, old age, and death with ignorance at the end to start the cycle all over again.

Then, having engaged in these meditations and spiritual exercises, having freed his mind of malevolence, torpor, weakness, sloth, fretfulness, irritability, vexation, perplexity, doubt and hankering, he must sit cross-legged with body erect and intelligence alert. Sitting thus, aloof from sensual appetites and evil ideas, he enters and abides in the

first state of rapture, in which there is cogitation and deliberation, which is born of solitude and full of joy and ease. Then, suppressing cogitation and deliberation, he enters and abides in the second state of rapture which is born of concentration and full of joy and ease. Next, putting aside joy, he enters the third state of rapture, abiding calmly contemplative while feeling in his body that ease which contemplation produces. Finally putting aside all feelings both of ease and lack of ease he enters and abides in the fourth rapture, a rapture of utter purity of mindfulness and equanimity in which neither ease is felt nor any ill.

Thus does he follow the path of the fourfold setting up of mindfulness which was called by the Buddha "the one and only path leading to the purification of beings, to passing far beyond grief and lamentation, to the dying out of ill and misery, to the attainment of right method, to the realization of Nirvana." (27)

Such was the way of life that Gautama, the Buddha, originally taught in India. It differed from the teaching of Krishna in several respects. First it demanded complete renunciation of the world. The idea of performing one's duty as a sacrifice has no place in Buddhism as originally taught. Second it denied the existence of God and of God-in-man. The whole concept of the *atman* was rejected by the Buddha. Self in any form is an illusion. There is neither a higher self nor a lower self. Finally it denied the efficacy of rites, of sacrifices, of prayers and of priests. It firmly proclaimed that every man must depend for his liberation on his own efforts, that there is no god to save him or protect him or redeem him, that he is absolutely alone in the blind sea of cause and effect (*samsara*) and neither prayers nor grovelings will help him out of it. The words spoken by

the Buddha shortly before his death leave no doubt on this score.

“I am grown old, Ananda, and full of years. My journey is drawing to a close. I have reached the sum of my days and am turning eighty years of age. Therefore, Ananda, be lamps unto yourselves. Rely on yourselves. Do not rely on external help.

“Hold fast to the truth as a lamp. Seek salvation alone in the truth. Look not for existence to any one beside yourselves.

“Those who now or after I am dead, shall be lamps to themselves, relying on themselves only and not relying on any external help, holding fast to the truth as their lamp, seeking salvation in the truth alone, it is they, Ananda, who shall reach the topmost height! But they must be anxious to learn.” (28)

The same stern spirit of self-reliance vibrates in the final words uttered by the Buddha just before his death.

“Decay inheres in all component things. Work out your salvation with diligence!”

To a man brought up in the Western tradition, busy, hyperactive, concerned with doing and getting, these teachings of the Buddha may seem open to criticism on several scores.

To begin with, why all this emphasis on suffering? No doubt in the India of 500 B.C. there was a lot of suffering. Life was short, disease rampant, poverty widespread, hunger more or less continuous for all but the wealthiest. But what has this to do with us, favored children of the scientific revolution, healthy, well fed, well clothed, and lavishly amused, watched over from cradle to grave by a paternal government? Would it not be the grossest ingratitude on

our part if we were to accept the first of the Four Noble Truths and declare that birth is suffering and practically everything that follows it is suffering? How can we truthfully say this when we can eat steak every day and at the flip of a switch call up little shadows to dance and gyrate in a glass tube for our amusement?

And what about all this retiring into forests or shaving off one's hair and living as a beggar? Let us admit that to retire to a forest now and then may have a soothing effect, especially for a city dweller. But to make a regular habit of it . . . this is a very different matter. Think what would happen if we all went trekking off into forests. The wheels of industry would grind to a halt, there would be no medical services, no heat, no light, no gas, no electricity. There would be no food, there would be no clothing. The crops would rot in the fields, the fruits wither on the trees.

And then all this begging . . . Doesn't the Buddha realize that it is shameful to beg? Shall we, in the name of the Higher Life, drift around looking for handouts? What's so despicable about earning an honest living and playing a useful role in human society? Why should I hold out my bowl and expect another man to fill it?

And then this celibacy. . . All this rigmarole about never looking at a woman. If the practice became universal what would happen to mankind? Is it the aim of the Enlightened One's teaching to wipe the human race painlessly off the face of the earth? Admitted we may not be any great credit to the biosphere but surely we have some useful role to perform!

These criticisms are obviously justified. Buddhism, as originally taught by the Buddha, is an extreme example of what Albert Schweitzer has called world and life negation.

The Buddha went far further in this direction than did Sri Krishna when he offered his advice to Arjuna. For Krishna never told Arjuna to turn away from the world, to retreat to a forest, shave his hair, leave his wife and children, and become a beggar. Quite the reverse. Such an action would have violated Arjuna's *svadharma* and *svabhava*. It would have been a gross failure in the performance of his being-duty. The supreme task, as Krishna defined it, was to be in the world yet not of it, to act and yet remain indifferent to the fruits of action, to be actor and observer at the same time and to perform one's duty not with pride but as a sacrifice to God.

Perhaps it was because of this failure to take into account the social responsibilities of man that Buddhism finally died out in India. In Tibet, China, and Japan the teaching evolved, giving rise to what is known as Mahayana Buddhism or the Buddhism of the Greater Vehicle. This teaching centered about the Bodhisattva career, which placed emphasis on sacrifice rather than personal liberation. A Bodhisattva is a being who stands on the verge of attaining Buddhahood but who voluntarily refuses to take the final step. In the words of the Diamond Sutra: "Doers of what is hard are the Bodhisattvas, the great beings who have set out to win supreme enlightenment. They do not wish to attain their own private Nirvana. On the contrary, they have surveyed the highly painful world of being, and yet, desiring to win supreme enlightenment, they do not tremble at birth and death. They have set out for the benefit of the world, for the ease of the world, out of pity for the world. They have resolved: "We will become a shelter for the world, a refuge for the world, the world's place of rest, the final relief of the world, islands of the world, lights of

the world, leaders of the world, the world's means of salvation." (29)

This attitude is also neatly summarized in the Tibetan *Precepts of the Gurus* under the heading of "The Ten Errors": "Unless the mind be trained to selflessness and infinite compassion, one is apt to fall into the error of seeking liberation for the self alone." (30)

The Bodhisattva ideal makes the charge of selfishness untenable.

But what of *ahimsa*, harmlessness, nonkilling? Does the emphasis placed on this attitude by Buddha* leave civilization helpless before the armed barbarians? Must we bow to any gun-carrying gangster and make no attempt to oppose the violent and brutal? On the whole the answer would seem to be yes. "In India the monks offered no resistance when the Hephtalic Huns, and later on the Mohammedans sacked the monasteries, killed their inhabitants, burned the libraries and destroyed the sacred images. Organized Bud-

* (It must be emphasized that Mahavira, founder of Jainism, placed even more emphasis on *ahimsa* than did Gautama. In general Jainism resembles Buddhism in most respects but goes to greater extremes. For example Buddhist monks shave off their hair, Jains pull it out. Buddhists wear a yellow robe, Jains go naked (or did until recently), Buddhist monks eat meat if it is put in their bowls, Jains never touch it. Though Mahavira was undoubtedly an Avatar and the religion he founded was lofty it never attained the great influence of Buddhism. Limitations of space prevent a full discussion of Mahavira's teaching. The interested reader should consult Mrs. S. Stevenson's *The Heart of Jainism.*) (31)

dhism, as a result of this persecution, was extinguished first in Gandhara, and then in the whole North of India.” (Conze)

Nevertheless when Simha, the general, consulted the Buddha on this matter he was told: “The Tathagata teaches that all warfare in which man tries to slay his brother is lamentable, but he does not teach that those who go to war in a righteous cause after having exhausted all means to preserve peace are blameworthy. He must be blamed who is the cause of the war.” (32)

Finally, what answer can be given to the charge of unpracticality? We live in a modern society, have duties, have obligations. Is the practice of the Buddhist method of discipline possible under conditions of ordinary life? *Must* a man leave all he has, abandon wife, children, job, and home? Surely if Arjuna could find salvation on a battlefield then a modern man or woman can find it in everyday life.

It is difficult to answer this question. The Buddha seemed firmly convinced that life as a householder is not compatible with full spiritual growth. There were exceptions however. One such was the householder Vimalakirti, hero of the *Vimalakirti Sutra*, whose understanding of the doctrine was so profound that none of Buddha's disciples dared visit him when he was sick for fear of exposing their ignorance. When Manjusri, wisdom incarnate, finally consented to visit the sick man he held forth at some length on the doctrine of nonduality and asked Vimalakirti what he thought of it. The latter responded with total silence. For this he was praised by the Buddha, suggesting that, in rare instances, a householder can progress further along the Path than can a monk.

Finally what of Zen? This branch of Mahayana Buddhism has become fashionable in some circles and is much talked

about. How does it differ from the original teaching? What are the characteristics of the Zen method?

The chief characteristic of Zen is its directness. It is:

“Outside teaching, apart from tradition;
Not founded on words and letters;
Pointing directly to the human mind;
Seeing into one’s nature and attaining Buddhahood.” (24)

Or, in the words of D. T. Suzuki: “Zen in its essence is the art of seeing into the nature of one’s own being, and it points the way from bondage to freedom. By making us drink right from the fountain of life, it liberates us from all the yokes under which we finite beings are usually suffering in this world. We can say that Zen liberates all the energies properly and naturally stored in each of us, which are in ordinary circumstances so cramped that they find no adequate channel for activity.

“This body of ours is something like an electric battery in which a mysterious power latently lies. When this power is not properly brought into operation it either grows mouldy and withers away or is warped and expresses itself abnormally. It is the object of Zen, therefore, to save us from going crazy or being crippled.” (33)

Zen uses certain methods which are peculiarly its own, methods which seem to exert a fascination for the Western mind on account of their novelty and seeming simplicity. This simplicity is sometimes misinterpreted to mean that total enlightenment can be obtained by pondering a few logically unanswerable questions (*koans*) such as “What is the sound of one hand?” or “What are your original features which you have even prior to your birth?” The idea has also become prevalent that Zen involves flouting the conventions, an “all is permitted” sort of religion, a view

especially popular with some so-called beatniks among whom Zen, or what passes for Zen, has attained the status of a fad.

There is, of course, no truth in these ideas. Zen is a form of spiritual discipline aimed at producing insight into the illusory nature of self. To this insight there are no short cuts. In fact Zen, because of the very subtlety of its methods, may represent for some a long way round. None of the Zen masters has ever suggested that the way of Zen is short or easy. It may appear to be. But so do the effortless feats of a juggler or acrobat appear easy to one who has never tried to perform them.

The strenuous side of Zen discipline is perhaps best shown by Kakuan's "Ten Oxherding Pictures."* Though the pictures can be variously interpreted, as can most of the works of the Zen masters, they leave no doubt that the Way of Zen, in its early stages at least, is arduous. In the final stage, to be sure, the Zen adept returns from his spiritual pilgrimage looking to all appearances like anyone else. At this stage he can go anywhere and associate with anyone.

"His thatched cottage gate is closed, and even the wisest know him not. No glimpses of his inner life are to be caught, for he goes on his own way without following the steps of the ancient sages. Carrying a gourd (the symbol of emptiness) he goes out into the market, leaning against a staff he comes home. He is found in the company of wine-bibbers and butchers, he and they are all converted into Buddhas."

In short, this cheerful, roly-poly character, smiling broadly and "daubed with ashes and mud," might very

* (Reproduced in Suzuki's *Manual of Zen Buddhism*

well be a modern "beatnik," flouting the conventions, careless of his appearance and none too meticulous about personal cleanliness. But would-be Zen masters of the "Dharma-bum" school would do well to remember that the cheery old vagabond depicted above represents the result of many years of strenuous discipline. One can hardly expect to reach the tenth stage of spiritual oxherding when one has not even gone through the first or second.

If a simple sentence can be found to sum up the way of Zen it might perhaps be one from the writings of the Chinese master, Seng-t'san:

"Wordiness and intellection—

The more with them the further astray we go;

Away therefore with wordiness and intellection,

And there is no place where we cannot pass freely." (34)

In short the supreme aim of Zen, which underlies all its seeming absurdities and refutation of logic, is to lead the student out of that jungle of verbiage in which all of us wander as if in an enchanted wood, mistaking the symbol for the "thing in itself," unable to perceive the true "suchness" of anything. So the *koan*, that unanswerable question beyond sense and logic, can turn into a key which unlocks the door. It swings open and lo, a new world! Just the same old world actually but seen in a new way, no longer distorted through the eyes of self. This is *satori*, to attain which the Zen student may labor for as long as ten years. And when attained what is it? Listen to the words of the Zen poet, P'ang-yun:

"Miraculous power and marvellous activity—

Drawing water and hewing wood!"

Lao-tse and the Perfect Tao

Little is known about him. He passed across the face of human thought like a subtle breeze just ruffling the surface. A great century produced him, that same century which brought forth Confucius, Buddha, Mahavira, Socrates, Zoroaster, and Pythagoras. It seems that he was born in Honan and became keeper of the archives at the court of the Chou dynasty. To Confucius, younger than Lao-tse and very different in temperament, he appeared an enigma, an almost fabulous being who defied classification. Wrote Confucius, after an interview with Lao-tse:

“I know how the birds fly, how the fishes swim, how the animals run. But there is the dragon. I cannot tell how it mounts on the wind through the clouds and flies through Heaven. Today I have seen Lao-tse, and I can only compare him to the dragon.”

Confucius was not alone in finding Lao-tse elusive. No other great book is quite so hard to grasp, quite so filled with apparent contradictions and paradoxes as is the *Tao-Teh-King*, the document in which the “Old Philosopher” incorporated his view of the way to salvation. Brevity is its

very essence. Indeed it seems at times that the passion for brief statement has brought the sage to the verge of becoming unintelligible. But since he laid it down as a basic principle that "He who knows does not speak: he who speaks does not know," how did it happen that he wrote a book at all? The answer is that he might have stolen off the stage of life unnoticed, without writing a word, had not a certain obscure customs official elicited from the departing sage the promise of a book. Here is what happened in the words of Lao-tse's sole biographer:

"Lao-tse practised reason and virtue. His doctrine aims at self-concealment and namelessness.

"Lao-tse resided in Chou most of his life. When he foresaw the decay of Chou, he departed and came to the frontier. The custom-house officer, Yin-Hi, said: 'Sir, since it pleases you to retire, I request you for my sake to write a book.' Thereupon Lao-tse wrote a book in two parts consisting of five thousand and some words, in which he discussed the concepts of reason and virtue. Then he departed. No one knows where he died."

And what view did the "Old Philosopher" express in his five thousand and some words? What is the Tao?

"The Tao that can be expressed is not the true Tao.

The name that can be defined is not the unchanging name."

Name and form again, the old problem. But what does it mean to live "in accord with Tao"? Simply expressed it means "noninterference" or "letting alone," a philosophy very alien to our modern world where interfering, organizing, and standardizing is the order of the day.

"Not exalting the worthy keeps the people from emulation.

Not valuing rare things keeps them from theft.
 Not showing what is desirable keeps their hearts
 from confusion.

Therefore the sage rules
 By emptying their hearts,
 Filling their stomachs,
 Weakening their ambitions
 And strengthening their bones.

He always keeps them from knowing what is evil and desiring what is good; thus he gives the crafty ones no chance to act. He governs by nonaction, consequently there is nothing ungoverned." (35)

Government by noninterference both inward and outward, here is the secret of harmonious development. The follower of Tao has three treasures which he holds and guards; the first is called love, the second is called moderation, the third is called not venturing to go ahead of the world. As regards love it must be given freely both to those that hate us and those that love us:

"The sage has no self to call his own;
 He makes the self of the people his self.
 To the good I act with goodness;
 To the bad I also act with goodness:
 Thus goodness is attained.
 To the faithful I act with faith;
 To the faithless I also act with faith;
 Thus faith is attained.
 The sage lives in the world in concord, and rules
 over the world in simplicity."

Moderation must be shown in all things, especially in government. "Govern a great state as you would cook a small fish (do it gently)."

As for not venturing to go ahead in the world this concept is bound up with the whole concept of nonpossessing, nonconquering, nondominating. For the conqueror defeats himself, the victor is worse off than the vanquished. The higher he climbs the farther he falls.

“The weakest things in the world can overmatch the strongest things in the world.

“Nothing can be compared to water for its weak and yielding nature; yet in attacking the hard and the strong nothing works more surely.

“The weak can overcome the strong and the yielding can overcome the hard.”

Therefore:

“The best soldier is not soldierly;
 The best fighter is not ferocious;
 The best conqueror takes no part in war;
 The best employer of men keeps himself below them.
 This is called the virtue of not contending;
 This is called the ability of using men.”

As for war and conquest, the man who lives in harmony with Tao abhors such activities: “So far as arms are concerned they are implements of ill-omen. They are not implements for the man of Tao. He uses them only when he cannot avoid it. In his conquests he takes no delight. If he took delight in them it would mean that he enjoys the slaughter of men. He who takes delight in the slaughter of men cannot have his will done in the world.”

Therefore:

“He who knows others is wise;
 But he who knows himself is enlightened.
 He who conquers others is strong:

He who conquers himself is mighty— . . .
 Over-love of anything will lead to squandering;
 Amassing of riches will be followed by plundering.
 So he who knows contentment can never be humiliated.
 He who knows where to stop . . . will long endure.”

All of which is a very alien philosophy to our modern culture devoted to external conquest, to the plundering of nature, to squandering on a gigantic scale and preparations for wholesale, total, and reciprocal destruction. Rarely indeed has a civilization been more completely out of harmony with Tao!

The true way lies in humility and obscurity, in accordance with the saying, “Be humble, and you will remain entire,” a piece of ancient wisdom which Lao-tse amplifies, defining, in so doing, the truly harmonious man.

“Be bent, and you will remain straight.
 Be vacant, and you will remain full.
 Be worn, and you will remain new.
 He who has little will receive.
 He who has much will be embarrassed.
 Therefore the sage keeps to One and becomes the
 standard for the world.
 He does not display himself, therefore he shines.
 He does not approve himself, therefore he is noted.
 He does not praise himself, therefore he has merit.
 He does not glory in himself; therefore he excels.
 Because he does not compete no one in the world can
 compete with him.”

Finally, to summarize all that he had written, the Old Philosopher added one last verse to his book, a yardstick to

serve forever as a measure of the spiritual achievement of any man.

“He who knows does not speak;
He who speaks does not know.
He who is truthful is not showy;
He who is showy is not truthful.
He who is virtuous does not dispute;
He who disputes is not virtuous.
He who is learned is not wise;
He who is wise is not learned.
Therefore the sage does not display
his own merits.”

A marvelous doctrine! “Nothing like this book. . . .” wrote the Reverend Samuel Johnson in his study, *Oriental Religions*. “So lofty, so vital, so restful, at the roots of strength; in structure as wonderful as in its spirit. Terse aphorisms of a mystical and universal wisdom.” The praise is appropriate from a Christian for how often, in the sayings of Lao-tse, do we hear echoes of those teachings given five centuries later by Jesus. Nonetheless the book lacked a certain practicality. It was so terse as to be in places almost unintelligible. As a basis for living it tended to be eclipsed by the more activist though shallower teaching of Confucius.

In short Lao-tse’s teaching was almost too ethereal. It badly needed interpreting in terms closer to everyday reality, pots and pans, chairs and tables, food and clothes, sorrows and joys, hopes and fears. This new interpretation was forthcoming. It was made by a man who, by whatever standards one chooses to adopt, must be regarded as one of the most brilliant writers in the history of world literature.

His name was Chuang-tse. He lived two hundred years after his master, at a time when the teachings of Lao-tse were being eclipsed by a revival of Confucianism. In a series of short stories which, for sheer literary brilliance, have never been equaled, Chuang-tse illustrated how the principle of *wu-wei* can be applied to real-life situations.

There are subtle overtones to the meaning of *wu-wei* not fully captured by the usual English translation, nonaction. For to live in harmony with Tao does not mean to sit around doing nothing. It means to act in such a way that there remains at all times something, some inner point of reference, that remains apart, that does not become identified with the action. Thus the excellent cook so praised by Prince Hui ("From the words of this cook I have learned how to take care of my life") did not rely merely on skill but on eternal principles which he applied to his personal task, cutting up bullocks. As a result even that unromantic task acquired harmony and beauty.

"Every blow of his hand, every heave of his shoulders, every tread of his foot, every thrust of knee, every *whish* of rent flesh, every *chhk* of the chopper, was in perfect harmony, rhythmical like the dance of the Mulberry Grove, simultaneous like the chords of the Ching Shou." (36)

In the same way the Court carpenter, Ch'ing, whose work was of such beauty that it seemed of supernatural execution, relied not on skill but on perfect inward collectedness.

"I first reduce my mind to absolute quiescence. Three days in this condition, and I become oblivious of any reward to be gained. Five days, and I become oblivious of any fame to be acquired. Seven days and I become unconscious of my four limbs and my physical frame. Then, with no thought

of the Court present in my mind, my skill becomes concentrated and all disturbing elements are gone. I enter some mountain forest. I seek a suitable tree. It contains the form required which is afterwards elaborated."

So what does it mean to live in harmony with Tao? It means to roll like a pebble in the water, to flow in the stream of life, to concentrate on being without bothering about becoming. Such a one floats through life to rest in death. He has no anxieties. He makes no plans. Honor does not make him feel illustrious nor does misfortune make him grieve. His sleep is dreamless and he wakes without pain. Unconditioned and in repose he is a partaker of the virtue of God.

But how does an ordinary man, surrounded as if by a host of phantoms with petty cares, small hopes, small fears, trifling ambitions, and locked in the circle of a narrow ego, ever attain such a harmonious state? He will never attain it, says Chuang-tse, as long as he remains in his ordinary state. To change he must first have a glimpse, however fleeting, of wider horizons, of the territory beyond the petty self that he might explore could he ever break out of his personal prison. Without this glimpse he will remain forever a victim to the illusion of his personal importance, as a river may think its power infinite until at last it receives a glimpse of the sea. In his own inimitable way, Chuang-tse states this fact.

"It was the time of autumn floods. Every stream poured into the river, which swelled in its turbid course. The banks receded so far from one another that it was impossible to tell a cow from a horse.

"Then the Spirit of the River laughed for joy that all the beauty of the earth was gathered to himself. Down with the

stream he journeyed east, until he reached the ocean. There, looking eastwards and seeing no limit to its waves, his countenance changed. And as he gazed over the expanse, he sighed and said to the Spirit of the Ocean, 'A vulgar proverb says that he who has heard but part of the truth thinks no one equal to himself. And such a one am I.

" 'When formerly I heard people detracting from the learning of Confucius or underrating the heroism of Poh I, I did not believe. But now that I have looked upon your inexhaustibility—alas for me, had I not reached your abode, I should have been for ever a laughingstock to those of comprehensive enlightenment!'

"To which the Spirit of the Ocean replied, 'You cannot speak of ocean to a well-frog,—the creature of a narrower sphere. You cannot speak of ice to a summer insect,—the creature of a season. You cannot speak of TAO to a pedagogue: his scope is too restricted. But now that you have emerged from your narrow sphere and have seen the great ocean, you know your own insignificance, and I can speak to you of great principles.

" 'Dimensions are limitless; time is endless. Conditions are not invariable; terms are not final. Thus, the wise man looks into space, and does not regard the small as too little, nor the great as too much; for he knows that there is no limit to dimension. He looks back into the past, and does not grieve over what is far off, nor rejoice over what is near; for he knows that time is without end. He investigates fullness and decay, and does not rejoice if he succeeds, nor lament if he fails; for he knows that conditions are not invariable. He who clearly apprehends the scheme of existence, does not rejoice over life, nor repine at death, for he knows that terms are not final.

" 'What man knows is not to be compared with what he

does not know. The span of his existence is not to be compared with the span of his non-existence.

“ ‘I have heard say, the man of TAO has no reputation; perfect virtue acquires nothing; the truly great man ignores self;—this is the height of self-discipline.’ ”

“ ‘But how then,’ asked the Spirit of the River, ‘are the internal and external extremes of value and worthlessness, of greatness and smallness, to be determined?’ ”

“ ‘From the point of view of TAO,’ replied the Spirit of the Ocean, ‘there are no such extremes of value or worthlessness. Men individually value themselves and hold others cheap. The world collectively withholds from the individual the right of appraising himself.’ ”

“ ‘If we say that a thing is great or small because it is relatively great or small, then there is nothing in all creation which is not great, nothing which is not small.’ ”

“ ‘The life of man passes by like a galloping horse, changing at every turn, at every hour. What should he do, or what should he not do, other than let his decomposition go on?’ ”

“ ‘If this is the case,’ retorted the Spirit of the River, ‘pray what is the value of TAO?’ ”

“ ‘Those who understand TAO,’ answered the Spirit of the Ocean, ‘must necessarily apprehend the eternal principles above mentioned and be clear as to their application. Consequently, they do not suffer any injury from without.’ ”

“ ‘The man of perfect virtue cannot be burnt by fire, nor drowned in water, nor hurt by frost or sun, nor torn by wild bird or beast. Not that he makes light of these; but that he discriminates between safety and danger.’ ”

“ ‘Happy under prosperous and adverse circumstances alike, cautious as to what he discards and what he accepts;—nothing can harm him.’ ”

From all this it follows that man should not busy himself with what he chooses to call the "conquest of nature." Such a conquest and the desire for such a conquest is totally out of harmony with Tao and with the concept of noninterference. Modern man, pushing and shoving, jostling his fellow creatures out of the way like the inveterate bully he is, tearing up the soil, blasting the rocks, even sending his meddling messengers out into space, is about as unenlightened from the Taoist standpoint as anyone could be. It is amusing to compare the worshipful modern attitude toward the omnipresent labor-saving device with that of the old gardener of Han-yin who so sternly rebuked the mechanically minded Tze Kung.

"When Tze Kung went south to the Ch'u State on his way back to the Chin State, he passed through Han-yin. There he saw an old man engaged in making a ditch to connect his vegetable garden with a well. He had a pitcher in his hand, with which he was bringing up water and pouring it into the ditch,—great labour with very little result.

"'If you had a machine here,' cried Tze Kung, 'in a day you could irrigate a hundred times your present area. The labour required is trifling as compared with the work done. Would you not like to have one?'

"'What is it?' asked the gardener.

"'It is a contrivance made of wood,' replied Tze Kung, 'heavy behind and light in front. It draws up water as you do with your hands, but in a constantly overflowing stream. It is called a well-sweep.'

"Thereupon the gardener flushed up and said, 'I have heard from my teacher that those who have cunning implements are cunning in their dealings, and that those who have cunning in their hearts cannot be pure and incorrupt, and that those who are not pure and incorrupt are restless

in spirit, and that those who are restless in spirit are not fit vehicles for TAO. It is not that I do not know of these things. I should be ashamed to use them.'

"At this Tze Kung was much abashed, and said nothing. Then the gardener asked him who he was, to which Tze Kung replied that he was a disciple of Confucius.

"'Are you not one who extends his learning with a view to being a sage; who talks big in order to put himself above the rest of mankind; who plays in a key to which no one can sing so as to spread his reputation abroad? Rather become unconscious of self and shake off the trammels of the flesh,—and you will be near. But if you cannot govern your own self, what leisure have you for governing the empire? Begone! Do not interrupt my work.'

"Tze Kung changed color and slunk away, being not at all pleased with this rebuff; and it was not before he had travelled some thirty li that he recovered his usual appearance."

Leave things alone! Such is the essence of the Taoist teachings. In story after story Chuang-tse pokes gentle fun at the organizers, the meddlers, the fussers, fumers and general interferers. If only man would behave with decent moderation, would make his peace with nature instead of trying to "conquer" her, would stop puffing himself up and learn to roll with the stream he would find that joy in life now so painfully lacking and that tranquillity for which he seeks in vain. And as for death, what need to worry about that?

"What have I to fear? Ere long I shall be decomposed. My left shoulder will become a cock, and I shall herald the approach of morn. My right shoulder will become a cross bow, and I shall be able to get broiled duck. My buttocks will become wheels; and with my soul for a horse, I shall be

able to ride in my own chariot. I obtained life because it was my time: I am now parting with it in accordance with the same law. Content with the natural sequence of these states, joy and sorrow touch me not. I am simply, as the ancients expressed it, hanging in the air unable to cut myself down. Why then should I be afraid?"

Why indeed! To have fear of anything that may happen signifies lack of harmony with Tao. Instead of rolling with the stream one tries to swim against it. Or worse still, one tries to alter its course. Modern man, that chronic busybody, is always trying to change the stream to suit his own convenience or comfort. As a result he finds himself in danger of going head first over the cataract and smashing himself and his boastful civilization on the rocks at the bottom.

Such at least would be the Taoist argument. Of course it is not very difficult to find fault with this line of reasoning. Letting things alone, if conscientiously practiced, would have left man at the level of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, a creature without fire, without tools, without clothes, without books, without houses, without medicines, or cities. It would also have left him without policemen, tax collectors, politicians, prisons, armaments and armies, without either the blessings of civilizations or its blights.

Chuang-tse evidently felt that the blights outweighed the blessings. "Ever since the time of the Three Dynasties, men have done nothing but struggle over rewards and punishments. What possible leisure can they have had for adapting themselves to the natural conditions of their existence?"

As a recipe for salvation, however, Taoism lacked appeal. Despite the charm of Chuang-tse and the wisdom of Lao-tse the doctrine never took hold in its pure form in China. As

the centuries passed it became more and more associated with spells, incantations, magic, and a weird concoction assumed to confer immortality. This was not wholly surprising. While it is true to say that formal rites of any kind threaten the vitality of a religion, the teachings of Lao-tse and Chuang-tse went too far in the other direction. They were so totally informal as to tend to evaporate completely in the conditions of ordinary life.

The spirit of Taoism is not lost, however. Its fine distilled essence was captured by the Zen masters and incorporated into their version of Buddhism. Zen, though about as informal as any religion can be, had sufficient external shape to enable it to hold together. In this way Zen Buddhism functioned like a vessel to hold the ethereal essence of Taoism and prevent it from evaporating.

