

TRANSCENDENTAL THEOSOPHY

Articles by H. P. Blavatsky

LE PHARE DE L'INCONNU

WORLD-IMPROVEMENT OR WORLD-DELIVERANCE

WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR OUR FELLOW-MEN

HPBLAVATSKY SERIES : NO. 36
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (MYSORE) PRIVATE LIMITED
BANGALORE 560004

FOREWORD

AN article written by H.P.B. in French for *La Revue Theosophique* (May 1889), “Le Phare de l’Inconnu” (“The Beacon-Light of the Unknown”), appeared in English in four parts in the *Theosophist* for July through October, 1889, introduced by an editorial note saying that the text was “a rough translation,” but — “Better H.P.B. at second hand than not at all.” In this article H.P.B. addresses herself at length to the uninformed complaint that Theosophy is a revival of old superstitions and illusions of “magic,” pointing out that such critics know nothing of the lost science to which ancient philosophers referred in speaking of magic or theurgy. It was a part of her mission to restore respect for the knowledge of ancient wise men, and in this case she wrote with the twofold purpose of showing the strength of the ideas of these teachers of the past, while exposing the shallow misconceptions in scholarly opinions on such matters among nineteenth-century authorities.

Two other themes appear in this discussion. One is the need for development of an inner faculty of perception as the only sure means of dissipating ignorance, the other that the key to all true human growth lies in altruism and self-sacrifice. She replies also to strictures against “secrecy” by demonstrating that the distinction between exoteric and esoteric teachings has been common to the great religions and philosophies of the past, as protection and service to both teacher and learner.

The two “articles,” titled “World-Improvement or World-Deliverance” and “What Should We Do for our Fellow-Men?”, are reprinted from the “Correspondence” pages of *Lucifer* for July, 1889, and October, 1889. Dr. Hiibbe-Schleiden, editor of the *Sphinx*, to

whose criticisms Of “Le Phare de l’Inconnu” she re-, plied, was a German savant who had met H.P.B. through the Geb-hards. It would be difficult to find in all Theosophical literature a better illustration of the difference between the esoteric and the exoteric outlook, or to have a clearer warning against the misleading character of logical deductions made from inadequate or faulty premises. The contrast between these points of view makes the form of the interchange between H.P.B. and Hiibbe-Schleiden, while the core of the difference between them is H.P.B.’s uncompromising commitment to the altruism and service to all humanity affirmed in the First Object of the Theosophical Movement.

Dr. Hubbe-Schleiden’s remarks seem learned and plausible, but his bland confidence in what he says exhibits the habitual condescension of those who suppose that scholarly learning entitles them to “correct” an H.P.B. However, Hiibbe-Schleiden not only misreads the exoteric texts on which he relies, but has also accepted the interpretations of a Vasishtadwaita “Brahmin guru” whose views vary widely from both the esoteric teaching known to H.P.B. and the doctrines of the Adwaita school founded by Sankaracharya. The lesson for students of these replies by H.P.B. is the supreme importance of cleaving to the pure source of the Teachings. This is her unqualified example, to the point of remarking that having the “unbroken oral teachings revealed by living *divine* men” is better than even her own intuition, since “there is no *infallible* intuition.” Moreover, so far as the Buddhist *Sutras* available to Western Orientalists are concerned, “no Sanskrit or Pali scholar has so far understood that which is taught.”

LE PHARE DE L’INCONNU*

IT is written in an old book upon the Occult Sciences: “Gupta Vidya (Secret Science) is an attractive sea, but stormy and full of rocks. The navigator who risks himself thereon, if he be not wise and full of experience,¹ will be swallowed up, wrecked upon one of the thousand submerged reefs. Great billows, in colour like sapphires, rubies and emeralds, billows full of beauty and mystery will overtake him, ready to bear the voyager away towards other and numberless lights that burn in every direction. But these are will-o-the-wisps, lighted by the sons of Kaliya² for the destruction of those who thirst for life. Happy are they who remain blind to these false deceivers; more happy still those who never turn their eyes from the only true Beacon-light whose eternal flame burns in solitude in the depths of the water of the Sacred Science. Numberless are the pilgrims that desire to enter those waters; very few are the strong swimmers who reach the Light. He who gets there must have ceased to be a number, and have become *all numbers*. He must have forgotten the illusion of separation, and accept only the truth of collective individuality.³ He must “see with the ears, hear with the eyes,⁴ understand the language of the rainbow, and have concentrated his six senses in his seventh sense.”⁵

* “The Beacon-Light of the Unknown.”

¹ Acquired under a Guru.

² The great serpent conquered by Krishna and driven from the river Yanuma into the sea, where the Serpent Kaliya took for wife a kind of Siren, by whom he had a numerous family.

³ The illusion of the personality of the Ego, placed by our egotism in the first rank. In a word, it is necessary to assimilate the whole of humanity, live by it, for it, and in it; in other terms, cease to be “one,” and become “all” or the total.

⁴ A Vedic expression. The senses, counting in the two mystic senses, are seven in Occultism; but an Initiate does not separate these senses from each other, any more than he separates his unity from Humanity. Every sense contains all the others.

⁵ Symbology of colours. The Language of the prism, of which “the seven mother colours have each seven sons;” that is to say, forty-nine shades or “sons” between the seven, which graduated tints are so many letters or alphabetical characters. The language

The Beacon-light of Truth is Nature without the veil of the senses. It can be reached only when the adept has become absolute master of his personal self, able to control all his physical and psychic senses by the aid of his “seventh sense,” through which he is gifted also with the true wisdom of the gods—*Theo-sophia*.

Needless to say that the profane—the non-initiated, *outside the temple or pro-janes*,—judge of the “lights” and the “Light” above mentioned in a reversed sense. For them it is the Beacon-light of Occult truth which is the *Ignis fatuus*, the great will-o-the-wisp of human illusion and folly; and they regard all the others as marking beneficent sand banks, which stop in time those who are excitedly sailing on the sea of folly and superstition.

“Is it not enough,” say our kind critics, “that the world by dint of isms has arrived at *Theosophism*, which is nothing but transcendental humbuggery (fumisterie), without the latter offering further us a rechauffee of mediaeval magic, with its grand Sabbath and chronic hysteria?”

“Stop, stop, gentlemen. Do you know, when you talk like that, what *true* magic is, or the Occult Sciences? You have allowed yourselves in your schools to be stuffed full of the ‘diabolical sorcery’ of Simon the magician, and his disciple *Menander*; according to the good Father Ireneus, the too zealous Theodoret and the unknown author of *Philosophumena*. You have permitted yourselves to be told on the one hand that this magic came from the devil; and on the other hand that it was the result of imposture and fraud. Very well. But what do you know of the true nature of the system followed by Apolionius of Tyana, Iamblicus and other *magi*? And what is your opinion about the identity of the theurgy of Iamblicus with the ‘magic’ of the Simons and the Men-anders? Its true character is only half revealed by the author of the *book De Mysterus*⁶ Nevertheless his explanations sufficed to convert Porphyry, Plotinus, and others, who from enemies to the *esoteric theory* became its most fervent

of colours has, therefore, fifty-six letters for the Initiate. Of these letters each septenary is absorbed by the mother colour, as each of the seven mother colours is absorbed finally in the white ray, Divine Unity symbolized by these colours.

⁶ By Iamblicus, who used the name of his master, the Egyptian priest Abammon as a pseudonym.

adherents.” The reason is extremely simple.

True Magic, the theurgy of Iamblicus, is in its turn identical with the gnosis of Pythagoras, the *yvīwu r«v ivr*v*, the *science of things* which are, and with the divine ecstasy of the Philaletheans, “the lovers of Truth.” But, one can judge of the tree only by its fruits. Who are those who have witnessed to the divine character and the reality of that ecstasy which is called Samadhi in India?⁷

A long series of men, who, had they been Christians, would have been canonized,—not by the decision of the Church, which has its partialities and predilections, but by that of whole nations, and by the *vox populi*, which is hardly ever wrong in its judgments. There is, for instance, Ammonius Saccas, called the *Theo-didaktos*, “God-instructed”; the great master whose life was so chaste and so pure, that Plotinus, his pupil, had not the slightest hope of ever seeing any mortal comparable to him. Then there is this same Plotinus who was for Ammonius what Plato was for Socrates—a disciple worthy of his illustrious master. Then there is Porphyry, the pupil of Plotinus,⁸ the author of the biography of Pythagoras. Under the shadow of this divine gnosis, whose beneficent influence has extended to our own days, all the celebrated mystics of the later centuries have been developed, such as Jacob Boehme, Emanuel Swedenborg, and so many others. Madame Guyon is the feminine counterpart of Iamblicus. The Christian Quietists, the Mussulman Soufis, the Rosicrucians of all countries, drink the waters of that inexhaustible fountain—the Theosophy of the Neo-Platonists of the first centuries of the Christian Era. The gnosis preceded that era, for it was the direct continuation of the *Gupta Vidya* and of the Brahma-Vidya (“secret knowledge” and “knowledge of Brahma”) of ancient India, transmitted through Egypt; just as the theurgy of the Philaletheans was the continuation of the Egyptian mysteries. In any case, the point from which this “*diabolic*” magic starts, is the Supreme Divinity; its end and aim, the

⁷ Samadhi is a state of abstract contemplation, defined in Sanskrit terms that each require a whole sentence to explain them. It is a mental, or, rather, spiritual state, which is not dependent upon any perceptible object, and during which the subject, absorbed in the region of pure spirit, lives in the Divinity.

⁸ He lived in Rome for 28 years, and was so virtuous a man that it was considered an honour to have him as guardian for the orphans of the highest patricians. He died without having made an enemy during those 28 years.

union of the divine spark which animates man with the parent-flame, which is the Divine ALL.

This consummation is the *ultima thule* of those Theosophists, who devote themselves entirely to the service of humanity. Apart from these, others, who are not yet ready to sacrifice everything, may occupy themselves with the transcendental sciences, such as Mesmerism, and the modern phenomena under all their forms. They have the right to do so according to the clause which specifies as one of the objects of the Theosophical Society “the investigation of unexplained laws of nature and the psychic powers latent in man.”

The first named are not numerous,—complete altruism being a *vara avis* even among modern Theosophists. The other members are free to occupy themselves with whatever they like. Notwithstanding this, and in spite of the openness of our proceedings, in which there is nothing mysterious, we are constantly called upon to explain ourselves, and to satisfy the public that we do not celebrate witches’ Sabbaths, and manufacture broom-sticks for the use of Theosophists. This kind of thing, indeed, sometimes borders on the grotesque. When it is not of having invented a new “ism,” a religion extracted from the depths of a disordered brain, or else of humbugging that we are accused, it is of having exercised the arts of Circe upon men and beasts. Jests and satires fall upon the Theosophical Society thick as hail. Nevertheless it has stood unshaken during all the fourteen years during which that kind of thing has been going on: it is a “tough customer,” truly.

II

After all, critics who judge only by appearances are not altogether wrong. There is Theosophy and Theosophy: the true Theosophy of the *Theosophist*, and the Theosophy of a Fellow of the Society of that name. What does the world know of true Theosophy? How can it distinguish between that of a Plotinus, and that of the false brothers? And of the latter the Society possesses more than its share. The egoism, vanity and self-sufficiency of the majority of mortals is incredible. There are some for whom their little personality constitutes the whole universe, beyond which there is no salvation. Suggest to one of these that the alpha and omega of wisdom are not limited by

the circumference of his or her head, that his or her judgment could not be considered quite equal to that of Solomon, and straight away he or she accuses you of tfrt//—theosophy. You have been guilty of blasphemy against the spirit, which will not be pardoned in this century, nor in the next. These people say, “I am Theosophy,” as Louis XIV said “I am the State.” They speak of fraternity and of altruism and only care in reality for that for which no one else cares—themselves—in other words their little “me.” Their egoism makes them fancy that it is they only who represent the temple of Theosophy, and that in proclaiming themselves to the world they are proclaiming Theosophy. Alas! the doors and windows of that “temple” are no better than so many channels through which enter, but very seldom depart, the vices and illusions characteristic of egoistical mediocrities.

These people are the white ants of the Theosophical Society, which eat away its foundations, and are a perpetual menace to it. It is only when they leave it that it is possible to breathe freely.

It is not such as these that can ever give a correct idea of practical Theosophy, still less of the transcendental Theosophy which occupies the minds of a little group of the elect. Every one of us possesses the faculty, the interior sense, that is known by the name of *intuition*, but how rare are those who know how to develop it! It is, however, only by the aid of this faculty that men can ever see things in their true colours. It is an *instinct of the soul*, which grows in us in proportion to the employment we give it, and which helps us to perceive and understand the realities of things with far more certainty than can the simple use of our senses and exercise of our reason. What are called good sense and logic enable us to see only the appearances of things, that which is evident to every one. The *instinct* of which I speak, being a projection of our perceptive consciousness, a projection which acts from the subjective to the objective, and not *vice versa*, awakens in us spiritual senses and power to act; these senses assimilate to themselves the essence of the object or of the action under examination, and represent it to us as it really is, not as it appears to our physical senses and to our cold reason. “We begin with *instinct*, we end with omniscience,” says Professor A. Wilder, our oldest colleague. Iamblicus has described this faculty, and certain

Theosophists have been able to appreciate the truth of his description.

