

Dear ds Karli

-
writing Separately.

Here's the section
on the 4 bolts.

Blake impossible
but essential

(his Saban Incarnate)
will have to have another
^{shd} to ^{organise} him
much Love from us both

Pip.

15/8/63.

my one excuse for riding my hobby
horse, as a complete outsider, into the
the field of anthropology - where even
the learned doctors move with caution.
Being quite uninstructed & ignorant, I could
only trust to the mens creatrix. And
this is what it told me (& if I've
got it all wrong, never mind; there
are lots of people better qualified who
can explain why it's wrong, & do so much
better in consequence): -

We might take as an analogy, from
chapter on mother & child in Persons
in relation. Just because the human
in fact is so much more richly
endowed than the animal cub,
it is not born with instinctive
& definite endowments - just with
an embryo 'general-purpose' mens
Creatrix. The result is that it is for
along time helpless & utterly dependent.
That is the critical time, & would

be discussions if the m.c. had
already brought up 'mother love'
spit it there to meet the need.
(Just like the m.c. bless it). The result
is that the human infant can become
'human'; ^{in its own way & time} the m.c. can develop it
into a real human, ^{mature} person in the
physical world.

But what about the infant human
race? The situation was just about
the same. There was infant mankind
magnificently gifted if he could only
survive to become mens creatur - but
correspondingly helpless; lacking although
the special endowments of the wild
creatures; wings & claws, beaks &
sabre teeth, strength & swiftness,
fur & pachydermatous hide, the
rest he had only his mother wit - that was
an embryo! And where was
'mother'? Well, mother ~~was~~

was of course the mens creatrix itself.

And if ever anyone wants to know what the m.c. is capable of he has only to watch

it eat words, morder 'primitive' man.

In the one fatal thing would have been for man to lose heart and fight back.

What he needed above everything else

in the world was en-couragement, self confidence, morale, 'faith'. But

how was he to become possessed of it in his desperate predicament until

his ^{mother} ~~mother~~ ^{with} ~~with~~ ^{could} ~~could~~ ^{become} ~~become~~ ^{promethee?} ~~promethee?~~ ^{his} ~~his~~ ^{was} ~~was~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{critical} ~~critical~~ ^{medicament} ~~medicament~~ ^{of} ~~of ^{all} ~~all.~~~~

And what did the m.c. do but for his elemental human life of

'imagination' into starchy to be creative.

~~the~~ ^{man} had it as 'The Power' or 'the special powers'. But suppose he could believe,

^{30 years} ^{with} ^{the} ^{imagination}, he had? Suppose he could imagine himself possessor of 'the Power' &

'the powers'. Suppose he believed he had the know-how to master control

all the mysterious & imposing forces

at work in the world around him?
Then he would indeed be on top of his
world, nothing could defeat him.
So the m.c. set the creative imagination
of man imitating Magic! It suggests
to 'primitive' man that by going down
into the womb of the body of Mother
~~Earth~~ ^{Earth}, his inner 'entrails' so to speak
out of which came the life that
penetrated itself out of the body of Mother
nature every spring & summer, just
as the new born creature of the
mother animals & the mother human ~~produce~~
came out of the womb of the mother -
by spirit ~~in~~ into this womb of the
Mother Earth, he would be at the
creative source ~~of~~ of his life,
~~which~~ ^{which} with her living power. If he there
'became' the animals he hunted, he
would possess himself of their 'powers'.
Man being primarily 'Agent', ^{power} ~~power~~
Actor, he ^{first} spontaneously 'acted' himself

(4)
into becoming the embodiment of the
'power' of the animals he hunted.
This was his ritual, which was
nothing more or less than an active
identification of himself with the
animal ^{and} with its power. Then
the creative imagination chattered all
this up on the walls & ceilings of the
paleolithic caves. These images
& visualizations of its ritual acts were
now 'there' all the time, embodying
the 'powers' of the ritual at the heart
of ~~man's~~ Nature's life-powers. There was
a doubly ^{truly} charged dynamo from which
the tribe could re-charge its own batteries
whenever necessary. So it could imagine
itself ~~master~~ possessor & master of
'the powers'. It only imagined itself to be
So - but what did that matter?
It believed itself to be so - ^{conviction} that was
enough to give ^{man} the faith, the
confidence, the morale, the courage that

he needed, till the mens creatrix co "1
nurse his mother" wid into such
inventions skills as would really
secure his survival the power of
his real powers as mens creatrix.
Now isn't that just like the mens
creatix. Always, at the desperate
crisis, it produces the surprise
ace of trumps from up its sleeve!
And so we can follow its activities
through man's ^{history} as he grows towards
maturity; till the creative imagination
in its maturity becomes 'the
prophetic soul of the wide world
dream on things to come' - envisaging
what the ^{use derived the} mens creatrix ^{is} ~~is~~ trying
to bring into being as the next
~~step~~ stage of its creative advance.
Meanwhile ^{the m.c. had also} it created its new
Great Transformation - the greatest
since it invented the imagination
itself with magic. It discovered
& created 'Scientia'. Now it could

distinction + ⁽⁴⁾ 'know' what the energies
of its own mens creatrix were doing,
+ what the energies in the world around
it + of which it was one member
were doing. So it has at least reached
the great crisis of the human predicament.

It has learnt to understand + control
to its own ends the elemental forces
of 'Nature'. It has discovered itself
as a hidden core of ^{almost unbroken} dynamic
energies - creator + destroyer - which it
must now learn to understand +

control. It has (I believe, this is what
I have tried to show) discovered + solved
its problem of becoming personal
mens creatrix, - in imagination. It

can see why it has succeeded as
creative imagination. It can ^{also} realize

that in the most important ^{of} activity
of all - the personal world of social

political + economic life - it has not
learnt that lesson, so it has failed
to become a human race.

- why failing it has at this stage
brought itself into an 'existential'
choice between self annihilation
& a new creative advance into a
world commonwealth of persons. This is
the last & greatest of all its 'trials of
faith', the most difficult of all
its challenges & self transformations.

The whole fate of mankind is in the
balance. Who knows what will happen?

The first thing we have to do is
to use of newly acquired 'Scientia'
to become fully aware of the situation,
to see it as it really is.

There are, as you say, rays of
light. For example, John's giving
a rational & logical & 'philosophical'
form to the ~~real~~ real nature of
the human world as a personal
world. Now there is your own Stone's
carrying forward of ~~the~~ Marx's
illumination; your massive

accumulation (5) of historical evidence to
convince anyone capable of being
convinced that human beings are
'human' beings; that it is disastrous
to treat them as things; to substitute
a world of machines + gadgets +
gimmicks for a world of human persons
& call the monster Progress. This is really
what we need now: this kind of massive
irresistible evidence that lights up the
historical reality of man, as you are
doing. My own discovery has been
the heartening discovery that the mens
creative needs + wants to make use of
all the tortoises it can lay hands on,
as well the hares, to get on with its
creative advance. You never know what
the Blessed Creature would be up to if
you only give it the chance. ^{in folklore} it would
have laid the golden egg!!
I have done my best to let the me.
say that he has to say through me.
Now most of it is on paper, as best
as I can. I'm not worrying. It's

there for anyone younger & better
qualified than me to see what can
be made of it. If only I can get
this last bit done on the mens creation
as the magician I shall feel I haven't
altogether let the m.c. down. What a
relief that would be. I just about feel
at the end of my tether.

One of my greatest regrets is that I
have never been able to live & work
in regular contact with your mens
creatures. I agree with Plato's Phaedrus
that the living contact between
living minds of persons is the only
real life. All the best things that
have come to me have come from that.
What I could have learnt from you &
John. Well never mind. It was not to
be. Please do see if you can
interest your friend Prof Bohannon
in what I'm trying to say. Of course,
he must recognise that I am a ^{damn a} ~~quite~~ un-instructed

restrained ^{entirely} guesses (into anthropology,
just trying to 'imagine' a fruitful
hypothesis or two. But if what I've written
can stimulate him, or anyone else -
- even if only by way of indignant
reaction! - to go on with the business
of helping the man's creative or its last
& greatest labour of Hercules, I shall
be only too thankful. I shan't have lived
in vain.

Dear Karl. How can I thank you
for being what you are, & for coming
me in the generous way you have
done?

My most grateful love to you all

Pep.

Karl

MENS CREATRIX

In most parts of Africa today, the more elemental and harsh realities of life must now, I imagine, be as starkly present as they were in India at the Partition. Brutal and elemental forces have been uncovered which lie, I believe, not very far underneath the surface of 'culture' and 'civilisation' even in the small area in which we 'Westerners' happen to live. Where this happens we find ourselves driven into a situation in which the sole alternative is either a creative solution or complete futility and now almost certainly disaster.

What we are thus driven to face is (I have come to believe) the ultimate issue underlying 'the Human Predicament' itself. It is (as I see it) the problem of two 'worlds' (or two 'levels', two 'ways') of living and thinking: one death, the other (as yet) powerless to be born. It is the dilemma which (we can now see) has been present all through human history. It has once, at least, been revealed with transparent clarity and force not only in thought and words but in a life. But we have never yet found a practical solution for it. And now we have got to find a solution - the right solution - or man is 'dead and done ~~with~~ with'.

It is our good fortune that the innermost significance of this, the great human dilemma, has been crystallised ~~and~~ and illuminated for us in one of the supreme creations of human

genius: Ivan Karamazov's parable of the Grand Inquisitor. We must not miss the devastating irony of this parable: the fact that the cynically frank Absolute Authoritarianism of the Grand Inquisitor was an actual historical development of Christianity itself! 'The Great Wise Spirit' to whom the Inquisitor appeals is the Satan of the Gospel story: that is to say, the Anti-Christ of Jesus himself. The Inquisitor is perfectly well aware of this ("I know who you are"); but he says deliberately that Satan was right. The original Gospel of Jesus is therefore a heresy which the Christian Church has been compelled to destroy, root and branch. And since the Prisoner was apparently proposing to start it all over again, the Inquisition of 'the Catholic Church' - whose sole function was to stamp out heresy - would have to burn him at the stake before he could do more mischief ('tomorrow'). This is a timely reminder that the most callously cruel embodiments of the Inquisitor's 'Great Wise Spirit' today (from Franco and Fascism to ^{Stalin} Communism) have also arisen in the West - i.e. in 'Christendom'.