Socrates and the Stoics

He came at the end of an epoch, at a time of trouble. The glory of the age of Pericles still shed its light over Athens, but it was a sunset glory, red and lurid. The war with Sparta, grinding on through year after dreary year, had infected the whole of Athens with a kind of communal insanity which reached its height with the dispatching of a fleet to invade Syracuse, an arrogant, needless and, as it turned out, disastrous gesture from the effect of which the state never recovered. During this protracted struggle a progressive deterioration in moral standards took place, aptly described by the historian Thucydides:

“War, by imposing hardships and controls on daily life, produces an aggressive mentality and degrades people’s character according to their wretched conditions. The result in this case was a general state of public disorder in all countries. As time went on and the earlier atrocities became an accepted fact, the later ones were marked by refinements of technique and novel methods of retaliation. Even words lost their proper meanings and were changed to

suit current propaganda. . . . Even family ties were broken for the sake of party loyalty. . . . Relations between people were governed not by the security of established customs but by the prospect of selfish gain in defiance of the law." (37)

Such was the atmosphere prevailing in Athens at the time of Socrates. To be sure, Athens was a democracy, but a democracy that had fallen on evil days. The rights of the individual were no longer respected. So widespread was corruption in the courts of justice that Socrates, following the bidding of his "inner voice," refused to accept any sort of public office. Instead he functioned as a sort of "conscience of society," in much the same way as did the Hebrew prophets. He was, however, no uncouth solitary, no "voice crying in the wilderness" denouncing the evils of his time. Observing the Delphic injunction, "Moderation in all things," he avoided extravagant asceticism. Certainly he curbed the cravings of his body. His capacity to endure cold and hunger aroused the admiration of Alcibiades. But his restraint was not ostentatious. He could, if the occasion demanded, drink deep at a banquet. Nor did he clothe his ideas in the pompous language of the Sophists or bore his listeners with interminable harangues. His endeavor at all times was to lead men to truth by questioning. And the truth he valued most highly related not to externals but to the laws that govern man's inner being.

"Know thyself." This phrase, also Delphic in origin, was the root of his teaching. He who does not know the truth about himself will certainly never understand the truth about anything else. It must, however, be recognized that no truth is harder to obtain, no knowledge harder to master than this knowledge of the self, for man is a stranger to himself, sees not the realities but only their shadows.

“Let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened:

“Behold men living in an underground den with its mouth open towards the light. Here they have been from their childhood and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move but can only see before them. Above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way. And envisage men passing along the wall carrying all sorts of vessels and statues and figures of animals made of wood and stone and various materials.

“This is a strange image and these are strange prisoners.

“Like ourselves, and they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of one another.” (38)

Here is the starting point of the Socratic teaching as expressed by Plato in the seventh book of *The Republic*. Here once again we find the concept of illusion, common to the teachings of all the great Avatars. Man is a prisoner in a cave. He sees not reality but only shadows, shadows of himself, shadows of others, shadows of the objects in the outer world. From these shadows he constructs his concept of the world, never for a moment doubting that the shadows are reality. So his dark cave becomes populated with illusions and his mind takes on the qualities of the cave, a dark place aswarm with errors.

But what happens if one of the prisoners escapes into the world outside and stands for a moment in the full glare of the sunlight? Will he not, when his eyes grow accustomed to the light, look back in horror at the dark den from which he has emerged? Will he not, if he is of an altruistic disposition, try to enlighten his fellow prisoners, to tell them that the shapes they see are only shadows, that all their specula-

tions about themselves and the world are based on delusions?

But will he, suppose he does return to them, be welcomed by those prisoners as their liberator? Far from it, says Socrates:

“There will certainly be laughter at his expense and it will be said that the only result of his escapade up there is that he has come back with his eyesight ruined. Moral: it’s a fool’s game even to make the attempt to go up aloft; and as for the busybody who goes in for all this liberating and translating to higher spheres, if ever we have a chance to catch and kill him we will certainly take it.”

Again the same story. Man does have the capacity in himself to emerge from the cave of his illusions into the full light of reality. But though the capacity exists it is very rarely used and he who speaks of this capacity to his fellows does so at his peril. At best they will laugh at him, at worst they will kill him.

But how does it happen that anyone craves to escape? For, though we may admit that it is a rare event, we must allow that in every generation a few individuals make this effort. Indeed the longing to escape from the dungeon of their personal world may, for these people, be stronger than the craving for food or sex or comfort or even life itself. What implants in the beings of those rare individuals so strong a longing to become something more than they are?

Socrates gave his answer to this question in the form of a myth. Consider the soul, he says, in the form of a pair of winged horses and a charioteer. The winged horses and charioteers of the gods are noble and of noble descent, but those of other races are mixed. As for the human he has one

horse of noble breed but the other is ignoble and vicious. The charioteers of the gods make the cycle of heaven followed by those of lesser beings. There, in that higher realm, the soul gazes on the truth. The reason why the soul exhibits this eagerness to behold the plain of truth is that pasturage is found there, which is suited to the highest part of the soul: and the wing on which the soul soars is thereby nourished.

But the soul cannot always remain on this lofty level. There is a struggle between the good and the evil steed and, in the course of that struggle, the wings are broken. The soul sinks down and enters its earthly prison carrying with it only a dim memory of truths it has seen. The dominant urge of a man is related to the vividness of his memory. He whose memory is most vivid will become a philosopher, a lover of truth, whose status is the highest among men. Souls with less vivid memories will incarnate in progressively lower orders of beings, warriors, priests, artists, poets, physicians, demagogues, etc. All humans, declares Socrates, have souls which, at one time or another, have seen the truth, for, had the soul never beheld that vision, it would incarnate as an animal not as a man.

“A man must have intelligence of universals, and be able to proceed from the many particulars of sense to the one conception of reason, that is, to the recollection of those things which our soul once saw while following God, when she raised up her head towards the true being. But the mind of the philosopher alone has wings. And this is just, for he is always, according to the measure of his abilities, clinging in recollection to those things in which God abides. And he who employs aright these memories is ever being initiated into perfect mysteries and alone becomes truly

perfect. But, as he forgets earthly interests and is wrapt in the divine, the vulgar deem him mad and rebuke him. They do not see that he is inspired." (39)

In the perfect state, the Divine City, described in *The Republic*, philosophers will be kings and kings will be philosophers. All things will be ordered around the idea that the search for wisdom is the highest good. But here on earth, declares Socrates, the man who chooses liberation is thought to be mad. What then can one hope for man in this condition? Stability in government is never attained. Aristocracy, the rule of the best, is the highest form of government, but even the noblest aristocracy sooner or later becomes corrupted. There follows timocracy, the rule of those greedy for glory, then oligarchy, the rule of the powerful few. But government by the few gives rise to envy on the part of the many who rise and destroy their rulers in the name of freedom. But few peoples indeed are able to govern themselves. They confuse liberty with license and in the end make life for themselves so intolerable that they long only for freedom from freedom, for someone to order their lives and tell them what to do. Then comes tyranny, the rule of a single man, most accursed and most degrading of all forms of government, destructive to ruler and ruled alike.

Such is the cycle traversed by humanity, an endless succession of ups and downs, with no stability in sight. And the philosopher, who, whether he likes it or not, must live in this cycle, should not lament. He should rather regard himself as a watchman posted by God, to warn of the approach of the enemy. Nor should he ever permit considerations of personal comfort, convenience, or safety to persuade him to leave his post.

“I should have been acting strangely,” said Socrates to the citizens of Athens assembled at his trial, “if at Poteidaia and Amphipolis and Delion* I stayed where I was posted by the captains and risked death; but where God posted me with the duty to be a philosopher and to test myself and others, there I should fear either death or anything else and desert my post . . . You are wrong, my friends, if you think a man with a spark of decency in him ought to calculate life or death; the only thing he ought to consider is whether he does right or wrong. . . . And if you say, ‘my dear Socrates, we will let you go free but on this condition, that you will no longer spend your time in this search or in philosophy, and if you are caught doing this again you shall die,’ I should reply ‘Many thanks for your kindness, gentlemen, but I will obey the god rather than you and, as long as I have breath in me and am able to do it, I will never cease being a philosopher and exhorting you and showing what is in me to anyone I may meet. . . . For this is what God commands me, make no mistake, and I think there is no greater good for you in the city than my service to God. All I do is to go about and try to persuade you, both young and old, not to care for your bodies or your monies first but to care more exceedingly for the soul, to make it as good as possible. Either let me go free or do not let me go free: but I will never do anything else even though I die many deaths.”

It is on account of these words that Socrates can be classed not as a philosopher but as a great religious teacher, an Avatar, for his concern was not with those elaborate verbal web spinnings that commonly preoccupy philosophers but with the immediate problem of man’s salvation from the

* These places were scenes of battles in the war between Athens and Sparta in which Socrates served.

dark prison of illusion in which he is chained. And because men cherish their illusions and hate those that try to enlighten them the Athenians condemned Socrates to death, a fate he accepted calmly.

“You would not have had long to wait, gentlemen, [Socrates was seventy years old] but that short time will have given you the name and the blame for killing Socrates, a wise man: so those will say who wish to speak evil of our city, for they will call me wise even if I am not when they wish to taunt you. . . . Neither in court nor in war ought I or anyone else to do anything and everything to contrive an escape from death. No, gentlemen, the difficult thing is not to escape death but to escape wickedness—that is much harder for wickedness runs faster than death. And now I, being old and slow, have been caught by the slower one, death. But my accusers, being clever and quick, have been caught by the swifter one, evil. And now I and they depart. I condemned by you to death, but you who sentenced me condemned by truth to depravity and injustice. I abide by my penalty; they by theirs. I think it is fair enough.” (40)

Socrates died by poison, but the message he had given survived as he had prophesied. Through centuries of turmoil during which Greece lost her sovereign status and Rome arose to dominate the world, the followers of Socrates continued their relentless search for inner truth and inward integrity. Completely fearless of the consequences they upbraided tyrants, condemned luxury, and castigated self-indulgence. Their aim was to operate as the conscience of society and operate they did, sometimes in so violent and abusive a fashion as to make themselves highly unpopular. The more extreme members of their company were called Cynics and, because of their habit of casting doubt on the

value of almost every form of human behavior, the term cynicism came to connote a spirit of mocking derision, a meaning which it has retained to this day.

The best of the Cynics, however, were no mere mockers, but regarded themselves rather as spiritual athletes, gladly dispensing with all physical comfort to avoid cluttering their souls with material superfluity. Diogenes, one of the better-known members of this fraternity, walked barefoot through the streets without any coat carrying a lantern. Asked by the people what he sought he replied: "An honest man." The great Alexander found him lying one day in the sun and was astounded by the indifference with which the ragged beggar regarded "The Conqueror of the World." "I am Alexander the Great," said the Conqueror. "I am Diogenes the Cynic," said the beggar. "I give you permission to ask for a boon," said Alexander. "I ask nothing," said the philosopher on whom Alexander was casting a shadow, "but that you would get out of my sunshine." The conqueror took the rebuff better than many tyrants might have done, exclaiming, "Were I not Alexander I would be Diogenes!"

It cannot be denied, however, that this spirit of supreme indifference and independence tempted many a Cynic into the sin of spiritual pride and caused him to mistake for spiritual excellence what was actually arrogance, boorishness, and bad manners. It is also true that the title of Cynic was often taken by men quite unworthy of the name who used their philosophical pretensions as an excuse for living in idleness and trying to impose on others standards of behavior which they themselves were quite unable to adopt.

In the first century A.D., however, the ideals of Socrates and the concepts of such earlier Stoics as Zeno and Cleanthes were united by a teacher of exceptional power.

Epictetus was the product of a harsh environment. Born a slave he was placed from the very start in that terrifying situation which was the lot of all Roman slaves at that time. On a mere whim of his master he could be flogged, crucified, or burned. If his owner was accused of any crime he would automatically be put to the torture for, by the curious standards of the ancient world, a slave's evidence was only of value when extorted under duress. His master could sell him to anyone he chose. If he had any children they also were slaves and subject to the master's whim.

Under such conditions a man of powerful intellect and great moral force could only survive by drawing on his inward resources. This Epictetus did to such an extent that he rose above his slavery to become a free man in the fullest sense of the word and to teach others the real meaning of freedom. Enfranchised by his owner, Epictetus taught for a while in Rome; but when the tyrannical and insanely conceited Domitian banished all the philosophers from that city, he established a school at Nicopolis in Epirus. It is to his pupil Arrian that we owe our knowledge of his teachings just as we owe our knowledge of the teachings of Socrates to Plato. One suspects that Arrian was an accomplished stenographer for his *Discourses of Epictetus* are lively reading. The fierce undaunted spirit of the old man breathes in every line, infusing the book with fire and energy that place it in a very different category from most systems of philosophy.

Actually it was not philosophy. Even more than Socrates, Epictetus was a religious teacher. His lectures deal with an immediate and practical problem, the problem of how to live rightly, in a manner befitting a human being as opposed to a mere beast. In this connection Epictetus was far more specific than was Socrates. He wasted no time on

myths but came straight to the point. In what respects is man free and in what respects is he not free? What can he hope for from life and what should he avoid? What is the purpose of his existence and how can he achieve that purpose?

Epictetus, like the rest of the Stoics, had no use for dualism. There are no two principles, no God and devil, in the Universe. For this reason, it is merely a sign of ignorance to talk about evil. Evil is in the mind. It is a symptom of delusion, of a failure to understand what things are and what things are not under our control. Such deluded people will be forever crying out like children whenever they either fail to get what they want or get what they don't want. But the Stoic is made of sterner stuff and recognizes that what comes is ordained and should be accepted as impartially as a sensible person accepts the weather. For externals are not to be valued. Fate sends us riches. Well, it sends us riches. It takes them away. So it takes them away. As we did not rejoice on receiving them so we do not lament on losing them. What difference does it make whether we own or do not own a few paltry bits of gold or silver? The tyrant threatens us. Let him threaten. What can he do?

He can put me into prison.

Slave! Do you call that prison, that he puts your bit of a body between four walls? Is not your soul as free between those four walls as it is between any others?

He can put a chain on my leg.

So he puts chains on your leg. Are you merely a leg?

He can kill me.

You mean he can kill your bit of a body. What of that? Will the tyrant himself, before whom you tremble, have power to keep his own body for ever?

But I will be flung abroad without a decent burial.

“So I shall be, if I and the dead body are one, but if I am not the same as the dead body state the facts with more discrimination, and do not try to frighten me. These are things to frighten children and fools. But if a man has once entered a philosopher’s lecture room and does not know what his true self is he deserves to fear and to flatter. I mean if he has not learned that he is not flesh or bones or sinews but the faculty which uses them, and which also governs the impressions and understands them.” (41)

Here was the basis on which the Stoics built their philosophy. The body is not me. My possessions are not me. It is therefore not fitting for me to be too concerned either about what happens to my body or about what happens to my possessions. He who cares about these makes his own prison.

This attitude of indifference to externals, this inward self-sufficiency so great that it could laugh at the blows of Fate, was the attainment toward which Stoic training was directed. There was nothing soft or easy about this training. To qualify for the title of philosopher was as difficult, in the opinion of Epictetus, as to train for competition in the ancient Olympic games. Philosophy was no verbal web-spinning. It was a way of life, strenuous, demanding. But what did it demand?

“First, you must show a complete change in your conduct, and must cease to accuse God or man: you must utterly put away the will to get, and must will to avoid only that which lies within the sphere of your will. You must harbor no anger, wrath, envy, pity: a fair maid, a fair name must mean nothing to you . . .”

But what was the starting point of such training? Everything, said Epictetus, begins with impressions and the manner in which we deal with our impressions. They stream in

upon us all the time, nor can we by any means at all keep them out, though we can, by choosing our surroundings, modify them a little. A man's only freedom is his freedom to deal with his impressions, to accept one, to reject another. All human history is shaped by this. Had Paris reacted differently to his impression of Helen the Trojan War would not have happened and a great city with its people would not have been destroyed. See how much may depend upon reactions to impressions.

Watchfulness therefore is the vital need, for he who does not watch is soon overwhelmed. The steersman need only sleep for a moment and the vessel is lost

"It is very much the same in life. If you doze a little all that you have gained leaves you. Keep awake then and watch your impressions, it is no trifle you have in keeping, but self-respect, honor, constancy, a quiet mind, untouched by distress or fear or agitation—in a word, freedom."

Attention is all-important and the training of the power to direct attention is the starting point from which all else follows. From this rule there should be no departure.

"When you relax your attention for a little, do not imagine that you will recover it whenever you wish, but bear this in mind, that your error of today must of necessity put you in a worse position for other occasions.

"But I want to play today.

"What prevents you, if you attend?

"I want to sing.

"What prevents you, if you attend?

"Is there anything in life which is done better by those who do not attend? Does the carpenter by inattention do his work better? Does the helmsman by inattention steer more safely? Do you realise that once you have let your mind go wandering, you lose your power to recall it, to bring it to

bear on what is seemly, self respecting and modest, that you do anything that occurs to you and follow your inclinations?

“To what then must I attend? First to those universal principles I have described: without these you should neither sleep nor rise, drink nor eat, nor deal with men: the principle that no one can control another’s will, and that the will alone is the sphere of good and evil. No one then has the power to procure me good or to involve me in evil, but I myself alone have authority over myself in these matters. So when I have made these secure what need have I to fear tyrant or disease or poverty or disaster?

“So we must set our mind on this object; pursue nothing that is outside us, nothing that is not our own, even as He that is mighty has ordained: pursuing what lies within our will, and all else only in so far as it is given us to do so. Further we must remember who we are, and by what name we are called and must try to direct our acts to fit each situation and its possibilities.”

This inward collectedness, this refusal to become attached to anything outside of the control of the will, should not cause a man to cut himself off from life. The good Stoic is not one who retires into the wilderness. No one understood this truth better than that great Stoic, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, who seemed to embody in his person Plato’s dream of the perfect ruler, the king who was also a philosopher.

“Men seek retreats for themselves,” he wrote in his *Meditations*, “cottages in the country, lonely sea-shores and mountains, and you too are apt to hanker after such things. And yet this is the very commonest sort of stupidity, for it is in your power, whenever you wish, to retire into yourself. For nowhere either with more quiet or more freedom from

trouble does a man retire than into his own soul; above all if he have within him thoughts such as he need only regard attentively to be at perfect ease; and that ease is nothing else than a well ordered mind. Constantly then use this retreat and renew yourself therein; and let your principles be brief and fundamental, which, as soon as you recur to them, will be sufficient to cleanse the soul completely and to send you back without discontent to whatever awaits you. With what are you dissatisfied? With the badness of men? Recall to your mind this conclusion, that rational animals exist for one another, and that to endure is a part of justice and that men do wrong involuntarily." (42)

Or if you cannot find contentment in such a way, then cease to regard the events of life as a matter for concern. Draw back as if at the theater and observe. Go through the motions, act your part and stop complaining. Says Epicurus:

"Remember you are an actor in a play, and the Playwright chooses the manner of it: if he wants it short it is short: if long it is long. If he wants you to act a poor man you must act the part with all your powers; and so if your part be a cripple, a magistrate or a plain man. For your business is to act the character that is given you and to act it well; the choice of the cast is Another's."

So play your part, accepting what comes in the spirit of Cleanthes' hymn:

"Lead me, O Zeus, and lead me, Destiny,
Wherever is ordained by thy decrees.
I'll follow doubting not . . ."

Which is, indeed, the only sound attitude for a philosopher to take as far as externals are concerned. But where inward

reactions are concerned a strict account must be given and no day allowed to end without such an accounting as is recommended in the verse ascribed to Pythagoras.

“Permit not sleep to close your tender eyelid
Till you have reckoned up each deed of the day—
How I have erred, what done, what left undone?
So start and so review your acts, and then
For vile deeds chide yourself, for good be glad.”

Such was the Stoic teaching. Its demands were harsh, its conditions severe. It offered no rewards in the life to come, disdained alike the charms of heaven and the pangs of hell. It called on no external savior, but ruthlessly demanded from those that would follow its path, a spirit of self-sufficiency, of sturdy independence that would neither cringe before a human tyrant nor before the more impersonal malignance of Fate. Nevertheless, the doctrine, harsh though it was, postulated at the center of the universe a benevolent God of whose divine nature man partakes.

“You are a principal work, a fragment of God himself, you have in yourself a part of him. Why then are you ignorant of your high birth? You bear God about with you, poor wretch, and know it not. Do you think I speak of some external God of silver or gold? No, you bear him about within you and are unaware that you are defiling him with unclean thoughts and foul actions. If an image of God were present you would not dare to do many of the things you do; yet when God himself is present within you and sees and hears all things, you are not ashamed of thinking and acting thus: O slow to understand your nature and estranged from God!”

Thus, in spite of its somewhat grim emphasis on endurance, Stoicism was not a gloomy doctrine, as sometimes de-

picted. It was suffused with a belief that God was essentially good and that all things should be accepted as good even if they might appear evil. This spirit of joyful acceptance is beautifully expressed in a saying of Marcus Aurelius.

“Everything harmonizes with me, which is harmonious to thee, O Universe. Nothing for me is too early or too late, which is in due time for thee. Everything is fruit to me which thy seasons bring, O Nature: from thee are all things, in thee are all things, to thee all things return. The poet says, Dear city of Cecrops: and wilt thou not say, Dear city of God.”

And from Epictetus, old, poor, lame and in exile, comes a similar hymn of praise and acceptance. “What else can I do, a lame old man, but chant the praise of God? If I were a nightingale I would sing as a nightingale; if a swan, as a swan: but as I am a rational creature I must praise God. This is my task and I do it, and I will not abandon this duty so long as it is given to me; and I invite you all to join in this same song.” (41)

Zoroaster and the Dual World

The stream of religious thought which arose in Sumer was shaped and channeled by several Avatars. Moses and the Jewish prophets fashioned what is now Judaism. Zoroaster founded what is now the religion of the Parsis. Jesus, without intending any such thing, caused a diversion in the stream of Judaism and founded Christianity. Mohammed endeavored to reunite Christianity and Judaism into a single stream, succeeded only in sundering them further and in setting up his own religion centering about the worship of Allah.

The teaching of all these Avatars had one thing in common. It was firmly rooted in dualism, Sumerian dualism, which was one of the more questionable gifts which mankind received from that ancient civilization. Based as it was on the concept of a good and evil spirit, god and devil, it confronted thoughtful believers with a universe over the inconsistencies of which they continue to rack their brains to this day.

If God created the world, from what source came the devil?

If the devil created the world (as the Manicheans believed) from what source came God?

If God is a loving father why did he try to destroy man?

If man is made in God's image why is man imperfect whereas God (by definition) is perfect?

If God watches over man why does he let him build H bombs?

If all things are governed by divine providence then how can we maintain that man has free will?

If he does not have free will what is the point of virtue? All things are ordained. Salvation itself becomes a matter of compulsion.

So why save some and damn others? Such a God is either grossly unjust, totally confused, or does not have full control over the Cosmos.

Such are the awkward problems that have arisen as a result of the aforesaid Babylonian dualism, and which have bothered thoughtful adherents of all four religions, Jews, Zoroastrians, Christians, and Moslems.

It was Zoroaster, the Persian Avatar, who laid the greatest emphasis on the dualistic concept, and it was from Zoroastrianism, to which the Jews were exposed during the Babylonian exile, that the biblical writers borrowed Satan along with guardian angels, archangels, and other items of celestial fauna.

No one knows just when Zoroaster lived on earth. The most probable date, 660-583 B.C., is at best a guess. The story of his birth is richly encrusted with legends. His vital essence was spread on plants by the archangels, the plants were devoured by virgin heifers who then (miraculously) began to give milk. Zoroaster's mother and father drank of the milk and thus absorbed the spirit that had been 3000 years in preparation. Their sexual union was thrice

interrupted by demons, endeavoring to prevent the materialization of the Avatar. At the time of his birth the entire village in which he was born became luminous with celestial light. On being born Zarathustra "laughed outright" and the seven midwives in attendance fled in terror.

Like Krishna before him and Jesus after him the infant Zarathustra faced danger from the evil forces he had been sent to oppose. The wizards of the race of Karaps tried to destroy him, first by twisting his neck, second by throwing him under the feet of oxen, third by throwing him under the feet of horses, fourth by piling wood over him and setting it afire. But Ahura Mazda, the giver of light, sent down three archangels, Spendarmad, Aredvisur, and Ardairavad, to protect the child who, with their assistance, survived all villainous tricks of the Karaps.

Zarathustra appears to have felt the call of his divine mission early in life. At fifteen he selected the sacred girdle as a symbol of his devotion. At twenty years old, without the consent of his father and mother, he adopted a wandering life.

When he reached the age of thirty the archangel Vohumano assumed human shape and met with Zarathustra on the banks of the river Daitih. The following conversation ensued.

Said Vohumano: "Who are you and of what race?"

"I am Zarathustra of the Spitamas."

"O Zarathustra of the Spitamas, about what is your foremost distress, about what is your foremost endeavour; and for what is the tendency of your desire?"

"About righteousness is my foremost distress; about righteousness is my foremost endeavour, for righteousness is the tendency of my desire." (43)

At this point Vohumano led Zarathustra into the presence of the Lord of Light, Ahura Mazda saying: "O Zarathustra of the Spitamas, leave behind the garment which you are carrying so that we may confer with him by whom you are produced and by whom I am produced, who is the most propitious of spirits, who is the most beneficent of existences."

Accordingly Zarathustra followed the archangel into the assembly of spirits gathered on the bank of the Daitih in Iran. Seven archangels were there and so brilliant was the light they emitted that Zarathustra could not see his own shadow. He offered homage and spoke: "Homage to Ahura Mazda, and homage to the archangels!" and he went forward and sat down in the seat of the inquirers.

Thus seated he addressed the following questions to Ahura Mazda: "In the unbodied world which is the first of the perfect ones, which is the second and which is the third?" And Ahura Mazda replied, "The first perfection is good thoughts, the second good words, and the third good deeds."

Zarathustra inquired: "What thing is good, which is better, and which is the best of all habits?"

Ahura Mazda replied: "The title of the archangels is good, the sight of them is better, and carrying out their commands is the best of all habits."

Then Ahura Mazda proceeded to reveal to Zarathustra the fundamental duality of the evolutionary process. This, as is declared in the *Gathas* (the hymns of Zoroaster), resulted from the existence of two mentalities:

"At the beginning of life

The holier Mentality said to the opposing Mentality which
was more hostile,

Neither our thoughts, doctrine, plans,
Beliefs, utterances, deeds,
Individualities, nor souls agree."

This fundamental dualism was reflected in the mentalities of men who became divided into two groups, the Ashaists who chose the best and who worship the Lightgiver, Ahura Mazda (also called Ormuzd), and the Drujists who serve the Druj, an aspect of the evil Ahriman, also called the Demon-of-the-Lie.

Such was the vision revealed to Zarathustra on the banks of the Daitih. Departing from the interview with the Holy Ones Zarathustra encountered a demon and was tempted, as were both Jesus and Gautama at the beginnings of their ministries. Having dealt with the demon he proceeded on his mission. He gave himself as a sacrifice to Ahura Mazda, "As an offering, Zoroaster brings the life of his own body, the choiceness of good thought, action and speech unto Mazda." He received, however, little encouragement from the deity. For ten weary years he struggled to spread the new religion, but made in this time only one poor convert. One winter, when he was refused shelter and "even his two steeds were shivering with cold," he was attacked once again by the lying evil spirit and tempted to renounce the religion of Mazda in exchange for temporal sovereignty. He managed to rebuff the fiend but could not restrain himself from expressing a few rather pathetic doubts.

"To what land shall I flee? How am I to please thee, Mazda Ahura? I am without success! Few cattle are mine! I have but few folk! I cry unto Thee. See thou to it, Ahura, granting me support as a friend gives to a friend . . . This I ask: tell me truly, O Ahura, shall I indeed earn that reward, even ten mares with a stallion and a camel which

was promised to me, O Mazda, as well as the future gift of welfare and immortality?"

Ahura Mazda did not desert his chosen one. The King of Persia, Vistaspa, was converted. The new religion was spread briskly, not without violence, for Zoroaster did not preach a gospel of harmlessness. "Hew ye them all with the halberd." Reanimated by the new religion the Persian state expanded. Its armies conquered its powerful western neighbor in 539 B.C. and pushed on into Europe until stopped by the Greeks at Salamis. Subsequently the religion suffered partial eclipse as first the Macedonians under Alexander the Great and later the Arabs, stimulated by their new religion, Islam, swarmed across Persia. The Zoroastrians mostly became converted to Islam or fled to India where, as the Parsis, they survive to this day, a small community, fewer than 150,000 in number, stubbornly clinging to their ancient religion.

Zoroaster had little to say that is of any value to one interested in the psychological basis of the concept of salvation. His teaching is chiefly of interest because it supplied concepts which the Jews borrowed and the Christians borrowed again and which, for better or worse, affected the structures of both religions. Fundamental dualism was the chief of these. God under the name of Ahura Mazda, Angra Mainya, or Ormuzd fights constantly with the devil, *daeva* (from which our word devil is derived) or Ahriman. In the world of men this struggle was reflected. The Ashaists chose good, the Daevaists were unable to discriminate, became a prey to delusions and chose the worse of the two Minds. Even the Ashaists, however, did not escape being tainted with the second principle, for the fifth duty of the Zoroastrian priest is defined as "to struggle prayerfully, day and night, with your own fiend."

The concepts of the good and bad angel, of the Resurrection, and of the Last Judgment are all present in Zoroastrianism. The cosmic drama is performed essentially in four acts, each lasting for 3000 years. During the first act the good spirit, Ahura Mazda, creates the spiritual world. During the second he creates the material world which is then invaded by the evil spirit, Ahriman, with an army of six archfiends and swarms of lesser fiends. During the third period the contest between the two principles rages hotly until the birth of Zoroaster ushers in the fourth period. This period, it was foretold, would end with a final all-out struggle between the good and evil principles. At the end of the struggle the Messiah (Soshyans) would appear to initiate the resurrection of the dead and pass judgment on men in accordance with their deeds.

“In the assembly of the Sadvastaran, where all mankind will stand at this time, everyone sees his own good deeds and his own evil deeds, and then, in that assembly, a wicked man becomes as conspicuous as a white sheep among those which are black . . .

“Afterwards, Soshyans and his assistants, by order of the creator Ahura Mazda, give every man the reward and recompense suitable to his deeds.” (44)

Thus the Zoroastrian Soshyans was the prototype from which Jews and Christians alike borrowed their own concept of the Messiah. As for the nature of salvation, it is defined in the *Avesta* as the fruit of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, of a persistent striving to assure world perfection by the adoption of the right path. Such world perfection, it is supposed, will sooner or later come to pass with the setting up of the “Good Kingdom,” the “Wished-for Kingdom,” or the “Kingdom of Desire.” For it is accepted by the Zoroastrians that the outcome of the

great struggle is a foregone conclusion. Light will triumph over darkness, Ahura Mazda over Arhiman. The world will be melted, purified, and regenerated and thereafter, apparently, remain pure for ever. The Zoroastrians, like the Jews and the Christians, visualize the cosmic drama as a once-round affair in which a man has only one opportunity to prove himself. The endless cycles that play so important a role in Hindu and Buddhist thought and which offer even to the most degraded the hope that he can some time emerge from the ocean of error, have no place in these religions.

