

Karli

PART II

THE HUMAN PREDICAMENT
TO-DAY

Infynt been the sorrows and the tears
Of olde folk, and folk of tendre yeers.

(Chaucer)

'Man, proud man,
Dressed in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured -
His glassy essence - like an angry ape
Plays such fantastic tricks before high Heaven
As makes the angels weep.'

(Shakespeare)

~~'Oh I have ta'en
Too little care of this. Take physic, pomp,
Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
That thou may'st shake the super-flux to them.'~~

~~(Shakespeare)~~

I. INTRODUCTORY

A. The Discovery of the Hidden Dynamo.

At one stage of Pavlov's experiments in the forming of conditioned reflexes in dogs, the laboratories where the dogs were kept were flooded, and the dogs were only rescued when the water had almost reached the ceiling. By that time the dogs were in a state of extreme terror. When the experiments were resumed it was found that the panic had obliterated all the carefully built up patterns of conditioned reflexes. Similar observations were later made by psychiatrists dealing with war-neuroses, such as shell-shock: if the actual state of panic or shock which had induced the defence mechanisms of the neurosis were revived in the patient so powerfully as to reproduce the original emotional 'brain-storm', ^{a state resembling} the neurotic paths formed by them in the brain could be obliterated.

This is the report of Dr. W. Sargant on 'The Battle for the Mind'. Dr. Sargant, who took part in the research, went on to compare the effects of hell-fire preaching - effects deliberately aimed at this result - by certain well-known older revivalists; and repeated in the techniques of producing hysterical symptoms and fits employed by some religious sects in America to-day. The effects in all such cases were the same - the violent emotional crises tended to obliterate relevant patterns of past habits and ideas, leaving the convert open to 'reconditioning' in accordance with the convictions and aims of the sect.

Once these methods are understood, there is nothing to prevent any unscrupulous authoritarian from developing them into a form of 'brain-

washing' that will be, in almost all cases, irresistible. For - leaving aside any resort to physical torture - only very rare individuals are capable of resisting the continual production of prolonged or violent emotional crises; especially when these are aggravated by persistent isolation, or by social disapproval and ostracism. And the rare obstinate heretic, who cannot be broken down by this psychological equivalent of 'the cold war', can always be finally 'liquidated'.

Modern methods of propaganda have to be experienced for their full power to be realized. People who made the experiment of going to stay in Nazi Germany for two or three weeks and cutting themselves off from all sources of information except those to which Germans themselves were exposed, were shocked to find how quickly they became drawn into the flood of incessant propaganda by which they were continually surrounded, with nothing to counteract it, and their critical detachment broken down.

More direct methods, from the concentration camp to mental and physical torture, are now equally familiar, and have frequently been described in detail - sometimes with convincing objectivity - by survivors.

More subtle, but perhaps for that reason no less effective in the long run and even more dangerous, are the multifarious activities of 'hidden persuaders' of every type. American writers have specialised in the analysis of them.

Thus a modern 'Absolute Dictator' supported by a Totalitarian State and a 'secret police' - the Grand Inquisitor of to-day, who includes every embodiment of imposed 'absolute' authoritarianism - has not only the threat of the hydrogen bomb with which to reduce us to submission. He has also at

his disposal everyone of the 'persuasive' methods indicated above. All these together present a threat more formidable, more effective, and more alarming than any method of purely physical destruction.

And of course none of these can be regarded as 'the last word' in its own field. On the contrary, few things are more certain than a progressively rapid development in the understanding and technique of all such forms of knowledge and control.

This is the most characteristic aspect of the 'Human Predicament today. The possibilities it opens up of anyone in absolute authority or power obtaining such a mastery of those subject to him that he can play on them as a musician plays on his instrument can no longer be dismissed with Hamlet's devastating irony. (And Hamlet after all was a prince and heir to a throne!) Even Henry James' story (The Turn of the Screw) can no longer be dismissed as a horrifying but pathological phantasy. On the contrary, such dramatic pictures can now be recognised as uneasy stirrings of the mens creatrix, 'dreaming of things to come'.

B. 'The Hidden Dynamic'

When Freud declared that 'the dream is the royal road to the 'Unconscious', he was introducing a revolutionary discovery of no less importance than the splitting of the atom.

He was, firstly, pointing to the existence of an 'Unconscious'. For our purpose we need only assume this to mean that man's conscious activities constitute no more than a small focus of awareness at the surface of the 'psyche': the point at which the dynamic activities of the psyche-soma

meet the dynamic activities playing upon it from the outer world. Beyond this surface-play lies an indefinitely large field of powerful forces which are constantly active but which (as yet) lie outside the small focus of awareness.

But this is only part of its significance. It was also the discovery, for the first time in human history, of the fact that, while it is impossible to observe these activities directly, it is possible to gain an indirect understanding of them, thanks to the strange and incurable habit of the human psyche—some of 'giving itself away' by embodying ('exteriorising', 'projecting') its goings-on in 'imaginary' symbolic forms which provide a kind of running commentary on its activities! Consider, for example, the dream — the activity which opened Freud's eyes. 'Primitive' man regarded his dreams as 'real' happenings, parallel to the 'waking' events of his every-day life: something that could be compared with the world he saw reflected in still water and polished surfaces[†]. Later, dreams came to be regarded as 'oracles': warnings^{or} predictions of what would happen. (We have only to recall the Iliad, The Epic of Gilgamesh, the dreams of Joseph and Daniel in the Old Testament, the opening chapters of Luke and Acts in the New Testament, etc.). Finally, rationalism dismissed the dream as confused nonsense. Freud established that the dream is a true revelation; but not of the happenings in the 'outer' world of historical events. It reflects what is going on 'inside' the hidden world of the human psyche. If the dream appears nonsense, that is because it is a product of the 'imaginative' activity (phantasia) and therefore 'symbolic'; and its symbolism — like that of any other 'language' — needs to be understood and interpreted. This

† The mirror is one of the archetypal images of mythology.

pioneer discovery of a new psychic 'America' was extended into a field of equal importance in Piaget's careful studies of 'Play' in children.

These were discoveries of incalculable significance. It could now be established that the imaginative activity is an essential function of the human psyche-soma-mind^{self}, and belongs to its very nature. It ranges from the workings of phantasy, day-dreaming and 'play' to the maturest developments of man's 'Creative Imagination': his arts, religions, philosophies and scientific discoveries.

There was plenty of other evidence that Freud was on the right track. Quite a number of queer facts had been coming to light about 'hypnotism'; Morton Prince had published a detailed study on a case of 'Dissociation of the Personality', soon authenticated by others; Janet and Charcot were calling attention to the strange behaviour of what they called then 'hysterical patients'; Binet, Sidis and others were collecting accounts of loss of memory, 'fugues', and the sudden eruption of dissociated memory-clusters; Le Bon and Trotter were pointing to the familiar but unexplained symptoms of the mob-hysteria and panic; there was now interest in why men commit crimes - especially crimes of violence; and in 'collective neuroses' such as the South Sea Bubble, tulipomania, and Klu-Klux-Klan. These were soon to be followed by detailed studies of 'split-personalities' like Father Joseph, who seemed able to function most efficiently in two water-tight compartments; one-track minds like Fouche and Robespierre; and fanatics (whose name is legion). How account for the operation of the violent and obstinate prejudices which not only carried on a pitched battle against Florence Nightingale and blinded Whig politicians to the

horrors of the Irish Famine, but broke out even in the austere fields of science and medicine, producing bitter opposition to Boyle, Lister, and Darwin and to Freud himself. And finally, 'insanity' in all its forms has proved a promising field when studied in this light: the first full scale account of schizophrenia by a sufferer himself had already appeared in Germany before Freud began writing.

In the international field, the first half of the 20th century saw two World Wars; the degeneration of the League of Nations into power-politics; two new 'volcanic' eruptions: the Russian and Chinese Revolutions; the rise of Fascism and Hitler. In India too there were rumblings of political earthquakes to come.