The Grand Inquisitor is admitting, with a blunt and refreshing candour impossible to any of his historical representatives in the Christian Church, that the compromise of the Church with Imperial Rome had, in reality, involved a choice between two irreconcilable ways of being, thinking and living. This has been

obscured by 'heaps of huge words uphoarded hideously' - i.e. orthodox doctrine and theology. One of the most recent examples - this time Protestant - is that of the biblical critics and theologians who have been busy explaining that Jesus was unconcerned with (or 'above') politics. Whereas in the records Jesus said as plainly as he could speak - at the Temptation, at Caesarea Philippi, at the Trial - that the ultimate choice was between the 'power' politics of Imperial Rome and being crucified as a criminal by that 'Power'; and that the second way was God's way and God's choice! He also warned the 'nationalists' of his day (Zealots, etc.) that if they resorted to power-politics as 'God's chosen people' they were heading straight for the most appalling disaster. Josephus' 'Wars of the Jews' is one long commentary on the accuracy of Jesus' insight, both into what he was rejecting and why he ~~xxx~~ rejected it. The original records make it perfectly clear that - at least in Jesus' view - the two are at opposite poles of human living and thinking. And this is what I take ~~xx~~ as the clue to 'the Human Predicament'.

St. Paul, as usual, takes us to the heart of the matter when he reminds his converts that the Romans owed their success to establishing little colonies of Roman citizens, living the Roman way of life, all over the Roman world; similarly the new Christian ~~...~~ must be 'colonies of Heaven', citizens of the Christ.

like way of living and thinking. (The Communists have taken a leaf out of the same book with their 'cells' and ~~party centres~~ elite party centres.) The clue is therefore once more a new kind of people, living a new kind of life with a new kind of outlook. In Whitehead's great phrase, they embody human nature living 'at a new point of creative advance' through the 'energising' (Paul's word) of the Creative Spirit. To sharpen the point we need only remind ourselves that 1800 years later Nietzsche grasped exactly the same necessity (a 'super-man'). But he deliberately chose 'the will to power': the Great Wise Spirit (Zarathustra) was right.

The direct impact of Jesus' personality, life and death - beautifully epitomised in the story (or legend?) of St. Paul's 'conversion' on the way to Damascus - did for a time produce enough of the original 'Spirit of Christ' to inspire St. Paul's 'ragged battalions' (I Cor. 1); with the result that these scattered little groups of men - without arms, power, wealth or political influence - actually brought the proud Roman Empire to its knees: 'Credo quia absurdum'. But as the original dynamic of Jesus and his gospel faded into the past ("Comes faint and far thy voice, From shades of Galilee"), the old human impulses began to 'choke the word (gospel)' (Mark 4; 7, 18). Already in the third century we find the Church admitting to its all-sacred authoritarian canon of 'divine revelation' an Apocalypse ('Revelation') that simply transfers to the more competent hands of Omnipotence all the accumulated and repressed cravings for irresistible power and revenge stirred up by persecution (Rev. 6; 19 v. 11f). What this spirit really comes to has been 'blasphemed' for all time by one of the most powerful creative imaginations ever given to a man: in the stark savagery of Milton's 'Christian' epic (PL, PR and SA), the avowed purpose of which is 'to justify the ways of (the Christian) God to man'. The brutal impact of this immensely powerful epic, once we have rid ourselves of the veils of sentimental pietism in which it has been decently obscured, and the magic of its superb artistry, would turn any comment into anaemic lavender water. So I leave it to speak for itself. But what both 'The Book of Revelation' and Milton do is to make fully intelligible the true significance of the compromise which the Christian Church so soon came to ^{make} with the Roman Empire. 'The Great Wise Spirit' (the ancient 'Magus') had won. And it is on this fact that

Dostoevsky's parable throws its fullest illumination: the 'Christian' Church of the Inquisition, of Ferdinand and Isabella and Alva, of the Conquistadores, of the persecution of the Jews, of the witch-hunts, had in the name of Christ become the Anti-Christ (Satan) of the original gospel. As the Grand Inquisitor bluntly tells the Prisoner: 'The Gospel hasn't worked, doesn't work, never will work; it is the heresy, and we burn heretics at the stake'.

This explains why I am taking D's parable as the central clue to human history and experience - 'the human situation'. I believe that it crystallises the ~~whole~~ whole 'vision' of the different 'planes', ~~or ways~~, of being, living and thinking, and the compelling necessity to choose between them (the existentialist choice). And this in turned me to the discovery - which took me completely by surprise - of the most extraordinary paradox of human history: that the way of the Prisoner has been tried out over whole ranges of human experience, comprising all the arts sciences and philosophies; and the result has been to release the mens creatrix in such astonishing enrichments of human life that the Prisoner has been completely vindicated. But the one sphere in which it has never been tried again by any community is the sphere in which it is most fundamental and most important.

This insight that there are two different - often opposed - ways of living is of course not unique. In Greece, for example, there was Socrates. As Herodotus' history reaches its climax we can feel the great wave of idealism and love of freedom (of the mens creatrix) which had been roused by the defeat of the Persians, and its marvellous flowering in Athenian art and the ventures of thought. But in politics the dynamic passed almost immediately into imperialism and power politics; only a generation after Herodotus, the sequel is unforgettably depicted in the pages of that embittered idealist, Thucydides. Pericles' magnificent funeral oration has exercised such magic on Western classical culture that the devastating irony of Thucydides' record of it has been missed: when it was delivered, Pericles' policy had already involved Athens in disaster and degeneration. One of the heirs to the cut-throat savagery that resulted (Greek city-state politics) was the young aristocrat Plato. Then Plato met Socrates; and he tells us - characteristically through the mouth of

a drunken Alcibiades, the very embodiment of this unscrupulous power politics! - how this meeting came to him as a sudden revelation that it is possible to live on an altogether different plane: it was like a voice (he says) from a 'diviner' world which could 'transfigure' human life. But by the time that Plato wrote, all this had happened long ago; and meanwhile the Athenians had killed Socrates; and all the bright and generous young creatures of the earlier dialogues had ended as the prime leaders of the blood-bath of City-state power politics. Such was the outcome of Pericles' policy. And Plato's ending was despair: only the rarest of men could live the Socrates life. So the Grand Inquisitor was right after all. The true community was 'laid up in the heavens': for earth, the 'Laws'. And we recall the only funeral speech in history to match that of Pericles, spoken by as noble a man as Pericles over the dead of another civil war which Lincoln had begun. Its legacy is evident today, 100 years later.

Indian tradition offers us the final word of Hindu philosophy on the solution of the human predicament in the Bhagavad Gita - still rightly treasured today as the 'crown' of the Hindu religious creative imagination by all Hindus and their western admirers. It claims to be the supreme divine revelation, spoken directly by the supreme God himself to the greatest of the old semi-divine hero-kings. Arjuna shrinks appalled from the prospect of killing all his own kinsmen in battle. The divine answer is this: 'It is your religious duty, in a world maintained and ordered by God, to kill your kinsmen and their followers. But you must do it with serene and passionless detachment, knowing that you are nothing but an actor in the 'play' (lila), the cosmic drama which the Absolute 'imagines' to himself (maya). However real the sufferings of the puppets to themselves, to the Absolute Spirit this is all a stage-illusion, and the pains no more real than those of the characters in a work of fiction. The 'actors' (i.e. all human beings) are themselves only such stuff as dreams are made on; but they are bound to play the part written for them by the divine dramatist. If this is Hinduism at its highest reach, we are not surprised to find another Brahmin philosopher writing a treatise on the 'realistic' practice of politics beside which Machiavelli grows pale. Buddha's ^{answer} solution was therefore far more radical: if we are such stuff as dreams are made on, condemned to act in a transitory shadow-show of pain and disease and death,

the only solution is to end the nightmare once for all by 'waking up'. This can be done. But only by a gradual, painful and complete detachment from the lila-maya, pulling up all your human roots one by one till at last the entire illusion of this life vanishes completely and leaves not a wrack behind. Pain, transitoriness, fear, suffering, the driving rage for power after power -- all these can never be banished from this life: they are endemic to human existence. The only salvation is complete withdrawal to another mode of existence as different from this as waking from a bad dream: so different that all ideas, analogies, pictures and thoughts of 'nirvana' drawn from this dream world are irrelevant and futile speculations. The only way out is to follow 'The Way' out.

Medieval Christianity continued the Roman compromise. It organised detached and isolated islands for 'the good life' as a preparation for the life to come, and -- except for formal moralistic warnings -- left the 'practical life' to its power politics. This method of isolating the two planes of living may have had temporary advantages but it was no sort of solution. And as soon as Europe 'came of age' at the Renaissance, we find Machiavelli saying in effect: if religion is religion and politics is politics, this is how practical politics has to be run. In personal life the attempt to live seriously in both worlds could only lead to a complete split in the personality between two water-tight compartments; Father Joseph as Grey Eminence could then conduct his power politics, untouched by any scruples of the saint of 'the wounds of Christ' who belonged to the other department. Once more Caesar wins: the 'practical' world is ruled by men without religious or moral scruples, without consciences: by Napoleons and Fouchés -- and a Richelieu aided and abetted by the ascetic mystic, 'Father' Joseph of the Church of Christ.

In eighteenth century rationalism, the 'Enlightenment', and nineteenth century scientific materialism, there is no place for the God or the Gospel of Jesus. In intellectual circles, so far as a religious tradition does survive, God has become a celestial mechanic and mathematician, the Clock-maker and Winder-up in Chief of the 'Universe'. In traditional pietistic circles an ineffectual Angel beats his luminous wings in vain in the void -- or in the more brutally realistic words of Marx, religion has become a drug to keep the masses consoled with sentimental dreams while

the 'realists' get on with the serious business of exploiting them and cutting each others' throats. Even the realists (the 'economic liberals') dope their consciences with a vague 'Providence' whose sole function is to produce a celestial harmony out of the apparent discords of the struggle-for-existence, competition, the factory system, and the power politics of economic imperialism - 'in the end all shall be well'. Sancta simplicitas.

Marx's own solution was to expose this shoddy humbug and carry this ruthless 'struggle for existence' into the class war which had emerged as the last phase of man's 'struggle', first with his natural environment, and then with his fellow men, for control of the natural resources he needed, and the means of their production and distribution. The ultimate reality is still the physical world of scientific materialism; but a 'dialectical' movement is given to it by the driving impulse in man to satisfy his material needs more fully. The logical outcome is the Communist Manifesto; and nothing could be more frank and blunt than that. The Manifesto is the 'fighting' heart of Marxism, embodying Marx's 'fighting' declaration that the most important thing in the world was no longer to understand the world but to transform it - a radical revolution in philosophy. It is ^{as} central to Marxism as I Cor. 13 is to Christianity. In all my discussions, study groups and meetings with communists in India and elsewhere, I have never met one who, when he became familiar enough to forget to treat me as a sentimental bourgeois, did not express open contempt for 'tender-minded' scruples and hesitations about the campaign of hatred, deliberate deceptions and inventions, use of violence and so forth which 'any true communist will of course use whenever necessary', openly or under cover. And they were certainly right, - on their assumptions: this is the logical outcome of dialectical materialism, as Lenin plainly said.

