



[Back to main page](#)



[The original text in German: Arische  
Weltanschauung](#)

Houston Stewart Chamberlain

# **Aryan World-view**

Because truth lays beyond  
the reach of the intellect,  
we can't use words for it.  
(M a h á b h á r a t a)

4

---

Translation from the German, based upon the 8th  
edition of

***Arische Weltanschauung,***

published by F. Bruckmann A.-G., Munich 1938

5

---

Dedicated to the indologist

**Leopold von Schroeder**

in admiration and grateful friendship

6

---

*blank page*

7

---

Preface

Some studies I have been working on in earlier times have had a lasting influence on the direction of my thoughts. On the following pages I have tried to make my efforts fertile, in the hope to encourage others to take up similar studies and to give them some helpful advice along their journey. The layman is the expert of laymanism, as it were, and so he may succeed in ways that are unpermitted to the professional. As soon as the provisional stimulation and explanation has taken place, the neophyte has to entrust himself to the guidance of competent scholars. At the end of this book a short list of literature will provide the necessary grip for further studying.

The title „Aryan World-view“ isn't entirely free of objection. „Indo-Aryan“ would have been more precise, or even „ancient Aryan“, if need be. But the composer fears to discourage just the reader he wishes to interest, by using a learned-sounding word.

Let be said right here that in this little book „Aryan“ is not meant in the much debated and anyway difficult to limit sense of a problematic primeval race,

## 8 Preface

---

but in the *sensu proprio*, meaning, to characterize the people that descended, several millennia ago, from the Central Asian plateau into the valleys of the Indus and the Ganges and who remained pure by obeying strict caste laws for a long period to keep themselves from mingling with strange races. These people called themselves the Aryan, that is to say the noblemen or the lords.

V i e n n a, January 1905  
Houston Stewart Chamberlain



D. S. C. 11. 11. 111

text was critically examined, the list of literature brought up to date. My dearest, honoured friend, Professor Dr. Leopold von Schroeder, assisted as a mentor and advisor, as he did for the previous editions.

As I have said on another occasion: being „Aryan“ is not the point, becoming „Aryan“ is what matters. In this respect an enormous task remains to be fulfilled by all of us: the i n n e r liberation from entangling and ensnaring Semitism. This is about the fundamental

## 9 Preface

---

thinking of all world-views and all religion; there — at the beginning — the roads divide; may this modest booklet encourage many people to leave the high roads and climb the steep mountain path — the *Devayana* of the ancient Aryans — that leads to the high summits. Never forget this one thing: by thinking alone thinking can be liberated; he who doesn't have the courage or the staying power to rethink the thoughts of the Aryan race of thinkers, is and will remain a servant, regardless his ancestry, for he is mentally imprisoned, blind, bound to earth.

B a y r e u t h, November 1915  
Houston Stewart Chamberlain

## 10

---

### Index

<a href="#">The idea of humanism</a>	11
<a href="#">Historical overview</a>	14
<a href="#">Paul Deussen</a>	27
<a href="#">The significance of Aryan thinking</a>	33

<a href="#">The significance of Aryan thinking</a>	33
<a href="#">Characteristics of Aryan thinking</a>	36
<a href="#">Racial purity</a>	37
<a href="#">Buddhism is un-Aryan</a>	42
<a href="#">The thinking of an entire people</a>	47
<a href="#">Organic thinking</a>	51
<a href="#">A-logic thinking</a>	55
<a href="#">The substance of Aryan thinking</a>	59
<a href="#">The shape of Aryan thinking</a>	69
<a href="#">Hellenes and Indo-Aryans</a>	72
<a href="#">Thinking and religion</a>	77
<a href="#">Epilogue</a>	87
<a href="#">Bibliographic supplement</a>	89

## 11

---

### **The idea of humanism**

A great humanistic work still remains to be fulfilled; that is the vocation of Aryan India. When several centuries ago the long hidden world of ancient-hellenistic thinking and poetry was rediscovered, it was as if we ourselves — the *Homines europaei* of Linnaeus — were suddenly set free from subterranean dungeons and had stepped into bright daylight. It was not until then that we achieved, step by step, the ripeness we needed for our own — un-greek —

all the might a deeply felt need can grant.

The cultural quest of humanism is a grand one, not only it enlarges the extent of what we know, it also elevates our spiritual power to a higher degree; it teaches us, but it also moulds us; and only examples have the ability to mould. Tuition is the supply of subject-matter, which I make or make not — depending on my nature — an element of my own life, and which I remodel for the benefit of this pursued incorporation; as a contrast, in examples the real life directly affects the real life.

## 12 The idea of humanism

---

Abusively I think that I imitate, in reality I create something new, I can't do otherwise because originality is the great law of nature, and it can only be suppressed into oblivion by the sick arbitrariness of an artificially fabricated, tyrannical demanding school dressure. The rediscovery of hellenistic intellectual life had — back then — affected us like a favourable change of climate; we remained the same and yet we became different; powers, until then slumbering within us, were unleashed. We were raised in a world of ideas that could never be our own, but which we nevertheless tried to incorporate as best as we could, with the same „obtuseness“ Dr. Martin Luther praises us for, and suddenly our ear heard the voice of the kindred Indo-European. It was a wake up call. What happened before — the sprightly, passionate life of the 12th and 13th century — rather resembled the unconscious labour in the dark womb of a soulless uprising; daylight has broken, now we are masters of our own will, and we stride into the future with self-consciousness. Surely it was not a renaissance of the past, as enthusiast scholars believed; it was something much more desirable: the birth of something new, the ever growing

the people, and this affect — not the philological by-work — was the humanistic aspect of the sensational discovery of these great people from the past. Towards other directions,

### 13 The idea of humanism

---

but in exactly the same way and maybe even deeper, gripping onto the inner core of our being, knowledge of the Indo-Aryan inner life will influence us.

What causes this fact to remain veiled for common awareness, is, besides the widespread unaquaintedness with this inner life, the circumstance that the development of our knowledge in both cases differ and had to differ. Therefore a short historical overview is necessary as an introduction.

### 14

---

#### **Historical overview**

For the rediscovery of Latin and Hellenic literature the enthusiasm for certain works is the starting point. Then, step by step almost all attention is drawn towards the mere linguistic interest. Every scholar from the 14th century spoke Latin fluently, they learned Greek from genuine Greeks, and so they had a much more vivid knowledge thereof than we do today, albeit not as philologically exact; their only aim was the life-giving. In the year 1450 Gutenberg's press-room came into business, and before the end of the century all Latin authors known at that time were printed, a few years later all Greek writers. It was the hunger of oppressed people for freedom and beauty — for the example! Only much later the grammar of these languages became purpose on itself, and the triumphal car of humanism sunk ever more deeper into the

threads of fellowship with ancient Indian literature, however thin, existed, as was the case for Hellenic poetry and thinking thanks to the writings of the fathers of the church. The philological uncovering and founding had to precede, and this task is such an extensive one, with almost insurmountable difficulties to overcome, due to the artistic nature of this language,

## 15 Historical overview

---

due to the enormous expansion of the area of dispersion of the language and in connection herewith the splitting-up in dialects, due also to the old age of many writings and the historical revolutions they have seen, that it isn't finished up till now. Long time, up until a few years ago, we only had miserable abridgements of abridgements of the literary landmarks, often in a malformed shape as a result of misinterpretations of the language. Only now the humanistic significance of the Indian heritage asserts itself, slow and sure, upon our awakening culture.

When Anquetil Duperron, hero of the orientalisists, found the [Zend-Avesta](#) in the heart of Persia, brought it to Paris and translated it (1771), an impetuous conflict ignited between the scholars of Europe about the value of these writings; the so-called „authorities“ almost unanimously expressed their despise. The German orientalist Meiners for instance said short and concise: „it is the same nonsense as the teachings of the Indian priests“; and an English scholar, William Jones, judged haughtily in his review composed in french: „*Sied-il à un homme né dans ce siècle de s'infatuer de fables indiennes?*“ Does it suit a man born in the eighteenth century to go into raptures over Indian fables? But Duperron could not be confused. He discovered (1775) the manuscript of a Persian translation of several ancient Indian [Upanishads](#) whereupon he based his publication in Latin.

## 16 Historical overview



---

Soon an unexpected ally joined him; the William Jones just mentioned was transferred as a functionary to India; in this position he had the opportunity to learn the Sanscrit language more thoroughly, and he lost himself ever deeper in the „*fables indiennes*“; he admitted the narrow-mindedness of his earlier conviction; his enthusiasm increased every year: it was he, who translated Kalidasa's magnificent poetical works into English and got the world acquainted with these, he charged himself with the laborious task to translate the [Manu code](#), he took the initiative for the first print in Sanscrit script... in short, Jones became, next to Duperron, the veritable founder of our knowledge of India's intellectual treasures. This history is instructive. May the people of good sense learn from this, that it is unwise to laugh over „Indian fables“.

But our knowledge of the ancient Aryan heritage wasn't on track yet, far from that. Surely the first grammars of Sanscrit were soon published (1805 Colebrooke, 1806 Carey, 1808 Wilkins); but at the same time people wanted to master the half-comprehended literary inheritance too hastily. [Bhagavadgita](#), Sakuntala and other works were published short after one another. It is true that Friedrich Schlegel had warned, in his exciting — even today very readable — writing *Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Inder* (On speech and wisdom of the Indians, 1808), that the great thing to do would be: „to ground a solid foundation whereupon hereafter could be built further with confidence“; but that didn't keep back the philologically ill-educated; a kind of intoxication took hold of even the greatest minds. It is well known

## 17 Historical overview

---

that Goethe and Herder welcomed these first

achievements of the human intellect. But soon the disenchantment set in, a disenchantment due to our material incapability to get along in this new world. We had not yet mastered the language, and at the same time we desired to fathom philosophy and poetry! And so we see Goethe, who once wrote:

*Willst du, was reizt und entzückt, willst du, was  
sättigt und nährt,*

*Willst du den Himmel, die Erde mit e i n e m  
Namen begreifen,*

*Nenn' ich Sakontala dich, und so ist alles gesagt;\*)*

and who didn't despise to borrow inspiration from the Indians for his own greatest poetical work, him we see disappointed and confused, asking himself how it had ever been possible that poetry could blossom „in conflict with confounding philosophy and monstrous religion“.

One only has to examine the first attempts to get ourselves acquainted with the kernel writings of the Indian world-view, the [Upanishads](#), to understand that in this manner a humanistic work of culture could never, ever be accomplished. As I have mentioned before, Anquetil Duperron was the first to publish a collection of Upanishads, in the year 1802, in a Latin transcription he had based upon a Persian translation

---

\*) From Goethe's poem SAKONTALA. A translation of this poem can be found at [www.everypoet.com](http://www.everypoet.com):

Wouldst thou the blossoms of spring, as well as the fruits of  
the autumn,

Wouldst thou what charms and delights, wouldst thou  
what plenteously, feeds,

Would thou include both Heaven and earth in one  
designation,

All that is needed is done, when I Sakontala name.