All this invited a new study of such notorious facts in the history of religion as fanaticism, persecution, crusades, inquisitions, witch-hunting, pogroms, odium theologicum and excommunication.

We were reminded that strange things had happened to transform the great historical religions themselves. Even stranger things happened to the original gospel of Jesus.

Meanwhile Frazer had opened up a vast new perspective of 'primitive' ritual, mythology and folk-lore, which, together with the study of witchcraft and of alchemy, pointed to workings of the human psyche so strange and alien to the rational mind as to be almost unintelligible.

Even the mature Creative Imagination of Art shows every sign of rising from 'the burning core below'. For example, Coleridge in ordinary life was an unending stream of metaphysical and theological speculation; even at school (we are told) he 'spouted' neo-platonism and metaphysics (Lamb's button!). But when his 'shaping spirit of imagination' gave birth

it was to the Ancient Mariner - an embodiment of sheer magic (black magic at that), crystallized into a language and movement of such purity and speed that the poem contains hardly a superfluous word. Milton surely never intended the superb figure of Satan which, like the blazing constellation^{of 'Ophiuchus'}, 'fires the length' of the opening books of Paradise Lost. Any more than Shakespeare intended to wreck the light-hearted comedy of The Merchant of Venice with the tragic figure of Shylock. Keats began Hyperion as an escape from watching his brother Tom die at 19; but soon he found it taking such an unsuspected shape as an embodiment of his most profound experience and insight that he began to rewrite it from the beginning.

Then there are Shakespeare's tragic heroes. Each one in turn is disastrously betrayed by his blindness to 'the hidden dynamo' within him, which engulfs him like an earthquake. The public figure of Othello as the cool master of every situation is built up with elaborate care; no one (except Iago), least of all Othello himself, has any suspicion of the volcanic forces that destroy both him and Desdemona. Macbeth has hardly killed Duncan to obtain 'the sweet fruition of an early crown' before awareness of his tragic error overwhelms him, and every new day joins 'the yesterdays' that 'have lighted fools the way to dusty death'. Lady Macbeth too deceives herself; all her proud words recoil on her with dreadful irony in the sleep-walking scene; life breaks her and she dies. Lear is driven mad by his own blind folly. Brutus assassinates Caesar to keep Rome free and finds he has enslaved her. And so with them all!

† See Part IV

The picture that was now building itself up on every side suggests an analogy from modern physics: a tremendous dynamic core of energy taking shape in all the creations of art and thought, culture and civilization; and moving continually into new and astonishing creative advances. But equally liable to break out in unpredictable and uncontrollable outbursts of destructive activity, comparable to the floods and volcanic eruptions which so deeply impressed themselves on the memory and imagination of the human psyche that they haunt all mythology. Both these drives are apt to generate such tensions of hidden anxiety and fear that they ^{consolidate} petrify the energies of the psyche into ^{close packed} fields of stubborn resistance to all movement and life, and at the extreme emerge into absolute authoritarianisms which make freedom itself the arch heresy.

So urgent and so immediate is this challenge that no one can refuse to commit himself to working for greater knowledge and control of it, with whatever resources he can find in himself.

R O D O S

C H A M E L E O N T O S

An attempt must now be made to find a way through the confusing complexities of the Human Predicament to-day. What I am concerned to suggest is that what distinguishes this situation to-day is that it is ~~the~~ 'human' not only in the sense that this is the kind of situation which 'human nature' is apt to produce as it goes on its characteristic way, but also in the sense that it has now become world-wide. This is something that is unique in its history; it has literally never happened before. The advance of modern knowledge and the violent clash of rival claims to possess the true way in which 'humanity' as such should organize itself and live, have combined to break down all the enclosures in the shelter of which the various human groups, racial and national, types of civilization and culture, regional and temporal, and the like, ^{had} developed their own peculiar ways ^{of living} of living, thinking, feeling, speaking and organizing themselves. All these protective walls have been broken down. The rival claims ~~is~~ about the proper way ^{of living} for all human beings - not as particular groups and societies but as universally human; and the militant, revolutionary and deliberate determination of at least one group to impose its way of living on the entire human race - these have drawn every people and 'class' over the whole globe, without exception, into this universal struggle and is making it a conscious struggle. Moreover in the course of this process, 'the march of revolutionary advance' - both in the field of knowledge (e.g. physical science and technology) and of social organization ('Communism', 'democracy', international economy, and so forth) - have everywhere destroyed, or at least are destroying the habits, the ways of living, the beliefs and values that were rooted in the far-distant past,

^{which} and have for millenia moulded the entire 'human living' of all who belonged to them. The human race is in the melting pot. It is this that makes 'the Human Predicament' to-day' unique.

It is almost impossible for any understanding to embrace all that is happening. It is quite impossible to predict the outcome. And yet this is the world we live in, and to which we must ^{adjust} adapt ourselves. And the fact that it is the world of the Atom Bomb with all its 'open' possibilities of development, compels us all to a choice of extreme necessity and instant urgency.

Some of the elements of this world-situation, at least, we have now to grasp as best we can; we have to make what practical judgment we can in face of a deliberate challenge that leaves us no choice but to choose.

Individual limitations and personal inadequacies, ^(such as mine) would, in this state of affairs, seem to be so obvious as to suggest it is superfluous, even absurd, to draw attention to them. But however plausible, this attitude is completely mistaken. In view of the power of propoganda and similar sources of confusion, prejudice and misleading, it was never more important for everybody both to clear the mind of cant and to be as candid as possible about the limitations and disabilities of the particular mens creatrix that is trying to contribute its individual insights to the common cause. Corruption of consciousness, both personal and social, is one of the most formidable of all the present problems, and none is more difficult to deal with.

This is excuse enough for the attempt here made to find a way through the complexities of the present world situation as it has reflected

itself in one personal experience.

The harsh realities of the Predicament so starkly present in India at the Partition are now apparent, ^(mutabi mutandis) all over Africa. That the same savage and elemental forces have come to the surface in a similar form and on a scale as in the rest of the world. This is another proof that we are dealing, not with local or temporal problems, but with a problem which is characteristic of human nature as such. Here too, we are faced with the same problem of two ways, or levels, of living and thinking; one death, the other yet to be born; and if we do not find the right solution we are "dead and done with".

Looking back we can now see that the human mens creatrix has been 'in labour' with this predicament all through its development and history. Our first ^{necessity} is to understand this process and its present outcome. This (we have suggested) can now be done because of the discovery that the human creative imagination has an ineradicable habit of 'bodying forth' the inner story and significance of its birth pangs in dramatized images of its inner life. And when we turn to early mythology we find that it is full of images of the waters of 'the Great Below' rising up in a flood to cover man and his earth. The universal appeal of such legends shows that it is more than a memory: it is also a prophetic image of the dynamic energies in man's psyche breaking through the 'superstructure' of his civilizations and traditional life-forms. The typical act of creative imagination in the individual mens creatrix can be observed in great artists. Here is ^A characteristic example of the visionary power at work in a great poet: *is to be found in*

Wordsworth's {Prelude (VI 525-542, 556-572)}.

Again: The universal theme of all mythologies is the decisive conflict between the forces of creation and destruction, life and death. It is this, for example, that lends such significance to Dostoevsky's imaginative illumination of such a conflict in the world-crisis of to-day. We are growing so aware of the problem that we can hardly miss the devastating irony of his parable: the fact that the cynically frank 'superman' authoritarianism of the Grand Inquisitor was the actual outcome of the way taken by the historical development of Christianity itself! 'The Great Wise Spirit' to whom the Inquisitor appeals is (he admits frankly) the Satan of the Gospel story: that is to say, the spirit that to Jesus was the very embodiment of Anti-Christ. The Inquisitor himself is perfectly well aware of this ("I know who you are"); and he says deliberately that 'Satan' was right - that in fact it was Satan who was the Great Wise Spirit. 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 of Christ' whose sole function was to stamp out heresy - would have to burn Jesus himself, ^{as the grand heretic} at the stake before he could do more mischief ("tomorrow"). This is, among other things, a timely reminder that the most callously cruel embodiments of the Inquisitor's 'Great Wise Spirit' today (from France and Fascism to Communism) have also arisen in the West - i.e. in 'Christendom' itself.