This needs to be ~~plainly~~ reasserted as clearly as possible at the present time, because of a sentimental confusion, which threatens to become disastrous, between: (1) The irrepressible dynamic drive of the mens creatrix towards 'creative advance'. and

(2) The inevitable, and up to a point invaluable, destructive dynamic which shatters the whole oppressive system of an old order which has long remained clamped down on the mens creatrix like an iron mould. And (3) The imposition of a new absolute authoritarianism - Grand Inquisitor or Dictator - which almost invariably attempts immediately to re-impose the philosophy of the Great Wise Spirit, in the guise of a new 'revelation' with a new cast-iron 'Law', on the 'revolutionary situation'. The conflict that a Revolution arouses between these three forces is beautifully illustrated in the panegyrics on the American and Russian revolutions - as Blake, Shelley and Wordsworth at first saw them. What these poets welcome with such enthusiasm is clearly the release of the mens creatrix. It so happened that Wordsworth was in France at the time, and he has left us in the Prelude a first hand description of the process: "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive, But to be young was very heaven" - why, he has explained in more detail in his talks with Beaumarchais. Then came Robespierre, the imposed worship of the Goddess of Reason (!), the Terror, the military dictatorship of Napoleon, and the smug bourgeois finale that has since settled like a pall of death over everything.

The course of events in Russia was as different as the two civilisations. But there too, the logical outcome of the Revolution was the dictatorship of the Grand Inquisitor: Stalin. And of course the new Grand Inquisitor had his new authoritative sacred writings (Marx-Lenin), his new Inquisition (the secret police), heresy hunting and the liquidation of heretics - and the rest of the familiar story. We might in fact call it an 'Illuminated' illustration of Dostoevsky's parable.

But it is, I think, as characteristic as it is significant that this, the 'real' situation, has been obscured by an ambiguity in Marxism itself. There was nothing original ~~skunk~~ in Marx's 'materialism': it was the orthodox nineteenth century scientific assumption. There was nothing original in his view of history as a developing ('evolutionary') process: he got that from Hegel, who got it from the Bible by way of Christian theology, though like

Darwin he gave it the current materialistic form. There was nothing original in his theory of the economic struggle for existence then in process: he borrowed that from Ricardo, Adam Smith and the others. Marx himself candidly admitted his debt in all these fields. His 'originality' lay exactly where he claimed it to be, and where it really mattered: in his shift of emphasis and his forging of it into a Thor's hammer for shattering the old oppressive order once for all.

The point I want to suggest here - and I think it is very important - is that, so far as its principles and theory are concerned, Marxism-Leninism never moved, and never professed to move, outside the orthodox circle of nineteenth century scientific materialism, the economic 'war' of the industrial revolution, and power politics. But in fact the unrecognised ('unconscious') source of Marx's deepest convictions lay elsewhere: in his Jewish inheritance, with its hidden roots deep in Jewish tradition. The only 'sacred scriptures' in the world that have ever taken history seriously and indeed made it the clue to the whole of human experience and destiny is the Bible: the O.T. 'proclaims' throughout that history is a directed process because it is the working out of a conscious ('divine') purpose. Hegel merely reinterpreted the elaboration of this conception of history by Christian theology (the N.T. never claimed to be more than the culmination of the O.T. process) as more properly to be understood as 'the march of Absolute Reason'. He also borrowed Plato's term 'dialectic' - correctly, as dialectic means 'discussion', and the give and take of discussion is in fact the way in which the mens creatrix continues to move at the point of relative advance. But the term is ~~absolutely~~ absurdly incongruous when applied to a Darwinian process of blind biological-physical evolution. All these unconscious factors with their confusion played a large part in making Marx's materialism plausible when it reasserted a direction and goal of history produced by 'dialectical' (rational) processes in human history. The same unconscious influence of Judaism produces a new 'Chosen People' - the Proletariat; and a new 'Messianic hope' - the Communist millenium when everything in the garden will somehow become lovely.

Lenin was not a Jew: he was the heir of the Russian nihilists and revolutionaries. And his logic is as clear and honest as that of Nietzsche: if there is no God and no Providence, nothing but a material process moving by an inevitable self-impulse through a ruthless 'class struggle for survival' to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Communist state - then there can be nothing 'higher', 'greater', 'superior to' this Communist-State-in-the-making. This is the be-all and the end-all ~~is~~ for anyone who has grasped the revelation of Marx; and therefore there cannot possibly be any 'moral law', social obligation or 'duty' other than what works for this society. This 'end' therefore not merely justifies but imposes an absolute obligation on the believer to employ any means necessary for this end, however violent or cunning or deceptive. To be deterred from this by any scruples - moral, religious or 'humanitarian' - was a weak-minded and sentimental betrayal of the Revolution. The conclusion, logical and practical, is (as Lenin realized so clearly) a single-minded will to power embodied in the single-minded dictatorship of a leader supported by a 'professional' revolutionary élite; for the sake of the Revolution/proclaimed in the Manifesto.

Lo The force and weight of this revolutionary drive brings the enigma of the human predicament and the Grand Inquisitor of the ~~Paradise~~, right back into the centre of the picture, in its most challenging form: is it really the only way, or even a possible way, to create the new human world-commonwealth, by open hatred, violence and deception? On the contrary, can we really believe that any other way is possible? Suppose Marx and Lenin had rejected all revolutionary violence and chosen the way of the Prisoner, would not the appalling oppression and misery of Tsarist Russia have continued indefinitely - not to say grown worse? And so led to futile, because undirected, outbursts of bloodshed? If so, would not Marx and Lenin, if they had rejected the Revolution, made themselves responsible for the continuance of the ~~old~~ order (supported by the 'Christian' Orthodox Church!) and all that this involved? Let us even suppose that the outcome of the Manifesto

and the Revolution was bound to be Grand Inquisitor Stalin. Could not Stalin reply that all the suffering and terror were a comparatively small price to pay for the fact that the operation saved the patient's life and set him on the road to complete recovery, health and vigour? In less than 50 years, in spite of a civil war and the devastations of two world wars, has not the Russia of 1914 become the second greatest and most wealthy power in the world, with master-scientists, technicians and the rest? Why does Sartre, atheist, ^{sc/} and humanitarian, existentialist, hover so uneasily on the borders of Communism - hostilely critical very often, but still insisting that Communism is the only possible philosophy for today? Because he can see nothing else that will save 'the common people' of France from their present poverty and suffering. What else is there? The Catholic Church - ally of Mussolini and Franco and Salazar and the rest?

This again sharpens the issue. We cannot deny what the Russian Revolution has done for Russia or the Chinese Revolution for China. We cannot deny what 'orthodox' 'Christian' Churches have done in Russia, Spain and elsewhere. Can the Prisoner make any effective reply?

This is what I take to be the crucial issue of all human history. And in attempting to come to a decision I think it is all-important to distinguish clearly between:

- 1) The workings of the Mens Creatrix pressing always towards creative advance;
- 2) The aggressive-destructive drives in human nature;
- 3) the nature and mode of working of Absolute Authoritarianism - the Grand Inquisitor in any of his roles;
- 4) Short-term and long-term effects.

It is of course true that the core of dynamic energy in human nature is active as a whole, and that we cannot isolate any one of its mixed and often self-contradictory workings: but whatever confusion and complications this may give rise to in practice, everything depends on our learning to discern the activity of the

mens creatrix and to work with that with all our powers wherever we find it. The short term effects of a break-through, such as a Revolution, is always to release new energies; and in so far as it then destroys the dead-weight of a tradition or situation which is anti-mens creatrix, it sets free the human spirit for new advances. But will it then go on to live at a new point of creative advance? This can only be answered by considering the long-term effects: What are you 'saving' these people or community (ies)? What kind of persons and societies will you have produced when you have finished? What will you have made of them in the process? And this makes the means employed very far from irrelevant.

Perhaps, then, the Prisoner's reply might run somewhat as follows: 'Have you broken clear of the old vicious circle of power-politics, deception, intrigue and violence? If not, won't you find yourself back in a new room of the old prison-house of the human spirit? Hate will again breed hate; deception will breed lying and fraud; violence will breed counter-violence - and so on to the end of time. If the real evil is the tyranny of 'power-politics' (and both Hobbes and Nietzsche saw that this is by its very nature 'boundless') and its effect on the mens creatrix and the creative advance, what have you done in the long run but fasten this tyranny anew on humanity? Meanwhile every advance in knowledge increases the disastrous possibilities of that tyranny.'

If you reject this reply, are you not in effect asserting that the use of power politics, hatred, terror, torture, 'liquidation' and the rest of the instruments of the Grand Inquisitor, will actually and suddenly produce a Society in which all these things will have 'withered away' and the human spirit be set 'free'? That is precisely what present-day Communism does claim: it insists that these methods, and the faith in scientific materialism are the only way to 'the new plane of living' in the new 'Commonwealth of Mankind'. The issue couldn't I think, be put more plainly than that.

The next point is that 'scientific materialism' is materialism - whatever fancy or incongruous adjectives we attach to it. Marx was a materialist in the full sense of 19th century 'scientific

materialism'. He wanted to dedicate Das Capital to Darwin whose evolution theory immensely impressed him. Though Darwin - whose function was to amass evidence in his own field, and ^{who} had no 'gift' for speculation - was protected by his mens creatrix which very wisely prostrated him on the sofa with a nervous headache whenever the theorists and logicians tried to drive him into a corner; so he refused Marx's request. But there is no doubt whatever as to the real nature of Darwin's Evolution Theory. Man has emerged from the 'natural' order of living things. The peculiar feature of biological organisms is that they reproduce themselves in greater numbers than can survive. Each individual product embodies a slight variation; and the variation may cover a wide range. Since all cannot survive, those 'naturally' tend to survive which are best adapted to their particular environment. This happens in each generation, and so the survival value tends to be 'perfected' so long as the environment remains unchanged. Consciousness, intelligence, purpose - these do not enter into the process at all: if you are a white rabbit in the snow or a green caterpillar on green leaves, your enemies won't easily see you; but a brown rabbit in the snow will be easy to spot. The swiftest bucks and antelopes will escape from the tigers, whose appetite will be satisfied by the slower ones. In every generation these advantageous qualities are therefore again inherited with similar variations and the same 'natural' process (on the whole) again selects the fittest of these to survive. Given unlimited time and the variable inheritance of such special qualities, the human organism as we know it would develop as the end product of this process of natural selection; eventually the nervous system grows a brain, and the best brains survive. The whole process is 'natural', 'mechanical', 'blind'. It is also a bloody struggle for existence - "nature red in tooth and claw"; for the evolutionary development depends precisely and entirely on its being just such a ruthless struggle and elimination of the unfit at each stage. That is how man evolved, like any other animal or organism. It only remains to add with Spengler that "man is a beast of prey", and to interpret the rise and fall of civilizations in purely biological terms, and we

see that the struggle for power in human society, the economic 'laws of competition', the 'group' (nation, class, etc.) war - these are not merely inevitable but a most healthy, 'natural' and necessary process of human development. So Nietzsche's superman logically issues in Hitler's super-race: 'the iron laws of nature' procuring the survival of the 'master-race' in the inevitable struggle for survival, which has now become the struggle for 'power after power' between national and racial groups.