## 18 Historical overview

---

from the original text. This double transmutation was enough to effectively erase many things; because the

„monstrous“. The first sentence of the first Upanishad may serve as an example: „*Oum hoc verbum (esse) adkit ut sciveris, sic to maschghouli fac (de eo meditare), quod ipsum hoc verbum aodkit est...!*“ Soon some real improvements were made, but always fragments only, and these fragments remained so much the more incomprehensible, because the Upanishads not only came into existence recently, historically seen, but are also methodologically a last achievement. The Indian student was taught the Upanishads at the end of a scholarship of many years, to crown it all, but even then he wasn't capable of understanding this work immediately, and he had to learn the work by heart for a later day; then, when he was old and gray, he withdrew from the community and into the forests, not just rich in well digested learning, but above all ripened in knowledge of men and experience and purified by suffering and happiness (the twin sisters), only then, with death approaching, the shell of the disguising form would come off, and the transcendental truth, no longer interpreted, but directly apprehended, would rise like a new, inner sun above the outward blinded. And we, who neither had the historical development, the self reflection of the Indian — from the bardic songs of the [Rigveda](#) to the so-called Vedanta, i. e. Veda-End —, nor

## 19 Historical overview

---

were familiar with the course of study that led towards this „End“, we, who didn't even understand the language, we thought we could just reach out our hand and pick the ripest fruits of the luxuriant tree that grew so slowly! Only a flattering Satan would make such an impossibility seem possible, and with flaming sword we, sinners, were banished from the paradise that was so richly tilled during many thousands of years of cultural labour.

and, by so doing, furnishing the material conditions for a real understanding. Before we could gain profit from Indian culture for our own cultural task, comparable with what we did from the Greeks, we first had to come into touch with them in the same precise manner; the land and the people had to be brought closer to us. This bringing closer was the work of the Indologists in the previous century. As Goethe has remarked correctly, science, purely as such, has no creative power, it only nourishes, nothing else:

*Ihr erzeuget nicht das Leben,  
Leben erst muß Leben geben.*

The characteristic of our Indology during the entire 19th. century is, that it — born out of enthusiasm — never lost this inner moving spring. It wasn't a dead philology with the brainless studying of prefixes and suffixes as its purpose.

## 20 Historical overview

---

Surely but few of those who devoted themselves to it had figured what an important cultural work it was they were labouring on; here also the unconscious intervenes successfully in our activities; yet we laymen will sense a faster pulsation, wherever we may dig into this studies, than on whatever other academic discipline, with exception of certain branches of physical sciences. Youth and joyful expectation breezes through these writings, remarkable indeed, because most of the time the subject matter is barren, and tiresome due to its mass; Otto Böhtlingk for instance, one of the outstanding, was at his eighties still mentally as fit as a young man. One often notices with these scholars the widened world-view and the newly gained freedom of judgement in remarkable contrast with our classical philologists; here, in the vicinity of those few experts the humanistic effect began to work, freeing

conscious „Indo Europeans“. Those signs are important. The Indology, born out of life, leads back to life; apart from its learned achievements it will, paired with life, produce new life; a great task awaits it.

There is another important difference between the unavoidable course of development of research into Indian and Hellenic culture. While the centre of gravity of Hellenic life lays in artistic creativity, for the Indian life this centre was in the religious-philosophical thinking. Greek philology

## 21 Historical overview

---

coheres closely with poetry, Indian with philosophy. The intermediating lens of scholarship has to be focussed sharply onto this point, if we wish to behold the luxuriant, immense rich image of Indian poetry and faith, Indian arithmetic, grammar, knowledge of the gods, the art of musical composition, Indian family life and frame of government, Indian grandeur and Indian downfall as an organic whole, and only in this way science becomes „Life“, the Life that gives life. Wanting to understand and judge Brahmanic culture without having fathomed Yājñavalkya's thinking, is about the same as if one wanted to describe the development and meaning of the Hellenic mind while excluding Homer. But how to master this thinking, without a more precise knowledge of the language, albeit sufficient for understanding a poetical work? And, truly, in its kind the most perfect, the richest and therefore most difficult language in the world. Besides this, it comes along with an unprecedented number of declensions, and one single character often changes the meaning of a word substantially. Moreover, the philological precise knowledge of the forms of speech wasn't sufficient, the philologist had to become a cultural historian, because the words used in those literary monuments, that often

sentence, that he nonetheless could not understand, because the manifold meaning of the verb remained unknown to him due to his unfamiliarity with the concerning circumstances in life. Max Müller

## 22 Historical overview

---

gives as an example the word *setu*, that originally meant „bridge“, but later — when the Indo-Aryans had descended the heights down to the watery plains —, without losing the first connotation, it also had to serve to name an object that was unknown to them in the mountains and for which they subsequently didn't have a word, namely for a dam dividing irrigated rice fields. However, a bridge connects two banks that would otherwise be separated, whereas a dam divides and „keeps at a distance“, what otherwise would have been an undivided whole. This twofold meaning of keeping together and keeping apart then served the metaphysicians to figuratively indicate certain profound, difficult to define insights concerning the nature of individuality. How could the scholar who never left his study room and didn't know India from his own experiences, ever find this second meaning, that represents quite the opposite of the first? Thus meaning and purport of the philosopher's words were misunderstood. So the philologist and cultural historian had to work together with indefatigable zeal to determine, line by line, word by word, the exact text, the literally „real-meaning“ (if I may say so) of the philosophical writings of the Indian. Yet one man was missing: the philosopher; the man who not only knew, but also understood.

If one wants to comprehend how badly this man was needed, one just has to take Max Müller's translation of the twelve most mentioned Upanishads in hand (*Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. I and XV, published 1879 and 1884). That was, until recently, the best publication

## 23 Historical overview

---

that actually existed. A long way has been travelled since the appearance of Anquetil Duperron's *Oupnek'hat*, and yet, how many passages — and exactly those passages where thoughts go in-depth, where it seems one has gone through the night and reached the shore of morning light — are still very „anquetil-duperronical“! Max Müller, as a scholar and popularizer, was a man of merit; He stood at the heights of both philological and cultural historical knowledge; he had published the oldest hymns and maintained contacts with the most eminent living Pandits of India for half a century; what failed him to comprehend? The answer is so instructive for the subject of this treatise, that I will give it a separate paragraph.

What was missing was a trifle everything depended on: `t h e i n n e r e x p e r i e n c e` of what the Indian thinkers so indefatigable tried to catch in words, not with the purpose to build a nice system without lacunas, not to prove, they „were right“, but that others could also experience the Unspeakable by heart. For this Indian thinking — at least at this highest level of the Upanishads — is about a real process, about the inner transformation of man. It is comparable with the heroic attempt to translate words into action, not to demonstrate but instead to `l i v e t h r o u g h` the transcendental nature of man. In order to make a change of mind possible, the natural disposition has already to be there. In this kind of matter

## 24 Historical overview

---

the word of Christ fits: „He who understands, let him understand“; the same thing is expressed in the [Kathaka-Upanishad](#) from a more cosmic than individual point of view: „It is to be attained only by the

with Hellenic — poetry:

*Hier fordert man euch auf zu eignem Dichten,  
Von euch verlangt man eine Welt zur Welt.*

This Indian wisdom isn't funnelled into one like Mosaic cosmogony, or displayed like intellect-authorized logolatry at the abacus of the thinking machinery, instead it concerns something that has to be nourished in order to live. And it takes two to tango: in order to assimilate into the world, that is brought to me by the Indian thinker, I myself have to bring in a world, a specific one. The Indian philosophy is entirely aristocratic. It loathes every form of canvassing; it understands that the utmost of knowledge is only accessible for the chosen ones, and it knows that only under specific physical racial conditions combined with specific education the chosen can be raised. It is obvious that we see here the exact opposite of the Semitic idea of universalism, that has found its utter fulfilment in Mohammedanism; here the democracy of absolute equality under the unrestricted tyranny of a god reigning at will, there aristocracy and moral independency of the individual that is considered to be timeless:

---

\*) From the translation of the [Katha-Upanishad by Sanderson Beck](#). Max Müller translates: „He whom the Self chooses, by him the Self can be gained“. [Katha-Upanishad, 2nd. Valli, 23.](#)

## 25 Historical overview

---

„invisible, untouchable, unseizable, uncharacterizable, unimaginable, indescribable, based only upon the certainty of the own self, wiping out the entire vastness of the world, at ease, delighted, non-dual“ (Māndūky-Up). As a contrast a kind of pan-eclecticism („*Grundsuppe*“ — primeval soup — as it is said Luther mockingly called it) of all religions and philosophies of



demonstrated a tendency of striving apart (even where initially uniformity ruled) in all live forms; Man however is in certain respects, namely with regard to the intellect, the most refined construction of all creatures; and it's obvious, purely empirically and natural-scientifically speaking, that especially the intellect of man had to show the richest level of degrees in development and variety, not only in the form of differences between man and man, but also due to racial selection. Max Müller's assertion, „no specific distinction“ exists between a Chinese Taoist and an Indian Brahman, is just an enormity. He who thinks like that, will never be capable „to understand the individuality of matters with loyal and pure sense“, as Schiller summons.\*) And if one doesn't comprehend individuality, one does comprehend basically nothing. For what remains is what I called the abacus of the thinking machinery, and that is build everywhere according to uniform principles for sure, just as all people have eyes an ears,

---

\*) *„die Individualität der Dinge mit treuem und keuschem Sinn zu erfassen.“*

## 26 Historical overview

---

and yet just one single, absolute individual kind of people was capable of seeing mount Olympus, populated with gods, and only a single other one of „hearing“ Isolde's love-death.

That is why he who has Max Müller's conviction, will never get to the bottom. The temple of Indo-Aryan thinking, buried in sand and debris of ages was discovered and polished clean; yet one small thing failed: the key, to unlock the door, so we could enter. To have delivered this key was in the first place the achievement of Paul Deussen, professor in philosophy

## Paul Deussen

Since so many people have co-operated — from Colebrooke and Bopp, from Burnouf and Lassen, Böhtlingk, Roth, Weber and Whitney to Bühler, Garbe, Jacobi, Pischel, Schroeder, Rhys Davids and countless others —, it would be ridiculous to give all credits to just one man. But after a period of long and wearisome working together it's almost always one single man that picks the ripest fruits; the right man at the right time. It was Paul Deussen who was destined to make the writings, in which Indian thinking had reached its purest expression, accessible to us, and, at the same time, to give a vast overview of the entire development.

Now the time was right; instead of philologists improvising as philosophers, a professional philosopher had to take over. Surely this philosopher had to have special and rare qualities. First of all a linguistic talent so extraordinary, that he — who could employ but a part of his working time thereon — became a proficient master of Sanscrit; lots of grammatical problems awaited the philosopher, in spite of all the founding work done by philologists and cultural historians; not only the big front gate had to be unlocked, but a lot of singular shrines too. Imagine that Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*\*) had been forgotten for centuries,

---

\*) *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1781.

## 28 Paul Deussen

---

that the German language had become extinct; how would an investigator succeed in reviving that work, if he wasn't capable of following grammatically every adumbration of thought? Besides this our philosopher

philosophy; most often our inborn idealism is stolen from us at the class room, and our metaphysic at the auditoria. But metaphysics only wasn't enough; without a deeply felt religious instinct Indian thinking can never be understood. It was an advantage, that Deussen, the philosopher, had theology as a starting point. He was the man predestined to unveil Indian thinking; he has fulfilled his destiny brilliantly. In the year 1883 his best known work, *The system of the Vedanta*\*), was published, it was acknowledged everywhere as classical and conclusive, both by indologists and by the few philosophers interested in these matters. With his first step he had reached a mountain top, otherwise he could not have continued; for he who does not quite understand the Indian, doesn't understand him at all. But even such an excellent work on Vedanta wasn't sufficient. Real knowledge of a world-view is entirely impossible without knowledge of the original writings; one can inform creatively on a „system“, one can not on a living creation of the mind, reflecting the entire personality of the maker. How many

---

\*) *Das System des Vedānta*, Leipzig 1883.