The Grand Inquisitor is admitting, with a blunt and refreshing candour impossible to any of his actual 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 frequently obscured by orthodox doctrine. 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 actual records Jesus said as plainly as he could speak - at the Temptation, at Caesarea Philippi, at the Trial - that the ultimate choice was for him a choice 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', and others) that if as 'God's chosen people' they resorted to power-politics, they were heading straight for the most appalling disaster. Josephus' "Wars of the Jews" is one long commentary on the accuracy of Jesus' insight. The original records make it perfectly clear that at least in Jesus' view - the two are at opposite poles of human living and thinking.

St. Paul (as so often) 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 Empire; similarly the new Christian communities must be 'colonies of Heaven', citizens of the Christ-like way of living and thinking. The Communists took a leaf out of the same book when they created their 'cells' and Party centres. The clue is in all cases the same: a new kind of people, living a new kind of life, with a new kind of outlook. To repeat once more 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 (mens creatrix).

Eighteen hundred years later Nietzsche grasped exactly the same necessity (his 'super-man'). But he deliberately chose 'the will to power', that is, (the Grand Inquisitor); and his Zarathustra was the Inquisitor's Great Wise Spirit.

The direct impact of Jesus' personality, life and death - so vividly epitomised in the story 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. 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 IV 7, 18). Already in the third century A.D. we find the Church admitting to its sacred authoritarian canon of 'inspired 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. VI 19, V 11f). What this spirit really comes to has (as we have seen) been 'blazoned' 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 (Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes), the avowed purpose of which is 'to justify the ways of (the Christian) God to man'. The brutal impact of these immensely powerful writings - once we have rid ourselves of the sentimental pietism in which they have been decently obscured, and the magic of their superb artistry,

^{reduces any} makes comment a feeble echo. ^{whisper} But what both 'The Book of Revelation' and Milton do is to throw into relief 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 Dostoevsky's Parable was not really about the past but an insight into the present. The Russian Orthodox Church, united to Caesar (Czardom), had in actual fact, in the name of Christ become Anti-Christ. The Russian people were already about to give birth to a revolution that was to change the course of history; and this coming event too his creative imagination had seized on and embodied in 'The Possessed'. What Dostoevsky's imaginative insight had understood and illuminated was therefore one of the most extraordinary paradoxes to be found in human history: 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 ways of living in conflict with one another is of course not unique. In Greece, for example, there was Socrates: Plato used all his early genius to make clear the significance of his life and fate. Again: as Herodotus' history reaches its climax we can feel the great wave of idealism and love of freedom (the working of the mens creatrix) which had been roused by the defeat of the Persians, and its marvellous flowering in Athenian and Ionic art and 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 not always been apparent; for 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 as a kind of 'conversion': a sudden revelation that it is possible to live on an altogether different plane. It was like a 'message' (he says) from a 'diviner' world which could 'transfigure' human life. But by the time that Plato wrote the Symposium, 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 very near despair: only the rarest of men could live the Socratic life; no 'Republic' could survive in this 'Actual World'; so the Grand Inquisitor was right after all; the true community was 'laid up in the heavens': for earth, the 'Laws'. We recall the only funeral speech in history to match that of Pericles, spoken by as ^{great} noble a statesman as Pericles over the dead of another civil war which Lincoln had begun. Its legacy is still evident to-day, 100 years later. *-

* of Edm. Wilson: 'Patriotic God'.

Indian tradition offers us, as the final word of Hindu philosophy on the solution of the human predicament, the Bhagavad Gîta. The Gita itself 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 passionate detachment, knowing that you are nothing but an actor in the 'play' (lîlâ), the cosmic drama, which the Absolute 'imagines' to himself (mâyâ). 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 is almost anemic. Buddha's answer 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. In short: 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 - the general effect was to leave 'the world' to 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 is and has to be run. In personal life, the attempt to live seriously in both worlds could only lead to a complete split of the personality into 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 conscience: for example, a Richelieu aided and abetted by the ascetic mystic, 'Father' Joseph of the Church of Christ. Richelieu and Napoleon have themselves ^{no} ~~ex~~ illusions; if there must be 'opium dreams', they are reserved for 'the masses' they rule.

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 now survives, 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. The practical 'realists' (i.e. the 'economic liberals') - ~~do make~~ ^{by} a concession to traditional piety, ^{was} doping 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', 'free enterprise', 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 to carry this ruthless 'struggle for existence' into a class war which would prove the last phase of it in human history. This struggle had always been a battle; first with 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 world of 'scientific materialism'; but a 'dialectical' movement is given to it by man's driving impulse to satisfy his needs more fully. The logical outcome is the Communist Manifesto which is the 'fighting' heart of Marxism, the practical embodiment of Marx's declaration that the most important thing in the world is no longer to understand the world as a detached philosopher-
interpreter, but to transform it by a radical revolution both in history and philosophy.

Ecrasez l'infame: in all my discussions, study groups and meetings with communists in India and elsewhere, I 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, ^{and} use of violence and so forth which 'any true communist will of course use whenever necessary', openly or under cover. A kid-glove Revolution! Had I read the Manifesto? They quoted Lenin. They pointed to Stalin.

Ecrasez l'infame! If this had been all, the problem would have been comparatively simple. A straight line would have run from the Manifesto through Lenin to Stalin. And there Stalin was, the living reincarnation of the Grand Inquisitor, complete with his new Inquisition, his prisons into which heretics vanished silent and without trace, his secret police, his purges, his up to date version of the auto da fe - all the familiar rest of it; dressed in the trappings of 20th century Moscow of course, but essentially unchanged. After all, what can you do with heretics? They are 'the enemy', the 'traitors', 'the wreckers', the 'infidels', spreading corruption and death like the plague. 'Heresy': grant the Inquisitor in all his guises that master conception and you must grant him the rest. The Prisoner and his fatal 'freedom' are the delusions of a drug-addict (opium for the herd). Ecrasez l'infame so that they can never trouble mankind again. 'The march of history' leads inexorably to the class-war, to Stalin's Russia, to the dictatorship of 'the Party' (the true Proletariat!). So there can be no room for sentiments; it was the cold clear logic of the dialectic of history. What had the Prisoner done for

the industrial proletariat, for the Russian masses? Was not the Czar the Head of the Orthodox Church (the new Holy Roman Emperor)? For the matter of that, what had Hinduism done for the Indian masses? All this the Indian communists underlined. In the security of the British Raj in India it might (and did to me) appear somewhat exaggerated and inflated propaganda. But (they replied) the facts were too plain; it was this bourgeois complacency that was unreal, intolerable. It wasn't pleasant; but nor were the Czar, Mussolini and Hitler. 'We' were the dreamers.

'If' that had been all, the issue would indeed have been so much more straightforward. But of course it wasn't. How could Stalin's Russia be what Marx had intended? An association in which 'the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all'. Free conscious activity is the nature of man as man... In degrading spontaneous activity, free activity, to a mere 'means', estranged from the fruits of his labour, we make man's life as man nothing but a mere means to his physical existence... Man also forms things in accordance with the laws of beauty. That man is estranged from his nature as man means that men are estranged from each other, as each of them is from essential human nature.. Communism is already conscious of itself as the return of man to wholeness, to his real self, the transcendence of human self-estrangement. When communist workers meet the brotherhood of man is no mere phrase for them, the nobility of man shines upon us from their work-hardened bodies .. Assume man to be human and his relationship to the world is a human one, then love cannot but be a mutual relationship.. If you want to enjoy art you must be an artistically cultivated person.. Every one of your relations to man and nature must be a specific

expression, corresponding to your conscious intention, of your real individual life.. If through a living expression of yourself as a loving person you do not make yourself a loved person, your love is frustrated - and that is a misfortune...' (The 1944 MSS).