“There exists,” he says, “a faculty in the human mind which is immeasurably superior to all those which are grafted or engendered in us. By it we can attain to union with superior intelligences, finding ourselves raised above the scenes of this earthly life, and partaking of the higher existence and superhuman powers of the inhabitants of the celestial spheres. By this faculty we find ourselves liberated finally from the dominion of destiny (Karma), and we become, as it were, the arbiters of our own fates. For, when the most excellent parts in us find themselves filled with energy; and when our soul is lifted up towards essences higher than science, it can separate itself from the conditions which hold it in the bondage of every-day life; it exchanges its ordinary existence for another one, it renounces the conventional habits which belong to the external order of things, to give itself up to and mix itself with another order of things which reigns in that most elevated state of existence.”

Plato has expressed the same idea in two lines: “The light and spirit of the Divinity are the wings of the soul. They raise it to communion with the gods, above this earth, with which the spirit of man is too ready to soil itself. ... To become like the gods, is to become holy, just and wise. That is the end for which man was created, and that ought to be his aim in the acquisition of knowledge.”

This is true Theosophy, inner Theosophy, that of the soul. But followed with a selfish aim Theosophy changes its nature and becomes *demonosophy*. That is why Oriental wisdom teaches us that the Hindu *Yogi* who isolates himself in an impenetrable forest, like the Christian hermit who, as was common in former times, retires to the desert, are both of them nothing but accomplished egoists. The one acts with the sole idea of finding a nirvanic refuge against reincarnation; the other acts with the unique idea of saving his soul,—both of them think only of themselves. Their motive is altogether personal; for, even supposing they attain their end, are they not like cowardly soldiers, who desert from their regiment when it is going into action, in order to keep out of the way of the bullets?

In isolating themselves as they do, neither the *Yogi* nor the “Saint”

helps anyone but himself; on the contrary both show themselves profoundly indifferent to the fate of mankind whom they fly from and desert. Mount Athos⁹ contains, perhaps, a few sincere fanatics; nevertheless even these have without knowing it got off the only track that leads to the truth,—the path of Calvary, on which each one voluntarily bears the cross of humanity, and for humanity. In reality it is a nest of the coarsest kind of selfishness; and it is to such places that Adams' remark on monasteries applies: “There are solitary creatures there who seem to have fled from the rest of mankind for the sole pleasure of communing with the Devil *tete-a-tete*.”

Gautama, the Buddha, only remained in solitude long enough to enable him to arrive at the truth, which he devoted himself from that time on to promulgate, begging his bread, and living for humanity. Jesus retired to the desert only for forty days, and died for this same humanity. Apollonius of Tyana, Plotinus, Iamblicus, while leading lives of singular abstinence, almost of asceticism, lived in the world and *for* the world. The greatest ascetics and *saints* of our days are not those who retire into inaccessible places, but those who pass their lives in travelling from place to place, doing good and trying to raise mankind; although, indeed, they may avoid Europe, and those civilized countries where no one has any eyes or ears except for himself, countries divided into two camps—of Cains and Abels.

Those who regard the human soul as an emanation of the Deity, as a particle or ray of the universal and ABSOLUTE soul, understand the parable of the *Talents* better than do the Christians. He who hides in the earth the *talent* which has been given him by his “Lord,” will lose that talent, as the ascetic loses it, who takes it into his head to “save his soul” in egoistical solitude. The “good and faithful servant” who doubles his capital, by harvesting for *him who has not sown*, because he had not the means of doing so, and who reaps for the poor who have not scattered the grain, acts like a true altruist. He will receive his recompense, just because he has worked for another, without any idea of remuneration or reward. That man is the altruistic Theosophist, while the other is an egoist and a coward.

⁹ A celebrated Grecian monastery.

The Beacon-light upon which the eyes of all real Theosophists are fixed is the same towards which in all ages the imprisoned human soul has struggled. This Beacon, whose light shines upon no earthly seas, but which has mirrored itself in the sombre depths of the primordial waters of infinite space, is called by us, as by the earliest Theosophists, "Divine Wisdom." That is the last word of the esoteric doctrine; and, in antiquity, where was the country, having the right to call itself civilized, that did not possess a double system of WISDOM, of which one part was for the masses, and the other for the few,—the exoteric and the esoteric? This name, WISDOM, or, as we say sometimes, the "Wisdom Religion" or *Theosophy*, is as old as the human mind. The title of *Sages*—the priests of this worship of truth—was its first derivative. These names were afterwards transformed into *philosophy*, and *philosophers*—the "lovers of science" or of wisdom. It is to Pythagoras that we owe that name, as also that of *gnosis*, the system of $\wedge yvw < ns r > v *vrwv$ "the knowledge of things as they are," or of the essence that is hidden beneath the external appearances. Under that name, so noble and so correct in its definition, all the masters of antiquity designated the aggregate of our knowledge of things human and divine. The sages and *Brachmdnes* of India, the magi of Chaldea and Persia, the hierophants of Egypt and Arabia, the prophets or *Nabi* of Judea and of IsraeJ, as well as the philosophers of Greece and Rome, have always classified that science in two divisions—the *esoteric*, or the true, and the *exoteric*, disguised in symbols. To this day the Jewish Rabbis give the name of *Mer-cabah* to the body or vehicle of their religious system, that which contains within it the higher knowledge, accessible only to the initiates, and of which higher knowledge it is only the husk.

We are accused of mystery, and we are reproached with making a secret of the higher Theosophy. We confess that the doctrine which we call *gupta vidya* (secret science) is only for the few. But where were the masters in ancient times who did not keep their teachings secret, for fear they would be profaned? From Orpheus and Zoroaster, Pythagoras and Plato, down to the Rosicrucians, and to the more modern Free-Masons, it has been the invariable rule that the disciple must gain the confidence of the master before receiving from him the

supreme and final word. The most ancient religions have always had their greater and lesser mysteries. The neophytes and catechumens took an inviolable oath before they were accepted. The Essenes of Judea and Mount Carmel required the same thing. The *Nabi* and the *Nazars* (the "separated ones" of Israel), like the lay *Chelas* and the *Brahm&charyas* of India, differed greatly from each other. The former could, and can, be married and remain in the world, while they are studying the sacred writings up to a certain point; the latter, the Nazars and the Brahmacharyas, have always been entirely vowed to the mysteries of initiation. The great schools of Esotericism were international, although exclusive, as is proved by the fact that Plato, Herodotus and others, went to Egypt to be initiated; while Pythagoras, after visiting the Brahmins of India, stopped at an Egyptian sanctuary, and finally was received, according to Iamblicus, at Mount Carmel. Jesus followed the traditional custom, and justified his reticence by quoting the well known precept:

Give not the sacred things to the dogs,
Cast not your pearls before the swine,
Lest these tread them under their feet,
And lest the dogs turn and rend you.

Certain ancient writings—known, for that matter, to the bibliophiles—personify WISDOM; which they represent as emanating from *Ain-Soph*, the Parabrahm of the Jewish Kabbalists, and make it the associate and companion of the manifested Deity. Thence its sacred character with every people. Wisdom is inseparable from divinity. Thus we have the Vedas coming from the mouth of the Hindu "Brahma" (the *logos*); the name Buddha comes from Budha, "Wisdom," divine intelligence; the Babylonian *Nebo*, the *Thot* of Memphis, *Hermes* of the Greeks, were all gods of esoteric wisdom.

The Greek Athena, Metis and Neitha of the Egyptians, are the prototypes of Sophia-Achamoth, the feminine wisdom of the Gnostics. The Samaritan *Pentateuch* calls the book of Genesis *Akamauth*, or "Wisdom," as also two fragments of very ancient manuscripts, "the Wisdom of Solomon," and "the Wisdom of *Iasous* (Jesus)." The book called *Mashalim* or "Sayings and Proverbs of Solomon," personifies Wisdom by calling it "the helper of the (Logos) creator," in the following

terms, (literally translated):

I(o)HV(e)H-* possessed me from the beginning.
 But the first emanation in the eternities,
 I appeared from all antiquity, the primordial.—
 From the first day of the earth;
 I was born before the great abyss.
 And when there were neither springs nor waters,
 When he traced the circle on the face of the deep,
 I was with him Amun.
 I was his delight, day by day.

This is exoteric, like all that has reference to the personal gods of the nations. The INFINITE cannot be known to our reason, which can only distinguish and define;—but we can always conceive the abstract idea thereof, thanks to that faculty higher than our reason,—*intuition*, or the spiritual instinct of which I have spoken. Only the great initiates, who have the rare power of throwing themselves into the state of Samadhi,—which can be but imperfectly translated by the word *ecstasy*, a state in which one ceases to be the conditioned and personal “I,” and becomes one with the ALL,—only those can boast of having been in contact with the *infinite*: but no more than other mortals can they describe that state in words.

These few characteristics of *true* theosophy and of its practice, have been sketched for the small number of our readers who are gifted with the desired intuition.

III

Do our benevolent critics always know what they are laughing at? Have they the smallest idea of the work which is being performed in the world and the mental changes that are being brought about by that Theosophy at which they smile? The progress already due to our literature is evident, and, thanks to the untiring labours of a certain number of Theosophists, it is becoming recognized even by the blindest. There are not a few who are persuaded that Theosophy will be the

* JHVH, or Jahveh (Jehovah) is the Tetragrammaton, consequently the Emanated Logos and the creator; the ALL, without beginning or end,—AIN-SOPH—not being able to create, nor wishing to create, in its quality of the ABSOLUTE.

philosophy and the law, if not the religion of the future. The party of reaction, captivated by the *dolce jar niente* of conservatism, feel all this, hence come the hatred and persecution which call in criticism to their aid. But criticism, inaugurated by Aristotle, has fallen far away from its primitive standard. The ancient philosophers, those sublime ignoramuses as regards modern civilization, when they criticised a system or a work, did so with impartiality, and with the sole object of amending and improving that with which they found fault. First they studied the subject, and then they analyzed it. It was a service rendered, and was recognized and accepted as such by both parties. Does modern criticism always conform to that golden rule? It is very evident that it does not.

Our judges of today are far below the level even of the philosophical criticism of Kant. Criticism, which takes unpopularity and prejudice for its canons, has replaced that of “pure reason” and the critic ends by tearing to pieces with his teeth everything he does not comprehend, and especially whatever he does not care in the least to understand. In the last century—the golden age of the goose-quill—criticism was biting enough sometimes; but still it did justice. Caesar’s wife might be suspected, but she was never condemned without being heard in her defence. In our century Montyon prizes¹⁰ and public statues are for him who invents the most murderous engine of war; today, when the steel pen has replaced its more humble predecessor, the fangs of the Bengal tiger or the teeth of the terrible saurian of the Nile would make wounds less cruel and less deep than does the steel nib (*bee*) of the modern critic, who is almost always absolutely ignorant of that which he tears so thoroughly to pieces.

It is some consolation, perhaps, to know that the majority of our literary critics, trans-atlantic and continental, are ex-scribblers who have made a fiasco in literature, and are revenging themselves now for their mediocrity upon everything they come across. The small blue wine, insipid and doctored, almost always turns into very strong vinegar. Unfortunately the reporters of the press in general—hungry poor devils whom we would be sorry to grudge the little they make,

¹⁰ Prizes instituted in France during the last century by the Baron de Montyon for those who, in various ways, benefitted their fellow mtn.—Ed.

even at our expense—are not our only or our most dangerous critics. The bigots and the materialists—the sheep and goats of religions—having placed us in turn in their *index expurgatorius*, our books are banished from their libraries, our journals are boycotted, and ourselves subjected to the most complete ostracism. One pious soul, who accepts literally the miracles of the Bible, following with emotion the ichthyographical investigations of Jonas in the whale's belly, or the trans-ethereal journey of Elias, when like a salamander he flew off in his chariot of fire, nevertheless regards the Theosophists as wonder-mongers and cheats. Another—*dme damnee* of Haeckel,—while he displays a credulity as blind as that of the bigot in his belief in the evolution of man and the gorilla from a common ancestor (considering the total absence of every trace in nature of any connecting link whatever), nearly dies with laughing when he finds that his neighbour believes in occult phenomena and psychic manifestations. Nevertheless, neither the bigot nor the man of science, nor even the academician, counted among the number of the “Immortals,” can explain to us the smallest of the problems of existence. The metaphysicians who for centuries have studied the phenomena of being in their first principles, and who smile pityingly when they listen to the wanderings of Theosophy, would be greatly embarrassed to explain to us the philosophy or even the cause of dreams. Which of them can tell us why all the mental operations,—except reasoning, which faculty alone finds itself suspended and paralysed,—go on while we dream with as much activity and energy as when we are awake? The disciple of Herbert Spencer would send anyone to the biologist who squarely asked him that question. But he, for whom digestion is the *alpha* and *omega* of every dream,—like hysteria, that great Proteus with a thousand forms, which is present in every psychic phenomenon—can by no means satisfy us. Indigestion and hysteria are, in fact, twin sisters, two goddesses, to whom the modern psychologist has raised an altar at which he has constituted himself the officiating priest. But this is his business so long as he does not meddle with the gods of his neighbours.