## 29 Paul Deussen

---

descriptions of a man one may have heard, when one meets him in person, one is surprised and clearly understands, one has never known him up till then; the distinction is not in the broad outlines, for we all have those in common, but in the small characteristics, in the thousands of things that escape from dissection, description, enumeration. „Words can not clarify the best part“ \*), Goethe says somewhere; and yet there is no other way to describe thoughts but with words. So it is very important that those words — not being the best part, but transferring the best part — were more and

lightning flashing through a dark sky, one single sentence shines brightly! We have made contact with the strange soul. From now on the words — words, belonging to the whole world, yet serving this singular person in this special way — have become the messengers of what surpasses all words, of what the Taittiriya-Upanishad calls so beautifully „the world for which all words turn around, unable to reach it“. \*\*) No reporter, however skilled, can evoke this affect — whereon nothing less but *everything* depends. A world-view is just as an ingenious achievement as a great work of art: it carries its secret inside, the root idea of its unmentionable principles. How could a man like Deussen not have known this? And so he commenced — *unus pro multis* — working on that,

---

\*) „Das Beste wird nicht deutlich durch Worte.“

\*\*) Max Müller translates: „...from whence all speech, with the mind, turns away unable to reach it...“, [Taittiriya-Upanishad](#), 2nd. Valli, 9th. Anuvaka.

### 30 Paul Deussen

---

what hitherto no community of scholars could have finished successfully. In 1887 *The Sutra's of the Vedanta of Badarayana with the unabridged comments of Cankara*\*) was published in the German language, a book with 766 small and densely printed pages, the most important theoretical work of India on the religious metaphysics of the Upanishads, and in 1897 a work consisting of over 900 pages appeared: *Sixty Upanishads of the Veda*\*\*). Only abridgements of the sutras were known<sup>1)</sup>, and the largest collection of upanishads, in whatever european language, were the twelve I mentioned before, translated by Max Müller into English: that should give the ignorant a notion of the amount of work that was accomplished. Even the so rightly praised „German diligence“ combined with all

scholarship was in effect: the uninterrupted understanding of what was being said, the intuitive, immediate mastering of every thought, a lynx-eyed sharpness for the meaning of every — often very far-fetched — simile. My summing up isn't completed yet. In 1894 Deussen has given us his book *The philosophy of the Veda up till the Upanishads*, followed in 1899 by *The philosophy of the Upanishads*<sup>2)</sup>. Now the building was finished. Of course our knowledge

---

\*) *Die Sūtra's des Vedānta des Bādarāyana nebst dem vollständigen Kommentar des Çankara*, Leipzig 1887.

\*\*) *60 Upanishad's des Veda, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt, und mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen versehen*, Leipzig 1897.

<sup>1)</sup> Meanwhile G. Thibaut's english translation (in the „*Sacred Books of the East*“) has been finished.

<sup>2)</sup> Both books *Die Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's* and *Die Philosophie der Upanishad's* published by F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig.

### 31 Paul Deussen

---

with regard to the Indo-Aryan religious-philosophical world-view will increase year by year; Richard Garbe's work on Indian rationalism, the Samkhya philosophy\*), along with his translations of the major writings of this school (namely *Moonshine of the Samkhya truth*, 1899\*\*), shows us there is more to expect on this subject. Deussen himself promises us a work on post-Vedic Indian philosophy; moreover this critical knowledge of other products of the Indian mind, namely of the large epic works — making progress every day — will reflect its light on this incomparable achievement in the annals of humanity, on this religious-mythological world-view that spans — majestic like the Himalayas — from [Rigveda](#) to Cankara, i. e. a period of thousands of years. But the main point, that, what was necessary to qualify the real Indo-Aryan world-view to act upon our

This short paragraph should be sufficient as a historical sketch; I'm only drawing outlines, with the purpose to give a first, general impression with the characteristic features of the subject. Therefore I won't annoy the reader with a summing up of the various kinds of Vedas, Sutras, Upanishads, Aranyakas and whatever other sorts of religious-philosophical writings there existed in India. One look in a conversation lexicon will give an orientation

---

\*) *Die Sāmkhya-Philosophie. Eine Darstellung des indischen Rationalismus*, 1894. Translated into English: *The Samkhya-Pravacana-hasya, or Commentary of the Exposition of the Sankhya Philosophy*, Harvard 1895.

\*\*\*) *Der Mondschein der Sāmkhya-Wahrheit*, Munich 1899.

### 32 Paul Deussen

---

on the most needful; he who really remains an utter stranger to this rich world of human contemplating and creating, he who has no knowledge at all of this literature, that in quantity surpasses that of Greece and Rome combined (according to Max Müller's calculation), is obliged to his own education to start reading at once Leopold von Schroeder's fifty essays on *India's literature and culture in historical development*\*); it is — next to Max Müller's *India: What can it teach us?*, though having an entirely different purpose — the only book for a general but at the same time thorough introduction that we have up till now; full of enthusiasm for the subject and at the same time moderate in its judgement; professional and nonetheless understandable for everyman.

---

\*) *Indiens Literatur und Kultur in historischer Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1887.

I, who has no scientific knowledge and doesn't want to show off with borrowed knowledge, will limit myself to a question of general cultural significance and will explain here, why I think that a „humanistic“ accomplishment of the many things we owe to incomparable Hellas, is desirable, yes, indispensable, and why knowledge of ancient Aryan thinking isn't just a growth of historical subject-matter, but instead will and must be an increase of life force for us.

To get to the conclusion right away: the Indo-Aryan has to help us to get an open eye for the goal of our culture.

I praised classical humanism as an act of liberation, but it didn't conclude our independency. Shining as the Hellenic talents may have been, they were limited in many directions; moreover their creations were subjected in an early stage already by strange and estranging influences. They have given us many things, but the Hellene also left us standing in the cold sometimes, and not seldom they even led us astray. Our emancipation from the slavery of strange ideas remained uncompleted. Namely with regard to religion we are still vassals — not to mention servants — of strange ideals. And by this

### 34 The significance of Aryan thinking

---

the inner core of our being is so strongly corrupted, that our collective scientific and philosophical world-view, even in the most liberated minds, almost never reaches perfect purity, trueness and creative power. We don't have the courage, we don't dare — not only in public, but even towards ourselves *in foro conscientiae* we don't dare — to think our thoughts to the end. A solitary Kant may well prove to us, that as soon as we start believing in the Jewish Jahve, science will become

science, but we couldn't also have true religion, as long as „a god in the machine produces the world's changes“: it didn't help a lot or even not at all; for it's just as difficult to completely remove the Semitic world-view that is engrafted in an early stage upon the mind, as to remove metals from the blood circulation; and though we may have overcome Mosaic cosmogony, exactly the same idea that the world could be understood as a result of the connection between cause and effect, i. e. historically, will reappear immediately somewhere else. We are raised artificially as materialists, and the majority will remain materialists, regardless whether they devoutly attend the mass or stay at home as free-thinker. With respect to their principles there's almost no difference between Thomas Aquinas and Ludwig Büchner. This

---

\*) „...eine feierliche Abbitte zu tun“, [Naturgeschichte des Himmels](#), also translated into English: [Universal Natural History and Theory of Heaven](#).

### 35 The significance of Aryan thinking

---

means an inner alienation, a discord with ourselves. This explains the lack of harmony in our interior live. Every noble-hearted, thinking man among us is swung between the desire for a forming, leading, life-explaining religious world-view and the incapability to resolutely tear himself away from ecclesiastical ideas. For this purpose the Indo-Aryan thinking is perfectly apt, to encourage us and to show us the way. That's why Deussen can express his expectation: „A sufficient acquaintance with Indian wisdom will result in a revolution, not so much affecting the surface but especially the last depths of religious and philosophical thinking of the Western world.“



## **Characteristics of Aryan thinking**

If we ask ourselves what characteristics gave this thinking such a particular meaning, specific to itself only, then we have to mention three things, if I'm not mistaken: first of all this thinking is purely Aryan, untouched by strange influences, both in its golden age and in the best testimonies in later centuries; secondly it's the thinking of an entire people, that continued for centuries, and therefore it springs from deep searching life-roots; the third follows from the second: the element of individual arbitrariness — that often has so much power over thinkers — is lowered to a minimum; it is true that therefore this thinking isn't very systematic, but instead it is entirely organic. Let's have a closer look at these distinctive characteristics.

**37**

---

### **Racial purity**

Surely the first characteristic — purity — doesn't spring from own force, but is the result of historical providence; yet it concerns the core of thinking: In the entire history of Indo-European intellectual life only the ancient Indian philosophy and poetry was completely free of contact with Semitic ideas — however remote — and therefore pure, clean, real, own. Who would not want to fall on his knees and gratefully dip his lips in such a rare stream? I don't say this because of a bloodthirsty anti-Semitic inclination, but because I know that this peculiar human breed — the Semite —, that has scattered itself all over the world and has the astounding quality to appropriate everything, never touches anything without altering it in its very heart. The acknowledged greatest and at the same time liberal

like no other the quality to appropriate everything. But what is this appropriating? To understand a thought, I must be able to think it over myself, it had to be there in me already, prepared and waiting latently, so to speak; creativeness requires a co-creator in order to live. Our Indo-European geniuses don't differ specifically from the crowd — on the contrary, a Shakespeare is more English than

### 38 Racial purity

---

any other Englishman, a Shankara is the Indian with all his faults, Homer is the conclusion of real Hellenic, superabundant creative force and bold boasting, Goethe — the great and conscientious pedant — is a compendium of the German character; only the larger unfolding of the flame of life, that radiates more light and heat, „*l'activité de l'âme*“, as Diderot says in his essay on the genius, makes that they create things unheard of, things not yet in existence, but that we — the next of kin — immediately re-create and absorb as a lasting, original property of our own. How could a man, entirely unfamiliar herewith, who, besides, lacks creative power, succeed in appropriating in this particular manner? I think that that's impossible. And I see that the Semites, ranging from pre-Babylonian Sumero-Akadia to contemporary Europe, assimilate the cultural achievements of strange races in such a way, that they convert it in something else, and they have a perfect right to do so, but it has nasty consequences for us, as soon as we are being worsted by the stronger, or, to say the least, more intrusive will, and allow our own will to be disformed, and yet are unable to find satisfaction in the strange representation. One of the most regrettable characteristics of all Indo-Europeans is the light-mindedness with which they can be alienated from themselves. Neither a barbaric prosecution, only

the Jew was never a pure Semite, still isn't, and that as a consequence his blood contains a lot of mediating elements, and it follows,

### 39 Racial purity

---

that one has to distinguish between Jews and Jews and cannot overlook that lots of Jews yearn to be freed from Semitic ideas just as much as we do; secondly, that the Jewish half-Semite, due to the power of his will, and due to the connection to a closed international community, is the most remarkable „strange“ element in our midst, but certainly not the only one. There are other strange elements, that remain unnamed, and that are therefore far more dangerous, people that look quite like us seen from the outside, but have a specifically different soul, and who not just entirely convert, like the Semite does, but internally corrode and poison everything they receive from us and participate in, turning the blessing into a curse. Not only history teaches us, that the genuine European (the Indogerman), while migrating to the West and South, had to fight his way through strange, strongly mingled and intellectually inferior ethnic elements, which he never exterminated, but also anthropology testifies the existence and the gradual increase of the descendants of the ancient inhabitants of Europe, who partly fled for the *Homo europaeus* into the highest mountains, partly were suppressed by him as slaves, and henceforth, favoured with the physical and especially procreative power that comes with relatively limited intellectual capabilities, notably grew in number and mingled step by step with the Germanic stock. Over and above this came the considerable commixture with Mongolian elements, that, according to Buschan's research, resulted in a provable decrease in skull capacity, brain size and therefore also in

### 40 Racial purity

---

cultural capabilities — in plain English, a stupefaction — of entire nations.<sup>1)</sup> Ignatius of Loyola, the Basque, the child and prototype of these sworn enemies of our culture, is as dangerous to it as the Jew. How should we, how can we protect ourselves? How will we sustain this righteous, even holy struggle — the struggle for our own existence? First, when we learn to see the necessity of this struggle, secondly, when we reflect upon our own nature and get hold of it in full consciousness. For an entire century we have sacrificed unlimited tolerance to this caprice; we have almost lost the sense of the irreplaceable significance of borders, of the meaning of personality, of what's never coming back, whence creations and great deeds originate from; we are steering towards chaos. It is about time we wake up; not to oppress the intellectual freedom of others, but to become masters in our own home, that we are not at present.