Moses and the Prophets

It started in Sumer and its beginnings are shrouded in mystery, a mystery which may one of these days be cleared away if the archeologists come upon the needed documents. At the moment we must rely in part on the traditions of Judaism supplemented with the lost but now rediscovered Sumerian literature. What emerges from the fog of the past is an Avatar remote and not very credible, an Avatar combining crude superstition with lofty awareness of One God, an Avatar capable of considering and of preparing to perform a human sacrifice, whose God, moreover, was capable of demanding it as a test of faith.

A strange god . . . A strange Avatar. Father Abraham.

What a durable stream of belief was initiated by this being concerning whose origins we know so little!

Abraham, citizen of Ur of the Chaldees, an Ur threatened on either side, whose days were numbered . . . the Elamites were devastating Sumeria from the southeast, the Amorites from the west. *Homo ferox* was on the rampage in the valley of the twin rivers and Abraham fled. It was the only sensible thing to do.

So he fled and with him he took his god plus a collection of Sumerian legends relating to the creation. The god and the legends he bequeathed to his descendants, a Semitic people, few in numbers but already conscious of their historic mission. From Canaan they journeyed to Egypt perhaps accompanying the Hyksos, the Shepherd Kings, a Semitic people, Egypt's first foreign invaders. And when the Hyksos were driven out by Ahmose the hatred of the Egyptians was visited on the children of Israel. Under Amenophis these Egyptians seemed determined, in Hitler's phrase, to find "a final solution to the Jewish problem."

In short the Hebrews were on the verge of being exterminated.

Then came Moses, abandoned in his basket, set adrift on the Nile, saved from the waters and the crocodiles by Pharaoh's daughter, raised in the court as a highly educated Egyptian. Moses, however, retained his loyalty to his own people, slew an Egyptian who had been mistreating a Hebrew, fled to the desert of Midian where he married and lived for forty years as a shepherd.

It was in Sinai, on Mount Horeb, the holy mountain, that Moses received the message which transformed him from an obscure shepherd to a mighty lawgiver whose influence in human affairs is felt to this day. What happened on Horeb? We shall never be able to explain it in psychological terms. The account in Exodus is too brief and overemphasizes such crudely miraculous "props" as the bush which contrived to burn without being consumed, the rod that turned into a serpent, the hand that became leprous then clean again. We can only say that Moses was transformed. Though, by his own confession, a man with many faults (he had, after all, murdered that Egyptian; he was also "slow of speech and of a slow tongue"), Moses

became endowed with that tremendous unity of purpose which is one of the characteristics of the Avatar. He was, from that time on, the servant of God and he spoke not in his own name but in the name of God.

But who was this God, this Yahweh, whose only definition of himself was I AM THAT I AM? The name, it appears, was new. "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty but by my name Yahweh* was I not known to them."

Can we say, then, that the cult of Yahweh was originated by Moses? Did he borrow the monotheism of Akhnaten? Or did Akhnaten borrow the monotheism of Moses? † We shall probably never be able to answer this question, but can only say that neither in Sumer, Assyria, nor Egypt was the concept of one god generally accepted. Moses had a new and powerful weapon to weld together a demoralized and enslaved people, to lead them through the desert to the land of Canaan, and to endow them with a sense of unity and purpose that has enabled them to survive as a people to this day.

In creating this concept of the one God, Moses drew heavily on those myths which were part of the heritage of Sumer that Abraham took with him when he fled from the smoking ruins of Ur of the Chaldees. These ancient tales have proved amazingly durable, in fact they are still taken

* Yahweh seems to be the best approximation to a pronounceable form of the Tetragrammaton YHWH. The commonly accepted Jehovah is a misleading corruption.

† As to who came first, Moses or Akhnaten, scholars are divided. If the Exodus took place during the reign of Amenhotep II (1450-1415 B.C.) it was Moses, if during the reign of Merneptah it was Akhnaten.

seriously even in our "enlightened" age of the automobile and the atomic bomb. How can we explain the persistence of these primitive legends? Does their prolonged survival merely offer evidence of the incurable credulity of the human race? Or do they, underneath their quaint exterior, their serpents and cherubins and trees of knowledge of good and evil, conceal certain deep insights into the nature of man's predicament, intimately bound up with the problem of his salvation?

With this thought in mind let us consider these myths as they have come down to us in the book of Genesis. To begin with, the myth of the Creation. As soon as we examine it closely we find ourselves impaled on the pitchfork of dualism. It is not the obvious dualism of Zoroastrianism in which a principle of light (Ahuramazda) and a principle of darkness (Ahriman) come into direct conflict. It is a dualism that separates the creator from the creation, that sets him outside of it in some mysterious realm of being not clearly defined. This dualism endows God with a number of qualities which are inherently contradictory. He is good and yet his creation is, in part at least, evil. He is all-powerful, and yet one of his creations has free will. He is omniscient, and yet he cannot foresee the results of his creative activities. In Genesis 1 he seems well satisfied with his creations: "and God saw that it was good"; but by Genesis 6 he is planning to wipe out the whole thing: "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth, both man and beast and the creeping things, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them."

With such an inconsistent creator in charge of the cosmos it is hardly surprising that things did not go smoothly. The God of Genesis reflects a state of confusion in the mind of his human biographers which has continued to plague the

Judeo-Christian theologians ever since and which they have not resolved satisfactorily to this day.

The myths, however, portray clearly the evolutionary blunders of man and in this respect they must be regarded as inspired. In the beginning man was innocent. He pranced round the Garden of Eden naked and unashamed. He ate and drank and slept and copulated and concerned himself neither with salvation nor damnation. He didn't even need to work for the earth brought forth abundantly.

A charming picture. We can refer it, if we wish, to a pre-hominid stage of existence in which a diet of fruit and nuts sufficed and the habit of bashing and bludgeoning had not become engraved in the human psyche.

Then came the Fall. The innocent pre-hominid turned into a rampaging killer, evolving, along with a taste for meat, a muddled and inconsistent morality, a generally confused idea of good and evil which would not even permit him to accept his own nakedness. Hence the "aprons of fig leaves."

Then came murder in the family, Cain slew Abel. This is a very strange myth the significance of which is commonly overlooked. The Lord, we are told, cursed Cain, informing him that the earth would not yield to him her strength. But when Cain complained that every man's hand would henceforth be raised against him the Lord set a mark on Cain and announced "whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold." It appears therefore that, even at that early stage, the Lord was thought of as being opposed to the death sentence as a penalty for murder. Human society, even today, has not been able to accept this idea.

Next came wholesale corruption. God, at this point in the book of Genesis, has become an experimentalist, a sort

of super-scientist who, after creating the terrestrial stage and populating it with living beings, has settled back to observe the outcome. He lacks, however, that objectivity so essential to a scientist and is constantly passing moral judgments. The experiment did not go according to his liking. "God looked upon the earth and behold it was corrupt. . . . God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. . . . And God said to Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me: for the earth is filled with violence through them, and behold I will destroy them with the earth."

Thus God becomes a moral experimentalist. He is portrayed as having limitless power but he does not necessarily use that power. He creates conditions, he places living things in those conditions, he watches to see what will happen. He is not, most emphatically not, an impartial observer. He is capable of indignation and of wrath when the experiment does not turn out as he had hoped. Man is his main preoccupation, for he has created man in his own image, that is to say he has endowed man with the power of creation, of bringing order into chaos, especially the chaos of his inner world. When man fails to use his creative power and falls instead under the sway of delusions, dreams of grandeur, lustful, cruel, or destructive impulses, the "wrath of God is kindled" and he is tempted to terminate the whole experiment, saving perhaps a few virtuous specimens like Noah who had "found grace in the eyes of the Lord."

So the flood came and went and the biosphere was recolonized from the pairs of "beasts clean and not clean, and of fowls and of everything that creepeth on the earth"

which Noah had maintained in the ark, a feat of nature conservation never since equaled. The divine experimentalist was evidently somewhat appalled by his own destructive power and was reconciled to the idea of letting the experiment continue without repeating such drastic forms of interference as the Deluge.

"I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth, neither will I again smite any more everything living, as I have done. While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease."

Then came the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues. Of all the myths in the Book of Genesis this is the most profound, and, for our times, the most appropriate. It clearly foreshadows the spiritual sickness of our age, gadget-intoxication and technological idolatry. The builders of the Tower of Babel (Genesis 2) who said: "Go to, let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven," are exactly equivalent to our contemporary Epimetheans who exclaim: "Go to, let us squander a huge sum of the taxpayers' money and build us a rocket whose nose cone shall reach unto Mars, Venus, Jupiter, or any other planet you wish to name."

The same delusions of grandeur underlie both projects, the same almost imbecilic failure to relate the magnitude of the effort with the practical value of the result obtained, the same intoxication with sheer power and bigness. Fortunately for the ancient tower builders the divine experimentalist felt moved to interfere before the project got too far off the ground.

"Behold the people . . . have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from

them which they have imagined to do." So it was arranged that they should become entangled in the web of their own verbiage and, ceasing to understand each other, would be forced to abandon their project. The web of verbiage and the accompanying confusion has prevailed to this day, a confusion between verbal symbol and the thing in itself. Unfortunately the confusion has not sufficed to prevent our modern rocketeers from repeating, in a more dangerous form, the error of their tower-crazy forebears. And this time the divine experimentalist has not seen fit to interfere.

It was out of this collection of myths that the Avatar Moses built the foundation on which his teaching was constructed. To the skeptical modern the foundation may appear defective. It postulates the existence of an experimental creator with pronounced moral views and a tendency toward righteous indignation who both can and does interfere with the course of events whenever man's behavior becomes more than usually reprehensible. The modern critic of course has plenty of ammunition with which to bombard Moses' structure. Nowhere, he will maintain, can science reveal evidence that any moral force is at work in nature. Nor does an impartial study of history suggest that any higher power ever intervenes to save the virtuous or to chastise the wicked. The history of man is almost as amoral as the history of evolution.

Moses, however, was not concerned with history or evolution. His problem was to unite, strengthen, and lead a nation demoralized by slavery, threatened by idolatry, and distracted by hankerings after the fleshpots of Egypt. To do this he needed a power greater than that wielded by any mere human. "Do this because I, Moses, tell you to," was a command which carried little weight. But the same com-

mand prefaced by the words. "Thus saith the Lord," acquired at once an almost overwhelming force.

It would be unjust and almost certainly inaccurate to accuse Moses of using Yahweh as a convenient fiction to maintain order among the Hebrews in the wilderness. He was convinced, as the later Avatar Jesus was also convinced, that God spoke through him. Nor can the modern critic, even though he refuses to accept the hypothesis, deny that the concept of God, the Moral Experimentalist, gave to human existence a dignity and sense of purpose. Man, according to this view, was not merely the plaything of the gods as the Sumerians had supposed. He was the object of God's hopes and of his concern, the one being endowed with the capacity to grow in wisdom and virtue, capable of ascending up the Great Chain of Being connecting heaven and earth, symbolized by the ladder of which Jacob dreamed in Bethel.

Above all, Moses was inspired by the concept of the Hebrew race as a people devoted to spiritual rather than material aims. They would, of course, receive for their trouble the Promised Land, a land flowing with milk and honey. But the milk and honey were secondary. The real joy and duty of the Hebrews would be to worship Yahweh and serve him in virtue and humility. This supreme hope of Moses was expressed in a single sentence in Exodus: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation."

Such was the legacy of Moses. Such was the vision. And all those who followed Moses, the prophets, the messengers sent by God, had their eyes fixed on this vision and their hopes centered upon it. God, the Moral Experimentalist, had chosen the Children of Israel to further his aims on earth. Woe to them if they failed in their task, if they substituted mere rituals for the performance of virtue, think-

ing that God would be deceived and accept such imitations as the real thing.

But who were these prophets, these messengers of Yahweh? How did they differ from the priests and the Levites? Psychologically speaking they belonged to a different species. Whereas the priests and Levites concerned themselves with rituals the prophets despised them. They were men of the desert, voices in the wilderness. They were often unlettered, simple people, like the shepherd Amos. "I was no prophet," says Amos, "neither was I a prophet's son." None the less the Lord had spoken to him and he had no choice but to bring the message to Israel. "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

Quite often the prophet felt completely unworthy to fulfill the task imposed upon him. Isaiah, greatest of them all, cried, "Woe is me! for I am undone." But when, in his vision, the Lord demanded a messenger saying: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Isaiah, despite his misgivings, said: "Here I am. Send me."

Herein lay their source of strength. The Hebrew prophets had *seen*; they *knew*. There was, in their mental processes, none of the careful rationalizing that characterized the Greek philosophers. They did not concern themselves with investigations of the forces of nature, with careful correlations or measurements or calculations. Their vision and their conviction was inward. It was also unquestioning. "Can man by searching find out God?" The Greek would say yes, but the Hebrew prophet said no. There was no search required, God spoke. All that the prophet needed was to listen and place himself at God's disposal as his messenger. "Here I am. Send me."

As a result of this inward conviction the Hebrew proph-

ets spoke "with authority, not as the scribes." And to the great credit of the country's rulers it must be recorded that on the whole, they listened. David accepted the rebukes of the prophet Nathan. Even the abominable Ahab "humbled himself" when castigated by Elijah. For kings were only kings, but about these men of the desert, ragged and uncouth as they might appear, there hung the aura of a greater authority and even the most unruly monarch trembled before that concentrated spiritual power.

But what was the message of the prophets? What did they say? The emphasis varied, but one thing they all had in common. They rejected outward forms of devotion when these were not accompanied by the practice of righteousness. For the Jews this tendency to substitute ritual for righteousness was a national weakness. Tremendously conscious of "the Law," they were inclined to concentrate on minutiae of external observation and to neglect the spirit of the law completely. The priests and Levites did nothing to restrain this tendency. Rituals and the performance of sacrifices were their means of livelihood and they seemed well satisfied to "go through the motions" of religion without making any attempt to put into practice the higher ethic prescribed by Yahweh for his "holy nation."

But if the priests were satisfied with such hypocrisy the prophets most emphatically were not. Again and again these messengers of Yahweh thundered their disapproval of empty ritual.

"I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies: though ye offer me burnt offerings and meat-offerings, I will not accept them. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. . . ."

Thus Amos, prophesying the inevitable disaster that God would inflict on Israel for failing in her high duty. From Hosea came similar warnings, similar rebukes; "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing that thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget the children."

From Isaiah comes a similar message. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?"

"Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

Fierce, uncompromising, moral teaching! No offerings, no rituals, could conceal from Yahweh the breach of the higher ethics. Woe, cried the prophet. Woe to the insolent, the greedy, the oppressive, the intemperate, the vain! Woe to those that join house to house, that lay field to field. Woe to those that grind the faces of the poor. Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may follow strong drink. Woe to the daughters of Zion who walk with

stretched-forth necks and wanton eyes mincing as they go and making a tinkling with their feet. Woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees to turn aside the needy from judgment and to take away the right from the poor of my people. Woe to that vineyard of mine from which I had such high hopes and which now bears evil fruit or no fruit at all.

And what will the Lord do to this unproductive vineyard?

“I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard. I will take away the hedge thereof and it shall be eaten up; and I will lay it waste, it shall not be pruned, nor digged, but there shall come up briars and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it. For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant; and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry.” (Isaiah V)

Yahweh, the Moral Experimentalist, here appears in the guise of a husbandman hoping for spiritual fruits from the people he has favored but receiving nothing. So the vineyard would be destroyed and Yahweh himself would prepare the instrument of destruction.

“O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath I will give him a charge, to take the spoil and to take the prey and to tread them down like the mire of the streets.”

Small comfort here. But it was not the function of the prophet to offer comfort. It was only the false prophets, the smooth deceivers who “cried peace where there is no peace” and tried to persuade the people that they could break moral laws and not pay the price. Nor, for that mat-

ter, were the Jews the only ones that would have to pay. Reading Isaiah one receives an impression that practically every nation then on earth will sooner or later be judged by Yahweh, be found wanting and be destroyed. Woe to Damascus, woe to Egypt, woe to Tyre, to Tarsish, to Ephraim, to Nineveh, to Babylon, to practically everybody.

And yet . . . and yet . . . Does there not show at times among all these lamentations and prophecies of destruction, a vague suspicion that even Yahweh may not always be right, that the Moral Experimentalist did, after all, design the great experiment and cannot, if we are going to pass judgment, entirely escape responsibility for the experiment's outcome? The prophets, if they felt such misgivings, did not record them. Yahweh *had* to be right. To have admitted that he could make mistakes would have wrecked the whole structure that Moses had made and about which the Jewish state had been constructed. For the prophets the one supreme duty was to accept and ask no questions.

But the doubt could not be stilled. It appears now and then in the more peevish of the Psalms, in the weary cogitations of Ecclesiastes, and above all in the Book of Job.

In Job we see an acceptance of the concept of dualism not in quite such an extreme form as was expounded by Zarathustra and the Manichees, but openly admitted none the less. Besides the Lord there is Satan, the Adversary. And this Satan is able to persuade God, the Moral Experimentalist, to perform a particularly drastic experiment on "his servant Job," involving the destruction of Job's seven sons and three daughters (what is this if not murder by divine decree?), of his flocks and herds and homes and, finally, the affliction of his person with boils.

The object of the experiment? Will Job at this point

curse God or continue to praise him, boils notwithstanding?

About one thing the reader of the Book of Job is left in no doubt. Its writer was one of the world's supreme poets. Clothed as it is in the Authorized Version of the Bible in English of Shakespearean magnificence it rotates before one's gaze like a somber jewel illuminated by the reflection of cosmic fire. But neither the splendor of the imagery nor the joyous ending can conceal the fact that it gives no real answer to the problem presented.

"Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his maker? Behold he put no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly: how much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth? They are destroyed from morning to evening: they perish forever without any regarding it. Doth not their excellency which is in them go away? They die even without wisdom."

True, but beside the point. The question is not whether man can be more just than God but whether God is any more just than man. Take those seven sons and three daughters, for instance. Were they not callously destroyed as a part of the experiment? Even the most ruthless of human experimentalists would hesitate to cut down ten innocent young people merely to test the reactions of their father.

"Doth God pervert judgment? Or doth the Almighty prevent justice?"

The sad thing is that apparently he does. Either that or his standards of justice are totally different from our human ones. Says Job: "He destroyeth the perfect and the

wicked. If the scourge slay suddenly he will laugh at the trial of the innocent. The earth is given into the hand of the wicked: he covereth the faces of the judges thereof."

And to this there is really no answer though the writer of the Book of Job tries desperately to find one. Suggests Elephaz: "Happy is the man whom God correcteth: therefore despise not the chastening of the Almighty." To which Job might well have replied: "If you are so keen on chastisement you can have my boils." Zophar suggests that the whole thing is beyond human comprehension: "Canst thou by searching find out God?" Finally the writer even brings in God in person to justify himself before Job. But what does it all amount to, this divine justification? Under all the magnificent imagery what is there but boasting and bullying?

"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? Or who has stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the corners thereof fastened? Or who laid the cornerstone thereof; when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

What a concept! What a poet! But again completely beside the point. The Lord is simply evading Job's problem by dragging in astronomy and geophysics. And so it is throughout the Lord's harangue. There are references to the Pleiades and Orion, to wild goats, asses, eagles, to the plumage of peacocks, the reproductive habits of the ostrich, the anatomy of Behemoth, the peculiarities of Leviathan. But nowhere, nowhere is there an answer to the question of why, when a man assiduously walks in the ways of the Lord, is upright, merciful, loving, charitable and abstemious, he is just as likely to suffer misfortune as is the wicked

man who breaks every divine ordinance and even denies that Yahweh exists.

In the end Job gives in, in the face of all this bludgeoning, allows that the whole problem was beyond him, and, like a good Party man, admits that the boss is always right. "I know that thou canst do everything, and that no thought can be withholden from thee. . . . Therefore I have uttered that I understand not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not. . . . Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."

At which point the writer hastens to wind up the book as if scared that the problems he has raised will undermine his own faith in the righteousness of Yahweh. So he adds an obviously contrived happy ending, gives Job seven new sons and three more daughters to replace the ones sacrificed to the experiment; "And he called the name of the first Jemima." What an anticlimax!

Actually the writer of the Book of Job side-stepped the question. Impaled on the horns of dualism and compelled to face the absence of justice in the material world, the writer resorted to a new device, a means of justifying Yahweh's ways to man which would be forever beyond the reach of carping critics. Like the first solemn chords of a symphony we hear in Job the first mention of the Messiah's Kingdom and the life to come. None of the earlier prophets had offered this promise but now Job, robbed of his wealth, his children, and plagued by boils, looks forward beyond this life to compensation in a hypothetical after-life.

"For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon earth: and though worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."

A new source of consolation. Certainly the writer of Ec-

clesiastes had no use for it. On the contrary he was convinced that with death came the end and that the only time to do anything was here and now. "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten . . . Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor desire, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest."

Sensible advice, more typical of Greek skepticism than of the Hebrew passion for unquestioning belief. But, sensible or not, it did not offer the reassurance of which the Jewish people felt in need. For the unfolding of history brought to the Chosen People a succession of shattering disasters. The northern state of Israel vanished completely in 721 B.C., swallowed up in the growing might of Assyria. Judah retained its independence until, scorning the wise advice of the prophet Jeremiah, it allied itself with Egypt, was set upon by the Assyrians under Nebuchadnezzar. After a desperate siege lasting two years Jerusalem was stormed and razed to the ground (August 586 B.C.). Most of its inhabitants were carried off into exile. Left among the ruins was the sorrowful prophet, lamenting the destruction of his city and the captivity of his people. "Is it nothing to you all ye that pass by? Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow."

Sorrow. From this point on sorrow and exile were the lot of the Jewish people. By a tremendous moral effort the captives in Babylon managed to avoid the fate that had overtaken the ten tribes of Israel. The laws, rigidly codified, acted like a moral fence to keep the Jews from being absorbed by their captors. But the laws alone were not enough. Fresh hope was needed.

So, in the prophesies of "Isaiah of the Exile," * a different note predominates. Yahweh no longer threatens his people with punishment. The emphasis is rather on forgiveness, on restoration: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."

Comfort. Undoubtedly the Jews of the exile had need of it. "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept when we remembered thee O Zion." But the tragic events of those days, the total destruction of the Temple and the utter ruin of the holy city had shaken the confidence of the people in earthly consolations. Taking his theme perhaps from the beliefs of his Babylonian captors, Isaiah turned his eyes to the future, clothing the Zoroastrian concept of the Soshyans in a new role of poetic magnificence, foretelling the coming of the messenger, the chosen one of God.

"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light, they that dwell in the valley of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. . . . For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Councillor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. . . .

"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of

* Modern Biblical critics regard the Book of Isaiah as the product of two different writers. A change in tone occurs at Chapter 39, from which point on the emphasis is on the Messianic vision rather than on threats of disaster to come.

Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears, but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins."

The Messiah . . . And with his coming at last the ancient error would be corrected. Man would no longer be ruled by the delusion-producing mechanism in his psyche. He would open his eyes and hear with his ears, stop behaving like a maddened beast, slaughtering his fellow creatures and his fellow men. In the Messiah's kingdom, the redeeming power would extend beyond man to every savage animal, the carnivores would all become herbivores, even the poisonous reptiles would cease to strike.

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Gentle and comforting dream! Unversed though he is in the modern theories of evolution the prophet has sensed how greatly man's taste for meat has contributed to shap-

ing his evil destiny. The carnivores are killers, or, like the jackal and hyena, are the companions of killers. Man, a carnivore without the carnivore's excuse, is the bloodiest killer of them all. But in the kingdom of the Messiah these deadly impulses will be restrained. The lust to devour red meat will pass away and the lion will eat straw like the ox. How a lion's digestive system, designed to handle protein, will manage to cope with this diet of cellulose, the prophet does not consider. He is the dreamer of a beautiful dream, of a kingdom not of this world. But he is not so naïve as to suppose that this new kingdom will arrive until the old bloodstained evil one has been totally liquidated.

“For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations and his fury upon all their armies; he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. . . . And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night or day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever.”

All of which sounds uncomfortably like a poetic account of the results of all-out nuclear war. But what of the Promised One, the Messiah? Should we look for his coming before the start of the universal holocaust or will he only appear after the slaughter, a judge of the dead presiding over the resurrection, dispatching the souls of the good to enjoy an eternity in heaven and those of the evil to suffer eternally in hell?

On this matter the prophet seems to speak with two voices. The Messiah, as first portrayed, is a figure of power

who will "smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked." But in a later account the Messiah is portrayed very differently. "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not."

It is in connection with this concept of the Messiah as "a man of sorrows" that the prophet Isaiah advances a new doctrine with some startling implications.

"Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and he was afflicted yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."

Truly a startling doctrine! Its implications will be considered in more detail when we discuss the concept of salvation as presented by the Avatar Jesus. Here we can only say that this concept, "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," presents Yahweh in a new and strange light. He was, we have to admit, a meddlesome deity from the beginning, never content to leave the experiment alone, prone to pass moral judgments, liable to tear down the

laboratory and start something new, to “repent of having made man” and then repent of having tried to destroy man. But how, in the name of any sort of concept of justice, can this very arbitrary deity make a sinless man responsible for the sins of others? It was bad enough to give Satan a free hand with Job, but here at least the excuse could be offered that Job was being tested for his own good. But to lay on a guiltless man the burden of all mankind’s sins . . . what sort of divine justice is this? How can one man’s suffering atone for the guilt of another? This strange concept of the prophet Isaiah, incorporated as it was into the structure of Christianity, did much to create a confusion about the nature of man’s salvation which continues to have an effect to this very day.

Jesus and the New Commandment

He came at a time of trouble, a time of fear. Great nations had come and gone, risen to power and fallen into impotence. Assyria was hardly remembered. Egypt was a mere shadow of her ancient self. All-conquering Alexander had passed like a whirlwind across the East, spreading in the train of his conquests the concepts and values of the Greeks, but only a memory remained of that famous Alexander. Greece herself was reduced to the status of a vassal. All power now belonged to Rome, and her soldiers were everywhere. Even Jerusalem was filled with those armed legionaries whose swords and breastplates symbolized that faith in physical force which had made Rome ruler of the Western world.

The ancient homeland of the Jews, to which they had returned in triumph after the Babylonian exile, had been reduced to the status of a Roman province, governed by a series of procurators each more corrupt than the last. Rome herself was ruled by homicidal maniacs. The great Augustus had been succeeded by the cruel and gloomy Tiberius. Tiberius gave place to Claudius. Claudius to the raving Caligula whose conceit was so boundless that he com-

manded that his statues be erected in the Temple at Jerusalem. The Jews of those days were fanatically devoted to the law. Rather than comply with the emperor's command and defile the Temple with a graven image they preferred to risk extermination. "The Jews said, 'We offer sacrifices twice every day for Caesar and the Roman people,' but that if he would place the images among them, he must first sacrifice the whole Jewish nation; and that they were ready to expose themselves, together with their wives and children, to be slain." (Josephus)

Such was the temper of the times when, as St. Luke puts it, "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed," for which reason Joseph left Galilee and went to Bethlehem. There the new Avatar was born. Like the other Avatars, Krishna, Gotama, Zoroaster, the story of his birth became richly embroidered with legends. Like Zoroaster he was born of a virgin, like Gotama, his coming was proclaimed by angels and his future greatness foretold by an ancient sage (Asita in the case of Gotama, Simeon in that of Jesus). The lives of both Krishna and the infant Jesus were threatened by evil kings (Kamsa and Herod). Both were taken by their fathers into another country. Both evil kings staged a massacre of the innocents in their efforts to destroy the infant Avatar. These similarities suggest that the writers of the Gospels had access to both Buddhist and Hindu scriptures, accounts of which had perhaps been brought to Alexandria by the soldiers of Alexander.

Concerning the early training of Jesus and the source of his power the Gospels are almost completely uninformative. They are, it should be remembered, documents written long after the events they describe. Paul's Epistles are the oldest record. Mark's Gospel comes next. The Gospels of

Matthew and Luke were probably not written until the second century. As for the fourth Gospel, far from being the work of the "beloved disciple," it was evidently written by a Greek in the second century A.D. who was either a great fabricator or had access to an entirely different set of traditions from those drawn upon by Mark, Luke, and Matthew.

These, in any case, are the opinions of those scholars who, like a swarm of learned termites, have been chewing their way through the Gospel texts since the early part of the nineteenth century (to have done this sort of thing earlier would have been asking for death at the stake). Their findings have been admirably summarized by Albert Schweitzer in *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*. They need not concern us here except insofar as they enable us to rule out much legendary and Apocalyptic material which has no bearing on the central teaching anyway. Thus the whole "birth story" in Luke and Matthew with its star and manger and ass, angels, wise men, Herod, flight to Egypt, etc. is pure legend probably borrowed from Zoroastrian or Hindu sources. Similarly those miracle tales which the German critic, David Frederick Strauss, called Sea Stories and Fish Stories (including those improbable "Picnic Stories" in the course of which a few loaves and fishes are parlayed into a feast for several thousands) can be ignored as mere inventions of writers anxious to sell their doctrines to a public which craved for the miraculous.*

[*It should be noted here that Gautama, the Buddha, sternly forbade his disciples to have any dealings with the miraculous: "The Blessed One addressed the bhikshus and said: There is another great prohibition which I proclaim to you: an ordained disciple must not boast of any super-human perfection. The disciple who . . . boasts of a su-

Similarly the story of the *physical* resurrection can be regarded as an invention as can the ascent into heaven (modeled, most probably, on the earlier story of Elijah). It is also probable that the story about the end of the world (stars falling from heaven, moon turned into blood, etc.) which occurs in Mark 13 was not spoken by Jesus but was lifted bodily from a Jewish-Christian apocalypse of the first century probably composed just before the destruction of Jerusalem.

It seems highly probable that Jesus did not regard himself as the Messiah but simply as another prophet inspired by God and sent to restore spiritual values. He was, in fact, a spiritual descendant of Isaiah and his teaching started where the latter's left off. On the foundation laid by Isaiah he built his doctrine.

This foundation can be seen most clearly in the concept of the vineyard which plays so important a role in the gospel teachings. Man is compared to a vine and God to a husbandman. Like all husbandmen God expects fruit from his vine. He is prepared to go to considerable trouble to get this fruit but when, after all that trouble has been taken, the vineyard still refuses to yield fruit, he loses patience and destroys it.

perhuman perfection, be it celestial visions or miracles, is no longer a disciple of the Sakyamuni. I forbid you to employ any spells or supplications, for they are useless, since the law of karma governs all things. He who attempts to perform miracles has not understood the doctrine of the Tathagata." If Jesus had only imposed a similar prohibition mankind would have been delivered from a great deal of nonsense and Christianity would not have been ridiculed in the "Age of Reason."]