From all this it follows that, since the Christian characterises Theosophy as the “accursed science” and the forbidden fruit; since

the man of science sees nothing in metaphysics but “the domain of the crazy poet” (Tyndall); since the “reporter” touches it only with poisoned forceps; and since the missionaries associate it with idolatry and ‘Hhe benighted Hindu,’—it follows, we say, that poor *Theosophia* is as shamefully treated as she was when the ancients caHed her the TRUTH,—while they relegated her to the bottom of a well. Even the “Christian” Kabbalists, who love so much to mirror themselves in the dark waters of this deep well, although they see nothing there but the reflection of their own faces, which they mistake for that of the Truth,—even the Kabbalists make war upon us. Nevertheless, all that is no reason why Theosophy should have nothing to say in its own defence, and in its favour; or that it should cease to assert its right to be listened to, or why its loyal and faithful servants should neglect their duty by acknowledging themselves beaten.

“The accursed science,” you say, good Ultramontanes? You should remember, nevertheless, that the tree of science is grafted on the tree of life. That the fruit which you declare “forbidden,” and which you have proclaimed for sixteen centuries to be the cause of the original sin that brought death into the world,—that this fruit, whose flower blossoms on an immortal stem, was nourished by that same trunk, and that therefore it is the only fruit which can insure us immortality. You also, good Kabbalists, ignore,—or wish to ignore,—that the allegory of the earthly paradise is as old as the world, and that the tree, the fruit and the sin had once a far profounder and more philosophic signification than they have today,—when the secrets of initiation are lost.

Protestantism and Ultramontanism are opposed to Theosophy, just as they are opposed to everything not emanating from themselves; as Calvinism opposed the replacing of its two fetishes, the Jewish Bible and Sabbath* by the Gospel and the Christian Sunday; as Rome opposed secular education and Free-masonry. Dead-letter and theocracy have, however, had their day. The world must move and advance under penalty of stagnation and death. Mental evolution progresses *pari passu* with physical evolution, and both advance towards the ONE TRUTH,—which is the heart of the system of Humanity, as evolution is the blood. Let the circulation stop for one

moment and the heart stops at the same time, and it is all up with the human machine! And it is the servants of Christ who wish to kill, or at least paralyze, the Truth by the blows of a club which is called “the letter that lolls!” But the end is nigh. That which Coleridge said of political despotism applies also to religious. The Church, unless she withdraws her heavy hand, which weighs like a nightmare on the oppressed bosoms of millions of believers whether they resent it or not, and whose reason remains paralyzed in the clutch of superstition, the ritualistic Church is sentenced *to give up its place to Religion* and—to die. Soon it will have but a choice. For once the people become enlightened about the truth which it hides with so much care, one of two things will happen, the Church will either perish *by* the people; or else, if the masses are left in ignorance and in slavery to the dead letter, it will perish *with* the people. Will the servants of eternal Truth,—out of which Truth they have made a squirrel that runs round an ecclesiastical wheel,—will they show themselves sufficiently *altruistic* to choose the first of these alternative necessities? Who knows!

I say it again; it is only theosophy, well understood, that can save the world from despair, by reproducing social and religious reform—a task once before accomplished in history, by Gautama, the Buddha: a peaceful reform, without one drop of blood spilt, each one remaining in the faith of his fathers if he so chooses. To do this he will only have to reject the parasitic plants of human fabrication, which at the present moment are choking all religions and churches in the world. Let him accept but the essence, which is the same in all: that is to say< the spirit which gives life to man in whom it resides, and renders him immortal. Let every man inclined to go on find his ideal,—a star before him to guide him. Let him follow it, without ever deviating from his path; and he is almost certain to reach the Beacon-light of life—the TRUTH: no matter whether he seeks for and finds it at the bottom of a cradle or of a well.

IV

Laugh, then, at the science of sciences without knowing the first word of it! We will be told, perhaps, that such is the literary right of our critics. With all my heart. If people always talked about what they understood, they would only say things that are true, and—that would

not always be so amusing. When I read the criticisms now written on Theosophy, the platitudes and the stupid ridicule employed against the most grandiose and sublime philosophy in the world,—one of whose aspects only is found in the noble ethics of Philalethes,—I ask myself whether the Academies of any country have ever understood the Theosophy of the Philosophers of Alexandria better than they understood us now? What does any one know, what can he know, of Universal Theosophy, unless he has studied under the masters of wisdom? and understanding so little of Iamblicus, Plotinus and even Proclus, that is to say, of the Theosophy of the third and fourth centuries, people yet pride themselves upon delivering judgment on the Neo-Theosophy of the nineteenth!

Theosophy, we say, comes to us from the extreme East, as did the Theosophy of Plotinus and Iamblicus and even the mysteries of ancient Egypt. Do not Homer and Herodotus tell us, in fact, that the ancient Egyptians were “Ethiopians of the East,” *who came from Lanka or Ceylon*, according to their descriptions? For it is generally acknowledged that the people whom those two authors call *Ethiopians of the East* were no other than a colony of very dark skinned Aryans, the Dravidians of Southern India, who took an already existing civilization with them to Egypt. This migration occurred during the prehistoric ages which Baron Bunsen calls *pre-Menite* (before Menes) but which ages have a history of their own, to be found in the ancient annals of Kalouka Batta. Besides, and apart from the esoteric teachings, which are not divulged to a mocking public, the historical researches of Colonel Vans Kennedy, the great rival in India of Dr. Wilson as a Sanskritist, show us that pre-Assyrian Babylonia was the home of Brahmanism, and of the Sanskrit as a sacerdotal language. We know also, if Exodus is to be believed, that Egypt had, long before the time of Moses, its diviner, its hierophants and its magicians, that is to say, before the XIX dynasty. Finally Brugsh Bey sees in many of the gods of Egypt, immigrants from beyond the Red Sea—and the great waters of the Indian Ocean.

Whether that be so or not, Theosophy is a descendant in direct line of the great tree of universal GNOSIS, a tree the luxuriant branches of which, spreading over the whole earth like a great canopy, gave

shelter at one epoch—which biblical chronology is pleased to call “antediluvian”—to all the temples and to all the nations of the earth. That gnosis represents the aggregate of all the sciences, the accumulated wisdom (savoir) of all the gods and demi-gods incarnated in former times upon the earth. There are some who would like to see in these, the fallen angels and the enemy of mankind; these sons of God who, seeing that the daughters of men were beautiful, took them for wives and imparted to them the secrets of heaven and earth. Let them think so. We believe in Avatars and in divine dynasties, in the epoch when there were, in fact, “giants upon the earth,” but we altogether repudiate the idea of “fallen angels” and of Satan and his army.

“What then is your religion or your belief?” we are asked. “What is your favourite study?”

“The TRUTH” we reply. The truth wherever we can find it; for, like Ammonius Saccas, our greatest ambition would be to reconcile the different religious systems, to help each one to find the truth in his own religion, while obliging him to recognize it in that of his neighbour. What does the name signify if the thing itself is essentially the same? Plotinus, Iamblicus and Apollonius of Tyana, had all three, it is said, the wonderful gifts of prophecy, of clairvoyance, and of healing, although belonging to three different schools. Prophecy was an art that was cultivated by the Essenes and the *B’ni Nebim* among the Jews, as well as by the priests of the pagan oracles. Plotinus’s disciples attributed miraculous powers to their master; Philostratus has claimed the same for Apollonius while Iamblicus had the reputation of surpassing all the other Eclectics in Theosophic theurgy. Ammonius declared that all moral and practical WISDOM was contained in the books of Thoth or Hermes Trismegistus. But Thoth means “a college,” school or assembly, and the works of that name, according to the *Theodidactos*, were identical with the doctrines of the sages of the extreme East. If Pythagoras acquired his knowledge in India (when even now he is mentioned in old manuscripts under the name of Yavanacharya,¹¹ the Greek Master), Plato gained his from the books

of Thoth-Hermes. How it happened that the younger Hermes, the god of the shepherds, surnamed “the good shepherd,” who presided over divination and clairvoyance became identical with Thoth (or Thot) the deified sage, and the author of the *Book of the Dead*,—the esoteric doctrine only can reveal to Orientalists.

Every country has had its saviours. He who dissipates the darkness of ignorance by the help of the torch of science, thus discovering to us the truth, deserves that title as a mark of our gratitude quite as much as he who saves us from death by healing our bodies. Such an one awakens in our benumbed souls the faculty of distinguishing the true from the false, by kindling a divine flame, hitherto absent, and he has the right to our grateful worship, for he has become our creator. What matters the name or the symbol that personifies the abstract idea, if that idea is always the same and is true! Whether the concrete symbol bears one title or another, whether the saviour in whom we believe has for an earthly name Krishna, Buddha, Jesus or Esculapius,—also called “the saviour god” *l’Arnp*, —we have but to remember one thing: symbols of divine truths were not invented for the amusement of the ignorant; they are the *alpha* and *omega* of philosophic thought.

Theosophy being the way that leads to truth, in every religion, as in every science, occultism is, so to say, the touchstone and universal solvent. It is the thread of Ariadne given by the master to the disciple who ventures into the labyrinth of the mysteries of being; the torch that lights him through the dangerous maze of life, for ever the enigma of the Sphinx. But the light thrown by this torch can be discerned only by the eye of the awakened soul—by our spiritual senses; it blinds the eye of the materialist as the sun blinds that of the owl.

Having neither dogma nor ritual,—these two being but fetters, the material body which suffocates the soul,—we do not employ the “ceremonial magic” of the Western Kabalists; we know its dangers too well to have anything to do with it. In the T. S. every Fellow is at liberty to study what he pleases, provided he does not venture into unknown paths which would of a certainty lead him to *black magic*,—the sorcery against which Eliphas Levi so openly warned the public.

¹¹ A term which comes from the words Yavana or “the Ionian.” and acharya, “professor or master.”

The occult sciences are dangerous for him who understands them imperfectly. Any one who gave himself up to their practice by himself, would run the risk of becoming insane; and those who study them would do well to unite in little groups of from three to seven. These groups ought to be uneven in numbers in order to have more power; a group, however little cohesion it possesses, forming a single united body, wherein the senses and perceptions of those who work together complement and mutually help each other, one member supplying to another the quality in which he is wanting,—such a group will always end by becoming a perfect and invincible body. “Union is strength.” The moral of the fable of the old man bequeathing to his sons a bundle of sticks which were never to be separated is a truth which will forever remain axiomatic.

V

“The disciples (Lanous) of the law of the Heart of Diamant (magic) will help each other in their lessons. The grammarian will be at the service of him who looks for the soul of the metals (chemist)” etc.—(Catechism of the *Gupta-Vidja*).

The ignorant would laugh if they were told that in the Occult sciences, the alchemist can be useful to the philologist and *vice versa*. They would understand the matter better, perhaps, if they were told that by this substantive (grammarian or philologist), we mean to designate one who makes a study of the universal language of corresponding symbols, although only the members of the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society can understand clearly what the term “philologist” means in that sense. All things in nature have correspondences and are mutually interdependent. In its abstract sense, Theosophy is the white ray, from which arise the seven colours of the solar spectrum, each human being assimilating one of these rays to a greater degree than the other six. It follows that seven persons, each imbued with his special ray, can help each other mutually. Having at their service the septenary bundle of rays, they have the seven forces of nature at their command. But it follows also that, to reach that end, the choosing of the seven persons who are to form a group, should be left to an expert,—to an initiate in the science of occult rays.

But we are here upon dangerous ground, where the Sphinx of esotericism runs the risk of being accused of mystification. Still, orthodox science furnishes a proof of the truth of what we say, and we find a corroboration in physical and materialistic astronomy. The sun is one, and its light shines for every one; it warms the ignorant as well as the astronomers. As to the hypotheses about our luminary, its constitution and nature,—their name is *legion*. Not one of these hypotheses contains the whole truth, or even an approximation to it. Frequently they are only fictions soon to be replaced by others. For it is to scientific theories more than to anything else in this world below that the lines of Malherbe are applicable:

. . . Et rose, elle a vecu ce que vivent les roses,
L'espace d'un matin.

Nevertheless, whether they adorn or not the altar of Science, each of these theories may contain a fragment of truth. Selected, compared, analysed, pieced together, all these hypotheses may one day supply an astronomical axiom, a fact in nature, instead of a chimera in the scientific brain.

This is far from meaning that we accept as an increment of truth every axiom accepted as true by the Academies. For instance, in the evolution and phantasmagorical transformations of the sun spots,—Nasmyth's theory at the present moment,—Sir John Herschell began by seeing in them the inhabitants of the sun, beautiful and gigantic angels. William Herschell, maintaining a prudent silence about these celestial salamanders, shared the opinion of the elder Herschell, that the solar globe was nothing but a beautiful metaphor, a *maya*—thus announcing an occult axiom. The sun spots have found a Darwin in the person of every astronomer of any eminence. They were taken successively for planetary spirits, solar mortals, columns of volcanic smoke (engendered, one must think, in brains academical), opaque clouds, and finally for shadows in the shape of the leaves of the willow tree, (“willow leaf theory”). At the present day the sun is degraded. According to men of science it is nothing but a gigantic coal, still aglow, but prepared to go out in the grate of our solar system.

