

SECTION FIVE

Going Home 1982 - 1983

Sathya Sai Baba and the Quest for the Historical Jesus	247
Left and Right	263
Principles of Political Morality	290
Church and State	314
Seven Mothers	336

SATHYA SAI BABA and the QUEST for the HISTORICAL JESUS

by David R. Graham, August, 1982

SATHYA SAI BABA

Under the Refectory and under the great West-Central Tower of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, lies a charming, neo-gothic shrine, Lampman Chapel by name.

One Saturday morning in the late Spring of 1969, I came hurrying past the vestibule to Lampman Chapel, no doubt upon that kind of business which held so much of those glories of youth that mean so little in the lexicon of later life. On this occasion, the long-familiar details of my scholastic home were dramatically obscured by pungent clouds of incense, milling people and loud chanting in a non-English tongue. Stopped in my tracks long enough to observe the scene but not so long as to be thought a gaping intruder -- which indeed I was -- these facts came to my astonished attention: these people were Indians, dressed as such; they were engaged in a service of worship which must have been Hindu in nature; they were nothing daunted by their surroundings; and I was chagrined at the apparent desecration of a Christian shrine.

It was my introduction to the real meaning of catholicity and the real purpose of the ecumenical movement. I was negatively impressed. Yet, inside, I also rather liked what I saw. My head thought one thing and my heart said another. I moved on quickly, pondering the meaning of this experience.

At this same time I was engaged in the study of cybernetics and futurism with a British economist who had been reared in Madras, India. From him I heard stories which turned my attention favorably toward India, her civilization and life-style. Several apparently chance encounters with Indian nationals confirmed my interest in India and contributed to what I now believe was preparation for the turning point of my life.

I am free to admit that my first impression of Sathya Sai Baba was negative. I expressed myself in these terms rather forcefully. But such was not the case shortly after. It happened this way:

In the Fall of 1971 I was again in New York City. A young lady of my acquaintance asked me to accompany her to an evening meeting of devotees of Sathya Sai Baba. These were the days when Indian gurus were announcing themselves almost daily in this country. This young lady was also known to me as a dabbler in occult matters, witchcraft and that whole phenomenon. As a trained theologian, I was unimpressed with and disposed to condemn outcroppings of spiritual chicanery and half expected to meet another variety of the same at the proposed meeting.

Nor was I disappointed in this expectation. I agreed to attend out of friendship for the young lady and an appreciation of the strong sincerity on her part about this fellow "Baba." The meeting was in a dilapidated loft on the Lower East Side. This contrasted sharply with the quarters of the young lady, which were off upper Park Avenue. She being nothing daunted by the scenery, I in turn resolved not to be either.

The people, mostly young, largely Jewish, and manifestly not Wall Street Bankers, were dressed in approximations to Indian attire which, when the lights finally came up, resolved themselves into the usual tatters of stylish hippies. I was dressed in the manner appropriate to the Arizona cowboy and so was not inconspicuous in this assembly.

The meeting began with a letter from Ram Das, née Richard Alpert, known to one and all as a burned out druggie, associate of Tim Leary, and now making it as a guru. I was unimpressed. Then began the chants of OM, the primal sound, and certain sacred songs, called Bhajans, either composed by Baba or improvised by the leader, a woman of advanced years and not in good health.

The people seemed to hang upon this woman as ants on thick honey and I was not impressed with that either. She was not impressed with me either, for she interrupted the music to threaten that if everybody did not participate the proper effect could not be had. She had reference to me, silent and wide-eyed in the midst, utterly resolved not to participate. The young lady whom I accompanied was, of course, right in there with the rest. At least, she was no social bigot.

During the singing I observed young men staring transfixedly into one another's eyes, breathing with rapidly accelerating gasps and finally expending some pent-up energy upon

each other through a sudden, violent imposition of hands upon the opposite shoulders. This behavior I found distasteful and was further not impressed.

Then it was announced that a movie of Baba would be shown. This sounded better to me since heretofore I had observed much that was obviously connected with drugs and several things not intended to meet the approval of a traditional theologian, be he even a graduate of Union Theological Seminary.

It was an 8mm film, nicely done, without sound, but the Subject of it was clearly a paragon of charm and a holder of complete power. (It may be observed in passing that these characteristics are uniquely suited to impress a New Yorker.) He also and obviously held the strong affection of those around Him.

The film was made at the Ashram, or House of Peace, in India where He resides in the physical sense. It showed Him walking among the people, standing, smiling, chiding, waving and materializing sacred ash with the wave of His Hand. The devotees take this ash, which He produces frequently, for remedies and for reminders of the evanescence of this life.

But the main interest of the film for me was the materialization of the Linga in His Stomach and the eruption of it from His Mouth and into His Hand.

The Linga is an egg-shaped stone which symbolizes the mergeance of the world in God and the emergence of the world in Him. It is particularly the symbol of Shiva, the third aspect of the Hindu Trinity, representing the destruction of illusion. Sathya Sai Baba is the Incarnation of Shiva. Rama and Krishna are alike Incarnations of Vishnu, the second aspect of the Trinity, representing preservation.

The movie showed Baba before a vast throng in the night of Mahashivarathri, the festival dedicated to Lord Shiva. His Lips quiver, His Face grimaces, He makes many movements as of throwing up, starting small and gathering in intensity and strength until finally one great eruption throws the Linga up and out upon His Hand. He smiles wanely and holds the Linga up for all to see and adore, the Body still in the aftermath of physical stress, the people clearly overcome with delight and awe at the mercy, sweetness, kindness and omnipotent sport of the Lord.

I recognized Him instantly. Here was God in all His Fullness: the love, the wisdom, the playfulness, the beauty, the dashing vigor, the sense of command -- all of these characteristics were here apparent. But one stood out, and that was the Love.

Still, my mind was negatively impressed. Why, I said, does God have to play these parlor games, making a show, being obvious? I announced my displeasure on these accounts rather forcefully and in doing so failed to win the warm affection of my auditors.

The next morning, a gentle wave of sweet, subtle fragrance crossed over me in a moment and was gone. I immediately associated this with the events of the previous evening. Whatever else I thought, I knew exactly and unequivocally Who this Person is and I resolved to travel to Him.

This desire was fulfilled in fullest measure, once in late 1971 and a second time in early 1972, for it is Baba's habit not to leave anything lacking when a person genuinely pines to be near Him. I decided that if I didn't like all the showy materializations this was just something I did not understand and would have to hold in abeyance, for, I knew Him to be God and I knew that God would never do what is unneedful. (When He called me into His Presence, He laughed and said that I was angry at Swami. I laughed and said, "Yes.")

Incidentally, I found out later, and with my own eyes, that the materializations are anything but showy. Unless you watch carefully you do not notice them since they occur ^{so} easily, naturally and swiftly as to be no more remarkable than a bird's song or a cricket's chirp. Baba even chides people for taking them as "miracles," saying that the real "miracle" is they themselves. When He materialized some things in my immediate presence, I took it as in the very nature of Him and as less noteworthy than what He had to say to me. The film, by taking such things out of context, makes them appear spectacular. In context of the Ashram and His usual activity, the pulling of things by Baba from mid-air or sand or even without the agency of His Hand is entirely unremarkable.

Now I was in a scholastic predicament. My mind was full of the tenents of Christian theology. My heart was not very full of love, but it was pure enough to see that Sathya Sai Baba is God in Human Form. Now what to do about all those Christian tenents and, simultaneously, the heart? I already knew in the bitterness of

experience that scholarship is no substitute for love and the tenents of theology are no substitute for genuine experience in the affairs of the spirit. The heart had to be ^{expanded} and the tenents had to be forced into the crucible of logic, experiment and study of the other religions of mankind.

Upon this apparently dual but actually single course of inquiry the writer has been engaged since 1961 and in earnest since 1971. It is now 1982, his hair is falling out and turning grey, a cosmetologist might recommend him for a face-lift and his friends already regard him after the manner of an antiquarian engaged upon that melancholy field of inquiry. However, certain facts have come to the attention of this student, through what light has been given to him, and he here desires to note them down for the uplift of his fellow men and for the fostering of truth, righteousness, peace and love.

(Personal note: I find the section above especially appealing to read while listening to the third (slow) movement of the Second Symphony, by Rachmaninoff - DRG 2/4/86 - on a tape machine we purchased to let the children hear the music of their culture.)

THE SCHOOL

It is to be noted that the great theologians of the past were men and women of deep experience in spiritual affairs. One of them, St. Teresa of Avila, was entirely uneducated, in the scholastic sense of the term, yet her writing is generally regarded as on a par with Augustine's, who was so educated. The reason for this is to be found in the fact that she merely wrote out of her own experience. Writing sincerely and plainly about her experience, which was incomparable, she attained a level of theological excellence -- in the scholastic sense -- which has never been surpassed. And, it will be remembered, she wrote not at her own prompting, which deprecated the project, but at the instance of her Spiritual Director, who commanded it.

On the other hand, history is littered with the graves of countless men and women, of enormous scholastic achievement, whose fame as theologians lasted but a brief while. The reason for this is easy to find: they had no experience of spiritual affairs and, out of empty heads and impure hearts, merely recorded what others declared. Not only so, but, casting away all sense of propriety, these ersatz theologians have tried to evaluate the

the declarations of the few genuine ones and pass off their worthless "criticism" as truth. Those given to many footnotes and picayune methods are generally of this type. Theologians they are not because their mouths only are in motion.

Modern Christian scholarship is almost entirely of this second type, being bereft of genuine experience. We have people, in effect, evaluating and passing judgement upon the sweetness of sugar, God, without ever having placed a crystal of it on their tongue. The atheist is a little more honest than the modern Christian theologian: he has never tasted the sugar so he declares that it does not exist. The theologian, on the other hand, has likewise never tasted the sugar, but he incautiously goes on to describe its characteristics, even holding it accountable to his own prejudice, convincing noone, thereby, of anything more exalted than that he is a fool.

This unfortunate state of affairs is apparent in the "liberal" German scholarship of the last Century and has since spread to almost all manners and types of Christian "theologians." It is no wonder that the Church makes no progress against the evils of this age: her leaders have no experience of the remedy, their words but hollow slogans and empty platters, unable to nourish mankind, who is starving for genuine spiritual food.

The reason that the quest for the historical Jesus has satisfied noone is that noone has experienced Him, at least hardly anyone recently and practically no theologians. The discussion of Jesus proceeds almost entirely from texts, both biblical and otherwise, and almost never from the experience of the theologian in applying the texts to the direction of his own daily life. Indeed, he would never think of applying them in practice in his own life: he considers that he would lose thereby the supposed authority and prestige of an objective observer.

To this backward way of thinking have our so-called theologians come. The result is an artifice of ignorance: an endless web of "theologies" of this and "theologies" of that, one fad tumbling over another, one "faith" replacing another, like the latest hit songs on the FAB-40. How can the blind lead the blind else but into the pit?

I think that Schweitzer succeeded to some extent in uncovering the historical Jesus from the dirt and grime

of scholastic speculation, but he seems to me to have never been fully satisfied. I attribute this, rightly or wrongly, to the apparent fact that, in his own heart, he was unable to reconcile the human Jesus with the Christ as Pantocrator. There is a certain note of sorrow that hangs over Schweitzer's life, as of an unfulfilled yearning for genuine experience, in his heart, of the historical Jesus. He is reduced to mere argument from texts, which produces nothing and has satisfied noone. *Schweitzer missed*

← Jesus' Humanity. Theologians talk about God and know Him not.

Teilhard de Chardin does a better job of it because he has tasted the ambrosia which God is. Indeed, he tasted it more freely than his latter-day admirers perhaps realize.

The predicament of modern Christian scholarship is its apparent fear of expanding from homo sapien, through Ecce Homo, into Homo Dei, Homo-Deus and, finally, Deus Dominus. It is good to be born in the Church but not to die in it. Man can only be happy when he expands into the limitless Eternal.

CHRIST JESUS OF NAZARETH

What does the experience of the historical, human Jesus reveal about Him?

First and foremost, He was a seeker like the rest of us. However, He was a seeker who was given birth with a special mission, to be the Messiah or Christ or Savior of the Hebrews.

The Hebrews had *unjustly treated themselves* for centuries. Through their great prophets and kings, they had developed one of mankind's religions. The lives of their prophets read like the lives of the prophets, saints, seers and rishis of other religions. They had been taught, rightly, that God would provide a savior who would finally rescue them from the clutches of their enemies, who had been legion and persistent — *namely, they themselves.*

This Savior was Jesus, son of Mary, conceived by a miracle and destined to save His people, the Hebrews, according to their scriptures. And He did just that, only not in the manner conceived by His contemporaries, the Jews.

These latter conceived of their enemies as foreign nations who had the upper hand on them. Jesus told them that their enemies were within their own hearts and comprised the six of fear, anger, greed, hatred, lust and pride.

The Jews expected a military hero after the manner of David. God gave them a spiritual hero, after the manner of the same King. It has ever been thus: through ignorance, men posit their enemies outside themselves; but God declares them to be within themselves.

Not the world but the heart of a man, its purity, its strength, its faithfulness, is the true domain of religion. This truth Jesus reestablished among the Jews and, through them, for all mankind. He resuscitated the true religion of mankind, the religion of love. He spoke the one language that all men everywhere can understand, the language of the heart.

Those who were prepared accepted His corrective. Those who were not rejected both Him and the corrective, namely, love itself. Jesus, therefore, can be experienced as the Embodiment of Love, and because of this, He is called Lord, God with us. For, God is Love, Love is God.

The great Christological formulations of St. Paul and others are based on the experience these people had of Jesus as Love Incarnate. The power and magnificence of that Love in the hearts of the believers, the joy and peace which it gave to them, was and is today the sole motivating power of the Christian and every other religion. In no other medium can or will life ever emerge.

Jesus was a seeker among seekers whose preordained success in reaching the Goal of life, namely, liberation from the ^{bondage of ignorance,} was accomplished along the path of ever-expanding love. He is thus a perfect model for mankind, or, as St. Paul says, the first fruits of salvation.

Jesus' parents were extremely poor and practically abandoned Him at an early age. His so-called "lost years" were filled with spiritual pilgrimage. First He tried the paths of pleasure, but gave these up. Then, He traveled in India, Persia, Russia and Tibet, seeking enlightenment. An ancient Buddhist manuscript records His stay at a monastery in Tibet. His original name was Isa, which, when repeated, comes out Sai, meaning Ishwara, God, and as Isa is He recorded in this manuscript. He did not realize that He was the Messiah until ^{about} His 25th year.

The progress or stages of His spiritual development can be traced, in the Bible, in the statements He made about Himself. First, He declared that He is the Messenger of God. Later, He declared that He is the Son of the Father. Finally, He declared, "I and my Father are One."

When He hung upon the Cross, Jesus began to get doubts and ill feelings toward his persecutors. He heard a Voice say, "All life is One, my dear Son. Be alike to everyone."

These three declarations by Jesus regarding His nature and ministry mark out the stages of His developing maturity and deepening insight. At first He declared that He is in the Light. Then, He declared that ~~the~~ Light is in Him. Finally, He declared that He is the Light. ← These stages can be observed in the Gospels and mark out the stages which every man must undergo to achieve salvation. The very life of Jesus itself, therefore, is the perfect model or type for all mankind to emulate. This is the basis of His claim to authority, an authority which is absolute and eternal: His life is His message, expansion is His life.

Through the practice of Love, Jesus came to experience the identity of all men and all creation with the Father. It was this same experience which was won by His little brother Francis on that dreadful mountain of Alverno. And, likewise, the same experience was granted to His sister Teresa of Avila during the ordeal of the Arrow and in her vision of the Interior Castle. Indeed, Teresa's description of the soul's progress toward the central chamber of the Interior Castle matches Jesus' three declarations mentioned above. St. Jerome, using the language of the Song of Songs, likewise describes the fulfillment of the soul's pilgrimage as in the nature of being taken by the hand and led by the King into His Bridal Chamber.

For each of these seekers the journey started and ended with Love, Love and more Love. Love is divine. Love leads to God. Love is God. Love is everlasting. Love reveals to man, in the chamber of his own heart, the true, ineffable, sublime unity of all in God.

The great principle and truth is stated in Deuteronomy: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." That is, God has no second. A thing and its nature are one and the same. Two is only one twice. God is all this. The whole world is but Names and Forms of Him. That art thou.

This is My Body. God said, "I am One, I will to be many."

And so it is. There are many wires but one current, many oceans but one water, many pots but one clay.

This is the truth, but it is bootless to merely mouth it.

Unless the truth is experienced in a man's heart, he is a zero. When he experiences the truth, in his own heart, a man becomes a hero. So, scholarship without experience is mere puffery. But, scholarship based on experience has the power to bring one to the Goal.

Jesus showed mankind the direct, simple way to experience the truth, through the daily practice of love, expanding toward one and all, embracing everyone and everything as another appearance, another manifestation, another Incarnation of the same God that one really is.

When ignorance is partially removed, a man sees himself as a Son of God, says St. Paul. When a man sees the truth, says St. Paul, God for him is all in all. Thus, rightly understood, the great creedal statements regarding the nature of Christ can be applied to every man.

THE GUILD

Biblical scholars of the past two centuries have been unwilling to accept straight on the miracles of the New Testament and the speech attributed to Jesus. The reason is that the scholars, led by German scholars, desired to have the prestige which had been gained by the physical and natural scientists and, to accomplish that end, adopted the criteria of verifiability which those scientists used. This was an ironic switch: only a few centuries earlier theology was regarded as the "Queen of the Sciences," but now her ways and means were to be subordinated to those of her former subordinates.

It was a betrayal of self-confidence that has literally thrown Western culture on its nose. Now the tail is wagging the dog and physical and natural scientists are dictating conclusions to theologians, who are standing for this nonsense. When a theologian desires prestige

rather than a heart saturated in Love, he stoops to mean tricks, discards his sacred responsibility and plunges society itself into the abyss of darkness.

The one thing needful to reestablish the proper function of theology, namely, experience of the sweetness, peace and bliss which God is, has been lacking among Christian scholars since many years. Thus, the miracles of Jesus are regarded as legendary fictions and His words as mostly, if not all, inventions of misguided disciples.

Because they have no experience in spiritual affairs, scholars do not observe that the New Testament records Jesus and others speaking at different points in one or more of the three stages of spiritual development. Diction, phraseology and subject matter differ widely between these stages. Apparent contradictions in the words of Jesus and others can be explained by reference to this phenomenon. But, since they have no experience of these matters, since their faith is fickle and their hearts devoid of love, scholars denigrate the text, ridicule the Subject and heap scorn upon His witnesses.

On the other hand, to one who has experience, who has love, the Bible in its entirety reads very plausibly, although throughout, its field of interest is the internal life of a man and not the machinations of the world. All of the "external" phenomena in the Bible are, really speaking, macrocosmic types of the microcosm which is a man's heart. Thus, if a scholar desires to find God, he must search inside his own heart. God resides there.

CHRISTUS VICTOR

Blown-up color pictures of a tiny crucifix materialized by Sathya Sai for an American devotee are available. The crucifix shows the Body at the moment of death. It is covered with huge clots of blood, from being beaten. The face is a study in resigned agony. It is a ghastly, awesome sight. The Romans knew how to do their stuff.

This event is referred to by all New Testament writers as the moment of Christ's glorification. The dreadful agony of the heart and soul of St. Francis upon receiving the

Stigmata is, likewise, referred to as the moment of his glorification.

Why?

The moment the ego is crucified, God appears. The moment the sense of I-me-mine is cut clean across, the primeval, eternal Reality is experienced. God is then manifest in all His glory, power and love. The crucifixion of the ego is the supreme achievement of the individual. Not until that awful event occurs is he worthy to be called a man. Only by that event can ignorance be completely removed and Truth shine forth in its native splendor. Therefore, the crucifixion of Jesus is regarded as His "lifting up," His glorification. It must be the same for every man. Again, the Life of Jesus is the type for mankind to emulate.

Jesus did not say that He would come again. He said that the Son of Man would come during the life-time of many of His listeners. He here had reference to the military/political aspect of the Messiah Who was expected to throw off the Roman yoke. The Son of Man did come, as the early Christians hoped, in 72 A.D., but He had the form of the Army of Titus, and instead of destroying Rome, He sacked Jerusalem.

In this way was Jesus avenged upon His enemy, pharisaical religion. This event was the "second coming" in the sense expected by the early Christians. Contrary to modern scholarly opinion, these people were not disappointed in their hope, though some of them and many people subsequently have failed to recognize the fulfillment of it.

The passage in John's Gospel in which Jesus uses the word "I" in connection with returning is probably composed by John's disciples from recollections of their Master's discourses. John himself reached the spiritual heights attained by his Master and could have used the word "I" while relating this conversation to his disciples. When the truth is known, the word "I" can be used for anything and everything.

But the dates of death of Peter and John show that the "coming" here mentioned is the destruction of Jerusalem in 72 A.D.

Jesus said, "He who sent me will come again." And he pointed to a sheep. The sheep says Ba-Ba. In this way

Jesus indicated the Advent of Sathya Sai Baba. He said, "He will wear a red robe and a crown of hair." Baba wears such a robe and has a large head of black hair.

Insofar as Christians today expect Jesus to come again, they are mistaken bearers of a forlorn hope. Indeed, inasmuch as most who now go by the name Christian are actually practicing that very phariseeism which Jesus condemned, they would likely have little pleasure in store if He did appear.

What Jesus did predict, that the Father Himself would come again, has been fulfilled in the Name and Form of Sathya Sai Baba. All of the passages in the New Testament which mention a "second coming" have reference to the sack of Jerusalem by Titus in 72 A.D. All of the predictions of Jesus have been fulfilled.

PACEM IN TERRIS

HOC EST CORPUS MEUM

From this examination of the "historical" Jesus -- as if there were some other -- several lessons may be learned.

The way is now open for genuine peace to be made with both Moslems and Jews. Both are essentially correct in stating that Jesus is a great prophet, a seeker like other seekers. However, the Jews must one day recognize that He is also the promised Messiah and that only the habit of looking outward instead of inward prevents them from recognizing Him. Christians are obliged to hold Jews in the bonds of love and warm affection, not only on account of their being, but also in honor of the roots of the Christian religion itself.