The situation positively cries out for an answer to the problems it raises. What was the real and abiding core of Marx's beliefs, of his true intentions and purpose? Were such statements as the above a passing phase, reflecting the idealism of youth and inexperience? Or did they remain the guiding light and inspiration of his entire life and work?

Ignorant of German, and without the time or means to discover 'what the evidence would persuade us to believe', this remained one of those many vital questions to which I was left without a clear and honest answer.

One thing however was clear. If this was the intention and the goal of Marxist Communism, then Stalin's Russia - and now Mao's China? - was not the answer. But if so here was another problem crying for an answer. What had gone wrong and when and where? Did this actual historical outcome (Stalinism) become 'inevitable' in the realities of real revolution? Or had it already fallen into this groove when Lenin, seeing clearly that a real revolution could never be made by an amorphous proletariat-peasant mass-movement, set himself to train an elite of professional revolutionaries with one thought and one will? - The elite that became the Party that became Stalin - the House that Jack Built? Or was Stalin one of those Grand Inquisitors 'by nature', that any 'Time of Troubles' throws up, and whose cunning seized the 'chance' of Lenin's premature death? Few questions could be more important. But the answer waits on the evidence that persuades

to belief'; and where and what is this evidence?

One thing at least seems to me obviously essential: to keep clearly in mind the distinction between the three things already referred to.

1. The irrepressible dynamic drive of the mens creatrix towards creative advance.

2. The inevitable, and up to a point invaluable, destructive dynamic which breaks to pieces the whole oppressive system of an old order which has long remained clamped down on the mens creatrix like an iron mould.

3. The imposition of a new 'absolute authoritarianism' - Grand Inquisitor or Great Dictator - which attempts quickly to re-impose the philosophy and the system of 'the Great Wise Spirit' on the 'revolutionary situation'.

The kind of conflict that a Revolution tends to arouse between these three forces is finely illustrated in the first rapturous response to the American and Russian revolutions of such 'creative imaginations' as Blake, Shelley and Wordsworth. What these poets welcome with such enthusiasm is clearly the release of the mens creatrix. It so happened that Wordsworth was actually in France when the Revolution began; and he has left us ⁱⁿ the Prelude a first hand description of the process he saw at work: "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive, But to be young was heaven" - why, he has explained in more detail in his talks with Beaumarchais. "France standing at the top of golden hours". Then came Robespierre, the imposed worship of the Goddess of Reason, the Terror, the military dictatorship of Napoleon, and the bourgeois finale that finally settled like a pall over everything.

The course of events in Russia was as different as the two civilisations. But there too, the actual outcome of the Revolution was a new dictatorship: not freedom but slavery. And of course the new Grand Inquisitor had his new authoritative sacred writings, his new Inquisition, heresy hunting and the liquidation of heretics - and the rest of the familiar story. It might serve as an 'Illuminated' illustration of Dostoevsky's parable.

Another problem which is raised by Marx-Lenin and the sequel to the Communist Revolution is the ambiguity of 'materialism'. There can be no doubt that 'materialism' is one of the key principles of Marxist Communism. Marx made that plain. And Engels, Lenin and Stalin and all their followers, repeated it ad nauseam. It is also claimed as 'scientific' materialism. Now 19th century science left little doubt what was meant by that. 'Dialectical' materialism injected the leaven of human energy into the lump; but what did this involve? And where did the human energy and understanding come from? When Marx said that Hegel's Idealism had put everything upside down and that he was going to get man on his feet again, did he mean more than the fact that, whatever else he may be, man is an animal, and that like all animals, he lives, acts and is aware of the world through his physical organism?⁷ Man was born in the mud (the clay of Genesis) and history is the record of how he developed his powers by wrestling with nature, moulding nature to himself and his needs while nature moulded him. Even man's sense of beauty and friendliness, if he had them, grew like everything else out of this. But that is not all that 19th century science meant by scientific materialism. It meant Darwin's theory of evolution

through the struggle for existence - as Darwin explained it. Sometimes it meant that 'the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile'. It could also mean the 'determinism' that the physical science of the time found to be the ruling principle throughout nature (cause and effect). What Marx and Lenin and Stalin and the various communist writers meant by 'materialism' was not always the same and is not always clear. Some of them even appear to have got confused between 'materialism' and 'realism'!

But however it came about this ambiguity is more than unfortunate. For what is called 'Marx-Leninist' Communism has now become the official creed of the two largest nations in the world and its influence has spread far beyond their boundaries, leaving nothing untouched. And since 'scientific materialism' is a foundation-stone of Communism this ideology too - as Communist orthodoxy has interpreted it - has left nothing untouched.

All this 'confusedness' reminded me very forcibly of Collingwood's advice about the shallowness of trying to understand people, and the movements they started 'from the outside'; ^{what} ^{to do is} 'We have, first of all to try to live ourselves into the minds of these people to the very utmost of our ability, basing ourselves on all the evidence we can come by; We have to get to know what the best and most knowledgeable minds who have worked ⁱⁿ in this field have thought and said about it; And finally we have to reflect for ourselves on the whole experience, and try to form our own conclusions about it.

Never had this seemed to me more necessary and more important. But how is the non-specialist to do it? Difficulty grows almost into absurdity, as the 'ordinary person', without means or time, tries to find his way through this hulkababoo.

The one crumb of comfort was a possible clue that Collingwood again suggested ϕ in his 'Philosophical Method'. The individual mens creatrix cannot live at somebody else's point of creative advance: its business is to live always at its own point of continuous creative advance as best it can. In comparison with that supreme function - which is its very nature and being as a mens creatrix - where you have actually got to and show fast you can go is a ^{comparatively} very small matter. That is no doubt true. But the ambiguity referred to itself presents a peculiarly difficult problem when we try to follow Collingwood's advice. As Plato pointed out, the process of thought and discovery in the mens creatrix - both individual and social - is like the process of child-bearing: a long and intimate process going down into the very roots of being; a matter of continuous and subtle experience and response to an infinite variety of influences. This is especially true in original and pioneering minds. It affects not only the ideas, the feelings, the 'meanings', both in their individuality and their place in the whole context of thought and experience: it extends to the very language in which these are expressed. This latter becomes at once obvious when we are dealing with a foreign language for here we can all see that the common processes of growth and change have been going on for centuries - the mens creatrix shaping the language, and the expression shaping the mens creatrix.

We frequently hear it said that a writer has misrepresented matters in his 'autobiography', or what not. How can the critic be sure? We all know how we suddenly become aware of new things, or see old things in a new way; and as we do so we realize that the insight has been slowly growing and coming to light over a long period. The illumination is only a climax.

Decidedly Plato, the superb artist, knew what he was about when he compared the whole activity to a process of 'generation', growth and birth! (Diotima in the Symposium). It is no easy matter therefore to understand exactly what an original thinker means in his pioneering work; not even if he is at the same time a creative master of expression like Plato.

Interpretation is still further complicated by the fact that Marx admittedly borrowed a great many of his conceptions: 'dialectic' and history as process from Hegel; economic terms and theories from Ricardo, Adam Smith and others. He wished to dedicate Das Kapital to Darwin. In particular he adopted that ambiguous word 'materialism' from current science. Indeed, may there not have been older and deeper influences at work as well, of which he may not have been fully conscious? For Marx was a Jew; and the Jewish inheritance - the most powerful in history - has its hidden roots in Jewish tradition. The only 'Scripture' that has ever taken history seriously, and indeed made it the clue to the whole of human experience and destiny, is the Bible: the Old Testament 'proclaims' throughout that history is a directed process with a goal because it is the working out of a divine and therefore conscious and intelligent purpose which challenges man to understand it.

The New Testament claimed to be the unexpected culmination of this conception. *Hegel reinterpreted the elaboration of this conception* of history by Christian theology, concluding that it could be more properly understood as the March of Absolute Reason. It is also in original Judaism that we find the concept of 'the Chosen People' (the Proletariat?) and 'the Messianic hope' (the Communist millenium?)

