

CIVILISATION'S
DEADLOCKS
AND THE KEYS

ANNIE BESANT, D.L.

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS
AND THE KEYS

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

BY

ANNIE BESANT, D.L.

FIVE LECTURES DELIVERED IN LONDON
JUNE, 1924

Indian Edition

THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE
ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA

1924

Printed in Great Britain

CONTENTS

LECTURE	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY	7
II. THE RELIGIOUS KEY	34
III. THE EDUCATIONAL KEY	58
IV. THE SCIENTIFIC AND ARTISTIC KEY	87
V. THE KEY TO A HUMAN SOCIETY	113

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

LECTURE I

INTRODUCTORY

FRIENDS :

In 1909 I delivered in this hall a series of lectures entitled "The Changing World." In those lectures I tried to show that in all the great departments of human life the old methods were showing signs of being out-worn : that whether you looked at Religion, at Science, at Art, or at the organisation of Society in the Western World, you found with all of them that we were coming to a point where continuance along the same road was practically impossible.

I gave at that time five lectures, as I am giving now ; and I want, if I can, to show you now the possibilities that are opening before us in these different lines of human life and of human activity. I am going to speak to you, after the introductory lecture of to-night, on those great subjects that I dealt with before, but with a difference. Fifteen years ago I spoke of the deadlocks

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

but not of the keys that might open the doors that were shut apparently against the onward march of humanity. This time, after asking you to shortly survey with me the field that we shall study in the following lectures, I am proposing to speak on the keys to each of the four great subjects.

Next Sunday I shall take the Key of Religion—the Religious Key. That is practically a glance, so far as one may venture to make such a glance, on the religion of the future, on the relations of religions to each other in that future, and on the possibilities of the further evolution, especially in the direction of the direct knowledge of God and also of the growing possibilities of communication with other worlds than the physical; so endeavouring to put before you a message of hope rather than a message of despair, of which the world seems to have too many at the present time, and to show you how the apparent deadlock has a key which, when used, might throw open that apparently immovable door. For although at first, when I took the title of “Civilisation’s Deadlocks,” I was using the word “Deadlock” in a metaphorical sense rather than in an actual, I found the other day, in speaking with a gentleman who knew more about locks than I did myself, that the deadlock was a real physical thing and not merely an allegorical expression, and he explained to me and sent two pictures afterwards to show me in an ordinary trade advertisement apparently, the difference between an ordinary lock and the deadlock; that the ordinary lock had a handle or a latch by which the door might

INTRODUCTORY

be opened by an appropriate touch, but that in the deadlock there was nothing but the keyhole—there was no handle, no latch, no apparent way to turn the lock at all—and that which was called a deadlock in the trade had its own particular key, and if you were the happy possessor of that key then the lock had for you no terrors. So I found my title more appropriate than I might have expected, and I am to try and show you the keys that will open the deadlocks of the present time.

The first of those will be the Religious key, as I have said. After that will follow the Educational key, for the very obvious reason that if, as I shall put to you in a moment, the world is at the end of one Age and at the beginning of a New Age, then I think it must be patent, obvious to every thinker and student, that it is to the young that we must turn for the effective shaping of the New Age, and that their power to shape that Age will depend very largely upon the nature of the education which they receive. Already they are showing susceptibilities to high ideals, are breathing great aspirations; but we have still, we who are elders, to perform for them the duty of not cramping them in their education, but of giving them the freedom to show out that which they have brought with them through the gateway of birth: an education that will show them the duties of the citizen; which will answer to the ideals which they are so ready to embrace; which will make them citizens of a greater and nobler type than we their elders have been; which will make them self-sacrificing rather

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

than grasping, co-operative rather than competitive, ready to use strength for the helping of the weak and not for their oppression, the heralds of a new and a happier Age, when all mankind will know themselves as a family, and the law of Brotherhood will be the law of Human Society.

Such an education I shall try roughly to sketch, and to show you that the beginnings of it are showing themselves to-day ; and I believe that as the duty of society to the young is better recognised, education will be a matter not only for the boy and for the girl, but for the youth and for the maiden growing into manhood and womanhood, and that the advantages which to-day are mostly restricted to those who are wealthier and able to pay for a longer education and a wider culture, that that may be the birthright of every child who is born into this land, so that those who have already much shall not because of that have greater advantages ; but that all the Nation's children shall be the Nation's care, so that they may mingle in one happy society and realise Human Brotherhood as it has never been realised before.

And the next lecture after Education will deal with Science and Art, that Science which is necessary for human evolution, that which gives the knowledge by which men should grow more and more human and not more and more inhuman, as so much of the Science of our own day is. The Art that shall beautify the life of every citizen of every land, where the capacity to admire shall be developed in all, and beauty shall become

INTRODUCTORY

the heritage of every Nation which ventures to call itself civilised.

And all this will lead up to the last subject with which I hope to deal, and that is, the key to the building of a Human Society. For I do not call our society of to-day a Human Society. It is a society of struggle, of combat, of man against man, of class against class, a social anarchy rather than a social union; and society should surely be a union built by brains that understand the causes of poverty and so can deal with its effects, and of hearts that will never be satisfied until they see all around them sharing in the possibilities of happiness, which now are restricted too much to the few.

That is practically the field along which I hope to study these subjects with you for the next four Sundays, and I will try to take what we may call a bird's-eye view of it now, so that the later lectures may fall into a natural outline and the details may fit reasonably into their various places.

Looking at the world as it is to-day and as it was fifteen years ago, that world that is sometimes called "the world before the Flood," that world seems to be separated from the present by an almost unbridgeable gulf, filled with the slaughtered bodies of men and women and children, over what is supposed to be the most civilised portion of the surface of our earth. And that great war that broke out in 1914, five years after those lectures of "The Changing World" were delivered, has been for civilisation a work of destruction which at that time probably few had anticipated. We were

looking then rather towards an advance, characterised more or less by goodwill and peaceful effort. We did not think of our civilisation as then crashing down into ruins around us, ruins that are still around us in what are called days of peace. There is no peace in the world to-day, look you where you will. Ruins everywhere meet our gaze as we cast it over the surface of our globe. Dread of still greater war: fear of a war that may break out between races, and not only between Nations; wars that people begin to talk about between Europe and Asia, between white and coloured peoples, although they marched under the Union Jack to battle in the last war. Coloured men who died with your men in the trenches, who fought in every theatre of war in a dream of Liberty that has not yet been realised. And now, instead of peace there are rumours of war—war that it is the duty of every man and woman to try to prevent and to make impossible.

Men spoke, you will remember, in the horrors of the past, of “a war to end war,” and to make “a world worthy of free men to live in,” and to create a real democracy; and now they are still talking of fresh weapons of destruction, and France and England are bidding against each other for some new horrible means that someone has dragged out of the recesses of Nature and hopes to make a great fortune by, in that the Nation who buys it may be practically impregnable. But surely these are not the thoughts which should be filling our hearts and minds to-day. Not of war more horrible, but of peace on a sure foundation—that is

INTRODUCTORY

what we should be striving for as we approach the second quarter of the twentieth century. Surely the world has had enough of war, enough of starvation and disease and misery that follow in the wake of war; yet still to-day they seem almost faced with bankruptcy, and the efforts to rescue Nations trembling on its brink, that is one of the pre-occupations of the statesmen of to-day. And looking at that we can hardly wonder that the world is so troubled to-day; for after all the war was not only a slaughter of myriads of human bodies, but myriads more were taken away from the peaceful toils of industry and sent out to struggle against their fellow-workmen of all ranks in the dread grapple of war; and not only were those who ought to have been producing food and clothing and comforts for the Nations turned to destroy instead of to produce, but we find also that they who were kept in their homes in their Nations were not employed in producing what was really wanted but on munitions of war, in order to supply their brothers who were fighting in the field. And with what result? That they made such masses of them, such tons upon tons of them, that they have made great dumps and have buried them all, so that they may not explode unexpectedly and again spread the destruction which is their nature and the aim of men in making them: and so we find the admirable result of human thought and science—I cannot say of human aspiration and love; we find they are now exploding their dumps, and sending up into the air all those munitions which took the labour of so many men

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

to make, and they have great explosions here and there—one in France the other day—to destroy the engines of destruction that they themselves spent so many weary years in making. If it were not true and horrible, it would seem like a comic opera, that men could waste their labour in making and then destroying the product of their hands, because of the dangerous nature of their work. And so Europe is poor—and she could hardly be anything else after the way she has dealt with her productive forces and her destructive ones—and we now have our civilisation literally in ruins. Now there is no possibility, I should venture to suggest to you, of rebuilding a new civilisation out of the ruins of the old. It has never been done in human history. There have been mighty Empires in the past, mightier apparently than any we have had in our own days, great as some of these admittedly are.

If you take some of those Empires of the past that you may read of—of Babylon the Mighty, of Nineveh, of Egypt; one after another come to the minds of men as they think of those huge aggregations of humankind; they seemed impregnable; they seemed as though they would last for ever. Yet, one after another fell into ruins, and we seek their remnants in their sepulchres and marvel over the treasures that therein are discovered.

Try to picture to yourself Egypt, one of whose Kings has lately had his tomb opened by modern curiosity, and try to see yourself in imagination what that kingdom must have been when that King was reigning, and the enormous wealth, not common coins—for you might as well use

counters instead of coins, there is no beauty in them that you should want them for yourself—but beautiful metals turned to their proper purpose to beautify objects which might give delight to educated and cultured people. The gold that they have found there buried away as though it were worthless, all given in homage to a mighty Monarch who was dead ; so wealthy a land that you unbury sepulchre after sepulchre, and then fill your museums with the spoils of those rifled tombs. And Egypt is only one of the great Empires, and they have all gone and disappeared, and long periods have elapsed during which less civilised Nations, as they were called, gradually climbed up again the ladder down which those great and learned and mighty civilisations have been cast ; and you only find here and there in the museum of the archæologist some trace of what they did, some of their great works, just as you may find sometimes in Indian cottages a stone beautifully carven, which has been taken out of some ancient city buried for the most part and partially excavated by curious men ; when you see a stone all carven, you wonder at a thing so fine artistically being used simply to be a stone in a hut, very often unworthy of a human being to live in.

Civilisations pass. You have to build anew, and the civilisation that is in ruins to-day will not be rebuilt out of those ruins. They will build—the mighty builders of the coming days, after they have cleared away these ruins, and make a place fit on which to raise a happier society—the New Age which is coming on the world, as the Old Age is dying. The miseries you see to-day are but the

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

convulsions of a dying Age. But a New Age is abuilding for the future, and it is that New Age which the younger generations will build. When you look abroad to-day, have you thought of noticing that in every country there is a great movement of the Youth of that country? All are showing it, although some more than others, and one of those which is showing it in a most remarkable and and wondrous type is the land of Germany ruined by the war.

There is something very beautiful and splendid in the way that these lads and lasses of that ruined Nation set themselves, are setting themselves, to the rebuilding of a new Germany on foundations other than the old ones, save that they are keeping alive the memory of German music and German philosophy and German thought; are casting away the memory of hatred and are stretching out hands of brotherhood to all the nations round; and they are young, mere boys and girls many of them, and you may read their record, for there have been many records made by travellers from America, reporting for their papers and magazines, and these came to us in India, but I do not know if they have come to you here. If they have, you will see there a promise, a hope for the world in that German youth; and one thing that was said by a lad to one of those American reporters was: "You have won the war and we have lost it. You have won perhaps much of wealth and we are the poorer"; but he went on to say: "But we have *really* won it, because we are learning to bear hardship, we are learning to struggle against great difficulties, and we are trying to rebuild our

INTRODUCTORY

people as a people who shall have the right to be worthy of their Motherland ; our creed is a new internationalism, and no longer the strife of nation against nation and of people against people." And that you find in young men and women who in their youth may naturally desire pleasure, and may naturally desire to find it along lines in which they see their elders take it ; and you see these young ones accepting hardship as delight and gain, and laughing at their own privations, and singing as they go. Well, that is more marked in Germany than anywhere else, although it is found in every country. You have a great international League of Youth amongst you, to which all of you might well show some goodwill and some encouragement. They are forming one over in America, and have had a boys' week and are having a girls' week. I do not know why they did not have them both together. One day a boy was made Mayor of the City. Another day one was put at the head of a great trading establishment and was shown how he should prepare himself to be a citizen of that great Republic. And if you come across to India, which you might think behind you in many ways, you would there find their League of Youth, and you will find in the Theosophical Society, since Christmas last, that they have formed forty-three of these Leagues of young Theosophists. In alliance with that are other young minds, who are not Theosophical in their views of life, but take the same ideals of brotherhood and of amity, of desire to be friendly with every Nation. And it seems to me that as this spreads, this International League of Youth, for they all join up together in the

International League in all the countries, we have here a beginning of a movement which will really reshape civilisation. We have there, with the ideals that attract them, with the hopes that they cherish, with the willingness to sacrifice instead of to grasp, we have there the markings of a new type which is gradually beginning to show itself, the forerunner of a physical type. For you must remember that a change in the physical type of man is always accompanied, as far as history shows us, by the beginning of a new form of religion and the beginning of a new civilisation. You can very easily trace that if you will through the great Aryan race. I am told that the word "Aryan" has grown out of favour, but it is one I am very familiar with and it means noble; as your ethnologists tell you, that race rose in Central Asia, so far as the pure race was concerned, and sent out migrations from Central Asia—sub-races we Theosophists call them—sent out great migrations westward always; and one of those went along the coasts of the Mediterranean and made great civilisations that have only lately been partially unburied there, and they also colonised Egypt and made its great civilisation. Then another went up to Persia and made that ancient Persia that we only dream of almost to-day, that antedated the Persian Empire that we read of in ordinary history; and then another came further westward and made Greece and Rome and went across to Spain and across France and Ireland, and was driven out of England to the Highlands of Scotland. We call it the Keltic sub-race, but I believe that name has also gone out of fashion among ethnologists now; call

INTRODUCTORY

them the Latin races of Europe, if you like, but a name does not matter, provided you realise the difference of type. Then came the emigration which formed the great Teutonic race which populated Central Europe and Scandinavia ; many of their tribes came over to England and gave you the foundations of your English freedom. For, as Sir Henry Maine has pointed out in dealing with village and municipal rule, coming from the Aryan race from Asia, they brought with them their own inextinguishable love of liberty and their passion for self-government. And even now the very roots of your liberty are in that unwritten law of your old Saxon forefathers, before the Norman Conquest came and killed those old liberal Teutonic institutions and established the feudal system, so that you had gradually to wrench your liberty from those above you instead of the liberty growing from the village up and up, in larger and larger aggregations as the means of communication improved. And so, looking at it you find these five types, all easily distinguishable physically the one from the other. The root stock came down across the Himalayas, by Assam, Kashmir, and Baluchistan, and settled in India. Those whom I mentioned, those colonists along the Mediterranean coasts, have left examples of their work in the unburied excavations of Crete, and have justified the old legends of Minos, and the Labyrinth rediscovered in our own time, and the great civilisations all over the shores of the Mediterranean have still traces of that great sub-race ; and then you come to the one I mentioned of Persia and the other two, every one a fresh type of humankind.

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

If you apply your knowledge along lines of ethnology to your own time and to the centuries just before the present, you will find out why the Irish and the English peoples cannot get on well together as rulers and subjects. They are different types, and you cannot fight against these racial types and temperaments. Irish people are moved by their emotions very much more than by their intellect : by beauty more than by ugly forms of civilisation like the industrial : they are moved by appeals to ideals where the emotions answer to them, and you can find that everywhere, if you choose to take the trouble, through what are called the Latin races, and the Irish and the Highlanders are amongst them. Now you can be friends, because you have agreed to let each sub-race govern itself in its own way instead of trying to force one civilisation, suited to one type of the concrete and scientific mind, on another that cares more for poetry and beauty than for science.

Each has its place and work and its own share in the great human evolution, but it is well to realise the differences, for the recognition of these is the way to peace and friendship. You may say : Why have you mentioned these things of the past ? I will tell you : because another sub-race is being born, the sixth, and if you care again to look at the scientific point of view, which is the most convincing, you will find in the Washington Bureau of Ethnology that the new type has been isolated in the usual way, and shown clearly by composite photographs, and the rest of the ways in which science marks out types ; and they call it the American type, but they make a mis-

INTRODUCTORY

take, for it is being born in different parts of the world, in Australia and New Zealand and elsewhere, but not so many at present as in California. The fact was mentioned at the last meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science by the Secretary of the Edinburgh Branch of the Royal Anthropological Institute, who brought it boldly forward, and threw this theory out into the faces of the learned men of the British Association. They merely laughed at it. I felt a little inclined to send them some newspaper cuttings from California, for some of the newspapers have come to recognise the new type, and they give pictures of and describe these peculiar children, with a temperament so different from the temperament of the ordinary American. They are more intuitional and not so much intellectual. You may remember that Bergson pointed out a good many years ago that intuition would be the next stage in the development of the consciousness of mankind, and that it would differ very much from intellect, for intellect looked outwards and based its observations on what it saw outside itself, whereas intuition begins within, and in forming its judgments unites its life with the life of the observed object, or human being, and looks outward from within the object and not at it from outside it. And that is recognised now in America, and they say these children are very difficult to teach in the ordinary school. They are not very fond of poring over books and learning lists of dates, and lists of cities and countries and products. They turn more towards the grasping of an ideal and are a little impatient of all the proofs offered them that the

ideal is really good. So to speak, they see it, they do not want argument about it. They puzzle their parents and their teachers, but they are becoming now fairly numerous, and are at least there a recognised type. And if you look into the records of the ethnological results at Washington, you will find all the measurements of the head, facial angle, and all they had to mark in a fresh type; and that type is appearing. I am putting this before you quite plainly and positively as a scientific fact, though I could not put it before you so strongly nine years ago, although I believed it then; but there was not the same support from science and therefore one could only put it as a theory more than as a definite fact, unless one was speaking to those who had studied the question from another point of view. There is no doubt about it now, and the sub-race is appearing in different countries.