Even so with the speculations published by Fellows of the Theosophical Society, when the authors of these, although they belong

to the Theosophical fraternity, have never studied the true esoteric doctrines. These speculations can never be other than hypotheses, no more than coloured with a ray of truth, enveloped in a chaos of fancy and sometimes of unreason. By selecting them from the heap and placing them side by side, one succeeds, nevertheless, in extracting a philosophic truth from these ideas. For, let it be well understood, theosophy has this in common with ordinary science, that it examines the reverse side of every apparent truth. It tests and analyses every fact put forward by physical science, looking only for the essence and the ultimate and occult constitution in every cosmical or physical manifestation, whether in the domain of ethics, intellect, or matter. In a word, Theosophy begins its researches where materialists finish theirs.

“It is then metaphysics that you offer us!” it may be objected, “Why not say so at once.”

No, it is not metaphysics, as that term is generally understood, although it plays that part sometimes. The speculations of Kant, of Leibnitz, and of Schopenhauer belong to the domain of metaphysics, as also those of Herbert Spencer. Still, when one studies the latter, one cannot help dreaming of Dame Metaphysics figuring at a *bal masque* of the Academical Sciences, adorned with a false nose. The metaphysics of Kant and of Leibnitz—as proved by his monads—is above the metaphysics of our days, as a balloon in the clouds is above a pumpkin in the field below. Nevertheless this balloon, however much better it may be than the pumpkin, is too artificial to serve as a vehicle for the truth of the occult sciences. The latter is, perhaps, a goddess too freely uncovered to suit the taste of our savants, so modest. The metaphysics of Kant taught its author, without the help of the present methods or perfected instruments, the identity of the constitution and essence of the sun and the planets; and Kant *affirmed*, when the best astronomers, even during the first half of this century, still *denied*. But this same metaphysics did not succeed in proving to him the true nature of that essence, any more than it has helped modern physics, notwithstanding its noisy hypotheses, to discover that true nature.

Theosophy, therefore, or rather the occult sciences it studies, is

something more than simple metaphysics. It is, if I may be allowed to use the double terms, mete-metaphysics, *meta-geomt-try*, etc., etc., or a universal transcendentalism. Theosophy rejects the testimony of the physical senses entirely, if the latter be not based upon that afforded by the psychic and spiritual perceptions^ Even in the case of the most highly developed clairvoyance and clairaudience, the *final* testimony of both must be rejected, unless by those terms is signified the *«ro* of Iamblicus, or the ecstatic illumination, the *Ay^r) pavreia* of Plotinus and of Porphyry. The same holds good for the physical sciences; the evidence of the reason upon the terrestrial plane, like that of our five senses, should receive the imprimatur of the sixth and seventh senses of the divine ego, before a fact can be accepted by the true occultist.

Official science hears what we say and—laughs. We read its “reports,” we behold the apotheoses of its self-styled progress, of its great discoveries,—more than one of which, while enriching the more a small number of those already wealthy, have plunged millions of the poor into still more terrible misery—and we leave it to its own devices. But, finding that physical science has not made a step towards the knowledge of the real nature and constitution of matter since the days of Anaximenes and the Ionian school, we laugh in our turn.

In that direction, the best work has been done and the most valuable scientific discoveries of this century have, without contradiction, been made by the great chemist Mr. William Crookes.¹² In his particular case, a remarkable intuition of occult truth has been of more service to him than all his great knowledge of physical science. It is certain that neither scientific methods, nor official routine, have helped him much in his discovery of radiant matter, or in his researches into *protyle*, or primordial matter.¹³

VI

That which the Theosophists who hold to orthodox and official science try to accomplish in their own domain, the Occultists or the Theosophists of the “inner group” study according to the method of

¹² Member of the Executive Council of the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society, and President of the Chemical Society of Great Britain.

¹³ The homogeneous, non-differentiated element which he calls meta-element.

the esoteric school. If up to the present this method has demonstrated its superiority only to its students, that is to say, to those who have pledged themselves by oath not to reveal it, that circumstance proves nothing against it. Not only have the terms *magic* and *theurgy* been never even approximately understood, but even the name *Theosophy* has been disfigured. The definitions thereof which are given in dictionaries and encyclopaedias are as absurd as they are grotesque. Webster, for instance, in explanation of the word *Theosophy* assures his readers that it is “a direct connection or communication with God and superior spirits”; and, further on, that it is “the attainment of *superhuman* and *supernatural* knowledge and powers by *physical processes*(!?) as by the theurgic operations of some ancient Platonists, or by the chemical processes of the German fire philosophers.” This is nonsensical verbiage. It is precisely as if we were to say that it is possible to transform a crazy brain into one of the calibre of Newton’s, and to develop in it a genius for mathematics by riding five miles every day upon a wooden horse.

Theosophy is synonymous with *Gnand-Vidya*, and with the *Brahmd-Vidya*¹⁴ of the Hindus, and again with the *Dzyan* of the trans-Himalayan adepts, the science of the *true* Raj-Yogas, who are much more accessible than one thinks. This science has many schools in the East. But its offshoots are still more numerous, each one having ended by separating itself from the parent stem,—the true Archaic Wisdom,—and varying in its form.

But, while these forms varied, departing further with each generation from the light of truth, the basis of initiatory truths remained always the same. The symbols used to express the same idea may differ, but in their hidden sense they always do express the same idea. Ragon, the most erudite mason of all the “Widow’s sons,” has said the same. There exists a sacerdotal language, the “mystery language,” and unless one knows it well, he cannot go far in the occult sciences. According to Ragon “to build or found a town” meant the same thing as to “found a religion”; therefore, that phrase when it occurs in Homer is equivalent to the expression in the Brahmins, to

¹⁴ The meaning of the word *Vidya* can only be rendered by the Greek term *Gnosis*, the knowledge of hidden and spiritual things; or again, the knowledge of *Brahm*, that is to say, of the God that contains all the gods.

distribute the “Soma juice.” It means, “to found an esoteric school,” not “a religion” as Ragon pretends. Was he mistaken? We do not think so. But as a Theosophist belonging to the esoteric section dare not tell to an ordinary member of the Theosophical Society the things about which he has promised to keep silent, so Ragon found himself obliged to divulge merely relative truths to his pupils. Still, it is certain that he had made at least an elementary study of “THE MYSTERY LANGUAGE.”

“How can one learn this language?” we may be asked. We reply: study all religions and compare them with one another. To learn thoroughly requires a teacher, a *guru*; to succeed by oneself needs more than genius: it demands inspiration like that of Ammonius Saccas. Encouraged in the Church by Clement of Alexandria and by Athenagoras, protected by the learned men of the synagogue and of the academy, and adored by the Gentiles, “he learned the *language of the mysteries* by teaching the common origin of all religions, and a common religion.” To do this, he had only to teach according to the ancient canons of Hermes which Plato and Pythagoras had studied so well, and from which they drew their respective philosophies. Can we be surprised if, finding in the first verses of the gospel according to St. John the same doctrines that are contained in the three systems of philosophy above mentioned, he concluded with every show of reason that the intention of the great Nazarene was to restore the sublime science of ancient wisdom in all its primitive integrity? We think as did Ammonius. The biblical narrations and the histories of the gods have only two possible explanations: either they are great and profound allegories, illustrating universal truths, or else they are fables of no use but to put the ignorant to sleep.

Therefore the allegories,—Jewish as well as Pagan,—contain all the truths that can only be understood by him who knows the mystical language of antiquity. Let us see what is said on this subject by one of our most distinguished Theosophists, a fervent Platonist and a Hebraist, who knows his Greek and Latin like his mother tongue, Professor Alexander Wilder,¹⁵ of New York:

¹⁵ The first Vice-President of the Theosophical Society when it was founded.

The root idea of the Neo-Platonists was the existence of one only and supreme Essence. This was the *Diu*, or “Lord of the Heavens” of the Aryan nations, identical with the law (*Iao*) of the Chaldeans and Hebrews, the *Iabe* of the Samaritans, the *Tiu* or *Tuiseo* of the Norwegians, the *Duw* of the ancient tribes of Britain, the *Zeus* of those of Thrace, and the *Jupiter* of the Romans. It was the *Being*—(non-Being), the *Facit*, one and supreme. It is from it that all other beings proceeded *by emanation*. The moderns have, it seems, substituted for this their theory of *evolution*. Perchance some day a wiser man than they will combine these systems in a single one. The names of these different divinities seem often to have been invented with little or no regard to their etymological meaning, but chiefly on account of some particular mystical signification attached to the numerical value of the letters employed in their orthography.

This *numerical* signification is one of the branches of the *mystery language*, or the ancient sacerdotal language. This was taught in the “Lesser Mysteries,” but the language itself was reserved for the high initiates alone. The candidate must have come victorious out of the terrible trials of the Greater Mysteries before receiving instruction in it. That is why Ammonius Saccas, like Pythagoras, obliged his disciples to take an oath never to divulge the higher doctrines to any one to whom the preliminary ones had not already been imparted, and who, therefore, was not ready for initiation. Another sage, who preceded him by three centuries, did the same by his disciples, in saying to them that he spoke “in similes” (or parables) “because to you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given . . . because in seeing they see not, and in hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.”

Therefore the “Similes” employed by Jesus were part of the “language of the mysteries,” the sacerdotal tongue of the initiates. Rome has lost the key to it: by rejecting theosophy and pronouncing her anathema against the occult sciences,—she loses it for ever.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

WORLD-IMPROVEMENT OR WORLD-DELIVERANCE

CORRESPONDENCE

You yourself must make an effort. The Tathagatas are only preachers.—
If a man find no prudent companion, let him walk alone like a king who has left his conquered country behind. It is better to live alone; there is no companionship with the *fools*. Let a man walk alone; let him commit no sin, with few wishes—like an elephant in the forest.

Dhammapada: 61, 276, 329, 330
Sutta Nipata.l. 3, § § 12 and 13

To the Editor of LUCIFER

AVERY important paragraph which you wrote in No. 3 of your “Revue Theosophique,” published in Paris, May 21st, 1889 (pp. 6 and 7), has caused very serious doubts in the minds of some of your readers in Germany—doubts, probably caused by our misunderstanding you or by your shortness of expression. Will you permit me to state our view of the case, and will you have the kindness to give us on this basis your opinion of it publicly, perhaps in LUCIFER?

You were speaking of Indian “yogis” and European “saints” and said:

La sagesse orientale¹ nous apprend que le *yogi* Indou qui s’isole dans un foret impenetrable, ainsi que *Vhermite* Chretien qui se retire, comme aux temps jadis le desert, ne sont tous deux que des egoistes accomplis. L’un, agit dans l’unique but de trouver dans Tessence une et nirvanique refuge contre la reincarnation; l’autre, dans le but de sauver son ame, —tous les deux ne pensent qu’a eux-memes. Leur motif est tout *personnel*; car, en admettant qu’ils atteignent le but, ne sont-ils pas comme le soldat poltron, qui deserte / *armee* au moment de Taction, pour se preserver des balles? En s’isolant ainsi, ni le *yogi*, ni le “*saint*,” n’aident personne autre qu’eux-

memes; ils se montrent, par centre, *profondement indifferents* au sort de *rhumanite* qu'ils fuient et *desertent*.

[The Eastern Wisdom¹ teaches us that the Indian *yogi* who retires to the jungle, as well as the Christian *hermit* who used to repair to the desert are, both of them, simply perfect egotists. The one is moved solely by the hope of finding in the Nirvanic state an escape from reincarnation; the other acts but to save his own soul—neither of them has a thought but for himself. The motive is purely *personal*, for, even admitting that they achieve their object, are they not the same as the cowardly soldier who deserts the *army* at the moment of battle in order to save himself from shot and shell? In thus isolating themselves, neither *yogi* nor “*saint*” benefits anyone but himself; on the contrary, they show themselves to be *utterly indifferent* to the fate of the *humanity* they *avoient* and *desert*.]

You do not plainly say what you expect a true sage to do; but further on you refer to our Lord, the Buddha, and to what *He* did. We readily accept His example as well as His teachings for our ideal rule; but from those stanzas I have quoted above, it appears, that what he expected his disciples to do, does not quite agree with what you seem to expect from them.²

(²) The editor of LUCIFER and the *Revue Theosophique*, pleads guilty to an omission. She ought to have qualified, “la sagesse Orientale” by adding the adjective ‘*esoterique*.’

(²) The Western disciples and followers of the Lord Buddha’s ethics lay very little stress on the dead letter (and often fanciful) translations of Buddhist *Sutras* by European Orientalists. From such scholars as Messrs. Max Muller and Weber, down to the last amateur Orientalist who dabbles in Buddhism disfigured by translation and proudly boasts of his knowledge, no Sanskrit or Pali scholar has so far understood correctly that which is taught; witness Monier Williams’ fallacious assumption that Buddha never taught anything *esoteric*. Therefore neither the *Dhammapada* nor the *Sutta Nipata* are an exception, nor a proof to us in their now mutilated and misunderstood text. Nagarjuna laid it down, as a rule that “every Buddha has both a revealed and a mystic doctrine.” The “esoteric is for the multitudes and new disciples,” to whom our correspondent evidently belongs. This plain truth was understood even by such a prejudiced scholar as the Rev. J. Edkins, who passed almost all his life in China studying Buddhism, and who says in his “*Chinese Buddhism*”:

He taught that all the world, or the three worlds, in fact, every existence, is pain, or leading to pain and grief. World and existence is pain and evil *per se*. It is a mistake (*avidya*) to believe that desire can be satisfied. All worldly desires lead in the end to dissatisfaction, and the desire (the thirst) to live is the cause of all evil. Only those who are striving to deliver (to save or to redeem) themselves from all existence (from their thirst for existence); leading the “happy life” of a perfect *bhikshu*, only those are sages; only those attain nirvana and, when they die, *paranirvana*, which is absolute and changeless being.³

No doubt some sort of development or so-called improvement, evolution and involution, is going on in the world; but just for this reason the Buddha taught (like Krishna before him), that the world is, “unreality, *maya*, *avidya*.” Every actual form of existence has *become*, has grown to be what it is; it will continue *changing* and will have an end, like it had a beginning as a form. *Absolute being* without “form” and “name,” this alone is true reality, and is worth striving at for a real sage.⁴

(Ch. iii.) “The esoteric was for the Bodhisattvas and advanced pupils, such as Kashiapa. It is not communicated in the form of definite language, and *could not*, therefore, *be transmitted by Anandas as definite doctrine among the Sutras*. Yet, *it is virtually contained in the Sutras*. For example, the “Sutra of the Lotus of the good Law,” which is regarded as containing the cream of the revealed doctrine, is to be viewed as a sort of original document *of the esoteric teaching, while it is in form esoteric*.” [Italics are ours.]