The number of Jews alive today is very small indeed. For, nearly all who call themselves Jews are, really speaking, Zionists, comprising atheists, politicians, businessmen, bankers and terrorists whose sole desire is to expand their control of real estate.

The crusade against the so-called Moslem "infidel" can and must cease entirely. The Koran must be treated in the same spirit of veneration as the Bible since It also

is divinely inspired. The very failure of the Crusade could have been proof enough of that. Even the "crusade" of St. Francis, one of the world's few truly successful men, was a failure. In any case, Islam stands in equal brotherhood with Christianity as one of mankind's religions -- as the Koran Itself points out.

Jesus Himself studied under Hindu and Buddhist Masters. That He did not use the symbolism of these religions in Palestine is unremarkable: who would understand Him? Instead, He used the universal language of mankind, love, service, sacrifice, and applied that language in the context of the Messianic and monastic expectations then current in Palestine.

In this context, it is appropriate to mention that, as far as this writer can tell, it is unlikely that Jesus and the Essenes were on friendly terms. In some circles today it is declared that not only were they friendly, but that Jesus may have been an Essene. I think it more likely that the similarity of His speech with theirs reflects His efforts to educate them while using their own terminology. His ministry was expansive, relaxed and public, reflecting the universality of the Father's Love. With their contractive, secretive, unmagnanimous habits, the Essenes were probably in the forefront of those plotting against Jesus.

In any case, Jesus Himself found no difficulty in sucking at the breast of Mother India. Nor should we. In fact, it may be seen that India is the spiritual heart of this planet, that she has the gold that men from every clime and time come to mine. India is home to no less than 5 of mankind's religions: Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism, Jainism and Zorroastrianism. These are the Aryan religions, Hinduism being the mother of the rest. The Semitic religions are three: Christianity, Islam and Hebraism. The Mongoloid religions are likewise three: Confucianism, Taoism and Shinto. India and Hinduism are, really speaking, the source of all man's religions, just as Sanskrit is the source of all our languages.

Therefore, a Hindu service in Lampman Chapel was no desecration. It was a consecration of that shrine to its roots and a lesson to this aspirant in the Oneness of God.

All of man's religions testify to the Glory of God. All teach the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Men.

All teach the primacy of Love, of service and of sacrifice, which are the same thing. To perceive this fact and to live in tolerance and harmony with one and all is the true goal of the ecumenical movement. No longer can he call himself a Catholic who cannot in reverence, tolerance, forbearance and love live compassionately with all men everywhere.

While it is true that the "second coming of Jesus" has occurred long ago in the physical sense, the religion of Jesus would lead one to expect that in the spiritual sense there may be an infinite number of comings again. For, when knowledge is gained, everyone and everything can be hailed from afar as Christ Jesus. The Canticle to the Sun by St. Francis is an exuberant recognition of Christ in the form of the five elements, ether, air, fire, water and earth, the combinations and permutations of which compose the world. St. Paul sees Christ as filling Creation. Teilhard sees Him as both the warp and the woof of the eternal phenomenon of evolution and involution. St. Teresa of Avila declares that in the state of ecstasy, she experiences an identity of her self and "His Majesty." Jesus declared, "I and my Father are One."

Indeed, it is impossible to find anything that is not Christ Jesus. He is nearer and dearer than one's own skin. A man, and indeed, all creation, is merely His vesture, put on to enact the several roles of the great drama which this life and this world is. This experience gave rise to the First Chapter of St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians and to the great creedal formulations regarding the Nature of Christ Jesus of Nazareth.

So, while the statements of the Koran regarding the nature of Jesus must be accepted as true, the statements of St. Paul on the same subject must be taken as equally valid. In addition, both sets of statements must be taken to accurately describe the nature of every man.

The religion of love causes one to see everyone and everything as Divine, for all the distinctions which men use to wreak havoc among themselves are consumed in the Divine Fire which Love is. And for this reason it may be declared that the comings of Christ Jesus of Nazareth may be infinite in number. The more a heart is filled with Love, the more that person sees Him in everyone and everything, the more He "comes again." There is no need to "wait."

Those who insist that the Name of Jesus is the only Name given for salvation are carping in ignorance. First, it is a virtue of Semitical religion that it can be single-pointed, and, while the modern man of sophistication may regard this tendency as fanaticism, single-pointedness is a virtue that modern man needs to acquire. St. Peter made this declaration regarding the Name of Jesus to the Sanhedrin, and in that context the statement is correct.

Second, in the broader, ecumenical context, this statement is partially true or true as far as one devoted to that Name is concerned. Actually, the Names of God are infinite in number and no one is more efficacious than another in the pursuit of the spiritual life. However, the sages recommend that the seeker choose one Name that is sweetest to him and stay with it. This makes spiritual exercise, or piety, easy and progress toward the Goal rapid and sure.

The use of several or many names, particularly in meditation and prayer, makes for confusion, diffusion and consternation. So, one Name of God is not better than another, but, after an aspirant has chosen one Name as sweetest for him, he should stay with that Name single-pointedly, as St. Peter did.

CONCLUDING EXHORTATION

It has here been my purpose to do my duty as God has given me light to see that duty.

Let it be found that upon the day of decision we are enumerated among the saints, fit and trim, in line of battle drawn, moving forward to the attack on falsehood, wickedness, disease and hatred. Let it be said that we have kept the faith, that we have run the course and that we have earned the crown of immortality.

May all men everywhere be happy. And may Truth, Righteousness. Peace and Love be established upon the earth.

LEFT AND RIGHT

By David R. Graham, October 1982

In Omnibus omnia Deus
En pasi panta Theos
Vasudevasarvamidam
God is all in all

It has become a convention in Western Civilization to describe the many modes of thought, belief, feeling and action as either left wing or right wing or some shade of color along the spectrum from red (left) to, presumably, blue (right).

While this duality has no ultimate validity, it has some penultimate value and is deeply etched in both the human mind and the human morphology. I intend to use this duality to describe certain phenomena in my experience and wish to strongly warn the reader at the outset that I understand that I am writing about penultimates only and not about Truth Itself. Naturally, I desire that the reader understand what I have to say in the same terms.

Ego sum, nolite timere
It is I, be not afraid

Truth is non-dual, that is, it has no second by which it can be understood. Truth may be cognized and visualized, but it may neither be understood nor described. The reason for this is two-fold. First, Truth has no attributes that may be described. Second, language and its component concepts are inherently dualistic -- subject, object -- whereas, Truth has no attributes and is visualized as a unity of the seer, the seen and the act of seeing.

The nearest language may come to describing Truth is by way of the classical via negativa, by which is meant not, "Not that," but rather, "Not only that, but also" The reader who perceives the vast difference between these two uses of the via negativa, one mistaken and one correct, may feel as if struck by a lightning bolt. He would not be far at that point from cognizing Truth Itself.

All concepts, all emotions, all thoughts, all language, all actions may be classed into two groups. Both groups have the nature of illusion, that is, they posit a distinction between the seer, the seen and the act of seeing. However, one group, the left, comprises illusions which lead one inextricably down into confusion, despair and ruin, that is, into more and more illusion; whereas, the other group, the right, if firmly held, leads one up and up into the cool, pure ether of calm, peace and surrender, that is, toward the ultimate vision of unity in which Truth is cognized as the Base and Substance of the Self, of which the world is a mere fraction.

These two groups of illusions, left and right, have only penultimate significance. However, to the vast majority of struggling humanity, they appear to have very ultimate significance. One textbook in political science can remove any doubt on that score, or any newspaper or psychological review. The power of this appearance is built right into the human morphology, and indeed, according to Teilhard, the cosmic morphogenesis itself.

The religions of mankind have one purpose only, and that is to remove the ignorance which this appearance of duality indicates. The penultimate value of the duality is that one term, the right, is used to eradicate the other, the left, and in the process is itself destroyed. The ancient way of describing this process is to assert that there are two trees growing in the forest of a man's mind, illusion that leads to more illusion and illusion that leads to Truth. These trees grow side by side in close proximity. The wind comes up and causes the right-hand tree to rub against the left-hand tree. Pretty soon all this friction

and scraping sparks a fire. The fire feeds on the tree of illusion that leads to more illusion and in time that tree is reduced to ashes. It has no more power to delude the mind.

However, the same fire has also, meantime, started burning the tree of illusion that leads to Truth. Pretty soon this tree, too, the right-hand one, is gone up in flames and reduced to ashes. Now both trees are gone and what remains is calm, still, silence, a mind which has been destroyed. That silence and calm is pure God flowing into one.

The experience is called Self-Realization and may be described as non-dualism, the experience that the seer, the seen and the act of seeing are one and the same. What before appeared to be three threads is now experienced as one thread.

The wind which causes these trees to rub together and ignite is the urge to Godliness. Really speaking, this urge is God Himself, and it harnesses all thoughts, feelings and actions into a disciplined way of daily living which is called piety or spiritual exercise. Not all people have this urge, and, among those who do, one may observe different degrees of intensity. But, without the urge to Godliness, the twin trees of illusion keep growing into monstrous and terrifying proportions.

So, dualism has penultimate value because it may be used -- must be used -- to reach the experience of non-dualism, which is called Truth-Consciousness-Bliss, or, God, or, Reality, or, Self, the true and only "I."

In this sense I want to describe the experience of dualism in my own experience and in the general experience of Western Civilization.

Sic transit gloria mundi
Thus passes the glory of the world

The "left" and "right" are built into the human body, which is merely the most recent plateau of the cosmological morphogenesis.

Incidentally, it may be asserted as a fact that in the entire universe there is no other life such as we know it here. Earth alone supports Life and is, therefore, as Teilhard believed, the leading shoot of noogenesis, which is also cosmogenesis. This Earth is the only sidereal body upon which God Incarnates.

The left hand represents the world. It must be "left." That hand should always be open so that it cannot fasten onto anything. The right hand, however, represents God and must always be closed tight around Him. That is why one hand is called "left" and the other "right."

Now, this morphological distinction has given rise to a description of man's feelings, thoughts and actions as left hand, left wing or leftist and right hand, right wing or rightist. To these distinction do I wish to invite the reader's attention.

The difference between the left wing and the right wing is functional. The difference consists in to what and to whom they attach their desires.

People on the left attach their desires to the things of this world, such as money, prestige, family, houses, cars, jobs, sex and the like. In other words, they have attachment to the body and its appurtenances. Their desires are for satisfying the five senses, hearing, touching, seeing, tasting and smelling. They may be described as voluptuaries dominated by lust, in the broad meaning of the term as the desire to gratify all the senses, the more and the more often the better. At present, the vast majority of the citizens of Western Civilization are sunk deep in a glittering whirlpool of lust. It is a pitiable sight,

for animals, lacking intelligence, behave more uprightly than humans lost in gratifying their senses.

People on the right, however, attach their desires to God, and especially, to the divine attributes such as truthfulness, sincerity, simplicity, humility, honesty, audacity, courage, kindness, forbearance, tolerance and non-violence. Such people attempt to live above the roar of the crowd and, at the very best, try to decide matters on immutable principles of right and wrong which have been handed down through centuries of human experience. These people are intent upon living virtuously rather than gratifying their senses. They have an urge inside them to draw Godward. Very few such people are alive today, and fewer still steadfastly tread the path to the end. But upon these few people do all the rest depend for their very sustenance, if they but knew it, which they do not. Those who get the chance to experience the company of Godly people are very fortunate indeed and must make the most of their opportunity.

So, the difference between the left and the right is functional and involves a different point of attachment for desire itself. The left throws all of its desire at the world. The right throws all of its desire at God as represented in His Attributes.

No difference could be more profound, nor have such divergent consequences. The difference between the left and the right is so fundamental and irreducible that no sophistry of wit or reasoning can ever unite the two wings, even if one had a thousand life-times to make the effort. The greatest philosophical mind of this century, Ludwig von Wittgenstein, tried desperately to combine these two. But, he failed, along with Hume, Spinoza and Hegel before him.

It cannot be done. This duality cannot be resolved. It can only be removed, and that through a lot of hot, hard and heavy work in the "right" direction.

Plus ça change, plus c'est la mem chose.

The more things change, the more things stay the same.

The left wing and the right wing may be observed all through Christian history. However, the first time the fundamental differences surface in a clear philosophical way is during the great debate in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries between the nominalists (left) and the realists (right). The nominalists argued that a thing exists only if it is experienced through the senses. Realists argued that a thing exists regardless of whether it is experienced by the senses. Nominalists argued, after the manner of the Red Queen, that, "It is so because I say it is so." Realists declared that, whatever is, it is whether one says -- or knows -- so or not. Nominalists declared that man is the measure of all things. Realists declared that God is the measure of all things.

The issue was decided by the adoption of the realist position and the emasculation of the leading nominalist, Peter Abelard.

However, the drag of the nominalists is very heavy indeed. Three centuries after Abelard, during the Renaissance, they reemerged with a new name, humanists, and now dominate Western Civilization.

Domine, fac ut videam

Lord, make me see

During the Renaissance the left and right wings emerged in the full splendor of their glory.

The left wing took the form of the arts and sciences, what today is called liberal arts or liberal education. The right wing took the form of the mendicant orders, Franciscans and Dominicans, plus other less well-known orders.

For centuries during and after the Renaissance the differences between left and right were not widely recognized. A few geniuses on each side, for example Machiavelli and St. Francis, perceived the differences, but the general policy was to hold the differences together through the concept of Mother Church. Scholars invented a name for this merely gorgeous absurdity and called it Christian humanism. And the supreme example of it is the Cathedral of St. Peter at Rome.

Schools, generally, were founded for religious purposes and under royal/ecclesiastical patronage. The example here is the Sorbonne at Paris, founded under the great King St. Louis IX, a Tertiary Franciscan. But the academic content of these schools was more and more humanist so that by the time of the Reformation, they were now Universities as we know them, direct descendents of the liberal arts and sciences of the Renaissance, that is, Temples of Humanism.

Along the way a few schools tried to remain faithful to religion and the Church, but as the Church Herself was gradually swung from right to left, Protestants in advance of Catholics, even these schools succumbed to the "liberal arts" rather than face a term without students or teachers both.

The left, therefore, grew so pervasive through the schools that one modern historian has remarked, correctly, that to deplore humanism is almost equivalent to deploring the whole of Western Civilization.

It may be taken as an indication of the triumph of humanism that the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, which is the author's scholastic home, now seeks government money and no longer offers a Doctorate in Theology but only a Doctorate in Philosophy in conjunction with Columbia University, a great center of liberal, humanist learning.

The right wing during the Renaissance may be seen in the great mendicant orders and their missionary activities in Europe and elsewhere. In the arts it may be seen in the work of Dante, Giotto, Bernini, and later,

El Greco. A modern descendent of the right wing in painting is Kandinsky, himself the son of a Mongol Princess. Bach, Brahms, Beethoven, Franck, Dupre, Prokoffiev, Palestrina, Gershwin and, usually, Handel are descendents of the right wing, also.

But the true inspiration of the right wing is observed in the Franciscan and Dominican Orders, the one eschewing education as a temptation to pride and a diversion from service to men, the other boldly taking up the cause of education in order to demonstrate its true purpose, which is the uplift of all men through the practice of truth, righteousness, peace and love.

The impulse of the Franciscans may be seen in the whole body of law and institutions which aims to protect and foster the meek and lowly, the broken and dispossessed. The Discalced Carmelites of St. Teresa of Avila are progeny of St. Francis through St. Clare and St. Peter of Alcantara. Interestingly, Teresa's Confessors were Dominicans and Jesuits.

The impulse of the Dominicans may be seen in the modern Jerusalem Bible. St. Teresa was given to understand during one of her ecstasies that in later years God would bring about a reestablishment of true religion through the efforts of a particular Order in translating and fostering the Bible. She did not name the Order. Some commentators believe that she meant the Jesuits. But her closest friend and spiritual adviser declares that she meant the Dominicans. The author believes that the Jerusalem Bible is the text indicated in St. Teresa's ecstasy.

The Dominican impulse may also be seen in the Spanish Inquisition, from which left wingers shrink in horror, and in the great missionary expeditions and social experiments of the Jesuits.

The full intellectual, scholastic fruit of the Dominican commitment to education is seen in the life and writing of Teilhard de Chardin, who has been called a second Aquinas, although that title may do him too little honor. For, although Teilhard's work is synthetic, like that of his great predecessor, it is so in a different system of philosophy, namely, non-dualism, whereas Aquinas' work is synthetic in

in the system of dualism.

This puts Teilhard among the Franciscans, spiritually speaking, although by Habit he was a Jesuit, a descendent of St. Dominic by way of St. Ignatius Loyola. It is ironic that whereas Brother Elias had, perhaps, the heart of a Dominican in the Habit of a Franciscan, Teilhard had the heart of a Franciscan in the Habit of a Jesuit (Dominican). And for this reason was he suppressed.

That there was something right and true about the Spanish Inquisition -- about which its horrified detractors know little more than that they hate it -- may be observed in the fact that St. Teresa herself, her writing and her Order all passed the scrutiny of that institution.

Fomes peccati

The attraction to sin

The left and right wings may each be sub-divided into two classes.

The right side of the left wing is composed of genteel humanists who generally stress the development of human potential, the design and creation of vast social projects and the so-called "bleeding-heart" attitude toward human suffering. They are very loud about liberty, equality, fraternity, but only insofar as those grandiose phrases are not applied in such a manner as to disturb or retard their own voluptuous life-style. The Reverend Martin Luther King typified this state of mind.

In England this genteel humanism was brought to a high pitch of polish by the Fabians, among them G. B. Shaw, H. G. Wells, John Maynard Keynes, Bertrand Russell and others. Their attitude was imported to this country early in this century and settled at the Ivy League Schools and around Chicago and the Great Lakes States. It became the rallying cry of the labor movement, the Zionist movement, the Field and Rockefeller

families, the Durants, Norman Cousins, Hubert Humphrey and the Americans for Democratic Action and the main-line Protestant denominations.

In Europe it is represented by a political party: the Social Democrats. From Harvard University it spread throughout the Administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and every Administration since then. This smug brand of humanism, the right side of the left wing, is the single most powerful force in American political, social, intellectual and artistic life today. Its triumph is complete. It controls the schools, the Church, the government, the media and the purse-strings. It is a white witch.

The black witch is the left side of the left wing, often called radicals or, in Russia, Bolsheviks. These are the terrible humanists who lack polish and sophistication. They are a bit impatient of success and achieving domination so they prefer physical combat to verbal and financial leverage. They are more handy with the trigger than the pen and pocketbook and will demonstrate, march, lecture, discuss and propagandize in a vulgar manner which would never occur to the membership of the University Club. Their goals, too, are a bit crude and comprise merely that ham-handed imperium which is all that ever beckons the slothful and dull-witted. The so-called Mafia represents this attitude of the left side of the left wing, although recently that body is really responding to the keener, more sophisticated minds and money of the right side of the left wing, which is using it as a bag-man. The regime of Menachem Begin, also, typifies the left side of the left wing. Politically, he is opposed by the right side of the left wing, which regards him as a boor.

Usually, this left side of the left wing is called communism. But, the right side of the left wing is also, really speaking, communistic. They differ in methods and demeanor only, the one using violence, the other cunning words, the one throwing bombs, the other hurling money and sarcasm, the one playing a black witch, the other playing a white witch. But, there is no real difference between them, for their goal

is the same: to redistribute the wealth of the people into their own pockets.

In this country the Fabians rule. In Russia, the Bolsheviks. But, there is no real difference between them. Both espouse an essential idiocy: that a man, who in private life cannot be trusted to manage his own affairs, becomes, in public life, a superman who can manage the affairs of the world. Both are trying to satiate their insatiable senses. Both are lusting for any opportunity to tell their neighbor how to live. Both are seeking to destroy that self-sufficiency and independence which is the true measure of the divinity of human nature. Both are yearning to grip the concentrated attention of mankind by fostering in men a base fear for their mere survival. Both are trying to win the allegiance of human beings by distributing perks in a context which appears to be controlled entirely by them. Both, therefore, are attempting not to govern men but to enslave them.

The demeanor of the left may be observed in the tumbrels of the 22nd Prairial and in the policy of the Congress of the United States toward the Southern States in 1866. In the latter case, the Southern States ceased to exist and became Military Districts for the purpose of "reconstruction," by which was really meant exploitation.

When this happened, General Robert E. Lee, of course, pointed out that since the issue of an inviolate Union of states had been decided in the crucible of war, it was as "incompetent" for the Congress to declare the states no longer states as it was for the states to secede from the Union. However, this way of thinking failed to impress Thaddeus Stevens, the other "radicals" and Unionists in general who were bent upon the exploitation of what they considered as conquered territory.

Qui replet omnia, in quo omnia constant
Who fills all things, in whom everything holds together

The right wing also may be sub-divided into two parts. These parts are represented by, on the left, Moses, David, Jeremiah, Jesus, Paul, Jerome, Benedict, Francis, Teresa of Avila, Teilhard, and, on the right, by Aaron, David, Ezekiel, Jesus, Peter, Augustine, Bernard, Dominic, Aquinas, Ignatius Loyola and John Henry Newman.

Luther and Calvin, descendents of St. Augustine, belong to the right side of the right wing.

The Anglican Divines, generally, belong to the right side, right wing, but the Anglican and Episcopal Church, as an organization, belongs to the left side of the left wing. Anglicanism was born as a royal attack on the right wing itself. It has never lost that impetus and remains today opposed to the right. It is Toryism and is focused, in this country, in the markets and media of New York City.

The two sides of the right wing are the soldierly and the priestly functions, the one guarding and fostering the moral order, the other guarding and fostering the spiritual order. St. Peter calls the Church a royal priesthood, thereby indicating both of these functions. In most of his letters St. Paul calls the Church a marching army, but in the Letter to the Hebrews he calls Her a divine priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. That great priest-king of Jerusalem is a type of Christ and the Church. Abraham himself pays him homage. He may, therefore, be taken as God.

One other personality reveals himself as both King and Priest and that is David, who is the Father of Jesus.