Now, whenever a new type is appearing, has appeared—as I have already mentioned—in the great Aryan race there has been a great Teacher who came to give that race a religion which would develop it along its own peculiar lines, and which would have a civilisation based on the religion whose outlines were laid down by Him. There again, if you will read history, you will find plenty to support my statement. I have not the time in this lecture to go into it at length, so what I will ask you to observe is this: that each of these sub-races I have mentioned looks up to such a Teacher for the religion it follows; one of those has practically perished, having done its work—that which went along the shores of the Mediterranean, Northern Africa and Egypt. But others

remain and you can test them. Each of them looks back to the Founder of its faith, and if you look at that religion and compare it with the civilisation, you will find that the civilisation was based on the religion, and you will find that with the Hebrews as you have them in your Old Testament. The Old Testament gives laws not only with respect to religious teachings but laws as to the ownership of land; they quoted one of these in the House of Commons the other day, stating that the land was not to be held in perpetuity because the land belonged to God.¹ You will find exactly the same thing in the other great books. They make hygienic laws, and then sanction them by religion. They make laws of the polity of the Nation and there is then a sanction from their religion for it. The religion, spreading from within, moulds the whole of these laws, and the sacred books of a religion are not only books on what is narrowly called religion, but are on the polity and the whole social life of the people. You recognise that to some extent as regards your own great Teacher, if for a moment I may take you as, in the majority, a Christian audience. There may be many here holding various doctrines, many sects and churches; but I am not concerned with the many sects and churches, only with the great doctrines taught by the Christ. You will be inclined to say, and to say truly, that the greatest of those doctrines has not

¹ "The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine: for ye are strangers and sojourners with me. And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land."—*Leviticus xxv. 23 and 24.*

yet been incorporated in Christian society : but you must remember that the religion is not only ultimately to bring out as it were the fairest flowers of civilisation, but also to train the whole type of the humanity to whom that religion is given ; and if for a moment you will take that as a theory if you like, or as a fact if you study history, you will find that the great object of Christianity was to develop the individuality. It is a point of enormous importance, because history goes in cycles it is often said. But it was necessary for the progress of the whole world that individuality should play a very much greater part in the Christian civilisation, in the type of that civilisation, than it had played in the older religions that had gone before. The civilisation of the West is founded on the individual ; the civilisation of the ancient Nations in Asia is founded on the family ; I shall have something to say about that later on ; and the difference that comes out of that is, that if you found your civilisation on the individual, *rights* is the prominent feature of the civilisation ; and if you found it on the family, *obligations* are the principal features of that civilisation. I am putting it to you very broadly and roughly, but you will find it truer and truer to you as you study it, and both these have gone to excess. You will find a tremendous stress laid on the value of the individual in the words of the Christ Himself when He said : " What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul ? Or, what shall a man give in exchange for his soul ? " (*Matthew xvi. 26*). And if you believe at all in the guidance of Nations along the line for the development of their special qualities and

their gifts to the evolution of mankind, you will realise that in the West alone of all the world the doctrine of Reincarnation gradually disappeared, after Christianity spread. And it is very easy to see why that should be. It was condemned in one of the Councils of the Church—condemned truly only in the form that Origen had taught it—and after that time the doctrine remained only in heretical societies like the Albigenses. That is one reason why the Church of Rome persecuted those people so bitterly, and right through you may trace these heretical societies holding to that philosophical doctrine. But if you think it out you will see that if a strong individuality was to be developed it could not be developed as rapidly in a Nation that believed in rebirth, in the coming back to life over and over again, as in a Nation that was put in the position—a very terrible position, but very prominent through the Middle Ages—that a man had only one life, and that his everlasting life on the other side of death depended on the way that he spent that one life, that he went either to everlasting heaven or hell according as to how he had spent that short span of life, short even though he lived to one hundred years, but he very often died in youth or even in infancy. That doctrine is not held by many in all its crudity to-day, but you still find it here and there, and nothing could have done more to stimulate the growth of individuality than that teaching. And so European civilisation has been a great competitive civilisation, always struggling and struggling, and developing an intellectual keenness of brain and not always certainly a largeness of heart; and yet again that

was helped where people felt sympathy for suffering and tried to relieve it. But as you study these teachings, you will find there was one great corrective to combativeness given by the Christ, that which so far, as I have said, Christianity has not developed in society, although you can see signs of it all through your society, in the idealists who are trying to make society a brotherly union, and to do away with the great differences, artificial differences, between man and man. For you may remember that when He was away for a short time His disciples quarrelled as to who should be the greatest—men and women are always quarrelling even down to to-day over that question—His answer was a remarkable one: “He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve” (*Luke xvii. 26*). And that is what I will call the second great cardinal doctrine of Christianity, and that is developing to a very considerable extent, although not strongly enough to build society upon that great basis of service. And He taught through one of His chief Apostles that those who “are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please themselves” (*Romans xv. 1*). Strength is not for trampling upon the weak, but that strength is to be used for service and not for oppression, and that is the striking lesson of the Christ; strength of brain is no more righteous if used for oppression than strength of muscle by the strong physical arm. And so we have to recognise in modern society that it is a denial of one of the greatest teachings—by the teachings and by the example given to it by the Founder of its faith; for

there is no phrase that you can find more explicit than that verse written by one of His great Apostles : " Though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich " (*2 Cor. viii. 9*). When the rich of society have learned that lesson, that they are rich that others through their poverty may become rich, then they will have the right to call Christ their Master.

And so you have this great peculiarity of the new type of mankind, and the Teacher who comes to give it the new type of religion—the old doctrines in a new garment and the civilisation based upon it. Now you have definitely at the present time the sign of the new sub-race. You have no proof at present save that, of the likelihood of the coming of the World Teacher ; but there is hardly a country in the world in which you do not find great crowds of people in the different religions who are looking for the return of the Founder of their own faith. In Buddhist Burma there is a sect of thousands of people who say that the Bodhisattva is coming—their name for the World Teacher—and they are building halls and places for Him, so that He may preach His message when He comes. The Hindus talk of the Jagatguru, the World Teacher, and look for His coming ; and among Christians there are many looking for the return of the Christ ; and all this is natural if you read the Christian part of the Bible, but you find there the mis-translation of the word " everlasting," where the true translation was for an " æon," an age, and it is true that we are now at the breaking down of one age and the

beginning of a new age, and on this point study is worth while. I do not for one moment say that you should believe these things I am saying, because I am speaking them with authority ; but I say it is for you to form your own judgment, and you must study before you condemn.

One indubitable fact is before you, and another scientific fact, mentioned years ago, is that a new continent is looked forward to from the earthquake ring in the Pacific. Islands are being thrown up as many great earthquakes are taking place, and these islands are the peaks of future mountains. Then we read that part of the sea bottom near Chile has come very much nearer to the surface. And all these great shocks are signs of coming changes in the disposition of land and water, and that is one of the accompaniments of the evolution of humanity. I am not asking you to believe this ; I want you to study it and not to take it on another's word. I do not believe in people taking things on another person's word. I think everyone should form his own judgment on the data he can collect. You can study a theory if it appeals to you, but it is not a real belief until study has made it true for you, and you gather for yourself one pearl of truth out of the great ocean of the unknown which lies around you.

Looking at it in that way and seeing these difficulties that society is in to-day, it seems to me it might be worth while for you to consider whether you are not at the beginning of a New Age ; in every Scripture outer signs are mentioned when a New Age is beginning, so that you may not be like blind people when looking at what is around you, but may even read your newspapers with new

INTRODUCTORY

eyes and mark the things that matter instead of the things which do not matter; and very often you find the things that do matter are in a corner in small print, but things which do not matter are in large print: prize-fighting, horse-racing, and those things which will all be forgotten in a few years.

And this New Age, how shall we think of that? We should look in the world around us at the tendencies that you find among different types of people. Things do not really come with a sudden jump, only people are rather blind to the signs that are not manifest on the surface. We live so much on the surface that it is no wonder we do not see very far below it; but if you study the society around you, in spite of the old civilisation crumbling into ruins, are there not many hopeful signs you can see, which seem to presage the beginning of a New Age? I mentioned the Youth Movement, which passionately desires to realise these ideals of World Brotherhood and Service. Talk to any collection of young people whom you like to-day, and put before them these great ideals, and see if they will not grow enthusiastic under your words, and realise the greatness that is possible, and that they may have a share in the building of it. You will not move your young people by appeals to selfishness, such as the love of power and the love of fame, but you will move them always by examples of sacrifice and the ideals of service to their fellow-men. Their hearts respond to it even if their elders have grown too cold to contact that rarer world, to see that glory that shall be revealed; but the young ones who may have

brought with them something of the memory of their past, they realise something of the beauty of the ideal before contact with the rough outside world has too much dulled their appreciation of the beautiful. And they are to be the builders.

Now just looking at that for a moment, I would ask you to consider: if this has even a chance of being true, what is the main thing that we ought to be striving for in our troubled world? You know the great things the war has left behind it—that thousands of the men who risked their lives for us came back, many of them, mutilated; thousands of them miserably poor; many of them are now walking our streets trying to find employment. Is there no duty from us to them? They made it possible that we should not bear the horrors of invasion that France suffered, save by the occasional raids which showed you something of the terrors of the war. Ought they not to be the national care? Are there to be any grudgings with any Government that is in power, call it Socialist or Bolshevik, or any other pet name you might like to apply to it? I tell you it is a scandal here, with the wealth that is wasted on every side, to see those for whom we ought gratefully to care, begrudged the little help that the law gives them, and that a man who has risked his life and health and who is unemployed because of it, should be turned out of a house because he has not money enough to pay his rent! Many of you would not have had money enough to pay your own rent if the country had been invaded, as it would have been but for those men who put their breasts between you and the German

INTRODUCTORY

ravage ! Ought there to be debates whether thousands thrown out of employment as a result of the war—whether soldiers or not—should have a few shillings more ? Ought that to be grudged them when so much can be spent in luxury ?

We have to work for Brotherhood, and if your brother was starving you would not grudge him the little help he needed ; even if you were the poorer for the giving ; and we have to learn that supreme doctrine of the New Age, that we are one human family, and that the sufferings of any one are really the sufferings of all.

You cannot let your country go on as it is going on to-day and hope to be among the foremost builders of the new civilisation. Every tendency towards co-operation against competition should be encouraged. Every tendency which makes the common good the aim instead of individual gain the object, should be encouraged by all who have eyes to see the coming future. You may say to me : “ But you are a Socialist.” Well, yes, I am ! You may also say : “ You are also a member of the Labour Party.” I would say, Yes, I am, and I am proud to be one. Let me say this to you : that the next type of civilisation which is to be builded will be what many of you call Socialism. Not in its perfection at first, because true Socialism does not try to win its way by pulling down, merely in order that the poor may triumph over some who are (let us acknowledge it) unjustly rich. The true Socialism seeks for the causes of poverty, that it may get rid of its effects ; it works by argument and reason and not by violence. It will come when the

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

majority of you who have power in the country are convinced that you must have a change in the very basis of your society, and then you will want that by legislation and not by the violence of mobs.

May I add to that one final word? This great Commonwealth—I prefer that word to Empire, for there are so many ideas about Empire that you should have discarded, and you might well do as the Prince of Wales did, and say Commonwealth of Nations; though that is only a matter of words, yet words do matter in a way—this great Commonwealth has an opportunity that no other Nation in the world has to-day. You are given that opportunity by the Powers that make for Righteousness, that you may take or refuse as you will—for the higher Powers do not force Nations any more than they force a man—they only *offer* opportunities for greatness, and if these are thrust aside another is chosen for the next opportunity. Now your opportunity lies in this: that you are the only Nation in the world to-day who can make peace between the East and the West, between Europe and Asia, between the white races and the coloured; none other can do it. The greater part of your Commonwealth consists of coloured peoples, and the vast majority of the members of what should be a complete Commonwealth are coloured men. No other Nation is in that position to-day, and you have won it, for opportunities come by working and not by favouritism; you have won a great possibility because, in a moment of trial, you took upon yourself the burden of the extinction of chattel slavery and paid out of your own

pockets the owners of those human chattels, seeing that where the Nation had sinned the nation should atone, and not a single class that might be impoverished by the change. By that you have won much of your position in the world, for there *is* a Power that works for Righteousness, and a Nation that does a great deed of national righteousness inevitably wins the opportunity for greater work ; you have struggled for liberty, not always wisely—no Nation is always wise—but bravely and perseveringly, and with endurance, so that you have been called, not untruly, the Little Island which is the Citadel of Freedom. But if you forget your traditions and cast aside what has really made you great ; if looking at the world-wide opportunity you say, No ! We will have subjects and not Brothers, we will assert our own superiority over those we deem inferior, although all the great Prophets of the Nations have been coloured men and the greatest civilisations of the world have been coloured civilisations ; if you are mad enough to refuse the opportunity offered, then your Empire will perish, and it will be the final denial of Brotherhood among the peoples of the world.

LECTURE II

THE RELIGIOUS KEY

FRIENDS :

Those of you who were here on Sunday last will remember that the lecture I gave was introductory in its nature. I ran over in outline the subjects with which I propose to deal in the remaining lectures, and the first of those subjects was The Religious Key.

Now religion may be defined, I think, I have often defined it, as "Man's search for God," and the religions of the world are great organisations by which men who accept a certain great Teacher, a World Teacher, who accept the doctrines that He taught, have built up a civilisation according to these doctrines in the form that He gave them, these religions differ from each other in the outer form and shape, but every one of them conveys the same eternal truths, adapted to the needs of the time when the World Teacher comes, and adapted also to the stage of human evolution which the religion and the civilisation founded upon it are intended to develop.

You will recognise the truth of that if for a moment you recall that brief statement of last Sunday on the stages of human evolution in races and divisions of races, each developing some great characteristic part of that humanity which is to become perfect when these stages are seven times repeated and concluded ; keeping that in mind as

a principle which underlies my talk this evening, we shall realise why it is that religions are at once united in their fundamentals and different in many of their characteristics.

Man being so complex a being, his consciousness having so many facets, as it were, before it can shine out as the perfect diamond reflecting the glories of the One Light, man being so complex, having so many stages through which he has to pass, religions in their turn must also be numerous, whether we look to those which have taught and passed away, or whether we survey the world of the present with its various religions laying stress on special teachings and looking up to a special Founder. And so it is said in a great Hindu Scripture : " Mankind approaches Me along many roads ; on whatever road a man approaches Me on that road do I welcome him, for all roads are Mine " (*Bhagavad-Gita, iv. 11*).

On looking at the world to-day, we cannot pretend that the great religions taught by the World Teachers have really kept their power over the hearts and brains of men. Even if we confine ourselves to a single faith, that which nominally rules in Europe, can we for one moment pretend that Europe to-day shows out the power of the Life of its religion, carries out the precepts, or copies the example of its Founder ? When we see the contending Nations, when we see the struggle to achieve greatness in order to dominate and to rule, can we say that that religion has not come to a deadlock, whose Founder declared to his disciples : " The greatest among you is he that doth serve " ? The Christian ideal may be professed by many a mouth, but it is not lived,

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

politically or socially, in the organisation of any Nation in Christendom. And so we look around searching for some key to unlock this deadlock, and there is only one key that will do it, that which is known by the name of Mysticism, including in that meter Occultism.

Now Mysticism is essentially a matter for the individual. It is not only the search after God, but the finding of God. It shows out sometimes in what is called Occultism, which means that God is sought and found in His outer manifestations, in the nature of the worlds in which He has placed us, in the Guardians and Rulers of those worlds, the Great Beings who wield the forces of our world and their Peers who wield forces of other worlds in our Solar System. That is a certain form of the finding of God that I will deal with presently towards the close of my lecture, and the difference between Occultism and Mysticism is, that while Occultism strives to develop the human nature, so that the God within may answer to the God without, in Mysticism the search is not carried out in that manifestation of God that we call Nature and the Beings He has emanated, but that each individual searches for God within himself, and then realises that the inner and the outer God are one.

The object of the search is the same, the methods of the search are different ; but for a moment let me simply make the affirmation that the loss of this key in our modern days in relation to the religions of the time is the great reason why they do not influence as they should the whole life of man. For religion that is real and potent is a thing that cannot be separated from any part

of human life ; the life of the Nation should be as permeated by religion as the life of the individual. You cannot separate off one part of man, the departments which deal with him in his corporate nature, as it were, and guide that by one life and one rule, and the life of the truly religious individual by another. Religion is either everything or nothing. It must permeate the life of the individual certainly, but it must also permeate the larger life-individual, the congeries of individuals that you term the Nation ; and unless religion be as potent in the Nation and in all the departments of its life, as in the individual, then the religion is failing in its purpose, for it is not aiding in that great evolution of humanity into unity, the unfolding of the God within him, which it is the very object of religion to bring about. And so it is written in all the Scriptures of the world, you will find, that Nations, like individuals, should be ruled and guided by religion. " Righteousness," said an ancient Hebrew Teacher, " exalteth a nation " (*Proverbs xiv. 34*), but where righteousness is not in the nation, there that Nation begins to decay, and unless it mends its ways it will perish, as other Nations have perished in the past. And to-day, so great is the difference between the recognised claim of religion on the individual and of religion on the Nation, that you find a late Prime Minister of this great Empire rebuking a number of teachers of religion because they had gone " outside their sphere " and had spoken of politics from the pulpit. But what are politics ? Surely the outer life of the Nation, the corporate action of the Nation, the embodiment of the

principles which that Nation incarnates, the way in which that nation is seeking its national evolution. There is no such thing as a "sphere" of religion. It is all-embracing and all-permeating. There is nothing outside religion which is worthy of search. There is no power without it for the evolution of man. And when, many years ago now, Max Müller said (I hardly know whether in praise or in blame) that in the case of the Hindus they ate religion and drank religion and slept religion and lived religion in everything in their lives, he was only saying what is really a commonplace of what the life of a Nation should be, for the principles that are based on a true endeavour to find God are the principles on which a Nation must seek to climb the path of evolution that ends at the footsteps of His throne. Unless that be realised, unless politicians learn that their politics must be religious, unless merchants learn that their trading must be religious, unless lawyers learn that in the courts they should be the exponents of divine justice made manifest in those courts, then a Nation cannot continue to live, for it is not recognising as a Nation the Source of Life. There is only ONE LIFE in which the whole universe exists, ONE LIFE and ONE only from which a universe is emanated. That great truth, the Immanence and Transcendence of God, is the central truth of every religion. He is immanent in the smallest atom, transcendent in His own infinite, boundless Nature. And if I put it to you this evening that Mysticism and Occultism are the key to religion, I am only really stating what the great Christian teacher Origen said when he pointed

out that the Church of Christ could not exist only as a healer of the disease of sin in man. Medicine, he said, the Church has for the curing of the sinner, but no Church can exist only as a healer of sin. It must have for its walls, for its buttresses, for its roof, the Gnosis, the Gnostics, those who know God, and so are able to spread that life through that Church which is intended to awaken the God-consciousness in the minds and the hearts of its adherents. And he pointed that out very strongly and very eloquently: and the Gnosis is the same as Mysticism—the knowledge of God. Not belief in Him only, not aspiration after Him only, not reverence towards Him only, but the knowledge of God.

Now, as you are all aware—anyhow the elder of you cannot have forgotten it—one of the favourite words of the last quarter of the last century, chosen by Huxley to describe the scientific attitude, was Agnostic—*without* the Gnosis. And, as has often been pointed out, he certainly was not going to deny the name of knowledge to that which science had collected, the great truths that science had proclaimed. He was using the word in the old Greek sense, for the letter “A,” which went before “Gnostic,” is not a denial, remember, but a privative, “without”. He did not deny God, but said: “We are without the knowledge of God,” and he put it on a more sound basis, the only sound basis in that which your logicians call “the universe of discourse”. It was imperfect therefore in its limitation, for he defined what he meant by the word “Agnostic” by saying that man had two ways of gaining knowledge—the senses

which enabled him to observe the outer world, and the mind which enabled him to collect these sensations, to work upon them, to classify them and to reason upon them, and so by a process, logical in its nature, gradually to learn everything that was within his reach. But he said that man had no faculty whereby he could go beyond that which the senses taught him and that the mind built out of the impressions made upon the brain by the outer world examined by the senses. He did not consider that when he had made those two ways to knowledge clear there was any third way available for man to tread. And so he used this word "Agnostic" as describing his own position, and looked on the unknown as unknowable, where it transcended the possibilities of those two instruments of knowledge. If that were a true analysis of man, and if there were nothing more in him than the senses of the body which observed, and those powers of the mind which studied the results of the senses, and from that study gradually worked out a knowledge of all external nature, if that be a true definition of man, then the search after God is hopeless and the finding of God impossible.