The acquaintance with genuine Indo-Aryans now can become of decisive importance for this necessary „reflection“. For they give us an exaggerated view on virtues and vices, that are also inborn to us; and in such a similar way, that the relatedness of the Germanic race (notably the Germans) with the Indo-Aryans seems to be closer in many respects than that of the Germanic race with the Hellenics. The instinctive impulse to symbolically link together all appearances,

---

<sup>1)</sup> See *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie*, 1904, p. 697.

## 41 Racial purity

---

until the living (not bare intellectual) idea of unity is reached, the inexhaustible richness of phantasy, the bold, fearless flight of thought, the metaphysical vein, the intensity, the incomparable recognition of

but also the long-windedness, the disposition to look at the dark side of things, the tastelessness, the characterlessness, the frequency of unclear thinking, that goes hand in hand with childish fabrications, the willingness to esteem highly the alien, and to underestimate own superb values etc.: all this can also be found in the Indo-Aryan, and in consequence we see ourselves as in a magnifying mirror. That will help us, to know ourselves, and to clearly separate the real own characteristics from those obtruded on, forced onto and funnelled into us.

42

---

### **Buddhism is un-Aryan**

A necessary explanation must be inserted here in addition to these remarks on the purity of Indo-Aryan thinking. When I speak of the Indo-Aryan world-view, I am not referring to Buddhism.

That Buddha himself was of pure Indo-Aryan descent is questioned by but a few; all that is created by him flows to him from the thinking of his people. The idealism of his nature, the depths of his metaphysical aptitude, everything testifies to his race. Yet he was a renegade who entitled the world-view, naturally belonging to his race, as „empty foolishness“ and abandoned, together with the religion, the racial system; moreover it has become clear, that Buddhism was supported by non-Aryan elements from the beginning. The surveys of Garbe on Sâmkhya and of Josef Dahlmann on Buddha and the Mahâbhârata clearly show us, that everywhere where Indo-Aryan thinking deviated from the symbolic-transcendental ideal in religion and from the nobile racial system of the fathers (both went hand in hand), this was the

originated from a region in India that was scarcely inhabited by Aryans;

### 43 Buddhism is un-Aryan

---

remarkable in itself, this fact led to the insight that the people, coming from all social classes, who joined this movement and scattered themselves in all directions as missionaries of a new, alleged salvation doctrine, could not have been Aryan for the greater part. This doctrine, hostile to the religious tradition of the people, spread like a plague all over India; but in the end the ailing Aryan straightened up and threw the enemy out; there hasn't been Buddhism in India anymore for centuries. „Only on non-Aryan soil, among non-Aryan people, the worshipping of Buddha lives on“; but the creative power of India was broken forever. The influence of race is so undeniable, that Dahlmann, whose words I cited and who, in his quality of Jesuit father, impossibly could be inclined to emphasize racial relations, returns to this subject more than once. Buddhism — that has up till now monopolized the attention of the European to such a regrettable extent, to the detriment of all earnest and progressive humanistic occupation with Indian thinking — though from Indo-Aryan origin, as said before, is in its unfolding and in its entire developmental history a thoroughly non-Aryan, anti-Aryan and, what's more, unoriginal appearance. Until recently people believed to recognize at least in the epic Mahâbhârata traces of a productive influence of Buddhism; now we know, that the opposite is true and that Buddhism just borrowed from here like it did from everywhere; until recently people believed,

### 44 Buddhism is un-Aryan

---

at least in the invention of tales and fables the

disfigured form, in more or less the same way, in which the ancient church remodelled our man-proud, symbolically inexhaustible hero sagas to watered down legends of saints. Dahlmann concludes: „In the best case such a doctrine could take over the colportage of strange knowledge, strange cultural achievements. And thus Buddhism became the channel, through which the Aryan culture was supplied to strange people. Its cultural-historical mission lies herein, that it transplanted the creations and treasures of a spiritually superior people to extra-Indian countries, but here also not in the original form and completion... In the first centuries Buddhism preserved much of the Brahmanic culture; but the more Buddhism fused with non-Aryan people, the more an inner pollution took place on Aryan soil, the more its apparent bloom faded. The fundamental principle of Buddhism is the sworn enemy of every higher spiritual life. In it, destruction germinates and thrives, destruction of everything that has granted ancient India a glorious place in the cultural development of Eastern Asia.“ (*Buddha*, 1898, p. 215.) And when subsequently Dahlmann denotes Buddhism as „the victory sign of a destructive force“, then we know from his previous description, as from the writings of other scholars, what force this is: the strange, un-Aryan race.

#### 45 Buddhism is un-Aryan

---

Without having to go into further explanations, it is sufficient to refer to the practical rules of life so that one becomes aware of the unsolvable contradiction between Buddhism and genuine Indo-Aryan world-view. For the Indo-Aryan, the basic principle is: harmony with nature, for the Buddhists: denial of nature. The pessimism of the Indo-Aryan stands in relation to his entire world-view like the evening to the day, like

Here also the denial of the will to live was considered as highest wisdom; but this insight wasn't the starting point, it was the end, it was the last fruit of life, the heraldess of approaching death. Isn't this insight, that the most acute, most withdrawn metaphysics of the Indo-Aryan had still not lost direct contact with the cosmic world, almost an abyss of contemplation? Surely such an appearance could originate from organical growth only. In contrast, Buddhism is the revolt against what has arisen organically, against the „Law“; it denies both what surrounds him directly — the historical organization of society and the teachings of the Veda's — and, logically, the entire order of the universe. Here pessimism isn't the end, it is the beginning: absolute chastity, absolute poverty are the first laws. Also in the entire outward structure of both

#### 46 Buddhism is un-Aryan

---

religions this opposition becomes apparent: the Brahmans had no churches, no saints, all that was imported by Buddhism, and in the place of ever developing mythological metaphysics, with that wonderful ancient Aryan conception of the God-man, born again and again for the benefit of the world, came the rigid, infallible dogma, the „revelations of the Sublime One“.

Nowadays, where we experience a ridiculous pseudo-„Buddhistic“ sport, and where so many have the earnest conviction that Buddhism is a sufficient, exhaustive expression of highest Indian wisdom, it is important to protest, brief but energetically. The ancient Indian thinkers, by the way, have already done this long time ago; no lesser than Cankara denounces Buddhism, after a thorough refutation of all its major theses, with the following crude words: „Thus Buddha had only exposed his own boundless talkativeness, or



thinking, not its degeneration among the non-Aryan people of Asia.

So much for the first distinguishing characteristic of Indo-Aryan thinking — its purity; I will now pass over to the second.

**47**

---

### **The thinking of an entire people**

The deepest and at the same time most peculiar principle of this genuine Aryan world view lies herein, that it rose organically from the metaphysical activity of an entire people. This fact explains both the incomparable characteristics of the Indo-Aryan world-view, as well as its inadequacies, which none of their later systematic philosophers was ever able to exterminate.

The biggest advantage of such a circumstance is the organic principle that comes with it. What originates from the life of an entire people, gets its life-force from more roots than the ingenious caprices of a lonely dreamer. Our European philosophy just co-exists with our world, and if it was to vanish tomorrow, it wouldn't have the slightest consequence for our nations; the Indian world-view, on the other hand, was the very soul of the Indian people, it determined the outward appearance of its life, and it formed the contents of its thinking, its striving, its acting and its hoping. The era of the summit of power of the Indian people was at the same time the florescence of its metaphysics; and when philosophy lost its reigning position, the people perished.

To elucidate this particular role of philosophy in India I want to draw a comparison, that at first will seem a bit

**48 The thinking of an entire people**

---

contradictory, but of which I hope it will contribute to a better understanding. For I want to draw a parallel between Indian thinking and Hellenic art. Like the art of the Greeks, it was a constructive force and therefore — in certain respects — coupled with infallibility. The Greek art reflects the artistic feelings — i. e. world-view — of an entire people, and herein lies the inimitability. The taste of the Greek artist was infallible; for the artist received it from the undeceivable instinct of generality. It may be true that an individual Homer, an individual Phidias has surpassed all the others by the inner force of his talent: according to the nature of their talents they were all greek artists akin; what they created was always beautiful; and he who didn't know how to wield the pen or the chisel, lived nonetheless in the same world, took care of what it had achieved and increased it, for his life, his fashion, his striving, even his convictions and his thoughts were dedicated to it. In Greece, art was the very summit of human life, which can only be the case when it's entirely incorporated in life in accordance with all of its diverse manifestations, instead of something separated from this life (Richard Wagner). What had happened just one time in the course of world history for the arts, occurred (here also this one time only) in India for philosophy. A people which such an unusual talent for meditative thinking, comparable with what the Greeks had for artistic creativity,

#### 49 The thinking of an entire people

---

found itself placed in circumstances for a series of centuries that granted an unhindered care for and development of this talent. The final result was the Indo-Aryan world-view, as it can be found particularly in the „holy writings“, the [Upanishads](#), but that also makes its appearance, when further implemented and

Every occupation with Indian thinking will lead to false results or even to no results at all, if one shuts one's eyes on the fact that we are not dealing with the systems of individual men, but with the world-view of an entire people of thinkers instead.

How I want the expression „people of thinkers“ to be understood, may well follow automatically from this comparison with the Hellenic people. I don't come up with the enormous statement that in India every individual was a philosopher; I only say: the various wide-diverging branches of life and destinies of life and talents all collected into one focus, the respect for thinking. He who wasn't a thinker himself, supported the thinking nonetheless; for he recognized in the philosopher the most respectable man, whom he subordinated without questioning, and the achievements of that thinking served as a directive for his own life and as a foundation for his national and religious convictions. The professional thinkers (i. e. the Brahmans) formed the highest caste; the most haughty monarch descended from his throne, to

## 50 The thinking of an entire people

---

welcome a famous thinker; he who knew how to speak of „the eternal being, that can never be proven“, was overloaded by the wealthy with gold; the most honourable thing for a court to do, was to gather many thinkers in it's vicinity.

Thus thinking was demanded by the entire people, both materially and morally; for everybody was more or less aware of the notion that it expressed what was highest. And exactly this common sense testifies to a special, incomparable talent, spread across the entire nation; surely it will be hard to find a second example.

## **Organic thinking**

The third typical characteristic of Indo-Aryan thinking that follows from this, and what was already mentioned above briefly: this thinking is to a high degree organic.