It is obvious therefore that the 19th century scientific materialism which was the 'fundamental presupposition' of such pioneers as Darwin, Marx and Freud, must inevitably and logically lead to the conclusion that T. H. Huxley, Marx and Lenin, Hitler and the like, drew from it. None of them ever supposed anything else. Confusion about it is solely due to the fog of sentimental 'idealism' and 'humanitarianism' (so called) which is the polar opposite of the 'materialistic realism' of such authors. But as such 'bourgeois', 'soft', 'tenderminded' confusions about the real nature of this 'materialism' and its logical conclusions persist, and among certain groups are wide-spread, we may conclude this argument by referring to the two of the most clear-headed and honest upholders of it.

Freud, like Darwin and Marx, accepted as self-evident the scientific materialism of physical science in his day. In his early work he reacted with dislike and suspicion to the suggestion of anything not reducible to physical terms; and to the end he cherished a hope that the abnormal psychological states with which his psychoanalysis dealt might one day be reduced to chemical changes in the brain. But he was a most original observer, with a very keen mind and extraordinary honesty; so that when he found evidence accumulating that could not be accounted for in terms of the orthodox medical assumptions of his day, he forced himself to face it; and in doing so opened a new era in the understanding of human nature. But the same honesty and penetration that enabled him to go on developing his discoveries in the face of persistent abuse, neglect and misrepresentation, compelled him to dismiss the Messianic hope (he too was a Jew) as only 'the Future of an Illusion'; and his

pessimism about human nature grew steadily deeper. His theory of *it* human nature recognises nothing fundamental in that nature but the biological instincts and the awareness of the environment that this ID has developed as an instrument of survival in the struggle for existence (the function of the Ego is to warn the Id not to bang its head against brick walls, or it won't survive). The rest is due to the workings of that strange and unique function of human nature: fantasy - imagination. Freud clung to his legacy of scientific 'rationalism' to the end; but he came to see it more and more as a rare and feeble power, capable at best of influencing the destructive and aggressive drives which form the core of 'the Unconscious', in a mild way and in a few exceptional people.

B. Russell, a thinker of exceptionally keen ^{intellect} interest and of uncompromising honesty, puts the matter so plainly that it is only necessary to quote his own words: "Such in brief outline, but even more purposeless, more void of meaning, is the world which science presents for our belief. That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and beliefs, are the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave.... All these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffolding of these truths, only on the firm foundations of unyielding despair, can the soul's habitation be safely built.... Brief and powerless is man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way".

"Nature, omnipotent but blind", "the trampling march of unconscious power": this, in less imaginative form and sterilised of the emotion, is the materialism that now became the prevailing philosophy of the West. It will therefore be useful to trace its origin and course of development in order that there may be no misunderstanding of what it is and what has happened.

The father of modern philosophy in the West was Descartes. It was he who set the pattern of the honest seeker for 'intellectual' or 'scientific' truth which has been our model ever since. To be honest (said Descartes) we must be perfectly 'clear' about what we hold to be true and that it is, or is grounded on, what is 'self evident'. But what the society of his day believed was a confused mass of reasons, arguments, traditions, superstitions, hang-overs, etc. In order to clear our minds of cant with strict honesty we must therefore go through a process of doubting everything that can be doubted without self-contradiction. If we do so, we eventually arrive at one thing at least which is beyond all doubt: the reality of the doubting mind. For what is doubting? It is asking: Is this true/untrue (false), real/unreal, right/wrong? But asking these questions is the activity we call 'mind' or 'thought' in its most essential form. And therefore to ask: 'Can I doubt my activity of doubting (the questioning mind)?' is to ask: 'Can I do what I am necessarily doing in the very act of doubting?' I should always be doing what I question whether I can do! - which is self-contradictory, and therefore absurd. I therefore cannot doubt the reality and truth of myself as an honest thinking mind: cogito, ergo sum. And this implies that you can distinguish between the true and the false, real/unreal, etc. or the process would have no meaning; i.e. the ~~antixaxax~~ mind can know what is true/real. If we couldn't, the entire world of our experience would be pure illusion. But we don't make ourselves or the world we live in. So if everything was illusion the Maker of the world and our minds must be the author of this illusion; if so he would be a malicious Demon. If we are not prepared to believe that, our Maker is the guarantee of the reality of our experience and the capacity of our minds to discover the truth about it. This enables Descartes to restore all the certainties not only of science but of the Catholic faith as the revelation of the Maker. How sincere he was in this we can't say; it is one of the vicious effects of the Grand Inquisitor that he confronts 'the honest thinker' (doubter) with: Be orthodox or be burned at the stake. Galileo's fate was a sufficient warning. Nevertheless, the radical process of 'honest doubt' had been started and justified.

Kierkegaard carried on the process; and it led him to have no doubt at all that the conventional 'Christianity' and organised religion of his day was a dishonest sham. So too was the Hegelian worship of Reason, now the prevailing philosophy. As if man's little finite mind (Pascal could inflate itself into an Absolute Reason that could soar above the contradictions and miseries of human existence into the cloudless heavens of Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas and Hegel. There remained only the religious 'faith'. And faith for Kierkegaard meant both faith in the real historical Jesus and his gospel and a faith beyond the reach of reason. And this is an all-or-nothing act of choice; for Jesus himself had said: 'If anyone chooses to be my follower, he must be prepared to put a rope round his neck and follow me to the gallows'. Mankind, whether 'pious' or 'worldly', has no use for that kind of thing.... But why should you make such an irrational 'plunge of faith'? Nietzsche dismissed this whole attempt to 'smuggle' God back by an act of 'blind' faith as a betrayal of Descartes' principle of honest thinking with no humbug. There is no such God and no ^{real} ground for believing in him: the Christian God cannot survive the process of honest doubt carried to its honest conclusion. But the whole traditional morality and belief was grounded in the belief in God. Nietzsche was therefore faced with the herculean task of weeding out everything in Western civilization that assumed this belief. For example, the traditional morality had now no superhuman guarantee whatever, Platonic or Christian. All our values are human inventions with no other sanctions that men give them. And as our current values are shoddy and produce weaklings and cowards, we must find new ones. This will require a new and strange kind of man - the super-man. But to emerge and establish himself the superman will require a ruthless will to power. In the course of his effort to eliminate God and all beliefs based on his existence, and to make himself ruthless Nietzsche lost his sanity. But not before he had established these convictions as 'the only possible attitude for the honest seeker after truth'; and this assumption has been taken for granted by rationalist and empiricist thinkers ever since - from Marx and Darwin to B. Russell, Freud, Ayer and Sartre. It underlies the whole development of industrialism, economic liberalism, and the drive

to the affluent society through technological developments in the U.S.A; and through ^{Marx-} ~~Marx~~ Leninism it has been imposed on Russia and China. What it amounts to, briefly, is this: man has to provide his own beliefs, his own morals and his own ways of living and find his own sanctions for them in his own satisfactions.

This is the background, as I understand it, against which the crucial decisions have to be made to-day. At this point I recalled Collingwood's advice: not to theorise about such matters 'from the outside', but first of all to live yourself into the activity of the mens creatrix you are trying to understand, to the very utmost of your capacity; then (and not till then) to study what the very best minds who have ever worked in that field have thought and said about it; and finally to reflect on what this whole experience has taught you: all this in an attempt to understand the activity from inside.

Might it not throw new light on the Human Situation to try and follow the whole course of the development of the mens creatrix from the earliest forms in which it has left traces of itself to the present day? Naturally such a survey could only be extremely superficial and general at first, but it might be possible to distinguish at least the main trends.

The second lead I had also learnt from Collingwood. His 'Idea of History' is from beginning to end a demonstration that man can develop a capacity to live 'outside himself' in the lives, experience and minds of other people. He can train himself to discover the presuppositions which they take for granted as self-evident and on which they construct their ways of living and thinking; to follow their thoughts and aims as they struggle with the most urgent problems which their world - as they saw it - set them; and to go with them step by step to their solutions. All men, everywhere, who do this become a human commonwealth, each member of which can enrich himself to the limit of his own capacity from the accumulated wealth of this whole world, and in turn enrich it with everything that he has to give.

Of course Collingwood's work - the 'Idea of History' - is applied to his own definite field as a historian-philosopher. But John MacMurray has, I believe, demonstrated logically that it belongs to the innermost nature of human personality to be wholly, in all its aspects and functions, this kind of member of this kind of 'personal world'. Anything other than this, or short of this, is necessarily a restriction or a denial of man's true nature. Therefore living in any other way but this leads inevitably to self contradiction and self frustration and now probably self destruction.

It was the application of these principles that led me to the discovery referred to above: that there are whole ranges of human life and activities in which the Prisoner's way of life has been tried out and completely vindicated: activities in which the mens creatrix has thereby succeeded in living steadily at the point of creative advance and bringing into being, in these fields, a human commonwealth based on free cooperation which has immensely enriched the whole of human life. One beauty of this discovery/^{is} that it is impossible to dismiss it as the familiar 'opium dream' or 'Illusion'. On the contrary, it is the commonplace everyday actuality of all human arts and 'sciences' (in the broadest sense of the word). Anyone can prove this for himself at any time by the simple act of 'enjoying' any work of art or any form of the search for truth which he has qualified himself to share in.