In some of the very ancient Scriptures of the world, nay, in all Scriptures, ancient or comparatively modern, you will find the assertion of a third part in man's nature, the very essence of that nature, that which above all else makes him Man, and makes him able to realise the God within, who is himself. And that is the true nature of man, which is not a duality but a trinity, in which the essential human quality is that eternal Spirit

unfolded in its triple form in man, and not to that extent in the lower lives that are climbing up the long ladder of evolution. It is said—not in the Scripture I was thinking of, which I will quote in a moment, but in a commentary on one of the great Scriptures of the East—that the One, the One Life spoken of always there as Brahman, that THAT manifested in the mineral merely as existence; in the vegetable as the germ of feeling; in the animal as the germ of mind; but that in the man that Spirit could look before and after, had memory and had anticipation, and although but germinal in humanity it was the perfect reflection of God Himself (*vide* Sayana's Commentary on the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*). And there is one very very beautiful verse, it seems to me, in a Hebrew Scripture, in one of those books called Apocryphal—I really do not know why, for they contain some of the most wondrous teachings in the whole of the Hebrew Testament—it is said in a book of that Apocrypha of the Hebrews that “God created man in the image of His own Eternity”. That is a phrase worthy of deep consideration, and the separating of it from a word often used as though equivalent, although surely different, the word “everlasting”. You read of “everlasting life” in many a Scripture, but everlasting life would not be necessarily “eternal life,” if there were anything apart from the ONE ETERNAL whence all comes forth. Everlasting, as I said to you last week, only means lasting for an age. Eternity, eternal life, is Self-existent, Ever-present, knowing neither beginning nor ending. It is sometimes called “the Eternal Now,” for,

as it is defined wonderfully by some of the great Mussalman teachers of the ninth and tenth centuries, there is in the Eternal everything conceivable and inconceivable by us, that has the possibility of existence, everything that has been, everything that is, everything that will be, existing in one marvellous unity, ever existing, but manifested fragment after fragment. So it is also written in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, that that which does not exist cannot exist, and that which exists exists eternally ; and again we may read : " I established this universe with one fragment of Myself, and I remain." That which is a fragment of the Eternal must be eternal in its own nature. There is but one Eternal Life Self-existent, without beginning or ending, and a fragment of that Life is in every one of you and ensures your progress to perfection ; not only to human perfection but far beyond it ; and if you are inclined to challenge a statement which seems so audacious, let me remind you of the command of your own Great Teacher, the Christ on earth, when He gave that command to His disciples : " Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect " (*Matt. v. 48*). And we need to be eternal for so gigantic a manifestation of God. Germinal in us, we must admit, but none the less the true definition of man is that man is an Eternal Spirit, coming into contact with matter in a universe, in order that, as a seed of divinity, he may unfold all the possibilities of his divine nature. For just as a seed is the promise of what it shall be, just as an acorn is the promise of an oak, so is that fragment of divinity in man the promise of the

Divine Man, into which we all shall climb. Then we have to go a step further in our thinking, lest we should think that ought exists except God Himself, and that is to remember that in His manifestation in a world, in a universe, He manifests as a duality—Spirit and Matter. There again you find the same thing in your own Scriptures, where you have at the beginning of the first chapter of *Genesis* the sentence: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (*Gen. i. 2*).

Since God is the source of all that exists, we realise that that word "waters," the old symbol for Matter, is one phase of the manifestation into which the Life itself shall be breathed, and that Matter itself is permeated by that Life. Now, in the ancient Sankhya philosophy in India, that is put in rather a curious way. The Sankhya looks on matter in the ordinary way of being immobile in itself, left to itself, but possessing three attributes which belong to every tiniest fragment of Matter and to Matter as a whole, and one of those is resistance, and another, the second, is mobility, the capacity of being moved, and the third rhythm, or regularised mobility—vibration, as the scientists call it. When the Sankhya is trying to trace out the evolution of a universe it starts with these two ideas, Spirit and Matter, and it says that Spirit in propinquity with Matter vivifies Matter and sets it to work according to these three essential qualities that I have mentioned. It is peculiar in the wording, because the word propinquity seems to be peculiarly inapplicable to the Omnipresent; but what can you do when you are dealing with beginnings in human language,

the beginning of a universe, except in using inadequate phrases in order to give people some idea of what you are trying to symbol forth? So we may well regard this universe of ours, as a German poet called it, as "the Garment of God," the Self-emanated Garment of God, as it were, God in manifestation. And you will remember how in the Greek description of God He was the True, and the Good, and the Beautiful, and it was taught that in all the Nature that we see around us God is manifesting as Beauty. And the more science searches into the recesses of Nature, the truer is that ancient Greek idea of God as Beauty when He manifests in a universe, for the more you search into Nature and the more piercing the sight that you create by your microscope and your telescope, the more does the Beauty of that immanent Life shine forth upon you with a perfection, with a wonder, with a marvel, in the minutest fragments of that Matter-Life which has come forth from the Divine Beauty.

After looking at it thus, we begin to realise how the Eternal Spirit, having made man in the image of His own Eternity, sows this seed of Himself, as it were, in the great ocean of Matter, which is only a side of Divinity itself, and how the two are correlated together, and how the three great qualities in man answer to the three characteristics of Matter, and each aids each in the unfolding of the powers of the Spirit. The more we look into this the more we can realise our nature, and realise what this fragment of the Eternal Spirit in ourselves is, what this trinity in manifestation, though it is unity in the Eternal Divinity. And we find that man is

a being who can act, a being who can become conscious of his own nature, a being who can create, and we realise that in that triple nature of man we have, only in miniature, that Life which manifests in the emanation of universes, incalculable in their number, manifestations boundless in space. Then we begin to learn that these powers in man develop gradually in the course of his evolution, that they show themselves forth more and more as man evolves higher and higher, race after race, sub-race after sub-race, and we see in this human being an unfolding God, who needs nothing to be added to his powers, but only the touch of the matter which enables them to show themselves, and that matter is only the apparatus waiting for the impulse of the Life, the Divine Life which is Spirit, unfolding itself through the mechanisms which this living matter, matter permeated by Divinity, makes for the use of the powers infolded in the God within. That is more clear if you will look at Nature for a moment in its ordinary manifestations that you can study around you on every hand ; because one of the great secrets of the way in which a man may become either an Occultist or a Mystic, according to his temperament, is that he has in him, in his material encasements, all the apparatus that he needs for the unfolding and manifestation of these hidden divine powers within him. He has not to make his apparatus, although he can improve it very much by co-operation with Nature and the knowledge of her laws ; so that that co-operation may be wiser and quicker than the evolution carried on without the guiding intelligence of

man, for that guiding intelligence working in a realm of law can walk freely in that realm of law, if only he understands the laws and, as a great scientist says, "conquers nature by obedience".

You cannot violate a law of Nature, for every law of Nature is a manifestation of Him who emanated a fragment of Himself to form a universe. You cannot violate law. You may say: How then can I be free, surrounded by a complex of inviolable laws? The answer is: By learning those laws, by understanding those laws, and whenever you want to act, by balancing against laws, which oppose that which you desire to carry out, other laws which neutralise them, and utilising the laws that will enable you to carry out your will. The human will, surveying those laws of Nature, the human intellect understanding the workings of those laws, may choose out from the great complex the laws which balance each other if they are brought into opposition, can choose out those which serve his purpose when that purpose is conceived, and so may render Nature his servant and not his master, can unfold her secrets, can utilise her powers; for material Nature is the servant of the Spirit, and the spiritual intelligence of man is master of all these laws in Nature.

But the apparatus is there, I said; you can see that for yourself if you will look around you. Take a baby. A baby cannot walk, and yet he has muscles, he has nerves, the whole muscular apparatus is ready there for him to use, and the only reason he does not walk is that he does not know how to use it. It is not the

lack of the apparatus, Nature has made that for him ; but how shall you make him begin to use that apparatus ? I spoke just now of will, and will manifesting in our lower world is what we call desire ; and by the awakening of desire in the child you induce the life within him to put forth its vivifying power. If you are a very unwise person, whether mother or nurse, you try to get the child to walk too soon by artificial means, by holding him up a little, by giving a hand which may help him to walk ; but if you are wise you leave him to Nature, and you dangle in front of him something he wants and cannot reach. Knowing what awakens desire in the child, use some bright object, some toy, and he will desire that and desire to reach it, and, finding he cannot reach it as he lies, he will begin to try to move himself, the instinct of the life within him. As he desires and strives, as he wishes to gain the object, and the life flows into the apparatus, first he begins to crawl a little, and then gradually he tries to lift himself up, and he falls, over and over again, but still the life makes its efforts and still the apparatus grows stronger under the impetus of the life, until at last he rises on his feet, until at last he learns to balance himself by the apparatus given him, and he walks securely. And that is true of all your bodies and not only of the physical. In your brain you have organs that your life does not yet much permeate, and therefore they are called " rudimentary " ; but as the life uses its unfolding powers and desires certain knowledge that it has not, that desire (which is only will in the lower aspect) begins to exert its impulsive forces,

and you can bring the rudimentary organs of your brain into action, if you have patience, if you have perseverance, if you are able to show that sublime patience which William Kingdon Clifford once said is the characteristic of the investigator. You cannot hustle Nature; she won't stand it. Great patience is wanted to bring the various mechanisms of your various bodies into working order and under effective control. Nature does it for you in the course of many millennia, and that is a safe way of doing it. At the stage the human race has reached now, that apparatus has grown very considerably, and can be utilised more easily by those who study and understand; but there is always a danger in going faster than Nature is prepared to go, and there comes in the need of teachers for those who would quicken their evolution. You have teachers when you are learning psychology, the laws of the mind, and you need teachers when you learn the higher psychology, the laws of the unfolding of the Spirit and the adaptation of the apparatus to his needs. And so again it is written in one of the ancient books that you will think I am very fond of quoting, addressed to man in the average condition: "Awake, arise! Seek the Great Teachers and attend. For verily the path is narrow; verily it is as narrow as the edge of a razor" (*Kāthopanishad*, § I, Part iii, 14).

And this is true of all the forms of science which deal with some of the great powers in Nature. The hidden forces of Nature have to be explored at a certain risk, whether in the physical world or in the higher worlds, the subtler worlds which interpenetrate the grosser

matter. Every great investigator into Nature in the early days did it at great risk. Remember Roger Bacon in the course of his chemical investigations, how he was stretched unconscious on the floor of his cell, how he blew out an eye, blew off one of his fingers, and so on. That is where there is a great advantage that your young chemists have at the present time having a teacher, so that the dangers of experiments are understood and proper precautions are taken that they may not hurt or injure the experimenter. And those who are called the Great Teachers, those whom we Theosophists call the Great Masters because They teach, with Those the same conditions are necessary, the same in their nature as the care that you would give to warnings of a scientific chemical professor, and They teach because They have trodden the road and know its dangers and can guard their pupils from them.

Looking for a moment at that possible rapid advance of man, let me recall to you a passing statement I made last week about the appearance of a new sub-race in America. We all have, as you know, what we call the five senses. We have touch, from which the others have developed. We have taste, smell and taste are rather of the same order ; and we have sight and hearing. But we have found that these senses can be intensified by Nature in the course of sub-races by the individual, if he chooses to use the laws of the worlds to which they belong. Now I spoke—you may have thought that I made a mistake when I spoke of your bodies in the plural ; you have your physical body—it is the great

organ of action ; and you have a body which is of a subtler matter, which is the organ of feeling ; and you have a body of still subtler matter, which is the organ of thinking ; organs in matter answering to the stages of consciousness. There again in your Scriptures you will find hints and suggestions of these. S. Paul threw out several suggestions of this ; at one time he said we have a body terrestrial and a body celestial,¹ and in another case he spoke of " being clothed upon " (2 Cor. v. 1-4). I need not take you through the many cases in the Scriptures, but S. Paul, you must remember, was one of the great apostles of the World Teacher who gave Christianity to the world, and those great World Teachers always left behind them when they left this physical world—or went into retirement from it would be more correct—they always left behind them a certain band of disciples who knew more than the crowds around them. Remember how the Christ would sometimes say to His disciples that He spoke to the people around Him in parables, but to them by explanation (*vide Luke viii. 10 ; Matt. xiii. 11, etc.*). Remember that verse, laid much stress upon by some of the great early Fathers of the Church, that He spoke to His disciples " in the house " after He had left the crowd outside, and how He said to them : " To you it is given to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom of God." You find accordingly

¹ " All flesh is not the same flesh. . . . There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial ; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. . . . There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." . . . (1 Corinthians xv.)

in the early Church that there were certain Mysteries to which the entrance was very, very carefully guarded, for the old proclamation made to the candidates for the Mysteries, as given by S. Clement of Alexandria, stated : " Those of you who have for a long time been conscious of no transgression after having received the hearing of the Word, let them come forward and learn the teachings given in secret by Jesus to His disciples." That was the great tradition ; not written down where it might be betrayed, but passed from mouth to ear, passed from teacher to pupil, the hidden Mystery of Christianity, that which produced the Saints in the Middle Ages and the Seers and the Mystics ; those who could see the world unseen by the eyes of the flesh ; those who could leave the body and come back to it and learn the things of the unseen.

Now, in that new sub-race that I spoke of, this intensification of the senses is manifest, specially on the West Coast of America, where the atmospheric conditions are peculiar and the electrical tension, as it is called, is very high. You will find a very large number of people there who see colours, for instance, when music is played. For the matter of that, the late Queen of Rumania said that whenever she listened to music she saw colours, and some people over here will tell you that the blast of a trumpet gives a scarlet colour and so on. These are all details and of no importance, but it shows a certain growth in evolution when this intensification of the senses makes visible and audible that which is not visible or audible to the average person.

When I was lecturing on the West Coast of America I found it was practically unnecessary to talk to them about this invisible world nearest to the physical—nearest, that is, in density of matter, more subtle than the physical—for so many of the audience saw colours that it was only necessary to explain to them what they were seeing ; they had a slight intensification of sight, but they wanted to know what the colours meant, a very natural and proper desire when they were confronted with phenomena they did not understand.

There is a peculiar school of thought in India which enables people to hear sounds which ordinary people do not hear, and from that school I have had many people come to me and say . We can hear the sounds, but what do they mean ? Again a quite natural and proper desire. It is of no use hearing sounds that mean nothing, or seeing colours that say nothing to you ; but it becomes exceedingly interesting as regards the evolution of mankind, if you find that there are being born at the present time a considerable number of people with these peculiarities, because from the inner standpoint that means that not only are they intensifying but also increasing very much the range of the powers of vision. Almost everyone you know does it if he is thrown into a mesmeric trance, because when the outer life is silenced for a time the inner life shows itself more readily ; and so some of the scientists in France, who have carried on those experiments in hypnotic trances, will tell you that they can trace the feelings of their patients by the colours they see, and they can produce particular colours by

stimulating certain feelings. Unfortunately, one of the easiest to stimulate is anger, which shows itself as scarlet. Now the interest of all this to us is not the mere fact that it can be done; these are only so many more phenomena added to the vast number of the endless phenomena of the universe around us; but science is beginning to look into, to investigate the results, or some of the results, of ether movements.

Long ago Sir William Crookes—in one of those sudden insights into Nature which we call genius—when he made in 1891 his table of vibrations, pointed out that there were great gaps in our knowledge of the results produced by vibrations; that we could find certain notes, average notes, that everyone can hear; but as their vibrations became more and more rapid, moving in more and more subtle matter, they still go on producing sounds, and only a few people can hear them, and presently you can have a vibration going on around you and no one hears any sound at all. And he pointed out that all these unknown vibrations are going on around us all the time, but we are insensible to them because we have not developed in ourselves the organs whereby we can respond and reproduce the vibrations in our own bodies; and he suggested then that probably they worked in one of the more subtle forms of matter. And when people talk to you about telepathy, that seemed to be a suggestion that thought could travel along certain lines of waves to which some people could respond and others could not; and the whole of that has been very largely cleared up for you as a theory by

your wireless telegraphy, as you can throw out sounds and waves into space and they will find their way without the wires which in the old system of telegraphy were necessary, so that people are becoming less sceptical as to the transmission of thought without wires than they were in the times when it was thought to be either a superstition, or a mere imagination of some foolish dreamers. And while people have been led on to that by finding that when a person is in a hypnotic trance that person can see and hear at a distance, there is many a sceptic as to the many forms, that are talked about by Theosophists at the present time, of the forces of Nature. We find that people sceptical as to this become quite believers in some others, as many of them as orthodox science has discovered and can utilise; for that is a peculiarity of the average mind, that it will accept the authority of science, but it will not accept the authority of a science it does not know. And yet religion has often spoken of this. How do you suppose that your prayers, whomsoever you address, whether to Angels or to Saints or to some Divine Manifestation, can be answered but through kinds of wireless telegraphy going into worlds of subtler matter than our own? All these old things that people used to laugh at in religion are beginning to be justified by the scientific investigations of to-day; and who shall dare to say how far these examinations shall extend, and how much more of religious teachings will be justified by the experiments of modern science? And Occultism is only a form of science that goes a good deal further than these experi-

ments that science is making from below, because it begins with the culture of the human Spirit, and also with the more subtle evolution of the physical body. It learns of subtler forces, and it learns that behind all these forces there are Mighty Beings who manipulate them for the evolution of mankind and for the evolution of the world; and along that line many a man and woman is going to-day who desires to serve the world and to quicken the evolution of mankind, for it is written: "Sooner shall a man roll up the ether like leather, than destroy misery except by the knowledge of God." This is supremely true, and the Occultist takes that way that he may be a better servant of the world, that he may be enabled to quicken the evolution of the races around him, and take advantage of every opportunity to lift them a little nearer to the great Source of Life. For Occultism can only be successfully followed, if it is to be followed without danger, by treading that ancient, narrow Path, about which I just quoted an ancient saying. For if you begin to try to find out the Divine Spirit in the workings of outer Nature, you can only do it by training yourself along definite lines, by learning to control the mind, so that it becomes an instrument of your will; by learning to control the desire-nature, so that it becomes silent and only moves at the command of the will; by growing indifferent to the ordinary pleasures and pains of the man of the world—becoming dispassionate, as it is called—that means that you are not attracted by the outer material pleasures and that you are not alarmed by the outer material pains; that

you are learning to raise your centre higher, where pleasures and pains are only means of evolution, tools to be used by the Spirit which is your-SELF ; you must get rid of the feeblenesses and the weaknesses of human nature in its evolution, and find the true bliss which is only in union with the Divine. And so again it is written in an old Scripture : " Only in the peace of the senses and the tranquillity of the mind can man glimpse the majesty of the SELF."

And the other method, that of Mysticism, is the endeavour to find the God within you, and that demands a somewhat similar discipline : the learning to realise that all which in you changes cannot be the Eternal ; that your changing moods of mind are not the Eternal ; that your changing passions, your likes and dislikes varying with circumstances, varying with persons—these cannot be the Eternal which you seek ; and as each of these comes before you, you put it aside and you say : " Not this ; not this." So you go on and on with all the faculties of body and mind, denying that that which changes can be identified with the Eternal, until in one wonderful moment, when you have for an instant gained that steadfastness of the centre of the God within you, when everything is dark and silent around you and you feel the terrible loneliness, when all that is familiar disappears—it is then that for a moment through that dense cloud that surrounds you, you see for an instant the Glory of the SELF, know that the SELF is you, that you yourself are Divine.