Moreover we perceive that our learned correspondent has entirely misunderstood the fundamental idea in what we wrote in our May editorial, “*Le Phare de l’I»connu*” in the *Revue Theoso-phique*. We protest against such an interpretation and will prove that it errs in the course of this article.

(³) An exoteric and frequent mistake. Nirvana may be reached during man’s life, and after his death in the Manvantara or life-kalpa he belongs to. *Paranirvana* (“beyond” Nirvana) is reached only when the Manvantara has closed and during the “night” of the Universe or *Pralaya*. Such is the esoteric teaching.

(⁴) Just so; and this is the theosophical teaching.

Now what did our Lord, the Buddha, do and how did He live? He did not in any way try to *improve* the *world*; he did not strive to realise socialistic problems, to solve the labour question or to better the *worldly* affairs of the poor, nor the rich either; he did not meddle with science, he did not teach cosmology and such like;* quite on the contrary; he lived in the most *unworldly* manner, he begged for his food and taught his disciples to do the same; he left, and taught his disciples to leave, all worldly life and affairs, to give up their families and to remain homeless, like he did and like he lived himself.⁵

**Malunka Sutta* in Spence Hardy, "Manual of Buddhism," p. 375. *Say muttaka Nikaya* at the end of the work. (Vol. iii. of "Phayre MS.;" also *Cullavagga*, ix. 1,4.)

(⁵) Quite right again. But to live "like he lived himself" one has to remain *as an ascetic* among the multitudes, or the *world*, for 45 years. This argument therefore, goes directly against our correspondent's main idea. That against which we protested in the criticized article was not the *ascetic life*, *i.e.*, the life of one entirely divorced, morally and mentally, from the world, the ever-changing *maya*, with its false deceptive pleasures, but the life of a *hermit*, useless to all and as useless to himself, in the long run; at any rate *entirely selfish*. We believe we rightly understand our learned critic in saying that the point of his letter lies in the appeal to the teaching and practice of the Lord Gautama Buddha in support of withdrawal and isolation from the world, as contrasted with an opposite course of conduct. And here it is where his mistake lies and he opens himself to a severer and more just criticism than that he would inflict on us.

The Lord Gautama was never a *hermit*, save during the first six years of his ascetic life, the time it took him to enter fully "on the Path." In the "Supplementary account of the three religions" (*Sankhya-yi-su*) it is stated that in the *seventh* year of his exercises of abstinence and solitary meditation, Buddha thought, "I had better eat, lest the heretics should say that Nirvana is attained in famishing the body." Then he ate, sat for his transformation for six more days and on the seventh day of the second month obtained his first *Samadhi*. Then, having "attained the perfect view of the highest truth," he arose and went to Benares where he delivered his first discourses. From that time forward for nearly half a century, he *remained in the wor'i*,

Against this cannot be brought forward, that these are only the teachings of the Hinayana system and that perhaps the Maha-yana of the Northern Buddhists is the only right one; for this latter lays even more stress than the former on the *selfimprovement* and continued *retirement* from the world of the bhikshu, *until* he has reached the perfection of a Buddha. True, the Mahayana system says, that not *every* Arahat has already attained highest perfection; it distinguishes Cravanas, Tratykeabuddhas and Bodhisattvas, of whom the latter only are considered the true spiritual sons of the Buddha, who are to be Buddhas themselves in their final future life and who have already realised the highest state of ecstasy, the Bodhi state, which is next to Nirvana.

Until a bhikshu or arhat has sufficiently progressed in perfection and wisdom, "playing at" Buddha and fixing himself up as an example or as a teacher to the world, is likely not only to throw him entirely off his path, but also to cause annoyance to those who *are* truly qualified for such work and who *are* fit to serve as ideal examples for others. None of *us* is a Buddha, and I do not know which of us might be a Bodhisattva; not everyone *can* be one, and not everyone was by the Buddha himself expected to *become* one, as is clearly and repeatedly expressed in the *Saddharma Pundarika*, the principal Mahayana work.⁶ teaching the world salvation. His first disciples were nearly all Upasakas (lay brothers), the neophytes being permitted to continue in their positions in social life and not even required to join the monastic community. And those who did, were generally sent by the Master, to travel and proselytize, instructing in the doctrine of the four miseries all those with whom they met.

(⁶) Our correspondent is too well read in Buddhist *Sutras* not to be aware of the existence of the esoteric system taught *precisely* in the *Yogacharya* or the contemplative Mahayana schools. And in that system the hermit or yogi life, except for a few years of preliminary teaching, *is strongly objected to* and called SELFISHNESS. Witness Buddha in those superb pages of *Light of Asia* (Book the Fifth) when arguing with and reprimanding the self-torturing Yogis, whom, "sadly eyeing," the Lord asks:

"... Wherefore add ye ills to life Which is so evil?"

When told in answer that they stake brief agonies to gain the larger joys of Nirvana, what does He say? This:

Nevertheless, admitting for argument's sake, that we were somehow fit to serve as specimen sages for "the world" and to improve "humanity"—now what *can* and what *ought* we to do then?

We certainly can have nothing to do with humanity in the sense of the "world," nothing with *worldly affairs* and *their* improvement. What else should we do, than to be "*profondement indifferents*" to them, to "*fuir et deserter*" them? Is not this "army" which we are deserting, just that "humanity" which the Dhammapada rightly terms "the fools"; and is it not just that "worldly life" which our Lord taught us to quit? What else should we strive at then but to take "refuge against re-incarnation," refuge with the Buddha, his dharma and his

"Yet if they last

A myriad years ... they fade at length,
Those joys ... Speak! Do your Gods endure
For ever, brothers?"

"Nay," the Yogis said,

"Only great Brahm endures; the Gods but live."

Now if our correspondent understood as he should, these lines rendered in blank verse, yet word for word as in the *Sutras*, he would have a better idea of the esoteric teaching than he now has; and, having understood it, he would not oppose what we said; for not only was self-torture, selfish solicitude, and life in the jungle simply for one's own salvation condemned in the *Mahayana* (in the real esoteric system, not the mutilated translations he reads) but even *renunciation of Nirvana for the sake of mankind* is preached therein. One of its fundamental laws is, that ordinary morality is insufficient to deliver one from rebirth; one has to practise the six Paramitas or cardinal virtues for it: 1. Charity, 2. Chastity, 3. Patience, 4. Industry, 5. Meditation, 6. Ingenuousness (or openness of heart, sincerity). And how can a *hermit* practise charity or industry if he runs away from man? Bodhisatt-vas, who, having fulfilled all the conditions of Buddhahood, have the right to forthwith enter Nirvana, prefer instead, out of unlimited pity for the suffering ignorant world, to renounce this state of bliss and become *Nirmanakayas*. They don the *Sambhogakaya* (the invisible body) in order to serve mankind, *i.e.*, to *live a sen-tient life after death* and suffer immensely at the sight of human miseries (most of which, being Karmic, they are not at liberty to relieve) for the sake of having a chance of inspiring a few with the desire of learning the truth and thus saving themselves. (By

sangha!⁷

the bye, all that Schlagintweit and others have written about *thb* Nirmanakaya body is erroneous.) Such is the true meaning of the Mahayana teaching. "I believe that not all the Buddhas enter Nirvana," says, among other things, the disciple of the Mahayana school in his address to "the Buddhas (or Budhisattvas) of confession"—referring to this secret teaching.

(⁷) The quotation with which our correspondent heads his letter *does not* bear the interpretation he puts upon it. No one acquainted with the spirit of the metaphors used in Buddhist philosophy would read it as Mr. Hiibbe Schleiden does. The man advised to walk "like a king who has left his conquered country behind," implies that he who has conquered his passions and for whom worldly *maya* exists no longer, need not lose his time in trying to convert those who will not believe in him, but had better leave them alone to their Karma; but it certainly does not mean that they are fools intellectually. Norjioes it imply that the disciples should leave the world; "Our Lord" taught us as much as "the Lord Jesus" did, the "Lord Krishna" and other "Lords" all "Sons of God"—to quit the "worldly" life, not *men*, least of all suffering, ignorant Humanity. But surely neither, the Lord Gautama Buddha less than any one of the above enumerated, would have taught us the monstrous and selfish doctrine of remaining "*profondement indifferents*" to the woes and miseries of mankind, or to *desert* those who cry daily and hourly for help to us, more favoured than they. This is an outrageously selfish and cruel system of life, by whomsoever adopted! It is neither Buddhistic, nor Christian, nor theosophical^ but the nightmare of a doctrine of the worst schools of Pessimism, such as would be probably discountenanced by Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann themselves!

Our critic sees in the "army" of Humanity—those "fools" that the *Dhamfnapada* alludes to. We are sorry to find him calling himself *names*, as we suppose he still belongs to Humanity, whether he likes it or not. And if he tells us in the exuberance of his modesty that he is quite prepared to fall under the flattering category, then we answer that no true Buddhist ought, agreeably to the Dhammapadic injunctions, to accept "companionship" with him. This does not promise him a very brilliant future with "the Buddha, his dharma and his Saflgha." To call the whole of

But we further think, that the Buddha—as in every other respect—was quite right also on this point, even if one considers it as a scientist, as an historian or as a psychologist, not as a bhikshu. What real and essential improvement of the “world” can be made? Perhaps in carrying out socialistic problems a state might be arrived at, where every human individual would be sufficiently cared for, so that he *could* adduct more *spare* time to his spiritual self-improvement if he *wished* to do so; but if he does *not wish* to improve *himself*, the best social organization will not make or help him do so. On the contrary, my own experience, at least, is just the reverse. The spiritually or rather mystically highest developed living human individual I know is a poor common weaver and moreover consumptive, who was until lately in such a position employed in a cotton-mill, that he was as much treated as a dog, like most labourers are, by their joint-stock employers. Still this man is in his inner life quite independent of his worldly misery; his heavenly or rather divine peace and satisfaction is at any time his refuge, and no one can rob him of that. He fears no death, no hunger, no pain, no want, no injustice, no cruelty!⁸

You will concede, I suppose, that Karma is not originated by external causes, but only by each individual for himself. Anyone who has made himself fit for and worthy of a good opportunity, will surely find it; and if you put another unworthy one into the very best of circumstances, he will not avail himself of them properly; they will rather serve *him* to draw him down into the mire which is his delight.

But perhaps you reply: it is, nevertheless, our duty to create

Humanity “fools” is a risky thing, anyhow; to treat as such that portion of mankind which groans and suffers under the burden of its national and individual Karma, and refuse it, under this pretext, help and sympathy—is positively revolting. He who does not say with the Master: “Mercy alone opens the gate to save the whole race of mankind” is unworthy of that Master.

(⁸) And yet this man lives *in*, and with the world, which fact does not prevent his *inner* “Buddhaship”; *nor* shall he ever be called a “deserter” and a coward, epithets which he would richly deserve had he abandoned his wife and family, instead of working *for them*, not for his own “dear” self.

as many good opportunities as we can, for humanity in general, that all those who are worthy of them, might find them all the sooner. Quite right! we fully agree and we are certainly doing our best in this respect. But will this improve the *spiritual* welfare of “humanity”? Never, not by an atom, we think. Humanity, as a *whole*, will always remain comparatively the same “fools,” which they have always been. Suppose we had succeeded in establishing an ideal organization of mankind, do you think these “fools” would be any the wiser by it, or any the more satisfied and happy?⁹ Certainly not, they would always invent new wants, new pretensions, new claims; the “world” will for ever go on striving for “worldly perfection” only. Our present social organization is greatly improved on the system of the middle-ages: still, is our present time any the happier, any the more satisfied than our ancestors have been at the time of the Niebelunge or of King Arthur? I think, if there has been any change in satisfaction, it was for the worse; our present time is more greedy and less content than any former age. Whoever expects his *^//*-improvement by means of any Hw/d-improvement or any external means and causes, has yet to be sorely undeceived; and happy for him if this experience will come to him before the *end* of his present life!