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 material and embodied processes 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' or 'greater' than this Communist-State-in-the-making itself. This is the be-all and the end-all for anyone who has grasped the 'revolution' of Marx; and therefore there cannot possibly be any 'moral law', social obligation, or 'duty' other than what works for the realisation of 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. To be deterred from this by any scruples - moral, religious or 'humanitarian' - would be a weak-minded and sentimental betrayal of the Revolution. The conclusion, logical and practical, should therefore be a single-minded will to seize power, embodied in the single-minded dictatorship, centred in a leader and supported by a 'professional' revolutionary elite - all for the sake of the Revolution proclaimed in the Manifesto.

If so, it is clear why the force and weight of this revolutionary drive is bound to raise the enigma of the human predicament and the Grand Inquisitor in its most challenging form. In the light of the historical events, is it really possible to create the new human world-commonwealth, by open hatred, violence and deception? On the other hand, can we really believe that any other way but this 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, have 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 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 to-day? Is it not 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?

Thus we find the issue continuously focussed to sharper intensity. Can we deny what the Russian Revolution has done for Russia? Or the Chinese Revolution for China? Can we deny what Orthodox Christianity did in Russia, Spain and elsewhere? What effective reply can the Prisoner make?

~~About this most crucial of issues~~

It is when we attempt to come to a decision about this most crucial of issues that we realise once more the necessity of distinguishing as clearly as possible between what makes for the 'creative advance' in each situation: the aggressive-destructive tendencies; what works for absolute authoritarianism; and finally between 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 sometimes self-contradictory workings. But whatever confusion and complications this may give rise to in practice, experience shows that 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' effect of a break-through, such as a Revolution, is always to release new energies; 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: 'to' what are you 'sowing' these people or communities? 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, we might renew the Prisoner's reply somewhat as follows: 'Have you broken clear of the old vicious circle of power-politics, deception, intrigue and violence? If not, will you not 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 scientific 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'? Is that not precisely what present-day Communism would be claiming if it insisted that these methods, and the faith in pure scientific materialism, are the only way to 'the new plane of living' in the new 'Commonwealth of Mankind'?

And is not 'scientific materialism' still materialism - whatever adjectives we attach to it? Did not Darwin's evolution theory so impress Marx that he wished to dedicate Das Kapital to Darwin? And there can be 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 variations may, in all, cover a wide range. But 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 cannot 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 ~~repeated~~ (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 on the elimination of the unfit at each stage. That is how man evolved, like any other animal or organism.

It only remains for Spengler to conclude that 'man is a beast of prey', and to interpret the rise and fall of civilizations in purely biological terms. It then becomes obvious that the struggle for power in human society - the economic 'laws of competition', the 'group' (nation, class, race) war - are not merely inevitable but a 'natural' and necessary process of human development. So Nietzsche's superman logically issues in Hitler's super-race: 'the iron laws of nature (Hitler's favourite cliché) 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. (Mein Kampf).

Is it not obvious then that the 19th century scientific materialism which was the 'fundamental presupposition' of the pioneers of evolution leads inevitably and logically to the conclusion that T. H. Huxley, Marx and Lenin, Hitler and others, drew μ from it? 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.

Freud, like Darwin and Marx, accepted as self-evident the scientific materialism of the physical science of 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 psycho-analysis 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 he 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, led 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 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 beat its head against brick walls, or it won't survive). All the

rest is 'superstructure' - due to the workings of that strange and unique function of human nature: 'phantasia', imagination. Freud along 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 modifying the destructive and aggressive drives which form the core of 'the Unconscious' in a mild way and in a few exceptional people.

Bertrand Russell, a thinker of exceptionally keen intellect 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 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 became the prevailing ^{scientific} philosophy of the West. We are now well embarked on the process that has led directly to the surprising world-transformation that is

taking place before our eyes. How did it come about? To answer this ^{would} adequately require that it should be presented in ^{much} greater detail, in the ^{and} full context of its development. To do this adequately is the work of a specialist. ^{Knowledge} All I can do is to give a very brief sketch of what I have been able to gather of this (relevant) background. It would run something like this.

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 became the accepted model. 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, actually believed was (he found) a confused mass of reasons, arguments, traditions, superstitions, hang-overs - the usual medley. 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, real/unreal, right/wrong? But the very asking these questions is the activity we call 'mind' or 'thought' in its most essential form: mind the truth seeker. 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 the very thing that I am questioning whether I can do - which is absurd. Therefore, I cannot doubt the reality and truth of myself as an honest thinking mind: cogito, ergo sum. But this further implies

that you can and do distinguish between the true and the false, the real and the unreal, etc. or the process would have no meaning; and therefore that the mind can know what is true/real/just. If we could not, the entire world of our experience would be pure illusion. But we don't take 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 guarantor 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 self-revelation of the Maker. How sincere he was in this letter it is difficult to 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 an ominous warning. Nevertheless, the radical process of 'honest

doubt' had been started and justified. *the effect was revolutionary: the center shifted from Authority & Revelation to the Inquiring mind. This completed the work*

of Galileo

Kierkegaard carried on the process of doubt into the Christian theology and practice of his day and it led him to have no doubt at all that the conventional 'Christianity' and organized religion of his day was a dishonest sham. But so too, he concluded, 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 or Hegel. So doubt can only be resolved by religious 'faith'. And faith for Kierkegaard meant both faith in the real historical Jesus and his gospel, and a faith beyond 'reason'. And this is an all-or-nothing act

of choice; had not Jesus himself 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 the principle of honest thinking with no husbug. There is no such God and no real ground for believing ~~N~~ in him: the Christian God cannot survive the process of honest doubt carried to its honest conclusion. But the whole of traditional morality and belief was grounded on 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; so there were no 'categorical imperatives'. All our values are human inventions with no other sanctions than what we 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, a man 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'.

This assumption has been taken for granted by almost all ²rationalist and empirical thinkers ever since - from Marx and Darwin to Russell, Freud, Ayer and ^RSatre. It underlies the whole development of industrialism,

economic liberalism, and the drive to the affluent society through technological developments in the U.S.A. 'Marx-Leninist' Communism has imposed it on Russia and China and their satellites. Briefly it amounts to this: man has to provide his own belief, his own moral standards, his own values and ways of living; and to find his own sanctions for them in his own satisfactions.

Prof. Kemp-Smith, one of the finest thinkers then alive, summed the situation up in his 1931 Hertz lecture before the British Academy, as follows: "In residing 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 ..." And 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 man 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? Among Darwinists, Freudians, Communists, Existentialists, Behaviourists, Positivists, Logicians - and all such prevailing influences in the entire world of Western thought to-day - how many would anyone of them waste a moment's thought on such an 'absurd' question?

It need hardly be said that the object of this very brief and limited indication of the western 'climate of thought' since Descartes started his revolution in philosophy, is not to raise the question whether it is 'true' or 'justified'. That is a philosophical question which could not be dealt with briefly even by someone fully qualified to discuss it. All I am here concerned with is to call attention to the radical change of the climate of opinion and thought which has been taking place in the western world since the rise of modern science with Galileo, and of modern philosophy with Descartes. Whatever we make of it and however it should be assessed, the change itself seems to me unquestionable. My intention is further to demonstrate that the resulting change in outlook (*weltanschauung*) was incorporated by Marx and Lenin in their theory of Communism, and hence has become one of the ^{foundations} ~~fundaments~~ of the Communist creed. And, finally, that with the Russian and Chinese Revolutions, this creed has destroyed the whole edifice of the old oriental civilizations - which had existed without essential change since many centuries before the birth of Christ - from their foundations to the entire superstructures built on them. Indeed it is difficult to resist the suspicion that this situation may, in fact, be only one aspect of a profound transformation, not merely of our 'mental climate', but perhaps in 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 and God as pure thought. 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'. 'Right Reason' is equally central in the Puritan poet Milton. 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 of the Cartesian philosophy: ('clear and distinct ideas' are the basis of a mathematically precise reasoning; Euclid is a perfect example etc.; and of the 18th century 'Enlightenment'; and of the later scientific materialism so neatly summed by Laplace. Robespierre even decreed the worship of the Goddess of Reason by revolutionary France. It also formed 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 reinterpreting Aristotle and St. Thomas in accordance with the new scientific pre-supposition 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 comprehend the Absolute only in the dreams of megalomania; it was also that when Hegel applied his Absolute Logic to nature 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. This 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 him 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 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 ^{in the philosophy of} ~~in~~ ^{Eyle.}