Though the clouds of life may gather around you once

again, the troubles and sorrows of the world may again assert their power to give you pleasure or pain, you will never forget that mighty experience, and you will know that THAT is your Eternal SELF, that all the rest is transitory, that all the rest shall pass away.

And so Occultists and Mystics come to the same goal at last, walking along different roads but finding the same realisation. Then there gradually grows that wondrous experience that knowing the God within you is yourself, you see the God around you in every human being, and you know that in the lowest criminal it is only the outer coating of ignorance which leads him into wrong, that God is in him as much as in you, for He is present everywhere in the lowest criminal as well as in the highest saint, and then you learn not to condemn, not to strive to correct, another but to help him. You identify yourself with the Self within him, and you become a helper but never a condemner; and thus it is that gradually the Divine within you unfolds; thus it is that step by step you climb that long ladder which leads from the lowest to the highest; and the glimpses that you have had will make you a helper of your brothers, not giving them the truth, for you cannot give a truth that is not in them, but clearing away some of the obstacles which prevent them from unfolding that inner life. Then it is that all the world becomes beautiful; then nothing that happens really matters; for you are eternal as God Himself, and for the ETERNAL there is neither time nor space.

LECTURE III

THE EDUCATIONAL KEY

FRIENDS :

We have come this evening to the second of the Keys for which we are looking, the Educational Key, and at this time particularly, among the public, there is very much, a quite unusual amount of, discussion going on as to what is really meant by Education, and also as to the object of Education and the methods by which that object can be most readily, most effectively, attained. And there is no subject which can more justly exercise public attention than that of Education, and more than ever perhaps to-day is it a subject of enormous importance, because we are standing at the place where great changes are going on, changes in religion, in politics, in social matters, and one might almost say that the last-named is the one which is the most vitally affected by the education of the young.

It is natural that our answer to the question of "What is Education?" should be very largely determined by the standpoint that for a moment we are taking. If we look at it from the standpoint of the person to be educated, then the best education would be that which gives him the fullest opportunity of increasing the speed of his evolution by growing, as much as is possible during this

life-period, in everything that increases his human and noble qualities and eliminates the lower qualities of his nature. And if, instead of looking at it for the moment from the standpoint of the individual—although I am not sure that it does not come very much to the same thing in the end—we look at it from the standpoint of the Nation, and by that I mean the organised Nation, from that standpoint the great object of education is to make a good citizen.

Now what is a citizen? If we look at it in the very meaning of the word, we may, I think, fairly say that a citizen is a man who is not living in isolation but is fit to live in a city: and that idea has come down to us largely from the Greeks and the Romans, who looked on the life of the city as the best human life. A man who is very largely isolated from his fellow-men may have many idiosyncrasies, many roughnesses, many deficiencies, which do not cause any very serious trouble to himself and to his narrow surroundings, if he be living a fairly solitary life away from others, and do not mischievously affect other people. Far higher demands are made on human nature when a man is living in a city—for a city, remember, is only a word, according to that old definition of it, for human society—a man fit to live in the society of his fellows; a man who can so adapt himself to others that he is a helper of them and not an injurer, that he sheds light about him and not darkness, sheds health around him and not disease; a man who bears his share of the common burden and does his best in proportion to his strength to lighten that burden for the weaker

members of the community. And in the old days where the City State was the ideal of the Nations in which such States existed, in those days there was a remarkable equality of citizenship, a very highly cultivated, a very highly educated democracy ; but it had one tremendous fault—it was founded on slavery. The culture, the refinement, the art, the wonderful order of the life of the Athenian, for instance, were based on the property in and the subjugation of his fellow-men. He, the Athenian, scarcely looked on them as his fellow-men, rather he looked on them, as you may see from Aristotle, as an inferior race, a race that could not in any case claim equality with the products of his splendid civilisation. And the way in which his Nation divided civilisation off was very significant : they spoke of the Greeks and the Barbarians. Therefore, it was argued, that, in order to produce that exquisite flower of cultured democracy, it was well worth while to subjugate inferior types to the position of servitude. They, in a sense, made the soil in which that remarkable democracy grew. Their roughnesses enabled the others to be refined. Their ignorance left the others time to cultivate their minds to the highest extent. The very sordid nature of their surroundings, outside their masters' houses, helped in that perfectly polished nature of the Athenian, one, it has often been said, of the highest products of humanity. But inasmuch as it was essentially selfish, although the selfishness included that fragment of the race to which the city belonged, because it was self-seeking and indifferent to the welfare of those below itself, it was a civilisation doomed by the

Law of Brotherhood to perish, because there was no true Brotherhood in the city divided by so strong, so dark a line. Putting that aside for the moment, we can gain an idea of what a city ought to be—without the terrible blot that Athens had on her fair and exquisite life—for all the citizens went through a similar education, beginning at first in the home, then passing on in the care of a tutor to the city school, then when the age of 18, I think it was, was reached, being sent to be trained in military science (for one of the duties of the citizen was to defend his city), and after a couple or three years of that, coming back to the city from the outskirts where the armies dwelt, and being received in stately fashion into the citizenship of Athens; the oath that was then taken by the youth, when his own arms were formally presented to him, was an oath that bound him to his higher duties, to the State, the City, the object of his love, his reverence, his service and his efforts. You will remember how the youth swore that he would never injure his City, but would ever strive to improve it; that he would hand it down to those who came after him grander and not less than when it came into his hands; that he would die in its defence, if need were; that he would obey the laws and preserve the traditions; so that at his very entry into the duties of manhood and citizenship, he bound himself by the yoke of service to his State and dedicated his life to that great work. And strangely enough in these modern days, I read, while away in India, of an idea that is apparently printed or painted on a stone or on a board on the staircase of the Poplar Municipality, where those

who had been elected to look after the affairs of the City had held up to them a noble ideal of citizenship, recalling in its dignity of language and beauty of idea, recalling to my mind that ancient Athenian oath. And then on the man lay the duty of sharing in the Government of his City. He had been educated to be a citizen. The citizens were equal, and every man was bound to take his share in preserving the welfare and in upholding the safety of the City, as he had sworn ; and so any office in the Government might be placed on any citizen, and he could not refuse to serve in it. He had to be capable to take up his place in the executive, or in the legislative council of the City, or in the judicial council to decide cases and to promote justice among the people of the City ; so that you have that high ideal of citizenship, that the citizen is to be a man surrounded by other citizens, sharing the duties of their community, helping to take his share also of the burdens, ready by his education to assume an office to which he might be appointed and with no right of refusal of that office however burdensome it might be. And it was to this high ideal of citizenship that the whole of the education of the Athenian youth was directed.

I spoke of one point which was a great blot on that civilisation—the presence of slavery. There was another blot, and that was the practical ignoring of the citizenship of the woman. It was said that she could not discharge some of the duties of the citizen ; it might very well have been retorted, although I do not know that anyone thought of that retort in Athens, that there were duties discharged

by the women necessary for the welfare—nay, for the very existence—of the City which a man was not able to bear ; for the motherhood of the citizen is surely one of the highest claims to citizenship that any human being can possess. The first impressions on the infant senses, the health of the infant body, the training of the dawning mind and the dawning emotions, these are all among the duties that the mother of the physical body has to discharge, at any sacrifice of pain or trouble to herself. Every mother, in giving a new citizen to the State, goes down into the Valley of the Shadow of Death and walks there alone, and who can dare to deny to the mother who makes citizenship a possibility for the citizens, the right to share in those duties which include the welfare of the man, the woman and the child, without whose co-operation and assistance laws are not just, nor power rightly distributed ?

And those are the two great blots, it seems to me, on that wonderful civilisation, for wonderful it was ; and the lesson we can learn from it, especially to-day, I think, is that the education of the child and the youth must be a preparation for the life of the man or the woman. Education must be shaped so as to make the man fit to live in human society, whether you call it a village, or a town, or a city. These are all human societies, and therefore the supreme object of education is the training of every child who is born into it, so that he may be a blessing to his community, so that he may be a worthy member of that human circle into which he comes.

That is why it seems to me that education just now is

of such enormous importance, because we are going to change our social system, and that fact is patent if you look around you. Whether you welcome it, or whether you would fain reject it, an enormous change is coming over the social horizon. It is sometimes called Democracy, but Democracy itself needs to be defined—the meaning of it. In any case it is going to be a society where co-operation shall take the place of competition; where mutual assistance shall take the place of the more capable, of the stronger, gaining an unfair advantage over the weaker. It is going to be remodelled on the ideal of the family and not of the isolated man, who is an individual fighting for his own hand and thinking of his rights more than of his duties. That note was struck, you may remember, in Europe, by Guiseppe Mazzini, in his wonderful little treatise on man, where he pointed out that Europe had had enough of rights, and it was time that Europe should begin to consider the duties of the man and not only his rights. That wonderful patriot was a Prophet of the New Era, born long before his time, and therefore persecuted and contemned, but none the less his prophecy is working itself out into fact, and however blind some may be to the change of our system, that change is inevitable and the signs of it are everywhere around us; and with the change in the system from competition to co-operation, with all that that means, using the words in the very widest sense, the education must change its character.

Where the society is essentially competitive, the boy and the girl also in school are taught to be good fighters.

They fight for their family as well as for their own hand, but outside that—well, they are not always quite as considerate for the interests of their fellows as if those fellows were bound to them by ties of blood. We have to widen out our idea of the family into the attempt to realise that great eastern teaching, that every elder is our parent, and every contemporary is our brother or our sister, and every younger is our child ; so that, in our relations to the society around us they may be relations of love, of service, of helpfulness, and not of the anarchy that there is to-day, where men fight for position, fight for wealth, fight for individual property for their own advantage, and think but little of those they trample on in their struggle ; albeit the competition is more by keenness of brain than by strength of muscle, the competition of the brain is often as cruel in its workings, if not more so, than the competition of the strong arm ; and the people are beginning to realise it, and many are trying by combinations of clever brains to establish a more secure dominance through wealth in our social system.

That remarkable theory and practice in America, spoken of as the Trusts, where a certain number of clever men try to monopolise a particular trade, a particular business ; or where by clever and cunning speculation they try to “ corner,” as it is said, something that all men want, so that they may, as others have none of it to sell, make what profits the necessity of those around them may enable them to claim ; what are all these things but the fighting of animals in the jungle, where the strongest and the keenest and the most cunning takes the

lion's share, as it is well called, of the prey. But in this case the prey is men and women and children, and the poverty of the masses too often responds to the enormous wealth of the few ; and it is that in which you find, of course, one of the causes of revolution. We want in our education to put a different ideal before our children to begin with, which shall penetrate the whole of their school and college life.

It looks at present in society as though the ideal, the successful man, was a man who could idle away the rest of his life, as though idleness were really a reward, and the more idleness a man could have, the more he was prosperous and happy ; not because he had tired himself out with work, but because he had been able to get so many of his fellows to work for him that, taking a little from each, he had made his fortune grow by leaps and bounds. To hold up the ideal of idleness as success, as a great social ideal, is surely a very serious blunder. Rather in your education do you want to hold up the idea of successful creation of something which increases the comfort, the prosperity and the happiness of mankind, and above all, perhaps, you want to teach the children that happiness does not lie in the multitude of the objects that the person possesses ; that success is not a huge accumulation of wealth, of material objects in a few hands, objects that perish as you use them, objects of which the supply is limited, and therefore there will always be a struggle for their possession, and that success is to lift yourself out of the struggle. True wealth lies in the heart and in the mind, and not in gathering around

you so many objects for your house until it looks more like a bazaar than a place where a man is living. You want to teach the children that simplicity of physical life and the greatness and wealth of mental and moral possessions should be the result of education, and should be the joy of the man who has thus developed—not the things that perish in the using or in the giving away, but all those things that remain after their sharing, and of which the original owner becomes really the richer than he was before when he has shared his knowledge, his sense of beauty, his culture, his refinement, his true “property,” among his fellow-men, and finds the hands he empties to give and to share, are only the fuller after that gift and that sharing have been made. And as that ideal is the contrary of the ideal in which so many of us were brought up, it needs this great change in our educative system in order that we may fit the children and the youths to live in a more human society, than that into which we were born and have grown up.

That education, when we come to look at it, is an education in which the teacher is the helper rather than the master; where he studies his pupil, rather than tries to coerce him into some shape that the teacher thinks he ought to take in his growing; and we have to revolutionise many of our ideas about education, and to realise that it should rather minimise the inequalities of nature than tend to increase them, and to make a larger gulf between members of the same society. For when you come to think, if for a moment you would put words aside, of such a maxim as that of “Liberty, Equality and Frater-

nity," you will find there is no such thing as equality in Nature ; that Nature does not recognise it at all ; that she is rather intent on making differences than identities, and that all the products that she brings forth from her ever-fertile womb are different in their powers, in their qualities, in their characteristics ; and we have to learn and to understand that fact. Nature does not give us equality, physically, morally, mentally or spiritually. There is a true equality when you come to the Spirit, for in that you find the One-ness, but in the vehicles in which that Spirit clothes Himself, everywhere there is the mark of difference and non-equality ; and so it is sometimes said by the politician who defends the phrase "Equality," that it means "Equality of opportunity." But even that does not really make equality, for one of the great differences between human beings is the power to see the opportunity and ability to grasp the opportunity, when it comes into his way. And so in many ways we may very well, I think, disagree with one of his Majesty's Ministers, who lately made a remark that the system of democracy which enables a man to rise from an engine-driver to a Minister of the Crown "is good enough for me." Well, I cannot say that it is at all good enough for me, because such a democracy does not mean that we are trying to lessen the inequalities in Nature, but are simply giving them free scope and play. It does away with certain artificial inequalities like that of birth in a particular social class, but it does not do away with the differences of mental ability, the differences of physical strength, and often of that difference I spoke of,

the difference between individuals who see and take an opportunity and those who let it go by and only recognise it after it has passed beyond their grasp. We want a better democracy than that, and I hope it will be founded and grow in the future.

How then should we set to work on this question, looking at all the little ones that are coming into the world, and finding them so differently dowered by what we call Nature? On this point, while there are differences of theory as to the causes of inequality in religions, and while those differences are recognised in science, the way of dealing with them need arouse no quarrel between religion and science, because both recognise the fact, and education has to be based on that fact. We Theosophists say, as all the elder religions of the world have said, and as many of the moderns believe now, that the real cause of all these inequalities in the little children is the fact of re-incarnation, and that some are very much older in human life than others, when you consider as age the number of lives through which they have passed. Now I have no time to deal with re-incarnation at the moment, and I only want to put to you in two or three sentences what it means in creating these inequalities. The world is the place where we gather experience, and in this world we live for some ten, twenty, forty, or perhaps a hundred years, as the case may be, and during that time we are gathering experience. The opportunities for this may be very full and helpful; they may be very limited and give us little; whatever they are, large or small, great or little, we take the result of these opportunities with us,

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

in the shape of experience, through the Gateway of Death, and it is in another world—that is called by different names in different faiths, I may call it the Heaven World, as that will have a definite meaning for all of you—the world of mind and of thought that those experiences are woven up into faculties both mental and moral. That is about the shortest way I can put it, and the man himself, the Eternal Spirit clothed in matter, comes back again into this physical world with the qualities, mental and moral, that he has woven, during his life in the Heaven World, out of the experiences that he gathered in his previous life period on earth. That is the idea : a succession of lives ; experience gathered in each in the short space of human life ; a very long period in the Heaven World in which those experiences are woven into faculty. You might say that just as you might make a quantity of cloth according to the quantity of yarn you bring into the weaving sheds, so is the human Spirit gathering experience during his short life on earth, and weaving it in the Heaven World into the garment he will wear of mental and moral faculties for the next life. The result of that is that according to the experiences, according to the use made of them, are the man's gradually unfolding powers ; he unfolds more and more quickly as this great chain of lives is passed through by him. The more he has gathered together and woven into faculty and brings back into the world, the greater the progress that he is able to make in that new life-period which stretches in front of him, and so, if you come across a genius who does very readily and easily that which others by reiterated

effort and trouble accomplish worse than he does, the person who believes in re-incarnation does not feel any jealousy, but he says : " He is older than I am ; he has had more experience and more material to change into faculty ; and he is only an image of what I shall be in lives to come, when I shall have gathered more experiences than I have at present, and have changed those experiences into faculties." Similarly, when you see a criminal, you look in exactly a similar way on him, and you look on him as a young student in life's primary school and not yet in the university ; but you do not despise him any more than you despise a scholar in the elementary school, because you say he will pass through the lowest classes and will gradually learn his lessons, and what I am to-day he will be in his own future, cultivated and thoughtful and moral in his life. It is essentially a gospel of hope, of human perfectibility through effort.

Now science comes to very much the same conclusion along a very different road. At one time, as you know, when the doctrine of Evolution was taught by Darwin and Wallace, they looked to the parents to hand down to the children those faculties they possessed. That particular view, founded on an imperfect induction, is gradually passing out of modern science, and other views are being put forward in dealing with heredity, whatever views it has accepted in the past. Sometimes it regards the civilised man as inheriting the social results of a long continued civilisation, and so on : and sometimes it is not able to explain these great inequalities, but still regards

them as the results of evolution, which it is not able completely to trace. Anyhow, we come to very much the same conclusion : the child who comes into our hands is not a blank sheet of paper, on which you can write anything you choose, but he has many things written on him already. He has brought with him a definite character, a developed or undeveloped sense that we speak of as conscience, and we have to deal with him, with the character, with the conscience he brings with him ; wherever he got them from, he has them when he comes into our hands, in the family and in the school. The result is that whether you take the thing from the religious standpoint or from the scientific, you come to very much the same idea : that you are dealing, not with that blank sheet of paper to be written upon, which was the idea of the older educationists before evolution was thought of—the newly-created soul, with whom you must just do the best you can—but with one who comes with a very definite character, sometimes with a very strong character and sometimes with a very weak one. Taking him in this way, then the very first thing you must do in order to educate him is to study him and find out what his qualities are, and watch him with extreme care and with very much intelligence ; and you must no longer have a “ system ”—which is very happily passing away—in which you have a certain definite arrangement and a certain curriculum through which a boy, a girl, a youth or a young man and woman is forced : the same examinations for all of them when they come to a certain grade, the same set of text-books laid down for them, all

of which they must study, and the general idea that it is Education that makes the human being, his essential nature being left out of consideration. Now, you have to consider both, the organism and the environment. It is quite true that through environment you can do a good deal with the organism, but you must also remember that the organism reacts on the environment, is modified by it and modifies it in turn ; and that has been so strongly felt by men of science that you will find there is an axiom very largely accepted, that " Nature is stronger than Nurture," or that the character that comes into your hands is stronger than the moulding you can make of that character by Education. That is really true, and the more we observe the more we recognise it. If we happen to be people who have been brought up under the old system, who looked on that as a proper principle of Education, disciplining the child, teaching the child obedience, teaching him order, and all sorts of things that used to be taught to every child, then you begin to wonder, how, with all the new light thrown on Education by all the modern ideas of religion and the modern advance of science, how you are to deal with this creature who has to develop the germs of what he has within him. I have said you must watch and study the child, and there are many books now that teach intelligent people how to watch, and how to study, and how to draw conclusions ; and more and more the system—if I may still use a rather unpleasant word of the Education of the time—is giving to the child an enormous amount of liberty, and by seeing the use he makes of it, founding a judgment of his char-

acter and of the best ways of helping him, the methods that you should bring to bear upon him which should help and not crush him. I suppose even in England the old abomination of corporal punishment has very largely gone out, but I know a large number of men who boast that they were flogged in their youth at Eton and Harrow, and boast very strangely that they were much the better for it. They are dying out fortunately, and a more humane method of Education is coming in its place.