The soldierly function, which is the left side of the right wing, is performed in the great battle to render the heart of man pure and thereby attractive to the Lover, God. The spiritual warrior may only be

described by reference to the increasing love and even chumminess he has with his Lover. The great Francis is cognizable in these terms. He was in love with Our Lady Poverty and, in the manner of true lovers, would do anything to please Her. The left side, therefore, reveals all that is noble, mighty and chivalric in human nature.

The right side of the right wing is taken up with the right performance of ritual and with passing on the great principles and modes of spiritual living through education. Here we see St. Dominic of the Dogs of God at war with heretics, formalizing the Liturgy and establishing great schools for the propagation of true doctrine.

If St. Francis represents the heart, the feminine aspect of the Church, St. Dominic represents the bones and the flesh, the male aspect of that Body. Effort and cosmos, energy and structure, the female and male aspects of Creation, which the Church truly is -- these are represented by Sts. Francis and Dominic, the soldier and the priest, who, not by accident, were contemporaries.

Each side of the right wing has its own peculiar tendencies to wander off course, and the history of the Church may be viewed as a great drama showing the ways to leave and the ways to return to the high, royal road of spiritual exercise.

A tendency of the left side is to wander into worldly combat. St. Francis began his adult career in this fashion. Another tendency is to develop intolerance toward those who love God in a different aspect than the one one has chosen. Another, and more serious, tendency is to love the world but say that one is loving God -- that is, to be really in the left wing.

This last tendency is much in evidence today, especially among the official institutions of religion and among those who, for one reason or another, conceive an infatuation for the ersatz representatives of Eastern religions.

Love for God must be single-pointed. If it is not, it may shortly become love for the pleasures of the world, even if it proclaims itself as love for God. Not all who say, "Lord, Lord"

The tendencies to wander from the right side arise in its special functions, ritual and education. The purpose of ritual is to secure peace, prosperity and happiness for the whole world. This purpose could not be higher, for it is to harmonize Creation, to bring contentment to mankind and even to animals, plants, rocks and stars. It is a truly catholic and ecumenical activity. It must be saturated in love and self-abnegation. And it must be performed correct to every detail.

When ritual is performed incorrectly, it secures not harmony but discord. When it becomes a dry routine devoid of devotion it : reeks of ego and merely conjures the devil. This is the unhappy lot of the Liturgy today. Sincere, decent people cannot even bear to attend the Mass.

Education is meant to instill and foster those high and noble traits of character which take one safely through the storms of life and on to its Goal. A man must be strong, courageous, dashing, humble and kindly towards one and all, regardless of station or attainment, for, the "other" is oneself in a different sheath or body. Education should foster faith, steadiness, compassion and the practice of virtuous behavior in the daily details of ordinary living. For, the goal of this life is to transform it into an extraordinary hilarity of insouciant Divinity.

In 1865, General Lee set about to rebuild Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Virginia after this pattern. He saw himself serving the sacred cause of education and never styled it "Christian" education because he was not aware of any other kind which is worthy of the name.

However, when education becomes mere rote learning of facts in pursuit

of a job, it is degraded and serves the conceits of lust rather than the cause of life. When grades and status take precedence over character and practice, education becomes a monster devouring society and its resources, producing not men but demons. To this unhappy estate have we come today.

The system of education is almost entirely on the left wing and is fostering not peace and prosperity but discord and profit. A degree is no longer a symbol and seal of achievement but a golden begging bowl in search of a "job." To what base degrees will men consign their souls with enthusiasm! How mighty are the minions of ignorance!

Education must be high-minded and rightly directed towards fostering those divine attributes which are called virtues and alone comprise the proper raiment of mankind. Then only can it claim the sympathy and enthusiasm of public support.

Another tendency of the right side of the right wing is to fossilize in verbiage. This is particularly a tendency of scholars who, in the effort to preserve and fix right doctrine, may think that Truth may be codified in mere language and, what is worse, that the mere repetition of that language is significant.

This attitude, which is called dogmatism, is really an expression in language of the emotion of intolerance. It is rightly condemned. It arises both during the heat of controversy with heretics and during the periods of lull when Churchmen grow arrogant and lazy. A typical example of it is St. Augustine's doctrine of double predestination and his statements regarding works and grace in the teeth of the heresies of Pelagius. The indulgence system, which furnished part of the trigger of the Reformation, is another example of this adamant attitude called dogmatism or intolerance.

Really speaking, however, dogmatism is a cover for a secret shift from the right wing to the left, for a fixation of the affections on the

pleasures of this world, under the cover of "religion." Protestant fundamentalism and its recent progeny, the charismatic movement, "faith healers" and the so-called New Right or Moral Majority, are engaged in this covert infidelity. The louder the yell of "doctrine" the more one may assume that the heart is set upon appeasing the appetites of the body.

So, the right wing has responsibility for fostering the moral and spiritual orders. For this reason it is called right.

Omnis creatura adhuc ingemiscit et parturit
All creation groans and travails in pain until now

The great Popes, such as Gregory I and Leo XIII, strove to keep both the right and the left sides of the right wing viable and vigorous. However, as may be seen in the papal amelioration of St. Augustine's doctrines of predestination and salvation, and in the papal suppression of the Fraticelli, or radical Franciscans, it has always and rightly been necessary to curb and canalize the enthusiasms to which both sides of the right wing are sometimes prone.

Always, however, at the great crossroads of Her history, the Church has had wise hearts and strong minds to chart a true course. Both the right and the left sides of the right wing have had vigorous exponents, by the Grace of God.

Today, however, a surprising thing has occurred. The whole Church, Protestant, ^{Jewish} Catholic and Orthodox, has been swung over to the left wing. In the author's understanding, this circumstance has not obtained since the days of Herod and the Hasmonaeans, when Judaism as a body was swung over into a geo-political-economic movement -- and that alone -- even though reeking carcasses still smoldered on the altar in the rebuilt Temple of Solomon.

Before, a few persons here and there could be uprooted and destroyed so that mankind may have peace. But now, all are tainted with wickedness. We must even bear the supreme shame of living when a Pope is murdered in his apartments and of watching his successor prancing upon the grandstands of this world like a rock-and-roll celebrity, a hound-dog sniffing for mammon. The Church Herself is utterly humiliated by the vile conceit of Her leaders. St. Jerome but declared the truth when he said that vestments do not make a Bishop.

So, if God were to uproot wickedness, where would He begin and who should remain when He finished? Clearly, He has chosen another course, to confer joy and strength, to educate, counsel, advise, to show by example how mankind may tread the path he has forgotten, the way to blessedness.

Diligentibus Deum omnia convertuntur in bonum

For those who love, all things are turned into good

The author's life is interesting if not instructive. He was reared at Claremont, California, a town than which none ranked higher as a seat of liberal, humanist education. For 15 years he breathed deep in that atmosphere of drama, art, music, science, society, philosophy, literature and glamorous personalities. But, in the end, there was nothing to hold his attention and no one there who held him dear. He left that contest.

He had been a favorite of his teachers, respected by his peers and sought after by the parents of his playmates as a good influence for their children. Many favors and kindnesses had been done to him by the elders of the community, perhaps out of compassion for the ^{supposed} desolation of his domestic existence or, perhaps, after the manner of elders desiring that young people grow up straight and strong -- probably both. But, when he graduated from High School, there was nowhere to go but out. So, he left. Claremont was on the left wing, just as Egypt at the time of Moses, Jerusalem at the time of Paul and Rome at the time of Jerome.

(regular #)

He went to the University of Redlands at Redlands, California and there found a home of sorts. At the time, this institution was being guided by a man of high character and lofty goals, Dr. George H. Armacost. His stewardship of the University may rightly be compared with that of General Lee at Washington College. In some 25 years, he lifted her from the ranks of Baptist parochialism to the ranks of national renown for excellence in the quality of her faculty and the character of her graduates.

Dr. Armacost was a true son of the right wing. He wanted his graduates to succeed in the many occupations to which they were called, but even more so and primarily he wanted them to be citizens of high character, independence, integrity and kindness. He labored indefatigably to assure this goal and there are many people today who have achieved great things because Dr. Armacost poured out his life that they might become strong and noble. Above all, he loved his students and considered their deeds as a measure of the success of his own life. He has not been disappointed.

In this environment the author felt at home. Indeed, spiritually he thrived and intellectually he gained that inflexible purpose of pursuing the truth which has characterized his subsequent years and also brought down on his head the near-overwhelming insult, defamation and calumny of the whole left wing. The author cannot describe in words the salutary influence of the labors of Dr. Armacost in his own life. It has been both vast and decisive. It has brought him insult, persecution, and finally, exile. But, it was then, and is today, right.

A measure of Dr. Armacost's devotion to high principles may be taken in the fact that in an era when other universities were becoming insatiable and petulant pillagers of the public purse, he strove mightily to keep the University out of the Federal pocketbook, out of the shame of deepening the public debt. He saw clearly what others did not, that a University which relies on government monies is a government university.

When the author entered the University, he intended to have a career in medicine. But he quickly switched to music, which field had been the emphasis of the natural parents. It was their ambition to have their unrealized ambitions for fame in the arts realized in the career of the "son." But it may be attributed to the influence of Dr. Armacost that the "son" renounced that insanity and settled upon the pursuit of Truth through the study of philosophy, religion and literature.

This commitment never slackened since his junior year in college. It took him on to Union Theological Seminary at New York City. But, what a desolating experience awaited him there! For, with a few exceptions, Union was solidly on the left wing, the faculty generally on the right side and the student body on the left. Some three weeks after arriving at the place, the author realized that he had not a friend there, that he was, in fact, back at Claremont. He stuck it out.

In the second year at Union he tried to remedy the sense of being an alien by joining the left wing enough to understand what were its principles and goals. He found none. He studied its literature, methods and life-style for nearly six years, rising high in left wing circles. But it was only in the nature of a reconnaissance and the left wing eventually took the author for a snake in its midst.

One professor at Union has maintained cordial relations with the author, Dr. Robert T. Handy, Professor of Church History, a scholar of justified renown and a Christian gentleman of unsurpassed excellence. The author is happy to report that he had three experiences of feeling at home at Union and that one of these occurred during his study of Modern Church History with Dr. Handy. The class was asked to read Rerum Novarum, the great Encyclical by Pope Leo XIII, which was meant to establish and foster the Catholic labor movement in the teeth of then-rising communism.

It is one of those documents the nobility and grandeur of which may best be seen in the consequences of its having been ignored. It correctly.

establishes the priority of the family before the State and in true Aquinian fashion lays out the correct modes of conduct for workers, owners and rulers. While reading it, the author felt the hairs on his head tingling and goose bumps popping all over his flesh. He felt at home and even experienced some little bliss.

Near the end of the author's years at Union, Dr. Handy asked him to prepare a paper summarizing the sense of the deliberations of the Curriculum Review Committee, an official organ of the Seminary, on which they both sat. (That Paper heads this volume. DRG-3/23/85)

The other two experiences which made the author feel at home at Union occurred in Dr. Paul Lehman's course in Systematic Theology. The text of that course was Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion. This theological and literary tour de force had much appeal for the author. Whereas his student colleagues treated the text as a museum piece they were obliged to dissect, the author took it personally as relevant to his own aspirations. He felt that the Professor did also.

For several years after, the author could be seen reading Calvin with a very intense and personal appreciation. Indeed, he was as strongly criticized for this apparent romance with morbidity as he had earlier been censured for his deep and thorough ingesting of the words of the Prophet Jeremiah.

Who can understand the agony of yearning in the heart of an aspirant? Truly speaking, only God can.

Early in this period and then all through it, the author kept ever before his eyes a large print of a famous painting. It was El Greco's portrait of St. Jerome, robed as a Cardinal, the great thumb of his right hand resting upon the open Bible. Naturally, this apparition occasioned much gaiety at the author's expense. But, it never came down. It was meant for a seal and a warning.

But there was another and more profound incident in Dr. Lehman's course which, for all its microscopic dimensions, reacted later in the author as a spiritual earthquake.

During one of his discourses, formulated in his usual slow and paragraph-length sentences, Dr. Lehman began describing a very elderly woman of his acquaintance. The class understood that she was not highly educated, in the scholastic sense of that term, but from the tone and timbre of his voice it was apparent that Dr. Lehman held this woman in deep reverence, that he esteemed her as a person of the highest stature because she had wisdom. Softly and tenderly and with the most intense emphasis, Dr. Lehman declared, "She was a Franciscan in piety."

These words resounded in the heart of the author. They had the ring of bells more glorious than those of the Great Carillon in the Tower of The Riverside Church, nextdoor Union. The thrill, the enthusiasm, the bright hope of the peal and laughter and hilarity of those verbal bells filled the heart of the author through many years of severe ascetical practices.

The author had known of St. Francis for a long time, but the words of Dr. Lehman, over time, made the author realize that he is kith and kin to that Saint and him especially. Although he is at home on the right wing, he is especially at home on its left side in the business of spiritual exercise or piety. He did not know this before Dr. Lehman's description of his elderly acquaintance. But, during the subsequent years he found it out. Dr. Lehman's words were for the author like bells ringing, "Wake up," "Come Home," "Here I am."

The echo and reecho of those bells, the glad pealing of the Gospel, will go on into Eternity. For, the Gospel is merely God's call to gather his old playmates. In piety, the author, too, is a Franciscan.

Descendit ad infernos

He descended to the lower regions

After Union, the author went to work with a Fabian economist, self-styled as the "Father of the Guaranteed Income." This afforded an excellent opportunity for reconnaissance all across the left wing, which was just then feeling very potent. At the same time, he was ordained in the United Church of Christ, an event which only expanded the field of operations.

This reconnaissance covered a broad and deep territory. He explored the possible theological bases of the then-current ecology movement. He found none. He was among the first theologians to examine and evaluate the feminist and women's equality movements. He traipsed alone through Harlem examining programs of the "Great Society." He researched the extent and depth of the global ecological blight and forecast the petroleum "shortage" of 1973 in 1970.

He studied cybernetics theory from the writings of Gregory Bateson, a true son of Voltaire, before Stewart Brand ever heard of that Savant. Indeed, his thesis at Union purported to demonstrate certain congruities between that theory and Old Testament Theology. He walked straight in the Corporate Headquarters of IBM as an unsolicited nobody and laid before some gentlemen there, who received him hospitably if with astonishment, the whole modern market for personal computers. The gentlemen, though cordial, were not interested. They were skeptical.

The irony of this gesture was that one member of the author's family was then an IBM Corporate Vice President and another directed corporate legal affairs. But, the author mentioned not a word of this.

He drafted sections of the document which announced the United Nations Second Development Decade. And he had his first direct experience with the arcane obtuseness of Soviet diplomacy when the Delegation from that Country refused to countenance the final document because it did not

declare that Soviet Socialism alone will solve all the problems of mankind. He also marveled as the U.N. officialate flinched and cringed and cracked under this Slavonic brow-beating. Years later, he learned how, with courage, forthrightness and audacity, General Douglas MacArthur beat down these ham-handed Soviet bullies during the Allied Occupation of Japan. Not only so, but he did it with *evident* merriment.

The author became engaged as a writer and speaker on academic and political platforms. He studied the nouances of futures predicting and co-led a conference for corporation presidents in that field. He was invited to attend professional conferences under the auspices of august humanitarian foundations.

He learned the methods of mixed-and multi-media shows, producing one himself, and was among the first experimenters with personal, portable video equipment. He *was acquainted with* the artistic underground which drew inspiration from the aleatory principles of John Cage.

He numbered among his acquaintances men who had ridden Guderian's tanks and been present at the great drive across the Balkans to secure the Romanian oil fields.

He spent three months in Berkeley, California, eating pancakes and reading Paracelsus at the Library of the Pacific School of Religion. His diet was an element of his ascetical practices. At the same time, he studied the literature of the alchemists, the parapsychologists, the Masons, the herbalists, the sorcerers, the Hopis and Navajos, the gemologists and the most theoretical physicists.

He studied the life and writings of Hahnemann, the homeopathist, and of Schweitzer. Familiar already with the works of Brahms and Bach, he delved deep into their biographies. He *imbibed* the color theories of Goethe and Kandinsky, the latter having been his artistic mentor since 1965. This relationship persists, even today.

At one time he declared himself a Buddhist. At another time, a Hindu. He declared that Sri Sathya Sai Baba is his Mother and Father.

He used to sit for hours and days on end in Grace Cathedral at San Francisco. For, on the south wall of the nave, next the transept of that neo-gothic shrine is a mural which had captivated his attention. It depicts the moment when St. Clare arrives at the Portiuncula by torch-light in the dead of night, an aristocratic runaway resolved upon a conventual life. On that picture the author ruminated for, literally, ~~days~~ weeks on end. He became a friend of the Verger of the Cathedral and a steady acquaintance of the Organist, whom he listened to practicing for many a glorious hour. That was Richard Fenstermacher. His aunt was secretary to several Bishops of the Diocese of California.

The picture of Clare, Francis and the Brothers acted as a cynosure to the author's heart. He came back to it again and again for inspiration, solace and comfort. It would not be wrong to say that he was reborn within the walls of Grace Cathedral, and reborn a Franciscan.

Years later, unasked, his ~~consort~~ consort came to him in this very Franciscan way, in the dead of night, a refugee from the mayhem of this world. Their life together with their children is a Franciscan paradigm of a new order: a conventual family.

The left wing, however, took an increasingly less positive view of the author, and during the years 1969 to 1972, while he was engaged in reconnaissance on that wing, gradually came to the belief that he was a snake in its midst. During those years, in a series of clandestine meetings held all over the map, from New York to Pasadena and from Helena to Phoenix, the author was tried in absentia, found guilty of insanity and sentenced to exile.

Had the natural parents and certain acquaintances ~~—————~~ →
~~—~~ had their way, he would have been bound over to a psychiatric hospital, presumably for an indefinite period. But, this

particular enthusiasm of the left wing, highly regarded in the Soviet Union and *some other* countries, failed to mature in the case of the author.

However, with the left wing in control of the School and the Church, the sentence to exile was entirely effective.

Two times only was the author accused of insanity while present in the courtroom: once before the Judge Eternal in Bharath (India), and once before a psychologist he had consented to visit in order to please the natural father. In both hearings the charge was dismissed for want of evidence, and in the latter case it was applied by the psychologist to the plaintiff.

Insouciance was taken for insanity, a piece of rope for a snake. That is all.

Incidentally, the author was permitted to ^{to} peer into but not undergo the indescribable horror of a complete mental cleavage or epistemological collapse. This occurred after the events next related, while he was a solitary in the infinite depths of the desert of Arizona. The cause of this trauma was the question, "Who am I?" And the healing of it was the answer, "I am a cripple whom God has touched."

Spiritus principalis

Perfect spirit

By 1972, the exile, which had been declared first at Union in 1969, was put into full effect.

However, in late 1971 and early 1972, the Author of this whole Drama, and its only real Character, called this author in for a chat. He declared that the author was a good man, a hard worker, angry at Him, impatient, weak minded and destined to have a happy

life, a very happy life. He also declared that the author had a very pure heart.

That was the turning point. From then on, the author knew how to handle the left and the right wings. He knew what he had to do and that was to really study the right wing which he had supposedly spent some thousands of dollars to do at Union but had been denied the opportunity, for the most part, of doing.

So, after taking a final swing through the far left of the left wing (Paracelsus, parapsychology, etc.), the author settled down with General Douglas MacArthur, St. Jerome, St. Francis, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Teilhard de Chardin and Sathya Sai Baba, the Cause of it all.

The author found the writings of MacArthur and his principle officers very thrilling. Douglas Southall Freeman's biography of Lee he took for the finest historical writing of his acquaintance. The life and words of Jackson touched his very soul. Not only did he thrill to the military aspect, which he took in its significance for the spiritual warfare which this life is, but also, and even more, he thrilled to the high principles of character and audacious action which these Great Captains, Lee, Jackson and MacArthur, embody. They are Virginians, all.

In the same manner and for the same reasons he thrilled to the life of St. Francis and the life and writings of St. Jerome. Indeed, the three children whom he and his wife ^{care for} are named for St. Jerome, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and St. Francis. In piety, all of these men are on the left side of the right wing.

Sathya Sai Baba is this family's constant teacher, friend, mother, father, adviser, light, *guide and resource*. He is as close to us as the air we breath and really closer than that. We cannot do anything unless He says to. He is our constant Friend, Companion and *Witness*. He is all that we are and have. We are not anything else besides Him. *He is our Sad-Guru, the One with power to save and protect, now and forever,*

Whereas the author's reconnaissance of the left wing ended in 1973, his study of the right wing ended in 1978. However, the exile which was declared for him originally in 1969 is still in effect.

Today, the author declares that he is neither left wing nor right, neither a man nor a woman, neither child nor adult, neither sage nor miscreant, neither old nor young, neither Monarch nor Menial, wealthy or poor, sick or well, light or dark, happy or sad, strong or weak, sane or insane, good or bad. He is *Beethoven, come again.*

Hoc est cibus meus, ut faciam voluntatem Patris

This is my food, to do the will of my Father

For almost fourteen years the author has been listening with thirsty ears to the enchanting melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll. He has extended his lines far beyond the flanks of the enemy. He has prepared his order of battle with thoroughness. The elements of his command are trained to a high pitch of skill and enthusiasm. The army is ready and poised to attack. Whatever could have been done to assure victory has been done, for, in war there can be no substitute for victory. The commander desires nothing more than to close with the enemy and fight him to the death. He is awaiting the order to charge bayonets.

Benedictus

Lord, bless us

May all men everywhere be happy. And may Truth, Righteousness, Peace and Love be established upon the earth.

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL MORALITY

By David R. Graham, November 1982

It is a pleasure and a desire of theologians to serve as advisers to those who bear the responsibility for political affairs. It is also a desire and a pleasure of rulers to seek and to follow the advice of theologians. There is a natural and easy relationship of mutual esteem which obtains between rulers and theologians. For, the one carries the responsibility of the people's welfare and the other knows the ancient, immutable principles of right conduct which will make the discharge of that responsibility easy and fruitful.

For this reason, I am compelled to write down some principles of political morality for those who wish to place them in practice and experience the sweetness of the fruit which they bring forth.