A very clever modern philosopher has invented the theory that the best plan to get rid of this misery of the “world,” would be our giving ourselves up to it the best we could, in order to hasten this evil process to its early end.—Vain hope! Avidya is as endless as it is beginningless. A universe has a beginning and has an end, but others will begin and end after it, just like one day follows the other; and as there has been an endless series of worlds before, thus will there be an endless series afterwards. Causality can never have had a beginning nor can it have an end. And every “world,” that will ever be, will always be “world,” that is pain and “evil.”¹⁰

(⁹) This is no business of ours, but that of their respective Karma. On this principle we should have to deny to every starving wretch a piece of bread, because, forsooth, he will be just as hungry tomorrow?

(¹⁰) And therefore, *Sauve qui peut*, [Save himself who can], is our correspondent’s motto? Had the—

Therefore, like Karma, also *deliverance*, redemption or salvation (from the world) can never be any otherwise than “*personal*,” or let us rather say “*individual*.” The world, of course, can never be delivered from itself, from the “*world*,” from pain and evil. And *no one* can be delivered therefrom by anyone else. —You certainly do not teach vicarious atonement! Or, *can* anyone save his neighbour? Can one apple make ripe another apple hanging next to it?¹¹

Now what else can we do but live the “*happy life*” of bhikshus without wants, without pretensions, without desires? And if your good example calls or draws to us others who seek for the same happiness, then we try to teach them the best we can. But this is another rather doubtful question to us! Not only are we not properly fit to teach, but if we were, we require proper persons to be taught, persons who are not only willing, but who are also fit to listen to us.¹²

All Honoured, Wisest, Best, most Pitiful,
The Teacher of Nirvana, and the Law

taught the heartless principle *Apres moi le deluge*, I do not think that the learned editor of the SPHINX would have had much of a chance of being converted to Buddhism as he is now. Very true that his Buddhism seems to be no better than the exoteric dry and half-broken rind, of European fabrication, of that grand fruit of altruistic mercy, and pity for all that lives—real Eastern Buddhism and especially its esoteric doctrines.

(¹¹) No; but the apple can either screen its neighbour from the sun, and, depriving it of its share of light and heat, prevent its ripening, or sharing with it the dangers from worms and the urchin’s hand, thus diminish that danger by one half. As to Karma this is again a misconception. There is such a thing as a *national*, besides a personal or *individual* Karma in this world. But our correspondent seems to have either never heard of it, or misunderstood once more, in his own way.

(¹²) *Fais que dois, advienne que pourra* [One should do what is to be done, happen what may]. When did the Lord Buddha make a preliminary selection in his audiences? Did he not, agreeably to allegory and History, preach and convert demons and gods, bad and good men? Dr. Hiibbe Schleiden seems more Catholic than the Pope, more prim than an old-fashioned English

in spite of all these difficulties and quite conscious of our own incompetency, we nevertheless venture now to publish books and journals, in which we try to explain Indian religio-philosophy to the best of our understanding. Thus every one who has eyes may read it, and who has ears may hear it—if his good Karma is ripening! What else do you expect *us agnams* to do?¹³ Are we not rather to be blamed already, that we undertake such work, for which we—*not* being Buddhas, nor even Bodhisattvas—are as badly qualified as a recruit is fit to serve as general field-marshal. And if you cannot find fault with us, can you say that those “*yogis*” or “*saints*” whom you seem to blame in your above passage, were in a better position and could have done more? If, however, they were, *what* ought they to have done?

We are fully aware that a true Buddhist and a sage, or—if you like—theosophist, must always be every inch an *altruist*. And when we are acting altruistically, it is perhaps no bad sign in regard to what we some day might *become*; but every thing at its proper time: where competency does not keep pace with altruism in development and in display, it might do more harm than good. Thus we feel even not quite sure whether our conscience ought not to blame us for our well-intended, but pert work; and the only excuse we can find for our thus giving way to the prompt

house-wife, and certainly more squeamish than Lord Buddha ever was. “*Teach vicarious atonement?*” certainly we do not. But it is safer (and more modest at any rate) to make too much of one’s neighbours and fellow-men than to look at every one as on so much dirt under one’s feet. If I am a fool, it is no reason why I should see a fool in everyone else. We leave to our critic the difficult task of discerning who is, and who *is not* fit to listen to us, and, in the absence of positive proof, prefer postulating that every man has a responsive chord in his nature that will vibrate and respond to words of kindness and of truth.

(¹³) We expect you not to regard everyone else as an “*agnam*” —*if* by this word an *ignoramus* is meant. To help to deliver the world from the curse of *Avidya* (ignorance) we have only to learn from those who know more than we do, and teach those who know less. This is just the object we have in view in spreading theosophical literature and trying to explain “*Indian religio-philosophy*.”

ings of our heart is, that those persons who really might be properly qualified, do *not* come forward, do *not* help us, do *not do* this evidently necessary work!¹⁴

Yours respectfully,
HUBBE-SCHLEIDEN

Neuhausen, *Munich*, June 1st, 1889

(¹⁴) An apocalyptic utterance this. I think, however, that I dimly understand. Those who are “properly qualified, do *not* come forward, do *not* help us, do *not do* this evidently necessary work.” Don’t THEY? How *does* our pessimistic correspondent *know*? I “guess” and “surmise” that they do, and very much so. For had the T.S. and its members been left to their own fate and Karma, there would not be much of it left today, under the relentless persecutions, slander, scandals, purposely set on foot, and the malicious hatred of our enemies—*open* and *secret*.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR OUR FELLOW-MEN?

CORRESPONDENCE

You have obliged my friends and myself by answering or annotating my letter to you in your number of July 15th. Will you allow us to continue this discussion? Several letters which I have received in consequence of this correspondence not only from Germany, but also from England,¹ make it appear likely that your readers on the other side of the Channel also take an interest in this all-important question. As the purport of my former communication has been misunderstood, I have now made this question the title of my present letter, in order to emphasize the point. My friends and I did not ask: Shall we do *anything* for our fellow-men or *nothing*? but: *What* shall we do for them?

You agree with us—as your note 4 to my last letter (pg. 431) unmistakably shows—that the ultimate Goal which the mystic or the occultist have to strive for, is not perfection IN existence (the “world”) but *absolute being*: that is, we have to strive for deliverance FROM all existence in any of the three worlds or planes of existence. The difference of opinions, however, is this: Shall we now, nevertheless, assist all our fellow-men indiscriminately in their *worldly* affairs; shall we occupy ourselves with their national and individual Karma, in order to help them to improve the “world” and to live happily *in* it; shall we strive *with* them to realize socialistic problems, to further science, arts and industries, to teach them cosmology, the evolution of man and*of the universe, etc., etc.,—or on the other hand, shall we only do the best we can to show our fellow-men the road of wisdom that will lead them *out* of the world and as straight as possible towards their

¹ Perchance also, from Madras?—[Ed.]

acknowledged goal of absolute existence (*Para-Nirvana, Moksha, Atma*)? Shall we consequently only work for those who are willing to get rid of all individual existence and yearning to be delivered from all selfishness, from all strivings, who are longing only for eternal peace?

Answer. As the undersigned accepts for her views and walk in life no authority dead or living, no system of philosophy or religion but one—namely, the esoteric teachings of ethics and philosophy of those she calls “MASTERS”—answers have, therefore, to be given strictly in accordance with these teachings. My first reply then is: Nothing of that which is conducive to help man, collectively or individually, to live—not “happily”—but less *unhappily* in this world, ought to be indifferent to the Theosophist-Occultist. It is no concern of his whether his help benefits a man in his *worldly* or *spiritual* progress; his first duty is to be ever ready to help if he can, without stopping to philosophize. It is because our clerical and lay Pharisees too often offer a Christian dogmatic tract, instead of the simple bread of life to the wretches they meet—whether these are starving physically or morally—that pessimism, materialism, and despair win with every day more ground in our age. Weal and woe, or happiness and misery, are relative terms. Each of us finds them according to his or her predilections; one in worldly, the other in intellectual pursuits, and no one system will ever satisfy all. Hence, while one finds his pleasure and rest in family joys, another in “Socialism” and the third in a “longing only for eternal peace,” there may be those who are starving for truth, in every department of the science of nature, and who consequently are yearning to learn the esoteric views about “cosmology, the evolution of man and of the Universe.”—H.P.B.

According to our opinion the latter course is the right one for a mystic; the former one we take to be a statement of our views. Your notes to my former letter are quite consistent with this view, for in your note 3 you say: “Paranirvana is reached only when the Manvantara has closed and during the ‘night’ of the universe or Pralaya.” If the final aim of paranirvana *cannot* be attained individually, but only solidarily by the whole of the present humanity, it stands to reason, that in order to arrive at our consummation we have not only to do the best we can for the suppression of our own self, but that we have to work first for the world-process to hurry all the worldly interests of Hottentots, and the European vivisectors, having sufficiently advanced to see their final goal of salvation, are ready to join us in striving towards that deliverance.

Answer. According to our opinion as there is no essential difference between a “mystic” and a “Theosophist-Esotericist” or Eastern Occultist, the above cited course is *not* “the right one for a mystic.” One, who while “yearning to be delivered from all selfishness” directs at the same time all his energies only to that portion of humanity which is of his own way of thinking, shows himself not only very *selfish* but is guilty of prejudice and partiality. When saying that *Para*, or *Parinirvana* rather, is reached only at the Manvantaric close, I never meant to imply the “planetary” but the whole *Cosmic* Manvantara, i.e., at the end of “an age” of Brahma, not one “Day.” For this is the only time when during the *universal* Pralaya mankind (i.e., not only the terrestrial *mankind* but that of every “man” or “*manu-be^ring*” globe, star, sun or planet) will reach “solidarity” Parinirvana, and even then it will not be the whole mankind, but only those portions of the mankind which will have made themselves ready for it. Our correspondent’s remark about the “Hottentots” and “European vivisectors” seems to indicate to my surprise that my learned Brother has in his mind only our little unprogressed *Terrene* mankind?—H.P.B.

You have the great advantage over us, that you speak with absolute certainty on all these points, in saying: “this is the esoteric doctrine,” and “such is the teaching of my masters.” We do not think that we have any such certain warrant for *our* belief; on the contrary, we want to learn, and are ready to receive, wisdom, wherever it may offer itself to us. We know of no authority or divine revelation; for, as far as we accept Vedantic or Budhistic doctrines, we only do so because we have been convinced by the reasons given; or, where the reasons prove to be beyond our comprehension, but where our intuition tells us: this, nevertheless, is likely to be true, we try our best to make our understanding follow our intuition.

Answer. I speak “with absolute certainty” only so far as my own *personal* belief is concerned. Those who have not the *same warrant* for their belief as I have, would be very credulous and foolish to accept it on blind faith. Nor does the writer believe any more than her correspondent and his friends in any “authority” let alone “divine revelation”! Luckier in this than they are, I need not even rely in this as they do on my *intuition*, as there is no *infallible* intuition. But what I do believe in is (i), the unbroken oral teachings revealed by living *divine* men during the infancy of mankind to the elect among men; (2), that it has reached us *unaltered*; and (3) that the MASTERS are thoroughly versed in the science based on such uninterrupted teaching.—H.P.B.

In reference, therefore, to your note 5, it was not, nor is it, our

intention “to inflict any criticism on you”; on the contrary we should never waste time with opposing anything we think wrong; we leave that to its own fate; but we try rather to get at positive information or arguments, wherever we think they may offer themselves. Moreover, we have never denied, nor shall we ever forget, that we owe you great and many thanks for your having originated the present movement and for having made popular many striking ideas hitherto foreign to European civilization. We should now feel further obliged to you, if you (or your masters) will give us some reasons, which could make it appear likely to us, why paranirvana could *not* be attained by any *jiva* at any time (*a*), and why the final goal can only be reached solidarity

Answer (a). There is some confusion here. I never said that no *jiva* could attain Parinirvana, nor meant to infer that “the final goal can only be reached solidarity” by our present humanity. This is to attribute to me an ignorance to which I am not prepared to plead guilty, and in his turn my correspondent has misunderstood me. But as every system in India teaches several kinds of *pralayas* as also of Nirvanic or “Moksha” states, Dr. Hiibbe Schleiden has evidently confused the *Prakrita* with the *Naimittika* Pralaya, of the Visishtad-waita Vedantins. I even suspect that my esteemed correspondent has imbibed more of the teachings of this particular sect of the three Vedantic schools than he had bargained for; that his “Brahmin Guru” in short, of whom there are various legends coming to us from Germany, has coloured his pupil far more with the philosophy of Sri Ramanujacharya, than with that of Sri Sankaracharya. But this is a trifle connected with circumstances beyond his control and of a Karmic character. His aversion to “Cosmology” and other sciences including theogony, and as contrasted with “Ethics” pure and simple, dates also from the period he was taken in hand by the said learned guru. The latter expressed it personally to us, after his sudden *salto mortali* from esotericism—to too difficult to comprehend and therefore to teach,—to *ethics* which any one who knows a Southern language or two of India, can impart by simply translating his texts from philosophical works with which the country abounds. The result of this is, that my esteemed friend and correspondent talks Visishtadwaitism as unconsciously as M. Jourdain talked “prose,” while believing he argues from the Mahayana and Vedantic standpoint—pure and simple. If otherwise, I place myself under correction. But how can a Vedantin speak of *Jivas* as though these were *separate* entities and independent of JIVATMA the one universal soul! This is a purely Visishtadwaita doctrine which asserts that Jivatma is different in each individual from that in another individual? He asks “why parinirvana could *not* be

attained by any *jiva* at any time.” We answer that if by “*jiva*” he means the “Higher Self” or the *divine ego* of man, only-then we say it may reach Nirvana, not Parinirvana, but even this, only when one becomes *Jivanmukta*, which does *not* mean “at any time.” But if he understands by “*Jiva*” simply the *one life* which, the Visishtadwaitas say is contained in every particle of matter, separating it from the *sarira* or body that contains it, then, we do not understand at all what he means. For, we do not agree that Parabrahm only *pervades* every *Jiva*, as well as each particle of matter, but say that Parabrahm is inseparable from every *Jiva*, as from every particle of matter since it is the *absolute*, and that it is in truth that Jivatma itself *crystallized*—for want of a better word. Before I answer his questions, therefore, I must know whether he means by Parinirvana, the same as I do, and of which of the *Pralayas* he is talking. Is it of the *Prakrita* Maha Pralaya, which takes place every 311,040,000,-000,000 years; or of the *Naimittika* Pralaya occurring after each *Brahma Kalpa* equal to 1,000 Maha Yugas, or which? Convincing reasons can be given then only when two disputants understand each other. I speak from the esoteric standpoint almost identical with the Adwaita interpretation; Dr. Hubbe Schleiden argues from that of—let him say *whdt* system, for, lacking omniscience, I cannot tell.—H.P.B.