There are two things a child should never know. One of them is Cruelty, pain inflicted upon him by some one stronger than himself, who, because he has the place of teacher, thinks he may break the child's spirit. I venture to say that a man who wants corporal punishment in order that he may keep order in his school, is a man who has mistaken his vocation, and he would be very much better employed by going out and breaking stones on the highway than breaking the hearts of the children who are entrusted to his care.

And the other thing almost necessarily comes out of cruelty—Fear. No child should ever know fear. When parents and teachers have learnt that fact of enormous importance, then the race of children that will grow up will be very different from those who grow up to-day, who have been brought up in an atmosphere of more or less fear of their elders.

Now, I am not for a moment neglecting the fact that you have parents and teachers who do their utmost for their little ones and love them. They may even speak the truth when they say : “ If I punish the child it hurts

me much more than it does him." I hope it does! It certainly ought to. Fear is a wrong to the child. It is not realised that if a child is afraid his intellectual faculties are numbed for the time, to say nothing of the moral faculties that are wounded. A child cannot do his best if he is frightened; and yet you might be surprised if you knew how many young people, if they undergo that modern fashion of looking into the nature of the child that they call psycho-analysis, will, if they are tested in the ordinary way by association, and the word "School" is spoken, answer, "Fear." In all shapes and forms fear should be unknown to the child. He should grow up in an atmosphere which encourages the growth of everything good that is in him, and gently discourages by want of nourishment that which he may have brought with him of germinal evils; for what you *can* do by Education is to starve out the germs of the lower qualities that the child brings with him and feed the higher qualities that he brings with him, so that as you go on starving the vices, stimulating the virtues—I am using strong words—you will find gradually the evil germs shrivel up and disperse for the want of nourishment, and the others grow and flower because they are richly fed.

Our Education should be turned to that intent, to bring to bear upon the child everything that can stimulate the germs of good; to bring to bear upon the child everything that will gently ward off those influences that will stimulate the germs of evil. Therefore, the surroundings of the child must be full of love, full of refinement, full of gentleness, and full of consideration for others.

Very few tired mothers realise that the child's naughtiness is the unconscious reflection in the child of her own vexed thoughts and tired mind. A child is very receptive; the plastic brain takes almost any impression, and the plastic matter by which mind and emotion express themselves is even more plastic. Ill-temper in parents, even if controlled, affects and irritates the child and makes him tiresome, and that is what we call "naughtiness" in the child.

The next thing we need to do is to give the child full opportunity to choose in order to find out what he wants to know. I want to turn our Education just upside down. I cannot see the sense of teachers, who know a good deal, questioning children who know very little. I want the child to ask the questions and the teacher to answer them, because the child asks questions about the things *he* wants to know and is eager to know. Every one of you must be aware that the child is always asking questions which some of you cannot answer, and you say: "Oh! my dear, you will understand it all when you get older." That is how you explain things to the questioning child. Here even age has not helped you. But the child has faculties, trying to make themselves acquainted through the new body with the world around it, and it is not what the teacher wants to teach but what the child wants to know that he should teach the child. That is why I object to a "system." It should be adapted to the individual child to meet his dawning mind and satisfy his craving for knowledge. There is no difficulty about the attention of the child to the lesson,

if that lesson is made what it ought to be, interesting, thrilling, exciting to the child. The child wants to know. The next thing is, as he has to learn, what it is he should learn. I have had a great deal to do with the Education of children and I know how easy it is to keep the child "good" at school, if only the teacher will be good enough to make the knowledge attractive enough to the child, and coax him on from step to step, until he does not mind a little difficulty, if it is to give him something that he wants to know ; and so, if you take the Montessori system—the principle is right—you must adapt it to the children who are going to use it. Even a wise system must be adapted to the temperaments of the children, and every wise teacher must know her children, and that means that you must not put on a teacher a larger class than the teacher can know individually.

Another error that is very often made in our Education is, that we take the less good teachers for the youngest children, which is just the opposite from what we should do. I want to give the youngest the very best teachers we can get, preferably, I think, educated women rather than men, because they are rather more patient than men are apt to be, and have more of the instinct of meeting the child's confused thoughts and wishes. It is the young children who need the best teachers, that the foundations may be well laid. In any case, do not follow the very bad plan of having, with the lower price of the education, the lowest paid of the teachers, thus generally using the most incompetent. Now I have used a word that should not be used in connection with education—

the "price" of the education. Education ought to be *free*, not only for the little children and the young ones, but all the way up. You will think that rather a terrible idea, if you have not thought it out. It is not the father and the mother who should be held responsible for the training of the child in the matter of "price," because then their poverty or their riches will give to the child either a bad or a good education, though wealth may also harm a child's education by making him too luxurious and inclined to make him think too much of himself. What you want to do with the children is to try and formulate a flexible form of education, and to bring together children of a somewhat similar type who can learn together in class; and to have several classes of the same age and level in the school, so that you may have a variety of teaching to meet the differences of temperament and of age in the children. Then, remember that what you are trying to do is not to train the memory to hold a number of facts, which used to be called Education—you can get those out of encyclopædias—what you want to do is to draw out the faculties and train those faculties to deal with the new facts that the man or woman will have to deal with when he or she comes to maturity, and his Education is supposed to be finished. So many children still, I am afraid, are simply educated, so that their memories retain a certain number of facts. You pour knowledge into them as though they were empty, and they pour it out again in the examination-room, and later on, for the most part, they forget most of it and then go to the encyclopædias when they want to find out a

fact they are supposed to have learnt in the school. The whole object of education is to bring out all the faculties the child has and to make the best of them, the *very* best that can be compassed in the years of education and to suit the type of education to the type of child. First of all you must remember that there are certain natural limits put on the child. For the first seven years of his life his brain is not fit to carry on any processes that can be designated as reasoning. He does to a certain extent argue on the things around him, but the brain has not reached the stage where certain cells by which he "thinks" have sent out those tiny rootlets which come together at their ends, then the dividing wall breaks away and the cells are put into communication the one with the other; it is through these that the reasoning faculty embodies itself in physical matter, and for the first seven years of life it is the body as a whole that needs to be most attended to, and not any special working of the mind along lines of arguing and reasoning. You should not encourage or press the child to do it. It strains the infantile brain. The special cells in the child's brain are growing all the time, carrying on these processes of throwing out the rootlets and joining them together, so that you get a network through which the future reasoning faculties are to be carried on, and which you should leave to grow in the first seven years of life. But the body as a whole should be developed, for if this is neglected, the whole life suffers from it. You want to attend to the bodily needs of the child, to train his power to use his senses and develop them, making them far keener than

they would be if they were neglected at the time of life when, like the savage's senses, they are most ready for training. It is a crime to underfeed a child or to make it overstudy. A child not thoroughly well fed during those seven years of life will never recover what he has lost in his infancy, or be as strong as he would have been if he had had plenty of suitable nourishment and could grow to the utmost of his power. That is where the conditions of some of the children in every city are a disgrace to every civilised land, where children are underfed and ill-nourished, so that their whole life will suffer for the neglect which they underwent, and their poverty in the youngest part of their childhood. You may know that in some of the schools we have in Madras—schools for the very poorest of the population, founded by my predecessor in the Presidentship of the Theosophical Society, Colonel Olcott—we had a medical inspection of the boys and girls, and although we knew many were underfed, because we were used to seeing their little legs like sticks, yet I was horrified to see from the medical report that 78 per cent. of the children were ill-nourished. That is one of the causes of early death, of course, and of the short-lived population. And it is the same thing here, in your slums, only you have awakened here to the duty to feed the poor children before you teach them.

I remember, when I sat for Tower Hamlets division of the London School Board, how the teachers told me of children who had dropped from their forms to the ground because they had had no breakfast, and with the strain of learning—and the often uncomfortable forms,

where the children's legs did not reach to the ground but dangled in the air—they fainted. It is barbarous to teach a starving child, and it is the first duty of the nation to see that the children are fed, and where the children are ill-fed and come under compulsion to the school, you must feed the children as one of the first duties of the nation.

Then during the ages of seven to fourteen years, you come to another life period, where the emotions are strong, where they are developing, and where a little bit later on they will begin to get very troublesome to the young minds which do not understand how to manage them; those years of seven to fourteen are the years in which you want to train the boy and the girl in the morality which is to govern their life. I am not saying it only with regard to sex morality, to inter-sex morality, but in virtue, not in precept, which only tires them, but by stories and by examples. It is during these seven priceless years that the child's emotions are trained, and if you hold up to them great ideals, and if you read to them the stories out of the history of their country embodying the great ideals, if you teach them to train their emotions and stimulate their emotions for all ways of service which are open to them, then when they come to the age when the emotions become difficult to control, they will have a great mass of ideals before them which they have been trying to follow and which will carry them over the most dangerous period of dawning life. You should pick out the stories of men and women who have been of real service to their country and real benefactors, not only

the great kings—many of whom have done more harm than good ; not the great leaders in war—for many wars are not justifiable—but the many heroes of the country, those who have done it the best service and bestowed upon it by their sacrifice the largest benefits. These are the stories that inspire and raise the youth of the country to a high level of life and of desire to achieve. And that comes almost unconsciously. Meantime you are giving the elements of a literary education ; you are not straining the mind and the reasoning faculties, but only helping them gradually and slowly to develop along the easier paths ; when you come to the age of from fourteen to twenty-one, then you may work their brains as hard as you like. Then, with the strong body you have made, with the controlled emotions they have learnt from the ideals you have implanted in their hearts, then you can take up all the literary and scientific sides of education, technical studies, everything in which the brain has to be utilised to the full, and you will very rarely find that the boy and girl—with a healthy body, accustomed to exercise, accustomed to games, accustomed to use their muscles, accustomed to control their emotions—when their brains are well exercised and they are eager for knowledge, you will very seldom find that they go wrong.

It is our Education, or the want of Education, which is responsible for most of the evils of the young amongst us. Let us give them a better Education and they will grow straight and strong. Why even a tree grows crooked if you put a stone or an obstacle in its way, so that as it grows it gets a twist and a twist that can never be changed.

How many a boy and girl are ruined before they are grown up, merely because they are not guarded by their parents and teachers, and inspired to everything that is noble and to the looking with contempt on everything that is base. And probably you will have to decide—although I have not much time to deal with that it is none the less important—whether you will follow the tastes of the child, to train him, to educate him along what used to be called “the humanities,” the literary and artistic, or along the scientific side. You know the mind of people is very much changed on that now in the Universities as to Science. When I was young, then it was all literary pursuits, and I can only throw it out as a suggestion that the scientific education which necessarily, from the extent of science, tends more and more to specialisation, tends to make knowledge very deep on a single subject, but rather to narrow the mind by confining its efforts within that particular pursuit; is there not a danger that, in leaving out the other side of education—which is really culture, I should prefer to say, more than education—which by the study of literature, of history, of human nature in all its noblest manifestations, is it not that which really gives what we call culture, polish, as it were, to the stone, toleration, broadness of mind, which, exclusively confined to science, tends more to narrowness than to breadth? I am not thinking so much of the science which deals with great principles but rather with that science which investigates and which tries to discover and find fresh facts in nature. I know that both are wanted, and in addition many want what is called Tech-

nical Education, which has its value in the nation as much as all the other kinds of science; but whatever type of education you take, do not make it exclusive, but try to give a little knowledge over a wide field, and a full and thorough knowledge on perhaps one special line of thought or work, which the taste or temperament of the student chooses. Remember that a youth must choose his or her own vocation, aided by the teacher's thought but not dominated by it. The old way of choosing the vocation was, if you happened to be related to the Lord Chancellor, to go into the Church, as he had livings to give away; or, if you happened to have someone high in the legal profession, then perhaps the Law would be a good profession for the growing youth; always looking for an advantage in the things that perish instead of in the things which are real wealth, the things which endure. And I submit that unless a youth goes into a vocation which his own nature takes him into, he will never be a happy man in the profession or the line he takes up. There is a joy in work when it is work in which your nature expresses itself. It is toil and drudgery that everyone shrinks from, but the form of labour which gives a man the power to express himself, that will always be a matter of delight, for it is not exertion from which a man or a woman shrinks. Look at them playing golf, and you will see that they will use plenty of muscle in violent physical effort, because they like it. Why not have forms of vocation which are attractive in themselves and minimise the drudgery? And where a thing must be a drudgery, make the hours very short, so that the man

or woman may have time to expand in the leisure which will make the qualities of the human being come out more fully. I do not say you can do all your drudgery by machinery at present, but you will do a great deal more when those who feel themselves full of desire for knowledge and power to acquire it are thrown into these forms of labour merely because they are poor. That is why I say education should be free, for an educated and cultured nation will be far more productive, even in the production of the ordinary articles and necessities of the many, than an ignorant and more or less stupid one. Every child that is born into the world has the right to be surrounded by circumstances that enable him to develop to the full the qualities that he brings with him, and until that is the test of a nation's civilisation, we ought not to be satisfied with the social system of our land. The efforts that you see so much of to-day, the best of those efforts—I do not say that you may not sometimes have strikes that are unjust, unfair and unreasonable—the strike that is brought about by thoughtful men, even when they may ask for higher wages, is not a strike merely for the money in the hand, but for the opportunities of a more human life that that money may give—that the money may give to themselves, to their wives and to their children.

Is it not for us who know how much is added to life by education and culture and refinement and gracious manners, and those things of which the old society had some few fine blossoms, is it not time for us to realise that every child born into a democratic and civilised nation

should have every opportunity that education can give to develop what he has in him? That a child should not be stunted by mere poverty, and that money should not be a question between a child and Education; for you may have a child born rich, whose faculties are very limited, and you may have one born in the slums whose faculties may lift him up to be a statesman in his nation.

Remember that children come to you in helpless bodies; they cannot articulate their wants; they cannot say what they need; they cannot plead that their future would be made the poorer without Education. Ours is the responsibility. Ours is the duty. Ours is the shame if we neglect these things. And a nation is dealt with by the Power that makes for Righteousness, as it treats the children who are born into its homes.

LECTURE IV

THE SCIENTIFIC AND ARTISTIC KEY

FRIENDS :

I have been obliged to take this evening two subjects together in my talk to you, each of which ought really to be treated on a separate evening. Science and Art are clearly subjects so large, so deserving of study, that it would have been only right, if I had had the time, to treat them in two lectures. But I have been obliged to put them together, and they have this at least in common—they are two ways of studying the Divine revelation, the revelation, that is, of the Divine by Himself in external Nature. And that makes a link, as it were, between them ; two different ways of studying the phenomenal universe, of learning from it something of the ONE who emanated it, as a picture, a limited picture, of His own Nature.

Looking at them in that way we may perhaps realise that this Divine Self-manifestation is represented by three of our subjects in this course of lectures, Religion, Science and Art.

Religion, we may say, is the revelation of the Universal Spirit to the human Spirit : a part, a fragment of Himself. And so, glancing at it for a moment

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

in that way, we may recognise the deep truth enshrined in those words of Tennyson addressed to the human Spirit :

Speak to Him, thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet:

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

It is there that the most complete—however limited in fact—the most complete Self-revelation can be made to man of that One Life which he draws into himself as it were, which is the human Spirit, the Divine fragment in himself. And as we saw when dealing with Religion, it is that part of it that we call Mysticism, in which man, descending into the depths of his own being, realises himself as essentially Divine.

When we turn to Science and Art, then we come to the manifestation in the Nature external to man; and sometimes I like to think of that triple manifestation as embodied in the view that the Greek took of the Divine Fount of Life, when he represented Him as the Good, the True and the Beautiful. Good, in the sense of perfect Righteousness, emanating all the laws which help to raise the human to the Super-human, to the Divine. Then the True, sought by the human intelligence in external nature, adding fact to fact, knowledge to knowledge, and catching some glimpse of the Truth of Nature, realising that that Truth is to be found by the human intelligence. Then the Beautiful. Do we not see the effort to realise that in all forms of Art? In the fact that in Nature God manifests as Beauty? And there is nothing of His hand in Nature

around us that has not the impress of the Beautiful upon it.

Acting in that thought, naturally we may strive to make our own faint reflection of Divinity beautiful in human manifestations, as All-Beautiful in the Divine ; and we may realise that the pursuit of Beauty, the worship of Beauty, the living out of Beauty, as far as is possible to us, in that we are a faint reflection of the All-Beautiful, of Him who is essential Beauty, whose impress is on all the works of Nature that we see around us. And so to us Nature becomes a great Revealer, a revelation given to us of the Divine, as it were, by His manifestations as Truth and as Beauty. Thus all departments of our human thought become deified, as we may say. The term, you may remember, used in Roman Catholic theology, where it speaks of the "deification of man"—one of the strongest phrases, perhaps, which it is well that all of us should remember, as to the wonderful possibilities that lie before man in his progress towards perfection ; and that, as you know, is the climax of the Roman Catholic ideal of the Saint. Steps, many steps, are gone through in that long ascent by man, until he reveals his own essential nature as Divine ; and in that process, scientific and mystical at once—called by the Roman Catholic theologian "Interior Prayer"—that is the final step in this process which ends in the deification of man.

In dealing with Science and with Art, we are seeking to learn something of the Divine Nature by studying the emanation of the Divine, that we speak of as the

Nature around us that we know—phenomenal nature. And, looking at that, we find that some of the great Teachers of mankind have laid stress on the fact that Nature, transitory as it is, could not exist were it not for the Eternity behind it. For the Lord Buddha, when He was trying to raise the thoughts of His disciples towards Nirvana—that cannot be described, which can only be reached even by the acutest thought by a continual repetition of “Not this; not this,” of all that is phenomenal in the universe around us—the Lord Buddha gave that great and sublime teaching, that were it not for the uncreated there could not be the created; were it not for the eternal there could not be the transitory; and so led our thought higher and higher till some little glimpse of Eternity, Eternal Nature, came to illumine the darkness of our limited intelligence.