This is the framework on which the Christian tradition is constructed. Man is an uncompleted being charged by his creator with the task of bringing himself to completion. The fruit he is expected to bear is the fruit of spiritual struggle, of a long and arduous effort to overcome certain inherent defects in his make-up and to transmute lowly animal elements into lofty spiritual ones. The God depicted by Jesus is still a moral experimentalist, but now he demands far more from the object of his experiment. The standards of conduct offered by Moses and the Prophets are rejected. Man must aim at a higher ethic than merely repaying good for good and evil for evil.

“Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you: that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans do the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.”

This new standard of conduct involved the total remaking of man, the renunciation of all those patterns of behavior, the habit of bashing and bludgeoning and robbing and bullying that had become ingrained in man's nature during millennia of savagery. But the logic underlying the new commandment is inescapable. There is no credit in loving those that love you. It is loving those that do not love you that calls for effort and self-mastery.

This new doctrine of the Avatar Jesus demanded from

man so great a change that there are many today who describe it as unpractical. It is absurd, they declare, to expect this bloodthirsty, meat-eating primate, steeped in the gore of everything living, his fellow men included, to start suddenly blessing those who persecute him, turning the left cheek when smitten on the right, giving his cloak to those that take his coat. Such behavior patterns are simply beyond the creature's capacity. One might as well expect a cat to make lace or a bear to sing.

It is, of course, by far the easiest way out to dismiss the teachings of Jesus as the dreams of an unpractical perfectionist. They have been thus rejected from the beginning, not only by non-Christians, but also by millions who claim to "believe in" the doctrine (whatever this means) but make no effort to put into practice its precepts. Jesus, however, was not concerned with so-called practicality. He was concerned with the laws governing man's spiritual evolution. These laws he described in parables by which he hoped to provoke his hearers into thinking seriously and trying to understand what he was talking about: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

It is quite understandable that in this age of the labor-saving device, where all emphasis is on the *elimination* of effort, the teachings of Jesus should be labeled unpractical because they are difficult to put into practice. Yet a moment's reflection must show how inappropriate is this charge. For it is conceded even today that great achievements demand effort. No one is surprised to hear that a famous pianist practices eight hours a day, that a champion athlete trains vigorously and persistently, that a leading scientist spends long hours in his laboratory or that a great artist gives up everything for his art. But when Jesus, who demanded of man the highest possible achievement (Be ye

therefore perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect), demands at the same time tremendous and persistent spiritual effort he is labeled unpractical. He would have been far more unpractical had he declared that such an achievement can be accomplished *without* effort and sacrifice.

In demanding such personal effort Jesus differed from the earlier prophets. They had been content with generalizations about virtue; he was specific. Of all the great Avatars he was the most demanding. He assaulted the problem of man's salvation with an uncompromising vigor, exposing the fount and origin of all man's delusions. His prescription was drastic. Nothing would serve but a *total* change, a transformation so profound that it could quite justifiably be compared to a new birth. Hence his words to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

This concept of rebirth, of regeneration, formed the core of the whole teaching. "Natural" man, a bloodstained killer by instinct, prey to a host of grandiose illusions, cannot, in his present form, attain any communion with God. For God is a spirit and man is of the earth, earthy. There is, however, hope, not for the whole of mankind but for a few. To this tiny minority it has been given "to know the secrets of the Kingdom of God," the new laws of being whereby even the most sinful and deluded man can liberate himself from the prison of his delusions and attain the inward condition that can properly be called freedom. "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

But how is this liberation to be attained?

Death and rebirth is the sacrifice demanded. Not physical death, which is easy enough to accomplish, but a dying of the petty personal self whose incessant harping on its likes, dislikes, hopes, fears, hates, loves, desires, and dreams

fills the whole psyche of man with an endless clamor, as noisy and quite as senseless as that which prevails in a crowded monkey house in one of the larger zoos. With this din going on within how can any man be aware of or serve God? All his force, all his emotions, are dedicated, so long as he is in this condition, to one thing only, the service of himself. And, since he has no inner unity and his "self" constantly changes, they are dedicated to the satisfaction of whatever desire happens to be uppermost at the moment. So, in this condition, man is at the mercy of externals; lost in the temporal he has no sense of the eternal; immersed in the petty he has no awareness of the great. He is not a free being but a slave to trivial desires, to visions of self-importance, to endless petty mental meanderings centering about his own illusory ego.

Escape from this state is possible for man, but the price is high. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

What does this mean? How can a man "deny himself"? The answer can only be found if we accept one idea which is basic to the teachings of all the great Avatars. This idea is most clearly expressed by the Hindu concept of *jiva* and *atman*, the lesser, separate ego and the greater Self conscious of its unity with Divine Being to whom the Avatar Jesus referred as the Father. From this standpoint man is regarded as being capable of feeling "self" in two entirely different ways, either as a separate ego striving always for egotistical aims, or as a tiny part of a greater Being striving always to serve that Being. Jesus taught that man can, by great effort and inner discipline, change his feeling of self from one into the other.

For Jesus the feeling of being "one with the Father" was the central fact of his personal existence. Everything he did and everything he said he attributed to the Father. This awareness of the Divine Presence descended on him at the time of his baptism in Jordan and remained with him until shortly before his death when his cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" indicates that the sense of the presence had left him. It was his contention, however, that this direct awareness of the presence of God could be acquired by others. Not by all men. This was too much to expect; but by a select few who were capable of making the sacrifice involved.

This entity to which Jesus referred as "the Father" differed from the moral experimentalist of the early Old Testament who arbitrarily "chose" a particular race of Semites to be his own people, thus laying himself open to the charge of racial discrimination. The old, vengeful, meddling deity who was forever interfering with the experiment by means of floods, fire and brimstone, and other violent devices does not occur in the New Testament. In his place is the impartial Father, sending the rain on the just and on the unjust. It would however be incorrect to suppose that this Father had withdrawn completely into a condition of divine indifference. Far from it. God is still actively concerned about the outcome of the human drama being enacted on earth.

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begot-

ten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Here then is the new concept. "The light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not." This is, of course, a strictly Johannine interpretation for it occurs only in the gospel of St. John, and John was a Greek or a Jew who thought like a Greek, for which reason his gospel has a different tone from the other three. None the less his interpretation may really represent the concept which Jesus had in mind. In the beginning was the Word, the sacred Logos, the Divine Mind. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." Nevertheless there was darkness and this darkness was as much a part of the universe as the light. We return therefore to dualism, to the two principles, the dense, heavy opaque, "of earth, earthy," and the light of the spirit. The light of the spirit strives to penetrate matter. Man's free will consists only in this, that he can either turn toward the light or turn away from it.

Jesus did not imagine that because he had brought his message to earth men would then and there stop acting like maddened beasts and that peace, harmony, love would take the place of war, discord, and hatred. The signs of the times were too ominous to support any such hope. Tyranny, violence, corruption, cruelty and extravagance—irresponsible conduct by the rulers, irrepressible resentment by the ruled—such were the forces at work in the Judea of his day. The outcome was obvious. Sooner or later there would be an appalling catastrophe. Jerusalem would be destroyed, the temple reduced to ruins, there would not be one stone left standing on another. "For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom . . . and because in-

iquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.”

Endurance, therefore, was demanded, a certain inward constancy, a self-discipline like that which keeps a soldier at his post even when he is cut off and isolated from his fellows. It would be no easy matter, during the upheavals to come, to act in a manner worthy of a Christian. Jesus, however, had no intention of trying to frighten his followers into behaving themselves by scaring them with prophesies of disasters to come. On the contrary, he preached a way of living which involved taking no thought for the morrow. Our anxious fussings over what the future may bring are a sure sign of absorption in the petty self. To be in the full sense of the word involves emptying out the dregs of the petty self and thus becoming filled with the Spirit of Truth. For this it is necessary to stop worrying about the future.

“And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith. Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek.) For your heavenly father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought of the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.”

Simple being . . . being freed from the endless petty cares that shriek and jabber and moan in the mind of the self-occupied. Such thoughts may not be concerned with such practical and simple problems as what shall I eat or wherewithal will I be clothed. The flow of mental sewage in the modern mind does not pour through such innocuous channels but rather concerns itself with those glittering chrome-plated superfluties that a materialistic civilization holds up as symbols of achievement or with petty likes and dislikes, jealousies and envies, dreams of name and fame, sexual fantasies, physical adornments, lipsticks and coiffures, swimming pools and revealing bathing dresses, trips from here to there at near-sonic speeds and all the other senseless clutter with which the modern overloads his life, hoping thereby to attain a condition he calls happiness.

Simple being. . . . The concept is so foreign to the values of our busy age as to seem almost incomprehensible. And yet it was less than a century ago that Emerson wrote one of the finest commentaries of all times on that phrase of Jesus: "consider the lilies. . . ." "These roses under my window make no reference to former roses or to better ones; they are for what they are; they exist with God to-day. There is no time to them. There is simply the rose, it is perfect in every moment of its existence. . . . But man postpones or remembers, he does not live in the present, but with reverted eye laments the past, or, heedless of the riches that surround him, stands on tiptoe to foresee the future. He cannot be happy and strong until he too lives with nature in the present, above time." (41)

But how does a man attain this condition of simple being? Here the great difficulty arises. The soul, that divine principle in man, has become entangled in matter and calls

those things possessions with which it should not be concerned. Clinging to these it forges its own fetters nor is it strong enough in most instances to break these chains.

“And, behold, one came and said to him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but God: but if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments. And he said unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man said unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.”

It would be naïve to suppose that these great possessions are only physical or that the mere selling of goods brings spiritual freedom. The possessions that really fetter are attributes of the little personal ego, the chief of which is its sense of its own separateness. From this sense of separateness springs the pride, the selfishness, the arrogance, the aggressiveness that create for man his personal hell on earth. Again and again Jesus tried to show his disciples the importance of overcoming this sense of separateness, of sacrificing egotism, pride, and self-importance.

“Jesus called them unto him, and said Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will

be chief among you let him be your servant, even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Mat. 20:25-28)

And again, with reference to the scribes and Pharisees:

"All their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the market, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called, Rabbi: for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased, and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matthew 23:5-12)

And again, when the disciples asked him who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven:

"Jesus called a little child unto him and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven."

But how can this inward change be brought about? Assuming that some individual, some example of "average sensual manhood," equipped with all the usual egotistical illusions, suddenly decides to try to escape from the ego-prison, what shall he do? What is the first step? We already know that merely selling one's physical goods and giving to the poor is not enough. It is the spiritual impedimenta that must be got rid of. But how?

Two methods exist, the way of knowledge (*gnosis* or *jnana*) and the way of devotion (*bhakti*). In the Christian tradition both ways are recognized. "The peace of God

that passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God." It seems probable that, in the early Christian communities, considerable emphasis was placed on *gnosis*. In the Christian tradition that has come down to us, however, *bhakti* or devotion predominates and it was on *bhakti*, in the form of spiritual yearning or love, that the greatest emphasis was placed in the gospels. This is particularly true of the Johannine gospel. The whole emphasis is on love between God and man, on the mystical union of the soul with the divine which is brought about through love.

Love, therefore, was the foundation on which the whole structure was built. "A new commandment give I you, that you love one another." Nor was the love to be limited to friends or coreligionists. The persecutors, the mockers, and the despisers had also to be loved. And violence was on no account to be repaid with violence. "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

This was the extreme position taken also by Gautama and by Mahavira, founder of Jainism. No violence. No hatred. No thoughts of vengeance. Forgiveness even for those who have unjustly put one to death, because they "know not what they do" and thus cannot be held accountable. By such love as this the original error can be corrected and the gentle dream of the Prophet be brought to fulfillment. "They shall neither hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain."

But suppose they do hurt and destroy? Must I, in a world that teems with evil men, lay down my weapons and let them rob or kill me? Will not the crooks, the gangsters, the murderers and the destroyers take over the whole world and make chaos of everything? Is it not therefore the duty

of all men of good will to take up arms if need be to defend what they hold sacred?

Two answers can be given to this question. Said the Hindu tradition, as embodied in the *Bhagavad-Gita*: "Yes it is necessary to take arms for the protection of social order and he who fails to do so fails in his duty." Said the Buddhist tradition and the Christian tradition of the Gospels: "No, it is never justifiable. Violence breeds violence. Evil cannot be overcome by evil means. The real war is a spiritual war and must be fought with spiritual weapons. Neither swords and spears nor their modern equivalents will solve any of the problems that plague mankind. Man has inherited the consequences of millennia of bloodshed and his ancient passions urge him to try to solve problems by violence. Yet all his experience shows that violence solves nothing. Only by impartial love can this vicious circle be broken, for hatred is not assuaged by hatred but only grows stronger."

But how can the state of impartial love be achieved? It is easy to say, "I wish to love impartially," yet all our nature seems to revolt against such love. The moment we are crossed or frustrated our decision to love is forgotten. So long as our neighbor is nice to us we will love him impartially, but let him cheat us or insult us and we will be ready to boil him in oil.

How did Jesus imagine that such love could be engendered in man, the meat-eating primate, the greatest killer that the evolutionary process has produced? How can this monster be remodeled that he may no longer be the scandal of the universe but function as he should, as a being endowed with a fragment of divine reason?

A difficult question. We have received of the teachings of Jesus only such parts as were understood by his disciples or

by St. Paul and recorded either in the Gospels or the Epistles. There was, in all probability, a second teaching handed down by word of mouth to certain selected individuals. That such a teaching existed is suggested by the words: "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without all these things are done in parables" (Mark 4:11) and again: "With many such parables spake he the words unto them, as they were able to hear it. But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone he expounded all things to his disciples" (Mark 4:33, 34)

In short Jesus had an exoteric teaching for the multitudes "because seeing they see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand," and an exoteric teaching for his disciples "because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." It seems probable that this spoken teaching was not recorded and was ultimately lost. For this reason a gap exists in the Christian tradition. An extremely lofty ethic is offered but very little is said as to how the aspirant is to attain that high spiritual state. There is no practical method of self-discipline equivalent to yoga to help the aspirant to bring under his control those functions whose unmastered operations go contrary to all those behavior patterns advocated by Christ.

It is probably this lack of a practical system embracing all aspects of man's being, instinctive, motor, emotional, intellectual, that is in part responsible for the excessively *theoretical* quality of Christianity. No other great religion has suffered more at the hands of speculative theologians than has Christianity. The whole history of the Church reverberates with arguments about metaphysical and theological questions that few could comprehend and none could answer. Only a few groups (the Quakers are an example)

managed to avoid this quagmire of doctrinal argument and stood firmly on the ground of ethical conduct. The rest lost themselves in theology and offered in place of practice the more or less sterile ritual that passes today for religious observance, a kneel once a week in one's Sunday best, a hymn or two, a sermon and then back to Mammon.

But without spiritual exercises of some sort no religion can remain alive, for which reason the effort was made repeatedly to fill the gap which had resulted from a too exclusive preoccupation on the part of the church with theology, dogma, and ritual. A succession of Christian mystics, building on foundations offered by the Gospels, created a system of self-discipline that contained within it many of the principles of *bhakti* yoga. Out of their efforts emerged the method embodying in itself sound psychological principles, and cutting across the artificial barriers erected by the sects. Among the Catholics, Molinos and Fenelon, among the Protestants, Boehme and William Law, among the Quakers, Shillitoe and John Woolman all taught essentially the same method. The dogmas, rituals, theological wranglings and doctrinal squabbles were ignored by these enlightened beings as unworthy of serious consideration. Their problem was simpler and at the same time far more difficult: how to evict from its ruling place the petty personal ego and replace it with an unflinching recollection of the presence of God.

On the face of it, the method seemed simple. "Dwell in silence," wrote the Spanish Quietist, Juan Falconi. "Think of nothing, however good, however sublime it may be." The poor shoemaker of Goerlitz, Jacob Boehme, one of the most inspired mystics of all time, wrote similarly: "When thou standest still from the thinking of self and the willing of self, when both thy intellect and will are quiet, and pas-

sive to the expressions of the Eternal Word and Spirit: and when thy soul is winged up and above that which is temporal, the outward senses and the imagination being locked up by holy abstraction, then the Eternal Hearing, Seeing and Speaking will be revealed to thee, and so God heareth and seeth through thee, being now the organ of his Spirit, and so God speaketh in thee, and whispereth to thy spirit and thy spirit heareth his voice. Blessed art thou therefore if thou canst stand still from self-thinking and self-willing and canst stop the wheel of thy imagination and senses; forasmuch as hereby thou mayest arrive at length and see the great salvation of God, being made capable of all manner of divine sensations and heavenly communications. Since it is nought indeed but thine own thinking and willing that do hinder thee, so that thou dost not see and hear God." (48)

The method thus defined consisted in quietening and disciplining the mind, bringing it back from its wanderings to that state of recollection referred to by some of the mystics as the practice of the presence of God. This work is difficult not because it demands heroic exertions but because it calls for constant inconspicuous effort, like the steady drip of water which, in the end, will wear away the hardest stone. To assist the practitioner a number of methods have been devised, designed to prevent thoughts from wandering. One of these, the method of mental prayer, is vividly described in that gem of Russian literature, *The Sincere Narrations of a Pilgrim to his Spiritual Father*. It consisted in the repetition of a simple prayer, "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me," and of the gradual infusing of this prayer with emotion until it became the center of all conscious experience. Needless to say this technique is filled with difficulties and almost impossible to practice under the conditions of ordinary life.

The result of all this effort is a change in the sense of self, a change in all values and all aims. In the end a completely new being arises. This new being can put into practice the new commandment of Jesus and love not only friends but enemies. He can do this because, the small personal self having died, he no longer has cause to hate. He cannot be insulted or offended because there is in him no ego to offend.

It would, however, be completely unrealistic to suppose that everyone can attain this level of being. Nor was Jesus so naïve as to suppose that such a general transformation could take place. He hoped, rather, to train a spiritual élite, a small band who would be able, by intense self-discipline, to put into practice the instructions he had given. Hence the saying: "I pray not for the world but for those that thou hast given me out of the world." It would seem that humanity is so constituted that out of each generation only a handful strives to attain liberation: "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth into life, and few there be that find it," and similarly, "many that are first shall be last," and "many shall be called and few chosen." For to *call* oneself a Christian is one thing. Millions do so. But to *be* a Christian, in the sense of having achieved that liberation from the self of which Jesus spoke, is a very different matter.

Mohammed and the Sufis

Mohammed was the last founder of a world religion, unless one distorts the meaning of that word to include the doctrine of Karl Marx. In the year 570 A.D. he was born in Arabia in Mecca. No miracles occurred, no angels announced his birth, no shepherds rejoiced, no Herods slaughtered the innocent. For the first thirty-five years of his life he followed the business of shepherding and trading like other members of the Koreish tribe. It was not until he reached his fortieth year that the vision was revealed.

It occurred in Hirs, a desert hill not far from Mecca to which Mohammed had retired during the month of heat, Ramadan. It was his regular custom so to retire, for he belonged to the group known as the Hunafa, "those who turn away." Their turning away consisted in a rejection of the idols, "daughters of Allah," who had for centuries been worshiped at Mecca in the Kaaba. But Mohammed clung to an older tradition which declared that the people of Mecca were descended from Abraham through Ishmael and that Abraham had built the Kaaba for the worship of the one God.

So Mohammed turned away, disdaining the idolatry of the Meccans, seeking communion with God alone in a cave on the mountain. It was there, in the silence of the desert night, that the revelation came. The voice cried: "Read!" He said: "I cannot read." Again the voice said, "Read!" again he said, "I cannot." For the third time he was commanded. He said: "What can I read?"

"Read: In the name of thy Lord who created,
Created man from *clots of blood*.

Read: For thy Lord is the most beneficent
Who hath taught the use of the pen;—
Hath taught man that which he knew not." (49)

Mohammed went out of the cave and stood on the hillside and heard the voice cry, "O Mohammed, Thou art Allah's messenger, and I am Gabriel." And he saw the archangel standing surrounded in light.

So he became the messenger, doubting himself at first, but later moving with more assurance, fleeing from Mecca to Medina, returning to Mecca again at the head of an army, triumphing over his foes and setting in motion a religious movement that spread from Spain to India and which, today, numbers some 400,000,000 adherents.

But what was new about the message? What fresh light do the teachings of Mohammed throw on the problem of man's salvation that has not already been thrown by Krishna, Gautama, Jesus, Socrates, Lao-tse, and the Hebrew prophets? The answer is that Mohammed had nothing new to offer. There is dignity in Islam. It has never allowed itself to become enmeshed in verbiage as have the wordier Christian sects. It has never reverted to idol worship like some others. It prescribes prayers three times a day as opposed to the once-weekly kneel of the Christian.

But . . . on the vital subject of man's salvation it has nothing to offer except the old tired myth of the last day which has been prevalent since the days of the Pharaohs when Anubis presided over the Judgment of the Dead.

The task which the Prophet attempted was undoubtedly a worthy one. He was, as he freely admitted, only one of many messengers.

"And verily we gave unto Moses the Scripture and we caused a train of messengers to follow after him, and we gave to Jesus, son of Mary, clear proofs, and we supported him with the holy Spirit. Is it ever so, that when a messenger comes to you bearing tidings that you do not wish to hear, you grow arrogant, disbelieving some and slaying others?"

From this standpoint Mohammed's supreme task appeared to be the reuniting of the sundered stream of faith, that Jews, Christians, and Moslems might cease from arguments and combine in the worship of a single God.

Actually no such result took place. In the teaching of Mohammed war against the infidel was considered justifiable. There was no talk of loving enemies or turning the other cheek.

"Fight for the cause of God against those that fight against you: but commit not the injustice of attacking them first: verily God loves not the unjust.

"And kill them whenever ye shall find them, and eject them from whatever place they have ejected you."

All of which, of course, was precisely what the Christians themselves did whenever they felt inclined, with this enormous difference, that the Christians, when they strapped on their armor and marched off to kill, were flagrantly breaking the commands of their Lord whereas the Moslems, in

so doing, were only obeying the precepts of the Koran. This certainly freed the Moslems from that hideous charge of hypocrisy which is so often leveled by its foes against the Christian Church. But it also placed the Koran on a spiritual level far below that of the Christian Gospels, the Buddhist Sutras, and the Hindu Upanishads. It sheds no light at all on the inner dilemma of man, and offers no advice concerning salvation. A spirit of fatalism pervades the book which suggests that salvation and damnation are foreordained anyway.

“As for the disbelievers, whether you warn them or warn them not is all one for them; they believe not.

“Allah has sealed their hearing and their hearts and on their eyes there is a covering. Theirs will be an awful doom.”

But if Allah has sealed their hearts who is to blame for their disbelief? Something is amiss here. How can Allah “the Merciful and the Compassionate” hold them guilty for not seeing when he has put a covering over their eyes?

As for the nature of the rewards and punishments to be distributed after the Last Judgment, these are described in such meaty terms that the skeptical can hardly be expected to read without a smile of derision.

“Verily the pious shall be in gardens and pleasure, enjoying what their Lord has given them; for their Lord will save them from the torment of hell. . . . Around them shall go eternal youths, with goblets and ewers and a cup of flowing wine. No headaches shall they feel therefrom, nor shall their wits be dimmed! And fruits such as they deem the best, and flesh of fowl as they desire, and bright and large-eyed maids like hidden pearls, a reward for what they have done.”

Compared with this sensual paradise the Christian heaven with its harp and angels seems a tedious affair. As for the reverse side of the picture . . .

“Verily, we have prepared for the evil-doers a fire, sheets of which shall encompass them. And if they cry for help they shall be helped with water like molten brass, which shall roast their faces.”

The same old story! All in the name of Allah the Merciful, the Compassionate. One wonders what weird religious schizophrenia enables these teachers to endow a God with the quality of infinite compassion and at the same time have him condemn his creatures to an eternity in fire on account of one brief lifetime of error on earth.

Actually the teachings of Mohammed contain nothing at all that bears on the problem of man's salvation. They make no mention of escape from the veil of illusion, the transcendence of the personal ego, the replacement of the old savage habit of bashing and bludgeoning with a gentler pattern of behavior. For this reason, despite the fact that his followers today include nearly one-seventh of the population of the earth, the Prophet must be regarded as a light that failed. For though he himself admitted that he was only the successor to Jesus, he added nothing that was useful to the far profounder teachings of the earlier Avatar and succeeded only in further dividing that badly torn religious fabric so that to the squabbles of the Jews and the Christians there were added the still more destructive squabbles of both with the Moslems.

There would, in fact, be no point in considering the message of Mohammed in a book concerned with the psychological meaning of the concept of salvation had there not arisen out of the stony soil of Islam a new and more fruitful tree. This tree was Sufism, a mystical movement the

name of which is derived from the clothes of *suf* or coarse wool, which the Sufis wore. Of these Sufis by far the most famous was Jallaludin Rumi, born in Balkh (1207 A.D.), founder of the order of the Mevlevi dervishes.

It is to Jallaludin that we must turn for those instructions as to the nature of salvation and the means of its attainment, the absence of which from the Koran so greatly reduces the value of that sacred book. In Jallaludin we find such instructions in profusion. His *Masnavi* is indeed an enormous poem, longer than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* combined, a broad meandering stream of interconnected and sometimes interminable anecdotes, some of them so off-color that the very proper translator felt compelled to render them from Persian into Latin rather than English.

One who has the patience to dive into this huge stream can discover rare gems, for few mystics have ever possessed a deeper insight into the complexities of man's being than this great Sufi. Take for example, this passage which provides a key to the mystery of man's relation to God.

“God said: ‘Do thou grant his earnest request.
 Enlarge his faculties in accordance with his free will.
 Free will is like the salt of piety;
 Otherwise heaven itself were a matter of compulsion.
 If the whole world were framed for praising God,
 What merit would there be in praising God?
 Place a sword in his hand and take away his impotence.
 Let us see if he turns out a warrior or a robber.’ ” (50)

Here, once again, we are confronted with the concept of God the Experimentalist, a concept naturally congenial to a scientist, who, like everyone else, hankers after a god made in his own image. The words, “let us see,” rule out that element of predestination that, in the Koran itself,

proves such a paralyzing influence. Man has a sword in his hand. With it he can do whatever he chooses. He can use it to destroy others, to wipe out himself, or as a weapon in the prosecution of the spiritual war.

As for that spiritual war, it alone of all human activities is worth pursuing and the only warfare truly worthy of the name:

“All mankind are children except him that is intoxicated with God, none is grown up except him that is freed from sensual desire.

“The wars of mankind are like children’s fights—all meaningless, pithless and contemptible.

“All their fights are fought with wooden swords, all their purposes are centered in futility . . .

“The sciences of the mystics bear them aloft, the sciences of sensual men are burdens to them.

“Knowledge acquired through mystical experience becomes a helper, knowledge acquired through the senses becomes a burden.

“God hath said, *‘Like an ass laden with his books’*: burdensome is the knowledge that is not from himself. . . .

“If thou wouldst pass beyond name and letter, oh, make thyself wholly purged of self.”

But what practical methods did this great mystic prescribe to bring about this “passing beyond name and letter”? To answer this question would require a book in itself, describing the spiritual and physical exercises of the Mevlevi dervishes, for Jallaludin was too experienced a mystic to suppose that insight could be gained by reading, even by reading his own Masnavi. Suggestions, however, are scattered throughout the book and a few of these can be mentioned.

To begin with, the spiritual journey can never be under-

taken unless one realizes the danger imposed by one's own lack of unity. This lack of inner unity puts a man in constant jeopardy for he never can tell from one moment to the next which aspect of his nature will dominate his awareness.

"The being of man is a jungle. Be full of caution of this being if you are of *that breath*.

"In our being there are a thousand wolves and hogs.

"In our being there is the righteous and the unrighteous, the fair and the foul.

"Now a wolf appears; then a moon-like beauty with the face of Joseph. . . .

"Every moment a new species appears in the bosom; sometimes a demon, sometimes an angel, sometimes a wild beast."

As to the reason for this division, it results, declares Jallaludin, from the peculiar position man occupies in the scheme of things. Following Aristotle, Jallaludin envisaged the "Great Chain of Being" as involving a series of transitions from one level of spirituality to another. "First he came unto the realm of the inorganic. Long years he dwelt in the vegetable state . . . passed into the animal conditions . . . from the animal condition towards humanity . . . whence there is again a migration to be made." But man's suffering results from the fact that he does not reside wholly in one condition. He hangs suspended, so to speak, between two worlds and this state of suspension causes him great anguish while, at the same time, affording him his supreme opportunity.

"Verily the most high God created angels and set reason in them, and He created the beasts and set lust in them, and He created the sons of Adam and set in them reason and lust, and he whose reason prevails over his lust is

higher than the angels, and he whose lust prevails over his reason is lower than the beasts. . . . Angels and beasts are at rest from war and combat, while man is engaged in painful struggle between two adversaries.”

Needless to say this struggle is not universal. For every being who undertakes this spiritual war thousands or even millions know nothing about it. And why do they know nothing about it? Because they are satisfied with themselves as they are.

“No sickness worse than imagining thyself to be perfect
Can afflict thy soul, O arrogant, misguided one.
Shed many tears of blood from eyes and heart
That this self satisfaction may be driven out.
The sin of Iblis lay in saying: ‘I am better than he’
And this same sin lies in the heart of all creatures.”

Vanity, self-satisfaction, pride in the ego are the major obstacles in the way of liberation. Nevertheless the ego itself and its attributes must not be hated but rather regarded with detachment. Thus, when a wise man found a peacock tearing out its fine feathers in order that it might not suffer from vanity the sage did not commend the bird’s action but commanded it to desist.

“Tear not thy fine plumage but detach thy heart from it.
The existence of the enemy is a necessary condition for
waging this Holy War.
When there is no enemy the Holy War is inconceivable;
If thou hast no lust there can be no obedience to the divine
command.
There can be no restraint when thou hast no desire.
When there is no adversary what need for thy strength?”

In other words, a certain inner tension, a struggle between yes and no, between will and won't, is essential to generate the friction whereby the divided spirit finally attains unity and, shedding its separateness, regains its union with God.

Essentially, then, the teaching of this mystic of Islam regarding salvation is the same as that of Krishna, Gautama, Socrates, Lao-tse, and Jesus. Man is imprisoned in a web of his own delusions. He thinks himself perfect. He says I am better than you. He fights outer wars instead of inner wars, and spends the only wealth he has, his time and his vital energies, on baubles and trinkets and nonsense.