Contrary to our unorganical philosophy, of which the gradual development, one leap after the other, from statement to counter statement, depended on the activities of individual scholars, the Indo-Aryan metaphysics is a result of vivid and continuous growth. Such a thinking works upon those people among us, Europeans, who haven't yet lapsed into mental skeleton-starch, like a sudden liberation from the delusional gardens of system mongers. Suddenly we found ourselves at the opposite of nature, and in this particular area, where we were used to encounter only highest artificialness, so that we hardly could expect nature was possible here at all. Certainly nature is, like Goethe says, „simpler than one can think, at the same time more uncommunicative than can be understood“\*); and considerable difficulties arose from the characteristic I mentioned of natural relatedness of Indian thinking. One has to keep an eye on this, if one wants to occupy oneself with the hard but rewarding work of assimilating the Indo-Aryan world view from the source texts. Because then one understands that even the best and most detailed attempt to lead us on more comfortable paths

---

\*) „einfacher, als man denken kann, zugleich verschränkter, als zu begreifen ist.“

## **52 Organic thinking**

---

into this world will never have the desired result. An exclusively formal, logical occupation with Aryan

that all of our usual schemes: theology, cosmology, psychology, are just „cups without bottom“, compared with Indian thinking. Forcing that thinking into such schemes already means taking its life. If one wants to convince oneself of the impossibility to grasp the true meaning, seen from a occidental \*) point of view, of the Indian teachings, one has to read Deussen's „System of the Vedanta“ \*\*) , where he shows us the inaccuracy of our term *pantheism* when applicated to these teachings; yet they are always marked as pantheism, for just one miserable reason only, namely that the other terms remaining are even less suitable to denote Indian thoughts. We are stuck in systematics just as tightly as a 13th century knight in his heavy armour, and we are only able to make the few typical moves our artful armament is designed for; the Indian with his lighter weaponry had more freedom.

This characteristic of „organicness“ is at the same time a protection against all outgrowth of individualism, breaking away from the paternal stem and falling a prey to dreary arbitrariness. „Education entirely dedicated to the intellect leads towards anarchy“ Goethe says; that's what the Greeks have experienced already, when their philosophers had overcome their poets;

---

\*) „*abendländischen*“, lit. „of the evening-land“. A commonly used and poetic alternative in the German language for „western“, „occidental“.

\*\*) *System des Vedānta*, p. 127 and 128.

### 53 Organic thinking

---

today we live in this world of mental anarchy, and we believe this is freedom. When this alleged freedom — boundless and disconnected from all organic coherency — prevents us from regarding the far and the strange with empathy and understanding, it belies itself. Obviously we can't change our time and its laws of life;

of our creative force of fantasy, to name one item. He who takes up the study of Indo-Aryan thinking today, should be capable of overcoming, at least temporarily, the unlimited individualism of judgement.

To conclude these views on the three typical and positive characteristics of Indo-Aryan thinking I want to cite a few wise words from Calderón. In „Cry, woman, and you will conquer“\*), in the first scene of the first act, the great Spanish poet speaks of those scholars, who

know everything and understand nothing,  
and goes forth:

What would be in community truth,  
becomes delusion with the individual.

It is bound to happen that a lot of Indo-Aryan thinking will appear to us as delusion; I'll be the last one to deny that; more on this later.

---

\*) *Mujer, llora y vencerás*, by Pedro Calderón de la Barca, written 1660.

## 54 Organic thinking

---

The novice however will say: this now is not the delusion of a studyroom scholar, as it would be in our world, instead it is the slowly risen „common wisdom“ of an entire people, a natural product grown organically. This ought to be sufficient to allow oneself to assume that this delusion holds many things that must be seriously examined.

## 55

---

### A-logic thinking

because that seems to me the easiest way, albeit logically incorrect.

First, seen entirely from the outside, this slow organic growing from thousands of roots resulted in one of the most remarkable and interesting characteristics of Indian thinking, that has never been emphasized before.

On every domain this organic, living unity causes, in contrast with a restricted logic one, the *c o n t r a d i c t i o n*. Transformed into action, contradiction means *r e s i s t a n c e*, and as such it controls every aspect of life; just as the great Bichat defined life as „*l'ensemble des fonctions qui résistent à la mort*“ (the cooperation of all functions that resist death). In the inner life also this variety of forces are kept in balance by this resistance that we call „contradiction“. Primarily this is the basic fact in the structure of thinking. We see it everywhere: in all philosophical systems, in every theory, in the teachings of all outstanding men and in the life of the people of all great nations; the contradiction

## 56 A-logic thinking

---

is the balance bar that enables us to cross the small foot-bridge of our intellect over the yawning abyss of impenetrability. For us Westerners however, the coexistence of theses, of which the paradoxical nature is undeniable, is at first somewhat confusing. Normally we would call that „nonsense“. We may have shaken off the tyranny of faith, the straitjacket of logic restricts us even more, and we subordinate ourselves to its laws just as unconditionally as the later, misled Indian threw himself under the wheels of the *Jagannàth*. That's why we have made ourselves used to hide the contradictions of our thinking as careful as possible, deep inside our world-view, we try to deceive ourselves and others. Two

making detours. Like a shining garment it is hung around the truth. Countless gods and nevertheless only one World-spirit; the individual condemned to a long series of rebirths, and at the same time the denial of all individuality in *Tat-tvam-asi* („that art thou“); Ethics, which are based upon the theory of soul migration, and nevertheless the testification: „only they who are still afflicted with the weaknesses of ignorance are subjected to such a migration of the soul“;<sup>1)</sup> Freedom of will and destiny;

---

<sup>1)</sup> Çankara: *Die Sûtras des Vedânta*, p. 19.

## 57 A-logic thinking

---

ideality of the world, reality of the world etc. As if it's done with intentional irony, the Indo-Aryan places these teachings, that are incompatible when regarded only logically, adjacent to each other for preference.

Imagine the distance between such a practical wisdom and the philosophy our professional European philosophers still attend with the most sincere love: Baruch Spinoza's „*Principiorum philosophiae demonstratio more geometrico*“! True is that the tremendous talent of the Aryan for mathematics proves itself sufficiently by the fact that they, who had an aversion against the dead letter, invented the so-called „Arabic“ numbers and thus paved the way for all higher mathematics; yet in their childlike simplicity it would never occur to them to construct „God“ geometrically, and to reduce virtue to a rule-of-three. As said before, in all Indian writings the contradiction is presented openly. That's why the reader will not find there the naked plainness and clarity and consistency of one individual mind, that has only to be in harmony with itself. It is not a system, at least not in our sense of the word, but instead reflections on and investigations into



of congenial souls in the course of countless successive generations.

Do we have the right to disqualify such a thinking, where contradictions are placed next to each other without transition,

### 58 A-logic thinking

---

as downright illogical! I don't believe so. The Indians have had outstanding polemics, and I would not know whether our European philosophy can present us a practical use of logic thinking that is more sharp-witted and more accurate, than, let's say, the refutation of realism, the absolute idealism and nihilism in the Vedantasutra's of Cankara. The Indian world-view in its entirety however is, if not illogical, a-logical — a-logical in the sense that this logic doesn't control, but serves thinking wherever that is needed.

### 59

---

#### **The substance of Aryan thinking**

This consideration brings us to another, which leads even deeper in the unique nature of Aryan thinking.

In a certain sense, with restricted validity though, one could call „logic“ the exterior of thinking, its form; there is however, seen from this point of view, also thinking-substance which forms the interior. We are used to lay emphasis on the form, due to the example the Hellenics gave us; the inevitable contradictions — because the equation will always limp — we hide, as said, inward, we lay them in the substance itself, where they are less noticeable. The Indo-Aryan proceeds in reversed order; the substance is subject of his thinking

logic form, or, as Cankara put it: „every occupation with proof or proof-subject“.

When I distinguish between an outer and inner knowing then of course everybody will understand that I mean this only metaphorically. Without the aid of these symbols I could hardly express what I have to say about the most important basic characteristics of Indian thinking. This thinking doesn't occupy itself

## 60 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

with speculating for the sake of speculating, but obeys an inner instinct, a tremendous moral need. It's not exactly easy, to express oneself concise and at the same time clearly on this matter; but I'll give it a try.

There are things, that can be proven, and there are things, that can not be proven. When the Aryan founds his entire thinking onto his deepest conviction of the moral meaning of the world — his own existence and the existence of the universe —, his thinking is mounted on an „inner knowing“, beyond „all occupation with proofs“. This „substance“ can not be adopted from observing surrounding nature. Yet we see the Indo-Aryan, as early as the [Rigveda](#), consider nature as something that is closely related to him and as a consequence as something that has moral meaning. This shows up in his mythology, so complicated because the gods, who appear in the first place as embodiments of natural phenomena, are at the same time allegories of the internal forces in the human bosom. It seems, as if these Aryans felt the inner urge, to project what moved deep inside them on that what surrounded them, and as if in turn the great natural phenomena — the heavenly lights, the clouds, the fire etc. — returned on the same beams that radiated from the inside to the outside, entered the human bosom and whispered: yes, my friend, you and I are the same!

## 61 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

have a distinct notion of subordination, instead they speak familiarly of „both peoples“. As Deussen says: „While with the Semites God is above all master and mankind his servant, with the Indogermans the idea of God as father and mankind as his children prevails.“

And here, in this natural disposition to shape a world-view from the inside to the outside, lies the germ for the extraordinary development of metaphysical talent, here lies the germ for all great deeds of Indo-Aryan thinking. The old, unmitigated pessimism of the Indian for instance, their aptitude to recognize suffering everywhere in nature, is rooted in the experience of suffering in his own bosom; from here it spreads itself all over the world. Just as metaphysics, as the recognition of the transcendental ideality of the empirical world will have sense to a metaphysician only, compassion will have sense only to he who knows what suffering means. That is projecting the inner feelings onto outer nature; for all science in the world can't prove that suffering exists, it can't even make it likely. Suffering is an entirely inner experience.

I can remember one day, when I studied physiology in Geneva under the well-known professor Schiff, that I entered his laboratory, where all students were welcome and where always something new could be learned. In a crate sat a small dog, and when I approached to caress him, he began to howl so fearfully and plaintively, that I can still hear his voice today: to me it was the voice of nature,

## 62 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

and I cried aloud in pity. The highly learned man however, otherwise so quiet and patient, flew into a rage: what kind of unscientific language that was; how

animals one observes movements only, which can all be explained sufficiently as purely physical, he had planned a partial section of the spinal marrow of this dog, which would make it very unlikely that the sensory nerves... and then, after a detailed technical discourse, he ended with the conclusion that all I could say was that some impression, recorded by some optical nerve had caused, as a reflex, a vibration of the vocal cords in the larynx, and then followed an interesting digression on the meaning of the term Fitness seen in the light of Darwin's hypothesis. Schiff was quite right; he was not only one of the most learned men I have ever met, but also a philosopher of enviable sharpness and consequence. So if I make the assertion: Schiff was only logically right, but I knew the dog suffered\*); if I parry his faultless proof with Milton: *P l a u s i b l e t o t h e w o r l d , t o m e w o r t h n a u g h t !*; if I say, I am just as convinced of my own life as that that poor animal suffered unspeakable physical and mental agonies, abandoned by it's loved ones,

---

\*) According to H. S. Chamberlain's wife Anna, her husband came home one day with a dog he had saved from Schiff's laboratory. They baptised him *Arabi Pascha*, and the animal was quite pleased with his new accomodation in the country side of Vert Pré. (Could be a reflex, though). Anna Chamberlain, *Meine Erinnerungen*, p. 94.