by the whole of the humanity living at present. In order to further this discussion, I will state here some of the reasons which appear to speak against this view, and I will try to further elucidate some of the consequences of acting in accordance with each of these two views:

1. The unselfishness of the Altruist has a very different character according to which of the two views he takes. To begin with *our* view, the true Mystic who believes that he can attain deliverance from the world and from his individuality independent of the Karma of any other entities, or of the whole humanity, is an Altruist, because and so far as he is a monist, that is to say, on account of the *tat twam asi*. Not the form or the individuality, but the *being* of all entities is the same and is his own; in proportion as he feels his own *avidya*, *agnana* or unwisdom, so does he feel that of other entities, and has compassion with them on that

(*b*). To feel “compassion” without an adequate practical result ensuing from it is not to show oneself an “Altruist” but the reverse. Real self-development on the esoteric lines is *action*. “Inaction in a deed of mercy becomes *an action* in a deadly sin.” (*Vide The Two Paths* in the “Voice of the Silence” p. 31.)—H.P.B.

account, (*b*) To take now the other view: Is not the altruism of an

occultist who sees himself tied to the Karma of all his fellow-men, and who, on that account, labours for and with them, rather an egotistical one? For is not at the bottom of his “unselfishness” the knowledge that he cannot work out his own salvation at any lesser price? The escape from selfishness for such a man is self-sacrifice for the “world”; for the mystic, however, it is self-sacrifice to the eternal, to absolute being. Altruism is certainly considered one of the first requirements of any German Theosopher—we can or will not speak for others—but we are rather inclined to think that altruism had never been demanded in this country in the former sense (of self-sacrifice *for* the “world”), but only in the latter sense of self-sacrifice to the eternal, (c)

(c). An Occultist does not feel “himself tied to the Karma of all his fellow men,” no more than one man feels his legs motionless because of the paralysis of another man’s legs. But this does not prevent the fact that the legs of both are evolved from, and contain the same ultimate essence of the ONE LIFE. Therefore, there can be no *egotistical* feeling in his labours for the less favoured brother. Esoterically, there is no other *way, means* or *method* of sacrificing oneself “to the eternal” than by working and sacrificing oneself for the collective spirit of Life, embodied in, and (for us) represented in its highest divine aspect by Humanity alone. Witness the *Nirmanakdyā*,—the sublime doctrine which no Orientalist understands to this day but which Dr. HLibbe Schleiden can find in the *Ilnd* and *Illrd* Treatises in the “*Voice of the Silence*.” Naught else shows forth the eternal; and in no other way than this can any mystic or occultist *truly* reach the eternal, whatever the Orientalists and the vocabularies of Buddhist terms may say, for the real meaning of the *Trikdyā*, the triple power of Buddha’s embodiment, and of Nirvana in its triple negative and positive definitions has ever escaped them.

If our correspondent believes that by calling himself “theosopher” in preference to “theosophist” he escapes thereby any idea of *sophistry* connected with his views, then he is mistaken. I say it in all sincerity, the opinions he expresses in his letters are in my humble judgment the very fruit of *sophistry*. If I have misunderstood him, I stand under correction.—H.P.B.

2. It is a misunderstanding, if you think in your note 5, that we are advocating entire “withdrawal or isolation from the world.” We do so as little as yourself, but only recommend an “ascetic life,” as far as it is necessary to prepare anyone for those tasks imposed upon him by following the road to *final* deliverance from the world. But the consequence of your view seems to lead to joining the world in a *worldly* life, and until good enough reasons are given for it, we do not approve of this conduct. That we should have to join our fellow men in all their *worldly* interests and pursuits, in order to assist them and hasten them on to the solidary and common goal, is contrary to our intuition, (a) To

Answer, (a) It is difficult to find out how the view expressed in my last answer can lead to such an inference, or where have I advised my brother Theosophists to join men “in all their *worldly* interests and pursuits!” Useless to quote here again that which is said in note 1, for every one can turn to the passage and see that I have said nothing of the kind. For one precept I can give a dozen. “Not nakedness, not plaited hair, not dirt, not fasting or lying on the earth . . . not sitting motionless, can purify one who has not overcome desires,” says *Dhammapada* (chap. 1,- 141). “Neither abstinence from fish or flesh, nor going naked, nor the shaving of the head, nor matted hair, etc., etc., will cleanse a man not free from delusions” *Amagan-dha Sutta* (7, 11). This is what I meant. Between salvation through dirt and stench, like St. Labro and some Fakirs, and worldly life with an eye to every interest, there is a long way. Strict asceticism in the midst of the world, is more meritorious than avoiding those who do not think as we do, and thus losing an opportunity of showing them the truth.—H.P.B.

strive for the deliverance *from* the world by furthering and favouring the world-process seems rather a round-about method. Our inclination leads us to retire from all *worldly* life, and to work apart—from a monastery or otherwise—together with and for all *those* fellow-men who are striving for the same goal of deliverance, and who are willing to rid themselves of all karma, their own as well as that of others. We would assist also *all* those who have to remain in worldly life, but who are already looking forward to the same goal of release,

and who join us in doing their best to attain this end. We make no secret of our aims or our striving; we lay our views and our reasons before *anyone* who will hear them, and we are ready to receive amongst us *anyone* who will *honestly* join us. (b) Above all, however, we are doing

(b). So do we. And if, not all of us live up to our highest ideal of wisdom, it is only because we are *men* not gods, after all. But there is one thing, however, we never do (those in the esoteric circle, at any rate): *we set ourselves as examples to no men*, for we remember well that precept in Amagandha Sutta that says “Self-praise, disparaging others, conceit, evil communications (denunciations), these constitute (moral) uncleanness”; and again, as in the *Dhammapada*, “The fault of others is easily perceived, but that of oneself is difficult to perceive; the faults of others one lays open as much as possible, but one’s own fault one hides, as a cheat hides the bad die from the gambler.”—H.P.B.

our best to live up to our highest ideal of wisdom; and perhaps the good example may prove to be more useful to our fellow-men than any organized propaganda of teaching.

By the bye, in your note you couple together *Schopenhauer* and *Eduard von Hartmann*. In this question, however, both are of opposite opinions. Schopenhauer, like most German mystics and theosophers, represents the news of Vedanta and (exoteric) Buddhism, that final salvation can, and can only, be individually attained independent of time and the karma of others. Hartmann, however, verges much more towards your opinion, for he does not believe in *individual* consummation and deliverance from the world; he thinks all mysticism and particularly that which is now known as Indian philosophy, an error, and demands of everyone as an altruistic duty to give himself up to the world-process, and to do his best in order to hasten its end. (He is the “clever modern philosopher” whom I have mentioned on page 435).fc)

(c). As I have never read von Hartmann, and know very little of Schopenhauer, nor do they interest me, I have permitted myself only to bring them forward as examples of the worst kind of pessimism; and you

corroborate what I said, by what you state of Hartmann. If, however, as you say, Hartmann thinks “Indian philosophy an error,” then he cannot be said to *verge* toward *my* opinion, as I hold quite a contrary view. India might return the compliment with interest.—H.P.B.

3. There is, and can be, no doubt that Vedanta and (exoteric) Buddhism do not hold your view, but ours. Moreover, one could scarcely dispute that Lord Buddha—whatever esoteric doctrine he may have taught—founded monasteries, or that he favoured and assisted in doing so. Whether he expected all his disciples to become Bodhisattvas may be doubtful, but he certainly pointed out the “happy life” of a Bhikshu as the road to salvation; he expressly abstained from teaching cosmology or any worldly science; he never meddled with the worldly affairs of men, but every assistance he rendered them was entirely restricted to showing them the road to deliverance from existence. And just the same with Vedanta. It prohibits any attachment to worldly views and interests, or enquiries after cosmology or evolution *a fortiori* socialism and any other world-improvement. All this Vedanta calls *Agnana* (Buddhism: *Avidya*), while Gnana or wisdom—the only aim of a sage (*Gnani*)—is but the striving for the realization of the eternal (true reality, *Atma*). (a)

Answer (a). It depends on what you call Vedanta—whether the Dwaita, the Adwaita, or the Visishtadwaita. That we differ from all these, is no news, and I have spoken of it repeatedly. Yet in the esotericism of the *Upanishads*, when correctly understood, and our esotericism, there will not be found much difference. Nor have I ever disputed any of the facts about Buddha as now brought forward; although these are facts from only his *exoteric* biography. Nor has he invented or drawn from his inner consciousness the philosophy he taught, but only the method of his rendering it. Buddhism being simply esoteric *Bodhism* taught before him secretly in the *arcana* of the Brahminical temples, contains, of course, more than one doctrine of which the Lord Buddha never spoke of in public. But this shows in no way that he did not teach them to his Arhats. Again, between “attachment to worldly views or interests” and the study of Cosmology, which is *not* “a worldly science” however, there is an abyss. One pertains to religious and philosophical asceticism, the other is necessary for the study of *Occultism*—which is not Buddhistic, but universal. Without the study of cosmogony and theogony which teach the hidden value of every force in Nature and their direct correspondence to, and relation with, the forces in man (or the principles) no occult psychophysics or *knowledge of man* as he truly is, is *possible*. No one is forced to study esoteric philosophy

unless he likes it, nor has anyone ever confused Occultism with Buddhism or Vedantism.—H.P.B.

Agnani (misprinted in the July number page 436: *agnam*) signified just the same as what is rendered by “fool” in the English translations of the Dhammapada and the Suttas. It is never understood “intellectually” and certainly does not mean an *ignoramus*, on the contrary, the scientists are rather more likely to be *agnanis* than any “uneducated” mystic. *Agnani* expresses always a relative notion. *Gnani* is anyone who is striving for the self-realization of the eternal; a *perfect gnani* is only the *jivanmukta*, but anyone who is on the road of development to this end may be (relatively) called *gnani*, while anyone who is less advanced is comparatively an *agnani*. As, however, every *gnani* sees the ultimate goal *above* himself, he will call himself an *agnani*, until he has attained *jivanmukta*; moreover, no true mystic will ever call any fellow-man a “fool” in the intellectual sense of the Word, for he lays very little stress on intellectuality. To him anyone is a “fool” only in so far as he cares for (worldly) existence and strives for anything else than wisdom, deliverance, paranirvana. And this turn of mind is entirely a question of the “will” of the individuality. The “will” of the *agnani* is carrying him from spirit into matter (descending arch of the cycle), while the “will” of the *gnani* disentangles him from matter and makes him soar up towards “spirit” and out of all existence. This question of overcoming the “dead point” in the circle is by no means one of intellectuality; it is quite likely that a sister of mercy or a common labourer may have turned the corner while the Bacons, Goethes, Humboldts, &c, may yet linger on the descending side of existence tied down to it by their individual wants and desires.(b)

(b). *Agnam*, instead of *agnani* was of course a printer’s mistake. With such every Journal and Magazine abounds, in Germany, I suppose, as much as in England, and from which LUCIFER is no more free than the Sphinx. It is the printer’s and the proof-reader’s Karma. But it is a worse mistake, however, to translate *Agnani* by “fool,” all the Beals, Oldenbergs, Webers, and Hardys, to the contrary. *Gnana* (or, *Jnana*, rather) is Wisdom certainly, but even more, for it is the spiritual knowledge of things divine, unknown to all but those who attain it—and which saves the *Jivanmuktas* who have mastered both Karmayoga and Jnanayoga. Hence, if all those who have not *jnana* (or *gnana*) at their fingers’ end, are to be considered

“fools” this would mean that the whole world save a few Yogis is composed of fools, which would be *out-carlyleing* Carlyle in his opinion of his countrymen. A *jnana*, in truth, means simply “ignorance of the true Wisdom,” or literally, “Wisdomless” and not at all “fool.” To explain that the word “fool” is “never understood intellectually” is to say nothing, or worse, an Irish bull, as, according to every etymological definition and dictionary, a *fool* is one who is “deficient in intellect” and “destitute of reason.” Therefore, while thanking the kind doctor for the trouble he has taken to explain so minutely the vexed Sanskrit term, I can do so only in the name of LUCIFER’S readers, not for myself, as I knew all he says, *minus* his risky new definition of “fool” and *plus* something else, probably as early as on the day when he made his first appearance into this world of *Maya*. No doubt, neither Bacon, Humboldt, nor even the great Haeckel himself, the “light of Germany,” could ever be regarded as “gnanis”; but no more could any European I know of, however much he may have rid himself of all “individual wants and desires.”—H.P.B.