If ~~a~~ this stood alone, it might possibly - though 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 Tibet)

* My Development as a Philosopher

completes the process by making 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 ^{formally} laid by the logical empiricists on sense perception as the sole primary source of knowledge, it is interesting to note 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. 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 determinate feeling. Perhaps this is also not without a bearing not only on the Kantian tradition but 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. Have they not demonstrated that we must now regard our ordinary mode of 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 recognise 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 Barocci and Gombriich with Herbert Read's *Modern Art* to sense the surprising nature of what is happening. Botticelli's picture of the Annunciation is an almost ideal illustration of the 'classical' tradition: a centrally balanced harmony which embraces all is repeated in every detail of form, colour and symbol. In the development of Impressionism, Cubism, Abstract Art and the like - 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 enchantment fleeing, and regrouping themselves in queer subjective congregations of aspects and goblets of features, limbs, and fragments, related by memory or subconscious association 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. Words fail an astonished ignoramus. 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 can be. 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. Younger dramatists seem at present to be occupied mainly with the 'revolutionary' stage of rebellion against and breaking down of our civilization and its traditional ways of living and valuing, looking back at them 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). One aspect 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 like} that is the scarecrow who once embodied 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; ^{here we have} / a symbol that looks back to the oldest agricultural rituals -- too old for its origins to be remembered. A ritual however that did not in its original form forget the 'mens creatrix'; "If winter comes, can spring be far behind" (cf. Lawrence's Ship of Death). Eliot himself cherishes such a hope; but there is no such hint or memory of 'spring' in the 'Theatre of the Absurd'.

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'. I repeat: all I am concerned with is to ask whether they may not indicate a profound and radical change taking place

in the Western 'psychs', visible in art no less than in the Freudian psychology.

But once more: If it were only Western civilization that is characterized by these signs and symptoms - by behaviourists, materialists, technocrats, gadgeteers, Grand Inquisitors, Dadaists, Genet's abstracts and Becket's tramps - we might be justified in thinking that, remarkable and widespread as these are in the West, they signify no more than something familiar that has always been happening since the beginning of history: the fall and dissolution of 'local' civilizations and cultures with their traditions and habits and outlooks. But the present reality is far otherwise. What seems to me the unique and most deeply impressive fact in the Human Situation to-day is that 'the revolution' (in every sense) has affected the whole of mankind at the same time. Never before has such a thing happened in history!

In China for centuries the entire life of the people together with the whole hierarchy of society, centred round Emperor worship: ~~was~~ the Emperor was the focus-point of contact connecting all the ranked grades of peoples, classes, orders, families and individuals - throughout the Chinese empire - with 'Heaven', 'the Celestial World' (i.e. the Sources of Cosmic Power). The Emperor's person, his ceremonial robes and rituals, constituted something not far removed from 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 ordered system of words and ritual acts with the Dynamo of Cosmic Power. Through such centres (Pharoah, King, Chief, or Priest) 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, with the Emperor as the lynch-pin uniting the whole people and system to the Cosmic Order, easily accommodated Taoism, Buddhism (in Mahayana form) Confucianism and Shintoism. Taoism (for example) is only the 'pantheistic' way of regarding these 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 Lama of Tibet: Buddhism modified by the old Tibetan Shamanism). Confucianism was centred in '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 these illustrations may serve as examples of 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.) provides only 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 realise that this is the kind of thing that invariably happens to communities when their civilizations and 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, and with its crown reaching towards 'heaven'. 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 the life and the 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. But 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'; so the cow as the milk-giver was an embodiment and source of 'Life' (cf. 'I am the Water of Life'). The cow is therefore identical with

the Mother-Goddess - the Great Mother - as well as with each individual mother who is the first milk-giver' and 'saviour' to every son and daughter of man-kind. 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 in the West should not find this difficult to understand: what would Christianity be without the symbol of the Cross, or Islam without the Crescent, or *Catholicism without the motto of Jesus & Maria Church?*

The creation of every great civilisation is an immensely dynamic achievement of the *mens creatrix*. But at long last it expends 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 (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, or at least movement; and eventually, as was inevitable, the outside world broke in. What happens in such cases depends 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 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 momentarily diverted into the power-politics of nationalism and 'World-War'. But the effect of the first World-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 Marx-Leninist Communism. 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 (it confidently believed) 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, which thereupon became a new portent. For the second World War completely shattered the old militant order in Japan, which had remained centred round Shinto and Emperor worship, leaving it adrift, rootless, and 'home'-less. The new shock-wave moved on to repeat the Russian Communist 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'. 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 and its thought-bases. 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 at least in their ruling caste and its influences, avowedly atheistic and materialistic as well as revolutionary in the political and social fields. Their form of Communism has been rigidly authoritarian at home and aggressively militant abroad.

In both Russia and China the new scientific-materialistic order was 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 can be gathered from the imposed revolution β in Tibet. This Revolution has not yet in its Marxist form overtaken India; but her 'ancient civilisation' is also vanishing into her dust, and she is straining every nerve to transform herself into a modern scientific-economic society. There is little doubt that the only alternative to the present half-way house (not 'home') is Communism.

There remains Africa. There, it seems, tribal civilization based on 'the Chief' 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 and 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.

It has been an essential part of the thesis put forward here that the human 'creative imagination' reflects what is happening in the mens creatrix by first projecting itself in an imaginative embodiment of the new developments towards which it is moving. With the help of these imaginative projections, it gradually grows into awareness of what is happening until it becomes a 'conscious' movement towards a 'definite' goal. Finally it becomes crystallized in the form of a new 'self-real-ization'. This new embodiment may or may not be a 'creative advance'. It may be 'a corruption of consciousness' (e.g. The Inquisition, fascism, Hitlerism, Stalinism). It is in fact seldom, if ever, wholly one or the other. The elements are too mixed in it. If so, we should expect to find that the Creative Imagination has embodied this ever recurring process of 'Transformation' in an imaginative 'vision'. And it has. The 'melting pot' has been degraded to an overworn modern cliché. But when restored to its original form as an archetypal symbol, its true significance becomes plain as an imaginative presentation of the unceasing process of change both in the world of nature which is man's environment, and in the mens creatrix itself; and so of the process that finally became fully conscious in the evolutionary theories of Darwin, the new interpretation of the historical process by Marx, and the incorporation of 'Becoming' in the philosophy of Hegel. For 'the melting pot' was originally the 'Cauldron of Plenty' of the old mythologies; image of the immortal 'Womb of Mother Nature' from which all things come and in which they are unmade to be remade. It was the cauldron of Medea in which she 'renewed the youth of Jason'; the Celtic 'Cauldron of Life and Plenty'. But Medea's cauldron is

also a cauldron of Death which became the Witches' Cauldron. Behind these lies a complex of associations: 'the myth of the eternal return' which grew out of the annual death of 'nature' in winter (or the tropical heats), its 'rebirth' in the spring and its ripening to the 'harvest festival' in autumn. This was magnified and projected into a vast cosmic vision of 'creations and destroyings': the dance of Shiva and Kālī, and the immense periods in which cosmic history repeated itself exactly and endlessly.

The World's Great Age begins anew,
 The golden years return;
 The Earth doth like a snake renew
 Its winter weeds outworn.

In such great imaginative visions we can find an anticipation and reflection of what is happening in the world to-day, with its existential choice between life and death.

This seems to be characteristic of the advance of the mens creatrix in all its activities, from the most primitive to the most mature. It begins by projecting itself in an imaginative embodiment of the new development towards which it is moving. By this means it becomes an increasingly conscious movement towards a definite end. Finally it crystallizes itself in a new form of self-realization. It is most apparent in the genius in every field, the genius being the most dynamic embodiment of the mens creatrix in his own sphere. But the genius is the spearhead of the human race itself, at the new point of its creative advance. And this advance is not only embodied in the individual genius, or in the collective wisdom of the great myths. It also gathers itself into what we may call 'waves' or 'movements' within a civilization or people, which become social adventures in exploring new avenues or possibilities of advance.