When we take our stand at the first recorded movements of the human mens creatrix and attempt to follow its whole process of self-discovery, self-development and self-creation, the astonishing nature of these truths is immensely heightened. How could animal sounds be transformed into all the spoken languages of history? How could rude pictures scratched on rocks and caves become all the written languages of mankind? How could the coloured figures and shapes become all the experiments in painting, designing, shaping of every kind of material? How could the imitation of animal movements become a mankind dancing itself into civilization? How could images become the language of the great symbols? How could the primitive magic flute of the first shaman become the whole human chorus of music and musical instruments? Ritual become drama,

mythology become philosophy, curiosity become all the sciences? The creation of spoken and written language alone would have been an almost incredible achievement. But to have created all the arts and sciences is a sheer miracle that beggars the imagination. Credo quia absurdum. It couldn't have happened - and there it is. And even as I write this the mens creatrix is out in the blue at all points of the compass, putting out new ('snail-horn perceptions' and living at new points of creative advance. And (as you know so well), the more any of us works his way into any single one of these activities the more real, absorbing and inexhaustible it becomes! Certum est quia impossibile - there the whole spectacle is: quite unbelievable and yet a reality as solid and incontrovertible as the British Museum.

And yet the very extremity of our Human Predicament - especially when experienced at first hand in its most shocking form - reveals a strange self-contradiction at the very heart of human nature and human experience. For we have at the same time discovered that the aggressive and destructive forces of our nature, the drive to 'power after power', are far more real and formidable than we ^{had} remotely guessed them to be. We have found images charged with almost unimaginable potencies of terror and destructiveness (e.g. Moloch, the Furies, the Devil); whole clusters of resistance to creative growth - prejudices and traditions that hang like a mill-stone round the neck of the mens creatrix, and which we can only compare with magnetic fields because they act like hidden magnets of the highest potency; and above all these there rises the figure of the Grand Inquisitor - the spirit of absolute authoritarianism, denying every creative movement of the spirit as heresy, imposing a 'superhuman' wisdom which must be accepted with unquestioning obedience, and every deviation from which must be stamped out in blood and tears.

So we find ourselves living, as it were, at two levels. In whole fields of magnificent creative enterprise and achievement, the mens creatrix has thrown up genius after genius to embody and carry forward its creative advance to the benefit of all mankind; and because it is successfully being mens creatrix, the common wealth of mankind is the very air it breathes. But in the most crucial field of

all we have remained at the biological level, living in terms of tribal politics, the struggle for existence, ruthless competition, the will to power, the philosophy of the organism, technocracy and 'affluence' as the aim of society. This failure has grown more and more disastrous with every advance of scientific knowledge, until it now hangs like a sword of Damocles over the mens creatrix, and even over the human race itself. It would therefore seem no exaggeration to say that if the mens creatrix now fails to break through into the creative advance in these social fields of living there can be only one alternative: either an outburst of destructive violence on such a scale that human civilisation itself will disintegrate, or Hobbes's vision of 'that great beast Leviathan' - the Grand Inquisitor armed with all the increasing resources of human knowledge, from the atom bomb to propaganda and brainwashing.

The full significance of Dostoevsky's great parable now, I think, becomes plain. What the Prisoner was asserting is that the mens creatrix has the power to make this final creative advance, and establish a commonwealth of love (agape) which will transform all personal and social relationships into activities of mutual enrichment: the living spirit embodied with such transparent clarity and beauty in the life of Jesus himself, in his Sermon on the Mount, in his parable of the Prodigal, in I Cor.13. But (the Prisoner insists) this can only come about if the methods of the Grand Inquisitor are totally repudiated, and the spirit of 'agape' substituted for them. To the Grand Inquisitor this is the grand mistake: the ultimate of human folly which the Great 'Wise' Spirit must expose and dispel for ever: it is the 'opium dream' of Marx, the 'Illusion' of Freud, the 'absurdity' of the atheistic existentialists. And after all, Marx did inspire Lenin, who did successfully destroy the old Russia 'once for all'; Stalin did make Russia the Great Power and Scientific Technocracy that it is today - all in less than 50 years! And if the human cost was, while the process lasted, appalling, was it less than the cost of stagnation; of blind alleys; of dragging progress, if not collapse; of Mussolini and Hitler; of Franco and Salazar?

And even if the Prisoner was right, in that belief in power always corrupts and belief in absolute power corrupts absolutely, did not faith in the mens creatrix as the only possible source of the Commonwealth of Man-

kind, hang Jesus on the gallows? Didn't he foresee that it would? Didn't he say that his followers could not avoid the same fate? Of one thing the records ~~have~~ ^{leave} no doubt whatever. If Jesus could have faith that the way of the Cross would in the end destroy the old imperial way of power-politics (Mark 8³¹⁻³⁷), the exploiting of superstition, (Caesar Deus Maximus ~~us~~), and bribery (panem et circenses), it was only because that faith, like his life itself, was based on absolute conviction that 'Our Father in Heaven' is the ultimate Reality and Power in the Universe. But has not our review of the Human Situation today made it more than plain that in the Western World - (the old 'Christendom!') - this belief has become the most radical problem of all - or rather the ultimate 'doubt'? In fact, did not Jesus himself die calling on the God who had forsaken him at the last - a thought so terrifying that two of the gospels substitute words expressing the very reverse of it?

There is then ~~is~~ no doubt whatever that we have here reached the bed-rock issue between the Spirit of Christ and the 'Great Wise Spirit' of the Wilderness - as Dostoevsky presents them. Obviously we must now try to follow up its implications in the world situation today. ~~BEFORE~~ Before doing so, however, we have to meet a primary objection - was the reply of 'The Prisoner' the 'real' gospel of the 'real' historical Jesus? In brief, did the historic Jesus believe in and teach the eternal damnation of the 'wicked'? If he did, ^{Dostoevsky's} ~~his~~ version of the Prisoner's gospel may be the work of the mens creatrix 'dreaming of things to come', but its claim to the authority of the historic Jesus, on the worship of whom the Christian community was founded, is 'a ^{form} of great darkness'. The doctrine of 'eternal damnation' is nothing but the Grand Inquisitor's method of using power and authority of every kind to torture heretics and burn them alive, made not only final and absolute but everlasting. In that case, the worst brutalities of Hitler and Stalin are nothing but the most pale and feeble imitations of this 'absolute' Terror and Savagery that burns men for ever in burning hell. But isn't that ~~JUST~~ just what the vast majority of orthodox and pious Christians have affirmed almost from the first? For is it not in the original records? And was it not

canonised by the early church when it made 'The Book of Revelation' part of its divine 'revelation' and embedded it in its 'sacred scripture'?

The answer to this problem ~~must~~ clearly ^{requires fuller consideration*} be ~~worked out fully,~~ though not here (I have tried to do so elsewhere). ^{Here I need only} ~~All I can say now~~ is that I personally see no real difficulty in deciding that Dostoevsky was right. We have only to apply the methods of ordinary historical criticism to the records to see that the evidence to the contrary in the N.T. is to be explained by the fact that writer-editors of our own gospel records were ordinary simple men of their time and place who never questioned the current traditional beliefs and outlook; and further that what they recorded and interpreted had already passed through the memories and understanding of earlier recorders and 'eye-witnesses' who - if the records themselves are to be trusted - were even more simple-minded* (~~Mask~~). Moreover the record first took shape as 'preaching' and 'instruction of converts' at various 'church' centres in the Roman Empire, and this too naturally determined the selection, presentation and interpretation of the original recollections. In spite of this, however, the records themselves do disclose elements which are so strikingly original, so entirely contrary to the current beliefs, that we can only reasonably conclude that this element contains the 'real' gospel. It includes such of 'the Sermon', the great parables, the account of the Temptation, Caesarea Philippi, and Jesus' answer at his trial. Where else could this have come from other than Jesus himself? And how else could it have maintained its place in the original records as ^{being} too authentic and sacred not to be left there as it was, in spite of the difficulties it/raised? The direction in which the climate of opinion actually tended to work can be followed into the 'Apocryphal Gospels'.

Granting this, we can now take up the final questions whether it is possible to ~~believe~~ ^{believe} in the God of Jesus today. The spread of scientific materialism has already been indicated. It might, however, be replied that this was confined to a small intellectual elite: we must now try to show that this is far from being the case. Professor Kemp-Smith, one of the finest thinkers then alive, had this to say in his 1931 Herts lecture before the British Academy: "In residing,

* See Pt ...

Another Pt 9
m/s

some years ago, at an American State University, one of the things that most impressed me was the prevalence, alike among students and members of the staff, of the view that belief in God is no longer possible for any really enlightened mind . . . (this view) seemed assumed as a matter of course . . . " A hundred years before, both Nietzsche and Kierkegaard had agreed, from their opposite standpoints, that behind the facade of traditional morality and religion in the West, there was nothing but an empty hollow. And Nietzsche went on to say even of men like Kierkegaard: 'Fancy, the poor old chap hasn't yet heard that God is dead!' Of course the facade will go on existing as long as there are people who need the comfort of such support. But (we are asked) is there anyone capable of honest thought, any thinker of real quality and originality, to-day who does not lift his eyebrows at such credulity? Darwinists, Freudians, Communists, Existentialists, Behaviourists, Positivists, Logicians - all such prevailing influences in the entire world of Western thought to-day - would any one of them waste a moment's thought on such an 'absurd' question?

But this brings me to another of my 'growing convictions'! I find it more and more difficult to resist the suspicion that this situation is, in fact, only one aspect of a profound transformation, not merely ^{of} our 'mental climate', but perhaps of the human psyche itself. It is certainly something more radical than anything that happened at the Renaissance. In the Middle Ages the central tradition of orthodox philosophy had established a reconciliation of 'faith' in the Christian 'revelation' with Aristotle's Reason (or Intelligence) as supreme in the order of Nature. The two sources of Western civilization, the Hebrew and the Greek, were thus united in holy (if sometimes uneasy) matrimony. The Creator is perfect Intelligence and therefore his creation must be perfectly intelligible to right thinking. And if, later, men like *Vico* and *Machiavelli* began - consciously or unconsciously - to undermine the supremacy of 'faith', it was only to reinforce their passionate belief in the classical heritage of Greece and Rome, and 'right reason'. (So much so that it is equally central in the Puritan Milton^t). Galileo was a devout Catholic, who (characteristically) assumed that

God had written the book of his creation in the language of mathematics and man could learn to read it. This presupposition that 'the rational is the real and reality is rational', remained the foundation not only (as we have seen) of the Cartesian philosophy: 'clear and distinct ideas' as the basis of mathematical reasoning ⁴ (perfectly illustrated in Euclid), and of the 18th century 'Enlightenment', and of the later scientific materialism so neatly summed by Laplace⁴ (Robespierre even decreed the worship of the Goddess of Reason by revolutionary France!) ^{but} - was also the backbone of 19th century 'idealist' philosophy. When Hegel said that Reality is Reason, and that history is the march of Absolute Reason, he was only reinterpreting Aristotle and St. Thomas in accordance with the new scientific evidence that 'evolution' and 'history' are also fundamental characteristics of Reality.