It is interesting to notice that Giordano Bruno—a disciple of the teachings of Pythagoras, such as had come down in traditions in Southern Italy, where, and in the adjacent island of Sicily, the great Pythagorean schools, you will remember, had been founded—he, in working out his philosophy along the Pythagorean lines, urged on the student of Nature, the student of Science, that every fact that he discovered in that Nature was, as it were, a letter of the Name of God. And that word, the “Name,” is the ancient term by which the very science of being is described. It is that which is spoken of in the Egyptian scriptures when it is said: “Who makes his own way according to the Word.” The “Word” which is of the perfection of his nature,

identical in its essence, in its expression with that Eternal Word that the Greeks spoke of as the LOGOS, that we have in the Fourth Gospel under the translation of "The Word." That supreme Word of Nature is written, as it were, in the multi-forms of Nature, that great multiplicity of forms which seeks to image in its totality some faint reflection of the perfection of the Divine Word. And in that ancient way of looking at it we may realise that Nature can be read as a scripture, and that when the scientific man, seeking for the highest verities, studies Nature by means of his mind, by his analytical faculty observes, collects and classifies facts, and then by a great effort of the synthetic intellect passes on from that multiplicity of forms and facts, carefully classified, into the high intellectual conception of natural law; looking at the scientific man with what was rightly called "the sublime patience of the investigator," and his constant search for the true—constantly rejecting the half-truth and seeking for the whole, letting go opinions formed upon an imperfect synthesis, in order to include that which results from the addition of facts which before he did not know—we may recognise that that patient climber is climbing through the seen to the unseen, through the phenomenal to the noumenal, through the outer nature to the inner God. And we may gradually come to look upon his work as complementary to the other forms of investigation which come down from fundamental verities, seen by the Spirit, and so gradually passing through the prism of the intellect, showing their many colours all derived from

the one great Light, the creative power which brings universes into existence. And instead of the antagonism between Religion and Science, which grew out of the narrow sacerdotalism of tradition and put the priest in the position of the prophet of Nature, so that the great conflict grew up in the western world—that which Dr. J. W. Draper sketched so brilliantly and incisively under the title of *The Conflict between Religion and Science*—we, who may be striving gradually to learn how to realise the Divine by seeking in the depths of our own nature that fragment of Himself, we begin to realise that the scientist is not a foe but a helper ; is going to the same goal, although climbing by a different path ; and that the scientists are really the priests of Truth, and are therefore worthy of our reverence, worthy of our gratitude and of our love.

Science, from the modern standpoint of experiment, is very rapidly climbing upward into the domain which, in the separation between the two, has rather been assigned to Religion, and is becoming in very truth, as in the ancient religions, a part of Religion itself, a helper, a servant of the great spiritual truths ; and then we lose the distrust that may have grown out of the European experiences of the conflict between Religion and Science—very largely arising, remember, from the fact that Science was brought back into Europe from Arabia by the Moors, and so came under the banner of an alien faith, not the faith of Christendom—and looking at it and remembering that historical fact, we may let go the notion of a conflict, and see that both are seeking Truth

in their own way, one by the introspection that leads to the Spirit and the other by the observation that leads to that revelation of God to be found in the facts and in the laws of Nature.

In order that we may do this along lines that may be helpful to many, let us remember that in the Secret Teachings of the Jews, of the Hebrews, as in the teachings of the Greeks, we find the continual statement, in dealing with external nature, that "the world of ideas" comes before "the world of forms," only putting in another way the teaching of the further East that all forms are really divine thoughts clothed in denser matter, visible to the physical eyes of men, that thought precedes manifestation and that Idea is the parent of Form. The old scholastic theology, as it is sometimes called, of the Middle Ages had a great deal in it—only the way in which it was put seemed to be quaint and impossible to the ordinary layman and to the ignorant—that there was a difference between the "Substance" of the Idea and the "Accidents" in which that Idea became clothed in our physical world—a view very much mocked at, I know, by the more shallow thinkers, who do not realise what was intended by it in that doctrine which is incorporated in the great central doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, the doctrine of Transubstantiation. There is, of course, no pretence that the "Accidents" are changed, the mere form in which the great Spiritual Idea is clothed; it is the Substance behind those "Accidents," that which is embodied in the "Accidents"—the Bread and the Wine—that has changed,

that has been transformed into the very Life of the Object of Christian worship.

You may, or you may not, agree with the idea, but to think that it is ridiculous is only to show ignorance; and there is a good deal of that, you will find, in the writings of some of the less thoughtful people in the Reformation, where they ridiculed an ancient idea which they did not happen to have grasped.

Now Science is dealing continually with those "Accidents," as it were, and only when it turns to Philosophy, then it does begin to deal with what makes the "Accidents" what they are, what is within these which it can see and feel and touch; but if it has behind it the search for the Real, if under the transitory, and therefore the Unreal, it is seeking for the Eternal, the Real, then that will guide it in the methods of its research, and it will realise that the intellect, in striving to find out the truth, must not forget that it is an aspect of that Eternal Being, who also is the Power that makes for Righteousness, and guides evolution with Righteousness as its aim.

For it is well for a moment to remember that phrase I have just used from Matthew Arnold, because out of the study of history—as you trace the history of civilisation after civilisation, and as you trace the development of all the many forms of organisation which the human races have tried in their upward climbing—you cannot but realise that the decay, the destruction of form after form, is because the civilisation did not embody but blasphemed the Law of Righteousness in human asso-

ciations as Society. Disregarding those fundamental laws, civilisation after civilisation is born and grows and decays and passes away ; and the great problem of our own day is to seek if we can found a civilisation that shall be a Society built in accordance with the fundamental laws of righteous living—a problem which I shall strive, however imperfectly, to deal with on Sunday next.

That Power which makes for Righteousness is the Power whence the human intelligence also proceeds, and in its researches into Nature it must remember that great truth in evolution, that it is mounting stage by stage into a higher and higher humanity, and that that which might have been helpful for the savage is injurious to the growing, to the unfolding divinity in man. For the relation of the lower to the higher in the course of evolution changes its character as the more human qualities develop. We find right through that there is a forcible sacrifice of the lower things to the higher. The mineral decays to make the soil in which the plant may grow ; the plant becomes the food of animal life ; then there comes the struggle in the animal kingdom between the stronger and the weaker, in which so many necessary qualities are developed, so much of possibility for future evolution is brought into active existence ; and when we come on to the higher social animals, there we may find less of cunning, less in some respects of the dawning mind, but we find that social instinct which leads them to defend each other, the stronger to defend the weaker, the males to defend the females, the females to defend

the offspring, so making the first image of a possible society, in which creatures shall live together for mutual help, mutual improvement and safety, and not to prey on each other; there is the birth of the higher human qualities which, gradually evolving, after millennia and hundreds of thousands of millennia, are striving in our midst to-day to assert themselves more definitely and more forcibly. So, in looking at our Science, we cannot but ask the question: Is it on the road of evolution in the path it is following to-day? Or, has it turned aside from that path, and is it using intelligence not to build up society but to destroy it? Is it using its new discoveries not to spread peace and goodwill and happiness among men, but rather to make worse instruments of destruction whereby one nation may destroy another? And we begin to ask: Will our society endure? Can our civilisation last? If, as has been in the past, Science turns along this deadly road of destruction instead of following the upward path of helpfulness and beneficence to men, so that human intelligence becomes degraded in the objects of its research, and loses sight of all conscience, all morality in prosecuting then what it called its "advance" is really its decadence; when we look at some of the methods of Science to-day, then all in us that is compassionate, that is loving, that realises duty to the weak, that knows that strength is given to help and not to oppress; when we see the intelligence of man and his wonderful powers of investigation, armed with the knife that tortures the living animal and tries out of animal agony to wrench from Nature secrets for

the stopping or the alleviation of human pain, then we begin to realise that Science is taking the downward path, and that to take that way to health is to deny the very principles on which evolution is founded; we realise that *human* beings are beings in whom compassion has triumphed over cruelty, in whom love is seeking to triumph over hatred; that no gift should be taken by a true man or woman which was bought with the agony of helpless creatures, who ought to be trained, whose evolution ought to be quickened by human beings, and not be used in their weakness as sacrifices for an imagined good. Nay, even if something could be gained by it, if some knowledge could be torn from those miserable quivering creatures stretched on the board of the vivisector, even then such knowledge would degrade and not uplift, would tend to check the evolution of man in all that makes him man, and to degrade him downwards instead of lifting him upwards towards true knowledge. And I sometimes think that we should not have had so horrible a war and such frightful cruelties as the gassing of human beings and the other abominations discovered for the killing of men had it not been that too many scientists had had their moral sense blunted by the miseries inflicted on our lower brethren. For cruelty hardens and it degrades the human being, and where that is practised we can see it proving worse and worse, until human beings are made the subjects of experiments, and helpless human beings, suffering from some disease which will end in inevitable death, are tortured, even in their last moments, by the infusion

of some other horrible disease, because it is found that the animal results after all are not quite satisfactory, because the animal mechanism is not sufficiently like the human, because the results of the operations on animal tissues are unreliable for human beings and do not yield results certain of success. I do not want to dwell longer on that. You may read the records for yourselves if you will, chiefly in German, Austrian and Italian records by the doctors themselves, and if you want to know what horrors are perpetrated, they are there recorded by the people who have done them. I think that is a fairer way than by studying the subject from those who oppose them root and branch, as I frankly do myself, by reading the records I have myself read.

Apart from that, there are many other forms in which we ill-use animals of all kinds, as you may well know. Sports, in which there is killing: a most astounding thing that a human being can take pleasure in killing harmless and helpless creatures. It is one of the most extraordinary forms of amusement in which to take pleasure, though custom had blunted us to its disgusting nature. If we read about it for the first time in a work of fiction we would not believe it, if we did not know it was a fact amongst ourselves. And there are many other forms of cruelty; if I say that the slaughter of animals for food is cruel, you might object to that statement, but it all comes along the same line, the abuse of those who are placed in our power to train upwards and not to be slaughtered for our personal

satisfaction and pleasure. But even along the nobler lines of Science, where they are dealing with discoveries which really benefit the human race, where we find them searching into Nature in order that they may increase the happiness and health both of man and animals, then we realise also that there are other methods which are mistaken, although not so fundamentally wicked as those I have mentioned, and that is, the general idea as to how health is to be maintained. Is it to be maintained by increasing vitality, by obeying the laws of health, by the care of eating and drinking, by diet which is supplied for bodily rebuilding? or, is it to be sought by creating a kind of balance of poisons and calling that balance of poisons health?

Let me put it to you a little more plainly. People tried to get rid of small-pox by inoculation, and then they found that after all it was not a good thing, and they made it penal to inoculate anybody with the small-pox virus. Then they came to vaccination and tried to get a less mischievous poison from cows and calves, and so on. Then you find that this idea has spread so quickly that we are likely to be inoculated for so many diseases that one begins to wonder if one had not better take the risk of one or more of them than these temporary disablements and permanent lowering of vitality inflicted on us. I do not deny that we may gain a temporary immunity by poisoning. We know it with things recognised definitely as poisons. We know that if people work very much with arsenic that they gradually become immune to arsenical poisoning, and that the

symptoms of arsenical poisoning appear in the man who has been working with arsenic when he has entirely given up and leaves that particular branch of work. I do not say you may not become immune for a time by poisoning yourself up to a certain point, but the question is whether that balancing of one particular poison by a similar poison in a weaker form is health? I submit it is not. It means a decrease of vitality, and it means that the strength of the person is subtly undermined and rendered more liable to many other diseases, even if it should protect him from one for a little while. And that is a question that should be very carefully considered. What is the duty of a man who studies medicine? I submit it is to preserve the body in physical health and not to poison it in order to fight another poison. That is to say, it is his duty to point out the errors we constantly commit in connection with the laws of health, our unwholesome habits of eating and drinking, and by rational dieting. If a man makes himself ill by errors of diet, or excess of any kind, then he is sent off to a Spa for release from his trouble and in order to regain his health. But is it not rather the duty of our doctors to point out where it is that we are erring in our ordinary habits in this particular civilisation? How it is that we are harming our bodies and rendering them liable to disease by our artificial ways of living, by turning night into day, by taking far more food than the body can properly dispose of, by drinking alcohol, and by giving way to excessive smoking, all of which gradually bring on diseases? It is these so-called

“small vices” which lie at the bottom of the poor development of the many men who, during the war, you had to class as “C₃” because they were so far behind the average of health that was wanted for a soldier in the field. I want to see the doctors co-operating with Nature in making the people realise and understand the laws of Nature are the laws of health. I would have you remember that the laws of Nature are not commands, but are inviolable sequences in which one thing follows another. You may change the sequence by introducing some new element, but the law is simply the definite statement that this follows that, and another thing follows that, and so on and so on, bringing about inevitable results; and you cannot change or violate a law.

It is written in a Christian scripture that God is without a “shadow of turning”; and that is true of the laws of Nature, which are the conditions of the One Life. My complaint against modern medicine is that it deals with effects and not with causes.

There is an immense campaign going on to-day against a terrible disease that is sapping the very vitals of Society, a disease which, when I was a child, would not even be named in the presence of an ordinary woman. It is a disease created by “civilisation.” Now you find it—the campaign against it—in the papers, and everybody is asked to help against it. But what does it come from? From the abuse of the sex faculty and not from its rightful use. Syphilis grows out of vicious living, and not out of healthy natural living. It grows out of the exaggeration of that great power of creation,

exaggerated by memory and by anticipation, and by the action of the human mind, which is not found in the animal kingdom but is only found in the human. And where that becomes unbridled, where vice is practised often without shame, where women, themselves refined and gracious and right-living, welcome in their drawing-rooms profligates whom they know to be profligates, how can you expect to escape the terrible scourge of a disease which grows out of the deliberate sacrifice of women, and then sets all your Press and social reformers to work because it has become so widespread that it is necessary to proclaim it everywhere in the effort, in the campaign, to destroy it? You will never destroy any form of disease so long as you disregard the laws of Nature, which are the reflection in our physical world of the Nature of God Himself. It is only by following those laws, which would make us happy if we followed them, that we shall be able to purify civilisation from the evils which are threatening it with destruction. And so I would urge on all of you to use what influence you have to study, to spread right ideas about the relation between man and outside Nature, and so to bring about a Science which shall climb towards human perfection and not tend to drag men down again into savagery and barbarism. That is part of our great work to-day, to put before Science its true duty of helping men and not injuring them, making civilisation brotherly by right teaching, and not by destroying all social union by leaving causes to keep on working whose effects are destructive.

Let me now turn from that to the question of Art, and ask you : What do you really mean by Art ? What do you mean by an artist ? If you come back to that view that every object is the materialisation of a Divine Thought, then you may perhaps be inclined to take the view of the artist that personally I take, that he is a person who sees and hears a little more in the physical sights and sounds around him than does the average inartistic man ; and it is very interesting to look at Art from that standpoint. If you look at men who are craftsmen and not generally called artists, but whose craft has really become an art, you will find one peculiarity with regard to some of the most beautiful productions of human industry, the human products of the East through the hand-loom industry and the use of vegetable dyes.

Now if you take a weaver of Kashmir, and I presume, although I do not know, that the same would be true of a weaver in Persia, you would find that where you saw one colour in silk or cotton he would see many shades of that one colour. That is to say, his eye would discern differences of colour where you see none. Through generations and generations of hand-loom weavers and the putting together of colours near to each other, the eye itself has become developed along that particular line of seeing these exquisite gradations of colour that give you the marvellous results you get where one hue melts into another, and the product is all a wonderful harmony of delicate blended shades. You may wonder perhaps how it is that that skill has been developed and

how it works. The simple fact is that they see more colours than we do, and if you give them some shades of blue they will perhaps see a dozen shades where we only see one. And so in their weaving they put all those shades and gradations in until you cannot see where one colour begins and the other ends, any more than you can in a rainbow. The same is true of some forms of eastern music, as some of you know. In the ordinary Indian scales, as you may call them, you have something like twenty-three or twenty-four different sounds within the limits of your octave. The result is, on the European ear, that when a European first hears Indian music, he makes a great many complaints about it, and says that so many of the notes are "flat." That is because they have so many sounds intermediate between ours, which the Indian musician recognises as musical intervals. The European is not attracted by that beautiful, wonderful playing performed by the Indian musician, as is the Indian musician and hearer. So there again you must have some inner difference in the ear, as in the other case there is in the eye, and that intensification of the natural sight is one of the things that makes the artist—although not to me the greatest thing—the natural intensification of the senses brought on by generations of practice along some special line of sight or sound. In the case of the eye or ear, it is only a very limited form of art after all. You may go further than that, and you may find that a kind of sight can be developed, or a kind of sight can be found probably in any one of you, if you are thrown into a mesmeric or

hypnotic trance, in which a very extended form of sight becomes available to you, seeing over distances over which the human eye cannot see at all, and seeing through substances that to the ordinary eye are opaque. In these things there is no possibility of doubt, as there have been so many experiments that they are familiar to everyone who has studied this subject. You will find there is a great deal of evidence, in French books especially, dealing with these experiments, hysterical subjects mostly, because great tension of the nerves has something to do with the possibility of impressing on the brain the results that would normally pass unnoticed. It is a stage in evolution which is gradually showing itself, especially in Western America, where a somewhat new type is being developed, and where a very large number of people see colours that the ordinary person does not see, as for instance the human aura. And you have to remember, in relation to this, that there is no reason to suppose that the human brain is, as yet, a perfect instrument, because it has in it not only what are called vestigial but also rudimentary organs. The words are sometimes used as synonyms, but they are not one and the same thing ; they are two very different things. The vestigial organs are remnants of the past, while the rudimentary organs are the promise of growth in the future. It is true that an organ which has functioned in the past, but is no longer active, may be utilised for a different function in the future, and may therefore claim both adjectives. And there are especially two parts of the human brain that are much disputed over

just now, because Science has not yet found out their real use. These are the pituitary body and the pineal gland, both of which, many people know by their own experience, can be developed, and will open up new worlds—now open to people in the hypnotic trance—a fact which is curious, interesting and very instructive. It is thought that these two bodies are only vestigial remnants of organs that appeared in the long course of evolution in one or more of the lower animals ; but they are also capable of activity now in another direction, and if carelessly stimulated may bring about disease. The point is so much disputed now that I will not dwell upon it, but I want to put a theory of Art before you ; although I know it to be a fact, I do not want you to take it upon authority. If you talk with some artists you will find they see colours differently from yourself ; they see certain colours where you would see nothing, and they see colours that you do not see in ordinary nature. Mortimer Mempes was an artist of that kind. He painted colours which were like the colours you see in fireworks, like coloured lights, and so much so that people had suspected him in his exhibitions of having had transparencies in his pictures with lamps behind them. It was obvious that he was seeing what we should call astral colours, colours in the world of the emotions ; and one reason why an artist is so often found among people in whom the emotional temperament is very much developed is that he comes more readily into touch with that emotional world, called the intermediate world by people in Religion, or the astral

world, as it has been called for a long time by many students of the subtler forms of matter, or, psychologically, the dream world.

Now looking at that generally we come, I think, to a fundamental idea about Art. If Art be a thing which is studying the forms in Nature and those forms are the results of a Divine Thinker, is not the artist a man who is catching a little more of that divine thought than you and I may be able to do? or to hear, or to see a little more of that divine thought than you and I are able to do? And sometimes great artists have left on record a peculiar form of perception they have had. Take Mozart: I am taking one you can verify, because he has in one of his own reminiscences said that he, in a state which he was unable to understand or identify, but a state which was not his normal consciousness, heard a piece of music such as a symphony all at once, like a splendid chord, and that when he came back into his normal consciousness he had to work that out into a succession of notes. That is an exceedingly interesting as well as true statement. In a picture you see all the colours and forms together and they give you the idea, but the painter has had to paint in those colours one by one. In the case of Mozart, he heard a great symphony as a single impression that he was unable to describe owing to the physical limitations of the brain; then he had to write it all down successively, just as an artist has to paint his picture. It may be a difficult thought to grasp, but it is a very, very suggestive one. And it is worth while, if you are reading biographies of artists, to look out for things of

that sort, and you will sometimes find indications of powers of sight and hearing that we do not possess unless we have developed them by means of certain practices of Yoga.

Looking at it then in that way, we may see great possibilities for Art opening out in the future, and we may see that in some of the modern attempts to create new forms of art there may be people who are struggling and trying to bring into the limitations of our so-called three-dimensional space things that they see, thoughts and feelings outside of those limitations. To some their efforts may seem grotesque—seem so, I say, for perhaps there may be people here who are instructed in these things and can see more than most people can in a cubist picture. I am not at all sure there is not a struggle to represent what the artist is groping for through a higher sense and is partially seeing, but is not able to bring into proportional relation with the physical images; that he is trying to represent his sensations and not only the object which caused them. And if he is thinking along that line, even unconsciously, then it is profoundly interesting. If he is trying to see the effect of an object on him, and not what another person may see in that object, then there is opening out a line full of possibilities of the most wonderful character; and there is one thing in connection with that I should like to mention to you about Eastern Art, especially Japanese Art, where you find a vividness of action, of movement which is really beyond the kind of vivid action you find in Western paintings as, say, with a race-horse; in that case the

Japanese artist is not painting from a model—and after all the European artist cannot very well paint from a model of a racing horse—and if you take a photograph of a horse racing you will see the legs in awkward positions which you have never seen, because your eye cannot register on the brain all those different successive motions that you see and blends them into a curve.

Now an eastern painter does not as a rule paint from a model, unless he is westernised. What he does, even for a portrait, is to study the person, to try to watch him in all kinds of different moods, and then to paint the impression made on him without the person being present. He does not paint him as a sitter—he paints his picture. Very often, I am told, there may be in his picture an anatomical feature which is a mistake, but you get an admirable likeness of the person, and that difference of method is interesting. The artist memorises the face as he has seen it in many different moods, and he gives you a kind of synthesis of these, representing the person, and so you have a picture which brings that person vividly before you, although it may not be exactly like him in any one impression that you have had of that person: it is a picture, and not a photograph.

Now many great artists do something of that over here; I do not know how they do it, but in the East they memorise, and they do not copy direct from the sitter. And after all, when you come to creative imagination brought into Art, there surely you get a higher form of Art than when you get an exact reproduction

of an actual thing. I know there is a great deal of difference of opinion, and I am not dogmatising and saying that my opinion is right; but I submit to you that the imaginative work of Art is greater and is as artistic as copying exactly what Nature has done more perfectly than any artist can possibly do. I want from the artist something more than I can see for myself. I want to see what he sees with his larger sight than what I see with mine: something more of the Divine that is embodied in that form than I am able to see. And you get instances of that. One that I very often mention is the wonderful *Madonna di San Sisto*, one of the most wonderful pictures in the world. It is not an actual likeness; and there is a picture of Raphael painting it, and you might say that his model was not very much in particular, that the mother was not particularly beautiful nor perhaps was the child. But what has the painter really done? It seems to me that what he has really done is to create an ideal of Motherhood and an ideal of Infancy; not like any particular mother or any particular child, but one so wonderful in its beauty that when you see that picture you seem to see Motherhood, and not a woman; you seem to see Infancy, and not a child. And that seems to me to be the very highest form of Art. Why should we want Art to give us what we can see for ourselves? We want Art to give us something of that Eternal Beauty which is mirroring itself through great and noble human emotions; for the effect of that on the mind is not only that you have enjoyed with your emotions that wonderful picture,

but it is that you carry that with you into the outer world, and when you see a peasant woman and her child you see in her Divine Motherhood and you see in the child the wonderful beauty of Divine Infancy. You learn to idealise from the great ideal that the painter has revealed to you, and in a way that is more beautiful than you yourself could see, and you enter into a world where the Divine Power which underlies all great emotions and all noble thoughts manifests itself in a perfection that most of us cannot reach.

So I long to see in all Art a reaching out into a greater and wider and more idealistic world. I believe that the Key of true Art lies in that evolving faculty in man that will unfold in him the higher senses and open to him wider and more wondrous and more beautiful worlds. If any one of you can realise for a moment what it is to live in a world of beauty while you are asleep, and then to return to the present house of the flesh, you will realise what it is that I am longing to see developed in our artists—the power to see where many are blind, but which in time all shall see as they evolve into greater perfection of humanity. And so the Artist is the Priest of the Beautiful, as the Scientist is the Priest of the True, and as we look at them we see we are evolving and climbing higher and higher and becoming more and more divine, and that as we are building a nobler civilisation and making a more beautiful society we may look on those two great classes of human beings as forerunners of a more wonderful world. Only we would implore them to look upon the work they are

doing as sacred, and not to bring it down to the baseness of lower humanity, but to raise it up to the divinity of perfect Truth and of perfect Beauty. Then we can mount on their wings and find ourselves lifted by their power, so that we too shall evolve more rapidly and the world become—more perfect, I was going to say—a less imperfect vision of the King in His Beauty.

LECTURE V

THE KEY TO A HUMAN SOCIETY

FRIENDS :

We come to-night to the last of this course of lectures, which, as you know, bears what you may think a somewhat curious title, "A Human Society." The implication of that fairly obviously is, that our present society is not worthy to be called a "Human" Society. It is a social anarchy, not a social union. And if you look around you at the present time, there are plenty of proofs of that rather blunt statement as to the condition of Societies called "civilised" in our world of to-day. For, wherever we look, almost whenever we take up a newspaper, we read of some new struggle, some fresh strike, some breaking out of a quarrel between employers and employed, between class and class, between nation and nation. Such a condition of things is surely not worthy of humanity, of humanity with a brain to plan, with a heart to feel: a Society in which large numbers are miserably poor, in which some are—I was going to say—miserably rich. For one hardly knows which is the worst condition for a human being, intelligent and moral: to be so poor as not to be sure of even food and clothing and housing, or to be so rich that no wish remains unsatisfied which can be bought by money, which can be

gained by expenditure. Both of these conditions are demoralising to human beings. Neither condition should exist in a Human Society.

I am going to ask you this evening to face the facts of the time, not from the standpoint of formed opinions, but what one might call the elementary facts of the situation. To consider whether it is always to be true that Society must include those two extremes, the poor and the rich, the ignorant and the cultured, those who suffer from want and those who suffer from surfeit. Surely it is possible to escape from such a condition? And I want you to think what the price is that we must pay if we desire to put an end to a condition of things supremely irrational, and try to found a Society where men shall really be a Brotherhood, and where co-operation and not competition, mutual helpfulness and not mutual struggle, shall be regarded as the law, the condition in a civilised Society.

And we have to look, as I say, at certain facts.

Firstly: Is there no limitation to what we call Freedom? Is it consistent with a reasonable Society that a handful of men should be able to cripple a vast industry, to threaten to starve, or to deprive of water, or to cripple the means of transport from one place to another, even because a certain number may have a grievance? Is there no better way of removing the grievance than a partial paralysis of the social life? And when we talk of freedom, do we really mean the freedom of everyone, or for one conglomeration of human beings to injure others for their own advantage? Should there not be some

limitation to this in a civilised Society? As a mere matter of dry fact, only the savage is physically free, and even he is kept to some extent in order, either by some savage stronger than himself or some conspiracy of savages individually weaker but as a group stronger than the tyrannising individual. It is well, I think, that we should deliberately recognise that civilisation, a real civilisation, must always be a limitation and a burden. That it cannot be carried by the idle, or the frivolous, or the lazy, or the drunkard, or the wastrel. It can only be borne by the strong man and woman, trained and educated, disciplined in social service and ready to take their share of the burden which rests on the shoulders of any real Human Society.

Secondly : it would seem to be necessary to realise that the equality that men speak of is not a natural equality, for there is no such thing : nature is fundamentally productive of inequalities. If you take human beings and look at them with their differences of faculties, of powers, of health, you realise surely that the cripple and the healthy babes are not equal in the life that lies before them. That the genius and the defective cannot be expected to struggle against each other in the great contest of thought. That men are naturally on every grade of the ladder of inequality, and that the value of Society is partly, at least, to redress the inequalities of nature and to bring about a greater similarity of happiness to all its members, by the use of the human intelligence, by the creative power of human thought. For, what is it after all that we are doing in Society? Instead of

leaving the crippled child to perish, we try to bring it into at least some modicum of health, and we try to smooth the path for the crippled feet. We take the defective child out of the ordinary school and give him special advantages, special training, skilled assistance to develop to the very utmost whatever faculties he may possess, and so far as human skill and kindness can do, to turn him into a useful member of a social union. Surely it is true that in a civilised Society the strong try to bear the burden of the weak, and to serve them rather than to tyrannise over them? For strength used for tyranny, for oppression, for plunder, is the law of the jungle and not the law of Human Society; it is the condition of men in a state of savagery, and not in anything worthy to be called civilised.

Looking at it from this standpoint and realising that we are trying rather to remedy the inequalities of nature, we find that after all our society, as it is, is rather an animal society in many respects than a human one; for we find in the jungle that where animals are weak separately they come together in packs, like packs of wolves, to pull down the stronger animal for food, and that others come into a social condition like cattle, in order that they may defend the weaker among them from the assaults of the beasts of prey. We see even in those sub-human creatures some sort of approach to the idea that even the weaker may strengthen themselves by association if it is only for the gaining of food, and that others may have gained the higher ideal of the defence of the weaker by the stronger. And so long as the defects of

the non-social animal remain in us, we have hardly the right to talk of a real Human Society, for still we find that the strong *do* oppress the weak, whether it be, say, by the strength of capital making starvation wages the condition of employment, or whether it be by the strength of arms by which one nation tries to take the land of another and to bind it into subjection. Wherever strength is used for oppression, for plunder, for trampling on the weak, there you have the law of the jungle, however much you may call yourselves a Human Society. And I am going to ask you to consider with me, how much longer we are to go on with this kind of society? Whether we cannot come together to set up an ideal? We cannot reach it in a moment; it will need much of thought, of effort, of sacrifice; but let it be at least a voluntary sacrifice and not an imposed sacrifice, a sacrifice imposed on the weak by the strong. Nay! rather a sacrifice willingly undertaken by the strong for the uplift of the weak.

Now what does this ideal demand? I would submit to you that in the ideal we are putting, the picture which we do not expect to realise immediately, we are trying to understand the facts, so that by the studying of the facts we may find a solution of the problem of a social union, where everybody shall be the better for being in it, and where the worst punishment would be exclusion from such a Society into the lower conditions of struggle from which such a Society will have emerged. So, I would put to you as an ideal, certain large conditions in human life, and the first of these is a division of human life

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

limited by ages, for the moment sufficiently flexible, not to insist on the very letter or year of the age; but that there shall be a period of preparation for Society; a period of production of all the necessaries of a cultured and prosperous Society; a period when that necessary labour, manual and brain labour—for everything is labour which produces what is really serviceable to Society—shall to some extent change its character from providing the necessaries of Human Society and shall pass on into forms of service that need more experience, more training, more equipment both of brain and heart, than you can expect to find either in the preparatory part of life, or in that age which is mainly given to the production of the necessaries of a civilised Society. And roughly, I would suggest for a moment, rather for the purposes of discussion than as fixed dates, which after all will have to be worked out by experience and that can only be gained by experiment—we cannot dogmatise on untried fashions of living—and I submit that the period of probation to enter into the active period of life, the life of the active citizen, should be the education which lasts from the cradle to the age of one-and-twenty. Now some of you may think that an extravagant demand. I confess I am putting an ideal, but it is one I hope to see realised some day, when it shall be realised that the education of the young of the nation is a national duty on which the welfare and the prosperity and the greatness of the nation depend. When it shall not be a matter of individual choice but rather of social needs supplied by social organisation, and that it should not be a matter of indi-

vidual wealth or poverty, that there should not be a class of workers who because they live on *wages* should be content with the minimum of education for their children, while another class that lives on *salaries*, or from their unearned incomes, should have the right to the very highest education that the nation is able to provide.

I claim that education should be equally distributed over the youth of the nation, varied in its character to suit the varied capacities of the children and the varied interests of the nation, but an education that continued through those twenty-one years of life should turn out men and women capable of bearing the burden of the productive side of the nation both in brain and hand: that they should be able to associate together, because all have a common fund of knowledge, all have been trained in that culture which is the flower of education and greater than the mere curriculum of education—when we shall have a true democracy which can meet in society as well as in work, which shall be able to meet in sympathy with each others' tastes, in recognition of mutual duty, of courtesy, of kindness to each other, when it shall not be thought necessary that one class of workers shall be rough in appearance, rough in clothing, rough in manner, and another class shall be the very antithesis of all that and be regarded as the flower of the nation.

I decline to recognise an education as worthy of a civilised people that does not offer to every child born into it the opportunity of developing to the full every faculty, every taste, every power that he brings with him into the world, and that it shall not be the poor who shall

be handicapped and the rich who shall have the double advantage of competence and of the higher education and culture, which makes human life rich as money can never make it. And so I ask for what may seem to some of you a long period : I do not want to haggle about years, whether 12, 13, 14 or 15, at which a child becomes capable of labour : bread-winning is not the work of the child nor of the infirm : bread-winning is the work of the active young and mature men prepared by their education for the varied tasks of citizenship ; in a real Society there should be none who is ignorant, none who is not a worker : we have no room for the idle ; everyone must have some duty to the nation of which he is a component part.

People talk about the State, but what is the State ? The State is the organised nation and nothing else. It is not a collection of classes, some badly off and some well off, some educated and some ignorant, some ruling and some obedient without any consideration of the fitness either to rule or to obey. The State is the nation organised for human happiness, and organised so that the qualities of the citizens may find their appropriate field of work in some definite organ of the State. That has, to some extent, been recognised in theory, and to some extent the theory has been worked out. To some extent, I say, in some of the ancient civilisations which were aiming at that although not always reaching it, and very largely disfigured, we must never forget, by a slave class, which can have no place in a State which is an organised nation, for that includes all its members. Do not go

away with the old idea that the State is the government : that is a fundamental error. The government is only the executive, the legislature, the judiciary of the nation. We have definite classes of people who are put to do that particular work of the nation, because their powers lead them in that direction and their employment is really a vocation in every case, in the case of every member of the State. It was the fashion as you know in the early nineteenth century and even much later than that, even through almost the whole of it, to put the State and the liberty of the individual as opposite factors. I have even read that the larger the sphere of the State the smaller the sphere of the individual ; but it seems to me that is a fundamental blunder as to the meaning of the word " State." It is limited to the government instead of expanded to the nation, and surely that is a fundamental error, because the greater the sphere of the State, if it be the nation, the greater will be the liberty of the members who compose that organised State, for each will have his duty and each will be a helpful component of the State, and the old fevered opposition will disappear, and the antagonism will no longer exist.

Anyhow for what I have to say, I take the State as the organised nation, and then I consider how that nation must necessarily, if it is to endure, suit the work of each to the capacities of each ; and that is one reason why Education should extend to the age of twenty-one. You must not specialise too soon with your child, you must not begin to educate the child at 10, 11, or 12 for some special profession or vocation in the State ; you must

give him time to show out his powers, so that he may really pass into that department of the service of the nation for which his faculties best fit him, in which his powers will find their best field of exercise. That is an additional reason why education should be prolonged. And when we look at it from this standpoint, and when we are agreed that there is no room in a civilised nation for idlers, then we shall ask : What would be the period in the manhood and the womanhood of the nation which you would assign for that active work which makes the prosperity, which makes the comfort, which makes the safety of the nation ? I submit that that very active period of citizenship should extend from about the ages of twenty-one to about forty, and that during that time the citizen should be training still in some of the duties which he would assume after that age has been reached. Suppose for one moment, for the sake of argument, we say that the man is not fit for the heavy duties of the National Parliament until he has had a good deal of experience in life ; until he has had training, in various similar but smaller organisations, in the duties of administration ; that he should during his active period take part in what you may call generally one of the smaller areas of government, and pass from one to another as he gains a larger and larger administrative experience. Take for instance a man—putting aside the fact that he was a Capitalist and a Unionist, two questions I do not want to bring in at the moment—such a man say as the great Mayor of Birmingham, the late Joseph Chamberlain. There you had a man who had been trained in the administration of

the Municipality and in the wants of the people and in the things that could, or could not, be better supplied by collective action than by individual action. He was the more effective member of the National Parliament. He had a greater knowledge to bring to bear on the various functions of the State, because he had been trained in the duties of a great municipality and in the administration of a huge city like that of Birmingham. And so you find that in some of the great cities of this land to-day that they are taking up these duties of administration in the right way, in the training and the exercise of the faculties of their citizens. They are beginning to realise what can best be done collectively and what individually. They are beginning to put a social control over a large number of the functions of the city, the life of the city; that in my childhood would have been called the very rankest Socialism, and yet they are now looked on as the elementary duties of a well-conducted municipality. For men grow wiser as they grow more experienced, and as they begin to learn the powers of organisation and of co-operation instead of competition for the supply of necessaries of life in cities and country towns.

Now I submit that after the age of forty you would have men fit to go to a National Parliament, to deal with the great national and international problems, with the science of government, with all the higher offices in the State, with all the administration of the great national departments, with faculties trained and with experience gathered which would make them fit to deal with other nations, to act fairly and impartially and rationally with

the many problems that are presented to every great nation to-day. I am not able to understand why the greatest of all arts and sciences, the art and the science of human government and administration, should be the only art and science in which no training is apparently required; in which men are not taught but are pitch-forked from one post to another because of their advantages in the social scale and not for the capacity that they exhibit. To govern men rightly and justly and impartially, is one of the highest duties in Human Society, and yet you send men to your Parliament, not because they are fit to govern the nation, but very often because they can favour some particular trade in which their constituency is interested, and if they can get a man in that trade into Parliament he will be able to get for it perhaps some unfair advantage over trades that are not similarly represented. And it is in the National Parliament that men too often represent local interests, capitalist interests, working-class interests, in the nation that they are sent there to serve, and not the national interests. In my ideal State I would try to do away with that by making these gradations in periods of human living, so that after the age of forty a man's really productive labour, as you may say, would be over; and in a moment we shall speak of other offices necessary to the support of that productive labour in which others must be included, because without them production cannot be satisfactorily carried on. I want to get rid of some of those artificial distinctions such as once existed in the Labour Party, when no one but one who had worked in a Trade Union was allowed

to come in as a member. A great step forward was taken when the Labour Party realised that the labour of the brain ought to be recognised as well as the labour of the hands, and those were truly members of the Labour Party who worked for the good of the nation in any department of its national life. And supposing that you are willing to accept some such rough ideal, which would have to be worked out very much in detail and in practice, there is one question I would like you to consider with regard to education. It is a question on which men—I am using “men” to mean all men and women—are very much divided. Probably, if I say to you bluntly: “Are you in favour that drill should be a part of the school and college education?” a very large number of you who feel strongly against war would say “No!” because you think it fosters a military spirit. But take a country like Switzerland. Switzerland has a trained army only for defence and not for offence. She does not desire to invade any other nation. She has no desire to steal any one else’s land. She has no desire to force her trade by sending out an army so that trade may follow the Flag, as it is sometimes put. Switzerland is one of the most peaceful countries in the world, and yet every schoolboy is trained in drill, and every college boy is trained in the use of arms. There is no army, as I have said, for anything but defence. It is a citizen army. Every citizen is in it if he is healthy, and he is trained for a week or two in a summer camp every year, after he has gone out of the school group or cadet corps, and he takes his rifle home and hangs it up, and he takes his uniform

and puts it in his trunk, and the rifle and uniform stay there until the next year, when he goes again into camp. But if a war breaks out all around and other nations begin fighting each other outside the boundaries of Switzerland, as many men as are wanted take down their rifles, put on their uniforms, and the army is mobilised and lines the frontiers so as to protect the neutrality of that remarkable Republic.