4. As we agree, that all existence, in fact, the whole world and the whole of its evolutionary process, its joys and evils, its gods and its devils, are *Maya* (illusion) or erroneous conception of the true reality: how can it appear to us worth while to assist and to promote this process of misconception? (a)

Answer (a). Precisely, because the term *maya*, just like that of “agnana” in your own words—expresses only a *relative* notion. The world . . . “its joys and evils, its gods and devils,” and men to boot, are undeniably, when compared with that awful reality *everlasting eternity*, no better than the productions and tricks of *maya*, illusion. But there the line of demarcation is drawn. So long as we are incapable of forming even an approximately correct conception of this *inconceivable* eternity, for us, who are just as much an *illusion* as anything else outside of that eternity, the sorrows and misery of that greatest of all illusions—human life in the universal *mahamaya*—for us, I say, such sorrows and miseries are a vivid and a very sad reality. A shadow from your body, dancing on the white wall, is a reality so long as it is there, for yourself and all who can see it; because a reality is just as relative as an illusion. And if one “illusion” does not help another “illusion” of the same kind to study and recognise the true nature of Self, then, I fear, very few of us will ever get out from the clutches of *maya*.—H.P.B.

5. Like all world-existence, time and causality also are only *Maya* or—as Kant and Schopenhauer have proved beyond contradiction—are only *our* conditioned notions, *forms of our* intellection. Why then should any moment of time, or one of our own unreal forms of thought,

be more favourable to the attainment of paranirvana than any other? To this paranirvana, Atma, or true reality, any manvantara is just as unreal as any pralaya. And this is the same with regard to *causality*, as with respect to *time*, from whichever point of view you look at it. If from that of absolute reality, all causality and karma are unreal, and to realize this unreality is the secret of deliverance from it. But even if you look at it from the *agnana-view*, that is to say, taking existence for a reality, there can never (in “time”) be an end—nor can there have been a beginning—of causality. It makes, therefore, no difference whether any world is in pralaya or not; also Vedanta rightly says that during any pralaya the *karana sharira* (causal body, agnana) of Ishvara and of all jivas, in fact, of all existence, is continuing. (b) And how could this be other-

(b). This is again a *Visishtadwaita* interpretation, which we do not accept in the esoteric school. We cannot say, as they do that while the gross bodies alone perish, the *sukshma* particles, which they consider uncreated and indestructible and the only real things, alone remain. Nor do we believe any Vedantin of the Sankaracharya school would agree in uttering such a heresy. For this amounts to saying that *Manomaya* Kosha, which corresponds to what we call *Manas*, mind, with its volitional feelings and even *Kamarupa* the vehicle of the *lower* manas, also survives during pralaya. See page 185 in *Five Years of Theosophy* and ponder over the three classifications of the human principles. Thence it follows that the *Karana Saririra* (which means simply the *human Monad* collectively or the reincarnating ego), the “causal body” cannot continue; especially if, as you say, it is *agnana*, ignorance or the *wisdomless* principle, and even agreeably with your definition “a fool.” The idea alone of this “fool” surviving during any pralaya, is enough to make the hair of any Vedanta philosopher and even of a full blown Jivanmukta, turn grey, and thrust him right back into an “agnani” again. Surely as you formulate it, this must be a *lapsus calami*? And why should the *Karana Saririra* of Iswara let alone that of “all Jivas (!) be necessary during *pralaya* for the evolution of another universe? Iswara, whether as a personal god, or an *intelligent* independent principle, *per se*, every Buddhist whether esoteric or exoteric and orthodox, will reject; while some Vedantins would define him as Parabrahm *plus* MAYA (only, *i.e.*, a conception valid enough during the reign of maya, but not otherwise. That which remains during pralaya is the eternal potentiality of every condition of *Pragna* (consciousness) contained in that plane or *field* of consciousness, which the Adwaita calls *Chidakasan* and *Chinmatra* (abstract consciousness), which, being absolute, is therefore perfect *unconsciousness*—as a *true* Vedantin would say.—H.P.B.

wise? After the destruction of any universe in pralaya, must not another appear? Before our present universe must there not have been an infinite number of other universes? How could this be, if the cause of existence did not last through any pralaya as well as through any kalpa? And if so, why should any pralaya be a more favourable moment for the attainment of paranirvana than any manvantara?

6. But if then one moment of time and one phase of causality were more favourable for this than any other: why should it just be *any* pralaya after a manvantara, not the end of the *maha-kalpa* or at least that of a *kalpa*. In any kalpa (of 4,320 millions of earthly years) there are 14 manvantaras and pralayas and in each maha-kalpa (of 311,040 milliards of earthly years) there are (36,000 x 14) 504,000 manvantaras and pralayas. Why is this opportunity of paranirvana offered just so often and not oftener, or not once only at the end of each universe. In other words, why can paranirvana only be obtained by spurts and in batches; why, if it cannot be attained by any individuality at its *own* time, why must one wait only for the whole of one’s present fellow-humanity; why not also for all the animals, plants, amoebas and proto plasms, perhaps also for the minerals of our planet—and why not also for the entities on all the other stars of the universe? (a)

Answer (a). As Dr. Hubbe Schleiden objects in the form of questions to statements and arguments that have never been formulated by me, I have nothing to say to this.—H.P.B.

7. But, it appears, the difficulty lies somewhat deeper still. That which has to be overcome, in order to attain paranirvana, is the erroneous conception of separateness, the selfishness of individuality, the “thirst for existence” (*trishna, tanha*). It stands to reason, that this sense of individuality can only be overcome individually: How can this process be dependent on other individualities or anything else at all? Selfishness in the *abstract* which is the cause of all existence, in fact, *Agnana* and *Maya*, can never be *all together* removed and extinguished. *Agnana* is as endless as it is beginningless, and the number of jivas (atoms?) is absolutely infinite; if the jivas of a whole universe were to be extinguished in paranirvana, jivaship and agnana would not be lessened by one atom. In fact, both

are mere unreality and misconception. Now, why should just one batch of humanity have to unite, in order to get rid each of his own misconception of reality?(b)

(b). Here again the only “unreality and misconception” I can perceive are his own. I am glad to find my correspondent so learned, and having made such wonderful progress since I saw him last some three years ago, when still in the fulness of his *agnana*; but I really Cannot see what all his arguments refer to?—H.P.B.

Summing up, I will now give three instances of the difference in which, I think a Mystic or (exoteric) Buddhist, Bhikshu or Arhat, on the one side, and an occultist or theosophist on the other, would act, if both are fully consistent with their views and principles. Both will certainly use any opportunity which offers itself to do good to their fellow-men; but the good which they will try to do, will be of a different kind.

Supposing they meet a poor, starving wretch, with whom they share their only morsel of bread: the mystic will try to make the man understand that the body is only to be kept up, because that entity which lives in it has a certain spiritual destination, and that this destination is nothing less than getting rid of all existence, and, at the same time, of all wants and desires; that having to beg for one’s food is no real hardship, but might give a happier life than that of rich people with all their imaginary worries and pretensions, that, in fact, the life of a destitute who *is* nothing and who *has* nothing in the world, is the “happy life”—as Buddha and Jesus have shown—when it is coupled with the right aspiration to the eternal, the only true and unchangeable reality, the divine peace. If the mystic finds that the man’s heart is incapable of responding to any keynote of such true religiousness, he will leave him alone, hoping that, at some future time, he too will find out that all his worldly wants and desires are insatiable and unsatisfying, and that after all true and final happiness can only be found in striving for the eternal.—Not so the occultist. He will know that he himself *cannot* finally realise the eternal, until every other human individuality has likewise gone through all the worldly aspirations and has been weaned from them. He will, therefore, try to assist this poor wretch first in his worldly affairs; he will perhaps teach him some trade or handicraft by which he can earn his daily

bread, or he will plan with him some socialistic scheme for bettering the worldly position of the poor.

Answer. Here the “Mystic” acts precisely as a “Theosophist or Occultist” of the Eastern school would. It is extremely interesting to learn where Dr. Hiibbe Schleiden has studied “Occultists” of the type he is describing? If it is in Germany, then pitying the Occultist who *knows* “that he himself *cannot* realize the eternal” until every human soul has been weaned from “worldly aspirations” I would invite him to come to London where other Occultists who reside therein would teach him better. But then why not qualify the “Occultist” in such case and thus show his nationality? Our correspondent mentions with evident scorn, “Socialism” in this letter, as often as he does “Cosmology”? We have but two English Socialists, so far, in the T.S. of which two every Theosophist ought to be proud and accept them as his exemplar in practical Buddha- and Christ-like charity and virtues. Such socialists—two active altruists full of unselfish love and charity and ready to work for all that suffers and needs help—are decidedly worth ten thousand Mystics and other *Theosophers*, whether German or English, who talk instead of acting and sermonize instead of teaching. But let us take note of our correspondent’s second instance.— H.P.B.

Secondly, supposing further the mystic and the occultist meet two women, the one of the “Martha” sort, the other of the “Mary” character. The mystic will first remind both that every one has, in the first instance, to do his or her duty conscientiously, be it a compulsory or a self-imposed duty. Whatever one has once undertaken and wherever he or she has contracted any obligation towards a fellow-being, this has to be fulfilled “up to the uttermost farthing.” But, on the other hand, the mystic will, just for this very reason, warn them against creating for themselves new attachments to the world and worldly affairs more than they find absolutely unavoidable. He will again try to direct the whole of their attention to their final goal and kindle in them every spark of high and genuine aspiration to the eternal.—Not so the occultist. He may also say all that the mystic has said and which fully satisfies “Mary”; as “Martha,” however, is not content with this and thinks the subject rather tedious and wearisome, he will have compassion with her worldliness and teach her some esoteric cosmology or speak to her of the possibilities of developing psychic powers and so on.

Answer. Is the cat out of the bag at last? I am asked to “oblige” our correspondent by answering questions, and instead of clear statements, I

find no better than transparent hints against the working methods of the T.S.! Those who go against “esoteric cosmology” and the development of psychic powers are not forced to study either. But I have heard these objections four years ago, and they too, were started by a certain “Guru” we are both acquainted with, when that learned “Mystic” had had enough of Chelaship and suddenly developed the ambition of becoming a Teacher. They are stale.—H.P.B.

Thirdly, supposing our mystic and our occultist meet a sick man who applies to them for help. Both will certainly try to cure him the best they can. At the same time, both will use this opportunity to turn their patient’s mind to the eternal if they can; they will try to make him see that everything in the world is only the *just* effect of some cause, and that, as he is consciously suffering from his present illness, he himself *must* somewhere have consciously given the corresponding and adequate cause for his illness, either in his present or in any former life; that the only way of getting finally rid of all ills and evils is, not to create any more causes, but rather to abstain from all doing, to rid oneself of every avoidable want and desire, and in this way to lift oneself above all causality (karma). This, however, can only be achieved by putting good objects of aspiration into the place of the bad, the better object into that of the good, and the best into that of the better; directing, however, one’s whole attention to our highest goal of consummation and living in the eternal as much as we can, this is the *only* mode of thought that will *finally* deliver us from the imperfections of existence.

If the patient cannot see the force of this train of argument or does not like it, the mystic will leave him to his own further development, and to some future opportunity which might bring the same man near him again, but in a more favourable state of mind.

Not so the occultist. He will consider it his duty to stick to this man to whose Karma, as to that of everyone else, he is irremediably and unavoidably bound; he will not abandon him until he has helped him on to such an advanced state of true spiritual development that he begins to see his final goal and to aspire to it “with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might.” In the meantime, however, the occultist will try to prepare him for that by helping him to arrange his worldly life in a manner as favourable to such an aspiration as

possible. He will make him see that vegetarian or rather fruit-diet is the only food fully in accordance with human nature; he will teach him the fundamental rules of esoteric hygienics; he will show him how to make the right use of vitality (mesmerism), and as he does not feel any aspiration for the nameless and formless eternal, he will meanwhile make him aspire for esoteric knowledge and for occult powers.

Now, will you do us the great favour to show us reasons *why* the mystic is wrong and the occultist right, or why paranirvana should not be attained by any individuality and at any time, when its *own* karma has been burnt by *gnana* in *samadhi*, and independent of the karma of any other individual or that of humanity.

Yours sincerely,

HUBBE-SCHLEIDEN

Neuhaugen bei *Miinchen*, September, 1889

Answer. As no Occultist of my acquaintance would act in this supposed fashion no answer is possible. We theosophists, and especially your humble servant, are too occupied with our work to lose time at answering supposititious cases and fictions. When our prolific correspondent tells us *whom* he means under the name of the “Occultist” and *when* or *where* the latter has acted in that way, I will be at his service. Perhaps he means some Theosophist or rather member of the T.S. under this term? For I, at any rate, never met yet an “Occultist” of that description. As to the closing question I believe it was sufficiently answered in the earlier explanations of this reply.

Yours, as sincerely,

H. P. BLAVATSKY