Islam as a whole, however, suffers more than does Christendom, from the lack of practical teachings regarding the actual psychological techniques whereby the errors in man's psyche can be corrected. Undoubtedly the Sufis understood these techniques and practiced a form of yoga adjusted to fit the Moslem religion, but as far as the average Moslem is concerned the thrice daily prayers in the direction of the Kaaba, the fast of Ramadan, the pilgrimage to Mecca are practically all his religion had to offer. Possibly for this reason the Moslem Arab world has sunk into a state of almost total torpor both spiritual and intellectual. Neither in the realm of science, art, philosophy, nor religion has anything of major importance come from that world during the last few centuries. This torpor, however, may now be ending. The world of Islam is stirring in its sleep and may once again become a potent force. From a spiritual standpoint the most important event that could happen in the twentieth century is that Judaism, Christianity, and Islam should abandon their squabbles, recognizing their common spiritual heritage. They could then offer to the peoples of the

world a new and purified form of religion as an alternative to the rampant Marxian communism which now tends to stifle all spiritual manifestations in the blanket of a squalid, short-sighted materialism.

PART III:

Roads to the Future

The Age of the Antichrist

The Saviors have spoken. In their different ways they have offered essentially the same views both concerning man's defects and his potentialities. But the Saviors lived a long time ago. Two thousand years have passed since Jesus, the most recent of the great Avatars, labored and suffered, trying to bring light to men. Two thousand years is a long time by human standards. Our knowledge of ourselves and of the world we live in has changed during this period. We have entered a new age. Is the ancient message still valid?

There are plenty who claim that it is not. Throughout a vast area containing about a quarter of earth's human population the teachings of the Saviors have been abandoned. The structure they labored to build has been shaken, or appears to have been shaken, to its foundation. The spiritual aims they extolled have been repudiated in favor of various brands of materialism offering to men earthly paradises in which all needs will be satisfied. In place of Christ we have antichrists, preaching a new gospel of class war, dedicated to the proposition that the almighty lie is more powerful than the truth. And millions have eagerly ac-

cepted this new gospel in the place of the older spiritual teachings.

What does this mean? Has the message of the Saviors lost its force? Is it no longer applicable to modern man? Has the very nature of man gradually changed so that these old teachings are no longer relevant? Has man reached that condition foretold by Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*?

"It is time for man to fix his goal. It is time for man to plant the germ of his highest hope.

"Still is his soil rich enough for it. But that soil will one day be poor and exhausted, and no lofty tree will any longer be able to grow thereon.

"Alas! There comes the time when man will no longer launch the arrow of his longing beyond man—and the string of his bow will have unlearned to whizz!

"Alas! There comes the time of the most despicable man, who can no longer despise himself.

"Lo! I show you *the last man*.

"The earth hath then become small and on it there hops the last man who makes everything small. His species is ineradicable like that of the ground-flea; the last man lives longest." (51)

Nietzsche was not alone in prophesying a progressive deterioration in the quality of man's being, a general shrinking in the loftiness of his spiritual aims. Long before he voiced his prophecy the ancient Hindu tradition, in its concept of the four *yugas*, foretold a steady decline continuing from age to age until, in the *kali yuga*, the age in which we live, man would be but a dwarf in his spiritual stature.

"The *kali yuga* dwarf finds himself a prey to the glamour of phenomena and the allurements of the senses. Not having spiritual insight he takes the unreal for the real, the evanescent for the eternal, bondage for freedom and, identi-

fying himself with the body and the lower mind, makes of himself, in spite of his intellectual acumen, a being who, as far as spirituality is concerned, is not much above the animal kingdom." (52)

Will this progressive replacement of spiritual aims by material aims result in the emergence of a new type of man who has once and for all sold his spiritual birthright for a mess of materialistic pottage? It is entirely possible. The main trend of modern life appears to lie in this direction. Today man stands at a point where three roads meet. Dimly seen, as if through a fog or a dust storm, the signpost tells him where these three roads lead.

ANNIHILATION, INSECTIVIZATION, REGENERATION.

Which will he chose, individually and collectively? Has he any choice at all or have the huge mechanical forces which his own discoveries have generated taken away from him the power to make decisions?

We can do no more at this point than examine these forces and try to estimate their strength. The Saviors, as we have already seen, were unanimous in one respect. Man is a victim of *maya*, of a built-in mechanism for generating illusions which not only prevents him from realizing his full spiritual potentialities but also endangers his physical security. Now we must examine this illusion-producing mechanism, using the knowledge made available by modern science to define more exactly what it is, how it works, what forces in the modern world strengthen it and which, if any, tend to weaken its hold.

The Five Degrees of Maya

Quantitation is the essence of the scientific method. So, when we speak of the effect of *maya* on human societies it will be helpful if we try to create a scale whereby this effect can be determined. To begin with one can speak in general of the Average Level of Delusion in a particular society at a given time. To measure this level we need some sort of scale, like the Richter scale used in measuring the destructive effect of earthquakes. Indeed, the phenomenon we are studying has much in common with an earthquake for it involves the gradual building up of tension and its sudden release with violently destructive effects. The natural unit of our scale would be degrees of *maya* and, since we must fix on some arbitrary levels, we can roughly define five degrees with as many subdivisions between them as we choose to distinguish.

0° *maya*, on this scale would represent a perfect human society, in which the delusion-producing mechanism did not operate at all and in which all citizens had reached that level of perfection characteristic of the holy man described in the *Bhagavad-Gita*: "He never hates any being and is

friendly and compassionate to all; he is free from the feelings of 'I' and 'mine,' even-minded in pain and pleasure. He is forbearing, ever content, and steady in contemplation; he is self-controlled and possessed of firm conviction, alike to friend and foe, free from attachment, unchanged by praise and blame."

So far as we know, no example of a society with an Average Level of Delusion of 0° *maya* has ever existed on earth. A society at the next level, 1° *maya*, probably has existed. The Harrapa civilization was perhaps an example. In it, through a proper relationship within the social hierarchy, the individuals at different levels of spiritual development were perhaps so trained that even the lowliest received a glimpse of the vision of perfection, sufficient at least to enable order to be imposed not by threats or fear but by spiritual authority.

At the next level, 2° *maya*, we find a society still organized correctly so far as its hierarchy is concerned. The holders of spiritual power are still at the top, guiding and advising the administrators who hold temporal power. But the Average Level of Delusion being higher in this society there is a constant tendency toward misunderstanding, on the one hand by the executives who tend to ignore the directions of their spiritual advisers, on the other by members of the merchant or laboring orders who tend to try to take power into their own hands. It is at this level, 2° *maya*, that the struggle for power begins, a struggle which reflects the egotism and will-to-dominate generated by the delusion-producing mechanism in man's psyche. A society at this level may remain stable for long periods of time but contains inner stresses that may, if they reach a certain point, disrupt it completely.

At the next level, 3° *maya*, we find ourselves in familiar

territory, for this Average Level of Delusion is characteristic of most contemporary human societies. In such a society the hierarchic structure has been partially destroyed, the executive class is dominant and governs without reference to spiritual advisers who, confused and disregarded, have withdrawn and play only an indirect role in affairs. Aims in such a society are formulated in material terms. The fascination with phenomena, with mere gadgeteering, predominates over the craving for spiritual growth. Greed, acquisitiveness, power-hunger keep the society in a state of ferment. Lies, both big and little, play an increasingly large role in public affairs. And yet, even at this level, there is some respect for truth and the intellectual élite, though rarely listened to, are still left free to offer alternatives to those material aims pursued by the majority. At 3° *maya*, it is not regarded as a crime to speak the truth and to labor for one's spiritual liberation even though those who indulge in such activities are regarded as odd and perhaps a little mad.

At 4° *maya* the Average Level of Delusion reaches a peak value. In a society on this level the last shreds of respect for truth have disappeared. Any suggestion that man might devote his energies to the attainment of spiritual insight is regarded as a dangerous heresy. Such a society is generally dominated by terror as was Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia. But one might also conceive of a society in which such crude methods were not used. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* represents such a society. It is fixed on the level of 4° *maya*, but perfectly stable, filled with happy, healthy people deliberately kept at an infantile level of development. Whether such a society could really exist remains to be seen. Generally, when the Average Level of Delusion reaches 4° *maya*, a wave of destruction sweeps over the

society, leaving in its wake thousands or millions of dead and doing incalculable psychological harm to the survivors.

Contemporary societies fluctuate between 3° *maya* and 4° *maya*. The so-called cold war is in part a struggle by societies at 4° *maya* to drag down to this level other societies that have managed, so far, not to sink so low. Admittedly there is more to the cold war than this. Much of it is merely the result of shabby rivalry between two greedy materialisms. But behind the greed there is a spiritual element. Shall the individual be left at liberty to pursue spiritual aims, or shall he, as a mere instrument of the state, be kept in bondage and denied all knowledge of those ways of escape that they were taught by the Avatars?

Demons and Death Wishes

We must now consider those psychological mechanisms through which the force we call *maya* works in man. Sigmund Freud, in the course of his delvings in the human psyche, discovered two opposed principles which he labeled Eros and Thanatos. The life force, Eros, operates by fairly obvious mechanisms, driving the organism not only to perpetuate itself, but also, by sexual union, to perpetuate the species. The death wish, Thanatos, is a much more elusive impulse. It consists of urges which an older pattern of thought would have defined as demonic. Whereas Eros, by the urge it imposes toward union, tends to unite the separated in the bonds of love, Thanatos, dark and solitary, sunders these bonds, driving the individual toward greater isolation and finally, in extreme cases, to self-destruction.

It is not at all easy to understand why such a mechanism as the death wish should have developed in man. From the evolutionary standpoint it would seem to serve no useful purpose but so many things in man serve no useful purpose from the evolutionary standpoint that the existence of this impulse should not surprise us. Nor would we be correct in

supposing that Thanatos, the death wish, operates only in man. A mass impulse to self-destruction manifests itself in several lower forms of mammals when conditions of overcrowding, due to periodic breeding storms, have made the struggle for existence more than usually acute. The behavior of the Norwegian lemming provides a particularly fine example of such antilife activity. About every four years the breeding cycle of these creatures brings them to such a state of overcrowding that they set off in thousands on migrations which terminate in mass suicide when they reach the sea.

What is the cause of this urge to self-destruction? Dr. Edward Deevey, in an erudite review of this phenomena, has concluded that the lemmings' urge to migrate is due to stress. (53) A similar phenomenon can be seen in snowshoe hares, which do not migrate in swarms but simply drop dead when their members reach a certain level. The stress arises from glandular imbalance. "Their endocrine glands, which make the clashing hormones, burn sugar like a schoolgirl making fudge." They die of hypoglycemic shock (low blood sugar produces coma, as diabetics who have taken too much insulin will know). In the case of the lemming the clash of hormones resulting from overcrowding manifests as galloping anxiety, a state of apprehension so acute that many literally scare each other to death. The survivors swarm into the valleys and finally plunge into the sea.

In man the urge to self-destruction operates more subtly than it does in the lemming. Karl Menninger, discussing the urge in *Man Against Himself* (54), distinguishes many manifestations of the death wish, ranging from various types of neurosis to actual suicide. It is, of course, always easy, when discussing a subject so obscure, to lose oneself in the jungles of mere terminology and to erect philosophical

structures having little or no experimentally established foundations. We can say, however, that the aggressive, destructive impulses present in man from time to time turn inward, driving him to injure himself in one way or another or making him a prey of individuals in whom destructive impulses are dominant.

In the older traditions these individuals through whom the destructive impulse flows were called *demonic*. They might also be called anti-avatars, or antichrists because, in every respect, they exerted an influence opposed to that of the Avatars. Instead of glorifying truth they glorify lies, instead of exhorting their fellows to strive for inner freedom they labor to bind them more firmly in the chains of their illusions. Instead of encouraging them to love they encourage them to hate. In short they represent the negative destructive force and are in this sense, demons incarnate if we wish to talk in the language of Zoroastrian dualism.

The characteristics of those demonic types are described in the scriptures of all the great traditions. A comparison of two of these descriptions will show how closely they agree.

“There are two types of beings created in the world; the divine and the demoniac. The divine have been described. Hear now concerning the demoniac. Men of demoniac nature know not what to do and what to refrain from doing. Purity is not in them, nor good conduct, nor truth. They say: The world is devoid of truth, without a moral basis, and without a God. It is brought about by the union of male and female, and lust alone is its cause. Holding such views, these lost souls of little understanding and fierce deeds rise as the enemies of the world for its destruction. Giving themselves up to insatiable desires, full of hypocrisy, pride and arrogance, they hold false views through delusion and act with impure resolve. Beset with innumera-

ble cares that will end only with death, looking on the gratification of desire as their highest goal, and feeling sure that this is all; bound by a hundred ties of hope, given up wholly to lust and wrath, they strive, by unjust means, to amass wealth for the satisfaction of their passions.

“This have I gained today, and that longing will I fulfill. This wealth is mine and that also shall be mine in the future.

“That enemy have I slain and others, too, I will slay. I am the lord of all: I enjoy: I am prosperous and mighty.

“Bewildered by many fancies, entangled in the meshes of delusion, addicted to the gratification of lust; self-honored, haughty, filled with the intoxication of wealth; possessed of egotism, power and pride, and also of lust and wrath, these people, envious by nature, hate Me in the bodies of others and in their own.” (*Bhagavad-Gita*)

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, echoes this description, “Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient, being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boastful, inventors of evil things, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful, who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same but have pleasure in them that do them.” (Romans 1:28-32)

It is these demoniac types, who, in a society in which the Average Level of Delusions is already high, seem able to bring about a crystallization of the collective death wish and set in motion processes of enormous destructive power.

The outward manifestations of these processes, the bombings and blastings, the killings and torturings, are only symptoms of the inward disease which consists in a progressive stifling of man's craving for truth, a falsification of all real values, a substitution for spiritual aims of more or less insane material ambitions leading either toward the annihilation or insectivization of mankind.

The Treason of the Intellectuals

The demoniac types who keep our modern world poised on the brink of self-destruction are products of a confusion in the social hierarchy. According to the old traditions this hierarchy reflected the difference which exists in the mental worlds of men. Obviously all men do not live in the same mental world. The level of consciousness of a Jesus or a Gotama is so far above that of "average sensual manhood" that these individuals might be called members of a different spiritual species. So we can visualize human society as a hierarchy of superimposed mental worlds extending from such high levels as the objective consciousness of the Avatars to the twisted back alleys of delusion and passion characteristic of demoniacs or the sewers of lust and sloth characteristic of the human beast.

According to the ancient tradition it was self-evident that beings capable of the highest mental functions, the pursuit of knowledge and truth, should stand at the apex of the social hierarchy and operate as guides because they could see farther and more clearly than their fellows. In older societies these individuals were generally priests but they

do not have to be priests. We can better understand their function in society if we call them clerics or intellectuals.

Individuals belonging to this category can only perform their proper function as long as they place loyalty to truth above all other loyalties. Above all else these are objective men. They cannot permit themselves the luxury of rigid orthodoxy. At all times and in all connections they must try to stand above the squabbling partisans and to see clearly. They can only perform their duty if they remain above the dust of the arena, for their sphere is the realm of ideas rather than the realm of action. Their task is to help their fellows to define their aims, to remind them of the higher possibilities latent within them. They are the descendants of the ancient prophets, equipped by their special capacities to function as the conscience of society. Thus, in a healthily organized society, the intellectuals are responsible for the formulation of its aims. Using the language of modern cybernetics we can call them the goal-seeking mechanism of society.

The intellectual, according to this traditional concept of society, had no right to take over the actual business of government. By doing so he would be violating the laws of his own nature. Governing was regarded as a function of the second order in the hierarchy, an order made up of men of action, warriors, or administrators, natural temporal rulers. Such rulers, however, were considered capable of right action only as long as they accepted the guidance of the objective men. Being, of necessity, immersed in day-to-day problems they tended always to lose sight of higher principles, to govern on a day-to-day basis in a more or less opportunistic manner. Operating on his own the administrator becomes increasingly helpless and ends by becoming a plaything of external events. Only when he has standing behind

him the impartial observer, sufficiently removed from immediate problems not to be confused by day-to-day emergencies, can he steer the ship of state correctly.

Below the administrator, in this traditional concept of the social hierarchy, stood the merchant or artisan. His concern was with the actual mechanics of daily living, supply and demand, needs and the satisfaction of needs, buying and selling, manufacturing, business enterprises of all kinds. His mental world was one in which the making of money, the accumulation of possessions, were visualized as chief aims. For this reason, according to the tradition, a merchant could not rule rightly. His rule would be even more short-sighted and opportunistic than that of the unaided administrator. It would be a government of shopkeepers, in which spiritual values would be progressively displaced by material ones.

Below the merchant in the social hierarchy stood the manual laborer, limited in outlook, concerned mainly with his physical needs. He was regarded as being incapable of independent thought, highly suggestible, easily deceived, easily misled. It was regarded therefore as particularly necessary that he should submit to guidance from those above him in the hierarchy. Should he ever take power into his own hands the collapse of society would follow inevitably, the higher orders would be destroyed, all spiritual values would be lost, the surviving members of the stricken society would be dragged down to a condition little better than that of animals.

This concept of a social hierarchy is, of course, not very popular nowadays, when the emphasis is on equality and freedom for all. None the less these different categories of beings do exist and they do play different roles in society. The role of the intellectual, the objective man, is just as

important now as it was in the past. This role, however, has become much more difficult to play. In a society in which long-term aims have become obscured and technological jugglery has become an end in itself, the intellectual is liable to lose his way and to adopt false values. Such a civilization, having left itself in a spiritual vacuum by breaking with its own traditions, may not be able to find a substitute about which new metaphysical integration can take place.

“Modern civilization suffers from a lack of principles, and it suffers from it in every domain. It is as if an organism with its head cut off were to go on living a life which was at the same time intense and disordered. With the suppression of pure intellectuality each special and contingent domain is looked on as independent; one infringes on the other and everything is mingled and confused in inextricable chaos. Natural relations are turned upside down and what should be subordinate proclaims itself autonomous mentally as well as socially. All hierarchy is done away with in the name of that hallucination, equality.” (55)

In such a society the intellectual, whose normal function is to oppose the workings of *maya* and to attempt to liberate himself and his fellows from its clutches, tends to betray his trust. Instead of trying to reduce it he may actually try to increase the Average Level of Delusion in the society in which he lives. He not only sacrifices his own capacity to be impartial but does his best to deprive his fellows of that capacity. He joins that conspiracy which the French philosopher, Julien Benda, called *La Trahison des Clercs*, a treason which is symptomatic of the increasing contempt toward things of the mind and spirit which characterizes contemporary Western humanity.

Our age, declares Benda, has accepted the conquest of material things as an end in itself and “those who lead men

to the conquest of material things have no need for justice and charity." In the absence of any loftier aim it has become the age of the intellectual organization of political hatreds. Since the end of the nineteenth century, the intellectuals, those objective men whose proper function is to value truth above faction, have been drawn into the struggle and started to play the game of political passions. In the process a certain number have lost their objectivity and done everything possible to entangle their fellows even more hopelessly in the web of *maya*. Observes Benda wryly: "Although Orpheus could not aspire to charm the wild beasts with his music one could at least have hoped that Orpheus himself would not become a wild beast." (56)

Pathogenic Ideas

All the anti-avatars who have operated and are still operating in the modern world to increase the Average Level of Delusions have come from the ranks of the traitor intellectuals. All of them operated by letting loose on society pathogenic ideas of one sort or another which, spreading like plague bacilli, produced a spiritual epidemic every bit as destructive in its own way as the great plagues of the past.

“An idea,” wrote P. D. Ouspensky, “is a machine of enormous power.” (57) And pathogenic ideas are entities of enormous *destructive* power. The existence of such entities has not been generally recognized by contemporary science. We speak of pathogenic viruses, such as those causing small-pox, yellow fever, or influenza, or of pathogenic bacteria such as those that cause plague, pneumonia, or tetanus. But we fail to recognize that a pathogenic idea, let loose on a susceptible population, can prove every bit as destructive as these various micro-organisms which are the only pathogens recognized by modern science.

An example of a pathogenic idea, one which, fortunately,

has now lost its virulence, is the concept that human beings have the capacity to make pacts with the devil and to use the powers thus obtained to harm or "bewitch" others. This idea is exceedingly old and was widely believed in Europe long before the Christian era, but during the mediaeval and early modern period, it suddenly attained great virulence. A fantastic pseudo-science of demonology sprang up with the full support of the churches, both Catholic and Protestant. In its name thousands were imprisoned, tortured, burnt alive until, at the height of the hysteria, the whole of Europe was converted into a devil-obsessed madhouse. This condition was largely the result of the labors of two traitor intellectuals, the Dominicans Kramer and Sprenger, who allowed their exclusive preoccupation with the devil to lead them into writing the *Malleus Maleficarum*, (58) a handbook for witch hunters, filled with misapplied erudition, which described how the witch should be detected, tortured, and burnt to the greater glory of God and the Christian Church.

This particular pathogenic idea has no longer any power. Modern society has developed an immunity to witchcraft. Kramer and Sprenger today would be derided as madmen and their *Hammer for Witches* would be placed in the same category as horror comics, where in fact it belongs. But to draw from this fact the comforting conclusion that mankind has now become immune to all pathogenic ideas would be completely wrong. Pathogenic ideas remain with us, different in name but as virulent as ever, capable at any time of provoking spiritual plagues destructive both on the mental and on the physical level. Indeed, because the frenzy they incite is more generalized than that provoked by the old belief in Satan, contemporary pathogenic ideas may be regarded as more dangerous than the ugly little devils who

exercised such power over the imaginations of our forefathers.

“Our last state is worse than our first because, in this vastly expanded house, we are possessed today by devils more terrible than any that ever troubled even our seventeenth or sixteenth century ancestors . . . We cannot say for certain that our doom is at hand; and yet we have no warrant for assuming that it is not, for that would be to assume that we are not as other men are; and any such assumption would be at variance with everything we know about human nature.” (59)

All pathogenic ideas have one thing in common. They justify that process which Aldous Huxley has called “downward self-transcendence.” (60) This is a characteristic of the human psyche that may express, if we choose to use Freudian jargon, the collective death wish, the will to total chaos and anarchy. Upward self-transcendence, emergence from the prison of the personal self into the light of objective consciousness, is a hard and uphill struggle undertaken only by a few individuals in each generation. But downward self-transcendence is as easy as was the galloping downhill rush of the Gadarene swine after their encounter with the devils. And, far from being a feat accomplished only by one or two choice spirits, it can be performed by thousands, even by millions, the more the merrier, though merry is hardly the appropriate word. In short it is a mass phenomena, a symptom of what Aldous Huxley calls herd poisoning which insures that, once possessed by a pathogenic idea, men will mutually inflame one another’s taste for cruelty and destruction until, in the mass, they will perform deeds of horror of which, as individuals, they would be incapable. (61)

Both the Avatars and the anti-avatars have always recog-

nized the existence in man of the urge toward mass descent into the abyss of unreason. And both have realized that mobs, crowds, masses are particularly liable, if manipulated in the right way, to fall victims to this urge. For this reason the Avatars represented salvation as attainable only by individuals, never by masses. And those individuals were encouraged to shun the multitudes, to withdraw, at least from time to time, into solitude and silence.

The anti-avatars, who preached salvation in reverse, have always done everything in their power to encourage the mass descent into the abyss. They realized that those who made this descent could be manipulated more readily than those who refused to plunge over the brink. So, in both of the epidemics of pathogenic ideas which have shaken our modern world, both the one initiated by Karl Marx, and the one initiated by Adolf Hitler, there is the same emphasis on manipulating the masses, the same total disregard for the rights of the individual.

Two Antigospels

In our age two antigospels have gripped men's minds, the antigospel of racial hate promulgated by Adolf Hitler and the antigospel of class war promulgated by Karl Marx. The first of these antigospels has suffered an eclipse though this eclipse is in all probability only temporary. The second has triumphed over an enormous area and darkened the minds of millions. How have these antigospels taken so firm a hold?

To understand the fascination evoked by these teachings we must consider again the structure of the human brain. It is composed of a vast new cortex, the roof brain or neopalium, superimposed like a cloak over a naked red savage that lurks in the more primitive midbrain, wherein are housed those propensities for bashing and bludgeoning that form a part of man's heritage from his raw and raucous past. This old red savage has an absolute relish for deeds of violence and cruelty, a taste which in normal times is kept under control by the roof brain and satisfied with such substitutes for the real thing as adult Westerns and murder stories.

The two antigospels which have played such a large role in the modern world both appeal directly to the primitive savage in man. Both justify the use of violence and encourage indulgence in hatred, arrogance, envy, and physical destruction. The antigospel of Naziism does it in the name of the Master Race, the antigospel of Marxism in the name of Class War. This is what makes both antigospels attractive. They provide lofty excuses for releasing the old red savage.

Marxism consists, in its essence, in the systematic envenoming of human relationships by means of envy and hatred carried out in the name of the Coming Good. Throughout the literature of Marxism runs like a theme song the steady high-pitched screech of vituperation. Good Marxists hurl invective like manure spreaders. Their speech abounds in passionate clichés: “lackeys of imperialism,” “bloodstained capitalists,” “bourgeois reactionaries,” etc. Nor is this verbal violence a mere substitute for physical violence. Given the chance, they use both with equal enthusiasm and with an equal disregard for truth, justice, fair play, decency, and compassion.

In this respect the Marxist is worthily following the master. Marx was an anti-avator in practice as well as in theory, manifesting in his behavior all those qualities that the Saviors had most emphatically condemned. Wrote Bakunin, from personal observation, “Mr. Marx is immensely malicious, vain, quarrelsome, as intolerant and autocratic as Jehovah, the god of his fathers, and like him, insanely vindictive. There is no lie, no calumny, which he is not capable of using against anyone who has incurred his jealousy or his hatred; he will not stop at the basest intrigue, if, in his opinion, it will serve to increase his position, his influence or his power.” (62)

Carl Schurz similarly depicted the overwhelming egotism

of this anti-avatar. "I have never seen a man whose bearing was so provoking and intolerable. To no opinion which differed from his own did he accord the honor of even condescending consideration; every argument that he did not like he answered either with biting scorn at the unfathomable ignorance that prompted it, or opprobrious aspersions upon the motives of him who had advanced it. I remember most distinctly the cutting disdain with which he pronounced the word bourgeois; and as a bourgeois—that is, as a detestable example of the deepest mental and moral degeneracy—he denounced everyone who dared to oppose his opinions." (63)

This same almost insane egotism was characteristic of Hitler and Stalin, powerful anti-avatars who dragged down whole nations to disaster. Both these beings drew their strength from the destruction of conscience which gave them a singleness of purpose not possessed by those in whom conscience continues to function. For conscience, though identified by the Freudians as merely the collective prohibitions of society embodied in the superego, was represented by the Avatars as the emotional preference for truth which exists in man as a part of his birthright.

It would seem that there really is such a preference in normal man. The telling of a deliberate lie produces a reaction on the part of the autonomic nervous system, reactions which form the basis for the lie-detector test. Something registers a protest, makes the liar feel uncomfortable. But it also appears that man has it in his power to destroy conscience, to root out this inborn preference for truth and to become firmly convinced that one particular set of beliefs is always right. This stifling of conscience is the basis of fanaticism of all kinds and gives to the fanatic tremendous power, the capacity to follow one line of action with abso-

lute disregard for the effects it has on the lives, happiness, morals of others. Declared Adolf Hitler in a revealing statement: "I move with the assurance of a sleepwalker." His definition of conscience is equally revealing: "Conscience is a Jewish invention; it is a blemish, like circumcision." (64)

After destroying conscience in himself the first concern of the anti-avatar is to destroy it in others. There are no limits to the extremes to which he will go in order to accomplish this end. He will order history rewritten and scientific truths revised; he will bring to bear on the minds of those within his power every force that terror can impose to root out the taste for truth and drag down all to the level of unquestioning obedience characteristic of the herd. Said Hitler: "At a mass meeting thought is eliminated. And because this is the state of mind I require, because it secures to me the best sounding board for my speeches, I order everyone to attend the meetings where they become part of the mass whether they like it or not, intellectuals and bourgeois alike." (65)

Once conscience has been destroyed any atrocity can be committed. The way is wide open. Wholesale collapse of moral values makes it possible for the anti-avatar to impose his will as he pleases. Totalitarian propaganda, observes Hayek in *The Road to Serfdom*, "is destructive of all morals because it undermines one of the foundations of all morals, the sense of and respect for truth." (66) Once this respect has gone little remains. The anti-avatar and those beings he has made his slaves drag down to their own demonic level all beings in their power. Fear, hatred, suspicion, lies, hypocrisy become characteristic of the spiritual climate in which people live. Anything in the nature of an objective search for truth or a struggle for

higher spiritual development is out of the question. Men are transformed into small frightened animals forced to devote all their energies to keeping themselves alive and out of trouble. The atmosphere was well described by Louis Fischer writing of Russia as it was during the Stalinist purges:

“Citizens who had always followed politics at home and abroad escaped into apathy. Suicides multiplied. Youth took refuge in cynicism. Everybody played safe. Lying, hypocrisy, humiliating obeisances, violence towards one’s deepest convictions and disloyalty to friends were a small price to pay for keeping out of prison. To divert suspicion from yourself you accused the other fellow.” (67)

All Is Permitted

A group of three pathogenic ideas were used by the anti-avatars to gain a hold over the minds of their fellow men. These can be referred to as *All is Permitted*, *The Class War*, and *The Master Race*. We must now, like careful pathologists, examine these ideas, the combined effects of which in terms of death and destruction have equaled those of the greatest plagues and pestilences that have, in times past, ravaged the human race.

All is Permitted is certainly not a new idea. It is as old or even older than the Paleolithic, a primordial revolt against all social restraints. During the nineteenth century, however, the idea was rediscovered by certain traitor intellectuals who regarded it as being very novel and daring and made it the basis for a half-baked philosophy of life. It arose as a consequence of the overthrow of Jacob's ladder and its replacement by the Darwinian roulette wheel. The chain of reasoning was more or less as follows: there is no moral law in the universe, no heavenly father watches over man, no angel records his deeds; there is neither reward for virtue nor punishment for vice. Man is the casual product of a

random process which has, at the same time, produced the tapeworm, the spirochete of syphilis, and a host of other destructive or disgusting organisms. From the standpoint of the random process of evolution man is of no more importance than the ant. His prayers to a Higher Power are the pathetic grovelings of a deluded fool before a figment of his own imagination. No Higher Power cares whether man marches off down the road to extinction along which countless thousands of species have preceded him. No Higher Power cares because there is no power to care.

But if there is no Higher Power there is also no Higher Law. So the foundations of morality do not rest on the rock of eternal truth but are merely jerry-built structures put up by man and, like all human institutions, subject to change without notice. And although weak slaves may be awed by these flimsy affairs the free spirits will spurn them and boldly proceed beyond good and evil proclaiming the great new principle, *All is Permitted*.