But it was just this that made Hegel's Logic-Philosophy a portent. It was not merely that, as Kierkegaard mocked, the finite littleness of man can only comprehend the Absolute in the dreams of megalomania; it was also that when Hegel applied his Absolute Logic to the multiplying discoveries of science and history, only a Procrustes could have made the pattern fit the facts. Hegel's (reported) retort "So much the worse for the facts", showed that the game was up. What it signified was the end of an entire epoch: the rationalism of the Greeks, of the Medieval Church, of the 'Enlightenment' was itself proving as illusory as the God it had displaced. And though it made a last stand in the 'mechanical' universe of 19th century materialism, even this form of rationalism gave up the ghost when Laplace's hypothesis faded into Relativity Theory and the discovery that the patterns of physical science on which we rely are statistical averages. Thus B. Russell himself who began as a pure rationalist attempting to reduce science, thought and language to terms of abstract mathematical and symbolic logic, has (if I understand rightly) been driven ruefully to admit that the more precisely accurate the logical-symbolic forms, the less can they be squared with reality.* So 'rationalism' collapsed into a revival of

* (ref will be given)

Hume's empiricism: all we can know is pure sense-experience, the rest is mere private feeling. Metaphysics was dismissed as due to the mystification produced by inflated terminology. Philosophy reduced itself to the analysis of linguistic forms, or the Behaviourism which rules in America and Ryle.

If this stood alone, it might possibly - though personally I do not think wisely - be dismissed as no more than a change in the intellectual climate of the West. But it does not stand alone. It appears to me to be only one symptom of a profound transformation which began to come to the surface in Kierkegaard and Nietzsche with their discovery that 'the solid ground' of western tradition was no longer more than a facade spread over foundations that had crumbled away. Contact with a different civilization, rooted in and producing an altogether different psyche (as in India or Africa or Thibet) makes one profoundly aware of how sharp the limitations are of every individual type of 'historical existence' and its products, and how illusory the obstinate assumption of 'changelessness' that it generates ('eternal' Rome, etc.)

The ^{present} popular cult of Eastern religions in Europe and America, first introduced by Schopenhauer and then spreading widely, is itself a sign that the Western consciousness is groping half blindly for new footholds. In view of the stress laid by the logical empiricists on sense perception as the sole primary source of knowledge, it may be worth mentioning that the Yoga systems of bodily exercise do undoubtedly, by producing abnormal physical states, change the normal mode of sense perception and feeling in a way that seems closely parallel to the action of certain drugs and toxic conditions of the brain; and that this is a reminder that the human organism is itself no more than one highly complicated and 'limited' instrument of experience, which determines what 'we' regard as the 'normal' functioning of perception and feeling. Perhaps this is also not without a bearing on modern art?

There are two other very impressive 'signs of the times' which certainly cannot be dismissed as mere passing phases. The first is the revolutionary change in our view of the human 'psyche' effected by the pioneer discoveries of Freud, and the researches of analysts of every school which has followed them. It seems to me

certain that we must now regard our ordinary consciousness as little more than a 'surface-play' beneath which are concealed dynamic psychic energies which match the elements of modern physical science in their tremendous potentialities and effects, but about which as yet we know almost nothing.

The second manifestation is modern art. Here I can only speak with the utmost caution as an awe-stricken outsider. But only a blind man could fail to see the radical transformations taking place so impressively in all the arts. Painting is one of the most striking. We have only to compare the studies (let us say) of Berenson and Gombrich with Herbert Read's *Modern Art* to sense the strangeness of what is happening. ~~That lovely little~~ ^{Botticelli's} picture of the Annunciation ~~which you give your mother~~ is an almost ideal illustration of the 'classical' tradition: a centrally balanced harmony which embraces every detail of form, colour and symbol. In the development of Impressionism, Cubism, Abstract Art, etc, which finds its negative (revolutionary) extreme in Dadaism and 'anti-art', we can watch this centrally balanced harmony and perspective of 'normal' vision, disintegrating before our eyes into 'atomic elements' which shed themselves all over the canvas like leaves from an enchanter fleeing, and regrouping themselves in queer subjective congregations of aspects and gobbets of features, limbs, and fragments related by memory rather than direct visual association; or abstracted into mathematical (almost Platonic) shapes and figures; newspapers, stringed instruments (Pythagoras!), wires, cloths, pots and pans rubbing shoulders with glowing canvases of pure paint But words fail an astonished ignorance. Fortunately the pictures speak so eloquently for themselves that we are spared any necessity to try and describe them. In geniuses like Picasso we become aware of how profoundly serious and significant and radical these transformations are. In literature, we must be content to refer to James Joyce, Dylan Thomas and all those writers who have followed and are following up their experiments. The younger dramatists seem at present to be occupied mainly with the 'revolutionary' stage of rebellion against and breaking down of our civilisation and its traditional ways of living and valuing: 'Look

back in anger! In France we find a rather more positive and vigorous affirmation of 'the absurdity' of human existence, faced at the same time with the 'existentialist' choice (Sartre; Camus). The prevalence of this negative and repudiating ('revolutionary') phase in drama might I think be summed up in 'Waiting for Godot': our derelict souls represented as ragged and seedy tramps repeating the same old things over and over again in aimless talk while they wait for someone or something who may or may not exist and may or may not be going to keep what may or may not be an appointment with them. This sense of desolation, of fin-de-siècle, was already anticipated in Eliot's 'Waste Land': "We are the hollow men, We are the dead men. Headpieces fitted with straw - ~~an~~ alas!". The scarecrow who embodies the Old Year - the dying or dead past, wrapped in the dead and dried straw from which the living grain has gone and which now is only fit for burning - this is, we remember, the great 'Unconscious Archetype' of the oldest agricultural rituals - too old for its origins to be remembered; a ritual power that did not forget the 'mens creatrix': 'If winter comes, can spring be far behind' (cf. Lawrence's Ship of Death).

I am of course only making a few hasty gestures in the direction of a few of the finger-posts visible to the most superficial observer in this 'revolutionary situation'. All I am concerned with is to ask whether they may not indicate a profound and radical change taking place in the Western 'psyche' visible in art no less than in the Freudian psychology.

But once more: If it was only Western civilisation that is characterised by these signs and symptoms - by behaviourists, materialists, technocrats, gadgeteers, Grand Inquisitors, Dadaists, and Godot's tramps, we might be justified in thinking that, remarkable and widespread as these are in the West, they signify no more than something that has always been happening since the beginning of history: the fall and dissolution of local civilisations and cultures with all their traditions and habits and outlooks. And again, the reality is far otherwise. What seems to me the unique and most deeply impressive fact in the Human Situation today is that 'the revolution' (in every sense) has

affected the whole of mankind at the same time. Never has such a thing happened before in the whole of known history!

For example. In China for centuries \forall the whole life of the people with the whole hierarchy of society, centred round Emperor worship: the Emperor was the focus-point of contact connecting all the ordered grades of peoples, classes, orders, families and individuals - throughout the Chinese empire - with 'Heaven', 'the Celestial World' (the Sources of Life). The Emperor's very person, ceremonial robes, rituals, constituted something corresponding to what happens for the Catholic in the Mass when the bread and wine become the incarnate presence of divinity itself - ^{of} the Creative Life of the Universe. Similarly in the Brahminical theory of Sacrifice in Hinduism, the person and ritual acts of the Brahmin priest might be compared to a switch which turns on the current that connects the whole system with the Dynamo of Cosmic Power. Through such centres (Emperor, Priest, King, Chief, etc.) the entire community and its activities become charged with the Life-power of the Universe. 'Excommunication' and 'exile' cut off the individuals concerned from this life and commit them to the powers of death; hence their terrifying significance in earlier communities. The same was, of course, true of Japan. This system easily accommodated Taoism, Buddhism (in Mahayana form), Confucianism and the like. e.g. Taoism is only a more pantheistic way of regarding the same beliefs: Open yourself to and live in harmony with 'the Nature of things' and they will flow through you and take you up into themselves (cf. Spinoza). In later (Mahayana) Buddhism, 'Heaven', 'the Spiritual World' was conceived as a whole hierarchy of innumerable Buddhas incarnating themselves one after another in this illusory world for the salvation of men. (cf. the Grand Llama of Tibet: Buddhism modified by the old Tibetan Shamanism). Confucianism centres on the Ancestors as the repository - the dynamo-of order and harmony which charges the social structure and family system the ultimate sources of Power. The same kind of principles and sources could be easily demonstrated in Hinduism and the African Chief system. But the above illustrations can serve as examples of all the rest.

In view of the abstract intellectualism of so much Western thought, we cannot remind ourselves too often that a civilization is not a 'house' but a 'home'. Intellectualism (Platonic Ideas, etc.) provided blue-prints. Even a 'house' is still an abstraction from the reality. But a 'home' is so much 'more' as to be different in kind: it has become 'charged' with the magic of personal and family 'mana', saturated with the whole personalities and lives of all the members who have belonged and belong to it; and this is something that goes down to the roots and fibres of their very being, and involves their loves and emotions and passions and memories and thoughts... Or we might take as another analogy the words of the African mother: That fatherhood may be a casual encounter for a man; but the moment the child is created in a woman and she begins to carry it, it not only becomes flesh of her flesh but sends out roots into the finest fibres of her whole being, rousing all the physical and emotional and responsible potentialities of motherhood; she is never the same again.

It seems to me all-important to realize that this is the kind of thing that invariably happens to communities when their civilizations and ~~ex~~ cultures are created and grow and put out roots into the deepest unconscious sources, as well as spreading over the surface of life in ritual, custom, tradition, habit, and the everyday appearances of things. The result is a home not a house. We can readily imagine how after generations and centuries it must pervade and condition and 'charge' the most intimate recesses of life and psyche of the whole community and all its members. It embodies itself in those typical 'symbols' of civilization, which are often so puzzling to the outsider. For example: Englishmen found it very difficult to understand Hindu cow-worship, and Gandhi's insistence that the cow was as sacred to the Hindu as the Virgin to the Catholic. To the ancient Egyptian and Hindu the cow was in simple everyday fact the giver of milk, and milk gave man life and health and energy: it was therefore the embodiment of the 'life-mana', and the cow as the milk-giver was an embodiment and source of life itself (cf. 'I am the Water of Life'). The cow is therefore identical with the Mother-Goddess - the great Divine Mother - and the individual mother who is the first 'milk-giver' and 'saviour' to every son and daughter of mankind. The Cow thus becomes the

Symbol, as it is the embodiment, of the Divine Power of Life whose source is the all-embracing Mother-Goddess. We should not find this difficult to understand: what would Christianity be without the symbol of the Cross, or Islam without the Crescent?

