

Precisely from them are generated shameful mutual human hatred, of which we are witness. The study of the nervous system, with its fiery energies, shows what an actually many-sided instrument the human organism is.

In the name of the highest knowledge, in the name of the betterment of life, in the name of co-operation, we have to acknowledge the hidden properties and possibilities in every human being. And having admitted the existence of these happy qualities, people must find in themselves the moral strength to express themselves, despite the whisperings of darkness, for the good of all, not being held back by prohibition there, where existence itself commands about the possibilities of flourishing, containment and synthesis. Especially let the youth, students from the first days of their studies, hear of the blissful synthesis, as the true mover of progress.

I rejoice to hear that you in various writings stress synthesis as the foundation of culture. Thus it is! If synthesis is pre-ordained to be vitally realized, then let the best creative elements, without dark negations, unite on the benevolent understanding of synthesis.

Thus let us keep cordially together. Let us at last expel malicious dark denials, and let us find in various fields of life, a radiant unifying concept!

Reprinted from *The Scholar*, January 1934.

Darkness versus Synthesis.

(DIARY LEAVES) *

BY NICHOLAS ROERICH



EARTY thanks for all your kind messages in reply to my calls for synthesis. It is joyful and timely that you support in your various articles this undeferrably needed conception.

It would seem that the entire history of humanity directs us once and for ever to understand the principles of co-operation, containment and harmonization of centres. But reality shows that things are entirely different. I will not reiterate about the obviously dark forces, to which every mention about synthesis is adverse and irritating. This is quite natural, for chaos, with all its disorderly whirls, is opposed to harmony, progress and constructiveness. Thus we shall not be surprised that darkness always is and will be against every constructiveness and synthesis. But it is especially deplorable when one witnesses that even certain seemingly cultural minds are disturbed and revolt against every reference to synthesis. Such a sight is so unexpectedly rude and vulgar that one does not even want to believe that under the masks of respectability and sweet-voicedness could hide such fossilized and dusty outlived ideas. Darkness hopes to break up the Light, but encounters defeat in such absurd attempts. All voluntary and involuntary allies of darkness, are also certainly defeated in due course. But time is needed to find out every absurdity. It is infinitely sad to witness how valuable, irreplaceable time is wasted on mutual negations and divisions, in order not to admit the possibility of healthy blissful synthesis.

If we shall tell ourselves that this deplorable state is the consequence of darkness, it will be a poor consolation. Or, if we say that it issues from narrow thinking or envy or malice, then this shall be a still poorer consolation, because such abhorrent properties also are created by the same darkness. The spreading of darkness is terrible, and it ravages like a pernicious epidemic. Humanity has discovered many salutary remedies against plague, cholera and similar pestilences, but the microbes of dark negation have still not been found.

Turning to the history of humanity, we see a multitude of examples of most absurd negations with the sole purpose to

* A message to Swami Jagadiswarananda, our esteemed and regular contributor, concerning his review of Prof. Roerich's latest book.--Ed.



besmirch constructive synthesis. Many stupidities were expressed to the effect that Leonardo da Vinci harmed his great art by being at the same time a remarkable engineer, biologist and philosopher. And more than once it was hinted, in a most ignorant way, that the art of Rubens suffered from his diplomatic career and statesmanship. However, a mighty creativeness and a wide mind demand multifarious expressions in varied materials and domains. The ordainments of Eastern wisdom tell us, that even Boddhissattvas should master at least one art and one craft. The wisdom of ancient rabbis underlines that if the youth, besides its main activity, will not be skilled in some craft, then it will be like preparing them for banditry of the crossroads.

The whole of antiquity, all epochs of renaissance relate the most striking compatibilities. Let us not forget that Cardinal Richelieu, when searching for an active secretary, chose a man, who was busy in many fields. And when it was hinted to the Cardinal that this man was already too busy for a new appointment, the experienced statesman replied: "If he is so busy he will know how to find time also for my work." The much experienced Cardinal valued all advantages derived from the realisation of synthesis.

We further know that Julius Ceasar sometimes dictated six letters simultaneously. Long is the list of similar such examples of containment and compatibilities, which but prove the inexhaustible possibilities of man.

We heard that Einstein, besides being a brilliant mathematician, is also a wonderful violinist. Has music belittled his astounding mathematical foresight? Certainly not. The harmony of sound gave him new daring thoughts in his definition of the universe. The remarkable pianist, Hoffman, at the same time is also an excellent mathematician and engineer. Who will dare to say that one or the other is incompatible and an impeding principle? Spinoza was a skilfull master of telescopic lenses and besides was known as a fine portraitist. Has his deep philosophy suffered from this, or have his lenses become worse because of his philosophy?

One may enumerate without end similar examples, in which a thinker expressed himself also in different fields of creativeness and craftsmanship.

It would seem that these facts are sufficiently obvious and clear and that one needn't dwell on them. But humanity up to now strives by all means to affirm the unnecessary divisions and perilous specialisation.

Horrors of unemployment, horrors of the inability to properly assign one's time and capacities, are due just to such absurd divisions. If at the time of the Italian renaissance, Leonardo and many other masters, who wilely contained various talents, were recognised, then now, in spite of every kind of human progress, this would call forth many negations and condemnations. I was witness to a discussion that took place, as to whether the composer Rakhmaninoff should appear also as conductor of a symphony orchestra. According to the opinion of a certain manager, a good composer could not be a good conductor also, and *vice versa*. Besides this the ideas of the manager were that one should not burden the public with such compatability. As if the broad public could in no way understand that a man can act in two fields, if they are close to each other in their essence! No doubt, the same manager would have condemned Hoffmann for his love for mathematics, or Benois for permitting himself to be at the same time an artist and a writer. No doubt, a reference to the famous Italian Vasari, who was both an artist and a historian, would have been of small avail to persuade the present-day ignoramusses. Someone even stated the stupidity that an artist cannot be a philosopher, in other words a clever person, as if creativeness were connected with idiots only! And when it was recently printed in the papers that the Lord Mayor of Bridgeport, who is a skilled roof layer, even during his municipal activities continues his handicraft, then the readers only smiled. From the point of view of the disseminator and belittler this was a proof of the uselessness of the Lord Mayor in both fields. And what is there bad in the fact that the famous Russian composer Borodin, of "Prince Igor" fame, was a professor of the Military Medical Academy?

You would be horrified, if I would whisper to you several names of persons who are very remarkable in their own line, but who judge extremely narrowly about the ability of synthesis for others. The above mentioned example of the cause of unemployment, as a consequence of narrow specialisation, should make critics and deniers think, whether it is right to condemn and limit human abilities and possibilities. Man, as a true powerful microcosmos, has in himself infinite expressions and many beautiful qualities. Would inadaptability and limitations correspond to the great aims of the macrocosmos? No doubt, if people strive towards progress, then the latter should first of all express itself both in co-operation and in synthesis.

Divisions and conventional limitations have reached incredible absurdity. One must have a very poor mind, when one directs humanity towards such deadly divisions and prohibitions.