First, let me set the background of these discussions.

It is common in Western political theory to assert that men always act in terms of what they perceive to be their own self-interest. Furthermore, it is commonly assumed that what tends to the self-interest of one man will violate the self-interest of another. Finally, it is assumed that, given this situation of conflicting self-interests, society will always be a jumble of conflict which rulers must orchestrate in such a manner as to ensure that the greatest number of people, and/or the most influential, whether great in number or not, will succeed in achieving their self-interest.

In other words, it is assumed, with Hobbs, that men are "short, mean, nasty and brutish" and must be ruled with an iron fist or at least not disturbed or deterred from fulfilling their desires -- if they have influence by virtue of numbers or another medium, such as money, status, fame, etc.

Now, each of these assumptions will be found to rest on a single cynicism regarding human nature. That cynicism is expressed by Hobbs, already quoted, and really underlies almost all Western political theory from the time of Machiavelli to the present. The more genteel humanists try to dress it up with high-sounding phrases about fulfilling human potential, but a careful examination of the tone and timbre of their remarks reveals the fact that they really hold men in low esteem and try to hope for the best while always ^{expecting} the worst.

A very interesting and capsulated expression of this cynicism regarding human nature came to light during the Congressional investigation of the relief from command of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. MacArthur's chief accuser, General of the Army George C. Marshall, whose jealousy and anger were responsible for the petulant manner in which MacArthur was relieved, took this public occasion to express his disgust with MacArthur and the noble ideals which he embodied.

MacArthur declared that the leaders of the people were responsible for the debacle in Korea. He said that there was no policy in Korea, that the leaders got into the war on an impulse -- calling it by the astonishing euphemism of "police action" -- and pursued it with indecision, vacillation and poltroonery. He declared that the leaders are responsible for the troubles of the world; "Ninety-nine percent of the people want peace. It is the leaders who are responsible for war." MacArthur quoted Lincoln: "The people are wiser than their rulers."

Marshall, who was one of the leaders, hotly contested MacArthur's statements and tried to brand him a traitor. Said he: "The basic error has always been with the American people." Marshall went on to assert that MacArthur's repeated and emotional expressions of horror at the senseless killing of millions of people in Korea was bad for the morale of his troops. Asked to say how many American soldiers were in Korea, Marshall could not answer: "I think (not of individuals) ... of divisions." Marshall had commanded troops for part of one year, MacArthur for the better part of 50 years. Marshall wanted the people -- and MacArthur -- to shut up and let him do what he wanted. MacArthur could "hear the grass growing."

One man was a cynic with all the weakness of a desk-bound officer. The other had all the experience, charisma and savvy of a Great Captain, a field commander who knew troops and how to handle them. He was also universally recognized as a peerless and fearless administrator.

But the point I wish to make is that the point of view of Marshall predominates in Western political theory. It is that men are "short, mean, nasty and brutish" and must be treated accordingly. In other words, the nature of man is taken as inherently, unalterably and irrefragably vile. At least, every man but oneself.

Now, if this assumption regarding human nature were true, it is safe to say that the human race, much less this great nation, would not be here. It is also safe to say that those who believe it do not practice it. For, if it were true, there would be no feeling that there is something better. Every man has to lay down his head to sleep while assuming that his neighbor is not going to interrupt him violently. He has to assume that if his neighbor does interrupt him violently this would be the exception that proves the rule. Else, he would never be unafraid enough to get some sleep.

In fact, as the Founding Fathers of this nation attest, the very opposite of this cynical assumption regarding human nature is true. Human nature is inherently and unalterably divine. Furthermore, mankind as a whole is proceeding Godward, some faster, some slower, some at one stage of the journey, some at another.

It is necessary to have faith in this fact, even if one does not at first experience it. First faith, then comes experience to support faith. Men desire to be happy because their nature is Bliss; they desire to see and to experience because their nature is Consciousness; they desire to learn and to understand because their nature is Truth. These elemental desires of men -- to be happy, to see and to understand -- are reflections of their innate, divine nature. They are the motive force of that immortal, sacred pilgrimage to Godhead upon which mankind is trudging onward.

The ultimate purpose and goal of all the activities of rulers is just this: to secure and assure that social and natural environment which will help all men to realize the truth of who they are, where they came from and whither they are going. It is not the responsibility of rulers to assure that all men tread the path of self-realization or religion. They are all doing that, whether they realize it or not. But it is the ruler's responsibility to make the social and natural environment safe and sound for those who are treading the path deliberately. The ruler is not supposed to make men religious. But he is supposed to make it possible for men to practice religion safely and successfully. In fact, he has no other purpose in being.

So, the first principle of political morality is that human nature is divine, that mankind is proceeding Godward and that the ruler exists to direct the natural and social order in such a way that men can tread the Godward path without let or hinder.

It may be observed in passing that those who regard men through the spectacles of cynicism really have no experience of people. For some reason or another they have been shut off from the common intercourse of men. They are not taking part in the give and take, the mutual uplift and sharing which being a man requires. Therefore, the cynic, no matter how exalted his position nor how plentiful his devotees, is to be pitied instead of condemned. He is like a flower off its stalk and so he is not tasting the sweet nourishment of the love of his neighbor and of mankind. He is actually wilting away and cursing his fate to boot.

Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, Hegel and Marx are examples of this phenomenon. Some very strange teratologies arise from a human flower (an individual) which is off its stalk (mankind). Such a one only reeks a stench. And, to believe him is fouler yet. So, it may be observed that the real cause of cynicism is an absence of experience with men. To know men is to love them. To despise men is to despise oneself.

The social order is organized into four functions, each of which is necessary to the smooth running of society. These functions are ordained by God and have no beginning and no ending. There is no escape from them, nor are they ever superseded. They are as the parts of one body, society, and each is essential to the whole. Therefore, it cannot be said that one is superior or inferior to another or that one is more valuable than another. All are essential components of the one body which society is, and so, all must be fostered with equal diligence by the rulers.

In India, these four functions are called castes. There the castes are marked out by lineage, which family one is born into. In the rest of the world they are marked out by the inner inclinations and preparations of individuals.

The first function comprises the priest, the teacher and the doctor. These people are repositories for the modes of living which bring peace, health, prosperity and happiness to mankind.

The priest is engaged in propitiating the gods of nature and prosperity through the correct performance of rituals. He is, therefore, engaged in maintaining the proper balance of forces in nature and society. For, ritual has the power to suppress wickedness by bringing showers of Grace. When ritual is done correctly the divine treasury has no choice but to open its flood gates.

The teacher is engaged in planting and nurturing the seeds of wisdom and right conduct which have been accumulated by saints and sages since ages. The teacher is actually one of the three manifestations of Godhead which the young person must revere, the other two being the natural parents.

The doctor tends the vehicle, the body, which the individual must use to cross the ocean of life. He establishes the habits and regimens which will keep the body fit and trim for doing its work. For, without good health, even the first steps in spiritual exercise, which is every man's true vocation, can hardly be taken.

The second function comprises the ruler and his surrogates, the soldier, the judge and the policeman. The responsibilities of the ruler are the subject of this paper. Essentially, they are to make sure that everyone is carrying out their responsibilities with enthusiasm and efficiency and without hinderance. The ruler embodies the imperium and the penal authority. He has these powers by right.

Whenever the Lord incarnates on earth it is always in this function.

The third function comprises those who produce, gather and distribute the common necessities of life, namely, food, clothing and shelter. We would call these people businessmen and farmers. Their responsibility is to grow and manufacture the products men need to live in decency and comfort.

The fourth function comprises those who supply the muscle and brawn that keep society moving. We would call them laborers. They are engaged in lifting, pulling, bending, pushing and carrying the gross physical aspect of the world so that nature and society may function harmoniously in concert.

Each of these functions is essential to society and no one is more important or valuable than another. Moreover, people are born into one function or another because that one best suits their inner needs and provides the easiest, most direct mode of spiritual exercise for them personally. Nothing happens by chance. Everything happens for the spiritual advancement of the individual.

A man must, therefore, be content in discharging the duties of the function into which he is born. He cannot be happy trying to assume and discharge the duties of any other function. And indeed, it may be stated that much of the unhappiness in this country arises from people refusing to discharge responsibilities which they cannot evade, or, seeking to assume responsibilities which they do not have. Rulers are supposed to guard against these aberrations, but, when most of our "rulers" are really nothing of the sort, how can society expect to get its wires

uncrossed? Divine intervention is required and *has occurred.*

It is the responsibility of every man to examine his inner inclinations to discover which function he is suited for, which will give him happiness. In the case of rulers, it may be noted that those only are truly qualified for the job who do not seek it.

The natural order is little understood and even less respected in Western Civilization. Our controlling attitude towards nature is both narrow and adversarial. We do not measure the deep affinities of ourselves and all of nature, from the siderial to the infinitesimal, from the inanimate to the animate. We look for what we can extract from nature, not realizing that we are diminishing ourselves thereby.

Moreover, we intend to dominate and control nature, to make her suit our purposes, unaware that nature is our servant to begin with and must be accorded all the love, reverence and care due a faithful *sister.* For, without her infinite love and support, we should not be strutting about like kings. It is a testimony to her love that, like the sun and the rain, she bestows her bounty on one and all, the sinner equally with the saint.

It is a sacrilege to approach such a *sister* as if she were a recalcitrant slave. Indeed, to do so reveals a man as an ignorant knave. When nature is received in a spirit of cooperation and thanksgiving, even a certain gay camaraderie, her task is made easier and she performs it with enthusiasm.

The ruler is supposed to assure that nature is appreciated in this spirit. For then society will have a stable base and mankind will have prosperity and opportunity to progress rapidly Godward. Mankind is merely the latest, leading shoot of the great Tree of Life whose trunk and roots extend through animal and plant life all the way into the deepest recesses of the ^{measureless} siderial mass. The ruler must assure that mankind has the proper reverence for his origins and behaves harmoniously with nature,

which is the visible representative of those origins.

This is the background of these discussions; human nature is divine, mankind is proceeding Godward and rulers must foster the social and natural orders so that mankind's journey may be safe and sure. The social order comprises the four functions of teacher, ruler, producer and laborer. The natural order comprises the whole universe from the heights of the human intellect to the depths of the cosmic quantum.

It may be observed, then, that the purview of the ruler's responsibility is vast indeed. He cannot discharge that responsibility without invoking showers of Divine Grace. And that is why the great rulers have all been men of deep piety and sincere religious aspirations. Only these great ones are remembered warmly in the hearts of men because they only have secured peace, prosperity and happiness for their people, through Grace.

Let us now examine some principles of political morality by examining the lives of their exemplars.

It is a fact that Pope St. Gregory the Great had to be forced onto the Papal Chair, which in his day resembled more the *stool* of St. Peter than the Throne of Constantine, which we have today. Gregory was of noble Roman stock, but he wanted to lead the contemplative life. When he was elected to the Bishopric of Rome, the barbarian hordes were *descending* upon the Empire and the City. He was not present at the vote and actually hid from the call, but not out of cowardice. He wanted to be a monk after the manner of St. Benedict, whose greatest biographer he became. But, many strong words later, he resolved to pick up the responsibilities to which he was elected, and he became the prototype of the Christian leader, strong, self-reliant, skillful, audacious, a man whose entire life was based on renunciation.

Gregory left us with the famous epithet for Popes which is really the most complete possible description of a ruler: servus servorum Dei, servant of

the servants of God. It is said that he who would be the master of men must be their servant and that great truth is enshrined in the epithet Gregory adopted for himself, and with which all subsequent Popes sign their names.

It is common for organization charts to resemble a rough pyramidal shape, the boss at the top and the rest descending in ranks to the base. But this picture gives a false impression of how an organization really functions. It implies, on the one hand, that power is concentrated at the top and descends downward to the bottom. On the other hand, it implies that the upper ranks are resting on the lower.

But, it can be stated that no organization which lasts more than a few hours actually works this way. The pyramid works well in the gross physical reality, but in the organic reality of human organizations it is nearer the truth to say that the pyramid is inverted. And any "top man" who takes the time to really examine his feelings about his role will agree that the organizational pyramid is really standing on its apex, inverted, namely, ^{on} himself.

Power can only flow up, like synergy. What flows down is only entropy, weakness, death. Furthermore, what "boss man" has not felt the weight of his responsibilities bearing down on him? That is because he is holding up so many things and people. He is really at the bottom of the heap, holding it up. His feelings, if not his eyes, will tell him that this is the truth.

So, a master of men will be their servant whether he wants to be or not. That is not an option but a cold fact. It is useless to strut about as if this situation is not true. On the contrary, it is the part of wisdom to grasp it enthusiastically, for that is the only way to ease and lighten what is otherwise an overwhelming burden.

The true ruler is always trying to get under men, to be their servant. This attitude, which must be both sincere and habitual, is formalized in the courtly bow. A hundred years ago in this country, gentlemen of

station signed their letters, "Your humble and obedient servant...." That is the courtly bow in language and it was used by both Generals Grant and Lee in their exchange of communications upon that immortal Sunday, Palm Sunday, the 9th of April, 1865.

It is said that whereas most men regard themselves as Kings amidst a world of courtiers, St. Francis of Assisi regarded himself as a courtier amidst a world of Kings.

Now, in that attitude is to be found the genius of the great ruler, the strength and glory of his realm and the joy and peace of his "subjects."

Billions of dollars and thousands of social programs will fail to restore the self-respect and confidence of a broken man. One gesture, the courtly bow, will do it. And with that gesture have the great rulers installed themselves in the everlasting affection of mankind.

The story of Asoka, the great King in India in the Third Century, B.C., is very thrilling. He was a Great Captain, a battle leader of surpassing brilliance. His armies subdued the major part of the Indian sub-continent. But then, he was touched by the ideal of Ahimsa or non-violence. He became a Buddhist and inspired a renaissance of religion in India, and in particular Buddhism. He used his royal power to spread the teachings and practice of the Buddhist way of living.

Along the roads of the Empire he erected signs which said, "Heretofore these roads were used by soldiers marching to war, but hereafter let them be used by pilgrims marching toward enlightenment." At places of recreation and liesure he posted signs which read, "Heretofore men gathered here to play cards, drink intoxicants and chatter idly, but hereafter let them gather to engage in austerities, self-inquiry and deeds of charity."

Asoka had the ideal of turning the Empire into a heaven on earth, and he succeeded in that endeavor. The people were happy, men were treated

fairly and compassionately, saints and sages were honored and fostered and nature poured forth every necessary article.

Asoka wanted that men should live in peace and security. He demonstrated that peace and security are won only when rulers and people both cultivate righteousness and follow the ancient modes of conduct laid down by sages. He taught mankind that a nation which relies on armaments for its security has no security at all. Security is the result of upright living, for, Righteousness will entirely protect those who are protecting It.

Janaka, the father-in-law of Rama, held frequent gatherings of sages and scholars at his Court. He was an avid questioner and would sit for hours imbibing the high-minded discussions of his illustrious guests, prodding them to answer all manner of questions on spiritual matters. He held the view that if the ruler could imbibe the wisdom of sages, he would himself achieve Liberation and his subjects would be content and grateful in their various occupations.

He gifted large quantities of valuable presents to his guests, as befitted his royal station. They, in turn, were always happy to be at his Court because the King was a genuine aspirant and they knew that their words were as seeds of Truth sown in fertile, well-tended soil. Janaka was always the embodiment of humility at these gatherings. His ears were always thirsting for the conversations of noble, pure and selfless men. From his hunger for good company he gained Liberation, and moreover, the honor of being Father-in-law to Rama.

The life of Janaka illustrates the auspiciousness which comes from the love of good company. Saints, sages and scholars of the highest renown, men ordinarily unavailable as company for anyone, were drawn by the purity and sincerity of Janaka and spent much time with him in spiritual discussions. The spiritual hunger he had cultivated during many previous lives got Janaka this rare company of sages, scholars and -- supreme gift -- Rama Himself. And that is the measure of the importance of good company, for a ruler and for all men.

The great St. Louis IX, King of France and a Tertiary Franciscan, demonstrated the proper mode of wearing the imperial robes. Under his he wore a hair-shirt, as did St. Claire under her habit. St. Louis was wise enough to know that he must wear the robes, but he was discriminating enough to carry a painful reminder of their evanescence. For, St. Louis had tasted that mad delirium of the ecstasy of renunciation which is the heart and soul of everything Franciscan and, of all man's insanities, the least harmful.

St. Louis, too, loved the company of wise men and encouraged Robert de Sorbonne to found the great University which bears his name, one of the oldest in Western Civilization. Furthermore, it is said that the scales of St. Louis' justice were tipped in favor of the poor. And it is a fact that France did not before and has not since enjoyed the prosperity and happiness which she had under St. Louis IX.

A Franciscan mission in California is named for this Saint: Mission San Louis Rey. It is north of San Diego and east of Oceanside.

During the panoply for crowning a Pope there is a little ceremony which bears upon the proper attitude toward the powers, privileges and appurtenances of the political authority. As the man to be crowned Pope is carried through the door of St. Peter's Basilica, a functionary approaches and halts the progress of his Chair. This man carries a small brazier and some packets of flax. The man on the Chair takes some flax and throws it on the fire. It flames up and goes to ashes while the functionary declares, "Sic transit gloria mundi." ("Thus passes the glory of this world.") These gestures are repeated three times in all. Then the functionary retires and the Chair proceeds to the Coronation itself.

Now, while it may be observed that at times the occupants of the See of Rome have shown no evidence of having imbibed the lesson of this little ceremony, that does not detract from its significance. For, the ceremony is an equivalent of St. Louis' hair-shirt. That is, it is a reminder that all the privileges and perks of holding worldly authority are as nothing in the end, that it is better to face both life and death as a renunciate

than to strut about in robes which deteriorate and which one day, in any case, have to be taken off.

The great "creators" of social projects and the arrogant rulers who put it out that they are something momentous both fear God in His aspect as Time. For, Time devours all of their plans and pretense. Time leaves them, at last, as at first, with nothing at all. The life of Nebuchadnezzar illustrates this fact.

When the world was made, a Voice from Heaven was heard to say, "All life is based upon renunciation." That great cry of Wisdom echoes and reechoes down the halls of history like the theme of a thousand-voiced Fugue. It is the everlasting pedal-point of that mighty, polyphonic Chorale which this life is. It is the heart and soul of a great ruler.

It may be observed today, however, that renunciation is the least of the desires of rulers. Indeed, it may be asserted that all the nations of the world are governed by men who have only a pretense of power and authority, only a posturing of skill and accomplishment. In fact, the rulers of nations today are almost all mutineers against righteousness. They claim to have followers, but really they have none. When they go home at night, they cannot even govern their own wives and children. Yet, they pretend to command the loyalty of the masses! They are not leaders but bleeders of the people's faith and courage. They are empty bags and hollow eggs, a mere burden upon the people's livelihood and a monstrous monument to hypocrisy.

Aquinas declared that any law which places the state anterior to the family is no law at all, but a species of violence. Yet, rulers today are busily engaged in passing laws which place the state anterior to the family. They are trying to usurp the genius of the family for their own purposes, to make themselves appear momentous. But, really speaking, they have neither power, nor authority, nor ability, nor following. They have to be replaced by true sons of renunciation, by true progeny of Sts. Gregory and Louis IX, by true servants of righteousness and the people. This will be done, ere long.

Parikshith was the grandson of Arjuna, the Pandava brother whose chariot was driven by Lord Krishna, the Eternal Charioteer, during the Mahabharatha War. Actually, Parikshith was the very self of Abhimanyu, the son of Arjuna, who had been hacked to pieces by the wicked Aswatthama, before his mother's very eyes.

The Mahabharatha War was the great contest between the forces of righteousness, embodied in the five Pandava brothers, and the forces of wickedness, embodied in the Kaurava clan, who had used treachery and deceit to seize the throne and realm which belonged to the Pandavas. Some four million men and some million horses and elephants engaged in this battle, which, though they were outnumbered and outweighed, was won by the Pandavas because Lord Krishna was on their side.

After their victory and their assumption of the imperium, the Pandava brothers required an heir to perpetuate their dynasty. This heir was Parikshith. While still in the womb he saw a fiery arrow let off by Aswatthama coming at him, sparking with terror. But, he also saw a Person of Magnificent Brilliance with a Terrific Wheel break the arrow in pieces before it reached him. That Person was Krishna Himself, Who, when Parikshith was a babe, gave him that name, which means "he who seeks or quests."

As a babe, the child examined everyone from Monarch to peasant to discover a particular Person he had seen while in the womb. This behavior was pronounced, constant and widely remarked in the Palace. Finally, when Lord Krishna came to the Court and the child was placed before Him, the child espied the Visage he had been searching for. Krishna tried all sorts of tricks to get the infant to take his eyes off from Him, but without success. The child wanted only to feast his eyes on Krishna, Whom he recognized as the One who saved him in the womb. His eyes followed Krishna wherever He hid, whatever He did. He would not even blink, but only stared quietly and contentedly at that Embodiment of Charm and Mischief. So, Krishna named him Parikshith, "he who seeks."

When Krishna left this earth for His Heavenly Abode, the Pandava brothers felt that they could not remain on this earth without Him. Accordingly,

the eldest of them, Dharmaraja, invested Parikshith with the royal crown, and then the five brothers set out walking in the northerly direction, without stopping, until each fell and breathed his last.

Parikshith grew to become a great king. He celebrated many great sacrifices, in strict accordance with Vedic rules, he fostered sages and Brahmins, and he traveled ceaselessly throughout the empire to ascertain and provide the needs of his subjects.

One characteristic of his rule deserves special mention. It was also a characteristic of the rule of Dharmaraja. And that is that Parikshith was ruthless in ferreting out wickedness and punished it with great and instant severity. His advisers said that wickedness could not be treated until it manifested in specific fell deeds. But, Parikshith disagreed. He was always for carrying the battle to the enemy.

He declared that the ruler must not wait for injury to be done before the injurer was apprehended and punished. He wanted to apprehend and punish the evil doer before he did any harm to person or property. And he spared himself no effort in putting this principle into practice.