The creation of every great civilisation is ^{an} immensely dynamic achievement of the mens creatrix. But at long last it expands its energy and the creative advance ceases. But its more or less fossilised form may continue to exist indefinitely. It has formed a protective carapace (what I have called the 'magnetic field'). In China, India and Japan these forms remained unchanged for centuries. But meanwhile other parts of the world had developed centres of creative advance; and eventually, as was inevitable, the outside world broke in. What happens in such cases depends of course on the strength of resistance still left in the old order, the changes that have been going on under the surface; and the degree of pressure from outside. In Europe after the Renaissance, the Scientific creative advance carried with it the political and economic orders. When it met a hard core of resistance, as in the French social order, it produced an earthquake. The scientific political and economic waves of this Revolution then spread to America, where the overflow of Europe had found an unexploited virgin field with almost unlimited resources at its disposal. The prevailing philosophy of the new scientific-economic drive was materialistic; but it won immense popularity and credit because of its unheard of practical and technical successes. This materialistic-scientific revolution attained economic and political consciousness, and a prophet, in Marx; and it was preparing to break down the remaining strongholds of the old order in the West when its energies were diverted into the power-politics of nationalism and ^a 'World-War'. But the effect of the war in Russia, where a reactionary despotism had already fallen into senile decay, was to make Russia the spear-head of the scientific-materialistic revolution of Marxism. The result was that for the first time in history a militantly atheistic materialism was imposed on a whole people as an absolute-authoritarian orthodoxy, driven home by all the rigours of a Grand Inquisition. This atheistic and materialistic Communism proclaimed itself the spear-head of a creative advance for the whole of mankind, which would inevitably destroy and supersede all the

old orders everywhere. Meanwhile Chauvinistic power-politics again intervened, and the second World-War produced a cataclysm not only in Germany but in Japan. The latter was ^a new portent. For the second World War completely shattered the old militant order in Japan, still centred round Shinto and Emperor worship, leaving it adrift, rootless, and 'home'-less (see above). It also moved on to repeat the Russian Communistic Revolution in China. And this last regime is ^{now apparently} even more militantly atheistic, materialistic and authoritarian than the Russian.

This then is the new 'human predicament' of a kind and extent that has never before happened in the history of mankind. Over the entire world, centuries old civilizations with their religious and social traditions have been laid in ruins by an earthquake-revolution and their place has been taken by the economic-technology of Western Science. Of the two most powerful world forces to-day, America embodies especially the economic materialism of the 19th century, backed by the ever-growing momentum of technological-scientific advances. Russia and China are avowedly atheistic and materialistic as well as revolutionary in the political and social fields. Their form of Communism is rigidly authoritarian at home and aggressively militant abroad.

In both Russia and China the new scientific-materialistic order has been imposed from above by a small 'elite'. The result is that - to revert to our metaphor - the old 'home' has been destroyed and a new 'house' is being built. What has happened to the dispossessed old-home-saturated 'psyche' or 'soul' of the Russian and Chinese peoples? No one knows. The ghosts have been driven underground. Some hints of the purgatory that the process may be won be gathered from Tibet. The Revolution has not yet in its Marxist form overtaken India; but her ancient civilization is also vanishing into her dust, and she is straining every nerve to transform herself into a modern scientific-economic society. ^{And} there is little doubt that the only alternative is Communism.

There remains Africa. There, I gather, a rather primitive tribal civilization based on 'the chief' (cf. the Emperor) as the link between the 'higher' powers of life and the community (a form of social order as old as the Pharaohs, the Mesopotamian Kings, the Greek 'heroes')

is now disappearing so fast under the impact of outside forces that the anthropologists are hurrying to record its 'vestiges' before they are gone! The abruptness of the shock is so great that no one can predict the effects. But we have recently seen that it can easily release the primitive destructive forces that only a well-knit and settled civilization can hold in check. (~~But I do not wish to say any more as you are going there yourselves; and one object of this paper is to provoke you into reporting on it from the 'world-angle' at first hand.~~)

To sum up:

The Melting Pot. The old metaphor of the melting-pot seems to be the only adequate image of the human situation over the entire world to-day. To rescue this symbol from its present fate as an overworn cliché and restore ^{to} it ^{its} imaginative power we have only to see it once more as one of the archetype symbols of the human race: image of the immortal 'womb of Mother Nature' in which all things are unmade to be remade: the cauldron (e.g.) of Medea in which she did restore old Aeson with the magic herbs of life and out of which he was reborn in all his youthfulness and vitality - the 'Cauldron of Immortality': but also the Cauldron in which those she hated were thrown to die - 'the Cauldron of Death' (the Witches' Cauldron, Macbeth, etc.); or the Celtic Cauldron of Life; and so back into ^{whole} a network of symbols of the Creative Imagination. ^{Thus} like all the old great symbols when recovered from the dull shoddy over cliché-ridden minds and restored to its symbolic power, the melting pot provides us with a magnificent imaginative vision of what is happening to the whole of our human world to-day - even to confronting us with an 'existential choice' between the Cauldron of Life and Rebirth and the Cauldron of Death. And this brings us back yet again to the Karamasov Parable of the Grand Inquisitor and his Prisoner; the choice being now literally a matter of life or death.

I have made it clear that I, personally, do not see much hope either in the new scientific materialism - as such: instrumentalism, gadgeteering, mass-effects (see Steinbeck's Passport) and the like. Nor

in the supremacy of power-politics; whether in the form of the old free-for-all of private competition, or in the new authoritarianisms, or the class war, or of 'love your enemies and hate the French like poison nationalism' and racial propaganda. What does seem to me evident is that the Communist Revolution has released the suppressed energies of the Human Dynamo, but has confined them once more in the old vicious circle and has therefore intensified the old destructive drives. The one hope as I see it, is to clear our minds of every kind of cant, new or old, 'traditional' or 'idealistic', 'sentimentalist' or 'authoritarian', so that we may recognise the real mens' creatrix' in its real nature and its real paths of creative advance. For if there is any truth in my reading of the Human Predicament, the mens creatrix has now reached the stage for its most critical and most difficult advance into the whole social and political and inter-personal ~~struggle~~ relationships of mankind. And the whole ^{future} of all mankind - whether it is to have a future - now depends on whether it succeeds in making this break through.

The Creative Imagination. 'A thing is what it does'. The mens creatrix can only be known 'at work'. That is, by living inside it as a creative process - or shall we say in so far as it comes alive in us? I know it best as Creative Imagination. I want to conclude therefore with a few random pointers (marginal illuminations to a new Book of Hours).

In the great poets the Creative Imagination seems to 'advance' by first projecting itself in an imaginative embodiment of the new development towards which it is moving; gradually it becomes an increasingly conscious movement towards a definite end; and finally it crystallises in the form of a new self-realization. The process is beautifully illustrated by Keats when he says that everyman's life of any worth 'is a kind of allegory', and refers to Adam's dream in Paradise Lost: when the Creative Spirit set out to create Eve, he first put Adam into a deep sleep during which he had a dream-vision of Eve; and when he woke up his dream had come true, embodied in Eve herself. This seems to be true not only of all forms of the artistic imagination,* but ^{of} ~~in~~ every mode

* In ancient mythologies it takes the form of prophetic dreams.

creative activity: scientific discovery, philosophic insight and social and political progress. It is most apparent in the genius in every field: the genius being the most dynamic and therefore manifest embodiment of the mens creatrix in his own sphere. But it can (I suggest) be 'proved on his pulses' by anyone working creatively in that field who takes the pains to reflect on what has actually been going on as he does so. Apart from this, no other evidence is of any value whatever.

To begin with a few poets. We can trace the process referred to by Keats (the 'life-allegory' and 'Adam's dream') in the entire body of Shakespeare's plays, as it grows into an increasing awareness of the human predicament. Marlowe's heroes were all embodiments of 'the will to power'. Elizabethan tragedy was obsessed by the themes of revenge and violence (e.g. Corboduic, The Spanish Tragedy, The Duchess of Malfi, 'Hamlet's Revenge'). Shakespeare presents these themes with powerful realism in his histories and tragedies, and the spectacle fills him with increasing dismay: "it will have blood, they say, blood will have blood" - it is a vicious circle with no way out. Shakespeare's own solution is finally presented in the imaginative form of one of the oldest myths. The Magus (Shakespeare-Prospero) employs his creative imagination (Ariel) to produce a ^v'Vision' of 'a brave new world' brought into being by forgiveness and reconciliation. This is clearly Shakespeare's own personal discovery of the spirit of the ^{Arztwerk} Prisoner as the one hope of solving the human predicament - "or my ending is despair" ... To Blake the brave new world is an ever-present reality - the true reality which surrounds us as an endless outpouring of 'the Energy which is eternal delight' and is only hidden from us by our 'fall' into a state of self-division and self-isolation dominated by the will to power, profit making (the 'golden guinea'), the repression of sensuous delight and imaginative activity by the abstractions of Intellect and imposed moral laws, and so forth. Blake too finds the only hope of 'Salvation' in the spirit of the Prisoner (end of Jerusalem)... Wordsworth tells us that he lived as a native of Blake's world until he let 'this world', and its worldliness close in on him like 'the shades of the prison house' ... Shelley embodies all his profoundest experiences, thoughts and hopes in another primitive myth which pictures the overthrow of