### 63 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

subjected to horrible tortures —, then I maintain a thesis that I cannot prove, but of which I'm nevertheless more convinced of than anything else in the world that can be proven to me by trial and conclusion. I can already see the superior smile on the face of the non-philosopher: „All this is nothing more but a conclusion by analogy!“ O no, dear Mr. anti-metaphysicist, now you've made an enormous mistake! You can't say that

that the conclusion by analogy is the weakest of all the various kinds of conclusion; that is taught by own consideration, and all logicians, from Aristotle to John Stuart Mill, testify and prove it. However, even a faultless syllogism and an induction with conclusive force often require careful testing and trained thinking, in order to be acknowledged as compelling; how pale and unstable the analogy is! That cry of pain however had not gone the way of conscious thinking at all; what had happened here was what the electricians call a „short-circuit“, where the current, instead of following the straight, long-winded wire, jumps directly from one pole to another in a rain of sparks; my understanding of the dog's suffering had just as little logical validity as the forest echo is a syllogism; it was a spontaneous impulse, of which the intensity of comprehension depended on my own capability to suffer. At that time I had never heard of the Indian *tat-tvam-asi*; I was so

#### 64 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

little an anti-vivisectionist, that I had defended Schiff publicly in the newspapers; at that cry however my heart seized with pain; the response-call had followed the call, and now it did not concern that one small miserable creature any longer, but, as I have said before, it seemed to me as a voice of the entire nature. This highly learned physiologist wasn't any crueller and — strictly speaking — not more conscious of what he was doing, than a destructive avalanche or a death-spitting volcano. Suddenly he stood before me as the typical ignorant man, the one to whom the eternal prayer applies: „Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.“

With this example I hope to have made clear what one could and should call „inner“ knowledge, differing from „outer“ knowledge; at the same time this will make

because a contradiction, a mutual neutralization is not the case here, and only a hair-splitting, ignorant mind would find one, unimportant to us, since such a train of thoughts would be based on lack of understanding. And the one and only thing that matters to me at this point, is that I want to be understood if I say: the acknowledgement of a moral meaning of the world, as it constituted the profession of faith of all outstanding and most genuine Germans — the profession of faith of Herder and Kant, of Goethe and Schiller, of van Beethoven and Wagner, of Frederick the Great

### 65 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

and Bismarck, and how this formed the only foundation of all Indo-Aryan thinking, is an „inner knowing“, an inner experience. It cannot be drawn from the mere outward observation of nature or be justified by a series of reasonable conclusions. The beginning is formed by the inner experience, the rock-firm conviction that ones own existence has a moral meaning. This conviction cannot be dissected dialectically and, one item after another, be proven right; it is quite an anti-dialectic feeling, a basic element of the personality, its roots reaching down into the dark depths of mother earth, at the same time a powerful protection against the rough storms of life and a supplier of precious nutrition. If the flourishing crown of a tree wanted to examine its roots analytically, it would pay for it with its life. This conviction of a moral meaning of ones own existence, upon which every true morality is based, can be present in the conscious mind less or more forceful, can occupy a larger or smaller place in the mental life of man; with the Indo-Aryan it was so incomparably developed, that it shaped the whole earthly existence of uncounted thousands and millions, and still shapes today, despite the sad decline of the nation. When the aged Aryan —

in order to recede lonely into the forests and to grow towards deliverance in years of silence and hardships, the logician

## 66 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

would be very embarrassed, if he had to explain this kind of behaviour in terms of reflex movements. Bear in mind that the notion of hell and eternal punishments is unknown to the Indo-Aryan, who was instructed by the Upanishads; if he subjects himself to hardships and self-chastisement, then this is not meant as a peace-offering to a god insulted by sins, nor as a battle against an enticing devil, but because he is so full of the awareness of the moral meaning of his existence, he wants to dedicate the last years of his life to the contemplation of this subject only, and he will gladly endure all pains, as long as it contributes to directing his thoughts inward, and to free himself step by step from the outer needs of life. It's clear to see, after all that's being said of the foundations of Indian mythology, that the conviction of the moral meaning of his own existence guarantees a moral meaning of the entire universe. It was these men, detached from the world, who wrote the Upanishads.

This now is the internal knowledge, which I had to bring forward as one of the foundations of Indo-Aryan philosophy. With the forest-settlers it appears to us in an increased, perhaps exaggerated shape. No matter what, what I wanted to direct the attention to, is that all Aryan thinking goes this way. One understands easily, what special shade a world-view must have, of which the starting point is not the surprise over the external world, but the surprise over the internal world, over its own self; a world view, that doesn't think of the visible world as something

insights can be achieved by means of dialectic considerations, but instead for which the invisible, the untouchable, the inexpressible of the own heart forms the only, indisputable knowledge. The Indian would smile compassionately at the venerable old hylozoists of Greece — and God knows that there are in the world of today enough scholars, who are still not finished with Thales.

One also understands easily, what special shade a thinking must have, if not only it originates from an inner instinct, but is also directed towards an inner goal. The Latins wrote: *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*. So, they would like to know the cause of things, the things around them, and since these things often prove themselves to be hostile, a pious wish followed:

*Atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum  
Subjecit pedibus.*

To appease fear, to control fate, to become masters themselves, this is what the Romans regarded as highest wisdom. The Indo-Aryan would say: these men have no insight, they are still lost in the mist of delusion, of „not-knowing“; what they call wisdom, is nothing more but the first ruffle of thinking; then what are these alleged „things“ and their alleged „causes“ if not the I itself? How should I experience what I am not? What is this „fear“, if not some movement inside my inner self? And what is this „fate“, if not the gigantic shadow

## 68 The substance of Aryan thinking

---

image of my own being? What was illustrated by the example of that cry of pain of the tortured dog, was also the starting point for the Aryan: the call from the mysterious, impenetrable world of the outside and the automatic response-call from the own, shining, living



familiar, revealing itself as a kindred being. What happens here, happens deep inside ourselves. All senses deceive us frequently, we know that quite well, and we seek to avoid deception by being thoughtful; the brain however, in the first place mainly a tool for unifying sensory perceptions and stimulating activity, meaning, in the first place mainly an organ that is directed at the outer world, but that, in the second place, has taken over other operations with higher animals, the brain can mislead us even more. The Indo-Aryan thinks of the naively empirical, rationalistic philosopher as of a child in the cradle, who reaches for the moon; while he himself believes he has reached the years of discretion.

69

---

### **The shape of Aryan thinking**

While we distinguished earlier — for the benefit of our present investigation — between shape and substance of thinking, it's easy to imagine, how such a neglect of the formal component must deeply and decisively affect the entire thinking; over and above this comes the originating from uncounted roots, in the course of thousands of years. And indeed, this unique history of development, of organization of Indian metaphysics, incomparable with anything that is otherwise familiar to us, requires a shape, which is — because of their long-windedness, because of their frequent references to conditions completely unknown to us, because of their tight intertwining with popular conceptions and with a whole world of symbols mish-mashed together, because of the impossibility to communicate „inner“ experience by means of words — most fatiguing and often almost unpalatable. Added to

aggravating momentum of an obligation to master an unusual, attitudinizing, often almost repelling form, which doesn't shrink from whatever contradiction.

And it's because of this shape that most attempts to approach the Indian thinker fails.

## 70 The shape of Aryan thinking

---

*In das Innere zu dringen*

*Gibt das Äußere Glück und Luft*

Goethe says; unfortunately that doesn't apply here.

Please allow me to outline what is characteristic of this shape by making a comparison; perhaps that for many a one, a clearer conception will attribute to the strength and patience, needed for mastering the obstacles.

Inventive Psycho-physiologists state, that tactition has played a role in the life of primeval man, almost unimaginable to us today, because the tremendous development and demands of vision and hearing have decreased that sense-organ to a level of insignificance. This handling entailed an awkward, cumbersome life — but there was also an advantage: man rarely erred. His conceptions were often baroque, enormous, but they contained nevertheless a larger amount of reality, they corresponded more exactly to nature.

*O, daß der Sinnen doch so viele sind!*

*Verwirrung bringen sie ins Glück herein.*

Later on the eye won itself a brighter, but more distant kind of conception, and man was accustomed to be content with an image of things; while the hand had investigated, had examined, had weighed... The Indo-Aryan metaphysicist now is the groping thinker! He exhibits all the disadvantages that goes with this: unmethodical examining, lingering on with details, endless repetition (somewhat like a blind man, who can only determine the number of columns in a cathedral by touching them all, one at a time),

## 71 The shape of Aryan thinking

---

but then also amusing himself with images, which the eye, still awkward and badly distorted, casts over the world, at the same time combined with the inability to develop something visible, sharp and exact (the failing aptitude for plastic arts and especially sculpture is particularly remarkable with the Indo-Aryans). However, the groping thinker has an advantage, exactly in the ranges of that inner world, of which we spoke a while ago, and of which the [\*Mundaka-Upanishad\*](#) says: “The sun does not shine there, nor the moon and the stars, nor these lightnings, and much less this fire...” Consider what it means, seen from the point of view of such a civilization, which had barely begun writing, not only to *think* but also to *live* transcendental idealism! Especially in the night of the inner world the Indian is at home; he is like the blind man, who has a disadvantage in the bright light of day, but who can find his way in the dark like no other. If London, that tremendous metropolitan, should get caught in an impenetrable darkness of fog, against which even the strongest sources of light aren't much good, there is only one help in case of emergencies: the blind! But it has no use to urge these leaders to go faster or find a shortcut; they proceed with their usual, careful pace and take their usual zigzag paths, where their skilful, groping hand finds back thousands of marks only known to them; and so they reach their goal with infallible certainty.

72

---

### **Hellenes and Indo-Aryans**

To us it seems almost mockery, if one compares a philosopher with a blind man. In order to avoid any misinterpretation of my comparison, I want to make

capabilities to serve mankind as the exclusive leaders on philosophical issues. Their whole life was a denial of introspection and therefore formed the sharpest contrast possible with the Indo-Aryan lifestyle. Now let us look at the upbringing of the Aryan thinker. The young Brahman received his education in the seclusion of a rural surrounding: mental treasures and moral habits; with incomparable severity and perseverance he was educated for thinking, according to plan. Twelve years and often longer the theoretical instruction and exercise took; then came the indispensable school of practical life, the founding of his own household. And it was only after his own son had grown up and had build his own house, that the time had come for a wise man to disappear into the forests, he, now freed from all the obligations of the rituals and from the entire equipment of the symbolic belief in gods, he, whose speculative abilities formed the best personal civilization one could think of, whose memories were enriched by all joys and

### 73 Hellenes and Indo-Aryans

---

sadness of family life, he whose knowledge of human nature had matured by the fulfilment of his practical civic duties — only now the time had come for this wise man to increase the treasures of thought, inherited from his ancestors, and thus to increase the mental possession of his people. For the Greeks however education consisted of the training of the eye and of rhythmic feeling: gymnastics and music, being pretty and recognizing beauty with sureness. From their childhood up they filled their days with looking at the other, „watching the outside“, talking and discussing and tuning. In short: the publicity was the atmosphere of Greek existence; all Greek philosophers were politicians and orators. And while even in today's degenerated times many Indo-Aryans of pure race

omnipresent world spirit, we hear Socrates, up to the moment when he empties the cup of hemlock, amusing himself with dialectic hair-splitting with his friends and discussing the advantage of the believe in immortality for the human society.

So we see that the serious obstacles, raised by the formlessness of the Indo-Aryan representation of their world-view, are not without some kind of atonement; and it's justified to expect to find something new here.

But we would be superficial, if we were satisfied with just this one insight. Because the distinction between

#### 74 Hellenes and Indo-Aryans

---

form and matter can lay claim to a limited value only; so here we have to dig somewhat deeper.