The idea appeared in the novels of Stendhal: Nietzsche knew it well: Turgeniev enshrined it in the character of his nihilist, Bazarov. But it was Dostoevsky, prophet and seer extraordinary, who most clearly saw the consequences of this pathogenic idea when introduced into the minds of the immature and unbalanced. All is permitted: "a pretty doctrine for scoundrels." It was this doctrine, expressed by the traitor intellectual, Ivan Karamazov, that set Smerdiakov on the road to murder and suicide, Dimitri on the road to Siberia for a crime he did not commit, Ivan himself on the road to insanity. The whole of *The Brothers Karamazov* can be regarded as an inspired commentary on this pathogenic idea and the inevitable destruction which it brings. Stavrogin in *The Possessed* is another example of a man obsessed with this idea. This time it leads to the rape of a

child, murder, the destruction of a town. Dostoevsky has often been accused of exaggeration and *The Possessed* is frequently cited as an example of this tendency. But he did not exaggerate. The pathogenic idea he was describing had far greater destructive power than even he foretold and ended in spreading ruin over most of Europe.

Class War

This pathogenic idea, let loose by Karl Marx, has proved almost unbelievably destructive. Class, for Marx, had nothing to do with the four social orders recognized by the older traditions. This Prussian philosopher thought in economic terms. The finer shades of difference evaded him. So there were owners of the means of production (the capitalists) and those who owned nothing (the proletariat). And because Marx could think only in terms of black and white and was totally blind to various shades of gray he visualized these opposites not as interdependent and co-operative but as essentially hostile, bound by the very nature of things to be at war. For, he argued, those who own the means of production must inevitably draw to themselves more and more of society's wealth, becoming increasingly monopolistic, while those owning nothing but their power to work must become increasingly dispossessed. So capitalist society, torn by internal contradictions, the rich getting always richer and the poor always poorer, would generate within itself more and more hatred between the two classes, hatred

which would erupt into open war as soon as the proletariat found courage to overthrow their oppressors.

“Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains.” And who would free the workers from these chains? Who but the members of the Communist Party, trained in the fine art of blowing smoldering hatred into flame, willing and able to use unlimited violence for the attainment of its ends.

So the gospel of hate was propounded to replace the older gospel of love, and class war was the idea about which that hate could crystallize. There were, of course, plenty of reasons for the hatred. Private ownership of the means of production had, during the nineteenth century, resulted in fantastic disparity between rich and poor. Working conditions were appalling. Filthy slums spread like cancers about the industrial centers. The most elementary of human rights were ignored. Children labored in coal mines under conditions unfit for a beast. The image of the greedy grasping Capitalist totally indifferent to the welfare of those whose labors created his wealth arose out of conditions such as these, and the overtones of contempt which still cling to the word, especially as used by Communists, had their origin here.

The established Christian Church did much to increase the appeal of Marx’s antigospel. Rich with the spoils of the centuries, indifferent to the welfare of the people, hopelessly bogged down in doctrinal minutiae, the clergy did virtually nothing to remedy the social abuses rampant in society. Karl Marx, who had apparently never bothered to study the Gospels, and merely looked at the outward trappings of the Church, dismissed the whole huge structure as a detestable fraud. Religion was the opium of the people, a drug used by ruthless masters to keep their slaves from revolting, to make

them contented with their wretched lot by offering them the consolations of a mythical future life.

So class war was launched: war to the death, without moderation, mercy, or pity. Nothing, declared the prophet, would ever persuade the capitalists to do anything but squeeze from the workers the maximum amount of work for the minimum amount of pay. Therefore let violence accomplish what persuasion would never be able to do. Man the barricades! Let blood flow freely! Let the hard-eyed conspirators, leaders of the Communist Party, equipped with one-track minds and a total disregard for truth, seize in the name of the proletariat the means of production and use the state (army and police) as a means of coercion to crush with unlimited terror all opposition. (68)

And then . . . ?

Why then, when the mess had been cleared up, the dead capitalists all buried, there would emerge a classless society in which the state (with its bureaucracy and secret police) would peacefully wither away and everyone would live happily ever afterward.

Was it possible that Karl Marx really believed this fairy tale? Perhaps he did. This strange being had lost touch with the real basis of morality. It was therefore quite possible for him to believe that out of unlimited violence could come peace; out of lying, terror, and tyranny could come truth, love, gentleness, and social harmony. Had he consulted the Avatars he might have learned differently. "Beware false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit: but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

But Marx had no use for the Avatars, mere purveyors of

the "opium of the people." He launched the idea of class war and organized his Communists on the basis of that idea. War to the death. No quarter to be asked and certainly none given. Chicanery, falsehood, shady maneuvers of every kind to be used without limit for the attainment of the end. For was not that end a noble one? Therefore the end would justify the means.

The idea took on a life of its own, continued to work and do harm long after the conditions had so changed that the idea of class war became outmoded. For change they did, at least in the most highly industrialized countries, and that without help from Marx. He was one of the most inaccurate prophets who ever lived, wrong about virtually everything. Trade unionism put an end to ruthless capitalist exploitation. The more enlightened capitalists themselves realized that if people were to buy their goods the people must have money and therefore high wages were good for trade. Widespread ownership of stock led to a wide diffusion of the ownership by the means of production. A class of professional managers replaced the old-style robber barons. Social legislation protected the worker from abuse. Unemployment compensation protected him from starvation. All without bloodshed, without revolution, without heroics. . . .

As for those lands where the doctrines of Marx did become official, they soon enough proved the truth of the saying of Jesus. The state showed no sign of withering away. The corrupt tree brought forth corrupt fruit; terror and violence, coercion and tyranny persisted; that "new class" about which Djilas has written, arose to impose on those below them the same old tyranny. (69) The wheel has come full circle so that now, to find the sort of conditions against which Marx fulminated in 1848, one must look in those countries that are supposed to have accepted his doc-

trines. This may be an example of the workings of dialectical materialism but it certainly is not the future Marx foretold.

One who examines the history of the Marxist movement can hardly help but exclaim: "Great is *maya*, wonderful is its power!" For this muddled dream of an ill-tempered prophet, whose every forecast has proved erroneous, has so expanded that it confronts contemporary man with the threat of self-destruction. Antiquated revolutionaries, by-products of Europe's "old, dynastic slaughter house," continue to extol their outdated ideas, prating of "imperialists" and "capitalists" like phonographs with their needles stuck in the groove. Among the deadly products of modern technology these noisy anachronisms blunder as clumsily as paranoid elephants. The hazards are fantastic. One false step and they will blow up both themselves and those they regard as their enemies. But so extraordinary is the power of man's delusion-producing mechanism that these aging conspirators, soaked from head to foot in blood they have caused to be shed, can still pose as leaders of humanity's advance toward the better life.

Mighty is *maya*!

The Master Race

This pathogenic idea, largely responsible for the genesis of World War II, can be regarded as one of the most destructive of all times. It has, of course, existed for a long while in a mild form as a sense of racial superiority. Jews regarding themselves as the Chosen People, Greeks referring to non-Greeks as barbarians, Kipling's Englishmen taking up the white man's burden and ruling the "lesser breeds without the law" with a firm conviction of their own racial superiority, all expressed the idea. In fact it was implicit in all those superior airs the white man gave himself because he had less skin pigment than some other races. Nor was it entirely confined to whites. The Chinese, with their repeated references to foreign devils, show themselves also to be prone to infection with this virus.

But it was not until the rise of Naziism in Germany that this idea, after passage through the minds of several traitor intellectuals, attained such fantastic virulence that it destroyed almost as many people as the great influenza pandemic of 1918-19 (the score: Master Race, about eleven

million, 'flu fifteen million). How did this idea attain such destructive power?

The idea of the Master Race, *Herrenvolk*, was applied to the Germans by an Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who in his *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* spoke of: "a mighty Germany spreading far across the earth the sacred heritage of her language, affirming herself everywhere and imposing herself on others." (70) Chamberlain borrowed from the French writer, de Gobineau, the concept of Aryan supremacy and also incorporated into his concepts the Aryan cult of Richard Wagner and the latter's anti Semitism. Additional power was given to the idea by Friedrich Nietzsche.

There is so much that is admirable in the writings of Nietzsche that one feels reluctant to saddle him with even partial responsibility for that disastrous idea that led Germany to her ruin and permanently altered the balance of power in the world. But Nietzsche, like Karl Marx, was a muddled prophet, one day an inspired visionary, the next a driveling romantic, a sickly, lonely neurotic, doomed ultimately to madness, who carried about with him like a disease a certain childish admiration for that physical violence of which he himself was quite incapable.

So Nietzsche, torn by his inward inconsistencies, could never make up his mind whose side he was on. In some respects he profoundly understood the message which the Avatars had given to men. No modern philosopher has ever equaled the magnificent statements in the Prologue to *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* that describes the great dangers and high possibilities inherent in the human condition.

"I teach you the Superman. Man is something that is to be surpassed. What have you done to surpass man?"

"All beings hitherto have created something beyond

themselves, and you want to be the ebb of that great tide and would rather go back to the beast than surpass man?

"What is the ape to man? A laughingstock, a thing of shame. And just the same shall man be to the Superman: a laughing stock and a thing of shame.

"You have made your way from the worm to man, and much within you is still worm. Once were you apes and even now man is more of an ape than any ape.

"Even the wisest of you is only a disharmony and hybrid of plant and phantom.

"Verily a polluted stream is man."

And again:

"Man is a rope stretched between the animal and the Superman—a rope over an abyss.

"A dangerous crossing, a dangerous wayfaring, a dangerous looking back, a dangerous trembling and halting.

"What is great in man is that he is a bridge and not a goal: what is lovable in man is that he is an *over-going* and a *downgoing*." (71)

Utterances such as these make one draw in one's breath and say: "Ah! This is no ordinary word-spinning philosopher. Here is a prophet, yes and more than a prophet!"

Why then did this remarkable being who might have been one of the great creative spirits of the nineteenth century, exerting a vitalizing effect on what was, by any standards, a stodgy, materialistic, hypocritical and *bourgeois* culture, inspire instead the monstrous creators of the Third Reich? For there can be little doubt that he did inspire them. Wrote Hermann Rauschning: "Hitler once conferred on me the privilege of learning his views on morality and things of the spirit. They were a mixture of misunderstood Nietzsche and popularized ideas of a certain tendency in modern philosophy." (72)

Nietzsche's error resulted from a misunderstanding of what he called Christianity. One can hardly avoid the conclusion that this misunderstanding was deliberate, that Nietzsche *chose* to be blind to the real message of the Gospels and to concentrate all his force on attacking one relatively minor aspect of the teaching. What roused his ire was the emphasis placed by Jesus on sheep and on the cultivation of qualities which Nietzsche imagined to be sheep-like.

"No shepherd and one herd! Everyone wants the same; everyone is equal: he who has other sentiments goes voluntarily to the madhouse." (73)

Essentially this was an aristocratic disdain for the dreary leveling process that would reduce all mankind to its lowest common denominator. Nietzsche deplored the process and regarded it as typically Christian. It was a deliberate glorification of the weak, the defective, the timid, the miserable over the strong, the healthy, the powerful, the joyful. Christianity, to Nietzsche, seemed a religion only fit for slaves.

So he swung in the opposite direction. He saw clearly the divided nature of man, a creature that is both herbivore and carnivore. Influenced by his romantic admiration for the warrior he concluded, because the carnivore type is a fighter, that it is necessarily nobler than the herbivore type which does not find satisfaction in the shedding of blood. So he exalted the ethic of the warrior above that of the objective man, the true intellectual. Before long he was writing like a real demoniac, glorifying "the superb blond beast," "the audacity of noble races," "the terrible gaiety and profound joy felt by heroes in all destruction, in all the pleasures of victory and cruelty."

Oddly enough Nietzsche himself seems to have under-

stood the dangerous effect his writings might have on the Germans, his contempt for whom he "carried about with him like a disease." But it was precisely those Germans that he despised and warned against reading his books who gulped down his confused outpourings with greatest avidity and absorbed from them all that was most poisonous. Thousands of strutting Nazis, bristling with swastikas and arrogance, saw themselves in the guise of the Nietzschean Supermen and found in Nietzsche's more demoniac utterances justification for any number of atrocities. Regarding themselves as the Herrenvolk they felt themselves to be a race of free spirits who had gone "beyond good and evil," a new aristocracy, born to rule over the herd, who had rejected the law of Christ as being only fit for slaves. Nietzsche can hardly be absolved from blame for the evil use to which his writings were put. His almost deliberate refusal to understand the difference between fossilized Church Christianity and the gospel teachings, his glorification of instinctive as opposed to objective man, places him in the ranks of the traitor intellectuals despite the real value of so much of his other work.

The Road to the Ant Hill

Hitler and Stalin were anti-avatars of the old style. They swept across the earth in a whirlwind of destruction, dragging down, smashing, degrading, debasing. Then, like the whirlwind, they passed on. They were noisy and hideous but ignorant of science and obsessed with their own importance. In a word they were old-fashioned and relied on means too grossly brutal to achieve permanent effects.

Times have changed. Now, in mid-twentieth century, we face the probable emergence of a new type of anti-avatar, compared with whom Hitler and Stalin were mere butchers. His coming has been foretold for quite a long time by certain prophets of our age. Dostoevsky portrayed his outlines in his *Grand Inquisitor*. Aldous Huxley drew him in greater detail in his *World Controller, Mustapha Mond*. This anti-avatar of the future pervades such studies as William Whyte's *Organization Man*. (74) It is worth while to look at him carefully for he may become the ruler of tomorrow's world.

Consider Dostoevsky's *Grand Inquisitor*. This is no petty despot driven by lust for possessions or personal power. He is a dweller in the desert who has eaten roots in the wilderness and striven earnestly to perfect his soul. He has wres-

tled with the terrible mystery of man's free will and has finally rejected that freedom which was offered to men by Christ. So firmly convinced is he that Christ was wrong that, when the Avatar reappears in Seville, he promptly throws him into prison and swears he will burn him alive. He stands there in the dungeon before Christ who said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." But the Inquisitor has weighed mankind in the balances and found in it little yearning for either truth or freedom. Listen to the words of the Grand Inquisitor, forerunner of anti-avatars yet to come.

"It is Thou. Thou. But be silent. What canst Thou say? Thou hast no right to add anything to what Thou hast said of old. Why hast Thou come to hinder us? Didst Thou not say to men, 'I will make you free?' But now Thou hast seen these 'free' men. We have paid dearly for that freedom. For fifteen centuries we have wrestled with it, but now it is over and ended for good. Let me tell thee that now, today, people are more persuaded than ever that they have perfect freedom, yet they have brought their freedom to us and laid it humbly at our feet.

"Thou didst think too highly of Man. Thou didst desire that men should love Thee of their own free will and didst reject the base raptures of a slave before the might that has overawed him. But man is a slave none the less, though rebellious by nature. Thou didst ask too much of him. He is weak and vile. How can he do what Thou didst? Everywhere now he is rebelling against our power, and is proud of his rebellion, but his pride is that of a child, the school-boy. They are little children rioting, keeping out the teacher at school. But their childish delight will end; it will cost them dear. They will cast down temples and drench the earth with blood. But they will see at last, the foolish

children, that though they are rebels, they are impotent rebels, and that he who created them rebels must have meant to mock them. . . . Freedom, free thought and Science will lead them into such straits and will bring them face to face with such marvels and mysteries that some, the fierce and rebellious, will destroy themselves; others, rebellious but weak, will destroy one another; while the rest, weak and unhappy, will crawl fawning to our feet. And we shall show them that they are weak, that they are only pitiful children, but that child-like happiness is the sweetest of all. They will tremble before our wrath, be quick to shed tears, but as ready, at a sign from us, to pass to laughter and childish song. Yes, we shall set them to work, but in their leisure hours we shall make their life like a child's game, with children's songs and innocent dance. Oh, we shall allow them even sin; they are weak and helpless, and they will love us like children because we allow them to sin. We will tell them that every sin will be expiated if it is done with our permission, that we allow them to sin because we love them and the punishment for those sins we take upon ourselves. And they will have no secrets from us. All, all they will bring to us and we shall have an answer for all. And they will be glad to believe our answer, for it will save them from the great anxiety and terrible agony they endure in making free decisions for themselves. Thus there will be thousands of millions of happy babes and a hundred thousand sufferers who have taken upon themselves the curse of good and evil. Peacefully they will die, peacefully they will expire in Thy name, and beyond the grave they will find nothing but death. But for their happiness we shall allure them with the reward of heaven and eternity, though, if there were anything in the other world, it certainly would not be for

such as they. It is said, 'Thou wilt come again in victory, Thou wilt come with Thy chosen, the proud and the strong,' but we will say that they have only saved themselves, but we have saved all. And I will stand up and point out to Thee the thousand millions of happy children that have known no sin. And we, who have taken their sins upon us for their happiness, will stand up before thee and say, 'Judge if Thou canst and darest.'

"Know that I fear Thee not. Know that I too have been in the wilderness, I too have lived on roots and locusts, I too prized the freedom with which Thou hast blessed men, and I too was striving to stand among Thy elect thirsting 'to make up the number.' But I awakened and would not serve madness. I turned back and joined the ranks of those *who have corrected Thy work*. I left the proud and went back to the humble. What I have to say to Thee will come to pass and our dominion will be built up. Tomorrow Thou shalt see the obedient flock hasten to heap up the hot cinders about the pile on which I shall burn Thee for coming to hinder us. If anyone has deserved our fires it is Thou. Tomorrow I shall burn Thee." (75)

A brilliant prophecy! Dostoevsky has foreseen the bewilderment that must inevitably result from the misapplication of a runaway technology. He has detected that yearning of man for "someone to keep his conscience, and some means of uniting all in one unanimous and harmonious ant-heap, for the craving for universal unity is the third and last anguish of men." But Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor is still in many respects an old-fashioned anti-avatar. He still depends for his power on terror, the threat of imprisonment, torture, and fiery death. For a portrait of the modern or future anti-avatar we must turn to Aldous Huxley's Mustapha Mond.

Compared with Dostoevsky's grim Inquisitor, Huxley's World Controller is a relaxed and pleasant individual. He has never eaten roots in the wilderness and would certainly not consider burning people alive to be the best means of combating dangerous thoughts. His task, of course, is much easier than was that of the Inquisitor. In the Brave New World he controls there are very few dangerous thoughts to suppress. The teachings of the Avatars have been virtually forgotten. The very concept of spiritual salvation has vanished from the patterns of human thought. Life has been reduced to simple, almost infantile terms, to an endless succession of copulations unhampered by feelings of guilt or passion, to visits to the feelies, rounds of Electro-Magnetic Golf.

In short it's a stable world fashioned after the style of an insect community, on limited patterns of behavior and a rigid separation of castes. There is in it no possibility of spiritual evolution. Man, in this new community, has once and for all retreated into the cave that Plato described. In exchange for stability he has accepted a life on an almost imbecile level. And Mustapha Mond is well satisfied to keep it this way.

But who is this Mustapha Mond? Is he a figment of Aldous Huxley's lively imagination or does he represent a real type, the predestined ruler of the world of the future? We can surely conclude that he is real. He is the logical outcome of that *Managerial Revolution* described by Burnham. (76) He is the highest manifestation of the *Organization Man* whose outlines have been delineated by Whyte. He is the technocrat, whose coming power has been foretold by many thinkers. Up to now he has played a small part in the ruling of the world. As a political force he has been negligible. But now he is slowly awakening. The

politicians have been forced to recognize his existence, for without him and the knowledge he commands the modern state could not function. He is groping for new concepts of world government and world order, steadily increasing in power and influence. The era of the Technocrats approaches.

What sort of world will these Technocrats create? Must they necessarily deprive man of his higher potentialities in order to save him from destruction? Why must stability be purchased at so high a price? H. G. Wells, who also foretold the coming rule of the Technocrats, appeared to think that no such payment would be necessary. He foretold that the Air Dictators, who would take control over the destiny of the human race, would transform the hagridden, hungry, disorganized human herd into a vast happy family engaged in the loftiest forms of activity. The men and women he portrayed in *The Shape of Things to Come* had broad and truthful brows and had lost their taste for those forms of nastiness which play so large a part in the life of contemporary man. In the year 2116 A.D. he forecast that mankind will be "one single organism of 2500 million persons,* and the individual differences of these persons is like an exploring tentacle thrust out to test and learn, to savor life in its fullness and bring in new experiences for the common stock. We work, we think, we explore, we dispute, we suffer—for there seems no end to the difficult and dangerous adventures individual men and women may attempt; and more and more plain does it become to us that not our

* [There will have to be intense destruction to reduce the population to this level. World population in 1959 was 2790 million. Estimated population for 2000 A.D., 6000 million!]

little selves but Man the Undying achieves these things through us." (77)

Wells at that time was still an optimist. Furthermore, for one so widely read, he was curiously ignorant, having never, apparently, studied the message of the Avatars or learned from it of the power of that "mechanism for creating delusions" which plays such havoc with the workings of man's psyche. His forecast had no relation to reality. How, in so short a time, could his Air Dictators transform the huddled, frightened, deluded, empty-headed, trivial-minded human mass into such broad-browed seekers after truth as he foresaw? His optimism departed from him later. In *Mind at the End of its Tether* and *The Fate of Homo Sapiens* he painted a picture as dark as the former one had been rosy. "Nature has no greater bias in favor of man than it had in favor of the ichthyosaur or pterodactyl . . . The universe is bored with *Homo sapiens*." And finally, in *Mind at the End of its Tether* came a cry of despair: "There is no way out or round or through." (78, 79)

So Wells's hopes for a Technocratic Revolution foundered before the spectacle of human idiocy. He too had "asked too much of man" and died disillusioned and disappointed. Aldous Huxley, writing *Brave New World* in 1931, asked nothing of man. He was, at that time, a witty, immensely erudite unbeliever, like one of the characters in his own *Antic Hay*, and he saw no reason why any fate better than insectivization should befall these "feeble, unruly, incomplete, empirical creatures created in jest" (Dostoevsky's phrase).

Later, having accepted the teachings of the Avatars, he was able to adopt a more optimistic conclusion: "Today I feel no wish to demonstrate that sanity is impossible. On the contrary, though I remain no less sadly certain than in

the past that sanity is a rather rare phenomenon, I am convinced that it can be achieved and would like to see more of it." This is certainly more hopeful than Wells's "no way out or round or through," and indicates that, as a general pattern of life, amused pessimism followed by cautious optimism is to be preferred to excessive optimism followed by hopeless pessimism.

This does not detract from the validity of Aldous Huxley's forecast. The conditions portrayed in *Brave New World* are the logical outcome of certain postulates, namely that mankind, *en masse*, has no interest in spiritual evolution, that it wants (a) security, (b) physical pleasure, (c) freedom from effort, especially mental effort. In short it wants comfortable slavery.

If this is true then *Brave New World* is the Technocrats' answer to the prayer of this would-be slave. The Technocrat is a tidy-minded man who wants a regulated and predictable human society operating smoothly like a well-oiled machine. Mustapha Mond expressed this sentiment admirably:

"Stability," said the Controller. "Stability. No civilization without social stability. No social stability without individual stability. . . ."

"Wheels must turn steadily, but cannot turn untended. There must be men to tend them, men as steady as the wheels upon their axles, sane men, obedient men, stable in contentment.

"Crying: My baby, my mother, my only, only love; groaning: My sin, my terrible God; screaming with pain, muttering with fever, bemoaning old age and poverty—how can they tend the wheels? And if they cannot tend the wheels . . . The corpses of a thousand, thousand, thousand men and women would be hard to bury or burn." (80)

From the Technocrats' point of view what could be more logical? They are tidy-minded men, enemies of disorder. They like close tolerances and want cogwheels that match. So, when it comes to biological and social engineering, they want men and women in predictable quantities having predictable qualities, designed to perform in society certain functions.

What follows from this?

First that reproduction must be controlled. It is absolutely unthinkable, from the technocratic standpoint, to allow the present population explosion to continue. Men and women cannot be allowed to breed like rabbits, especially as the heartiest breeders are generally the stupidest individuals. So, since the sex urge is universal and a source of much pleasure, let us divorce once and for all the sex function from the reproductive function. Sex will, in future, be fun. Reproduction will be a serious business left to experts. Eggs of the right type must be fertilized with sperms of the right type, selected by skilled geneticists to give individuals of the right type. Since we cannot, at the moment, raise embryos in bottles, let us employ for this purpose cow-like women, placid types designed for reproduction, housed in special breeding centers and compensated by the state, into whose wombs the selected fertilized eggs can be introduced three at a time if necessary and there permitted to grow in a human incubator.

And later?

The myth of the classless society must be abandoned. Class is the supreme social reality. Can we be so naïve as to suppose that the scientist who uses the laboratory belongs in the same class as the janitor who cleans it? But to prevent the Marxian virus of class war from ruining social stability let us condition each being for the social role he

must play so that, like a well-made cogwheel, he fits that place exactly and has no desire whatever to occupy any other.

How about amusements?

Of course he must have amusements, the more amusements the better. Simple activities, sports and childish games. What can be better than these to keep his caged mind from seeing the bars that enclose it or his imprisoned spirit from recognizing its condition? And if he grows weary of these there is always drug-induced happiness to distract his mind from more serious thoughts.

And if that fails?

Why then, let him have religion. But it must be technocratic religion, not the teaching of the Avatars. This religion is perfectly adapted for the likes of him, a simple ritual, a "singing religious," a communal reaffirmation of solidarity.

"Orgy-porgy Ford and fun
Kiss the girls and make them One.
Boys at one with girls at peace;
Orgy-porgy brings release."

If any one thinks this far-fetched let him reflect how small is the difference between the social get-togethers that pass for religion in America today and the Solidarity Services that reinforced the social cohesion of members of Huxley's *Brave New World*. One gains the impression that those ceremonies of the future were every bit as spiritual as the present-day hymn and psalm routines and a good deal more fun. As Huxley himself points out in his *Brave New World Revisited*, far from being a distant prospect, the world he portrayed is, in many of its aspects at least, already here. (81)

Exiles and Existentialists

Insectivization?

Well, why not? Organization Man should find little to alarm him in this prospect. No tyrant need drive him in the direction of the harmonious universal ant hill. He goes that way because it is the easiest road to take, downhill all the way, a pension at the bottom. Cared for, watched over, fed, clothed, amused, no efforts demanded, eight easy hours a day of undemanding toil for five days a week, two days to waste on fishing or driving about in car or boat; how easy, how pleasant! And no decisions to make, no struggles. Remain part of the organization. This is all that is needed.

And yet there are those that shriek: "I will not belong! I will not submerge myself in your shiny machine. I will not be a mere position on an organization diagram, a number on a pay roll, a cog in a machine. A plague on your organization! You may despise me, starve me, spit on me or shoot me, but the devil take your security! I still insist on my right to stand outside and make rude noises."

Rude noises. Retching noises. There are those in whom

the neat hierarchy so beloved by Organization Man and the shadow of more organization yet to come provokes a sensation of overwhelming nausea. Over the shiny factories, the hygienic offices, the well-run neat little lives of the whole race of conformists, they have an impulse to vomit.

This is Sartre's *Nausea*. One can call it by a host of other names: disenchantment, disillusionment, etc., but nausea is as good as any because it describes the almost physical disgust that overcomes a man who sees through outer appearances. Slowly, or in some cases quite suddenly, such a one finds himself unable to integrate himself any longer with the machine of modern society. The aims of men, their ambitions, hopes, fears, desires all become senseless. The whole outward structure of society, its houses and roads, its cars and buses and planes, its hospitals and police stations, its churches and law courts, its theaters, its newspapers, its novels, its plays, seems totally senseless, a mirage created by a mad magician. Such a one, moreover, sees, while in this condition, the utter bondage of men within the social machine. He sees that their lives are lived for them, that they are mere appendages of their houses, their automobiles, their TV sets, and about as mechanical. Sartre vividly expresses this awareness:

"I feel so far away from them, on the top of this hill. It seems as though I belong to another species. They come out of their offices after their day of work, they look at the houses and the squares with satisfaction, they think it is *their* city, a good, solid, bourgeois city. They aren't afraid. They feel at home. All they have ever seen is trained water running from taps, light which fills bulbs when you turn on the switch, half-breed, bastard trees held up with crutches. . . . They are peaceful, a little morose, they think about Tomorrow, that is to say, simply, a new today; cities have

only one day at their disposal and every morning it comes back exactly the same. They scarcely doll it up a bit on Sundays. Idiots. It is repugnant to me to think that I am going to see their thick self-satisfied faces." (82)

What meaning have such words? Are these the insights of a visionary or the ill-tempered mutterings of a mentally sick man? They are neither. They indicate a stage in a man's spiritual growth, an unpleasant stage to be sure, but not pathological. The veil of *maya* has not fallen but it has slipped a little. The conjurer's tricks no longer satisfy. The puppet has suddenly realized that he is a puppet and refuses to go on performing. The player has left the stage and stands on the outside looking in.

An Outsider. This term, used by Colin Wilson to give the keynote to his study of this condition, conveys as well as any the quality of psychological exile. (83) Potentially it is a dangerous condition. It may threaten life, it may threaten sanity. It may drive a man to take refuge in drink or drugs. Of the Outsiders whom Colin Wilson assembled in his book several perished most unhappily. Nietzsche and Nijinsky went mad. Van Gogh committed suicide. T. E. Lawrence committed "mental suicide." H. G. Wells died in despair. Gauguin fled to the South Seas only to embroil himself again with the symbols of society, the missionaries, the deacons, the local officials.

Sartre, who has expressed this condition of exile in the language of squalor so dear to the sophisticated modern, has in some circles been hailed as the prophet of the age, and enveloped in that mysterious intellectual aura which has become associated with the word "existential." As far as that much misused word has any meaning, Sartre has probably expressed that meaning as clearly as anybody. "Existentialism's first move," he declares, "is to make every

man aware of what he is and to make the full responsibility of his existence rest on him." (84)

Elsewhere in the same book, *Existentialism and Human Emotions*, Sartre returns to the *All is Permitted* fallacy: "Dostoevsky said 'If God didn't exist, everything would be possible.' That is the very starting point of existentialism. Indeed everything is permissible if God does not exist, and as a result man is forlorn, because neither within him nor without does he find anything to cling to. . . . So in the bright realm of values, we have no excuse behind us, nor justification before us. We are alone, with no excuses."

This may, if one feels inclined, be regarded as a bold doctrine, for it seems to assert that man is completely free. Actually it offers only a phantom of liberty, for what good does it do to tell the steersman that he is free to steer wherever he chooses if no indications are given as to the purpose of the voyage? If all courses lead to futility why take the trouble to leave the harbor at all?