the present tyranny and misery of mankind and its transformation into the brave new world by a Prometheus who is a pure embodiment of the Prisoner's Gospel: this new state of being cannot be pictured ('the deep truth is imageless'), so Shelley's verse turns into poetic music which culminates in three magnificent stanzas in which the spirit of the Prisoner comes alight with creative beauty ... Keats's rich and powerful creative imagination, under the pressure of tragedy and death, crystallizes in yet another archetypal myth whose theme is the birth of a brave new world. So real and personal does this become (the 'allegory' of Keats's own 'life-experience') that he begins to rewrite it consciously as the vision of his own mens creatrix; and the strangely moving picture of Apollo in the original version - the new god of song and music and beauty 'dying into life' as a god and coming 'to see as a God sees' - now becomes Keats himself, endowed by the tragic sorrows of 'Moneta' with the same visionary power 'to see as God sees' the new world order to which the mens creatrix is giving birth... It is the (at least temporary) extinction of this creative vision in the world of 19th century materialism, economic struggle for power, and world wars - so that its civilization is 'like a patient aetherised upon a table' - that is reflected in Matthew Arnold ('now he is dead') and T.S.Eliot ('We are the hollow men, we are the dead men ... This is the way the world ends, not with a bang but a whimper')... In France the reaction was more violent and more negative. Hatred of the stifling city and provincial life of bourgeois order drove Baudelaire to take refuge in a world of pure imaginative symbolism. It drove Rimbaud into believing that he could use his wonderful gifts of poetic creation as a verbal 'magic' to save him from the intolerable 'actual' world. When this failed him he took refuge, like Baudelaire, in drugs and intoxication, and then (at 21!) in gun-running in the slave trade area. It drove van Gogh into actual madness, and Gauguin into opium dreams of enchanted isles of colour and freedom in the South Seas ... In Germany Nietzsche had called for a new kind of man; Goethe was feeling after this superman in Faust These are a few examples from my own reading, of how the response of the poetic creative imagination to the world in which it finds itself can be used to reveal the activities of the mens creatrix: creative where the

genius was powerful enough; frustrated and rebellious where the dead weight of the 'magnetic field' and the 'anti-life forces' were too oppressive. But always in its visions of hope or revolt, giving imaginative expression to the restless impulse of the human spirit for a creative advance: 'the brave new world' ("the world's great age begins anew, the golden years return"; "a paradise within thee happier far"; "the consecration and the poet's dream"). The field here is as endless as it is fascinating. And the other arts, such as music and painting are not a whit less so! ^{To us we might glance briefly at} ~~Turning for a moment to~~ the activities of the mens creatrix in other spheres:

In religion, the O.T. 'proclaims' itself to be nothing else than a revealing of the working out of a divine purpose which would culminate in a new world. This messianic hope inspired, in the $\frac{7}{8}$ poems of the Deutero-Isaiah, some of the most magnificent religious poetry in the world. In the N.T. the transformation - the recreation and rebirth of man and his world - is seen as already begun: Jesus himself not only inaugurates but embodies 'the Reign of God'. Even the compiler of the Apocalypse, that nightmare phantasmagoria of blood and terror, wakes from his bad dreams into a suddenness of pure beauty when he sees a vision of 'the New Jerusalem' 'coming down from heaven' in its loveliness as 'the bride of God'.

All the Eastern philosophies are 'religious philosophies' - that is, dominated from beginning to end by 'the quest for salvation'. It is true that their world, and the human situation as they knew it, drive them to turn from 'this world' in frustration and despair. But the response of the mens creatrix in them is to assert that the true home of the human spirit must lie altogether beyond this life in an unimaginable mode of being - so far 'beyond' that all we can say of it is 'Neti': 'Not here: not this'. 'Salvation', therefore means deliverance from the entire human situation and all forms of human life on earth, as something which can never begin to satisfy the human 'spirit'; 'this world' is only a bad dream, and every form of discipline, asceticism and

detachment is worth while to enable the 'spirit' (atman) to wake from the dream into the self-realisation of the mens creatrix as 'Atman-Brahman': an altogether different kind of being in an altogether different mode of reality.

Then there are the mystics. "Rising very early they have run before in the greatness of their love. They have not shrunk from the sufferings of the Cross. They have faced the darkness of the tomb. And now their winter is over and the time of the singing of birds is come. From the deeps of the dewy garden, life new, unquenchable and ever lovely comes to meet them with the dawn". Those best qualified to know do not seem to think that this is ~~in any way~~ an exaggerated description of the experience of all the greatest mystics of all religions, times and places.

What the ultimate significance of such assurances of having attained to Brahman, atmahood, nirvana 'vision of Him', 'the living presence of God', 'eternal life' - may actually be, is altogether beyond me to say. Though I am convinced that to dismiss whole ranges of the most intense human experience by so many and so different devoted men and women of all times and civilizations as pure self-delusion would be as arrogant as it would be rash and superficial. However, all our concern here is only with such experiences as further examples of the unceasing activity of the mens creatrix as "the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming on things to come".

So we might take as our last example Plato. For, as has been proved from his day to this, those who are least convinced by Plato's metaphysics may be the first to admit that he is beyond question the most influential of all philosophers. Perhaps because his creative imagination was as great as his powers of rational thought, and this is as illuminating as it is rare. The whole aim of Plato's philosophy was, once again, 'salvation' from the human predicament. And that is only another way of saying that he had had a 'vision' of a new kind of life which made the ordinary worldly life seem pitifully unsatisfying beside it - the kind of life that he first saw embodied in Socrates. He was also so responsive to 'beauty' that this too appeals to him irresistibly as an almost 'blinding' revelation of another world (The Cave Myth) - an experience for the

understanding of which we have to turn, not to the philosophers but to such great reflective poets as Keats. What Plato thought of 'this life', in consequence, he tells us in the cave-myth in the Republic. The true life, for which 'this life' should become a mere 'ascensis', a preparation and self-discipline, could (he felt) only be adequately described as the 'divine visions' on which the soul once 'feasted' in the presence of the gods. His accounts of this 'other life' in this 'other world' - in the Republic, the Symposium, the Phaedrus - threw such a spell over Plato himself that his very words become magical with their beauty. Again, our concern here is not with the ultimate truth of Plato's philosophy. Call these his dreams if you will. But why did Plato and Shakespeare and Beethoven have such 'visions'? Why did Mozart's Magic Flute play such music to him? In short, why does the mens creatrix carry on like this? And make a habit of it too? Why do they always appear like as 'splendores ^{ante lucani} ante lucan'; as 'the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming on things to come'; as an 'Adam's dream' of a new reality that is coming into being - with ^{the} genius himself as 'the lovely forerunner in the lists'? The truth is that this is how the mens creatrix creates itself, and so lives at its own point of creative advance. That at least seems to me beyond contradiction: the evidence speaks for itself.

In conclusion, let me briefly and very inadequately, indicate what I take to be the new point of advance in the understanding of all this towards which John Macmurray is leading us. (Only my personal interpretation of course).

Consider a typical organic form of life. No plant is an isolated 'monad', an 'atomic' entity; it comes into being and continues to exist as an individual focus of biological activities and workings ~~in~~ which produce it and with which it is always and necessarily in a process of interaction and exchange; it puts out roots which appropriate the life in the soil; it puts out leaves which absorb the sunlight and transform it into chlorophyll; it gives out scent, provides food, attracts bees to its flowers, reproduces itself - and so forth. It is thus a very clear example of what it means to be a unique here-now embodiment of a world of living

activities and processes in which it is a centre of rhythmical give-and-take interchange. Again, a snail grows a protective shell: but it lives by its sensitive 'snail-horn' perceptions'; if it were to retreat into its shell and seal itself inside - become a 'monad' - it would die. Never can any living thing be real or exist outside the world of living activities within which it comes into existence, which produce and support it and to which it returns. Now man is a member of both these worlds; of physical and organic processes; but he also includes something more; The characteristic world in which the human being comes into existence and lives, from beginning to end, is a world of persons. He is a unique centre of this personal world and draws his life as a member of it from and through an unceasing mutual interchange with its goings-on. This unceasing rhythm of response, appropriation and outgoing return is as much an essential characteristic of the person as the similar organic activities are of the organism. It is this personal world in which he comes into existence and which makes him what he is; never at any point or moment does he exist as a human being outside it; in no way can he 'be himself' except as a member of it. It follows that to treat him as non-personal, or even to think of him as such, is an act of limiting abstraction which cannot do justice to his full reality, or tell the whole truth about him; or tell the whole truth about 'reality'. We can of course treat him as ~~factum~~ 'a thing' for a special purpose; and since he is a material body we can in this way learn what there is to be learnt about him as a physical object. Similarly we can regard him as an organism; and since he is a centre of organic activities we can in this way learn what there is to know about him as a member of the organic world. But to identify him with a physical entity or an organism, to assume that this is 'all there is to him' and constitutes his full reality, is to commit the plainest and most vicious of abstractions. Its falsity is evident; for if we know ourselves as physical bodies and as living organisms, we know ourselves, equally originally, ~~as living organisms~~ equally directly and certainly, as personal members of the world of persons. We have only to immerse ourselves in our awareness of ourselves as we 'really and truly' exist, to know immediately that we cannot really deny or reject such intimate knowledge. Indeed, this awareness, or consciousness, even of 'the physical'

and 'organic' is not shared by physical or organic entities as such, but is the unique characteristic of the personal. This 'personal' knowledge must therefore be the source and core of any 'true' or 'real' philosophy of human nature. And the denial of it in the practical world of daily life is therefore bound to be disastrous.

This insight calls for a complete rethinking and working out of all past philosophies, theories, assumptions, and inferences about 'the human animal'. What does it mean to be a member of the world of persons? And since we do not create ourselves as individual persons, and certainly do not create the world of persons, what logical inferences must we draw from the existence of the world of persons?...

At last we have the possibility of a philosophy which does full justice to the mens creatrix - to its existence and all its works; and this constitutes, in itself, a new break-through in its creative advance.

Everything that I have said above therefore constitutes the widows mite which is all I can contribute to this vast and exciting prospect.

P. P.

[Notes on
Pipes 1900]

Ap's "Bydualysis of and
the basic symbolic systems."

1. "splendores ante-luceni"

2. unconscious
new creatrix
"dynamis"
the psyche (immature)
the psyche - mind
"primitive" mind?

symbol - ^{love}
"charged image" e.g. falling in

analysis of primitive ritual
(function?) of myth

subjective } syncretism
objective } ^{mythical as myth forms}
 } confusion of functions

primitive ritual as a clue

Topicality: Collingwood

Idea of history as a
method. What is it?

Dreams - a running commentary on the
activities of the unconscious.
dreams & externalize the unconscious
symbolic representation i.e.
through imagination - without
it we should be completely in the
dark.

page 2: INSANITY
3: World War (other upheavals). Buddha.

Watching Tom die (Kestis) etc etc ETC

Positive approach

Page 6

Out in the blue; Creative advance
↕ magnetic fields of authority - the
Sanctuary from the dynamo
hitting the wonders of mind centross
language (unspoken)
spoken
written
symbolized

Correct [to the needs of prehistory
"explained"
Barthes (Europeans)

Page 9 comes to the point "the G. Inquants"
Myoma's answer.

the realm of society }
vs
realm of mind }

Karl: The answer to authority (its saving
need) is freedom - freedom gained
by knowledge: is the recognition
of necessity (=the evident)

Eril fromman came nearest
his reputation but short of
Jesus