Hellenic humanism — to which the Indo-Aryan now forms a counterweight — was for us in particular a school of form, or perhaps better of shaping, of creation, of the artists' individual works on up to the realization that a human society can have a form in which free-creative art is the all-penetrating element. In admiration of related strangers we climbed up to new achievements of our own. On the other hand, each attempt failed to master what was specifically Hellenic regarding the contents, if one refrains from those things — logic, geometry — where the form is already contents. This is quiet clear for the arts, but for philosophy the emancipation from Helleno-Christian ties has to still take place, although it was always followed out by our real philosophers, from Roger Bacon on to Kant. As for India the conditions differed. The Indian Aryan missed a Hellene, to keep within bounds in time his innate inclination — also inborn to us — to digress excessively, to canalize his over-rampantly thriving forces as it were, to accompany his overflowing fantasy with the wise guide called „taste“, and his judgement with a notion of

missed however sophrosyne, the restrictress. No poem and no philosophical writing of the Indian

## 75 Hellenes and Indo-Aryans

---

is enjoyable for a man of taste, formally speaking. And once these people wanted to avoid the excessiveness and therefore untransparency, the unartisticness of their creations, they immediately ran into the opposite extreme and availed themselves of such an exaggerated aphoristical briefness that their writings became nearly an unsolvable mystery. A well-known example is Pānini's grammar of Sanskrit, which is written in the form of algebraic formulas, so that this exhaustive representation of the Sanskrit language, 4000 rules large, fills hardly 150 pages. Another example are the philosophical comments of Bâdarâyana, with whom sometimes a whole chapter with explanations was necessary, before one could understand three words of his way of expression, concise to absurdity. The form of the Indian is therefore nearly always rejectable. And this means a lot; because a clear distinction between form and contents can't be found anywhere; he who criticizes the form, cannot praise the contents without some reservations. For this is also true; with the Indo-Aryan we have to dig deeply before we hit upon pure, unslagged gold. If one is not determined or capable to descend into the depths of this soul (for which a congenial attitude is necessary), one shouldn't make attempts at all; he will harvest little for much trouble. However, he who can and may descend, will return with ever-lasting rewards.

And now we see immediately, how very limited the criticism of such an organism often is; for while I just criticized the Indian form, one also has to admit that especially within this „formlessness“ the possibility of

communication between soul and soul emerges, which one would search for in vain in other places. Such things are untransferable and cannot not be detached from their environment; we learn to think thoughts, which we would not have thought otherwise, because we missed the material mediator — if I may say so. Nevertheless we may summarize our views on form with the following statement: what causes our deepest interests in the creations of the Indo-Aryan spirit, is the inner core, from whence they originate, and not the form in which they are represented to us. Thus if we expect an animating influence from India on our own spiritual life, then this expectation is mainly related to that core only.

77

---

### **Thinking and religion**

Now we have fathomed how decisive the inner point of view in Indo-Aryan thinking is, we will easily understand, how intimately this thinking must be related to religion.

And indeed: it would be childish to say that Indian philosophy, as „pure, systematic philosophy“, is on a same level as the systems of an Aristotle, a Descartes, a Kant; just as it would be frivolous, to consider the religion of the Veda's and the Christian religion to be of equal value. In one respect however the mental life of the Indo-Aryan stands unattainably high above ours: so far as that their philosophy was religion and religion philosophy. With us, our thinking and feeling, that once lay peacefully next to each other like twins in the lap of human consciousness, have ripened to a full-grown age and are now separated as two completely different natures; hostilely they face each other; every man with

positivism, then both endeavour only after subjugating the other one and making him subservient. Of course the „division of the work“ is a beautiful and much-praised life principle, but above all it affects the inner core of our personality and violently tears it apart, so that, as in the tale of Aristophanes,

## 78 Thinking and religion

---

from then on both halves seek each other, sometimes find each other, but are never more able to merge into a unity. The Indian philosopher still had this unity at his disposal, the Hellenic on the other hand didn't any more. It would be a sad thing, if the high development of our splintered, individual activities have robbed us of the ability to admire and estimate at its true to value, at least from a distance, the inimitable strength and beauty of a uniform oneness, complete in itself.

For this fusion of religion and philosophy made something possible, something of which we must confess with pain in our hearts that it fails our culture almost completely: no man in India was mentally so shallow, that he didn't had something of philosophy in him, not even the boldest wing-beat of thought took the extraordinarily talented so high that he would not have remained still basically "religious". There were no secret doctrines in India; this often heard statement is based on misunderstanding. But does not the deepest knowledge remain a secret to all of us? And does not everyone see that the different abilities of different men constitute a high ladder, so that what is obvious for one man, is hidden for others? That is something completely different than secret kabbalistics. This Indo-Aryan thinking and feeling now, slowly and organically emerging out of the hearts and heads of a whole people of religious philosophers, had grown into such a remarkable flexible organism, that it met all the



## 79 Thinking and religion

---

the most deviating, with regard to the relative requirements of thinking and feeling (philosophy and religion), the most deviating also regarding the „personal comparison“ of thinking (if I may say so); for transcendental idealists, and idealists comparable to those of the school of Berkeley, realists, materialists, philosophical sceptics, everybody in India lived — and today still live — like brothers within the same religious basic views. „In that country the absolute freedom of thought prevailed at all times,“ professor Garbe certifies. And, *nota bene*, this is not about laymen who (as with us) gradually extorted their freedom from a thwarting priesthood, but this „absolute freedom of thought“ is as it were an organic component of the Indo-Aryan religion, it results from it naturally, without opposition or questioning. Therefore the religion there is also the bearer of science, which cannot exist without freedom of thought. The achievements of the Indo-Aryans in the areas of mathematics, philology etc. are all interwoven with their epistemologic-religious conceptions. We can't say the same thing of ourselves. With us all genuine science and all genuine philosophy was on war footing with religion ever since; if, at times, this was not the case, it was either because of a practical adjustment to existing conditions due to mutual fundamental slackness in thinking and acting, or purposeful, planned hypocrisy. It may be that some part of our people has religion, but God knows one would search in vain for a single spark of thought in this part;

## 80 Thinking and religion

---

with our philosophers on the other hand, we find either no religion or a mask. Of the majority of the educated

off both their wings.

Now here we see clearly that characteristic of Indo-Aryan thinking, from which the desired humanistic effect should be expected, and I think I'll be understood if I make the following statement: I expect the largest direct influence for that core of our nature, from whence our entire world-view — that is, everything that is meant by religion and philosophy — springs; core must affect core, and awake us from slackness into new life. The separation wall between religion and sincere scientific thinking, so ingeniously erected by our church doctors, does not really exist; it means rather the acknowledgement of an official lie. This lie, which poisons both the life of the individual and of society, this lie, which will drag us sooner or later into utter barbarism, for it will, as a matter of course, bring victory to the evil and stupid ones among us (for they alone are sincere and therefore strong), this lie results from the fact that we Indo-Europeans — belonging to the most religious tribe of mankind on earth — have degraded ourselves so deeply by adopting Jewish history as the basis and Syro-Egyptian magic as the crown of our alleged „religion“. It is as if the two thieves, who were hung to the right and left of the Saviour

## 81 Thinking and religion

---

were mercifully fetched down from their crosses and then mocked the divine presence of Jesus Christ. True is, that we've fought a long and bloody war — from Scotus Erigena until today (where professors of philosophy still have to be very careful and have the almost ineluctable obligation to lie) — for the freedom of thought; but, as the Indo-Aryan profoundly teaches: „There is no thinking without faith,“ the light of our genuine, own world-view burns under the bushel; for it cannot accept this Syro-Semitic believe, that doesn't get

to learn from the Indo-Aryans, because we've forgotten.

There has never been an Indo-European branch where religion was historical, not only for the reason that each history of the world — take the Jewish version for example! — has to be ridiculously insufficient compared with the cosmic whole, but from the much deeper consideration that nothing is explained by the proof of a cause. Zeus is the master of the world, but not its creator; just as no mythological god-figure of the Aryans ever symbolized a world-creator out of nothing, but at most a regulator and a confirmer and a guardian, thus exactly like Kant demands: „the world's architect, not the world-creator.“ The materialistic conception of a creator out of nothing is the symptom of an organic inability for metaphysical thinking;

## 82 Thinking and religion

---

it is a misdeed to force it upon us as the basis of all religion. I won't go any further into the subject here; I'll bring into light only the most internal, most concise thoughts which forms the foundation of all the rest.

One knows of the old controversy between the followers of Being and those of Becoming, for the most of us embodied in the conceptions of the Eleatics and of Heraclitus. He who only perceives Becoming, is a born materialist, he who only experiences Being, is a one-sided idealist. Our Germanic world-view — which thus far found its most true expression in Immanuel Kant — acknowledges both as equal in value, but separates them at the same time. There is a mechanically interpretable world of Becoming, and there is a world, not mechanically interpretable, of Being. If man gives shape to the one, then he creates science, when he gives shape to the other, then he has religion. Real science shall never exceed the domain of Becoming and search for the final reasons of Being, because then, like

unmechanical mechanically, using arbitrary fallacies, it wipes out the immovable border and with its unlawful dogmatism it paves the way for the priests, who interpret what is mechanical unmechanically. On the other hand, real religion will and shall be related to Being only, never to Becoming (at least with us Indo-Europeans). The Indo-Aryans knew that so well, that they forbade, from the hymns of the Rigveda up to the comments of Çankara — that is, through thousands of years —,

### 83 Thinking and religion

---

all inquiring after world-creation, they forbade inquiring after primal causes at all, and yet if they did, it was at most a conscious toying of the fantasy with poetical symbols. „The cause of the world is even for the god-lords unfathomable“, Çankara says. As soon as religion encroaches on the domain of Becoming, in other words, as soon as it becomes historical — as is the case in the Judaeo-Christian tradition — it destroys science and at the same time loses its own incomparable meaning. „He who lets come into being that what is eternal, isn't aided by experience“; and „He who lets become that what came into being, relapses into an eternal regression“, \* the Brahmin Gaudapâda says. Eternal regression! A true word, revealing the inadequacy of all historical religion once and for all. Whereas a veritable religious point of view is expressed with marvellous aphoristical briefness in the Mrityu-lângala-Upanishad: „I am not in the time, but I am time itself.“ With the Indian, religion is never a sought-after explanation of external, temporal things, but instead a symbolic organization of internal, unmechanical, timeless experience. It is an actual proceeding, an uplifting of the mind, a wielding of the will — an insight, as far as it means a direct grasping of the transscendental world,

profound, at the same time half ironically, a poet in the Rigveda already asked: „Who is this god, to whom the fighters of both armies look up to?“ Here we are for certain

---

\* Chamberlain is probably referring to Gaudapâda's [Karika on the Mandukya Upanishad](#), Book IV, verse 57: „It is because of experience that everything seems to come into existence — 'surely nothing is eternal!' “ and verse 13: „There is no example to support the claim that the effect comes to be from an unoriginate cause. And if it is held that the effect comes to be from something else that also comes to be, then we face an infinite regress.“

## 84 Thinking and religion

---

far removed from the „God Zébaoth“, who created the entire universe for the convenience of the Jews! That what the Indian worshipped as divine — „beyond heaven and in the depths of the heart“ ([Mahâ-Nârâyana-Upanishad](#)) \* — has actually nothing, nothing at all, to do with the Jahve of Genesis and the Christian church-doctrines. Especially that God of the Indo-Aryans, „who can never be proven“ (as it is called in one of the Upanishads), since it is not given by external, but by inner experience; in reality however this was the God of all deeply religious Germanic Christians at all times, whatever outward confession they were forced to adhere to; that can be proven in particular of the mystics and philosophers, of Erigena and Eckhart on up to Böhme and Kant.