Cybernetics, that "science of the steersman," the principles of which Norbert Wiener has so well described, can aid us considerably in our thinking about this matter. (85) It is possible to conceive, it is even possible to construct a machine which will learn to correct its own mistakes. But in order to do this the machine has to have some sort of model representing perfect performance of the task it has been set. With such a model, given the necessary feedback mechanisms, the machine can adjust its working to approach more and more closely to the ideal. It compares its own efforts with the model, makes adjustments, approaches nearer and nearer to the set standard.

A mechanism of this kind seems to exist in man. One can call it conscience provided one distinguishes between true conscience and conventional conscience based on local

customs and mere etiquette. But the mechanism, conscience, can only work satisfactorily if it can compare the individual's conduct with some model which, if not perfect, is at least higher on the scale of behavior. To provide such a model has always been one of the functions of religion. From the religious standpoint (again one must distinguish true religion from conventional behaviorisms such as mere churchgoing), that life is most successful which follows most closely the model life of the Savior or Avatar. Thus, when Thomas à Kempis called his book *An Imitation of Christ*, he used the word imitation not in the derogatory sense but to describe a human attempt to copy a divine pattern.

Man does seem to have a built-in mechanism for correcting the errors in his psyche. He can readjust his course. He can remodel his conduct. If this mechanism did not exist within him, man's situation would be hopeless. In fact he would probably not have survived at all, for he would never have been able to learn from experience.

But (one may well face it) the mechanism is not always operative, is seriously damaged in many, totally ruined in others. Furthermore it lacks a model. More so today than ever before. For the skepticism of the scientists, the assaults of the psychoanalysts, the fulminations of numerous philosophers, and perhaps most of all the failure of religious leaders to practice what they preach, have clouded and besmirched the image of the perfect man. In fact the model is so distorted, so covered in grime, bespotted by mud-slinging sectarians and befogged by theological disputes, as to be virtually nonexistent for millions of ordinary people who quite sincerely need a pattern of conduct more elevating than that idol of the advertiser, Conspicuous Consumption.

The self-correcting mechanism is there. The model is not. So by what shall conscience be guided? How can it compensate for errors if no plot of the correct course is available? Take away God and what pattern has man to follow? Knock down the high star, by what point shall he steer?

Clever indeed are those existentialists who proclaim all the way along the Left Bank of the Seine and beyond that man is free, free, free and is therefore master of his fate. But where do we go from here? What has Jean-Paul Sartre to offer in the way of advice? "Shall I join the Resistance or stay home with mother who needs me?"

Says the Master: "You're free. Choose. That is, invent." (86)

Fine instructions for the steersman! Take your eyes off the compass and steer at random, that is, invent. And where will that voyage end, if not on the rocks? How could a doctrine so empty be accepted as something new and exciting in intellectual circles? And why did its chief proponent, after all his talk of freedom, take refuge behind the old tired dogmas of Marxism if not to escape from an emptiness too frightening to be endured?

Allies of the Avatars

We have reached the point where a number of lines of thought come together. The forces working against the Avatars have been delineated. The protest of the exile and the "Outsider" has been described. What is the conclusion? Must we accept Wells's gloomy prognosis: "There is no way out or round or through" and reconcile ourselves to being engulfed in a human version of the ant hill or cooked alive in a generalized thermonuclear holocaust? Or can we hope that regenerative forces, though not conspicuous, are none the less at work, that the age of Nietzsche's most despicable man, who can no longer transcend himself, has not yet arrived?

Of course we can hope. In fact we *must* hope, for to do otherwise is to insure the triumph of automatism and mass imbecility over every creative and independent impulse in our culture. In spite of the successes of the traitor intellectuals and the widespread acceptance of their antigospels there are forces at work in contemporary society which may in the end suffice to counteract these influences and reduce the virulence of the pathogenic ideas they have liberated.

In short there still exists, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, a spiritual élite capable of serving as a starting point for the regenerative process. As long as this élite is not exterminated there is hope.

From what sources can this élite draw its spiritual nourishment? How can it set about its task, which is to bridge the gap between established religion and contemporary science and create an intellectually valid and spiritually satisfying life aim to serve as a direction-giving influence to a high-powered society, in danger of running on the rocks?

Several elements of this new synthesis can be discerned. From the psychologists come encouraging signs. The studies of William James showed, early in this century, how scientific methods could be brought to bear on problems normally thought to fall in the realm of religion and lead to new insights. Karl Gustave Jung, drawing upon the religious literature of both East and West, has brought to light aspects of the human psyche which the more orthodox Freudians overlooked. The psychoanalyst, Erich Fromm, Freudian but not orthodox, has defined the difference between authoritarian and humanist religion, stressing the danger of the first and the virtues of the second. Similarly Rollo May, a proponent of existential psychoanalysis, has helped to disentangle the true from the false and to formulate for modern man a spiritual life aim. William Sheldon, with his constitutional psychology, has at last put the classification of human types and temperaments on a sound scientific basis, and laid bare many of the factors affecting human behavior, destructive and creative. In the realm of social psychology David Riesman has brilliantly classified the motivations of men in contemporary society and, with his concept of autonomous inner direction, provided a new rallying point for the truly creative segment of the human

community. Even the tired old pseudo-science of theology has been given new life and meaning by the work of Paul Tillich.

Finally, as if to prove that the human stock has not so far degenerated as to be incapable of producing spiritual giants, we have Mahatma Gandhi and Albert Schweitzer who can almost be classified as Avatars in their own right, offering once again the teaching of harmlessness or "reverence for life" to counterbalance the enormous emphasis placed on destruction by our contemporary antichrists.

In summarizing these positive contributions it is convenient to begin with the work of William James. With a sympathetic scientific enthusiasm he brought together, in his *Varieties of Religious Experience* a rich collection of observations on this little-studied realm of human behavior. It was James who defined most clearly the basis of man's craving for salvation.

"It consists of two parts:

- 1) An uneasiness; and
 - 2) Its solution
- 1) The uneasiness, reduced to its simplest terms, is a sense that there is *something wrong about us* as we naturally stand.
 - 2) The solution is the sense that *we are saved from the wrongness* by making proper connection with the higher powers." (87)

James, furthermore, was one of the few psychologists to point out that man very rarely uses his full powers, that he possesses reserves of energy within him, sufficient, if he would use them, to insure his spiritual growth.

"Compared with what we ought to be we are only half

awake. Our fires are dampened, our draughts are checked. We are making use only of a small part of our mental and physical resources. . . . Stating the thing baldly, the human individual thus lives far within his limits, he possesses powers of various sorts which he habitually fails to use . . .

“Admit so much then, and admit also that the charge of being inferior to their full self is far truer of some men than of others; then the practical question ensues: to what do the better men owe their escape?”

“In general terms the answer is plain.

“Either some unusual stimulus fills them with emotional excitement, or some unusual idea of necessity induces them to make an extra effort of will. Excitement, ideas and efforts are what carry us over the dam.” (88)

Here was a challenging statement by a great psychologist, which might have formed the basis of a series of researches dealing with the realization of man’s unused potentialities. On this basis the Eastern systems of yoga could have been integrated with Western psychology and physiology into a single discipline concerned with the study of man’s becoming. Few, however, seemed to be interested in trying to build on the foundation which William James had laid. The behaviorists studied rats in mazes, the Pavlovians devoted their time to dogs and tried to express all patterns of behavior in terms of conditioned reflexes. The Freudians manufactured myths and showed signs of abandoning the methods of experimental science in favor of unlimited speculation on the basis of very limited observations. They concerned themselves with the pathological in all its forms and their exclusive preoccupation with mental illness blinded them to the existence in man of the hidden potentialities mentioned by James.

Freud himself took a curiously narrow view of religious

phenomena. Primitive man, he declared, in *Civilization and its Discontents*, had to invent God in order to curb his instinctive impulses and gain the benefits of civilization. Although the unbridled gratification of every instinctive desire might seem to offer the recipe for perfect happiness, man early discovered that it also brought much misery and that, on the whole, the misery outweighed the pleasures. So it became necessary for man to forgo this gratification in the interests of social harmony. But because the instincts were strong and men were weak some means had to be found of reinforcing the restraints. This led some genius, let us call him Moses, to invent the One God, the ancient primeval awe-inspiring Father figure, in whose name man-made laws could be given a god's authority.

But, argued Freud, as we are not half-savage Israelites wandering in the Sinai peninsula but sophisticated moderns in a highly technical culture, is it not about time that we grew up and stopped bowing and groveling and offering up petitions to a figment of the primitive imagination?

Freud wrote more in sorrow than in anger of the "ordinary man's" reliance on "that system of doctrines and pledges that on the one hand explains the riddle of this world to him with an enviable completeness, and on the other assures him that a solicitous Providence is watching over him and will make up to him in a future existence for any shortcomings in this life. The ordinary man cannot imagine this Providence in any other form but that of a greatly exalted father, for only such a one could understand the needs of the sons of men, or be softened by their prayers and placated by the signs of their remorse. The whole thing is so patently infantile, so incongruous with reality, that for one whose attitude to humanity is friendly it is painful to think that the great majority of mortals

will never be able to rise above this view of life. It is even more humiliating to discover what a large number of those alive today, who must see that this religion is not tenable, yet try to defend it inch by inch, as if with a series of pitiable rearguard actions." (89)

Patently infantile. . . . The comment is similar to that of Gaylord Simpson when he compares belief in God to a child's faith in Santa Claus. And obviously from a scientific standpoint the Father-god is a rather shabby subterfuge, a means of evading one's responsibilities, of avoiding standing on one's own feet. Nor can it be denied that, by placing all emphasis on the Father-god, authoritarian religion, far from leading man to spiritual freedom, increases his bondage, adds to his illusions and reduces him, so far as spiritual development is concerned, to the level of an infant.

Freud's own concept of the varieties of religious experience was almost as narrow as that of Parson Thwackum.* For all the mention Freud makes of them Gautama, Krishna, Lao-tse or Socrates might never have existed and the aspects of Judeo-Christian religion which he discusses are the stupidest and shallowest. For this reason the father of psychoanalysis can hardly be called an ally of the Avatars. But he did perform one valuable function. He helped to strip away from man's concept of himself that heavy covering, woven of sentimentality and hypocrisy, in which Victorian prudery had enveloped the human psyche. He helped to remind his fellow men of one basic fact, that

* "When I say religion I mean the Christian religion, and not just the Christian religion but the Protestant religion, and not just the Protestant religion but the Church of England," (Fielding. *Tom Jones*.)

they do not know themselves, that behind the civilized mask lurks the old red savage, that a cesspoolful of rotting monsters (Nabokov's phrase) is likely to exist under even the most saintly exterior; that clamping down a heavy lid of repression on the aforesaid monsters is not going to drive them away, that, on the contrary, the surest way to keep the monsters in order is to take off the lid, let in some light, and have a good look at them. After which they appear much less monstrous and are much less capable of doing harm.

In short, he re-emphasized the importance of the old Delphic saying: "Know thyself," and described a procedure, psychoanalysis, whereby, in his opinion, the process of self-knowing might be expedited. It was, let us frankly admit, a limited and in some respects defective method, the value of which has been questioned by several experienced psychiatrists. It suffered the additional misfortune of being converted into a pseudoreligion by some of Freud's less scientifically mature followers, a transformation for which he can hardly be held responsible. He himself always firmly maintained that he was not a Freudian.

The American psychoanalyst, Erich Fromm, is even more emphatic than Freud when it comes to defining the faults of authoritarian religion. It is gloomy, pervaded with a mood of sorrow and guilt, it exaggerates man's weakness, wickedness, unworthiness, and miserableness. It bullies and blusters, threatens hellfire and eternal damnation. It insists on blind obedience to a heavenly Führer as the Nazis insisted on blind obedience to their earthly Führer. Above all it holds man at an infantile level, prevents him from maturing, becoming independent, standing on his own feet. Erich Fromm, backing up Freud's attacks, has restated the problem.

“If man gives up his illusion of a fatherly God, if he faces his aloneness and insignificance in the universe, he will be like a child that has left his father’s house. But it is the very aim of human development to overcome this infantile fixation. Man must educate himself to face reality. If he knows that he has nothing to rely on except his own powers, he will learn to use them properly. Only the free man who has emancipated himself from authority—authority that threatens and protects—can make use of his power of reason and grasp the world and his role in it objectively, without illusion but also with the ability to develop and to make use of the capacities inherent in him. Only if we grow up and cease to be children dependent on and afraid of authority can we dare to think for ourselves; but the reverse is also true. Only if we dare to think can we emancipate ourselves from domination by authority.” (90)

A vigorous statement! Dostoevsky’s Grand Inquisitor would certainly have added Erich Fromm to the bonfire he had prepared for Christ, and for the same reason. He dares to encourage men to seek liberty in place of bondage. Fromm has no doubts about man’s need for religion, but the religion capable of liberating modern man from the tangle in which he finds himself must be humanistic not authoritarian. And what are the first principles of humanistic religion?

“Humanistic religion . . . is centered around man and his strength. Man must develop his power of reason in order to understand himself, his relationship to his fellow men and his position in the universe. He must recognize the truth both with regards to his limitations and his potentialities. He must develop his powers of love for others as well as for himself and experience the solidarity of all living beings. He must have principles and norms to guide

him in this aim. Religious experience in this kind of religion is the experience of oneness with the All, based on one's relatedness to the world as it is grasped with thought and with love. Man's aim in humanistic religion is to achieve the greatest strength, not the greatest powerlessness; virtue is self-realization, not obedience. Faith is certainty of conviction based on one's experience of thought and feeling, not assent to propositions on credit of the proposer. The prevailing mood is that of joy, while the prevailing mood in authoritarian religion is that of sorrow and guilt.

"Inasmuch as humanistic religions are theistic, God is a symbol of *man's own powers* which he tries to realize in his life, and is not a symbol of force and domination, having *power over man.*" (91)

Those who regard such a statement as verging on blasphemy should remember a saying of Jesus: "The Kingdom of God is within you." And remember that that difficult commandment: "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect," sets up not a remote deity somewhere beyond the stratosphere but an inward image of the perfect being, potentially, though not actually, presiding over the thoughts, feelings and actions of man. Prayer from this point of view is neither groveling nor an underhand attempt to wheedle favors from the Boss, but an inwardly directed effort to make contact with that higher being potentially existing in every man who has retained the capacity to develop.

Clearly such a psychoanalyst as Erich Fromm, though a sworn foe of authoritarian religion, is none the less an ally of the Avatars, one who helps to bring back to life the almost forgotten science of Man's Becoming. This can also be said of Karl Gustav Jung whose main criticism of Freud

was that he overemphasized the sexual element in the libido which forms the main spring of human activity. It was a gross misrepresentation, declared Jung, to view the brain "as an appendage of the genital glands," one which led to an ignoring of many important aspects of man's being. To find the founts and origins of human behavior Jung went far beyond sex. He postulated the existence in man of a vast primeval ocean, the collective unconscious, on which the individual consciousness floats like an iceberg. From this primeval ocean come obscure upwellings, which entering the realm of awareness either as dreams or as obscure urges, are all the more powerful for being completely irrational.

Jung has pointed out repeatedly that man, as he is, cannot hope to cope with the problems created by his own technology, that he must learn to know himself and transform himself to insure his physical survival. This transformation is described in the literature of mysticism and alchemy from the *I Ching* to the symbolism of the Mass, from the writings of the medieval alchemists to the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*. Firmly refusing to be impressed by the technological advances made by modern man Jung sees in the demoniac elements lurking in the human subconscious a force sufficient to cancel out all that has been gained.

"While our intellect has been achieving colossal things, our spiritual dwelling has fallen to pieces." (92)

Rollo May, a leading exponent of the Existential school of psychoanalysis, also ranges himself firmly on the side of the Avatars, representing man as an unfinished being whose duty it is to complete himself. "Freedom," he declares in *Man's Search for Himself*, "is man's capacity to take a hand in his own development. It is our capacity to mold ourself." This inner work of molding is a continuous process,

a continuous challenge, and he quotes in this connection the great lines from Goethe's *Faust*.

"Yes, to this thought I hold with firm persistence,
The last result of wisdom stamps it true.
He only earns his freedom and existence
Who daily conquers them anew."

Rollo May is convinced that man's higher potentialities can be realized only through the expansion of consciousness. Speaking of the fourth level of consciousness which he calls objective self-consciousness, he says: "This level of consciousness cuts below the split between objectivity and subjectivity. Temporarily we can transcend the usual limits of conscious personality." He states further: "Self-awareness, as we have proposed it, brings back into the picture the quieter kinds of aliveness—the arts of contemplation and meditation, for example, which the Western world to its peril has almost lost. It brings a new appreciation for *being* something rather than merely *doing* something." (93)

Paul Tillich, in a refreshingly novel approach to theological problems, has backed up Erich Fromm's attack on authoritarian religion. The theism of the old testament, centering about a meddlesome and morally indignant Yahweh, is unacceptable, he asserts. It is bad theology, because it separates God from his creation thus making God into an outside force, all-powerful and all-knowing. Such a God appears as an invincible tyrant, the being in contrast with whom all other beings are without freedom and subjectivity. "He becomes a model of everything against which Existentialism has revolted."

For Tillich, the task of finding the "courage to be" is the supreme test which confronts man in the modern world. Torn from those old safe anchors provided by his tradi-

tional faith modern man confronts daily the anxiety of doubt and meaninglessness. How, asks Tillich, is the courage to be possible if all the ways to create it are barred by the experience of their ultimate insufficiency? If life is as meaningless as death, if guilt is as questionable as perfection, if being is no more meaningful than non-being, on what can one base the courage to be?

It can be based on a courage of despair which says "I accept in spite of. . . ." This, declares Tillich, is absolute faith. It transcends mystical experience and the divine-human encounter. It is the ultimate expression of vitality and intentionality and the only road to ultimate freedom. The vitality that can stand the abyss of meaninglessness is aware of a hidden meaning within the destruction of meaning. This ultimate faith, which has shed all belief in the God of theism, a judging or forgiving God, can yet find God. Concludes Tillich: "The courage to take the anxiety of meaninglessness on oneself is the boundary line up to which the courage to be can go. Beyond it is mere non-being. Within it all forms of courage are re-established in the power of the God above the God of theism. *The courage to be is rooted in the God who appears when God has disappeared in the anxiety of doubt.*" (94)

But how many people, we may ask at this point, really need to find the courage to be? How many really feel themselves threatened by a feeling of meaninglessness? Are not the great majority swept along by the stream of life so smoothly and quickly that they are not even troubled by the old questions: "Whence came I? Where do I go? What should be the purpose of my existence?" Is not the whole structure of contemporary life designed to prevent people from turning their glance inward and asking such questions? Does it not, with its glitter and glamour, tend to

keep their eyes focused outward, like the eyes of children watching a conjurer?

In connection with this question the studies of David Riesman are particularly valuable. (95) Riesman has added a new dimension to sociology just as Tillich has added a new dimension to theology. He has taken as his theme the types of motivation that affect contemporary Americans. He is a student of aims and directions. Under conditions existing in America today who moves toward what aim and what governs the movement?

Riesman's classification is masterly. On the one hand are the *other-directed* taking their cues from outside, steering as it were by means of a built-in radar that picks up its signals from society. The other-directed strive in all their activities to approach some accepted pattern of behavior and their goals are those accepted by others in the circle in which they live. They are, in short, the conformists, whose main concern in all that they do and think, in the clothes they wear, the houses they inhabit, the cars they drive, the opinions they express, is to conform as closely as possible to those standards accepted by fellow members of the circle in which they move.

Contrasted with the *other-directed*, gregarious conformists whose main concern is to keep up with the Joneses, is the smaller group of *inner-directed* individuals. These steer not by means of a radar sensitive to signals from without but rather by means of a built-in gyroscope, a set of aims and standards which they can call their own which do not fluctuate with every change of external function. The inner-directed person is not necessarily freer than the other-directed. His internal gyroscope, set by patterns imposed in early youth, may hold the individual it steers to a rigid and often outmoded pattern of behavior. This

rigidity was particularly characteristic of those so-called "strong characters" whose stern, set faces, framed in a noble crop of whiskers, gaze upon us from many a portrait of eminent Victorians.

But there is a subdivision of the inner-directed group that deserves special mention. Riesman calls these the *autonomous inner-directed*. Their outstanding characteristic is that they have not allowed their early training to impose a permanent setting on their inward gyroscope. By courageously exerting their own independence they have managed to set the gyroscope themselves, to determine their own inward aims, and to follow these aims without being pushed about by external forces, by either the approbation or the disapprobation of society.

Such autonomous inner-directed individuals have in the past played an important role in shaping the climate of opinion both in America and Britain. The New England Transcendentalists were the living embodiments of autonomous inner-direction. Thoreau's *Walden* is vibrant with this spirit. Emerson's essay on *Self-Reliance* expresses its very essence.

"Society is everywhere in conspiracy against the manhood of every one of its members. Self-reliance is its aversion. It loves not realities and creators, but names and customs . . . Most men have bound their eyes with one or another handkerchief. Their every truth is not quite true . . . Meantime nature is not slow to equip us in the prison uniform of the party to which we adhere. We come to wear one cut of face and figure, and acquire by degrees the gentlest asinine expression . . . Man is timid and apologetic. He is no longer upright. He does not say 'I think,' 'I am,' but quotes some saint or sage. He is ashamed before the blade of grass or the blowing rose. We want men and

women who shall renovate life and our social state, but we see that most natures are insolvent . . . As men's prayers are diseases of the will, so are their creeds a disease of the intellect." (96)

From a somewhat different angle William Whyte in *The Organization Man* shows Riesman's other-directed individual in relation to the environment in which he lives. The being Whyte portrays is a cog in a machine whose outstanding characteristic is that he wants to be a cog, likes being a cog, and has no intention of becoming anything other than a cog. The organization in which he functions surrounds him on every side with compensations for his lost liberty. In return for his unquestioning loyalty it gives him an adequate wage, comfortable working conditions, insurance, physical checkups, in a word, *security*, that jewel which contemporary man seems to cherish above all else. And in return for all this he is not expected to exert himself greatly or to display brilliance or originality. Such a display, far from being rewarded, is more apt to bring down upon him the disapproval of his peers whose concern it is to see that no individual advances too far ahead of his fellows.

The formulations of such thinkers as Riesman and William Whyte may not seem to have much bearing on the great struggle between Avatar and anti-avatar that is the hallmark of our century. Both these men, however, are performing the true role of the intellectual in society, the role of objective men, defining for their less clear-sighted fellows the forces at work in the society in which they live. Both portray the effects of progressive overorganization of Western society, the impoverishment of inner life that results from this process. And both make clear the nature of the real menace that confronts Western man, the

menace of total automatization, without war, without secret police or bloodshed, but simply as a result of spiritual indifference.

Organization Man, safe in his little niche in the big machine, is the product which both superpowers appear to be striving to create. The vaunted "Soviet Man," whose coming is supposed to justify all the atrocities which the Marxists have committed, is merely Organization Man *à la Russe*, that is to say fashioned with the maximum amount of brutality and violence. Autonomous inner-directed man in the Soviet Union is about as secure as a solitary stag in a wolf pack, as the fate of Boris Pasternak clearly shows. His only hope of survival is to disguise himself and let no sign of his real nature be seen, in accordance with the Russian proverb: "If you live with a wolf you must howl like a wolf."

In contemporary America the autonomous inner-directed man is not in serious danger of losing life or liberty, despite the efforts of such "crusaders" as the late Senator McCarthy. His enemy is far more subtle than that against which his Russian counterpart must struggle. It is the quiet but inexorable pressure to conform, to take his signals from without rather than within. In some respects this hidden enemy may be harder to fight than the more obvious and brutal foe confronted by the autonomous on the other side of the Iron Curtain. For the latter's is a clear, dangerous fight, an ever-present challenge, which if he manages to survive, may give him power such as Pasternak displayed, a shining example to men on both sides of the fence. Out of such a struggle emerges the true rallying cry of the contemporary intellectuals.

Fight to establish autonomy and inner-direction against the growing tendency toward insectivization.

Sleep and Awakening

Let us now summarize the suggestions of those moderns who can be regarded as allies of the Avatars. Let us put to them the old question: "What shall we do to be saved?" Here are some of the answers we might expect to receive.

Karl Gustav Jung: Learn to look into the depths. The collective unconscious of man is an unknown sea labeled: "Here there be monsters." Learn to know them, the Animus, the Anima, the Shadow . . . know your monsters before your monsters destroy you. Unknown monsters are dangerous.

Erich Fromm: Stop your flight from freedom. Stop hankering for certainty and authority and the old Father-God before whom you can grovel and behind whom you can hide from your responsibilities. Come out from the smelly little burrow which is authoritarian religion and face the storm. Realize that God is not a symbol of power over man but of man's own powers.

William James: Use your full powers. Realize that, as you are, you are only half living, a powerful machine using

only a fraction of its energies. Put your full powers to work. Fulfill yourself.

Rollo May: Realize that the only real freedom is man's capacity to take a hand in his own development. Strive for objective self-awareness. Only in this way can you transcend the limits of conscious personality.

Paul Tillich: Find the courage to be, the absolute faith which confronts the abyss of meaninglessness and says "I accept in spite of . . ." Develop the courage of despair and find the God that is beyond the God of theism.

David Riesman: Stop overconforming. Stop taking all your cues from outside yourself. Learn to be autonomous, to stand on your own feet, to steer your own course through life by inner-direction rather than by other-direction.

Albert Schweitzer: "With the spirit of the age I am in complete disagreement because it is filled with disdain for thinking." Find courage to think, not about the gadgets and the cheap external achievements that pass today for the "conquest of nature," but about inner values, inward aims. Develop the attitude of reverence for life, for all those other beings with whom you share the planet's surface. Stop bragging and boasting and bulldozing your way over everything. Have reverence for other lives and you will learn to reverence your own and will try to bring it to a higher level of development. (97)

George Gurdjieff: Realize that you are asleep and struggle to awaken.

The last curt piece of advice introduces an ally of the Avatars not mentioned in the previous chapter. In our contemporary "House of the Intellect" George Ivanovitch Gurdjieff occupies a place not easily defined. In a sense he was an experimental scientist, concerned with the study of man's latent potentialities, but the scientists would never

receive him as one of themselves. His methods were too unorthodox. Others have regarded him as the founder of a new religion but this again is not strictly correct. The methods he taught extend beyond the religious framework. They are a part of the science of Creative Psychology, which deals not only with man as he is but with man as he might become. Gurdjieff, who gathered much hitherto unavailable material, contributed to this science a number of important concepts that make possible a fuller understanding of man's predicament.

Gurdjieff agreed with Cardinal Newman that mankind had suffered a "terrible aboriginal calamity," but he was a great deal more specific as to the nature of that calamity and the means whereby its consequences could be escaped. The calamity consisted of the development in man's psyche of a mechanism for creating delusions that prevented man from knowing the truth about his situation. To this mechanism Gurdjieff gave the name "the organ Kundabuffer," a compound word formed from the English word *buffer* and the Sanskrit word *kundalini*.

Kundalini is described in the Tantric writings as the Serpent Power and thought of as residing at the base of the spinal column and of being more or less synonymous with sex energy. Gurdjieff, however, denied that the word had any such significance. It referred rather to a very dangerous and terrible power in man, the power of imagination, the power of fantasy, which takes the place of a real function.

"Kundalini is a force put into men in order to keep them in their present state. If men could really see their present position and could understand all the horror of it, they would be unable to remain where they are even for one second. They would begin to seek a way out and they would quickly find it, *because there is a way out*; but men

fail to see it simply because they are hypnotized. Kundalini is the force that keeps them in a hypnotic state. 'To awaken' for man means to be 'dehypnotized.' In this lies the chief difficulty and in this also lies the guarantee of its possibility, for there is no organic reason for sleep and man *can* awaken." (98)

The difficulty of awakening is made greater by the second property of the organ kundabuffer to which the word buffer refers. A buffer is defined as a device for lessening the shock of a concussion. In man this device operates to prevent contradictory aspects of his psyche from coming into contact. For man's being, in the state in which he normally exists, is full of contradictions because every passing thought or mood is regarded as "I" and these "I's" change all the time. Thus one I in man may decide to be a good Christian, to love his neighbor and even love his enemies. But a few moments later the Christian I has disappeared and the new I, which has not heard about the lofty resolve, is ready to boil his neighbor in oil because he did not like the cut of his new suit. Naturally if a man could see these contradictions in himself he would try to attain inner unity and stop being such a hypocrite. But the buffers in his make-up prevent the different I's from seeing each other and the contradiction is not noticed.

One of the consequences of the properties of the organ kundabuffer is that man, in his ordinary state, lives in a network of lies. This network is woven anew everyday both by his own personal kundabuffer and by those of others. From outside come the big fat high-sounding lies promulgated by those who imagine they "shape public opinion," ranging from lofty generalities about destiny, national aim, and God to the wheedlings of the hucksters suggesting that joy, happiness, and peace of mind can be obtained by a

process as simple as buying a new car, a new dress, a new hair tonic or a bottle of X's beer. From within come the petty personal lies, the delusions of separateness and self-importance, the prides and conceits, the stubbornly held errors that make up man's personal prison.

There is nothing intentional about these lies. This is what makes them dangerous. Men are no more aware of living among lies than they are normally aware of breathing. They lie each time they say "I" for there is no permanent I in man. They lie when they say "I will," for there can be no will where there is no inner unity. They lie when they say "I am," for in hypnotized sleep they have no true being but are lost in dreams, in a world of fantasy. Of all these lies they are quite unaware as they are of the countless thousands of other lies that go to make up the fabric of our so-called civilized world.

Man's situation would be hopeless were it not for the fact that a capacity exists in him to realize, for a moment now and then, that he is not all he might be. For a moment he stirs uneasily in his hypnotized sleep. For a moment he feels his powerlessness and longs for real freedom. Only for a moment. In most cases the moment passes, is dismissed and forgotten and man goes to sleep once again, taking refuge from an uncomfortable reality in the endless dreams that fill his so-called waking hours. But in some, a very few, the longing for inner liberty is powerful enough to initiate a search for ways of escape from the prison of mechanicalness. If such a one persists in his search and has a certain amount of luck he may find a way.

Man's chance to escape depends on his understanding of his position. A puppet who knows he is a puppet might conceivably free himself. It depends also on the fact that man's organism creates far more energy than he utilizes in

ordinary life. It is this energy, normally wasted, that a really resolute and properly informed individual can use to break out of the prison in which he finds himself and attain that freedom which belongs to man in his fully evolved form.

It was Gurdjieff's contention that four states of consciousness are possible for man. Metaphorically speaking man lives in a house of four rooms. The lowest room, the subbasement, corresponds to the state of deep sleep. In this state man knows nothing of the world outside. All impressions that reach him are misinterpreted and the simplest laws of logic are violated in dreams.