~~As an example~~ in the religious field an illuminating example may be found in the development of prophetic religion in the Old Testament. The Old Testament proclaims itself to be no ^{other} else than a revelation of the working out of a divine purpose which would culminate in a new world. This messianic hope inspired, in the poems of the Deutero-Isaiah, some of the most magnificent religious poetry in the world. In the New Testament 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 positive aspect of their response 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'. Thus in Hindu philosophy the mens ~~creatrix~~ is expressing its dissatisfaction with its present state of being and reaching out after 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 an exaggerated description of the experience of all the greatest mystics of all religions, times and places.

The ultimate significance, ^{or validity} of such assurances of having attained to Brahman, atmahood, nirvana, 'vision of Him', 'the living presence of God', 'eternal life', is not what we are concerned with here; though to dismiss out of hand 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 surely be rash - not to say arrogant. But our sole ^{purpose} intention at this point is to call attention to the obvious significance of such experiences as further examples of the unceasing activity of the mens creatrix in its role of "the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming on things to come".

Or, lastly, we might consider such movements as 'Platonism', 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 fascinating and influential of all philosophers; perhaps just because his creative imagination was as great as his powers of rational thought. The whole aim of Plato's philosophy was 'salvation' from the human predicament.

And that is only another way of saying that he had a 'vision' of a new kind of life which made the ordinary 'worldly' life of the Greek city-state and its politics, 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 - an experience for the understanding of which we have to turn not to philosophers but to such great reflective poets as Shakespeare and Keats.¹ 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 'ascêsis', 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? Why is the mens creatrix always breaking into such outbursts of the energy which is eternal delight? Why do these always appear to us as 'splendores ante lucani': 'the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming on things to come': an 'Adam's dream' of a new reality that is coming into being: and the genius himself as 'our lovely forerunner in the lists'?

It is the (at least temporary) extinction of this creative vision in 19th century materialism, the economic struggle for power, and world wars -

¹ Illustrations of this in English poetry are given in Part IV below.

so that its civilisation 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. For example, hatred of the stifling city and provincial life of the 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 intolerable 'actual' world; when this failed him he took refuge, like Baudelaire, in drugs and intoxication; and then (at 21!) ingun-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. But the field is endless; and these few examples may serve as illustrations of what happened ^(as I see it) to the creative imagination in the process which is producing the world in which we find ourselves to-day.

In contrast to the present tendencies to dogmatism on the one hand and pessimism on the other, I conclude with a reference to the possibilities of a new creative advance to be found, I believe, in the philosophy of Prof. John Macmurray. *I will not of course attempt to recapitulate his own beautifully clear & coherent argument; but only, in accordance with my practice here, summarised as follows, to indicate how it has led me to reflect on my own experience.*

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 which produce it and with which it is always 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 within 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 of organic processes. But he is also something more. The characteristic world in which the human being comes into existence and lives is from beginning to end, 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 human person ^{in the world of persons} 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 - 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 indeed tell the whole truth about 'reality'. We can of course treat him as 'a thing' for special purposes; 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, 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 in our 'real' environment to know immediately that we cannot 'really' deny or reject such intimate knowledge. Indeed, man's awareness even of the 'physical' and 'organic' is not (so far as we know) 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. The denial of it in the practical world of daily life, above all in the social world, is therefore bound to be disastrous.

If this is true, it calls for a complete rethinking of past *our* philosophies, theories, assumptions, and inferences about 'the human creature'. 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?

In such a context, the *mens creatrix* comes to full self-realisation.

Conclusion

Behind all the most recent 'progressive' movements of modern civilizations we find this claim to be 'scientific'. It is therefore necessary to come to terms with the claims of science. What is science?

From the point of view of the mens creatrix, so far as I have been able to follow its workings in experience, I find a radical ambiguity in the definitions of Science presented by the Movements we have been considering. The problem as I see it, is this.

Science is 'scientia', knowledge. And knowledge is not simply an object - 'what' is known; nor even a world of objects. It is a knowing of such objects; and knowing is an activity of human persons. It is what anyone who claims to be scientific claims to be doing when he knows anything. Further he is claiming to be carrying on this activity 'rightly' ('I know'). If, in doing so, he criticises similar activities in other persons he is asserting that they have done it wrongly, in some way; this too he knows, and his canon of criticism is his own knowledge. He is therefore claiming to know the distinction between carrying on this activity rightly and failing to do this; otherwise he could not claim that one was wrong and the other right. Without the capacity to know, and to make this distinction, there would merely be two different patterns of activity existing side by side, like two different molecules or organisms. In fact 'scientific materialism' in the strict sense (as asserted, ^{for example} by Bertrand Russell) must logically reduce all the events which we mistakenly imagine to be coherent trains of thought and argument to mere epiphenomena:

side-effects of the patterns of moving matter which in reality determine entirely the patterns of feeling and thought ('omnipotent matter'). If this were so both patterns of thought (or feeling, etc.) would be alike, - the materialist's and his opponent's - would simply happen to be there, like two of the 'collisions of atoms' or other movements of the material particles which produce and determine the 'thoughts' and 'theories'. If there is no sense in calling one molecule right and another wrong, what sense could there be in calling one 'accompaniment' of the material movements right and another wrong? But Bertrand Russell does (as all theorists must do) precisely this in the passage quoted. Like any exponent of 'materialism', in putting forward his philosophy of materialism he is claiming that it is right/true and his opponents' philosophy is wrong/untrue. He claims to have arrived at 'the truth of the matter' and to 'know' this, and in the light of this knowledge to be able to condemn the rival theory as untrue. And in fact, Bertrand Russell, in describing his own philosophical development, makes it abundantly clear that he has arrived at his conclusions by sustained, difficult and critical efforts of thinking, which cost him a great deal of labour and called for the most resolute honesty and the firm rejection of all 'conceptions of consciousness'. This seems to me to carry the clear implication that we 'ought' to carry on this activity in this way, and resolutely reject all temptations to comfortable illusions, lazy and slipshod thinking, fashionable errors (and so forth), which it would be less costly to indulge in.

This is the activity that is essentially involved in 'scientia', the acquisition of 'knowledge'; and is therefore the sine qua non of all

science. And it is one aspect or function of the activity that I have called the human mens creatrix, and whose various functions I have tried to present throughout. I conclude that the evidence compels me to believe that it is a fundamental characteristic of the human being as such. When we look back to human beginnings we find that the gradual emergence into consciousness, understanding and intention of this 'nusus' to 'scientia' in all the human functions, has been an essential element in 'the creative advance' of humanity, of the mens creatrix. In short, whatever we make of it, reflection on human 'experience' and our own 'experience' seems to compel us to recognise that this is one of the characteristic activities that makes us human persons. For example, the presuppositions and theories with which Darwin and Freud worked were biological-physiological; these hypotheses gave them their 'evidence'. But what was the 'nusus', the dynamic 'drive' that 'drove' both of them to reject all the 'temptations' to orthodoxy and expediency, to what was 'pleasant' and easy; to disregard the abuse, contempt and indignant repudiation of the colleagues they admired, as well as of public opinion, and chose to be loyal to what the evidence persuaded them to believe? At the beginning of 'modern' philosophy, what constituted it as 'modern', was Descartes' proof that we cannot evade this conclusion, whatever hypotheses we work with. He demonstrated that critical enquiry may assume the form of 'doubting' everything that can be doubted; but doubting is asking: Is this true or untrue, right or wrong, imaginary or real? And asking such questions is one of the activities that makes science 'science'. In my terms the mens creatrix includes a drive to discover and admit 'the truth of the matter' at any cost. Therefore

nothing can be 'the whole truth of the matter' that does not fully admit and take account of this truth. This, I submit, is what the evidence compels us to believe. Similarly, the Communism of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Mao and all their followers claims to be 'scientific' (knowledge) and also a form of materialism. But all these forms of Communism, whatever their differences, take it for granted that they 'know' the 'true' form of human society, 'the good life', the 'goal' of history; and that by this criterion they are justified in condemning and destroying the forms of society that they found established. Moreover, in the name of this humanity reality and human goal they insisted on the absolute 'obligation' binding all communists to live a wholly 'dedicated' life; to risk their lives, comfort, conformity, ease, pleasure, and all the attractions and temptations of 'bourgeois' society; to 'go out into the wilderness', become outcasts and rebels, face persecution, oppression, imprisonment and if necessary, death, for the better world, for the 'socialist society' which they might never see. Such 'dialectical' materialism is not a dialectic of mud, but of men. This fact too had been already pointed out - by Kant, who insisted that the ~~intrinsic~~ acceptance of binding 'obligation' is the ^(ought) essential characteristic that makes human nature 'human'. We seem driven to conclude that so far from being able to deny the mens creatrix, all science necessarily involves the fundamental acceptance of the absolute obligation to search for and accept the truth - 'what the evidence persuades us to believe'. All belief in social progress and the good life (το εὖ ζῆν) in any form presupposes an absolute obligation to 'give oneself' to the creation of this human goal - even though, like Communism, it at the same

time claims to be 'materialistic'. In fact, even the most sceptical or flabby adherence to the 'status quo' implies that this is 'the best we can do', the good we should accept. Similarly, every artist, in claiming to be an artist, rejects with contempt the 'prostitution' of art to money, ease, and personal advantage, 'tickling commodity': he repudiates indignantly the suggestion that 'if you want to sell your muffins, ring the tinkle tinkle bell'. Thus the evidence seems to lead us to believe that the dynamic drive of the mens creatrix has arrived at 'science' and 'civilization' as a 'nibus' to the knowledge, to a 'good life', to a perfecting of the artistic function. Even if we reject this whole activity as wrong or 'absurd', we are still affirming that our own mens creatrix has arrived at this true insight which enables it to make this judgment and justifies this rejection.

The evidence therefore seems to me to point clearly in one direction. We cannot engage in philosophy or science without becoming embodiments of the mens creatrix; the same mens creatrix that we found at work in the whole of mankind's advance from primitive savagery to civilization, language, art and religion. And further, we find that all these advances have been possible because, in its function as creative imagination, the mens creatrix has solved the problem of how to realise its true nature and live its true life by establishing, in all these activities, a commonwealth of free persons who share what they have with anyone who wishes to share them.

On the other hand, man has conducted his social, political and economic life on the principles of the struggle for existence and the necessity to obtain power at all costs. The result is that the historical

process has now crystallized 'the human situation' into two rival groups - embodied at the moment in American technocracy and the present forms of Communism. The declared aim of each of these rival groups is to eliminate the other as the enemy of mankind and progress. The establishment of superiority by one would literally 'be the end of it' for the other; and the successful rival would then impose itself on the whole world. Therefore every advance in relevant scientific knowledge or technique inevitably becomes a mortal threat to the rival group. There can be no limit to the deadly logic of this situation.

Owing to the rapid advance of science and technology on the one hand, and on the other the destruction of the old 'reactionary and oppressive' forms of society by the communist revolution, the entire human race in all parts of the world has now been drawn into this crisis and its conflicts. These events have transformed the whole human world and produced a radically new and critical world situation.

But the human predicament to-day is only the latest and most extreme symptom of numberless other symptoms of this malaise of human social existence. We observe incredulously that the early nineteenth century was dominated by the myth of 'inevitable progress'. This myth was itself the outcome of the 'Aufklärung': a belief in the supremacy of 'reason'. It was this, wedded to the advance of science and invention, and supported, (curiously enough) by the Darwinian theory of evolution (the survival of the fittest), that gave birth to the progress myth. Even the rebels against the contemporary forms of society attributed all human evils to the oppressions of the social system and made this a reason for believing in the perfectability of man.

In fact, we can now see - with Marx and the Revolutions behind us - that power politics and the idea of the world as a market, were the surest way to the brink of destruction on which we now stand. And we can see why. The practical application of 'reason' led to the applied science that was soon striding into technical advances. The result was 'the Industrial Revolution'. Analysis of this Revolution led the thinkers who approved of it as 'progress', to see and state plainly that the driving force behind it was the employment of natural resources and social organization to create wealth. This meant the creation of capital; for wealth was now 'power' - the power which enabled this progress. But the embodiment of wealth-power in capital - as the necessary ground of 'progress' (capitalism) could only be achieved by exacting the maximum effort out of human labour to accumulate capital. And this was just the break-through in science was making possible: it had created the 'machine' for 'industry'; and the industrial system took shape in the 'factory' system. This 'progress' was coming about - and could 'only' be perfected - by free competition in an open market. This economic process was obviously leading to the increase of wealth as capital and its investments in the 'right' hands. It was the social functioning of the universal law of 'perfection by a ruthless struggle for existence among competing existents' which always leads to that 'survival of the fittest in each generation' which had just been established as the culminating revelation of science by Darwin. But the accumulation of wealth as capital through industry in the form of the factory system, could only be successfully worked out by the maximum exploitation of the labour of the workers in the factories. This was

therefore the plain condition of continuing 'progress'. It must therefore be accepted and applied as the universal 'economic law' of society - corresponding to 'the laws of nature'. Therefore the ultimate goal must be the entire human world as one vast open market in which all these principles operated. This 'perfecting by a struggle for existence' in society necessarily involved the treating of the mass of human beings as factory 'hands': i.e. as part of the tools or instruments of machines that made the factories work successfully. They ceased to be human persons and became cogs in the social machine.

But we cannot treat human persons as mere ~~things~~ 'tools' 'things', and insist on being ruth-less about it ('ruth' is pity, compassion, tenderness), without developing a growing callousness towards them - their needs, their sufferings, their happiness - on principle: it is 'necessary' for the sake of 'progress'.

The attitude itself is nothing new. It has always been a characteristic of 'upper' classes, rulers, 'superiors', aristocrats, 'masters', the elite and the like towards 'the common people', 'the masses', 'the rank and file' and their like. Human societies have always been divided into the fully human persons and the 'not-so-human'. Slaves are sub-human; so have 'captives' often been; and outcasts and aliens - all 'the others who are not us'. The twentieth century has provided devastating examples of this. Recent publications provide more than enough evidence by themselves. The Irish Famine, the condition of the Russian Peasant, the history of the early Trade Unions; the American Civil War; the Franco-German War; Florence Nightingale; Verdun and the Somme; the Spanish War; Hitler and the

'master race'; the 'liquidation' of the Jews; Stalinism and Stalingrad; the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the Hungarian Rising; Chiang Kai Shek; 'racial' hatred and violence; the Congo; Partition in India. All these stagger imagination; but they are only the culmination of the callousness man has always shown towards man all down human history. They are more horrifying to-day because man has now greater power and greater knowledge of how to use it. And they are one and all based on the practical assumption that whole groups of human beings are not persons.

This situation seems to call urgently for answers to three questions: Firstly, what is science (scientia); what function is it performing; what function should it perform? Secondly, what is Communism; what has it been doing; what can or should it do? And thirdly, what is Christianity; what contribution has it made and can it make to the solution of the human predicament? The answer to the last question is examined in Part III. To answer the first and second questions adequately would require an intelligent and instructed examination firstly of modern science and secondly of modern Communism, from its origins in Marx and its subsequent developments, and the latter would have to be based on an 'objective' comparison of what its exponents have said with the patterns of their actions.

I am not qualified to undertake such an examination. I have had therefore to content myself with raising these problems, and presenting them in the light of such limited understanding of the mens creatrix and of the present predicament as my personal experience has impressed on me. I must leave it to those who are qualified, and appeal to them to make the 'evidence' available for those of us who are not qualified but who have nevertheless to make an urgent 'existential' decision.