He was always on reconaissance in the empire, always looking for people and situations which were threatening to cause trouble. He nipped them in the bud before they had a chance to poison society. His punishments were sudden and decisive.

On account of his ceaseless vigilance, his empire was a model of peace, happiness and prosperity. He did not wait for wickedness to become offensive. He attacked and destroyed it while it was still deploying to attack. His people did not have locks on their doors. They were not anxious for their security, and they were free to pursue their occupations without glancing fearfully over their shoulders. Women were honored, as were the elders. Children revered their parents and parents set examples worthy of reverence. The vigilance of Parikshith guaranteed the happiness of his subjects. No ruler ever worked harder at his allotted task.

Today, the situation is reversed. The rulers do nothing about wickedness until it has already gained the victory. Then it is too late, the harm is done, the injury insupportable. So citizens go about clutching their lives in their hands. The rulers are not doing their job. They are not ruling.

Such is not the way of true rulers. They are always trying to prevent crime by moving decisively against those who would commit crime before they commit it. Parikshith is a great exemplar of this manner of ruling, which is really the only kind worthy of the name. And the happiness and prosperity of his kingdom is proof enough of its rectitude.

The great King David is the prototype of a ruler and a spiritual aspirant. He is also the prototype and Father of Christ. He embodies the sweetness and truth of one of the sayings of St. Augustine: "Every man should die a penitent."

The fact is that this world is a penitentiary and this life is a sentence to rehabilitative incarceration. The offences which got us this fate were wicked deeds deliberately done in the previous birth. So, we should be good inmates, serving our time cheerfully, imbibing the lessons Providence is giving us, practicing them in the confines of the cell block among our fellow inmates. With good behavior we might get an early release.

It is rather like going to a doctor or a church. If we were well, we should not require either. It is only because we are not well that we are in this world. When we are well we leave it for good and forever -- which may or may not coincide with the next death. But, it is already a sign of humiliation that we have this body, which may be likened to a prison uniform, stamped with the letters, "Miscreant."

So, no man has any reason to be strutting about this prison yard we call the world. Every man will see his condition truly when he sees himself as an inmate of a vast reformatory, planet earth. For this reason, every man should die a penitent.

Now, King David not only died as a penitiant, he lived as one also. History measures his greatness not from his military victories or the size of his family or the extent of his realm but precisely from the fact that when he murdered a man to steal his wife and was called to account for these deeds, he repented instantly and bowed his head heroically to the inevitable consequences, neither maligning God nor threatening His prophet.

David's whole life was an example of contrition. His power as a ruler came from this inner turning toward God during the heat of self-reproach. He did not underestimate the power of contrition to cleanse his heart of impure thoughts and emotions. The New Testament records that the first message of Jesus was, "Repent and believe the Gospel."

If humility is the foundation, contrition is the walls of the life of blessedness.

After the Mahabharatha War, Dharmaraja felt remorse that he had killed his own cousins, preceptor and uncles. He felt that he was guilty of their death and that the Empire cannot have peace until he should expiate his "sins." Accordingly, he resolved to perform the great Horse Sacrifice, which the Vedas lay down as the means to wipe off all sins. Only so, he reasoned, will his throne be secure and his people happy.

Krishna told Dharmaraja that such was not the case. He declared that Dharmaraja only did his duty and incurred no guilt at all, that he was, in fact, only living up to his name. A warrior, Krishna said, incures no guilt when he meets and battles men who come to a field of war armed and intent upon killing. Indeed, a warrior would incur guilt if he did not engage in such a battle for righteousness.

Furthermore, Krishna declared that it was illusion to treat the leaders of the opposing army as kith and kin. They are of the same reality as Dharmaraja himself and when the Lord has resolved to have a battle, a man can only play his part with energy, skill and enthusiasm. Arjuna suffered from this same delusion regarding kith and kin just before the armies closed in combat. The Geetha is the discussion in which Krishna

removes the ignorance caused by the ego of Arjuna ("my uncles," etc.) so that Arjuna can fulfill his purpose in the drama upon which Krishna has resolved.

But, Dharmaraja is not going for Krishna's comforting and reassuring words. He insists that his sins must be expiated through the Horse Sacrifice. Krishna finally condescends to let Dharmaraja have his wish. But He insists that it be done in a manner appropriate to the station of Dharmaraja, who is the King. Therefore, a very grand Horse Sacrifice was arranged and executed with Lord Krishna Himself present and receiving the offering. This was a unique good fortune for Dharmaraja, to have the Goal of the Sacrifice presiding over it.

The point I wish to make is this: even Lord Krishna Himself, Whom Dharmaraja knew full-well to be the Supreme, Eternal Absolute Personified, could not induce Dharmaraja to forsake the habiliments and habits of a penitent. Upon attaining the imperial throne, after many long and bitter years of insult, exile, calumny and desperate hardship, the very first of Dharmaraja's wants was to atone for his sins.

He had no elation in mounting the Throne. It had always belonged to him, even when stolen by a usurper. The habit of renunciation had struck such deep root in him that he was not going to get excited or carried away by the trappings of power. He had never once deviated from the path of righteousness. His whole life had been an epochal model of uprightness, courage and faith. God Himself could find no fault in Dharmaraja. But Dharmaraja could. At his supreme moment of triumph, he only wanted to atone for his sins. So, he did.

And, it should be noted that his motivation in doing so was not to recompense his personal destiny but rather to assure peace and happiness for his subjects. For, he stated, if the ruler is living under the burden of sin, however slight, the people cannot have peace. If the head is ill, the whole body will groan on the sick-bed. The people's welfare was the first concern of Dharmaraja. In that way, too, he lived up to his name.

Dharmaraja is the very embodiment of the true ruler because he lived his life in the constant practice of penitence.

It is interesting to note that General MacArthur recalls that his feelings upon being promoted General of the Army were not of elation but a sickening sense of the horror and desolation of war. He says that it had killed something inside him to see his men die. He reports that the greatest happiness and sense of fulfillment he had during World War Two was in knowing how many lives he had saved through the use of bold, economical strategy. He had seen too many lives squandered upon fields of battle and he was resolved, above all, not to do that. (MacArthur's forces went from Australia to Tokyo with fewer casualties than were incurred on Okinawa alone.)

The assaults on Iwo Jima and Okinawa illustrate the ability of commanders to squander human life in the pursuit of unrealistic and unnecessary objectives. The atom bomb on Hiroshima, Korea after MacArthur and Vietnam provide further illustration of this evil propensity.

The point is that great leaders, and especially great battle leaders, feel remorse over the lives they have had to sacrifice. And they try to sacrifice as few lives as possible -- even of the enemy's. General George Patton drove his Third Army relentlessly forward to gain strategic and tactical coups de main. Said he: "An ounce of sweat is worth a gallon of blood." He also desired to prevent the Soviets from entering Western Europe.

Dharmaraja took into his care the aged parents of the Kauravas. He cared for them as he would have his own parents even though they had spawned the wicked brood which had bathed the country in blood and violence. This act of generosity, too, was but a fulfillment of his name.

Renunciation, penitence, non-violence, humility, love of good company, prompt and preemptive severity in dealing with evil doers -- these are characteristics of a true ruler. They are warp and woof of political morality. When they are practiced with steadiness and faith by the rulers of a country, that country will have peace, prosperity and happiness.

Let me now mention just one more principle of political morality, one which is especially needed today and which General MacArthur embodied. And that is respect for women, reverence for the mother.

The woman is an embodiment of the energy or power which inheres in the man. Man and woman are not two but one twice. A wife is the left side of her husband. It is truly said that she is formed from her husband's left rib. Therefore, she is treated as divine in her own right.

The so-called women's liberation movement has the realities of the woman's nature and situation so twisted and obscured that there is not even any value in trying to untie the knotted mass. The tangle is best discarded without further thought.

Women are more prone to anger and fear than men are and for this reason they are traditionally accorded a protection and fostering by society which men do not so much require. One of those protections is the requirement that women be accorded the reverence due to the Divine Person, and especially the Divine Mother. Every woman should be treated as the incarnation of Our Lady, or, the concretization of Parvathi, the Consort of Shiva.

And it will be noticed that to a man the great rulers embody this principle.

General MacArthur treated his own mother in this manner. Her husband, General Arthur MacArthur, died in 1912 in an heroic manner which fulfilled his own magnificent career. Until her own death in 1935, Mother MacArthur, a sensitive, brilliant and powerful woman, lived with Douglas, serving as his hostess, friend, adviser, confessor and inspiration. Like General R. E. Lee before him, General MacArthur was nurtured in the womb of Southern womanhood. Both men preferred the company of handsome, intelligent women to the company of men. Indeed, this particular feeling is characteristic of all great men, regardless of their occupations. General MacArthur declared downrightly that his mother made his father a Lieutenant General -- then the highest rank in the Army -- and himself a four-star or full General.

When he assumed command in Japan as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, one of General MacArthur's first acts was to enfranchise Japanese women. This may not appear very significant to those of us who have always lived with women voters. But, when he did this, the enfranchisement of American women was less than 50 years old, and Japanese women had never directly influenced the political affairs of Japan. General MacArthur enfranchised Japanese women, he said, in order that the influence of the Japanese home and family might be reflected in the political decisions.

His reasoning here is significant and needs to be underlined. He was emphatically not motivated by some vague and petulant impulse to "liberate" Japanese women. Rather, he regarded Japanese women as the repositories of the faith and morals of the Japanese family. It was the Japanese family, its interests, its needs, its goals, its preservation and enrichment, which he desired to foster. And he saw the Japanese family embodied in Japanese women. So, he reasoned, if women can vote, the primal and primary interests of the family will receive due attention in the course of political affairs.

General MacArthur wanted to do everything he could to nourish, strengthen and uplift the Japanese family because the Japanese family held the key to the strength and happiness of Japan itself. He was not for "liberating" women but rather for strengthening the family. He saw clearly what others do not, that the family can exist without the state, but, the state cannot exist without the family. Therefore, the family is primal and has existence, rights and privileges ^(which are) anterior to every jurisdiction of the state ^{and} which the state exists to safeguard and nourish.

Underneath General MacArthur's fostering of the Japanese family lies a clear perception of the crucial importance of that institution in general and a very warm appreciation for the Japanese variety of it in particular.

Of all the thousands of American diplomats, soldiers and statesmen of whom it must be said, finally, that they had no love for those among whom they represented this great country, the name of MacArthur will never be found. Indeed, no family in American history has contributed more

and more selflessly to friendly, tolerant and affectionate relations between Americans and Asians than the MacArthur family has, first in the Philippines and then in Japan. In their day, both Generals MacArthur, father and son, were recognized as our foremost authorities on Asian affairs.

Underneath the affection in which the MacArthurs were held in Asia was the recognition by Asians that the MacArthurs held them in the warm embrace of friendship. Arthur and Douglas MacArthur both regarded it as the purpose of their careers to join the hands of Asia and America, to forge bonds of understanding, cooperation and communication. They believed that America's destiny is tied with that of Asia. They were correct in this belief -- and prophetic. For, that is what has occurred.

Incidentally, Asia is not the Far East. That is the view from Europe. From America, Asia is the Far West. People on the East Coast of America tend to think through Europe. But the vital impulse of America is a westward movement and people on the West Coast of America tend to think through the Pacific Ocean. Douglas MacArthur grew up on Army posts in the vast American West, during the Indian Wars. He was of that Southern and Northern aristocratic stock which formed the foundation of civilization West of the Rockies after the War Between the States and which also conceived the likes of General George Patton. He was of that aristocratic tradition which serves rather than sits, which engages in the great adventure of forging the lineaments of culture rather than scrambling to insinuate its name into the social register.

The essence of the MacArthurs' feelings about Asia was expressed in the attitude of Douglas toward the Japanese family. The Japanese themselves sensed this attitude immediately and responded with a warmth of affection for their conqueror which is unique in the annals of history. And General MacArthur's most insolent critics have not cared to dispute this fact.

The deep reverence General MacArthur had for women is a characteristic of every great ruler. Examples could be taken from the lives of every kind of great man -- soldier, statesman, educator, doctor, musician,

inventor, farmer, laborer, saint and sage -- to show that underlying and supporting all of them is this same profound reverence for women. Indeed, it is rightly said of old that the true measure of the greatness of a man can only be taken in the care and kindness he lavishes on women.

If a man has done everything else of note except to foster womanhood, what he has done will be accounted nothing at all. But, if a man has done nothing else in life except to make his mother -- who is every woman -- happy, he will be accounted worthy of entering the Gates of Heaven. For, nothing more is ever asked of any man than that he uphold, protect and nourish womanhood. Nothing in this life or the next will ever take precedence over that sacred duty. No responsibility of any ruler, therefore, is more important than this one. And this fact cannot be emphasized too strongly.

The measure of the goodness and strength of a country may be taken in the honor and reverence which is accorded its women. When the women of a country are secure, the country is secure. When they are full of anxiety and fear, the country is teetering into oblivion.

All creation, animate and inanimate, earthly and siderial, is really feminine in nature. Womanhood, or femininity, is an illusion God imposes upon Himself. The only masculine principle is God. The ruler, who represents God in the affairs of this world, will be fulfilling his duty when he is fostering the women and the families of his realm. He is then engaged in divine activity which is surcharged with power, authority and auspiciousness. He is taking the surest, quickest and easiest road toward tranquility and happiness for his subjects and his own Seat.

Such a ruler has no need to demean himself and the people by begging for votes. They will fall at his feet without his even asking.

In this paper I have tried to mention some of the most essential principles of political morality.

To those who say that these principles are too hard, I say, you have not tried to practice them, so, how can you say they are too hard?

To those who say they will not believe that these principles, when practiced, yield peace, prosperity and happiness for a realm until they first see those fruits, I say, no, faith first, then experience. Augustine said it truly many years ago: Credo ut intelligam, I believe in order to understand. So, have faith that these principles yield sweet fruit when put conscientiously into practice. Then you will have the thrill of watching the fruit bud, ripen and mature. Finally, you will taste the sweetness of it. Faith first, then comes experience to confirm and strengthen faith. First of all it is necessary to have faith that the ancient way, guaranteed by the experience of great men and women of times gone by, is still and always will be the way to blessedness.

Does the farmer say to the seed, "Grow fruit and I will believe that you are worth planting?" No, he has faith that the seed will do what it is designed to do. He loses that seed in the ground. But it gives back to him a hundred-fold or more of its own kind.

So it is with the seeds called principles of political morality. The ruler must take care to plant, water, manure and tend the seeds and sapplings. Not for a long time will he get the tree and not for longer yet will he get the fruit. And he must wait even longer to let the fruit ripen. Finally, he or his successors will reap the sweet harvest of peace and contentment from the seeds of political morality planted long, long before.

A civilization is not built overnight. Nor, as in our case today, is one reconstructed in a day. It takes time, effort, skill, faith and patience. But, the ^{can,} job must and will be accomplished.

May all men everywhere be happy. And may Truth, Righteousness, Peace and Love be established upon the earth.

CHURCH AND STATE

By David R. Graham, December 1982

I have been asked to write about the relationship between the Church and the State. That subject has become an obnoxious conundrum for the people of this country, and so I shall endeavor, as best I can, to lay out the principles involved in an effort to resolve the dilemma, allay passions and make peace between factions.

I am not really happy about doing this because I am cognizant of the many half-truths and misunderstandings which attend the topic. Nor do I relish the thought of wading into a subject which is so full of dangers, both intellectual and spiritual. Least of all do I look forward to declaring, even implicitly, that what light I can shed on the subject is new and compelling -- and I do not make any such declaration. Nonetheless, I shall do my duty.

For, I consider that the subject is already clarified and even specified ages ago and has only become an obscure tangle through our own folly and ignorance, deliberately achieved. So, my efforts will be in the nature of removing the soot from the glass so that the light of the lamp may give warmth to one and all. I propose not to add any new ideas to the discussion, but rather, to remove those ideas which do not belong in the vicinity. In this way, I believe, the relationship between the Church and the State will stand forth in its native splendor without further effort on my part.

In the first place, it must be taken as self-evidently true that both the Church and the State only exist by Divine sanction. Nothing happens except by God's Will. It cannot be said that one does not exist. Nor can it be said that one is preeminent over the other. The Church and the State are members of one body, Society, the State being the head and the

Church being the heart. Each has a function to perform, each is mutually supportive of the other, and, because both are members of the same body, which is society itself, they can only be viewed as incomparable.

When the Church and the State are fulfilling their several responsibilities, it will be impossible to tell which is more important. It will also be impossible to tell where one ends and another begins. For, what really comes into view is not the Church and not the State but the One Body which subsumes them both, namely, Society or Mankind, itself.

In the second place, it is a fact that the Founding Fathers of this Country experienced the Church as an engine of tyranny. In their day the Church was used by the Throne as an instrument for enjoining and enforcing the royal will. It was, in effect, an organ of propaganda. And for that reason the Founding Fathers desired to keep the Church out of the political affairs.

There was another reason, however, for this same desire and that was that even by the late 18th Century, the character of the whole Church across the Colonies was already variegated and heterodox. There were, already in 1776, enough groups of divers opinion and practice, each calling itself the Church, to make up the typical Saturday Church Page of any modern American newspaper.

Before one could establish a State Church in this country, one would first of all need to face an embarrassing question; "Which one?"

In England at the time, the Church of England was the official religious body of the Throne and operated under the King in much the same way the Roman Church operates under the Papacy. But in this country no such single political authority existed to establish a single religious communion by executive order. Nor was one desired -- neither one political authority nor one religious communion.

It was felt, negatively, that the Church should not be an arm of the political authority, and positively, that the political authority should not be dictating the manners and modes of piety.

What the Founding Fathers felt, and rightly so, is that the Church and the State have their own functions to perform and should be left, each by the other, to perform them. They tried to accomplish this purpose with a constitutional instrument forbidding the making of laws regarding the establishment of religion. That is, they attempted to keep the State from assuming the responsibilities of the Church. They were not trying to keep the State from fostering religion, in whatever form it should take. The tax exemption on church property and income illustrates this point. What they were really trying to do was prevent the rise of a papacy in this country, either one wearing a mantle (royal) or one wearing a cassock (ecclesiastical). They were, in fact, trying to break entirely with the whole European phenomenon of ecclesiastical organization, which had been till then predominately autocratic and secular.

The autocratic papacy, either of a monarch or a prelate -- or one claiming both dignities -- was the real aversion of the Founding Fathers and the thing which they tried, rightly and successfully, to forbid.

Now, it is a common practice of modern historiography to rely on what was said during a period of history rather than, what is much harder, to understand what were the feelings during that period. It is assumed, generally, that what people said reflects their real intentions and goals. And so historical analysis and historiography tend to rely on the words of a period as indicators of its aspirations.

Some of the time it is possible to do this and arrive at a reasonably accurate cognition of a period of history. But, more often, this approach yields a misleading vision or a plain inaccurate one.

The reason for the latter case is simple. Men are motivated by their emotions to act. Emotions give rise to thoughts, thoughts to words and words to deeds. People whose emotions, thoughts, words and deeds are all lined up in a unified, consistent flow are spoken of as having integrity and sincerity. They speak what they feel and do what they say they will. On the other hand, people whose emotions, thoughts, words and deeds are

inconsistent and unrelated are described as being insincere and hypocritical. They say one thing and do another. They feel one way but speak another.

There are twelve emotions which give rise to all of the thoughts, words and deeds in the repertoire of mankind. Six of them are positive emotions and six are negative. The six positive emotions are courage, faith, love, generosity, reverence and humility. The six negative emotions are fear, anger, hatred, greed, lust and pride. The six positive emotions are all contained within love and for this reason all of the religions of mankind call men to the experience and practice of love. Indeed, really speaking, mankind has one religion only, the religion of love. Likewise, mankind has only one language, the language of the heart. The very morphology of mankind and the universe itself is not other than a concretization of love.

Love is a thorn with which we must remove the thorn of hatred which has lodged within us. When hatred is removed and cast aside, even love has to be cast aside. Salvation is mergence in the infinite, attributeless, eternal, unchanging ground of being, Atma.

In the gross historical reality the six positive emotions and the six negative emotions get mixed up in various combinations and permutations. Men of high sincerity have achieved the sublimation of the negative emotions in the positive. Their words can be taken as indicators of their deepest motivations and aspirations. Insofar as historiography relies on the words of such men, it will be accurate and useful. However, these people are scarce and their words scarcer yet.

Few men have achieved even a minimal degree of sincerity, much less a high degree of it, and so the words of most men merely obscure their deepest motivations. Most men are suffering from a propensity for aggressive conceit, what is sometimes called phariseeism, which precludes relying on their words, and much less their deeds, as indicators of their true motivations. Such men are really motivated by one of the negative emotions, or sometimes a combination of several positive and negative emotions with one negative predominating.

Insofar as historiography relies on the words of these men it has no value at all. And the bulk of the words that have come down to us are from such men.

In the New Testament we see Jesus in frequent conversation with insincere men, generally the leaders of the day. The pamphleteers and rabble-rousers of the unpleasantness of '89 in France were insincere men. Politicians and diplomats of every stripe today exemplify the propensity for hypocrisy.

It is a remarkable fact that for an official history of the First Century in Palestine we rely not on the Sanhedrin but on the Apostles and Evangelists, but when we look for an official history of the French Revolution we rely on the pamphleteers. In the one case we rely on sincere men, but in the other case we rely on hypocrites. And about this latter practice we can say nothing more than that it is absurd and not worthy of the historian's art.

The bulk of the words and deeds of history has emanated from insincere men. Since the words and deeds of such men cannot be relied upon to indicate their real motivations, an historian is obliged to intuit the actual feelings which their words mask. And this task requires that the historian have confidence in his intuition as a regular, formal and justified instrument of inquiry. But, if upon cognizing, through intuition, the actual emotions which were motivating people, an historian no longer wishes to keep their company, then that feeling should be carried into practice and the "history" of those people closed and forgotten forever. And I, for one, place the bulk of "history" in this category.

I have always felt that if our historians really knew what was in the hearts of those they were studying, they would not want to study them longer and history would become a much shorter, simpler subject than it is today. Really, history consists of the lives of saints and sages and their contemporaries. The rest is mere slag and soot which should be discarded and ignored. And in this manner have my own historical studies proceeded.

Now, the point I wish to make is that when we come to inquire into the meaning of the constitutional stricture against laws establishing religion, we should inquire into the feelings of the Founding Fathers who propounded that stricture. For, in those feelings will be found the meaning of the law.

We might use the common legal phrase and say that the "sense of" the Constitutional Convention must be canvassed regarding this stricture. And certainly that fine legal principle goes far toward what I am after here. But, it does not go far enough to reach the mark from which, I feel, the whole conundrum of the relationship between Church and State is resolved.

What did the Founding Fathers feel are the duties and responsibilities of the Church and of the State? How did they view the relationship between Church and State? The laws they propounded are necessarily imperfect expressions of their feelings and then only their feelings regarding the duties of the State. They were making a political constitution, not an ecclesiastical one. And even so, the fullness of their feelings on just this political aspect has had to be construed.

The Constitution contains not the least reference to the feelings of the Founding Fathers concerning the duties of the Church and only this one, apparently negative, indication of their feelings regarding the relationship between Church and State, namely, that the State shall not use the Church to further its own ends.

It is clear, therefore, that if we are to canvass the feelings of the Founding Fathers regarding the duties of the Church and the relationship between Church and State, we must go to extra-constitutional sources. Furthermore, since they chose not to treat these two subjects in the Constitution, we have considerable latitude, while treating the relationship between Church and State, in developing not only the genuine character of that relationship but also a correct understanding of the duties of the Church. The Founding Fathers have left us an enormous field which can be planted from their own feelings and modes of living and also from

our own inquiry into the subject.

The Founding Fathers felt, obviously, that the duties of the Church and the relationship between Church and State were matters for the people to treat in the course of their life together. The conundrum, therefore, is just this, that we are obliged to establish the Church and its proper relationship with the State. In other words, there is really no conundrum at all but only a failure on our part to discharge our responsibility to forge the lineaments of society, an activity which the Founding Fathers, in perfect wisdom, left us to accomplish. The only "issue" or "problem" regarding the relationship between Church and State is just that we have not yet set about forging that relationship. When we do so in earnest, all of the knots, tangles and conflicts will disappear like mist before the rising sun. The heat of activity burns off the miasma of confusion.

And that is my central message. The Red Sea looks like an impossible barrier to one trembling in fear and inaction upon its bank. But, when it is boldly marched into, the Red Sea parts to make its passage quick and easy. The relationship between Church and State is a problem for us because we have not set to forging that relationship. In fact, we have been trying to act as if there were none.

It is hard for us to imagine it today, but in those years when this nation was emerging from the crucible of war, her primary leadership was supplied by the Commonwealth of Virginia. Our history books are written by men with a Northern or Unionist bias, men for whom the South is a seat of reaction and backwardness. But, of course, this was ^{not} and is not the case, and especially was it not the case in the case of the Old Dominion.

Most of the great patriots of the early years of this country were Virginians. The Army Commanders, the composers and signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the first federal officials and the political theorists were mostly Virginians, and many of those who were not Virginians were Southerners, especially Carolinans. It is not wrong to say that even until the War Between the States, the principal leadership

of the country was supplied by the South and especially by Mother Virginia. When Light Horse Harry Lee, the sire of Robert E. Lee, spoke of "my country," he had reference to Virginia.

This is not to belittle the contributions of other States, but it is to recognize the weight and wealth of character, ability and wisdom which Virginia threw into the crucible of nation-building. Today we regard New York and California as the seats of American culture. But in 1776, New York was heavily Tory -- and still is -- and California was still a Spanish Arcadia -- as some would like it to be again. Virginia was the seat of American culture in 1776. And she had been that for many long years.

How did Virginians of station in those days view the Church and its relationship with the State? They took the Church for a given. They were, mostly, Episcopaleans and definitely what we would call "low Churchmen." Their feelings about religion were rather more sincere and simple than ours. Religion was tied with the code of the gentleman and the ideal of noblesse oblige. They tended to be generous in their charity and large-hearted in their hospitality -- attributes which lie at the base of all that is best in the American character. There was in Virginia a deep feeling for the kinship of all men.

Virginians were hard workers, thrifty, energetic and valued education much. They were also wealthy and rather wealthier than those of other Colonies. Although they had slaves, Virginians, as a rule, did not indulge in the inhumanities which were practiced at the deep South and many Virginians were freeing their slaves or sending ^{them} back to Africa long before the Republicans started expropriating Southern wealth under cover of emancipating Southern slaves.

Religion in Virginia was based on the practice of the ancient, immutable virtues of truthfulness, cheerfulness, generosity, self-reliance, faith, hospitality and gentleness. Virginians also cherished a virtue which has often been lacking at the North, namely, charm. The great Washington himself declared, "A man must not only be virtuous, he must also look

virtuous." It is no accident that pictures of Washington and other great Virginians show them dressed in charming splendor. Beauty is Bliss. I believe they made great efforts to appear in this manner.

The ideal of the man of station in 18th Century Virginia was not to be momentous but to be charming. A hundred years later, Robert E. Lee embodied this ideal in fullest measure. From his earliest manhood, people of all stations were remarking the beauty of his physical appearance and his bearing. The soul-stirring beauty of his character may be seen from the pictures and verbal descriptions of him as a defeated Captain returned to Richmond. And we must understand that charm or dash is a virtue which Virginians, rightly, derived from their religion.

At the North, ministers have always been trying to insinuate their voices into the councils of politics and business and education. At the South, and especially at Virginia, there was no such distance between the sacred and the secular leadership. In the same way, the warm piety of the South has always encouraged a feeling of intimacy and kinship between God and the aspirant. The stern, stark, insurmountable distance between God and man which is a bitter legacy of the Puritans at the North would not be understood at the South.

It is the sense of intimacy between the various organs of society which best characterizes the feelings of the Founding Fathers -- at least the Virginians and other Southerners among them -- regarding the relationship between Church and State. They were not in the habit of experiencing differences and distances as were their neighbors above the Potomac.

Indeed, if a feeling for their feeling for the relationship between Church and State may be gained from a sensitive inquiry into what they did and did not say about that relationship in the Constitution, it is that they were concerned to foster their habitual intimacy among all the organs of society by ensuring that one of them, the State, shall not gain preeminence over the Church.

I believe that we may have to acquire some very soft compassion before we

shall really experience the subtle power of their feelings for the unity of society. We are too habituated to thinking dialectically, that is, in terms of differences and distances, to be able to grasp right away the depth and catholicity of the finer sentiment of the South. By acquiring compassion and a heart as soft as butter we can do it.

It was the feeling of distance and difference, engendered by the Tory Throne, and later, the Puritan and Tory North in concert, which stirred up the effusion of blood of, first, the War of Independence, and later, the War Between the States.

At the North, the feeling of separation grew so acute that three separate and powerful religious movements arose in an effort, sometimes heroic, to swamp it in the feeling of love and unity. Unitarianism, the romantic pantheism of Thoreau, Emerson and Frost, and the practical pantheism of Mary Baker Eddy should all be viewed as very fine efforts to reassert the essential unity of mankind and all Creation. The common thread of these movements is that expanding feeling of kinship and sympathy for men of all stations -- and even for animals, plants and rocks -- which is the essence of that most precious and divine of sentiments, compassion.

¶ only

The Protestant forefathers of the North had failed to found a society based upon compassion or sympathy. They were more interested in waging their doctrinal disputes and in enforcing their narrow, haughty and impossible moralism than in fostering the fine, expansive virtues of humility, gentleness and sympathy. Photographs of Thaddeus Stevens and John Brown reveal these men as embodiments of ugliness, as demons, in fact.

Originally schismatics themselves, the Protestant forefathers at the North tended to perpetuate feelings of division instead of feelings of kinship. This is apparent in their literature, their social organizations and their

treatment of later immigrants from Europe. It is remarkable that within a fraction of the geographical expanse of the South, they had a gross aggregate of social organizations far in excess of that below the Potomac. They had a strong feeling for divisions and apparently relished it.

But, some of the more sensitive and finer-spirited Northerners did not relish divisiveness or feelings of separation. They turned, instead, to various forms of the philosophy of pantheism for solace and inspiration. Today these pioneers of "the other path" are remembered fondly, if wistfully, at the North with that vain melancholy which grips men who realize they have lost something precious but are too bloated with ego to turn around and retrieve it.

The North has but rarely been able to imbibe a feeling of kinship and unity from its orthodox religious leaders. Sadly, this situation persists today. The National Council of the Churches of Christ cries loud and hard for unity and ecumenism, but, its tone is aggressive and petulant. It partakes of the very disease it is wanting to eradicate. Very truly -- and unhappily -- does the NCCC call itself "a broken Church in a broken world." This is a pity that should arouse our deepest, most tender sympathy. The disparities at the North are responsible for its despair.

As a young seminarian, working at a little parish in a little town in suburban New Jersey, I remember suggesting that we invite the Catholics or the thises and thats to join us, or that we join them, for such and such an activity -- and being told that we cannot do that because they are thises or thats or because they don't do things the way we do. I wondered, "How many Gods are there, after all?"

I remember observing ecclesiastical and governmental agencies in New York City form enormous joint commissions to accomplish some simple task that any single member could have done in a trice. But, it was felt necessary to get agreement between all of the factions that might have some "interest" in the deed to be done. Of course, agreement was impossible until the original, simple task had been ramified into a tremendous project demanding the skills, money and attention of those at the highest levels

of government and industry. In other words, the job never got done. Divisiveness preempted action, and society kept sinking deeper into frenzy.

Now, while it cannot be said that the South, and especially the deep South, did not have people of a divisive spirit, it can be said that even until the War Between the States, the leaders of the South, and especially of Virginia, were motivated by the finer sentiments of sympathy, compassion and kinship. That they were able to instill these feelings into their society and thereby keep it alive and human, may be seen in two phenomena.

First, it may be seen in the fact that Southern men of intellect and noble mien never felt inclined to flirt with pantheism as an antidote to the spirit of division. It was not necessary because the spirit of unity lay at the foundation of Southern society and was vigilantly fostered by the Southern leaders, and by the people themselves. This phenomenon has never been appreciated at the North.

Second, the feeling of unity at the South is evident in the morale of Armies of Washington and Lee. The great morale of Washington's Army, so unflinching in its devotion to duty, is widely acclaimed. That morale was the work of the Army's Commander and on the field of battle it was never surpassed. Washington generated the morale of the Army after the manner of every Great Captain, by working tirelessly to ensure the safety, happiness and welfare of his troops, starting with the privates in the ranks. On the floor of the Congress, Light Horse Harry Lee bid Washington farewell with these famous words: "First in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Outside the military profession, it is not so widely recognized that the morale of the Army of Northern Virginia, commanded by Robert E. Lee, was never surpassed by that of its enemies. The history of this Army is so astonishing, its feats so heroic, that among military historians it is universally conceded that had General Lee had the resources available to

the North, the Army of Northern Virginia would have taken the War.

Now, soldiers do not fight for officers who distance themselves from their troops. They fight for officers whom they feel ever with them, sharing their hardships, enduring their dangers and deprivations, making them feel the supreme dignity of their station, from mess-boy to general officer. That sense of kinship and intimacy and shared destiny General Lee communicated to his troops without any pompous oratory but merely by his humble bearing, his gentle voice, his indomitable will for victory, his consummate military skill and his tireless efforts to feed, clothe and shelter his men with the few seed grains, tatters and tree limbs available.

The morale of the Army of Northern Virginia was the fruit of the feeling of sympathy and kinship which had been cultivated in Virginia and the South since years. And General Lee, the Southern Arthur, was its living embodiment.

(SECTION)

The term "separation of Church and State" would not occur to the finer feelings of a Southerner of the Colonial period. Nor does it indicate the spirit or intent of the constitutional stricture against making laws regarding the establishment of religion. The term comes from the spirit of division, not the spirit of cohesion. It denotes an untruth and applies neither to the Constitution nor to the wider reality. It may be discarded without further thought.

The Church is a company of believers, those who have faith in Christ Jesus of Nazareth, that He is their Guide and Shepherd in the Kingdom of God. This company is devoted to the Name of Jesus and in the repetition of His Name it grows in the Love and Service and Sacrifice which He embodies.

The Church is a company drawn together by Grace to become strong in faith and steady in the practice of love. It is not a company for unbelievers. Nor is it a company for those whose faith is strong and unwavering. It is a company for the doubtful, the timid, the wavering, for those who are unsteady in their convictions and experience. The Church is a spiritual hospital for those afflicted by the fires of hatred, those who are bloated

with pride, bothered by doubts, paralyzed by fear, blinded by greed, enfeebled by ambition.

The sick, the lame, the paralytic, the blind -- these are the only people who belong in the Church. God has promised to nurse them back to health through the instrumentality of the Church. And for that reason is the Church a sacred and eternal congregation.

The external forms may change from age to age, but the internal means and manners of the Church remain fixed, inviolate, immutable. If the forms of yesterday do not appeal to the people of today, change the forms -- but do not change the essence. If people like a green drink rather than a blue one, put the liquid in a green cup. But do not put green dye in the liquid. The essence of the Church is love itself. Love does not change, cannot change, will not change. But, the forms into which it can be poured cannot be numbered. The externals may be changed to suit the tenor of the times. But the internals are constant, unchanging. They are God, Himself.

The Church is a sanitarium for the spiritually ill. It is the repository for the various medicines which are used to treat spiritual diseases. Good company is a primary specific in the spiritual apothecary. And that is all the Church is -- good company.

Within that company believers are treated by the Physician of physicians. He nurses them back to health with injections of love, with pills of truth, with Vitamin "G" (God), and for physical therapy, much hard work, called service. The only thing that will remove ignorance, which is the cause of every disease, is knowledge, Truth. What removes darkness is Light. What removes the disease of birth and death is immortality. What the patient in the Church is really getting is God Himself, administered by Himself. He is both the doctor and the drug. He is also the patient.

The Church is responsible for the spiritual welfare of mankind. Those who are well she sends back on station. Those who do not know they are sick she prays for: "May all men everywhere be happy." ^(Today, it) is not necessary and is actually harmful to try to bring men into the Church. What

do we know? Men are at various stages in the spiritual pilgrimage. Some are already saturated in love for mankind and have moved beyond the Church. Within the Church, there are people representing different degrees of steadiness in faith and different intensities of experience of God. Outside the Church, men alternately cower in despair and revel in arrogance.

So, the best thing for the Church to do is to tend her own. Get them healthy and, when the hospital is empty, the pews deserted, then see if anyone else wants to come in. Sooner or later all men must pass through the Church. It is inevitable. They will pass in when they recognize their illness, and they will pass out after having imbibed the cure and held to the regimen of diet and recreation prescribed by the Physician.

There can be no rejoicing at an increase in Church membership, just as there can be no celebration in adding beds and equipment to a hospital. The Church and the hospital are two institutions about which there should be rejoicing when they are no longer necessary -- for that would indicate that people are healthy and happy and content and do not need the Doctor. Health, not disease, is the goal, after all. Those who are most dear to God are those who are standing on their own. A man must become grand by delving into his own innate nature, which is God. Every man has within himself the Source and Cause of his own healing. Only, few men believe this fact and so they place faith in pills and injections. When true faith is made steady, these props are thrown aside and a man walks as the Grandeur which is his real nature.

The Church gets Her eternal charter from the fact that human beings are always evolving from rocks and plants and animals and require that their bestial nature, left over from many previous births as animals, shall be transmuted into human and then divine nature. The Church is not eternal because people are staying in Her but because people are always coming up who require Her ministration, Her good company.

The Church is the Company in which the six negative emotions, which are from animal nature, are sublimated in the six positive emotions, making a man out of what before was a beast in human form. The eternal upsurge of evolution from the animal realm is what gives the Church Her eternal

charter. It is good to be born in the Church but not to die in Her. A man must travel beyond all the boundaries of reason and the mind and merge in the Eternal Absolute.

Really speaking, the Church is Creation Herself, the Body of Christ, the Female aspect, the Energy which inheres eternally in Godhead.

So, the relationship between Church and State is the same as that between Creation and Christ, between Consort and Lord -- they are inseparable and indivisible. The kinship and intimacy could not be more complete. It is the Deep calling to the Deep, the Eternal One calling to the Eternal Many which It has willed to be.

There is a stricture against the State making laws regarding the establishment of religion because to make any such laws would imply a difference between the Church and the State which does not exist. And I believe that the Founding Fathers understood this subtle point intuitively. Really speaking, the stricture they composed should be viewed as their positive affirmation of the inherent kinship, common purpose and shared destiny of the Church and the State. For one to make laws regarding the other would be like a Lord making laws for His Consort -- it would make differences and distance where there should be only grandeur. It is not done.

St. Paul's description to the Christians at Rome of the impotence of the Law and the power and glory of the Gospel is another way of playing the same theme I am trying to sound here. Love, not Law, is the medium for that which is inseparable. To try to make laws for a context of love is a step backward into the ignorance of dualism, this and that. It is a loss of grandeur, a perfidious and cowardly betrayal of one's own nature. St. Paul's sharpest words, to the Galatians, were called forth by just this sort of back-sliding: making "laws" for the Gospel of love.

A "separation of Church and State" is a regression, a feeling of differences, which the Founding Fathers were trying to avert. Actually, this feeling is a Tory propensity -- and here Tom Jefferson, who coined the phrase, considered himself an egalitarian!

FF

The relationship

↳ between Church and State rests on love and proceeds in love -- then, now and always. Were it to rest on law, the State would be to the Church like a papacy, either of a monarch, as in England, or a prelate, as in Europe. And it hardly needs repeating that that sort of thing is what the Founding Fathers were resolved not to have around.

I am unable to see that they made any mistake in formulating the constitutional stricture against laws regarding the establishment of religion. If we have gotten into a dither and a lather about the relationship between Church and State, it is because the interpretive tradition has gone off course. That tradition can be corrected and the great ship of society brought back on course. And that is what will be done, ere long.

In fact, the State must foster the Church directly, just as the Church must foster the State. For this principle we have the life of St. Thomas More as witness. Only, the concepts of Church and State must be expanded beyond what is customary before we can see what is meant by mutual fostering between Church and State.

We must think in terms of and see people. Instead, we see buildings and properties and laws about this and that. The State and the Church are both composed of people, men and women who are trudging along the Godward path. The same people who are members of the State are members of the Church. People are making the state govern or not govern and people are making the Church holy or insolent.

We are not really concerned with an abstraction called the State. We are concerned with people who are temporarily invested with the imperium or the authority to command and with the penal authority. Similarly, we are not really concerned with an abstraction called the Church. We are concerned with people who are temporarily invested with the authority ^(the essential) to perform rituals for uplifting mankind and harmonizing the elements of creation and who are also temporarily invested with the responsibility to teach mankind the ways of truth, righteousness, peace and love.

Since we are talking not about abstract institutions but about people assigned specific duties in society, we may assert that what we are really talking about is love itself and the need we have that love and all of its constituent virtues shall predominate in society and light the path on which all men are trudging Godward.

Sts. Paul and John are very clear on this point. Jesus is also. They are not concerned with laying down laws for the State or for the Church. The Bible does not endorse one form of government or reprobate another. The constant injunction in the Bible is to obey the civil authority, that is, to show love for the men who hold that authority. What the Bible declares is that rulers must foster righteousness itself. It is not talking about GNP and economic indicators, which is the infatuation of politicians today. The Bible speaks to rulers as men with hearts and minds and a vast responsibility to discharge, including, if not especially, the fostering of religion.

Our understanding of religion is narrow and divisive in spirit, and that is why we have trouble understanding the natural, easy relationship between Church and State.

Let us say that the Church includes all who are calling on God for succor and joy. Let us say that God has many Names, Christ, Allah, Rama, Krishna, Buddha, etc. And one Name is not more God's Name than another. In fact, all Names and all Forms are His. A ruler is having to understand this fact in the depths of his heart or he cannot see what he should be about. He is having to call on God in one of His Names ceaselessly or he does not even have any authority to rule. For, all authority is from Grace, and if a man has no Grace, he has no authority, no matter what his title.

An irreligious ruler cannot rule. He has to be a member of the Church, that is, the Company of those who are sincerely seeking to draw near to God, before he can even issue one command. So, in the broad sense of the term, the Church is already implanted in the halls of government or there will be no governing. The people who discharge the political authority will already be spiritual pilgrims or they will have no authority to be

politic about. This is only to say that love will saturate society or there will be no society but only chaos. And because we are near to that catastrophe, and in order to avert it, the Lord Himself has incarnated again in Human Form and with the Name, Sathya Sai Baba. He has come again to ^{inspire} ^(along) men the ways of truth, righteousness, peace and love and to instill in men confidence and enthusiasm for the Godward path we must all, perforce, succeed in traversing.

When love itself becomes the means and the end of living, society will have peace, prosperity and happiness. It is in the very nature of rulers to foster righteousness, just as it is in the nature of theologians and priests to foster equanimity and calm contentment in fulfilling the various duties men have in society. This is not something foreign to them or laid on them from outside themselves. What is foreign to the nature of rulers is cruelty and greed, and what is foreign to the nature of theologians and priests is hatred and intolerance.

Society rises or falls on the quality of its leadership, both political and spiritual. When the leaders are seeking God and practicing the virtues of Godliness, the people will be inspired to follow their example. When the leaders are puffed up with pride and seeking for prestige, power and pomp, the people will become cynical and crime will run rampant. In the former case, society will have peace and prosperity. In the latter case, society will be a tangle of discord afflicted by the twin evils of poverty and luxury. The Church leadership today likes to decry poverty, but we rarely hear anyone decry luxury. Apparently, we do not perceive that poverty and luxury are both evil and are flip sides of the same coin, which is attachment to the world.

Today, we are attached to the pelf and glitter of the world and detached from the Glory of God, Who is the Indweller in every being, Adam to atom. It should be the other way around: attachment to God, detachment from the world. That is the timeless message of the Church, and it should be the governing attitude of all governors, secular and religious alike.

What is most needed today is self-confidence, faith in the ultimate

verity, even though unseen, of the practice of Godly living. Mankind is really only marching Home, but we are afraid to walk straight and true. We have no confidence in the ultimate triumph of goodness, that is, in the power and resources of our own innate nature. This is very pitiable behavior for what are, really speaking, sons and daughters of Immortality. Courage and faith need to be conferred by Divine intervention and Churchmen must demonstrate, by the sweetness and kindness of their own lives, the real validity of spiritual exercise or piety.

How can one who has never tasted sugar induce another to taste it? The first person must light his own lamp and then offer to light the lamp of another. What right does a person with a bitter tongue have in telling another that he, the other, needs his tongue sweetened? How can a man in darkness demand that another man light a lamp? He will be called a hypocrite.

Just so, it is no use telling another to have faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness when one's own mind and the savor of one's own activity are filled with doubts. And this is the situation of our leaders today. How can they instill hope and happiness when their hearts are frozen in cynicism, their tongues encased in sarcasm? Who will believe a doubting man who is preaching faith, a compromised man who is preaching integrity, a spiteful man who is preaching love? No one will.

A man must first produce in himself the qualities he desires to find in others. A dry well cannot refresh a thirsty man. The leaders themselves have to become filled with hope and faith and courage. Then the people can imbibe these qualities and will come along nice and neat. And that is the task upon which both statesmen and churchmen can, must and will pull in harness, believe me.

The ancient way is still the correct way. Two days ago it was the vacuum tube. Yesterday the transistor. Today the chip. And tomorrow the super-conductor. By strenuous effort and the expenditure of mountains of money, science finally opens a door. But the door only leads to a long corridor off which there are twenty more doors. And each of these

doors opens on another corridor with twenty more doors -- and on and on and on. It is a never-ending regression of terms.

And what happiness has all of this effort and expense yielded? None at all. In fact, it only breeds frenzy and an insatiable desire for more of what can never satisfy anyone. Today, the "educated" people are less happy than the "uneducated." The number of his degrees and honors is the measure of a man's despair. This is a pity and the very opposite of what should obtain.

Sooner or later, we must return to the simple, ancient way, to the path laid down by saints and sages. The virtues must be instilled and practiced starting with the youngest children and continuing throughout life. Service to the needy, the despairing, the broken must be spontaneous and skillfully done. Repetition of the Name of God must become as habitual as breathing. Bad company must be shunned and good company sought after. The emotions must be purified and sanctified. The mind, which is the cause of all the troubles of mankind, must be calmed and silenced by systematic recollection of the Forms and Glory of God. Silence must become a habit, not just external silence, but the internal silence of delving deep into the inner calm and tranquility of the heart.

Food must be clean, fresh and of moderate amount. Recreation must be re-creation through study, prayer, meditation and service. The multifold duties of daily living must be performed enthusiastically and efficiently, being dedicated to God with no thought of reaping their fruits. The sacred texts should be studied and, what is more important, ruminated over -- and, what is most important, put into practice.

These are some of the ancient, ageless activities of spiritual exercise or piety. They are all designed with one end in view, to bring a person Godward. These exercises have to be gone through by each man himself. The fruits of one man's piety cannot suffice for another. A piece of bread tied to the belly will not satisfy hunger. The bread must be taken into the stomach and digested internally so that the nourishment is gained. Just so, each man must sink his own well down to the Water of Eternal Life.

Only through constant spiritual exercise can man be happy. Only by attaining the Home from which he is exiled will man have peace. The world and all its enticements and trappings is a mere dream, a mirage in the desert. Nothing in it or of it can give lasting happiness and peace.

The world is merely a school yard, a playground, for mankind to learn to keep his eye and heart and mind fixed irrevocably upon the Teacher. And this Teacher is like no earthly teacher because the goal of His Class is that the Students experience themselves as Him and Him as themselves. En pasi panta Theos; God is all in all. That experience is the Goal of this life.

Now, since all men are either trudging, walking, running or racing toward this Goal, it is safe to say that the Church and the State, or better, Churchmen and Statesmen, are entirely free and even obliged to do whatever is needful to help men -- including and especially themselves -- to achieve the Goal. Since mankind or society has a common source and a common destiny, the various organs of society should be pulling together in harness to accomplish that destiny.

This is the feeling we should have when considering the relationship between Church and State. And this feeling should be fixed and immutable and expanding toward one and all. Men can only be happy when they are expanding. The ancient way is open, therefore, for Americans, in the terms of their Constitution, to forge the lineaments of civilization by establishing a real intimacy and sense of kinship between Churchmen and Statesmen. The great task of drawing men together in love must and will be accomplished.

May all men everywhere be happy. And may Truth, Righteousness, Peace and Love be established upon the earth.

SEVEN MOTHERS

By David R. Graham

January 1983

While it is widely felt that respect is due the mother, it is perhaps not so widely recognized that this necessity runs very deep indeed and constitutes a basic requirement of civilization itself. While we are commanded to honor the father and the mother, we are not often taught just how deeply that duty is imbedded in life. Nor, generally, do we perceive and understand all the intricacies and responsibilities that the duty entails.

We feel enjoined to do something -- honoring the father and the mother -- that seems distant and removed from our daily experience. It is not our common practice. The depth of reality which this command embodies is not appreciated.

My purpose, therefore, is to explore the subject and to try to open some of the doors and untie some of the knots in order that the significance of this commandment may be imbibed and the practice of it the more zealously entered upon.

My comments will be confined to respect for the mother. This is not to minimize the requirement to respect the father. But it is to indicate -- what is also little appreciated -- that respect for the mother comes first and is the more important of the two. In Sanskrit, the priority of the woman is contained in the fact that the woman's name is placed first: Sita-Ram, Radha-Krishna. In familiar English usage, this same construction occurs occasionally: Helen and George Jones. This is altogether correct construction which reflects the fundamental truth that without the female, the male does not even exist.

So, "honor the mother" is a correct commandment. And, I want to discuss just how right it is.

The mother is the nourisher. She is the provider of food for the body, the mind and the spirit. Without the mother the child cannot grow at all. When the mother is fulfilling her duties and the child is gratefully imbibing the sustenance she provides, the mother will feel fulfillment and the child will grow straight and strong. That is the basic reality of mother and child.

The bond of attachment between mother and child is closer and stronger than that between father and child. Nature, which is a mother in her own right, has made this relationship so close. For this reason, the mother is supreme in the life of the child. And the debt which the child owes to the parents is first and foremost owed to the mother.

Culture rises or falls with the quality of motherhood. It is that simple and that important that women learn and practice the fundamental, primal role of motherhood. And it is up to the men to ensure that they do so. For, while the mother is supreme for the child, the husband is supreme for the mother.

Really speaking, each person has seven mothers: mother nature, the natural mother, mother cow, mother Scripture, mother language, mother country and the Divine Mother. Each of these mothers provides essential sustenance for the child. The child cannot exist without all of these mothers working in concert to foster it.

The child, therefore, owes each of these mothers a debt of sizeable proportions and he cannot evade the responsibility of repaying the debt he owes to each of them. The whole debt will be repaid in this birth or he will have another birth to repay it with -- while piling up fresh debts.

The seven mothers may be compared to the seven vital centers of the individual: feet (mother nature), genitals (natural mother), abdomen (mother cow), heart (mother Scripture), throat (mother language), between and behind the eyes (mother country) and crown of the head (Divine Mother).

Each of these mothers is a presiding deity for a vital center of the individual. If even one mother ceases her duties, the child dies. Therefore, the importance of these mothers cannot be too strongly emphasized.

General Robert E. Lee assumed the duties of President of Washington College -- now Washington and Lee University -- at Lexington, Virginia after the War Between the States. In dealing with indolent or mischevious or insolent students at the College, General Lee often appealed to their sense of filial piety. He would say that an indolent lad was a good fellow and certainly had a fine regard for the health of his mother's son. He attempted to appeal to the higher impulses of mischevious boys by remarking that he could always tell what sort of mother a boy had by the way the boy behaved -- and wouldn't the boy like him, the President, to think highly of his mother? In those days, this was usually enough to settle the matter.

When the War was over, and lost by the South, many Southerners despaired of ever regaining a decent, dignified existence in their mother states. The North had fought the War with the denizens of her urban slums, loosing nothing, really, in the way of trained, capable men. But, the South had thrown her best blood into the issue and lost it heavily. Southern men of station had fought as privates in the ranks. The officer corps, which contained the cream of the Southern society, had been decimated. The South had lost more than a War. She had lost huge chunks of her foundations.

Reviewing this situation, many Southerners, including Virginians, despaired and sought to emigrate West or abroad. But, General Lee tried to hearten them and halt their exodus: "Virginia," he said, "has need of all her sons and daughters, to rebuild her and make her strong."

Intensely devoted to his natural mother, a woman of deep piety and goodness, General Lee could not imagine abandoning his mother country in her time of need. And the power of his devotion to Virginia did indeed turn around the steps of many who were leaving and bring them home to supply the wants of the Old Dominion.

His own post-War occupation as President of Washington College was in line with his advice to others -- he turned down fabulous salaries in the field of business -- and the fruits of his labors in educating the youth of the South were vast and decisive. The South was rebuilt, and to General Lee belongs much of the credit. His devotion to the mother country was an inspiration to his countrymen and will be an inspiration to mankind, always.

It is probable that, during the last week of his life, lying upon his death-bed, General Lee felt that he had repaid the debts he owed to his natural mother and his mother country. When he was seized by the final spasm of what was probably angina pectoris, his wife saw a feeling of deep and final resignation in his eyes as he sank back quietly in his dining chair at home. His last words, strong, firm, commanding, were, "Strike the tent!"

It is probable that he felt his debts to the mothers repaid. But, it is certain that he did not feel them repaid so long as he was able to work, and of Robert E. Lee nothing more characteristic can be said than that his whole life was spent in deliberate and whole-hearted devotion to duty. He embodies the truth of the saying, "Duty is God, Work is Worship."

It is my feeling that the spirit, if not the very self, of R. E. Lee was reborn in the person of Douglas MacArthur. MacArthur was hailed as the inheritor of the mantle of Lee and Jackson by Lee's greatest biographer, Douglas Southall Freeman. MacArthur hailed his subordinate, Walter Kreuger, *General Commanding*, United States Sixth Army, as the inheritor of the mantle of Stonewall Jackson.

All of these men were continually exemplifying the life-long devotion to the mothers which is the cornerstone of civilization. Their lives were poured out as repayment of the debt owed to the mothers -- all seven of them. That is the real reason they are admired and revered. And no more than that -- and no less -- is required of ^{every} man.

Mother nature is the framework, the womb, the goodness in whom all beings subsist. She is not just the rocks and trees and insects and mice. She is the totality of all these things -- including man -- a vast, cohesive, purposeful matrix in which life is ceaselessly surging upward from inanimate to animate and even divine beings.

St. Jerome was frequently remarking the fact that the smallest insect has the same appurtenances as a man: eyes, limbs, mouth, stomach, etc. It can be said that even inanimate nature, taken on a vast scale, can be seen to be breathing, moving, devouring, creating, sustaining, directing at all times, in all climes, in a thousand million ways. The number of things in nature is beyond counting, but the ways in which these things are constructed and operating are very few indeed. Even morphology, which appears so astonishingly variegated, is really limited in the number of its manifestations.

This morphological consistency up and down the evolutionary scale, indicates that the processes of evolution and involution are purposive, directed toward some goal. Teilhard called attention to this fact. So did the Schoolmen.

This is the influence of mother nature. The winds come up. The floods go down. The sea gives moisture for rain. The earth yields food for man, beast and plant. The sun gives warmth to one and all without fail, never complaining about the purposes to which men harness his largesse. The trees purify the air and yield sweet fruit to quench the thirst of men and beasts. Birds are pouring praise and petition into the Heavens. Animals are providing food for one another. Stars are giving beauty and mountains grandeur and protection to men and beasts. Rocks are submitting to the wind, the rain, the chisel to be formed into shrines and statues of the Living God. Rivers are giving health and happiness to all beings --and to man they give a noble example of the Purpose of this Life: to merge in the Sea, in God.

All of this is basic, changeless, even though ever changing. It is ordered, but subtly so, and, to be appreciated, must be seen on the scale of the

very vast or the very minute.

Creation, preservation, dissolution are natural, fundamental processes. They are the footprints of Divinity striding through the world. They indicate that all of this plethora is really Pleroma, that this variety ^{enfolds} an essential Verity. Mother nature is purposive on and between every level of her existence. She is herself a vast, prodigious pilgrim to Godhead.

Teilhard witnessed this fact in the paleontological record. His neologisms were made necessary by the fact that neither his theological nor his scientific tradition contained words to describe what he was seeing. The "Omega Point" is his verbal representation of the siderial teleology which he ^{correctly} witnessed proceeding in toto through the particular teleology of planet earth.

Mother nature is in implicit harmony with herself. No where does she overstep the bounds laid out for her. She is ever watchful, perfect, devoted to righteousness, order, tranquility. Only man, of all the beings in the world, oversteps the boundaries of right conduct laid down for him. Only man has ever been cast out of the Garden of Peace -- because of the primal ignorance which afflicts him.

Still, mother nature continues to support man. He is made from her and to her he returns, regardless of anything he might do or want to do.

A man can start repaying his debt to mother nature when he regards her with a feeling of sympathy and kinship. The ant, the tree, the rock, the housefly and the horse must all be experienced as the same Reality that one is. The storm, the cool breeze, the fire, the river, the sky, the sod are all elements of one's own nature, all partakers in the same happiness or grief that one is experiencing.

It is not enough that nature be probed for her secrets and that these, once discovered, should form the basis for laws regarding the treatment of nature. For example, periodically researchers discover some new

element or compound that is essential for nourishing the body. So, health food stores are suddenly full of products containing this compound, that element, because it is essential to good nutrition. Well, this can go on indefinitely: it can be safely stated that all of the elements and compounds found in nature have a place in human nutrition. The human body is made from everything. The call of kinship lies at the very basis of life.

For this reason, what one eats is of profound importance: one is what one eats. Foods that impart the quality of tranquility should be taken in. Foods that impart the qualities of excitement or sloth should be shunned.

The most important attitude toward mother nature, and the one which will repay the debt she is owed, is the feeling of kinship with her.

The natural mother is the first mother experienced by the child and the most important. She and the natural father have given and sustain the body. The natural mother has to be revered by the child as the manifestation or incarnation of Godhead. The natural father is also to be treated in this manner. But, the mother comes first. She is primary, primal.

The real poverty of Americans today is that they have never experienced the love of the natural mother. This is why the children run after palliatives or worse and why they are constantly searching for new religions -- someone with whom they can share the special bond of love which mother and child should share.

Because they do not experience a mother's love, young men today are bereft of confidence and virility. When they marry, they are unaccustomed to the modes of conduct with women and they end up alternately groveling before and tyrannizing their spouses. And the young women, equally bereft of a mother's love, have become aggressive, conceited, foppish and flippant.

The modern American mother is too busy to care for her children. She has soap operas, garden parties, a career, an affair or two, phone calls, make-up and primping, shopping, house-work (which she never has done) and a husband to berate. The children are not even tertiary claimants to her attention. They are far down the list. So, the children die. Child abuse, it is rightly said, is not confined to the lower classes. It is a universal affliction, affecting the spirit even more than the body.

The movement to supposedly "liberate" women has made child abuse an acceptable, premeditated use of time.

Infidelity is the result of this absence of the mother's love. The correction of that disease is in the home and with the mother.

Now, our culture and civilization have not been built by women of the type we have today. They have been built by women who regarded their husbands as their Lords and their children as tender sapplings of Divinity. The gems of American motherhood have quite literally poured out their lives as an oblation to the welfare of their children.

There are still women who follow the ancient path living today. They can be recognized by the exhaustion of their physique and the irradiation of their face. In their presence one senses a supra-worldly grandeur, an exhaltation of the spirit, a feeling that the deep springs of life are running fresh and clean and plentiful.

Outwardly they may appear near collapse. But inwardly they have the strength of diamonds. They have found the secret of happiness in service, sacrifice, love. A mother is sacrificing herself, body, mind and spirit, from before she conceives until after she dies. She draws her strength from the eternal spring of bliss which lies within as her very nature. She tastes the sweet nectar of immortality while still in this body. Her life and deeds are surcharged with the sempiternal power of Creation Itself. The whole world does homage to her as the Incarnation of Godhead. She has saved herself by serving her husband and children.

An example of the true relationship between mother and child is contained in the following story.

In 1899, Douglas MacArthur entered the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York. It was the beginning of the fulfillment of all his boyhood dreams. At the time, his father, Arthur MacArthur, held the rank of Major General, United States Army, in command of the 2nd Division, VIIIth Army Corps, which was fighting Filipino insurgents near Manila, Luzon, P.I. General Arthur MacArthur later became Military Governor of the Philippine Islands.

When he entered West Point, Douglas MacArthur's older brother, also named Arthur MacArthur, had graduated from the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland, and was well-launched on his own distinguished career as a Naval Officer. The Mother, Mrs. Mary MacArthur, desired to be near her youngest son, Douglas, and took up residence at Craney's Hotel, near the Academy.

In those days hazing was practiced at West Point. The goal was worthy but the means were often extreme and brutal. So much cry of alarm went up that President McKinley ordered a special court of inquiry to investigate hazing at the Academy and several specific incidents, ^(of it) including one in which Cadet MacArthur was the so-called victim. The court convened in December 1900, and Cadet MacArthur was summoned before it as a principal witness.

As a child, his parents had instilled in him two immutable principles: never lie, never tattle. Now he would have opportunity to test those principles when the stakes were his own cherished career.

Under examination by the judges, he described general conditions at the Academy and the incident involving himself in detail. But, he gave no names. This last fact did not please the judges and before long Douglas felt he was in a desperate situation, as indeed he was. If, under orders, he refused to divulge the names of hazers, he could be arrested and dismissed from the Academy. It would mean the end of all his hopes and dreams.

During a recess in the court, Mother MacArthur, who was observing the proceedings and knew the agony that was rending the heart of her son, sent him a piece of paper with these words on it:

Do you know that your soul is of my soul such a part
That you seem to be fiber and core of my heart?
None other can pain me as you, son, can do;
None other can please me or praise me as you.

Remember the world will be quick with its blame
If shadow or shame ever darken your name.
Like mother, like son, is saying so true
The world will judge largely of mother by you.

Be this then your task, if task it shall be
To force this proud world to do homage to me.
Be sure it will say, when its verdict you've won
She reaps as she sowed: "This man is her son!"

MacArthur states: "I knew then what to do. Come what may, I would be no tattletale."

When the court reconvened, the attitude of the judges became insistent. Douglas tried his best to fend off the question. But at last the order came, short, peremptory, unequivocal. He had to say who did it. Nauseated, sweating profusely, knees giving way beneath him, Cadet MacArthur was reduced to pleading for mercy. He offered to undergo any punishment, but he begged not to be stripped of his uniform. He was no match for the wise old heads on the panel, and finally, the Presiding Judge recessed the court and ordered Cadet MacArthur taken to quarters.

For hours he waited for the adjutant to come and place him in arrest. But, the adjutant never came. Others revealed the names of hazers, and MacArthur states that never again was he in doubt about doing what he thought to be right.

Such mothers and such children are the ideal which all must exert themselves with all their might to emulate.

The natural mother is a tree. The children are her limbs. Their lives are her fruit. And that is why General Lee said he could always tell what sort of mother a young person had by the behavior of her children. The savor of their lives indicates the nature of hers.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux was a happy, chummy youth, pious yet somewhat frivolous. His mother, a woman of deep piety, died when Bernard was a young man. After her death, Bernard did not entirely forsake his spiritual development, but he apparently did not pursue it with all the zeal that his mother intended. For, she appeared to him in a dream to declare that she had not suckled him at her breast in order that he might become entangled in the vanity of worldly pleasures. She ordered him to pursue a religious life, to become a monk, to practice severe austerities. And so he did.

We next hear of Bernard and a small band of companions knocking at the door of a monastery for admittance to the novitiate. When ^{next} we hear of him, St. Bernard is "carrying the 12th Century on his shoulders." He did indeed renounce the worldly life and, besides, built up a great Benedictine reform order, the Cistercians, noted for extreme asceticism. He is revered as a Doctor of the Church, next in esteem behind the Four Great Doctors, Sts. Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory, among whom Jerome is called the Greatest.

The point I want to make is about the mother. She was not for pushing her son up the ladder of fame and fortune. She was not buying him easy chairs, fleet steeds and weekends at Cannes. She was not getting him introductions, honors, favors. She was not catering to his every whim. She was not trying to attach him to the world. She knew the world is a snare, a trap, a poison pill rolled in honey.

On the contrary, she wanted him attached only to God and prevailed upon him to practice deep austerities. Bernard took this urging avidly and fulfilled his mother's wish, as every child must fulfill the wishes of the natural mother.

But, how different the wish of his mother from the wishes of so many mothers!

Their sons, countless millions of them, have no place in the memory of mankind. But her son, Bernard, by taking the hard path of renunciation and discrimination, blazoned his name in the annals of history and the hearts of men as a tangible example of what a man really ought to do and be. He is known as St. Bernard, the Honey-Sweet Doctor of the Church.

The all-powerful wish of the natural mother was behind it all. And the obedience of the son, in fulfillment of the debt owed to her, brought her wish to fruition -- and brought her immortal fame.

No one, great or small, old or young, wealthy or poor, can fail to fulfill the wishes of the natural mother. In the life of her children, her will is supreme. A child must do as she wants before he can do anything else. And this fact holds sway whether the child recognizes it or not. A child cannot even become a monk without the consent of the mother.

Thus, the importance that the mother's wishes be high-minded, noble and Godly. She must want the child to be attached to God and not to the world, to what is permanent, not what is passing, to what is essential, not what is peripheral. The mother instills in the child the desire for repeating the Name, the love for detachment, the hunger for merging in the Ocean of Bliss. She does this by example even more than by precept.

God is intangible. Man is tangible. But, the intangible God inheres in the tangible man as his very Self. Since the natural mother is first in line of the child's experience of tangibility, she is revered and treated by the child as God. That is her one, true status. From treating the mother as God, the child learns to treat everyone, including himself, as God, one and the same.

A man once was resolved to worship the father and mother as God. One day he was holding their feet, engaged in adoring God in these forms, when, suddenly, Lord Krishna appeared beside him. Krishna told the man to hold His Feet, to worship Him, for He is God. But, the man replied that he had all the God he wanted in the parents, that Krishna may very well be God, but he was already engaged in worshipping God in the parents and

if Krishna really wanted him to worship Him, He would just have to stand aside and wait. Lord Krishna approved this reply.

The natural father and mother have given and sustain the body. This is a priceless gift. Gods themselves would like to have this chance. Men, therefore, may be accounted more fortunate than the deities of nature because the human body is the only instrument in the whole universe which can be used to reach the experience of Salvation or Mergence in God. And that is its whole purpose. The body is to be used to achieve the experience of liberation or at-one-ment. This incomparable instrument, the body, is a gift from the natural parents, acting themselves as God's instruments. All are mere actors in the Drama He is writing, acting and directing.

The parents are fulfilling their duty in gifting a body to the "child." But the child is having to be grateful for the chance they have given it, by means of this gift, to achieve Liberation Itself. The child shows gratitude to the parents and repays all debts to all mothers by using this unique instrument, this unique chance, this body, to the purpose intended for it.

Then there is mother cow. She, also, is very close to the child and gives it sustenance directly in the form of milk. Because she is actively nourishing the child, the cow is revered as a mother. Indeed, she and her mate are sacred. The cow is divine. Really speaking, the cow is a heavenly animal, the symbol and substance of Dharma or righteousness, eternal goodness, order, duty.

In this country people tend to ridicule Indians for their attitude about cows. But, let ignorance give way to knowledge and insight. The cow is sacred because she is providing sustenance to mankind. From her comes milk, which is food. But not only so. Milk is also a cosmological entity: it sustains the Body of Creation, meaning that it sustains God's Manifest Nature. Whatever sustains the human body is, on the macrocosmic scale, sustaining the whole cosmos. For, the whole cosmos is subsumed in mankind. So, really speaking, milk is sustaining the whole pilgrimage

to Godhead upon which Creation is trudging forward. The Cow is Divine.

The cow is as divine as the natural mother. And she is not eaten for the same reason that the natural mother is not eaten. One does not eat one's mother. The whole idea of eating a cow should arouse the same nauseous disgust as the idea of eating one's own mother. It is the same thing. It is not done. And this means the cow and her mate, equally.

If one has to eat meat, let it be venison or hare or bird. But not cow. Nor should it be fish. In fact, of all the fleshs that can be eaten -- which category does not include the cow -- the absolute worst, the most ghastly abomination is fish and sea-creatures. He who eats fish has very low impulses indeed. He who eats meat -- not including cow -- is better off. But he who eats neither meat nor fish is best off. His impulses are the highest. They are pure and calm. The meat-eater has passionate, unstable, cyclonic impulses. The fish-eater's impulses are stupid, dull, stygian. The cow-eater is a cannibal, at least after he knows better. Bovicide is a felony offence in the realm of morality.

So the cow is revered for very good reason. She is a divine animal and a real mother to mankind. She nourishes the universe. She is the symbol of all that is true and right.

The Sacred Scriptures are also a mother and should be paid the devotion of adoration, and even more, the respect of intense inquiry, and most of all, the honor of being practiced faithfully in all the details of daily living.

The Sacred Scriptures are the medium for the three phenomena, creation, preservation, destruction. From them the entire cosmos emerges and merges in Godhead. Everything that is made is made through the medium of the Scriptures, the Word of God. Without the Scriptures nothing is made. The Scriptures stand behind creation as the mother of all this variety.

The opening verses of the Gospel of St. John -- and the Christological passages of St. Paul's letters to the Ephesians and the Colossians, which reinforce and compliment them -- are accurate in the cosmological and the ontological sense. The cosmos is the variety which the Word has willed to be. Creation is God's Body, the Body of Christ: Hoc est Corpus meum. The ontos or substance of that variety is everywhere the same Word, concretized by Itself as this and that. Really speaking, the various things and their true nature are one and the same: God. God has no second.

The Sacred Scriptures are the Whisperings of God in the supraconsciousness of enlightened men, men who have achieved the sublimation of the passions and the senses, whose minds are pure, calm and fragrant as an Ocean of Milk. It is not wrong, therefore, to say that the Scriptures are eternal and have been written down under the sublime prompting of divine inspiration. They are inspired, meaning, they are the Breath or Whisperings of God. They have emerged from the profound tranquility of men specially prepared by God to hear them. To be imbibed they must be "heard" in the heart.

The Scriptures describe the true nature of this reality we call the world. They both feed and intensify the yearning men have to draw near to the Basis of the world. And they lay down the correct modes of conduct for the individual and the society which are trying to draw near to the Basis, God.

Above all else, the Scriptures are describing in many ways the essential kinship of man and God, of Creation and Christ, of the Based and the Basis. Unless this feeling of kinship is coming through and being experienced in ever deeper and wider contexts, like great arms expanding to enfold the world and more, one is not getting anything from Scripture and is really lying, not living. Kinship, the feeling that you belong to me and I to you, is the real experience that the Scriptures foster and that one must get from reading them and putting them into practice.

The Sacred Scriptures of one religion are those of every other religion, also. Christ is Lord of all, not just of Christians. He belongs to all religions. Rama, Krishna, Buddha, Mohammed, Zorroaster belong to all men equally. No one can claim that God is theirs exclusively. God belongs

to all and all belong to Him. There is not even a gradation between men, animals, plants and stones; all are equally close to Him, all have equal right to claim His Attention. He is impartial to one and all, for, all is Him, He is all. "I am the Vine. You are the branches."

A Christian must understand that the Ramayana is equally his Scripture with the Bible, the Koran equally with the Vedas. When we speak of the Sacred Scriptures, we must be careful to mean all of them, for, they are all Sacred, all Scriptures, all having equal dignity and authority as the Word of God. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Men have fostered the feeling of faction and division. The Scriptures have no part in this primal ignorance. They are always saying one thing: may all men everywhere be happy, love one and all equally. God is Love. Love is God. The Holy Fire which Love is incinerates all divisions and differences. Love lights the way to the feeling of unity and wholesomeness. In fact, Love itself is that very feeling. In the presence of Love, all divisiveness and meanness must disappear like darkness before Light. Love is expansion. Love is life and growth and tranquility. Love leads to God.

And all the Scriptures over which mankind engages in wrangling are only proclaiming this one necessity: Love one another.

In the Christian tradition we have a great and mighty exponent of Scripture in St. Jerome. St. Jerome is honored as the patron saint of Christian scholarship. He is also honored as the Greatest Doctor of the Church. Among scholars of Scripture, his only equal is the Apostle Paul, and no one has ever surpassed Jerome in knowledge and power of exposition. No one ever will.

It is my feeling that Moses, Paul and Jerome are the same ^{person,} reappearing as needed. Together, they constitute the central axis of advance of the Christian religion.

To return to the interpretive tradition represented by St. Jerome is a

primary necessity today. If the Bible has lost its power for us -- which it has -- the fault is not in the Bible but in our reading of It and our ersatz scholarship. Biblical scholars need to go back to St. Jerome, and back to the practice of the modes of conduct, inquiry and thinking laid down in the Bible.

The mind of man is the source of all his troubles. What Scripture does, primarily, is provide man with the correct ways of seeing and thinking. It lays out the mental and emotional fixtures which must occupy the mind and the heart so they may become calm and pure. The mind cannot be let to flit however it has the whim. It must be curbed and canalized like a wayward monkey and trained to proceed in a certain order, within specified boundaries, in a definite direction. The thoughts must be of a certain type, elevating, holy, single-pointed, happy, strong. That is, they must be focused on God alone and the mind laid to rest at His Feet.

It is said that when St. Thomas Aquinas finished the Summa Theologica, he placed the whole text on the floor before the altar of his Oratory. And lo, Christ appeared and stood on the Summa and blessed the great Saint.

The Bible provides the right thoughts, the elevating thoughts which enable the mind to gain strength and which curb its waywardness. Furthermore, It provides the emotions, which, when imbibed and digested, purify the heart of the rubbish of greed and hatred and burnish the intellect into a mighty sword of discrimination. It is necessary for the health of a man that he think Biblically, feel Biblically, see Biblically.

The human drama is played out in the Bible. It is the story of mankind as a whole and also of each individual, who, in his own person, is constantly recapitulating the experience of the species. Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny is a law of the spiritual as well as ^{of} the biological sphere. The individual lives as the species and the species lives as the individual. The species also lives as an individual.

But the Bible is always showing what are the proper thoughts and feelings and modes of conduct to use during all of this living; which ones take

one safely through the storms of life, which ones cause shipwreck, which ones are valuable and those which are worthless. And all of this example and precept from the Bible is guaranteed by the experience of those who wrote It and those who have believed and practiced It. The Bible is showing mankind what does and does not work in getting man through this mixture of truth and non-truth we call the world.

Nothing that man needs for a successful journey in this life is missing from the Bible. All that one needs to know, all that one needs to think and feel, all that one needs to be doing is right there ^{declared} in the Bible. If a man stays away from the Bible and hurls insults at It, who is to be blamed?

I always try to get people enthusiastic about reading and applying the works of St. Jerome. His works are hard to get in English translation nowadays, but I hope this want will be supplied. He is the greatest single storehouse of Biblical interpretation that is available to Christians and to mankind.

His literary style is incomparable and has been the benchmark for men of letters down to the present. The Latin Vulgate Bible and Jerome's own letters did for Latin -- and for all subsequent European languages -- what Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion did for French: they regularized it and brought it to the highest pitch of communicative power. Bach's music performed the same service for the Baroque Era. But the effect of St. Jerome's linguistic mastery has been vast and decisive on the whole subsequent history of Western Civilization.

He may be compared with Vyasa in India, about 3800 B.C.: the proto-type of Gurus or Teachers. Indeed, Vyasa did for the Vedas and other Scriptures what Jerome did for the Bible. He collected, edited and regularized the texts. Jerome established the canon, those books which are considered as forming the indispensable corpus of the Bible.

The value of this work for mankind cannot be gauged, even if one had a thousand years to make the effort. No price or gratuity can be paid for

such an effort. The Vulgate Bible was sent by St. Jerome to Rome as a free gift. In Rome, however, it was at first ridiculed. Even St. Augustine demanded, petulantly, that Jerome translate the Old Testament from the Septuagint, the Greek version of that text. But Jerome brushed aside this demand from the younger, less experienced man and translated the Old Testament from the original Hebrew. The Vulgate Bible became the official text for the Western Church and held that office for some 1500 years. Today we get a new translation of the Bible almost with every Sunday newspaper.

Jerome's response to the Roman ridicule became a famous retort: "You have no right to look a gift horse in the mouth." This refers to the regular practice of examining the teeth and tongue of a horse for age and soundness before deciding to purchase it. A gifted horse should not be criticized because it is gifted. St. Jerome was one tough fellow and he had already had a belly-full of the venality and intrigue of the Roman clergy. He was not about to humour the carping conceit of such people.

Scripture provides the signs and guideposts one needs for the spiritual pilgrimage. It provides the stories of God's mixing with His kinsmen and playmates, men, stories the constant remembrance and relishing of which alone will confer immortality upon the aspirant. He who gets convinced in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth died and was raised from death and is God Himself in Human Form is already guaranteed of salvation or liberation from the bondage of delusion. He who has unwavering faith in the power of God to grant him immortality is as good as immortal already. Such is the power of Scripture when held in firm faith.

And that is why Scripture is regarded as a Mother. She is nourishing all men constantly, showing the way, instilling confidence, conferring joy, guiding the impulse to Blessedness. She is an unending source of inspiration and correct advice. She is always fostering truth, righteousness, peace and love. She is deserving of the deepest reverence, and indeed, demands it.

Many people today decry the low estate to which the affairs of men have

devolved. And indeed they have. And many are the patent remedies hawked by individuals of all ranks for the restoration of order and peace.

But, a careful analysis of the causes of our discomfort will finally settle on the fact that we have not taken care of and fostered the seven mothers to whom we are beholden for existence, itself. Most especially, now, must we foster Mother Scripture. It is my feeling that she, especially, is the key to restoring humanity to sanity and firmness. She is the only and real wealth of the family of man. The more we add to her accounts -- by investing them in right conduct -- the more, I believe, will she fill us with delight and contentment.

Scripture is a wonderful Mother, a hard task-master, but a real winning coach. In fact, she has yet to loose a game. She has an unbroken string of victories. Yet, ironically, she is languishing in disuse today because men are more attracted to pelf than to truth. Faith in the ancient ways, confidence in the path laid down by saints and sages, has to be restored.

I believe that the fostering of Mother Scripture by applying her precepts and imitating her examples is the major work to be done today.

The language one speaks is also a mother, the mother language. She also is nourishing the individual, through the great eugenic enterprise called education.

Mother Language has stored up the great ideals and noble thoughts and stories which enable man to progress and direct his existence. She speaks of man's history and his destiny. She it is who enables a person to wake up in the morning and take a shower without having to reinvent, daily, the countless articles and routines which get water from the ocean to the shower head.

Education, which is really Mother Language concretized into systems of teaching and learning, is a genetic, or better, eugenic phenomenon. The

things, ideals, concepts and modes of behavior which are a civilization functioning are stored in and transmitted by the process of education, by Mother Language.

Communication is not a uniquely human phenomenon. But the concatenation of communication into education is. Beasts do not write books.

It is safe to say, therefore, that the information stored as Language is as much a genetics as the information stored as genes. The human community or family is a unit which rises or falls as a unit. Language is its genetic material and education is its reproductive activity. Without language, civilization would have to be reinvented in toto each day.

So, the debt we owe to Mother Language is profound.

But not only does this mother store and transmit the information needed for daily living, she also has the power to evoke the deepest, most divine urges of the human heart. She is the repository for all the feelings that stir in the human breast and she can call these feelings forth with incalculable might and celerity. She is the medium of Holy Scripture. In speech and art and drama she can coax a man to attain the highest heaven and the lowest hell. Really speaking, she is more powerful than the atom bomb and swifter than light, itself.

Of all the instruments which man can use to do good or evil, to sow peace or discord, benefit or disaster, the tongue is the mightiest. No artifice of human inventiveness, now in existence or contemplated for the future, can ever equal, much less surpass, the power of the tongue. The tongue can preach the Gospel of Love; the tongue can incite a stampede of terror.

Light takes time to travel from point to point. But when the tongue speaks, the effect is instantaneous and simultaneous within the whole universe. The reason for this is that the whole universe is contained in the heart of a man. And the whole universe is a mere fraction of what the heart really contains.

The Mother Language lies behind the tongue, waiting to be used properly, for the uplift of all beings.

Much has been said in recent years about the modern tendency to defile and deform the mother language. She has been stripped of her beauty, her evocative power suppressed or made to serve the lowest impulses, her abilities for tenderness and sympathy denied, her rubrics of sincerity and integrity discarded. It is true that various insane and stupid people, occupying positions of high trust in government, business and academe, have deliberately set out to dismember this Mother.

But, instead of bemoaning her imminent extinction -- which is impossible -- we should, instead, pay her the gratitude of using her in her most exalted mien. This will mean her most simple, direct and heart-felt expression. It is a fact that all the Scriptures of mankind are written in the common language of the people. God is not in the habit of speaking in abstruse terms, over the heads of His playmates. And it is a fact that all of the great truths of religion, morality, law, medicine and civilization can be expressed in plain, simple language.

God does not listen to the clanking of logic, the grinding of dispute. He is not impressed with oratory. The iron-clad arguments that men hurl around to defend their pretensions have no effect on Him. Instead, He is always listening for the language of the heart. The feelings, the emotions that lie in the heart and are the real motivators of men -- these He listens to. These feelings are the universal language of mankind. God wants them to be pure and simple, calm and sincere.

The emotion behind the gift is precious while the gift itself is worthless. God wants the Love, not the person; He wants what is eternal, not what is transient. God is life, not death. He says, "My Ways are not your ways and My Thoughts are not your thoughts." All of the boxes into which men invest themselves are mere commas for the Sempiternal Consciousness.

So, the Mother Language lies behind all and holds all in her embrace. Without her we would be mere beasts. Unless she is used properly we are

mere beasts. She must be paid the gratitude of being used to uplift mankind. Her true use is in pouring peace and praise into the Heavens.

Mother Country has suffered much disrespect and ridicule for many years now, but her claim to our unalloyed allegiance is not thereby diminished. She is a great mother who will not go away. It is rightly said that among all the virtues which a man must possess, none ranks higher than patriotism.

But, what is patriotism? It is the emotion of loyalty. But, to what, to whom?

To a group of men who hold the political power for a brief span of time? Well, yes, but only in a relative sense. Then is it to a structure of government, a law codice that outlasts the men charged with its stewardship? Yes, even more that, but this is still not all. Is loyalty fixed on the traditions and customs of a people, the sum-total of the habits they have regularized because they bring peace, prosperity and happiness? Yes, even more is this true, but so saying we have not fully identified the true focus for the emotion of loyalty or patriotism.

Let us look deeper, into the more subtle realms where the heart of man lives and moves. Here we find the true focus of patriotism. It is the principles and ideals which are necessary for upbuilding humanity and are, in themselves, mankind's only precious commodity.

One evening during the Second World War, the Headquarters Staff of the Southwest Pacific Area were dining together. The Chief of Staff, SWPA, was arguing that during time of war, democracy is an inefficient form of government. He felt and stated that a form of dictatorship would more precisely serve the needs of a nation at war. He went on with this view for some time until the Commander-in-Chief, Douglas MacArthur, stopped his argument with this statement: "The trouble with you, I am afraid, is that you forget that we fight for the principles and ideals of democracy."

(when put into practice)
 Principles and ideals, make a people demigods, virile and great. The absence of these makes a people demagogues, viral and despicable.

We do not often appreciate the crucial role of ideals and principles in shaping the destiny of nations. When low motives and unsound aspirations occupy a people's energy, the result cannot fail to be disaster. When lofty principles and genuine morality are constantly practiced, the result cannot fail to be peace and prosperity.

There is no need to look outside for the cause of one's own delectation or demise. The cause always lies within. If the fruit is bitter, the seed was a weed. If the fruit is sweet, the seed must have been God. The savour of ^{the} eruption is the savour of what one has imbibed.

Great nations are great because they are living by great principles, fostering true ideals. Mean nations are mean because they are living low, refusing to rise to a high level. This is also true of individual men and women. The savour of their lives is the nature of their aspirations, high or low, sweet or servile.

The principles of democracy, though not complete in comprehending all the virtues, are, nonetheless, of a high order. Basically, democracy is built on the ideal of kinship or brotherhood, the equal right of all men to approach the Seat of God, to love and be loved by the neighbor. Although all men are clearly not of equal ability and propensity, all men are equal in status as members of the same Divine Family. No one can be excommunicated from this Congregation. All are equally worthy of His Attention. He belongs to all, equally, and all belong to Him, equally. He has no favorites, none are "closer" to Him than others are. All are envelopes of the same Ember.

It is unrealistic and untrue to give one man your attention more than another. Ramana Maharshi used to feed his Devotees on Thursdays. He had a definite order. First he fed the dogs, then he fed the beggars and, finally, he fed the Devotees. Actually, the sinner is entitled to more of the Grace of God than the saint is because the sinner needs it more.

These are some of the ideals with which America is imbued. We did away with the class systems of Europe long before Marx was longing for their extinction. Indeed, after a century of Marx and his followers, the class system is still gripping Europe, as strongly as ever. Darkness can be driven out only by Light and Marx was only proposing one type of darkness in place of another. America is to Europe as Light is to darkness. That is the reason for the great migrations to this sacred country.

Every American should be profoundly grateful for the great chance of being born in this country. We are obliged to cherish the immortal principles of American society and make them flourish. He who ridicules this country is unworthy of the name, American. He who would sacrifice his life for the honor of this great Motherland is her true son.

Americans need to be imbued with confidence in the goodness of their Mother Country. America is playing the role of Arjuna -- the pure, white, spotless hero and companion of the Lord -- on the world stage. India has the role of Dharmaraja, the eldest of the Pandava brothers -- their chief and leader. Russia plays Bhima, he of the mighty mace, before whom the wicked shake in terror of his hammer strokes. India, Russia and America are brothers of the same sign and stripe.

Europe and China represent the Kaurava clan, the wicked, scheming cousins of the Pandavas who were annihilated because Krishna was on the Pandava side, the side of Right.

Mother America is an epic character in the Divine Drama. She has an epic role to play. We must remind ourselves of this fact each day so that we may have confidence to carry out our duties.

This Mother has the right to demand our very life as payment for our debt to her. And she will have that life, one way or another.

Today, those who cry, "America, America," are xenophobic. The right wing "patriots" are as blind to the essence of America as the left wing "radicals "

are. America is not slogans, she is not an idolatry, she is not any particular group of men who claim to be "real Americans." She is at once more vast and more simple than all the definitions and limitations placed on her.

America is a Mother, a nourisher and upholder of righteousness. She represents the feeling of kinship or unity. She is this feeling concretized in laws and customs, canalized in virtuous behavior. She is every one of Her sons and daughters who is endeavoring to put Her ideals into practice.

The greatness of America cannot be gauged by the most exalted poetry. The immortal virtues and ideals to which she stands as witness and guarantee should be put into practice. When this is done, her grandeur will be truly ineffable.

The Divine Mother is the power, the potency, the energy which inheres in Godhead. She is the motive force of Creation. She may be personified as Parvathi, the Consort of Shiva, as the Church, as the Blessed Virgin, as Wisdom -- it does not matter. The entity being personified is the same in all of these Names: Power.

She is not separate from God. Apart from the Cosmos she does not exist. She is the negative aspect, the active vitality or energy in all that is.

All spiritual aspirations, the primal impulse to know oneself, is really the Divine Mother seeking Her Lord, Her Base. She is the medium for the Divine Playfulness which is called the world. In and through all this welter of activity, one comprehending fact -- and one only -- should be observed: the Divine Mother is going Home.

May all men everywhere be happy. And may Truth, Righteousness, Peace and Love be established upon the earth.