Now that is the kind of drill I mean. I conceive that the defence of a country rests rightly on its adults organised for defence alone; a real citizen army, willing to guard the borders of its country against unjust invasion; and that defence of a country seems to me the function of an organ in the body politic.

Now we must begin to think: "What are those organs in the body politic which every nation must have if it is to live and be prosperous?" On this you might very well read Ruskin, for he has some admirable statements with regard to the organisation of a nation, and the organs which make up that national body, and the duty of each.

Let us then for a moment, before we take these details of organisation, ask: "What is the one thing that a nation has, necessary for its organisation as a nation, under almost all conditions?" I am obliged to put in that parenthesis, because you will admit that the Jews are distinctly a nation and yet they have not, what is usually called, a necessary constituent of a nation, a geographical area upon which it lives—the land of the nation. Now that is the one stable thing, you may say, in the nation—

its land. It is the one thing which should belong to the nation therefore as a whole ; because the whole of the nation depends upon the land for its subsistence, for its life, for its prosperity. And you may regard the land of a nation as for the moment divided into two parts : the surface of the land that produces the crops, and the lower part of the land below the surface where the mineral wealth of the nation, great or little, resides. Both of these are limited. The land that produces the crops is a limited amount, crops for all the life of the nation, for the housing of the nation, for the making of the clothes of the nation, by the cultivators of the land and by the craftsmen who utilise the other products of the soil. And so you find there, as the first necessity of a nation, the primary necessity, the cultivators and the craftsmen living on the land. Out of the land they produce what we call wealth, whether it be the food on which a nation lives, or the articles which are the necessities of its life. A very curious thing in modern days in the West is that it is very rarely that this fundamental body in a nation, the cultivators and craftsmen, have any property at all in the land which they till or in the products which the land gives for the exercise of their arts and crafts ; and yet when we look back to ancient nations we find that the primary principle was recognised as the means of a well-organised State, that the land should be used for cultivation by those who were the tenants of the nation as a whole, and that all the products of that land, the food, should be primarily used for the feeding of the nation, the arts and the crafts for houses and clothing and the

various necessities of their lives, and only the surplus of that exported from the land, making another part of the wealth of the nation, which they could interchange with other nations for other things which they in turn produced, and so on : and that is universal. But a nation cannot live only by its cultivators and arts and crafts : it needs people to defend it against either a strong arm within the nation, or a strong body of people within the nation, or a foreign nation invading the national land. You may have tyranny of the strong arm, tyranny of the skilful brain, or the tyranny that is imposed by an invader, and you must have a class to defend your land, which will preserve internal order, a class which will protect the boundaries which mark out the land of the nation. And so we get a second necessary class, the defenders, and they will be subdivided, you may find as you look into it, into the Government which organises the whole of its three great departments—the executive, the legislative and the judiciary, with the necessary officials and employees in each. The judiciary is concerned chiefly with the internal order ; the legislature with the making of the laws ; the executive with seeing that those laws are carried out and that the business and order of the nation as a whole is carried on. These are the three old divisions of Government that have got a little muddled up in modern times, but you find them recognised in the East, in Greece, and also by the comparatively modern writer Montesquieu, who dealt with Government and the Art of Government as Science, that if you do not have those three co-operating with each other, but not over-ruling

each other, you could not have liberty for the citizens ; and so there ought to be these three divisions in order that liberty should be secured ; and I believe that to be fundamentally true although I have not the time now to argue it out. It is certainly framed by the experience of mankind. Is that all you want, however, for prosperity ? You find that people have other needs, as well as food and clothing and houses and safety within and without. Many articles they want, but they also want education, health, help in sickness, and the like. And so you must have a great class which you may call generally the class of the teachers and the caretakers of the nation, which would include the educators of the nation and the doctors of the nation, and it would also include the distributors of the goods of the nation, engaged in commerce and trade, bankers, merchants, etc., so that these bodies will also grow up as part of your national organisation. Four great divisions of national work, every one of them necessary to the growth and the welfare and the freedom and the prosperity of the people.

I do not think quite with Ruskin that you need add a fifth class, as he does, as these seem to me to really cover the great organs of the nation's life. It is a thing that you should think over when you are dealing with the means to bring about an ideal State, and all these four things include labour for the nation's good : but all the absolute food and articles that they want and which they cannot do whilst they are discharging these other functions in the nation, how are they to be provided ? The ancients had two ways of doing it. One was to

divide the whole land of the nation among the three great classes of the rulers, the educators and the cultivators ; the land being in those three great blocks, made up, of course, of all the smaller similar blocks in each great area, for convenience sake. The cultivators cultivated the whole of the land, and the craftsmen made the articles for the whole of them ; the educators or the priests did all the teaching ; they had all the care of the sick, and they included all those who were doctors and nurses and all the mechanism of the hospitals and the household attendants, and so on. They also had the special care of the aged in the land, whose lives were supplied from the land given to these educators, for the whole of the comforts they had a right to, after discharging their particular functions in the State.

The other way of doing it was, that the cultivators had a tenancy of the land, and they cultivated the land of those who were not themselves cultivators but were necessary for the supply of the necessaries for the people. You would have in a village, for instance, the village as a whole holding the land. The cultivators cultivated it and they would cultivate a part for those who had the education of the people, for the craftsmen of the village, for all of the officials of the village, and so on ; and every one of these would have a portion allocated to him whose crops were raised by the agriculturalists, but handed over to him as part of the organised life of the village. That was the system that prevailed in India for admittedly at least 5,000 years, down to 1816, when the system was destroyed. It had existed for an unknown period of time before the

Christian era. I do not want to go into details more than to say, that the king was paid as a protector, where there was a king, but otherwise those who protected the people, and the crops of a bit of the land went as payment for their protection: but the king did not own the land. He could give away his share of the crops, but he could not give away the land, for that was the stable place on which the village resided, and on which in multiplied villages the prosperity of the State depended.

Well, in one or other of these ways, or in some other way, a solution will have to be found, so that there will be no landless people in the country, and I mean by that, no people who do not share in the advantages that come out of the common heritage of the land. For if you begin to think about it, is it not an irrational idea that the holders of land should make themselves proprietors of that land and transmit this to their particular families, and leave other people, an ever-growing mass of people, without any share directly in the produce of the land? It is a sort of scheme, if you can call it a scheme, for a lunatic rather than for rational persons; and indeed, even in England, when she was strong and comparatively free and happy, the landless man was looked on as a vagabond, who must have done something wrong to have forfeited his rights to a share of the national heritage. For then the land was divided between the villagers and the feudal lords, who were expected to give certain services and to pay the taxes, which did not then all fall on the people themselves. Of course, in this there is a mass of detail, I am only just touching on it. We

CIVILISATION'S DEADLOCKS AND THE KEYS

want to bring back the condition in which every man shall pay a service to the nation, and the land shall be the common heritage of the nation, and all shall share in the benefits that grow out of that land.

Now just for a moment I will look at the reverse of that, where land is held as private property in a particular family. Take the case of the building of Liverpool. There you have the case of a man who is the ground landlord, and where the town grows enormously wealthy, and the population grows very large. He rents out land on building leases, and the building leases fall in, and the whole of the land, plus the buildings, reverts to the landlord. Then the rents are raised, not because he and his family had worked, but because other people had made literally the great commercial city, and he reaps the result.

Take the case of some of the mines discovered in South Wales, where a great deal of coal comes from, and they belong to particular families. A family has grown enormously wealthy by levying a royalty on every ton of coal brought to the mouth of the pit, and the rest of the people, who have no share in the mines, have to see all that mineral wealth going to the landlords—the land laws of England are the worst in the world, allow me to remark, absolutely the worst in the world—going to certain families to enrich them. And why? As your population grows there are more people. Are they to be born into a land which all belongs to somebody else? And yet they are called “natives” of the land. That is one of the problems you have

to meet, for without that you will continue with the miserable poverty of some and the irrational wealth of others.

This is not the only problem you have to deal with. You have to deal with not only the question of the cultivation of the land and the question of the mines, but you have also to consider the various conveniences of civilised life, which ought not to be a means of profit to the individual. Take the railways and all means of national transport. Now it is fairly clear that with the nationalisation of railways, the profits would go into the pockets of the nation to relieve the taxes and not into the pockets of private individuals. But in the case of a company, composed of clever people, it raises loans and uses the proceeds of those loans to make the railway, and as the profits grow so they get larger and larger profits out of that. Or, you may find cases of companies who hold an immense amount of machinery. I had a mill-share the other day in my hand in India, which was originally worth one thousand rupees. The company had grown enormously wealthy, and such high dividends were paid that this share became worth nineteen thousand rupees in the market. Then, during the war, the dividends went down, and the value of the share went down in the gambling on the stock exchange market. That is perfectly irrational to me, that a bit of paper should be worth twenty times its original value to somebody who had done nothing at all for it. I did not get the twenty thousand rupees it is true, because the price went down again. The share was given to me for a school, and it was better that the money

went to the education of school-children rather than into the pockets of a shareholder.

It is these things you want to think out and deal with. There is another point I want to speak of. I have put to you the general proposition that the land of a nation, that the transport of a nation so far as it is national, that the great conglomerations of machinery in a nation, ought to belong to the nation, and the profits now made by the individual should go into the national exchequer and lessen the taxes of the nation. That is true, increasingly true, of municipalities, because municipalities are becoming wiser and they are beginning to take over, and have taken over, in many cases, the supply of some of the necessaries of life, such as light, drainage, the supply of water, and the like, sometimes the supply of baths and transport within the limits of the municipality. The municipality of S. Pancras, London, I was reading some little time ago, had made something like £47,000 of profit for the year out of these various things, and out of that profit they paid one-half to the relief of the municipal taxes and the other half went to a reserve, for other requirements of useful municipal activities.

Surely it is well that people should organise themselves in these ways. You know how the municipality of Bradford is organised for baby welfare and for maternity benefits such as the supplying of milk to mothers for infants, and have available attractive rooms where mothers of the poor can go when they are about to bring another life into the world ; and they manage all these things for the poorer classes of the city, and so give to them the

advantageous conditions they never would have if they had not had the municipality, which really represents the people who elected them, as owner, instead of concerns being in the hands of private capitalists, who become wealthier by the sale of those necessities of life to the people. You will now see the general lines on which I am going, that the production of those things that are necessary for all should be controlled by all. The larger things by the larger government, the smaller things by the government of the smaller areas—whether they be municipalities of large towns, or elected councils in villages—and the business of the smaller areas and the purveyance of the things that can be supplied better by co-operation, than by the individual who makes all the profit, should be in the hands of the bodies elected by the people who live there, the representatives of the people, responsible to the people who live there for the way in which they carry on their business. I ask you to think over it. It has worked well in the past. The system of the individual struggle to get wealthy at the cost of the nation works badly, and makes the extremes of poverty and wealth that you have at present. You saw that when you were at war and you realised it then ; and you realised one other point that I put with great timidity to you, because I have not studied it, and that is the view that is being put forward by some exceedingly able men with regard to national finance.

We all of us know that no nation possesses in what we call "precious metals" that which is disposable at its hands in what is called "national credit." The details

of that are more or less difficult to work out, I am merely putting the particular theory. I have not studied it enough to be able to say that I accept it or reject it yet, but I think it is worthy of study, because you get into difficulties and dilemmas here to-day, where you want the necessary things you cannot get—where materials are in one place and where workless labour is in another, and where you cannot bring labour and materials together to get the product of that labour and material in the shape of houses for those that are homeless. That seems to me like a lunatic asylum. There are materials for houses over there and the unemployed workmen who could build them are over here, and yet while people want the houses because they are homeless, but cannot get them, because there are “financial interests” in the country which would be injured if the three wealth-making things were brought together, namely, the materials, the labour and the credit. Well, that is really rather mad. And so a plan has been suggested for preventing this state of affairs by utilising credit.

Now I can put the theory of that to you in a moment from another point of view. The Sankhya philosophy in India has the idea, which is incorporated in this more modern scheme of utilising the credit on which great businesses are carried on. No bank has in its cellars the gold necessary to meet its notes in the hands of its creditors, and if the notes were all presented together it would be bankrupt, because it has not the money or the precious metals which are represented by its notes.

Now the Sankhya philosophy shows that there are two

factors in the universe, one is Matter and the other is Spirit. Matter has the whole of the materials necessary for the production of everything, for Spirit by itself cannot produce anything: but when Spirit comes near to Matter, then the Matter itself begins working by the propinquity, as it is called, of Spirit. That is the theory of the Sankhya philosophy. But the curious thing is that Purusha (Spirit) itself does nothing, it is its presence near to Prakriti (Matter) which causes the whole matter to become active and produce everything. Nature produces because Spirit is near to it. Now there is a certain chemical thing, it appears, which is quite comprehensible to me (and I have only learnt of this recently through the *New Age*) which they call a Catalyst, that is, a body that does not do anything of itself, it does not get exhausted and it does not add itself to anything, but it accelerates action which otherwise would take place slowly. They give examples, and we will take the case of Sulphur Dioxide (SO_2), that is, one atom of Sulphur in combination with two atoms of Oxygen. But they want the Sulphur in combination with three atoms of Oxygen (Sulphur Trioxide SO_3), ; they want an additional atom of Oxygen. Well, there is plenty of Oxygen about, but you cannot get it readily to combine with the Sulphur Dioxide, for the Sulphur won't make room for the additional Oxygen atom, and it is not easily introduced. And so they bring the Sulphur Dioxide and the Oxygen together in the presence of a piece of Platinum, and the very moment the Platinum is in the presence of the Sulphur Dioxide the latter rushes to take up the additional

atom of Oxygen and so they get the SO_3 they want. That is the example given of this theory, and I have given my example from the Sankhya Philosophy, but it is curiously like it, for in that the Spirit plays the part of this Catalyst and causes action, as, for some mysterious reason, when that piece of Platinum comes along the union is made and the Platinum goes off and never diminishes, but always brings about the union.

That is the theory, that you can utilise credit in the place of money ; that money is your commercial catalyst and that credit is the real thing that you have to work with, and you can make any amount of money by printing notes and then making these circulate, and then getting production of the articles the people want to supply their necessities of life. That is bluntly putting it in the way the *New Age* gives it, but I do not know whether it is sound or not. Major Douglas is the man who has outlined the theory together with Major Powell, whose name is well known to you, and you can study it.

Now supposing there is no truth in that theory as given (and whether it is true, I do not know), fundamentally the object aimed at is true. You should be able to so deal with labour and material that you can employ labour on the material to create wealth, and the people who can produce wealth should have the necessary means by which they can buy their own productions. Whereas, at the present time you employ labour which works too hard and makes by the help of machinery more shoes, say, than are wanted ; then there is a glut in the market and therefore you must turn the labourers out who pro-

duce the glut in the market ; they must go starving and shoeless in the street, while you have an over-glut of wealth in shoes, which they have not the money to buy. It is absolutely silly ! Now on the land and the machinery theories I am sure of my ground, but on the other theory of utilising credit I am not sure, not being wise on the theories of finances.

When in the war you had to fight for your lives, you all became Socialists. You discovered that no individual had a right to stand between the nation and its means of living. You took seven million men out of industry. You sent many of them to kill other men and you kept the remainder to make the munitions whereby those other men might be killed, and you had as result of the labour only corpses. And now you say you cannot control labour because you are at peace. You did not mind confiscating the railways then, but you cannot take them over now ? I do not say you ought to confiscate them, because all of us are consentors to the injustice of their private ownership. We have to remember that as a nation it is no good blaming the capitalist : you would all be capitalists if you could. You feel the injustice because you suffer from it, but you have consented to that aggregation of capital in a few hands, and you have no right to punish them for that wrong. They have worked in the established system, and they think themselves right, although, as a matter of fact, they are wrong. They think their profits are really honest results, whereas they are clubbing together in order to force others into the position where they must either starve or work on

their terms. You must not allow individuals to monopolise the instruments of production, and then maintain that it is unrighteous wealth that is earned by that monopoly. And so you must think it out, so that you deal fairly all round. But you did it in the war, and you went further, and you had a super-tax, and if people had more than a certain amount of income you taxed them heavily, and quite rightly, for the wealthy ought to bear a larger part than the poor of the burden of the nation. But why in war and not in peace? What magic is there in war, that you may do things rightly then, and go back to a senseless system when you have peace? The only result will be to bring about another war, or a revolution.

These are some of the great problems that our National Parliament composed of the men over forty will have to solve. You will also need them for international courts of justice; you will need them for the League of Nations, which will deal with international labour as well as national. You will want them in all these great tribunals which will substitute justice for force and law for struggle. It is these things that the leaders of the people should go into, and these for which you will want the trained capacity and the experiences that are to be gained within the years of twenty-one to forty. You use that strong and vigorous manhood for the serving of the producers, and the wisest and the most experienced men you will place in the seats of power, in order that they may consecrate to the service of the nation and mankind that which they have gained in their youth and maturity. And they will make that which to me will be a Human Society.

Think it out for yourselves : I do not ask you to take my view of it. You cannot, in justice, bring about such great changes until by argument you have won the majority of the nation to consent to these changes. You cannot, because you are numerous, use the strong arm of organised labour to starve out the other classes, nor to tyrannise over them in turn, as the privileged classes have tyrannised over the unprivileged. We all have to learn to be human together, not to blame our brother, but to make things just and equitable between brother and brother : and that must be done by reasoning and not by force. To use force to oppress, to try to starve out a great city, or to deprive it of light or water, is a form of social war, force by starvation instead of by rifles and machine-guns. We have to work by reason, by argument, by proofs of a better way, by persuasion, by trying to stimulate the human qualities in other men and women, and not only in using a new form of force as ruinous as the older forms have been ; and because manual toilers are many, because they have suffered and know what suffering is, because they have lived for years and years with that frightful spectre of unemployment in the cupboard, always dreading every year that because of that menace they are nearer to the age when employment will fall out of their hands ; because they know the suffering of necessity and poverty, of ignorance, of inequality and of restricted life, I call upon them especially to show a better example to-day than merely to utilise force of numbers to crush down those who are privileged. Let us lift others up and not pull others down ; lift up to a

higher level and not drag some who have gained by civilisation down to the lower level. "Not to destroy but to uplift," that is the social cry of the future, and that, I believe, will be the social cry of Britain, the country which by its education, its discipline, its trades unions, its habit of citizenship, is the most worthy of all the nations to lead the world in that great change.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED
PRINTERS, LONDON AND WOKING.