Another important consequence of this only true — or at least only „Aryan“ — view on religion is that the basis of morality is not to be found in future rewards and future punishments, but instead, like Goethe wanted it, in the respect of a human being for himself, for the world-encompassing unity that he saves „in the depths of his heart“. This means the liberation from the humiliating delusion of heaven and hell, against which

Germanic spirit. Religion is present, not past and future.

But — for this should not be left unnoticed — Christ has given us something, something that the entire classic Aryan philosophy could not have given. True is, that the idea of a human god — as already mentioned above —

---

\* „That which the hermits attain is laid beyond the heaven; yet it shines brilliantly in the heart“ (Transl. Swami Vimalananda).

## 85 Thinking and religion

---

is a notion common to the Aryan (for that matter, to all Indo-Germans in any form), for the Semites on the other hand it is completely unknown; but the living example distinguishes itself from the speculative idea, like day from night. Therefore, because Christ stands much closer to nature than the Indian, he stands closer to God: thus is shown, I believe, the crucial difference. Even the non-churchgoer will find it easy to call this appearance — who always speaks of God as „father“ — God's son. Everywhere in genuine Aryan thinking lies the germ of the view that nature is the work of the devil (one only has to think of Zarathustra and of the Christian gnostics); pessimism and ascese necessarily result from it; and pessimism, as soon as it has become a conviction, and not just a profound, recognized knowledge, leads to the resignation of the will, that is, to the shipwreck of human existence itself; in the end it leads to disgrace and slavery. We can see that in today's India. Whereas Christ (in his own, purely-human teachings and in contrary to what the church has made from it) preached the cheerful, unconcerned, confidence-creating affirmation: this life enclosed heaven, just as the field the buried treasure. This plainness surpasses all profundity. While I expect the

precious I have for something far-fetched, that by itself could never be satisfying to me. Rather I am convinced that the school of Indian

## 86 Thinking and religion

---

thinking is suitable to initiate a purer, freer, more sublime and consequently also worthier relationship to Jesus Christ.

I must break off here, happy, if I have encouraged others to engage themselves in Indo-Aryan thinking — a worth-while beginning now made possible thanks to the great achievements of German scholars, satisfied, if I have convinced that a trueful humanistic catalysator is present here, a catalysator, capable, of inciting a rebellion against unworthy intellectual bonds, capable, to further the awareness of today's people of their dignity — and thus at the same time of their liberty and their responsibility.

## 87

---

### **Epilogue**

Once I knew a little, pious child, who, instead of “Thy kingdom come“ used to pray: “Thy kingdom come soon“. Indeed, when we look around us today and see obtuse superstition, paired with the broad and heavy-weighted glory of the priests in Europe far more flowering as, let's say, in Homer's times, and less disputed as one hundred years ago, when we remind ourselves that the ancient real Aryans — lucky men! — had no churches and no priest hierarchy at all, when we remind ourselves furthermore that also among the Jews, long time ago, a Deutero-Isaiah \*) arose, who wanted to abolish church and cult, and a Jeremiah,

kingdom moves away further and further. And despite all that, the good is at hand and seems only to be waiting for our will. In particular the dream-image of a possible fusion of Indo-Aryan deep-thinking and feeling and Indo-Aryan inner freedom with a Greek sense for form-giving and a Greek appreciation of the healthy, beautiful body as carriers of outer freedom is so enchanting, that the idea makes one feel drunk, and one believes, just as that little child, one could already grasp that, what is only a projection of our longing on a distant heaven. But we **m u s t** imagine something like that. With regard to the unattainableness

\*) *Isaiah*, chapter 40-55. These chapters are said to be later in origin than the preceding text, and if they are, the author is not identical with Isaiah. H. S. Chamberlain adhered this theory (see *The Foundations of the 19th. Century*, [vol. 1, p. 468, note 3](#)).

## 88 Epilogue

---

of past glory we cannot indulge ourselves in deception, nor can we with regard to the dishonouring inadequacies of the present; all that remains to us is naked despair, if we don't have, somewhere in ourselves, that feeling: in you too all elements are united, which can lead to a new, free blooming of spiritual life, comparable with that of earlier glorious moments of humanity! Bessemer steel and telegraphy and evolution fantasies cannot be sufficient for the descendants of the Aryans and Greeks in the long run. Culture has nothing to do with technology and learnedness; it is an inner condition of the mind, a direction of thinking and wanting; torn souls without a well balanced world-view, without the high flight of a wing-safe conviction, are desperately in need of that what gives true meaning to life. But aren't we today walking as if „through damp night“, did we not see in Germany's greatest men the „summit of humanity“ shine again? As soon as we look up, we learn to have



fanning them to new flames in the focus of their minds, I believe I can assure that at least those among us, who don't reject being a pupil of the true masters of our race, will very „soon“ step into that special kind of Aryan world-view, and will feel, as if they got hold of a property that was up till then illegitimately denied them.

89

---

### **Bibliographic supplement**

The only purpose of the following compilation, is to modestly assist those readers of this writing who became interested in Indian thinking, and who would like to extend their knowledge. He who possesses a first orienting overview of the literature, will easily pick out what appeals to his taste, and will find his way from there on.

#### **At first should be mentioned**

two classical papers of everlasting value:

**Friedrich von Schlegel:** *Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*, 1808.

**Wilhelm von Humboldt:** *Über die unter dem Namen Bhagavad-Gitâ bekannte Episode des Mahâ-Bhârata*, two lectures held at the Academy of Sciences of Berlin, 1825 and 1826 (now reprinted in the 5th vol. of the large edition of the collected writings, Berlin, 1906).

Schlegel's writing contains very much about philosophy and history, that must be regarded as outdated; but the holy fire of enthusiasm ignites today as it did one hundred years ago, and what a spiritual mind once saw correctly and expressed eloquently, works encouraging in the long term.

**90 Bibliographic supplement**

thinking; it is not easy to read, but serious readers with a philosophical aptitude should not deny themselves this great pleasure: they will gain an enrichment for their whole life.

### **As a general introduction**

should serve:

**Leopold von Schroeder:** *Indiens Literatur und Kultur in historischer Entwicklung*. A cycle of 50 lectures, also as manual of Indian literature history, together with numerous samples from Indian writings, translated into German, Leipzig 1887.

**Leopold von Schroeder:** *Reden und Aufsätze*, mainly about Indian literature and culture, Leipzig, 1913.

**F. Max Müller:** *Indien in seiner weltgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, Leipzig, 1884. (Authorized translation by C. Capeller.)

The rest serves as introduction to the general history of India in the first place:

**Vincent A. Smith:** *The early History of India, from 600 P. C. to the Mohammedan Conquest*, Oxford, 1904.

**Rhys Davids:** *Buddhist India*, London, 1903.

**Max Dunckler:** *Geschichte des Altertums*, Vol. III, Leipzig, 1875.

### **91 Bibliographic supplement**

---

For the geography and topography of the country is, besides the well known, extensive works of Schlagintweits, probably the most recommendable the new small book

**Sir Thomas Holdich:** *India*, London, 1904.

### **General cultural history**

is to be found in many books, of which I want to mention the following:

**Heinrich Zimmer:** *Altindisches Leben, die Kultur der*

**Richard Garbe:** *Indische Reiseskizzen*, Berlin, 1889.

**Hermann Oldenberg:** *Aus Indien und Iran, Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Berlin, 1899.

**Alfred Hillebrandt:** *Alt-Indien, kulturgeschichtliche Skizzen*, Breslau, 1899.

**Richard Garbe:** *Beiträge zur indischen Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin, 1903.

**Richard Garbe:** *Indien und das Christentum, eine Untersuchung der religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge*, Tübingen, 1914.

In this connection should be mentioned the incomparable collection:

**Otto Boethlingk:** *Indische Sprüche, Sanskrit und Deutsch*, St. Petersburg, 1863—1865, 3 Volumes.

## 92 Bibliographic supplement

---

### **As an introduction to the thinking**

of the ancient Indians serve in particular:

**Paul Deußen:** *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen*: Vol. I, 1st chap., *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's*, Leipzig, 1894, Vol. I, 2nd chap., *Die Philosophie der Upanishad's*, Leipzig, 1899, Vol. I, 3rd chap., *Die nachvedische Philosophie der Inder*, 1908.

**Paul Deußen:** *Das System des Vedânta*, Leipzig, 1883.

**F. Max Müller:** *Three lectures on the Vedânta Philosophy*, London, 1894.

**Paul Deußen:** *Die Sûtra's des Vedânta*, Leipzig, 1887.

**Paul Deußen:** *60 Upanishad's des Veda, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt, und mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen versehen*, Leipzig, 1897.

**Paul Deußen:** *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahâbhâratam*, Leipzig, 1906.

*Darstellung des indischen Rationalismus*, Leipzig, 1894.

**Richard Garbe:** *Der Mondschein der Sâmkhya-Wahrheit*, München, 1899.

**Josef Dahlmann:** *Die Sâmkhya-Philosophie als Naturlehre und Erlösungslehre, nach dem Mahâbhârata*, Berlin, 1902.

### 93 Bibliographic supplement

---

In this connection another set of translations should be mentioned; namely

**Kaegi, Geldner & Roth:** *Siebenzig Lieder des Rigveda*, Tübingen, 1875. (Also Adolf Kaegi: *Der Rigveda, die älteste Literatur der Inder*, Leipzig, 1881.)

**Hermann Graßmann:** *Rig-Veda, übersetzt und mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen*, two volumes, Leipzig, 1876—1877.

**Robert Borberger:** *Bhagavad-Gîtâ, oder das Lied der Gottheit, aus dem Indischen übersetzt*, Berlin, 1870.

**Richard Garbe:** *Die Bhagavadgîtâ, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt, mit einer Einleitung über ihre ursprüngliche Gestalt, ihre Lehren und ihr Alter*, Leipzig, 1905.

**Paul Deußen:** *Der Gesang des Heiligen (Bhagavadgîtâ), aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt*, Leipzig, 1911.

**Leopold von Schroeder:** *Bhagavadgîtâ, des Erhabenen Sang*, Jena, 1912.

**Adolf Holtzmann:** *Indische Sagen*, reprint by Winternitz, Jena, 1912.

An unfinished work of **Winternitz** should also be mentioned: *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, 1st half vol., Leipzig, 1904, 2nd half vol. 1908; 2nd vol, 1st half, 1913.

Of course this list could be extended substantially, but I only wanted to give the novice some reference points.

unmentioned, since it has no connection with my book.

I, however, may not finish this small guide without drawing the attention of the more serious friends of Aryan spiritual life to Leopold von Schroeder's large-scale work: *Arische Religion*, 1st volume, „*Einleitung, Der altarische Himmelsgott, Das höchste gute Wesen*“, Leipzig, 1914; the 2nd volume, „*Naturverehrung und Lebensfeste*“ is due to be published before the end of 1915; a 3rd, last volume „*Seelengötter und Mysterien*“ will follow soon. This book — quite originally as problem definition and encyclopaedic with regard to the discussion of the material — will give an unique overview of our knowledge of what one can and may and must call „Aryan religion“, how it presents itself, as seen from the watch-tower of pure science, to the 20th century.



[Back to main page](#)



[The original text in German: \*Arische Weltanschauung\*](#)