Above the sub-basement is the basement, a dirty and smelly little room with narrow windows through which very little can be seen. This room corresponds to the state of waking sleep in which man normally lives. Besides being narrow, cramped, ill-lighted, and cluttered this room is lined by distorting mirrors. So even the impressions which do enter through the dirty windows are not received directly but taken at second hand, twisted and misshapen. A large part of what passes nowadays for education consists in supplying this basement with additional distorting mirrors.

Above the basement there is a much larger room, full of light and air, with large windows opening on the outside. This room corresponds to the state of true self-consciousness or objective self-awareness. In this state man is objective for himself, he is no longer imprisoned in a little separate ego which changes its color like a chameleon with every change in outward circumstances.

Above the third room is yet another, corresponding to that state of total awareness that Gurdjieff called objective consciousness. It would seem that sometimes, by accident,

people momentarily enter the fourth room and get glimpses of objective consciousness. They may get these glimpses by means of drugs such as mescaline or hashish. They may get them as a result of some powerful emotional experience. Accounts of experiences of this kind were gathered by Bucke and described in his book, *Cosmic Consciousness*. Such glimpses may indeed make a profound impression on one who receives them, strong enough to affect him for the rest of his life. But to be able to attain this level of consciousness at will a man must first enter and live in the third room. Only in this way can he find his way to the fourth when he wishes.

Man can begin the laborious climb to the third room only when he has accumulated sufficient energy to make the ascent. Man's energy is limited. This applies to all kinds of energy, muscular, nervous, etc. There is only just so much. In the state of waking sleep man squanders this energy unproductively. He wastes large amounts of unnecessary physical tension, on giving expression to various negative emotions and on the fabrication of that endless stream of fantasies that pour through his mind during the waking hours.

Practical inner work begins with the struggle to save energy, to plug the leaks in the boiler through which the steam escapes and which prevent the development of necessary pressure. It consists therefore in stopping rather than doing, stopping the flow of daydreams, stopping the expression of negative emotions, stopping the development of muscular tenseness, and relaxing them when they have developed. Such work may seem dull and is certainly not spectacular but its results are real. New energy becomes available and a new state of awareness replaces the old condition of identification. The student begins to sense a

new sort of freedom. He is able, at last, to direct his attention at will instead of being pulled all over the place by every accidental impression that accosts his senses. He is becoming to some extent autonomous and inner-directed. He is beginning, now and again, to remember himself and to realize that most of the time he does not remember himself. This experience and this realization represents the first approach to entering the third room.

It would be a gross misrepresentation of Gurdjieff's ideas to maintain that a man can accomplish all this on his own. Gurdjieff firmly maintained that this is impossible. The whole emphasis of modern life is not on waking up but on sleeping more comfortably, not on becoming autonomous and inner-directed but on becoming automatic and other-directed, an Organization Man, a cog in the machine. For this reason any man who attempts, unaided, to awaken is almost certain to fail. Everything is against him. The whole huge mechanized Juggernaut which calls itself contemporary culture resists with enormous power every attempt by the individual to escape from his own mechanicalness. It does not do this by obvious brutal means. No secret police threaten the individual with torture, exile, or death for daring to try to gain inner liberty. The opposition is far more subtle. It is exerted at every moment of the working day through a host of agencies which are all the more powerful for being hard to define. So one who tries to escape from mechanicalness finds himself in the position of a man caught in a quagmire. As soon as he frees one part he sinks more deeply elsewhere. There is nothing solid to which he can cling for support.

This would make man's situation hopeless were it not for the fact that organizations exist for the sole purpose of helping those who wish to escape. These organizations have

existed from the earliest times, generally disguised in one way or another, for the climate of opinion in most cultures has been opposed to their existence. Such organizations consisted of groups of people united by the common desire to attain full development, to awaken. And knowledge concerning the methods by which such development could be attained was gathered by people in such organizations. Generally it was kept secret to avoid distortion and misunderstanding. For this reason it became known as esoteric as opposed to exoteric knowledge.

Do such organizations still exist today? We cannot be sure. Throughout that huge area in which the Marxian anti-gospel has become the dominant faith no such organizations can exist. For it is absolutely contrary to the theories of Marxism that a man should be allowed to exert himself to attain inward rather than outward aims, or that he should esteem inner-direction above other-direction. It must therefore be the aim of Marxists everywhere to destroy any group which is dedicated to the attainment of inner liberty, for it is precisely such liberty that these disciples of the anti-christ are firmly determined to deny to their fellow men. So, if such organizations still exist they can only exist in the free world, and even there are probably more or less disguised. The climate of opinion, even in the free world, is not friendly toward those who wish to awaken.

Conclusions

The evidence has been assembled, both from the ancient traditions and the newer disciplines. A summary can now be attempted, a synthesis of old and new. We can seek a clearer answer to the old question: What shall man do to be saved?

Let us call to our aid once more one of the very newest scientific disciplines, cybernetics, the science of the steersman. This science enters more and more into our thinking about the structure of events whether on the biological or the mechanical level. We are all familiar with the task of the steersman; it was a stroke of genius which led Norbert Wiener and his colleagues to expand this steersman concept to include any kind of activity in which feedback, positive or negative, is involved. What is the steersman's task?

The steersman's task is to keep the ship on course. Not to set the course, this is a task for the navigator whose knowledge has to be wider than that of the steersman. We can consider his task later. For the moment simply envisage the steersman. He watches the compass. A deviation from the set course is registered by his brain, the more alert he

is the sooner it is registered. He interprets the deviation. He makes adjustments by turning the wheel so that the deviation is corrected.

Apply the concept now to a living organism. It goes on its journey from birth to death across a stormy ocean filled with perils. To avoid being wrecked on these rocks it must register dangers, interpret them, and make adjustments. Many of the adjustments are completely automatic. They occur below the level of consciousness, are concerned with maintaining the constancy of the *milieu intérieur*, keeping the blood at just the right pH, stabilizing levels of a host of substances of vital importance for our normal functioning. Some adjustments are conscious. Discomfort is registered and a conscious adjustment is made. Too hot, the creature moves out of the sun. Too cold, it seeks warmth. Short of water it seeks a drink. Short of chloride it seeks salt. Faced with danger it fights or flees, depending on the circumstances. The steersman, on such occasions, is operating via the roof brain; interpretation is involved and interpretation is a function of the cerebral cortex.

Now consider man. He too must sail from birth to death and keep off the rocks as best he can, but the hazards which threaten his safety are more complex than those threatening a mouse or a sparrow. He is confronted today with the problem of finding his way through an environment in which he himself has created some of the greatest dangers. Furthermore he has to face these dangers without any evolutionary preparation, having been thrust, in a matter of one century, into an unfamiliar environment created by a rampant technology with enormous destructive potential.

Never before in the history of the biosphere has a living organism been called upon to adapt itself to new circum-

stances with such rapidity. No wonder the steersman is confused! Why did the danger arise? How has it happened that man has become his own worst hazard? We repeat the view expressed earlier that the peril resulted from a series of evolutionary changes which took place after the hominids branched off from the pongids. First there was a departure from the normal primate diet, the development of a taste for meat. This probably happened at the level of *Australopithecus*. The taste for meat led to the making of weapons, to the evolution of a technology of destruction. Weapon-making involved skill, co-operation of hand and brain accompanied by expansion of the neopallium, the "cerebral explosion." Territorial defense, a matter handled by most mammals in a fairly bloodless fashion, became linked with man's proclivities for bashing and bludgeoning. The double morality resulted whereby killing within the tribe was execrated, killing outside it rewarded. The cerebral explosion, with its attendant development of the area of Broca, made possible language and conceptual thought. At the same time it created, because men have not learned to use words with proper discrimination, that jungle of illusions, fears, superstitions, and falsehoods in which men have been wandering since the Paleolithic and show no signs of leaving today.

So the steersman's task was made more difficult. He not only had to avoid material dangers, he also had to confront a whole host of immaterial ones ranging from belief in ghosts and witches to the frantic ambitions of demented dictators poisoned with pathogenic ideas.

Now consider the Avatars. We need not ask ourselves whether they were gods or the messengers of a god. We will leave such arguments to theologians and accept them as a special type of men able, owing to the possession of a higher

level of awareness, to see into the workings of that mechanism for creation of delusions that causes man's psyche to be so unreliable. To this deluding mechanism they gave the name *maya*, the Evil One, the Tempter, Father of Lies, etc., and defined it as the chief obstacle in the way of man's spiritual development, the source of most of his suffering and discontent.

The Avatars have all maintained that man's situation is not hopeless. He possesses the necessary equipment for correcting the errors introduced into his steering machinery by the delusion-generating mechanism. If he succeeds in making these corrections he will develop a different level of awareness, will become enlightened, or perfected. In short, he will have "attained salvation."

From the cybernetic standpoint the message of the Avatars can be reformulated. Man has the needed machinery for detecting deviations from his proper course provided he knows what the course is to begin with. He needs not only a steersman but also a navigator to set the course. The navigator is responsible for defining man's long-term life aim, the overall direction of his voyage and the nature of his goal. The steersman, knowing this goal, can watch and try to prevent the ship from straying off course. There is nothing easy or automatic about this work. It represents a struggle and involves the operation of neurone circuits in the brain that have not been provided by nature but which have to be developed by training.*

Definition of long-term aims involves an image of the Perfect Man. The more clearly defined this image the more

* For fuller treatment of this subject see M. Maltz, *Psycho-Cybernetics*. (99)

easily can man detect deviations from his true course. The Avatars tried to define this image. It was delineated most clearly by Krishna in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and other Gospel passages, by Gautama in the *Sutra* on the Fourfold Setting-up of Mindfulness, by Lao-tse, Socrates, Epictetus in their respective teachings.

In time the Avatars themselves, especially Jesus, Krishna, and Gautama, came to be used as symbols of the Perfect Man by their followers. The practice tended to deteriorate into mere idolatry and thus to lose its value. None the less, from the practical standpoint it must be admitted that a clearly defined image of perfect conduct centered on a model revered as divine gives the self-correcting mechanism in man's psyche a more definite basis for action than vague philosophical concepts about goodness and truth. The whole mystical concept of union with God refers to the effort to bring outward and inward behavior closer and closer to a pattern of perfection conceived as divine of which Jesus, Gautama, Krishna, and other Avatars can be taken as human models.

The concept of deluded man, by dint of long struggle and inward effort, shaping his outer and inner life to accord with the ideal pattern gives to all the great religions their emotional appeal, their grandeur and their power. This is the basis of their strength. Whenever this concept of inner work is lost sight of, the religions degenerate into idol worship, theological wrangling, forays against the "unbelievers," and the performance of empty and unprofitable rituals. This is the source of their weakness.

In the language of cybernetics true religion provides man with two things. It provides him with a navigator who defines his major life aim in terms not of material but

of spiritual accomplishment; it provides him with a steersman to see that that course is followed and who, by effort and watchfulness, can try to correct all deviations from that course as rapidly as possible. Religion may call the navigator God and the steersman conscience, but both words are vague and need clearer definition. Conscience can be defined as emotional preference for truth. God can be conceived not as a being outside man but rather the highest guiding principle that man can discover in his own psyche. In this way the false dualism that puts God somehow outside of his own creations can be avoided.

The self-discipline involved in shaping an unruly, deluded, and divided psyche to conform to a harmonized, integrated, and enlightened ideal is the subject matter of Creative Psychology. Creative Psychology is the highest discipline of those that make up collectively the Science of Man. It is also in our contemporary world the most neglected, in real danger of becoming a forgotten science. Objective research in this area is negligible. Contemporary Western science has ignored the subject.

The tremendous spread of various pathogenic ideas and antigospels, especially of the Marxian variety, can be attributed to this loss of interest in Creative Psychology. The latter is the vitalizing spark from which all truly creative effort springs. Extinguish it and one is left with a race of automata incapable of spiritual evolution, monotonously gyrating through limited patterns of behavior like Huxley's Brave New Worlders with their unrestricted copulation, Feelies, Centrifugal Bumblepuppy, and absolute lack of interest in anything above this level of activity.

Several objective observers have expressed the view that such an automated existence is all that contemporary man desires or deserves. The view may be correct. Many argu-

ments can be cited to support it; chief of which is the modern tendency to define life aims entirely in terms of acquisition of material possessions with a maximum of comfort and a minimum of effort.

The view may be overpessimistic. It is easier to detect the degenerative than the regenerative forces at work in the modern world. Degenerative forces affect large masses of people and can fairly easily be measured. The regenerative force works in individuals and scarcely ever shows as a mass phenomenon.

The cybernetic approach, presenting man as a being endowed with the capacity to detect and correct the errors in the functioning of his psyche can bring fundamental religious ideas into line with scientific concepts concerning the function of man's nervous system.

The problem of what corrections must be made and how they can be made are part of the subject matter of Creative Psychology. They cannot be studied in the abstract but only by individuals prepared to use themselves as their own experimental material. Creative Psychology is a practical science, the science of trying to live at the highest level of awareness of which the human organism is capable.

It is not interplanetary navigation that presents the challenge, but the far more difficult task of spiritual navigation, the formulation of valid aims, the exertion of appropriate strivings to reach these aims, the creation, within the higher levels of the nervous system, of the navigator and the steersman, neither of whom is provided by nature.

Of the problems that confront modern man the task of revitalizing Creative Psychology is the most challenging. Real progress therefore depends on the revival of this true queen of the sciences, now deposed and in exile, largely forgotten by the religious and not yet discovered by the

scientists. Restored to its rightful place this life-giving science could banish the frantic futility corroding modern life, arrest that rampant "gadget intoxication" that forces powerful nations to devote good brains and huge resources to the creation of glittering, dangerous, and useless toys. Only Creative Psychology, and the spiritual effort involved in its practice, could endow human life with dignity, purpose, and significance. Without it contemporary man is an overbrained pest, whose cerebral unbalance makes him a menace to the entire biosphere of the planet, an evolutionary blunder, if one assumes that evolution is in any way directed, of the first magnitude.

Can the supreme science be reinstated? Has modern man so degenerated that the urge to transcend himself has vanished, conscience ceased to function, and the labor of all the great Avatars been in vain? Tremendous forces oppose the regenerative process, a huge, well-organized system of pathogenic ideas exploiting, for its own purposes, every weakness inherent in the human psyche. This spiritual epidemic has spread in all directions, nor is it possible to see when contemporary mankind will begin to develop an immunity to the particular brand of pathogenic ideas which it propagates.

Insectivization, annihilation, regeneration, which will it be? We can only guess, and our guesses are not profitable. The question, as Buddha would have said, is one not tending toward edification. The ultimate battlefield is the individual mind. If a sufficiently large number of men and women base their lives firmly on the principles offered by the Avatars and rely on the practice of Creative Psychology for the integration and direction of their existence, they will, by their presence, modify the course of events. Only

by such individual exertion can a regenerative force be brought to bear on a noisy, shallow, glittering, gadget-intoxicated culture in danger of plunging headlong into the abyss created by its own unbalanced development.

Bibliography

PART I

- (1) Huxley, J., *Religion without Revelation*. Harper Bros., New York, 1927.
- (2) "Elegant Sayings of the Lamas." in *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines*. W. Y. Evans-Wentz (editor), Oxford University Press, 1935.
- (3) Jalal alDin Rumi, *The Masnavi*. C. E. Wilson (translator), Probsthain's Oriental Series, London, 1910.
- (4) Huxley, J., *Evolution, the Modern Synthesis*. Harper Bros., New York, 1942.
- (5) Simpson, G. G., "The World into which Darwin led Us." *Science* 131: 966-974. 1960.
- (6) *The Masnavi*. (as above)
- (7) James, W., *The Will to Believe*. Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1897.
- (8) Newman, J. H., *Apologia pro Vita Sua*. Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1864.
- (9) Moorehead, A., *No Room in the Ark*. Hamish Hamilton, London, 1959.

- (10) Eiseley, L. C., "Fossil Man." *Scientific American* 189:65-73, 1953.
- (11) Sherrington, C., *The Integrative Action of the Nervous System*. Cambridge University Press, 1947.
- (12) Hayes, C., *The Ape in our House*. Harper Bros., New York, 1951.
- (12a) Klüver, H., "The temporal lobe syndrome produced by bilateral ablations." in *Ciba Foundation Symposium on the Neurological Basis of Behavior*. Little, Brown Co., Boston, 1958.
- (13) Dart, R. A., with Dennic Craig. *Adventures with the Missing Link*. Harper Bros., New York, 1960.
- (14) King, J. A., "The Social Behavior of Prairie Dogs." *Scientific American* 201: 128-143, 1959.
- (15) Michener, J., *Return to Paradise*. Random House, New York, 1951.
- (15a) Sahlins, M. D., "The Origin of Society." *Scientific American* v. 203: #3: 76-87, 1960.
- (16) Barnett, L., *The Epic of Man*. Life Magazine, New York, 1955.
- (17) Ouspensky, P. D., *A New Model of the Universe*. Kegan Paul, London, 1938.
- (18) Kramer, S. N., *From the Tablets of Sumer*. Falcon's Wing Press, Colo., 1956. *Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur*. University of Chicago Press, 1940.
- (19) Luckenbill, D. D., ed. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylon*. University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- (20) Weigall, A., *The Life and Times of Akhnaton*. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1923.
- (21) Piggott, S., "The Forgotten Empire of Antiquity." *Scientific Americans*. 189: 42-64, 1953.

PART II

- (22) *The Bhagavad Gita*. Quotations are drawn in part from Swami Nikhilananda's translation, Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Centre, New York, 1944. and partly from that of Besant and Bhagavan Das, Theosophical Publishing House, Madras, 1940.
- (23) *The Buddha-Charita* in *The Sacred Books of the East*. Max Muller, editor, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1894.
- (24) Watts, A., *The Way of Zen*. Pantheon Books, Inc., New York, 1951.
- (25) *The Majjhima-Nikaya Sutta*, from *Buddhism in Translations*. Warren, H. C., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1915.
- (26) Carus, P., *The Gospel of Buddha*. Open Court Publishing Co. Chicago, 1904.
- (27) *The Maha Satipatthana Sultana*, from *Dialogues of the Buddha*. being vol III Sacred Books of the Buddhists. Rhys Davids, T. W., editor, Oxford University Press, 1938.
- (28) Carus, P., *The Gospel of Buddha*.
- (29) *The Diamond Sutra or Prajnaparamita*. Gemmell, W., translator, Kegan Paul, London, 1912.
- (30) *Precepts of the Gurus* in *Thibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines*, (ibid)
- (31) Stevenson, S., *The Heart of Jainism*. Oxford University Press, 1915.
- (32) *Questions of King Milinda*. in vol 35. Sacred Books of the East. Rhys Davids, T. W., translator, Oxford 1890.
- (33) Suzuki, D. T., *Essays in Zen Buddhism*. First Series. Rider and Co., London, 1949.

- (34) Suzuki, D. T., *Manual of Zen Buddhism*. The Eastern Buddhist Society, Kyoto, 1935.
- (35) Ch'u Ta-Kao. *Tao Te Ching*. The Buddhist Lodge, London, 1937.
- (36) Giles, H. A., *Chuang Tzu, Mystic, Moralizer, and Social Reformer*. Quaritch, London, 1889.
- (37) Thucydides. Smith, C. F., translator, Loeb Classical Library, Heinemann, London 1928.
- (38) Plato, *The Republic*, Rouse, W. M. D., translator, Mentor Books, New York, 1956.
- (39) Plato, *Phaedrus*. Fowler, H. N. translator, Heinemann, London, 1928.
- (40) Plato. *Apology*. *ibid.*
- (41) Arrian. *Discourses of Epictetus*. Matheson, P. E. translator, in *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers*, Random House, New York, 1940.
- (42) Marcus Aurelius. *Meditations* Long, G. translator, *ibid.*
- (43) *Pahlavi Texts* in *The Sacred Books of the East*. *ibid.*
- (44) *Pahlavi Texts*. *ibid.*
- (45) Josephus. *The Jewish War*. M. St. J. Thackeray, translator, Heinemann, London 1928.
- (46) Schweitzer, A., *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*. Macmillan Co., New York, 1950.
- (47) Emerson, R. W., *Self Reliance Works* vol. I. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1881.
- (48) Boehme, J., *Dialogues on the Supersensual Life*. Ungar, New York, 1960.
- (49) *The Glorious Koran*. Pickthall, M. M. translator, Allen and Unwin, London, 1953.
- (50) Jalaluddin Rumi, *The Mathnawi*. Nicholson, R. A. translator, Cambridge University Press, 1926.

PART III

- (51) Nietzsche, F., *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, The Modern Library, Random House, New York.
- (52) Avalon, A., *Principles of Tantra*, Luzac and Co., London, 1916.
- (53) Deevey, E. S. "The Hare and the Haruspex." *The Yale Review* 49:161-179, 1959.
- (54) Menninger, K. A., *Man against Himself*. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1938.
- (55) Guénon, R., *East and West*. Luzac and Co., London, 1923.
- (56) Benda, J., *The Treason of the Intellects*. R. Aldington, trans., W. Morrow Co., New York, 1928.
- (57) Ouspenski, P. D., *A New Model of the Universe*. W. Morrow Co., New York, 1928.
- (58) Kramer, J., Sprenger, M., *Malleus Maleficarum*. Summers, M. trans., London, 1948.
- (59) Toynbee, A. J., *A study of History*. Oxford University Press, London, 1945.
- (60) Huxley A., *The Devils of Loudun*. Harper Bros., New York, 1952.
- (61) Huxley, A., *Brave New World Revisited*. Harper Bros. New York, 1958.
- (62) Berlin, I., *Karl Marx; his life and environment*, Butterworth, London, 1939.
- (63) Schurz, C., *The Reminiscences of C. Schurz*. vol. I, McClure, New York 1907.
- (64) Rauschnigg, H., *Hitler Speaks*. Butterworth, London, 1940.
- (65) Rauschnigg, H., *Hitler Speaks*. Butterworth, London, 1940.

- (66) Hayek, F. A. *The Road to Serfdom*. University of Chicago Press, 1944.
- (67) Fischer, L., *Men and Politics* Duell, Sloane, & Pierce, New York, 1911.
- (68) Lenin, V. I., *State and Revolution*. Little Lenin Library, vol. 14, New York, 1929-42.
- (69) Djilas, M., *The New Class, An Analysis of the Communist System*. Praeger, N.Y., 1957.
- (70) Chamberlain, H. S., *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*. Lane, New York, 1911.
- (71) Nietzsche, F., *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.
- (72) Rauschnig, H., *Hitler Speaks*.
- (73) Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.
- (74) Whyte, W. H., Jr. *The Organization Man*. Simon and Schuster Inc., New York, 1956.
- (75) Dostoevski, F., *The Brothers Karamazov*, Garnett, C., translator, The Modern Library, Random House, New York.
- (76) Burnham, J., *The Managerial Revolution*, John Day Co., New York, 1941.
- (77) Wells, H. G., *The Shape of Things to Come*. Hutchinson, London, 1933.
- (78) Wells, H. G., *Mind at the end of its Tether*. Heinemann, London, 1945.
- (79) Wells, H. G., *The Fate of Homo Sapiens*. Secker and Warburg, London, 1939.
- (80) Huxley, A., *Brave New World*. Modern Library edition, Random House, New York, 1956.
- (81) Huxley, A., *Brave New World Revisited*. Harper Bros., New York, 1958.
- (82) Sartre, J. P., *Nausea*. New Directions, 1959.
- (83) Wilson, C., *The Outsider*. Houghton Mifflin, Co., Boston, 1956.

- (84) Sartre, J. P., *Existentialism and Human Emotions*. Philosophical Library, New York, 1957.
- (85) Wiener, N. *Cybernetics*. Wiley and Sons. New York, 1948.
- (86) Sartre, J. P., *Existentialism and Human Emotions*. Philosophical Library, New York, 1957.
- (87) James, W., *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1902.
- (88) James, W., *On Vital Reserves: the Energies of Men*. Holt, New York, 1939.
- (89) Freud, S. *Civilization and its Discontents*, Doubleday, New York, 1958.
- (90) Fromm, E., *Religion and Psychoanalysis*. Yale University Press, 1950.
- (91) Fromm, E., *Religion and Psychoanalysis*. Yale University Press, 1950.
- (92) Jung, K. G., *The Integration of the Personality*. Farrar, Rinehart, New York, 1939.
- (93) May, R., *Man's Search for Himself*. Norton, New York, 1953.
- (94) Tillich, P., *The Courage to Be*. Yale University Press, 1952.
- (95) Riesman, D., *The Lonely Crowd*. Yale University Press, 1950.
- (96) Emerson, R. W., *Essays*. Yale University Press, 1950.
- (97) Schweitzer, A., *From My Life and Times*. Henry Holt, New York, 1949.
- (98) Ouspensky, P. D., *In Search of the Miraculous*. Harcourt Brace Co. New York, 1949.
- (99) Maltz, M., *Psycho-Cybernetics*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.J., 1961.

INDEX

- Aristotle, 6, 25
Aims, human, 10
Australopithecus, 28
Assyrians, 49
Aton, 57
Akhnaton, 56, 155
Avatars, 69
Arjuna, 78
Atman, 82
Ahimsa, 109
Aristocracy, 133
Attention, control of, 140
Ahura Mazda, 148
Ahriman, 149
Abraham, 153
Amos, 164
Antichrist, 209
Anti-avatar, 218
Antigospel, 230
"All is permitted," 235
Awakening, 283
- Being, Great Chain of, 6
Brain, heirarchy of, 21
 mid, 21
Broca, area of, 24
- Bhagavad-Gita, 77
Being-duty, 80
Brahmin, 80
Brahma, day of, 83
Buddhism, Hinayana, 96
 Mahayana, 96, 108
 Zen, 96, 110
Bodhisattva, 108
Babel, tower of, 159
Being, 187
Boehme, J., 193
Benda, J., 224
- Cerebrum, cortex of, 21
 expansion of, 20
Conscience, collective, 26
 nature of, 232
Chuang-tse, 120
Cynics, 136
Cleanthes, 136, 142
Christianity, esoteric, 192
Cybernetics, 221, 261, 289
Class war, 238
Consciousness, levels of, 285
Creative Psychology, 294

- Delusion, in man, 15
 Dart, R. A., 38
 Dependent Origination, 104
 Divine City, 133
 Diogenes, 136
 Dualism, 145
 Death wish, 216
 Demoniacs, 218
 Deevey, E., 217
- Evolution, 6
 Egypt, civilization of, 52
 Eightfold Path, 98
 Existence, Round of, 99
 Epictetus, 137
 Emerson, R. W., 187, 277
 Existentialism, 258
 in psychoanalysis, 273
- Four Noble Truths, 97
 Fall of Man, 157
 Flood, 158
 Fischer, L., 234
 Fromm, E., 270, 280
 Freud, S., 267
- Gorilla, 17
 Gautama, 93
Gathas, 148
Gunas, 83
 God, 156
 Grand Inquisitor, 248
 Gurdjieff, G., 281
- Huxley, H., 7
 Huxley, A., 228, 248, 251
 Hominids, 16
Homo ferrox, 31
 Hyksos, 55
 Harappa, 59
Homo sapiens, evolution of, 66
 moral sense in, 68
 Hinduism, 70
- Hebrews, role of, 161
 Heaven, Kingdom of, 189
 Herd poisoning, 228
 Hitler, A., 233, 248
 Hayek, F. A., 233
- Ice Age, 30
 Indus Valley, 59
 Impressions, control of, 103, 140
 Isaiah, 164
 Intellectuals, role of, 221
 treason of, 224
 Ideas, pathogenic, 226
 Inner-direction, 276
 Intellect, collective, 24
- Jainism, 109
 Job, 166
 Jesus, 177
 Jallaludin Rumi, 201
 James, W., 12, 265, 280
Jiva, 82
- Korzybski, A., 24
 Killing, 31
 King, J. A., 35
 Krishna, 77
Karma, 83
 Kali, 85
Koan, 111
Kali yuga, 210
 Kundabuffer, 282
Kundalini, 282
Kshatriya, 80
- Leakey, L.S.B., 28
Lila, 82
 Lao-tse, 114
- Maya*, 15
 degrees of, 212
 Mesolithic, 34
 Morioris, 36

- Michener, J., 36
 Morality, 37
 Marcus Aurelius, 141
 Myths, biblical, 155
 Moses, 154
 Messiah, 169
 kingdom of, 172
 Man, rebirth of, 182
 Mohammed, 196
 Masnavi, 201
 Marxism, 231
 Marx, K., 231, 238
 Mahabarata, 77
 Master Race, 243
 May, R., 273, 281
 Mohenjo-Daro, 59

 Newman, J. H., 14
 Neolithic Age, 41
 Nomads, 43
Nirvana, 105
 Non-violence, 190
 Nietzsche, F., 210, 236

 Original sin, biology of, 32
 Ouspensky, P. D., 45, 226
 Oligarchy, 133
 Outsider, 260
 Objective self-consciousness, 274
 Other-directed, 276

Proconsul africanus, 16
 Pongids, 16
 Prairie dog, 35
 Piggott, S., 59
Persona, 87
 Pythagoras, 143
 Prophets, 162
 Possessions, 188
 Plato, 130
 Prisoners in the cave, 130

 Quietism, 193

 Rapture, 105
 Rauschnig, H., 246
 Riesman, D., 276, 281
 Religion, authoritarian, 270
 humanistic, 271

 Salvation, physical, 3
 spiritual, 4
 in Buddhism, 106
 Selection, natural, 7
 Simpson, W. G., 8
 Science, limitations of, 11
 Satan, 15, 166
 Sherrington, C., 22
 Sumerians, 47
Sudra, 81
 Shiva, dance of, 83
 Senses, control of, 90
 Suffering, nature of, 98
 Sins, forgiveness of, 99
Samsara, 105
 Susuki, D. T., 111
Satori, 113
 Socrates, 128
 Soul, 131
 Stoicism, 138
 Self-transcendence, 228
 Sufism, 200
 Saviors, repudiation of, 210
 Sartre, J. P., 259
 Schweitzer, A., 281

 Tools, 29
 Territorial rights, 35
 Technology, creative, 45
 destructive, 45
 Ten Evils, 102
 Tao, 115
 Timocracy, 133
 Tillich, P., 274, 281

Vaisya, 81
 Vineyard, allegory of, 165

Vimalakirti, 110

Witchcraft, 227

Words, hypnotic effect of, 25

War, 39

World Controller, 248

Whyte, W., 248, 278

Wells, H. G., 253

Wilson, C., 260

Wiener, N., 261

Yoga, 63, 87, 91

Zoroaster, 146



A noted biochemist and formerly a visiting research fellow at the Rockefeller Institute, Dr. de Ropp now lives in California where he is devoting all his time to writing. He is the author of *Drugs and the Mind* and *Man Against Aging*.

Jacket design by William Metzig

ST MARTIN'S PRESS
175 Fifth Avenue
New York 10, N. Y.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



134 530

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY