



The same fundamental mysteries are found in the sacred texts of every nation, of every people, from the beginning of the conscious life of humanity.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THEOSOPHY

Vol. L

December, 1961

No. 2

THE FLOW OF DOMINANT IDEAS

FOR some years, now, novelists and writers generally have been straining to get out of the limiting framework of the nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century conception of "reality." Even in science-fiction, that brash and forward stepchild of serious literature, there has been a change of theme, from upward and onward with rocket guns and spaceships in conquest of the universe, to an ominous questioning of the moral blindness and arrogance of earthmen, in contrast to hypothetically wiser entities from outer space. The realistic novel is no longer a treatise on the struggle for social justice, but a questing analysis of the idea of self and the role of the individual in human life. This tendency among the younger writers is nowhere better illustrated than in the stories of J. D. Salinger, whose sensitive explorations of the psychology of the young have turned two issues of the *New Yorker* into collectors' items, revealing that the wandering focus of interest of even casual readers had at last settled on questions of the direction and meaning of the inner life of individuals. Salinger wrote openly, also, of such supposedly exotic and unpopular themes as yoga development and reincarnation, with a light but provocative touch.

The pressure of this longing for a sense of meaning in individual existence, as distinguished from the meaning of the social struggle, cast up the talents of creative writers on the bleak shores of Existentialist thought, where ordinary individuals, cast as anti-heroes, suffered the penalties of an irreducible minimum of integrity. The dilemmas of Existentialist fiction might be thought of as the last gasp of nineteenth-century social idealism, impaled upon the cruel spikes of collectivist

materialism, hazards which have come to characterize the social arrangements of the age; the Existentialist theme is a sign of the final exhaustion of the nineteenth-century account of external or "natural" reality, leaving the way clear for a fresh inspiration.

Meanwhile, some preparations have been going on. It is well known that novelists take their cues from the science and the philosophy of their age. The "rugged individualist" novels of the early years of the century were conceived in the matrix of Darwinist evolutionary theory—embodying themes of the "struggle for existence" and "survival of the fittest." These were followed by stories heavily involved in Freudian psychology. Social themes animated the novels of the thirties, but were subjected to insistent questioning as the sour failure of social utopias became evident in the latter years of that decade. Steinbeck's *In Dubious Battle*, possibly his best book, might be taken as symptomatic of the changing intuition of the modern story-teller, who would soon be looking for another sort of "conflict-situation" as the background of character development.

After the war was over it was apparent that psychological science had changed its emphasis to a more clinical approach to the complex of human problems. The Neo-Freudians having, as Ira Progoff pointed out, turned Freud upside-down, and begun to press the case for an almost "spiritual" idea of the inner man, a new popularity became possible for the now liberated and more or less eclectic doctrines of psychoanalysis. The academic psychologists found that only by adopting the assumptions of the analysts could they infuse some life and interest into their dying, mechanistic discipline. In the nineteen-fifties, a loosely defined school, known as the "self-psychologists," began to make its pro-human theories felt. The cry for study of the normal man, the hunger for "maturity," the wondering about the sources of originality and "creativity"—these became the unashamed keynotes of the new psychology.

At the same time, the accumulating influence of the parapsychologists began to make itself noticeably felt. Groups within specialized professions, such as psychiatry, were formed to take note of parapsychological phenomena. Scientific publications which once disposed of theories of telepathy and clairvoyance with a gesture of contempt were now publishing cautious articles of a pro-and-con character. Men with reputations at stake in the sciences showed less timidity in announcing that they had "open minds" regarding the possibility of extra sensory perception.

The fringe magazines were of course far ahead of this slow progress among professionals, but then the fringe magazines are distinguished by the ability to be carelessly right and dreadfully wrong at the same time, concerning a large number of subjects.

Perhaps the most significant development along these general lines has been the slowly strengthening groundswell of interest in reincarnation. Not the interest of an occasional novelist—such as, for example, Nevil Shute, or Robert Nathan—who has always been with us, but of philosophers and medical men. The On the Lookout department of this magazine has kept fairly close track of this trend by frequent reviews of the papers of C. J. Ducasse, and, more recently, the writings of Dr. Ian Stevenson. It is no doubt far too soon to announce an actual “change” in the frame of reference of acknowledged psychic reality, but the work of such men may easily be taken as important evidence of another dimension of pioneering hypothesis concerning the range and scope of human life. With the passage of another decade or so, we may see other investigators and speculative thinkers helping to block in the dimension with stronger strokes and additional perspectives.

It hardly needs pointing out that the idea of reincarnation will help to fill a deep abyss of longing in the hearts of the people of our time. As, one by one, the familiar doors to a free and satisfying existence are slammed by the ominous march of events, new openings in the old ideas about the world and man will be sought. It is a time of revolutionary change, including the political sphere. That Bertrand Russell, the oldest and most distinguished philosopher of the nineteenth-century tradition—author of the most pessimistic passages one can find concerning the meaning of human life—is now on the barricades of change in relation to the methods men use to settle their political differences, is not without its encouragements. Change is in the air, and the wearing away of old assumptions in one department of human life contributes an inductive force of liberation in other areas.

It is with some satisfaction, therefore, that we note, in this month's announcement of books on the inside front cover of THEOSOPHY, the appearance of a new and quite complete anthology of quotations on the subject of reincarnation. Such volumes cannot help but lay the groundwork for daring conceptions in both the psychology and philosophy of the time. The world, we suspect, is quite ready for this book, and is likely to make good use of it.

CHRISTMAS THEN AND CHRISTMAS NOW

WE are reaching the time of the year when the whole Christian world is preparing to celebrate the most noted of its solemnities—the birth of the Founder of their religion. When this paper reaches its Western subscribers there will be festivity and rejoicing in every house. In North Western Europe and in America the holly and ivy will decorate each home, and the churches be decked with evergreens; a custom derived from the ancient practice of the pagan Druids “that sylvan spirits might flock to the evergreens, and remain unnipped by frost till a milder season.” In Roman Catholic countries large crowds flock during the whole evening and night of “Christmas-eve” to the churches, to salute waxen images of the divine Infant, and his Virgin mother, in her garb of “Queen of Heaven.” To an analytical mind, this bravery of rich gold and lace, pearl-broidered satin and velvet and the bejewelled cradle do seem rather paradoxical. When one thinks of the poor, worm-eaten, dirty manger of the Jewish country-inn, in which, if we must credit the Gospel, the future “Redeemer” was placed at his birth for lack of a better shelter, we cannot help suspecting that before the dazzled eyes of the unsophisticated devotee the Bethlehem stable vanishes altogether. To put it in the mildest terms, this gaudy display tallies ill with the democratic feelings and the truly divine contempt for riches of the “Son of Man,” who had “not where to lay his head.” It makes it all the harder for the average Christian to regard the explicit statement that—“it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven,” as anything more than a rhetorical threat. The Roman Church acted wisely in severely forbidding her parishioners to either read or interpret the Gospel for themselves, and leaving the Book, as long as it was possible, to proclaim its truths in Latin—“the voice of one crying in the wilderness.” In that, she but followed the wisdom of the ages—the wisdom of the old Aryans, which is also “justified of her children”; for, as neither the modern Hindu devotee understands a word of the Sanskrit, nor the modern Parsi one syllable of the Zend, so for the average Roman Catholic the Latin is no better than Hieroglyphics. The result is that all the three—Brahminical High Priest, Zoroastrian Mobed, and Roman Catholic Pontiff,

NOTE.—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in the *Theosophist* for December, 1879, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for December, 1943.

are allowed unlimited opportunities for evolving new religious dogmas out of the depths of their own fancy, for the benefit of their respective churches.

To usher in this great day, the bells are set merrily ringing at midnight, throughout England and the Continent. In France and Italy, after the celebration of the mass in churches magnificently decorated, "it is usual for the revellers to partake of a collation (*reveillon*) that *they may be better able to sustain the fatigues of the night*," saith a book treating upon Popish church ceremonials. This night of Christian fasting reminds one of the *Sivaratree* of the followers of the god Siva,—the great day of gloom and fasting, in the 11th month of the Hindu year. Only, with the latter, the night's long vigil is preceded and followed by a strict and rigid fasting. No *reveillons* or compromises for them. True, they are but wicked "heathens," and therefore their way to salvation must be tenfold harder.

Though now universally observed by Christian nations as the anniversary of the birth of Jesus, the 25th of December was not originally so accepted. The most movable of the Christian feast days during the early centuries, Christmas was often confounded with the Epiphany, and celebrated in the months of April and May. As there never was any authentic record, or proof of its identification, whether in secular or ecclesiastical history, the selection of that day long remained optional; and it was only during the 4th century that, urged by Cyril of Jerusalem, the Pope (Julius I.) ordered the bishops to make an investigation and come finally to *some* agreement as to the *presumable* date of the nativity of Christ. Their choice fell upon the 25th day of December—and a most unfortunate choice it has since proved! It was Dupuis, followed by Volney, who aimed the first shots at this natal anniversary. They proved that for incalculable periods before our era, upon very clear astronomical data, nearly all the ancient peoples had celebrated the birth of their sun-gods on that very day. "Dupuis shows that the celestial sign of the VIRGIN AND CHILD was in existence several thousand years before Christ"—remarks Higgins in his *Anacalypsis*. As Dupuis, Volney, and Higgins have all been passed over to posterity as infidels, and enemies of Christianity, it may be as *well* to quote, in this relation, the confessions of the Christian Bishop of Ratisbone, "the most learned man that the middle ages produced"—the Dominican, Albertus Magnus. "The sign of the celestial Virgin rises above the horizon at the moment in *which*

we fix the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ," he says, in the *Recherches historiques sur Falaise, par Langevin prêtre*. So Adonis, Bacchus, Osiris, Apollo, etc., were all born on the 25th of December. Christmas comes just at the time of the winter solstice; the days then are shortest, and *Darkness* is more upon the face of the earth than ever. All the sun Gods were believed to be annually born at the epoch; for from this time its Light dispels more and more darkness with each succeeding day, and the power of the *Sun* begins to increase.

However it may be, the Christmas festivities, that were held by the Christians for nearly fifteen centuries, were of a particularly pagan character. Nay, we are afraid that even the present ceremonies of the church can hardly escape the reproach of being almost literally copied from the mysteries of Egypt and Greece, held in honour of Osiris and Horus, Apollo and Bacchus. Both Isis and Ceres were called "Holy Virgins," and a DIVINE BABE may be found in every "heathen" religion. We will now draw two pictures of the Merrie Christmas; one portraying the "good old times," and the other the present state of Christian worship. From the first days of its establishment as Christmas, the day was regarded in the double light of a holy commemoration and a most cheerful festivity: It was equally given up to devotion and insane merriment. "Among the revels of the Christmas season were the so-called feasts of fools and of asses, grotesque saturnalia, which were termed 'December liberties,' in which everything serious was burlesqued, the order of society reversed, and its decencies ridiculed"—says one compiler of old chronicles. "During the Middle Ages, it was celebrated by the gay fantastic spectacle of dramatic mysteries, performed by personages in grotesque masks and singular costumes. The show usually represented an infant in a cradle, surrounded by the Virgin Mary and St. Joseph, by bulls' heads, cherubs, Eastern Magi, (the Mobeds of old), and manifold ornaments." The custom of singing canticles at Christmas, called Carols, was to recall the songs of the shepherds at the Nativity. "The bishops and the clergy often joined with the populace in carolling, and the songs were enlivened by dances, and by the music of tambours, guitars, violins and organs. . . ." We may add that down to the present times, during the days preceding Christmas, such mysteries are being enacted, with marionettes and dolls, in Southern Russia, Poland, and Galicia; and known as the *Kalidowki*. In Italy, Calabrian minstrels descend from their mountains to Naples and Rome, and crowd the

shrines of the Virgin-Mother, cheering her with their wild music.

In England, the revels used to begin on Christmas eve, and continue often till Candlemas (Feb. 2), every day being a holiday till Twelfth-night (Jan. 6). In the houses of great nobles a "lord of misrule," or "abbot of unreason" was appointed, whose duty it was to play the part of a buffoon. "The larder was filled with capons, hens, turkeys, geese, ducks, beef, mutton, pork, pies, puddings, nuts, plums, sugar and honey." . . . "A glowing fire, made of great logs, the principal of which was termed the 'Yule log,' or Christmas block, which might be burnt till Candlemas eve, kept out the cold; and the abundance was shared by the lord's tenants amid music, conjuring, riddles, hot-cockles, fool-plough, snap-dragon, jokes, laughter, repartees, forfeits and dances."

In our modern times, the bishops and the clergy join no more with the populace in open carolling and dancing; and feasts of "fools and of asses" are enacted more in sacred privacy than under the eyes of the dangerous, argus-eyed reporter. Yet the eating and drinking festivities are preserved throughout the Christian world; and, more sudden deaths are doubtless caused by gluttony and intemperance during the Christmas and Easter holidays, than at any other time of the year. Yet, Christian worship becomes every year more and more a false pretence. The heartlessness of this lip-service has been denounced innumerable times, but never, we think, with a more affecting touch of realism than in a charming dream-tale, which appeared in the *New York Herald* about last Christmas. An aged man, presiding at a public meeting, said he would avail himself of the opportunity to relate a vision he had witnessed on the previous night. "He thought he was standing in the pulpit of the most gorgeous and magnificent cathedral he had ever seen. Before him was the priest or pastor of the church, and beside him stood an angel with a tablet and pencil in hand, whose mission it was to make record of every act of worship or prayer that transpired in his presence and ascended as an acceptable offering to the throne of God. Every pew was filled with richly-attired worshippers of either sex. The most sublime music that ever fell on his enraptured ear filled the air with melody. All the beautiful ritualistic Church services, including a surpassingly eloquent sermon from the gifted minister, had in turn transpired, and yet the recording angel made no entry in his tablet! The congregation were at length dismissed by the pastor with a lengthy and beautifully-worded prayer, followed by a benediction, and yet the angel made no sign!

"Attended still by the angel, the speaker left the door of the church in rear of the richly-attired congregation. A poor, tattered castaway stood in the gutter beside the curbstone, with her pale, famished hand extended, silently pleading for alms. As the richly-attired worshippers from the church passed by, they shrank from the poor Magdalen, the ladies withdrawing aside their silken, jewel-bedecked robes, lest they should be polluted by her touch.

"Just then an intoxicated sailor came reeling down the sidewalk on the other side. When he got opposite the poor forsaken girl, he staggered across the street to where she stood, and, taking a few pennies from his pocket, he thrust them into her hand, accompanied with the adjuration, 'Here, you poor forsaken cuss, take this!' A celestial radiance now lighted up the face of the recording angel, who instantly entered the sailor's act of sympathy and charity in his tablet, and departed with it as a sweet sacrifice to God."

A concretion, one might say, of the Biblical story of the judgment upon the woman taken in adultery. Be it so; yet it portrays with a master hand the state of our Christian society.

According to tradition, on Christmas-eve, the oxen may always be found on their knees, as though in prayer and devotion; and, "there was a famous hawthorn in the churchyard of Glastonbury Abbey, which always budded on the 24th, and blossomed on the 25th of December"; which, considering that the day was chosen by the Fathers of the church at random, and that the calendar has been changed from the old to the new style, shows a remarkable perspicacity in both the animal and the vegetable! There is also a tradition of the church, preserved to us by Olaus, archbishop of Upsal, that, at the festival of Christmas, "the men, living in the cold Northern parts, are suddenly and strangely metamorphosed into wolves; and that a huge multitude of them meet together at an appointed place and rage so fiercely against mankind, that it suffers more from their attacks than ever they do from the natural wolves." Metaphorically viewed, this would seem to be more than ever the case with men, and particularly with Christian nations, now. There seems no need to wait for Christmas-eve to see whole nations changed into "wild beasts"—especially in time of war.

THEOSOPHIC MORALS

[Lookout for this issue (p. 95) reports, to the surprise of many Theosophists, that the article "Living the Higher Life"—several times reprinted in THEOSOPHY from Mr. Judge's *Path* magazine for July and August, 1886—was in fact written by a Hindu Theosophist, rather than by Mr. Judge himself under one of his pseudonyms. An unpublished letter of H.P.B.'s to Mr. Judge in respect to the article, now come to the attention of the editors of THEOSOPHY, indicates that Madame Blavatsky was considerably concerned with the effect the article might have—if interpreted as a canon of instruction regarding the ideal personal life of Theosophical students. From this standpoint undoubtedly, as well as that of disapproval of the author, one Bowaji, H.P.B. wrote on July 27, 1886, that "Living the Higher Life" contained "absurdities." In the same letter, H.P.B. sent for publication in the *Path* an article by Mr. A. P. Sinnett which she felt would help to balance the scales against over-emphases in the "Murdhna Joti" article. This polemical, but undeniably useful, rejoinder by Mr. Sinnett to "Living the Higher Life" is hereby reprinted for the first time in THEOSOPHY from the *Path* for September, 1886—followed by Mr. Judge's thought-provoking "Note" on both articles, which seeks to establish a synthesis between the concerns expressed in both articles. —Eds. THEOSOPHY]

SOME remarks professedly concerned with "The Higher Life," appearing in the *Path* for July, over the *nom de plume* of *Murdhna Joti*, strike me as presenting the readers with so narrow and unwholesome a view of Theosophic principles, that I find myself impelled to point out some of the misconceptions from which they seem to arise. That hard-worked phrase the "Dweller on the Threshold" has been interpreted in many fantastic senses, but surely it has never before been saddled with so ludicrously inappropriate a meaning as in this essay where it is made to stand for love of kindred and love of country. That these ennobling sentiments are what the writer means by "family defects" and "national defects" is apparent from the passage that would be little less than blasphemous in the ears of any real oriental Chela with whom I have ever been acquainted, in which "A Mahatma has, it appears, declared that he has still patriotism. But he has not said nor would say that he has still family attachment. This proves that he has

got out of the defects of the family to which he belongs, while he is only striving to get out of national defects, some of which at any rate cling to him."

The reference here is of course to one of the letters quoted by me in the *Occult World*, in which the writer so beautifully shows that the exalted rank in nature to which he has attained, leaves him as free as ever to entertain generous emotions of sympathy with the race to which his latest personality belongs. If he had been dealing with the subject from another point of view he would have equally shown himself to be, as I have good reason to believe that he is, animated by still more specific attachments to certain persons of his physical kindred. "Defects" of family and defects of nationality may undoubtedly be reflected in given individuals, and like any other personal failings may in such cases stand in the way of devotion to the Higher Life; but such defects are not those which are convertible terms, according to the extraordinary essay before me, with healthy patriotism and domestic affection. And I can hardly imagine a more grotesquely misleading account of occult progress than that which represents the "beginner" as employed upon first extinguishing his regard for his relations, and going on to teach himself indifference to the land of his birth.

If the extravagance of such a doctrine could be enhanced in an essay addressed to Western readers, it would be thus intensified by its author's reference to the "family duties" which must be duly accomplished first before the promising neophyte in the training subsequently prescribed for him is at liberty to enter the "circle of ascetics." A certain haziness clings round his theory as to the nature of these duties, but enough is said to show any reader familiar with India, that the writer's mind is running on the exoteric customs of the Hindu which constitute the local superstitions of the common people, a designation which applies equally to one caste as to another, for modern Brahmins may be as thoroughly dissociated from the spirit of the esoteric doctrine and as hopelessly saturated with corrupt conventionalities as British churchwardens or the corresponding functionaries in America. Some such fancies derived from exoteric Hindu thinking have clearly inspired the article under notice. In India even exoteric thinking recognizes the existence of Mahatmas and theories concerning the methods by which their condition may be approached, but Theosophic students in Europe and America should be on their guard against supposing that every

thing which emanates from an Indian source, must on that account be true occult philosophy.

Especially in India, but in other parts of the world too, in various disguises we continually encounter the fundamental blunder of the mere *fakir* that progress in occult development is to be acquired by simulating some of the external characteristics of a development that has been accomplished. No doubt there are states of immaterial existence to which human beings may ultimately climb, at distances of time as immeasurable as those heights themselves, where such relative attributes as those which invest embodied human beings with specific attachments, will be merged in the higher mysteries of nature, which we can talk about already, perhaps, and assign names to, but assuredly cannot yet realize, or even effectually comprehend. But it may be, there is hardly any level even in Adeptship, at which still embodied humanity is ripe to shed such attachments, and the notion of talking about attempting this from the point of view of incipient chelaship is as ludicrous as it would be to talk about pruning a seedling which had just protruded its first green shoot above the ground; and suggests, in regard to human illustrations, the notion of a beardless youngster, who presents himself to a barber to be shaved.

We Theosophists are engaged in an undertaking which makes it very desirable that we should not render ourselves ridiculous; and though there is no endeavor possible for us which is better entitled to respect than an honest attempt to lead "the Higher Life," we may perhaps more easily bring discredit on our movement by talking nonsense about that grand ideal, than in any other way. We may go further, indeed, than the mere recognition of nobility attaching to the pursuit of the Higher Life. We may grant that no one can truly be said to have assimilated the principles of esoteric teaching unless these have made a sensible impression on his conduct and on the practical attitude he assumes in relation to others and the world at large. But it will be a matter to be determined by each man's temperament, how far he keeps his own personal dealings, so to speak, with the great principles of Theosophy a private transaction between himself and his conscience, or how far he ventures to bring them into relief by devoting himself especially as a Theosophist to the task of preaching exalted morality. I am now of course passing out, on my own account, into the ocean of Theosophic discussion in general, and the sentence just penned has no reference to

the article I began by reviewing, which appears to me to be very far from promulgating any morality or even coherent sense, exalted or otherwise. But on the subject at large a few general remarks at this juncture may perhaps not be inappropriate.

The most exalted morality imaginable is inevitably deduced from the principles of occult science, for by explaining to mankind how it is that they really evolve through successive lives, each depending on the last and on all its predecessors as summed up in the last, the basic motives for good conduct are set out with far greater precision than they can be suggested by the bribes or threats of conventional religion. Such temptations and warnings, as experience has shown, come to be distrusted or no longer feared as the manifestly erroneous conceptions with which they are entangled become apparent to advancing intelligence. Then, loving the right still, under the influence of an inner intuition they have not learned to interpret properly, people attempt sometimes to supply the vacant places of their vanished faith with painful abstract theories of a barren duty, which take their rise in no intelligible sanction and tend to no specific result. For mere morality divorced from religion and justified by no prospects of future existence, it is impossible that the human mind could permanently furnish a nourishing soil.

To provide for the gathering emergency the esoteric doctrine is now beginning to shine on the world. In the longer freedom with which it will shine hereafter, no doubt it will do much more even than explain to men the scientific and satisfactory reasons why right *is* right, why the pursuit of good conduces to happiness and *vice versa*. Already indeed it is made apparent that the highest degrees of exaltation possible for human beings, can only be attained in connection with a pursuit of good which has a still more subtle motive than the thirst for spiritual happiness—which is animated by that unsurpassably sublime intention (often talked about so glibly, but surely realized so seldom) unselfishness and disinterested zeal for the welfare of others. But even if we do not handle that exalted topic—which sits ill upon the lips of any preachers who do not at all events outshine the average achievements of ordinary good men in the exercise of unselfishness—is there not in what is put forward above in the first purpose of Theosophy a sufficiently exhilarating task to absorb our best energies? To be laying the foundations of the future system of thought which *must* in due time replace—as the guiding rule of men's lives—the earlier and cruder prescriptions of a

priestcraft that their widening comprehension of Nature is fast outgrowing, is not that a sufficiently magnificent task for the Theosophical Society?

Certainly esoteric teaching opens up possibilities before the sight of ardent spiritual aspirants that suggest to some eager hearts the pursuit of an object which, if rightly understood may be more magnificent still, but which, as contemplated in the beginning may often be prompted by a relatively selfish motive, the personal pursuit of Adeptship. But in its original purpose the welfare of mankind at large and not the enlistment of new recruits in the army of chelaship was, as I read its design, the idea of the Theosophical Society. And how was that design to be carried out? This question seems to me to touch a point which it is highly important to keep in view at the present moment. The Theosophical movement did not begin by preaching *de haut en bas* an all but impossible code of ethics. It began by the highly practical course of linking its operations with one of the most growing impulses in the most spiritually minded sections of the Western community. These were *not* the merely good and pious representatives of still surviving, though decaying religious systems; they were not the hopeless however unselfish exponents of a barren philosophy that threw forward no light on the future; they were found mainly among people who in one way or another, and following various false beacons, perhaps, were realizing that discoveries were possible beyond the barriers that had formerly seemed to set a limit to the range of the human senses.

The bold though bewildered pioneers of psychic inquiry were naturally marked out, indeed, to be appealed to first by the esoteric teachers. For them above all was the rudderless condition of modern religious thought a dark and threatening danger. Along the road they had set out to travel they would certainly not stop short. But readers of Theosophic literature will not require to be reminded where the study of occult phenomena un-illuminated by occult morality must ultimately conduct its enthusiasts. The classes referred to were best qualified to receive the new dispensation; and most urgently in need of it. To them therefore the Theosophical propaganda in the beginning was directed, and this is the consideration which will be seen to explain the mystery that has so frequently been discussed in more recent years—the free and so to speak the extravagant display of occult wonders and marvellous phenomena with which the advent of the Theosophical movement was

heralded. Its directors, as it were, had to put themselves at the head of the psychic movement generally, in order to direct its future course aright, and they could not do this without commanding the attention of persons already largely experienced in psychic investigation.

No doubt the time has now gone by when the policy that thus inaugurated the Theosophical movement is either practicable or desirable. "The age of miracles is past," for us as for mankind at large—always making allowance for the familiar correction required by the saying that the age for helping on the more general comprehension of those resources of nature with which the "miracles" had to do has not passed, by any means. The interpretation of Nature—the promulgation of truth concerning the "powers latent in Man"—to the end that the world at large may the better understand its own destinies and promote its own healthier development through an immediate future, is still the ample task that lies before the working members of our organization. Again let us say that no one proposes to divorce this from recognition with which it is so intimately blended, of the sublime morality expressed in the phrase—the Brotherhood of Man. But in our zeal for the starry goal in the far distance, it will be discreet, on our part, to avoid the mistake of the Greek philosopher and not to forget the ground at our feet.

A. P. Sinnett

NOTE.—The admirable letter which we have printed above from the able pen of the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* is a good instance of the truth that there are many ways of arriving at the same goal, and incidentally it also illustrates how difficult it is for those who look at any subject by the light of their own "ray" to appreciate the view taken of it by one whose mental constitution is different. Both Murdhna Joti and Mr. Sinnett are right from their own points of view, and as they understand themselves. Both seem to us to be wrong as they probably understand each other. Patriotism and family attachments as understood by Mr. Sinnett are good things, for he characterises them by the adjectives "healthy" "ennobling" "generous." It cannot be supposed from either a critical or casual reading of "The Higher Life" that Murdhna Joti advocates the elimination of any sentiment to which these terms would ap-

ply. But patriotism and family attachments may be narrow, bigoted, and founded upon an ignorance of other countries and other families, and upon an inability to perceive in other nations and persons the very qualities that make us feel warmly toward those we are acquainted with, intensified by a corresponding blindness to faults we have become habituated to and perhaps partake of ourselves. It is the "provincialism" of patriotism which breeds the prejudice in favor of things which are a part of our "larger selves," and which is bad; and this narrowness in the case of family attachment (a different thing from personal affection), makes us fancy that our family geese are more beautiful than our neighbor's swans.

It is in this sense, it seems to us, that the family defects in question are held by Murdhna Joti as things to get rid of, and may be said to enter into that poetical conception "the Dweller on the Threshold"; and it is in this sense that a Mahatma may be supposed to lose them. As we rise to a higher level we perceive in clearer distinction the lights and shades in our own country and family, and we see also that much the same lights and shades exist elsewhere and everywhere; we lose at the same time the personal prejudice which made lights and shades of a particular tint more agreeable to us than others; and thus we are brought to view all countries and families in their true light and in their real proportions. But the process by which this is accomplished is more of the nature of a leveling up than of a leveling down. The attachment of a villager is at first confined to his village; as his mind expands, his interests extend themselves progressively to the county, the state, and the nation. This last entails an expenditure of "generous feeling" which is exhaustive for most men; but a Mahatma has enough left to stretch out over the whole of humanity. Anything smaller would not be "ennobling" or "generous" in his case.

We cannot agree, however, with Mr. Sinnett, in his criticism of Murdhna Joti's article, as to its presenting a false view of "Theosophic morals." The fact, at which the learned author of the *Occult World* hints, that a certain Mahatma has "specific attachments" to relatives, does not prove that He still has "family defects." Perhaps the writer of "Living the Higher Life" might have been better understood by Mr. Sinnett if he had in his first paper, intimated that while family defects were to be got rid of, the noble qualities of the family, were to be strengthened; but this seems to be plainly inferred, and is actually to be found in the paper,

(p. 153, 3rd paragraph [THEOSOPHY 42:207, 1st par.]); and all through the first paper, it is strenuously insisted, that the only theosophic morality, is that one which compels us to unselfishly perform our duty in our family where we are placed by inevitable Karma.

Not only has a Mahatma said He "still had patriotism," but He has also stated more emphatically, that "in external Buddhism is the road to truth." We cannot therefore agree with Mr. Sinnett in the objection that exoteric Indian thought and religion led to error. In complete knowledge of this second declaration of the Mahatma, we read and printed Murdhna Joti's paper, as we have "Theosophic Morals." We see in the paper criticised high aspiration and excellent precepts.

There are many modes of life; there are lower and higher planes. No man in one short article can write away all possible future misconceptions; both sides must be presented, and they shall be in this Magazine. We need therefore here warn readers, that Mr. Sinnett does not by any means desire them to understand that in saying that the Mahatma quoted has "certain specific attachments," he would convey the impression that such a great Being has to struggle with the limitations of a family, or that he had given up one legitimate set of ties only to assume others similar. Far from that. The nature of the attachment referred to, is quite as undefinable at Mr. Sinnett's hands as it is at those of the readers, and we think it would be wise for the critic to state with clearness what the attachment is, in order that all readers may for themselves be able to judge of the full meaning, extent and connection of Mr. Sinnett's reference, and what use can properly be made of it for comparison or analysis.

The Mahatma studies the *Bhagavad-Gita* in its higher sense, and all through that book the "passionless ascetic" is lauded. What does it mean? Neglect of life and family? Never! But sometimes one gets out of family defects quite naturally. Yet the world says that *Bhagavad-Gita* inculcates stony hearted selfishness, even as they carp at *Light on the Path* when it says "the eyes must be incapable of tears; ambition and desires must be killed out." These are hard sayings. Theosophy is full of difficult sayings, just as Jesus of the Christians said his parables were. But *Bhagavad-Gita* is the divine colloquy; and it is asserted that a Mahatma dictated *Light on the Path*—[Ed. (*Path*)]

QUESTION—AND COMMENT

IT seems to be an old, old problem for Theosophical students to encounter confusion when trying to identify themselves with either "Higher Manas" or "Lower Manas." Of course, this is an old, old problem for philosophers through many centuries, and accounts in part for the vehement rejection of any kind of dualism on the part of so many contemporary thinkers. The Theosophist sometimes speaks of the immortal individuality as "Buddhi-Manas" or "Higher Manas," and yet at the same time he is often reminded in Theosophical writings that evolution takes place in the area of Lower Manas. Is it possible to bypass some of the confusions and paradoxes of terminology to find a simple way of identifying ourselves?

Perhaps there needs to come a time, for each student engaged in the consideration of stated metaphysical principles, to temporarily set them aside and begin to reason from direct experience—later returning to metaphysical doctrine in order to see if correlations and confirmations have been established. In the simplest terms, we can say that each man is obviously a "unit of mind"—an individuality. Though all men manifest different degrees and varieties of intelligence, there is no doubt that each manifests *some* degree or *some* variety. The quality of mind is universal in two different respects, moreover: there is no "thus far shalt thou go and no farther" for the potential development of each mind, while at the same time each "mind unit" is definitely susceptible to absorption in group beliefs, opinions, and prejudices. So the "mind-unit" clearly works on different levels, and, in terms of modern psychological philosophy, one of these can be called the level of "*conditioned*" thinking and the other the level of autonomous thinking. Here, then, we arrive at a sort of operational definition of what in Theosophical terminology are called the lower and the higher mind.

Each mind-unit, then, lives in two worlds—the lower being represented by the three qualities as depicted in *The Bhagavad-Gita*, and the higher characterized by the capacity to transcend the conditionable aspects of intelligence. *We* are both the "lower mind" and the "higher mind" as we choose to be, alternately. But we are never, save momentarily, one of these to the entire exclusion of the other. This is another way of saying that there is no unalterable "self," though there *is* an un-

alterable "power" for molding or transforming the characteristics of our intelligence. The mind principle is imperishable, but none of its constructions can fail to be altered through evolutionary experience. The soul, as the self-moving unit, cannot be defined by any terms save its own—though it is also a fundamental differentiation of universal mind. The center of choice is neither in lower mind nor higher mind but in ourselves, as we choose one or the other level of expression. It is perhaps here that we come to a more detailed understanding of why contemporary philosophers object to any descriptions of the soul—and why Buddha, though convinced of the existence of an enduring individuality, refused to discuss the characteristics of this individuality.

It is this aspect of Buddha's subtlety which has been so emphasized—and also so exaggerated—in the Zen tradition, for in Zen a great deal of attention is paid to the doctrine of the "not-Self." (We find an echo in portions of contemporary existentialism when an existentialist philosopher affirms that "there is no self.") The point is that if we cannot describe ourselves as either higher mind or lower mind, there are no adequate descriptive terms for the consciousness of man, since everything we do ordinarily describe is by way of relativity—and every form of relativity may be construed as some point on a measuring scale of either "good" or "bad," or "higher" or "lower." This point is conveyed in an interesting fashion by Professor Huston Smith in *The Religions of Man*. In this passage he attempts to render Zen philosophy understandable to the Western mind:

With all they contribute, words have three limitations. At worst, they build up a false world in which other people are reduced to stereotypes and our actual feelings are camouflaged in honorific titles. Second, even when their description of experience is in the main accurate it is never adequate; they always dilute the intensity of immediate experience even when they do not distort it. Finally and most important, the highest modes of experience transcend the reach of words entirely.

Every religion that has developed even a modicum of semantic sophistication recognizes to some extent the way words and reason fall short of reality when they do not actually distort it. However much the fact may baffle the intellectualist and utilitarian, supra-rational experience remains the paradox and life blood of religion as well, indeed, as of creative art. The saints of every faith are constantly telling us of contact with another world which dazzles, delights, and transfigures them with its "clear day of eternity which never changes into its contrary." With all this Zen is at one, its uniqueness lying only in the fact

that it is so concerned with the limitations of language and reason that it makes their transcendence the central intent of its method. . . .

Zen has its sacred books. In addition to the Sutras which it shares with Buddhism as a whole, it has its own special texts, the *Hekigan roku*, the *Mumonkan*, and others. But one glance at these will reveal how unlike other scriptures they are. Almost entirely they are given to pressing home the fact that Zen cannot be equated with any verbal formula whatever.

And yet, as many Zen disciples so well demonstrate, reasoning and making comparisons are not without value. But if we *are* to undertake reasoning about the lower mind and the higher mind, we can hope to do so impartially only if we are neither—since it could hardly be expected that higher mind or lower mind could reason properly about “itself.”

One student has suggested: “Higher Manas, as a principle, as *itself*, so to say, cannot function on the material plane; only its ray, its *influence*, its projection, can be utilized at the operational level. It might be well, then, in the interest of semantic clarity, to use the term ‘Higher Manas’ chiefly as defining the essential, imperishable Mind-principle at the non-operational level.”

THE LOWER CULTURE

What are really culture and civilization? . . . Real culture is spiritual. It proceeds from within, and unless a person is naturally noble-minded and strives to progress on the spiritual before he does so on the physical or outward plane, such culture and civilization will be no better than whitened sepulchres full of dead men’s bones and decay. And how can there be any true spiritual and intellectual culture when dogmatic creeds are the State religion and enforced under the penalty of the opprobrium of large communities of “believers.” No dogmatic creed can be progressive. Unless a dogma is the expression of a universal and proven fact in nature, it is no better than mental and intellectual slavery. One who accepts dogmas easily ends by becoming a dogmatist himself.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY: “Progress and Culture”

THE HIGHEST KNOWLEDGE AND THE DEEPEST MYSTERY

ASTRONOMY has created a new concept of the universe. Never before has science been able to approach so near to an intimation of infinity. For all intents and purposes the findings of the telescopic cameras have pictured boundlessness. And, as more powerful instruments are produced, more sensitive films used, there is no reason to believe that our present knowledge of space will not be dwarfed. In comparison to that which is now known, our earth, which for ages was considered the center of the universe, has shrunk to a mere speck of dust, and the milky way, our galaxy, takes its place as a larger speck in relation to that which the human understanding can never hope to realize—the ALL. And yet, when we contemplate the human race as a whole, and the complexity and depth of the individual unit; when we consider the vast evolution of humanity, its aspirations, and the extent and power of its thinking and its faith, we are brought to the realization that, because each individual has within him a ray from the central Divine Sun, the Atma, there is potential infinity within each throbbing heart and searching mind. That which appears to shrink into oblivion in relation to the whole, is in reality a substantial part of that whole, spiritually, and will survive and increase infinitely as the cycles roll on.

It is only in chemistry that the meaning of the word principle parallels that given it in Theosophical teachings. In its general usage, "principle" is thought of as a rule of action or conduct, or a fundamental truth upon which other truths depend. In chemistry, however, it refers to a distinctive constituent of a substance. Thus in creating a vocabulary for Theosophical literature the word was chosen to name the distinctive constituents of the human being, physical, astral, and spiritual, and the corresponding divisions of great Nature and the Cosmos. But the word has also been used to represent the cause and basis of all manifestation—"an Omnipresent Eternal, Boundless, and Immutable PRINCIPLE on which all speculation is impossible, since it transcends the power of human conception . . . beyond the range and reach of thought." Thus the use of the word becomes paradoxical; it expresses in common usage something familiar, and metaphysically that which no one can conceive of in thought. How necessary, then, to have a clear understanding of the connotation of the word in this period of rapid advances in knowledge

of the material universe. To the Theosophist-occultist has been assigned, in this our century, the study of the inner, metaphysical, and spiritual universe.

So closely is the human being related to the cosmos that in order to understand it one must seek its divisions, energies, and hidden nature within the mystery of the human principles. When this is accomplished in a degree commensurate to the individual's power of perception, guided by the teachings, there will awaken a better comprehension of the First Fundamental of *The Secret Doctrine*. As this comprehension expands, there will arise in the mind a truer concept of the universe and its immensity. For the First Fundamental is expressed in a manner that will lead the mind from the incomprehensible to the comprehensible; from be-ness to being; from the unmanifested to the manifested. Once boundlessness and its relation to our conditioned existence has become possible as a theme for meditation, the mind is ready to return to contemplate the Self of All, of which the individual self is a ray. We are able to look at the sun only through a darkened glass, but we enjoy its beneficial rays upon the body. Unable to look directly upon the mystery of the Self of All, we nevertheless can perceive and enjoy the spirit in the body.

Those who become aware of the harmony of the life in spirit, so enlarge the power of perception that their consciousness reaches out and partakes of the harmony that exists in the ceaseless movement throughout the universe. And this consciousness of the greater harmony reacts throughout the seven principles within us to bring about a necessary adjustment to the flow of Karma, both good and bad. In other words, one learns to adjust to the stream of individual life, physical and mental, through a wider perception of the fundamental basis of all life. Without a broadening of the inner perception, the mind will focus upon the rapidly flowing stream of events affecting the material existence, and the inner consciousness will loose its hold upon the Eternal. Like the sap rising through the trunk and branches, reaching out to the smallest twigs and myriad leaves of a great tree, the One Law touches every part of the universe and every thought and act of man. Every facet of manifestation, all that we perceive and touch, and every form of ideation, is under universal law with its flux and reflux of cyclic motion.

The highest knowledge and the deepest mystery are rarely sought: they appear on no curriculum or college prospectus. The possibility of

finding such knowledge, and such mystery, does not enter into the longings or hopes of the average man or woman. This is understandable, for the search deprives man of his most cherished possessions—his pride of self and the ability to harvest the fruit of his actions. Why this is so may not be readily apparent, although there is a parallel in the life of the great scientist, or the great artist, both of whom must sacrifice to attain. However, the parallel ceases with the necessary sacrifice: not only must the true Occultist make the sacrifice, but he must continue on alone without the support of reward or acclaim until the desire to gain greater stature than fellow beings is completely purged, and until he proves worthy to receive the intuitive power he seeks. Should he succeed in establishing the necessary conditions, he finds that wisdom takes possession of his inner being, and he becomes the knowledge and the mystery. He will find also that he is traveling back in spirit to the original primordial state from which he started on the long journey through every degree of form and consciousness of the material universe, with the added luster of the knowledge gained.

With these thoughts in mind, the Theosophist will see how very important his work may become in this century of unprecedented scientific progress in material research. He has in his possession the only integrated body of metaphysical literature. It is important because science is now reaching, as it were, toward the metaphysics of gross matter; not, however, a true metaphysic, for it but enters upon the energetic plane, a plane envisioned when radiant matter was isolated at the turn of the century. The true metaphysic deals with all the unseen planes leading by successive steps to a knowledge of the seat of manifestation; and the instruments necessary for this research lie within man.

The proper use of metaphysical study is a means to approach esotericism. As *The Secret Doctrine* explains: "... Outside metaphysics no occult philosophy, no esotericism is possible." So direct a statement needs careful consideration. It refutes the many false claims to authority that have plagued the Movement from its early days, and puts clearly before us the need for individual study. But those experiences and intimations of reality which come to us through the hidden senses are hard to express. Knowing this, let us look for the moment at the prefix *meta*, a Greek derivative meaning *beyond*. It is therefore in the language of beyond-physics, beyond the illusive plane of gross matter, that our Theosophical studies must eventually lead the mind. Until it finds the means

and the language with which to explore the inner planes of being, the mind cannot transcend the intellectual plane of thought. The intellect may attain great heights, but always at the expense of the spiritual nature.

The advance into esotericism has a profound effect upon the inner principles—the hidden sheaths of the soul. "It is a law of occult dynamics that a given amount of energy expended on the spiritual or astral plane is productive of far greater results than the same amount expended on the physical objective plane of existence." To energize that part of the human constitution which will eventually remain as the permanent spiritual structure of the individual, is the duty of the occultist; and, conversely, he must de-energize, so to speak, that which is not pertinent in the personality. When this condition is reached and sustained, the knowledge and the mystery blend and become as one. All that the ego attempts, each venture, each effort, will be bathed in the light of the Higher Self.

CONSCIOUSNESS UNRELATED TO OURS

Question—In "Secret Doctrine," vol. I, among the remarks upon sentiency of matter and force, I find this statement—"This consciousness has no relation to our consciousness." Now as all knowledge is the result of comparison, and our "consciousness" being at one and the same time the cause and instrument of knowledge, as acts the process of obtaining and knowledge itself, why does the "Secret Doctrine" make affirmations, the data of thought or knowledge being absent?

Answer—The statement made by H.P.B. as above is a copy of that made by her teachers called "Masters" by her. These are supposed to know the facts they give. Whether the claim be true or not, it is evident that insects have a consciousness which is different from ours, as we seem to add the element which makes ours "self-consciousness." And when H.P.B. spoke of our consciousness it is very plain she meant the ordinary sort and not the extraordinary. If the questioner will reflect that she has no comprehension of the consciousness of elemental spirits—which yet do actually exist and function in their own sphere—she may see that there may be varieties of consciousness not ours as yet.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

ONE of the most basic attributes of modern society is an amorphous yet ubiquitous anxiety, which pervades not only all the affairs of man, but his relationships with his fellows as well. Is this fear, along with its twin by-products of timidity and reactive aggressiveness, an unavoidable characteristic of our age, or is there some way to throw off that shroud, and achieve peace in the midst of Kali-Yuga?

In no other period has anxiety seemed such an immense and heavy cloud hovering over us as it does today—in an age where a person's station, wealth, opportunities, and even existence seem so utterly dependent upon circumstances beyond his control. But it is not only the actual or potential threats to man's welfare that are productive of his myriad fears; Dr. Karen Horney, in *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, speaks of "certain definite contradictions in our culture" which produce potentially hostile tension in even the most normal people. These cultural inconsistencies may be summed up as follows: (1) the contradiction between "competition and success on the one hand, and brotherly love and humility on the other"; (2) that between our exaggerated conceptions of what we need and our factual inability to satisfy those "needs"; and (3) that between our alleged freedom to determine our own fate, and our factual limitations.

Nevertheless, although the above mentioned contradictions are very real causes of tension in our society, we may find, upon examination, that they are themselves only effects, and so cannot constitute *ultimate* causes of the world's anxiety. Clearly, there have been in the past, and are even today, societies without our particular cultural contradictions, which similarly have their share of anxieties. We must therefore disagree with many psychologists and sociologists, and declare that it is not primarily the outward conditions of a civilization that shape our attitudes, but rather our attitudes which shape the conditions of our civilization. We are, of course, very much affected by society, but we must not forget that it is man who has created society, not the reverse. Thus, to discover the primary causes for the apprehensiveness of our age, we must not turn to external circumstances, but to man himself.

As soon as we do consider man's inner nature, and the "war in heaven" raging within him, we see that the contradictions in society are merely reflections of contradictions within the man himself, and will continue to exist only so long as the subjective ones do. Basically, these inner conflicts are spawned by the dichotomy existing between man's higher, moral nature and his lower, animalistic nature. If a man were at peace with himself, if he would conform the desires of his lower nature to the service of the higher, he would be at peace with the world. As it is, the majority of men are desperately trying to remain neutrals in their own subjective war; they are fast learning, though, that a fence is not the most comfortable thing to sit on. In the midst of satisfying their personal desires, therefore, they may suddenly feel a tug at their hearts as they sense that time is passing and nothing constructive being done. By the same token, they may be trying to grasp a great truth in life, only to find that they cannot keep their minds from wandering, their friends from interrupting, their jaws from yawning. They want to be neither pure stoics nor pure sensualists; they want to be good, but not *too* good; and so, lured by the lower, summoned by the higher, they answer neither call. It is in this listless and frustrating position that the majority of men presently find themselves.

But if anxieties assail those who are torn between duty and desire, a very different set of anxieties affect those who have already made the choice to follow the whims of their separative personalities. Men of this class are, as a rule, afflicted by vague apprehensions. Believing themselves alone in a vicious "neon wilderness," they are in constant fear lest their possessions, their reputations, or their very life be snatched away by some hostile hand. Thinking that they have a great deal to lose, they play the game of Life on the defensive, thereby inflicting upon themselves a much greater loss than they would ever have dreamed possible—the loss of a lifetime's opportunity for the attainment of spiritual knowledge. Thus, their selfish fears have turned into liabilities rather than defenses, for in the great divine "battle" fought by every being for the "emancipation of the soul," only the fearless and the altruistic will be victors; only they shall seize the prize of spiritual enlightenment and the lasting sweetness of inner peace.

SPACE

SPACE is the omnipresent Reality: impersonal, because it contains all and everything. In the occult catechism it is asked: What is that which always IS, which you cannot imagine as not *being*, do what you may? The answer is—SPACE. For there may not be a single man in the universe to think of it, not a single eye to perceive it, nor a single brain to sense it, but still Space is, ever was, and ever will be, and you cannot make away with it. Try if you can to think of anything with Space excluded and you will soon find out the impossibility of such a conception. Space exists where there is nothing else, and must so exist whether the Universe is one absolute vacuum or a full Pleroma.

The fundamental Law in the Secret Doctrine system, the central point from which all emerged, around and toward which all gravitates, and upon which is hung the philosophy of all the rest, is the One homogeneous divine SUBSTANCE-PRINCIPLE, the one radical cause. It is called "Substance-Principle" for it becomes "substance" on the plane of the manifested Universe, an illusion, while it remains a "principle" in the beginningless and endless abstract, visible and invisible Space. Akasha, whose characteristic property and rudiment is sound (the "Word"), occupies the whole containment of Space. Akasha is the Universal Space in which lies inherent the eternal Ideation of the Universe in its ever-changing aspects on the planes of matter and objectivity, and from which radiates the First Logos, or expressed thought.

Space is indivisible Intelligence, not human. There is but one indivisible and absolute Omniscience and Intelligence in the Universe, and this thrills throughout every atom and infinitesimal point of the whole finite Kosmos which hath no bounds, and which people call Space, considered independently of anything contained in it. "Karana," eternal cause, alone *is* during the Nights of Brahma. The previous objective Universe has dissolved into one primal and eternal cause, and is, so to say, held in solution in space, to differentiate again and crystallize out anew at the following Manvantaric dawn, which is the commencement of a new "Day," or new activity of Brahmâ—the symbol of the Universe.

Nature and Space are one. In the Rig Veda, *Aditi*, "the Boundless," or infinite Space, translated by Mr. Max Muller, "the visible infinite,

NOTE.—Collated from the teachings of Theosophy.

visible to the naked eye (!); the endless expanse beyond the Earth, beyond the clouds, beyond the sky," is the equivalent of "Mother Space coeval with "Darkness." She is very properly called "The Mother of the gods," DEVA-MATRI, as it is from her Cosmic matrix that all the heavenly bodies of our system were born—Sun and Planets.

Surrounding space is not an empty void, but a reservoir filled to repletion with the models of all things that ever were, that are, and that will be; and with beings of countless races, unlike our own. Would it be impertinent to surmise that perhaps our modern scientists—hampered by the weight of their materialism and the insufficiency of what they name "the exact sciences" to demonstrate to them tangibly the existence of a spiritual universe, peopled and inhabited much more than our visible one—are doomed forever to creep around *inside* that circle, unwilling, rather than unable, to penetrate beyond its enchanted ring and explore it in its length and breadth?

One has to understand the phraseology of Occultism before criticizing what it asserts. The Doctrine refuses (as Science does, in one sense) to use the words "above" and "below," "higher" and "lower," in reference to *invisible* spheres, as being without meaning. When "other worlds" are mentioned—whether better or worse, more spiritual or still more material, though both invisible—the Occultist does not locate these spheres either outside or inside our Earth, as the theologians and the poets do; for their location is nowhere in the space known to, and conceived by, the profane. They are, as it were, blended with our world—interpenetrating it and interpenetrated by it. There are millions and millions of worlds and firmaments visible to us; there are still greater numbers beyond those visible to the telescopes, and many of the latter kind do not belong to our objective sphere of existence. Although as invisible as if they were millions of miles beyond our solar system, they are yet with us, near us, *within* our own world, as objective and material to their respective inhabitants as ours is to us.

Space is the eternal Parentless, *Anupadaka*. It is neither a "limitless void," nor a "conditioned fulness," but both: being, on the plane of absolute abstraction, the ever-incognizable Deity, which is void only to finite minds, and on that of *mayavic* perception, the Plenum, the absolute Container of all that is, whether manifested or unmanifested: it is, therefore, that ABSOLUTE ALL. The Occultists say that the ONE ALL is like Space, which is its only mental and physical representation

on this Earth, or our plane of existence, and is neither an object of nor a subject to perception. In his infinite conceit and inherent pride man shaped himself, with his own sacrilegious hand, out of the material he found in his own small brain fabric, the God of human dogma and his *humanized* "Word," and forced it upon mankind as a direct revelation from the one unrevealed Space.

The true Buddhist, recognizing no "personal god," or any "Father" and "Creator of Heaven and Earth," still believes in an *absolute consciousness*, "Adi-Buddha"; and the Buddhist philosopher *knows* that there are Planetary Spirits, the "Dhyan Chohans." If the Dhyan Chohans and all the invisible Beings—the Seven Centers and their direct Emanations, the *minor* centers of Energy—are the direct reflex of the One Light, yet men are far removed from these, since the whole of the visible Kosmos consists of "self-produced" beings, the creatures of Karma. Thus, regarding a personal God "as only a gigantic shadow thrown upon the void of space by the imagination of ignorant men," they teach that only "two things are (objectively) eternal, namely *Akasha* and *Nirvana*"; and that these are ONE in reality, and but a *maya* when divided. Buddhists deny creation and cannot conceive of a *Creator*. "Everything," says the Buddhist Catechism, "has come out of *Akasha* (or *Svabhavat* on our earth) in obedience to a law of motion inherent in it, and after a certain existence passes away. Nothing ever came out of nothing."

God is the symbolic conception of that which is Life and Motion of the Universe. From the beginning of man's inheritance, from the first appearance of the architects of the globe he lives on, the unrevealed Deity was recognized and considered under its only philosophical aspect, universal motion—the thrill of the creative Breath in Nature. The one infinite and unknown Essence exists from all eternity, and in regular and harmonious successions is either passive or active.

Space is called in the esoteric symbolism "the Seven-Skinned Eternal Mother-Father." It is composed from its undifferentiated to its differentiated surface of seven layers. . . . The God of the Apostle-Initiate [Paul] and of the Rishis being both the unseen and the visible Space.

It is impossible to define Parabrahm. Once that we speak of that first something which *can* be conceived, it has to be treated as a feminine principle. In all cosmogonies the first differentiation was considered feminine. It is *Mulaprakriti*, "the Root of Nature," which conceals or

veils Parabrahm. THAT, called the "Eternal Parent," is the Vedantic Mulaprakriti, and the Svabhavat of the Buddhists, or that androgynous *something* which means the Root of Nature or Matter and which is both differentiated and undifferentiated. In its first principle it is a pure abstraction, which becomes differentiated only when it is transformed, in the process of time, into Prakriti, or "Nature in general." If compared with the human principles, Mulaprakriti would correspond with Buddhi, while Atma corresponds to Parabrahm, Manas to Mahat, and so on.

Plato and Hermes Trismegistus would have regarded the "seven layers of Space" as the *Divine Thought*, and Aristotle would have viewed the "Seven-Skinned Mother-Father" as the "privation" of matter. It is that which becomes the seven planes of being, commencing with the spiritual and passing through the psychic to the material plane. The seven planes of thought or the seven states of consciousness correspond to these planes. All these septenaries are symbolized by the seven "Skins."

But Divine Thought cannot be defined, or its meaning explained, except by the numberless manifestations of Cosmic Substance in which the former is *sensed* spiritually by those who can do so. The Divine Mind *is*, and must be, before differentiation takes place. It is called the divine Ideation, which is eternal in its Potentiality and periodical in its Potency, when it becomes *Mahat*, *Anima Mundi*, or Universal Soul. But remember that, however you name it, each of these conceptions has its most metaphysical, most material, and also intermediate aspects.

The appearance and disappearance of the Universes are pictured as an outbreathing and inbreathing of the "Great Breath," which is eternal, and which, being Motion, is one of the three aspects of the Absolute—Abstract Space and Duration being the other two. When the Great Breath is projected it is called the "Divine Breath," and is regarded as the breathing of the Unknowable Deity—the One Existence—which breathes out a thought, as it were, which becomes the Kosmos. So also it is when the Divine Breath is inspired again the Universe disappears into the bosom of "the Great Mother," who then sleeps "wrapped in her invisible robes."

The Occult Catechism contains the following questions and answers: What is it that ever is? Space, the eternal Anupadaka (Parentless). What is it that ever was? The Germ in the Root (Mulaprakriti). What

is it that is ever coming and going? The Great Breath. Then, there are three Eternals? No, the three are one. That which ever is is one, that which ever was is one, that which is ever being and becoming is also one: and this is *Space*.

When Fohat is said to produce "Seven Laya Centers," it means that for formative purposes, the GREAT LAW (Theists may call it "God") stops, or rather modifies its perpetual motion on seven invisible points within the area of the manifested Universe. "The Great Breath digs through Space seven holes into Laya to cause them to circumgyrate during Manvantara," says the Occult Catechism.

The Great Breath is ceaseless, and is, so to speak, the universal and eternal *perpetuum mobile*. There is a magnificent poem on the Pralaya, written by a very ancient Rishi, which compares the motion of the Great Breath during Pralaya to the rhythmical motions of the Unconscious Ocean. During Pralaya everything that has differentiated, as every unit, disappears from the phenomenal universe and is merged in, or rather transferred into, the One noumenal. Pralaya is dissolution of the visible into the invisible, the heterogeneous into the homogeneous—a time of rest. Even cosmic matter, indestructible though it is in its essence, must have a time of rest, and return to its *Layam* state. The absoluteness of the all-containing One essence has to manifest itself equally in rest and activity.

THE FIFTH ELEMENT

Raimond Lully's views were a rationalistic mysticism. His doctrine stipulates that the thing which God created was what he calls "argent vive" (*argentum vivum*, quicksilver, mercury), and that this original matter gave rise to all other things. The finest part formed the bodies of the angels, a less fine part the heavenly spheres, stars and planets, and the coarsest formed the terrestrial bodies. But in the terrestrial bodies part of this "argent vive" became the four elements earth, water, air and fire, but a part remained as a fifth element, the *quintessence*. Thus, in every body there was some stuff akin to the heavenly bodies, and it was through this material that the heavenly bodies could bring about the changes of generation and corruption. The activity of the body abode in the quintessence, and alchemy was a process dealing with this fifth element and multiplying the activity of it.

—F. SHERWOOD TAYLOR

ILLNESS—ITS DUAL ASPECTS

DURING the darkness of Kali Yug, when effect is mistaken for cause, when body is thought to be real and soul the unreal, there has arisen the conception that inconvenience, hardship and pain are a curse, and that whatever interferes with the desires and ambitions of the personal man is evil. Along with this view, there has grown up the idea, shared no doubt by some Theosophists, that disease, or illness of the body, is likewise a curse, an enemy to man and his high purpose, and that this enemy must be repressed or exterminated at any cost.

We speak now of ordinary illness, those periodical outbursts of grippe, colds, fevers, and the like, which almost invariably come at the most inconvenient time, personally considered, and which are more of an annoyance and discomfort than of actual pain. But perhaps they are the passing down and out, through the crucible of the body, of impurities built up in the past by impure motive, thought, feeling and act—and the process is remedial. Even those chronic and severe cases of real disease which, except for accidents, are almost always hereditary, are likewise, from the long-range view of the soul, beneficent—and should be helped “out” rather than hindered or repressed. *Pain* is Nature’s way of warning that something is wrong; *disease* is often her effort to correct it.

Physical health is one of the most cherished dreams of the human heart. Would that moral and mental well-being were as ardently desired! For until the latter are achieved, it is not possible, or even desirable, perhaps, that the body should be permanently well. There is an old Buddhist saying that the man of hate must not be cured—meaning to imply, evidently, that it is not always wise to heal the outer man before the poisons of the inner being have been eliminated. None of the healers of the ancient temples concerned themselves exclusively with the ills of the body. Their chief concern was the soul, the well-being of the inner man, and their methods of healing were such that the soul itself might be purged.

It is quite easy, for those who put their minds upon it, and adopt strict rules of physical culture life (dieting, fasting, exercising, sun-bathing, etc.), to acquire bodily well-being—at least for a time. Yet

nature has also another mode of operation—an expression from within without, from the spiritual and ethereal to the physical and gross—and those who believe in Karma, or the Law of Cause and Effect, know that this Law cannot be reversed. Lasting physical health is not likely to be achieved by regimens adopted on the lower planes, but must come from causes planted on the higher.

The Universe is worked and guided from *within* outwardly. As above so it is below, as in heaven so on earth; and man—the microcosm and miniature copy of the macrocosm—is the living witness to this universal Law and to the mode of its action. (*Secret Doctrine* I, 274.)

Individuals who have not yet reached adeptship are still subject in some measure to the uncontrolled play of *kama-manas*. But how many are aware of the fact that the poisons thus generated on the planes of mind and heart are likely to find their exit through bodily disease? Is it possible, do we think, to ignore the effects of many years or lifetimes of wrong thought and feeling, or to stay the within-outward flow of natural evolutionary Law? Heartless though the statement may appear, the condition of the human mind of today leads one to wonder whether an occasional siege of illness may not be the best thing that can happen to the average person. For through bodily disease, said William Q. Judge, the inner man may feel relieved of “a load of sin.”

Those whose inner natures have never been soiled by impure motive, thought, and feeling, have, of course, little need for concern. But for ordinary mortals, who still require occasional purification, there may be positive danger, according to Mr. Judge, in attempting to escape disease by methods which involve the mind in one or another system of “mental healing.”

Few individuals, it would seem, have any conception of the part played by the mind in health and disease, of the risks involved in concentration upon formulas or slogans which have for their aim the avoidance of sickness. In the early days of the Theosophical Movement, a number of students were attracted to various forms of metaphysical healing. This fixation of mind upon a formula with the avowed purpose of escaping ill-health elicited from the teachers several articles of warning on the dangers of “mental healing.” Since the principles there set forth seem to have been overlooked by some, and forgotten or ignored by others, it may not be unprofitable to recall these ideas, and ask ourselves whether, with our vitamin slogans and health-food store cure-alls,

we may not be falling into a similar trap—not of “mind-cure,” with its fateful results, but of excessive preoccupation with physical well-being.

In an article entitled “Replanting Diseases for Future Use,” Mr. Judge says:

The high tone of thought enjoined by some schools of healers . . . probably adds to concentration. But any thought would do as well, provided concentration is persisted in, for it is the concentration that makes the effect, and not the philosophy. The system of affirming and denying makes concentration easier.

In any system or practice where the mind, with faith, keeps repeating to itself a formula of any kind, or concentrates intensely upon the avoidance of disease, the inner currents (astral, psychic and pranic) become disturbed, the channels clogged, and the natural flow of healing fluids from within may be blocked for the span of a whole lifetime. One individual, known to the writer, a faithful devotee of health reform and its practice, managed to escape illness for a period of thirty years—only to succumb finally to the tragic scourge of cancer. Another individual, mother of six and a strict physical culturist, perpetuated her own physical health and that of her children for more than twenty years. She, too, fell victim to the same tragic fate. Is it possible that through constant repetition of some health formula these individuals may have driven their mental and emotional impurities, which ordinarily would have passed down and out through bodily disease, back into their secret hiding places within—from which they ultimately reappeared in much more dreadful form?

Christian and other mental healers seem to have hit unconsciously upon the use of certain great forces belonging to the psychic and occult nature of man—especially those forces relating to the power of thought—only there is nothing “Christian” about them, since these truths are as old as man himself. The reality behind the idea of metaphysical healing lies in the fact, perhaps, that thought, *as a causative force*, has almost unlimited power; the fallacy of the theory lies in the belief that thought, or mind, can in any sense *destroy effects* once the causes have been sown. Advocates of mental healing, as well as other men, including those who never even heard of mind-cure, can and do accomplish amazing results, both for good and bad, through their thinking, and through affirmation and denial. Cheerfulness of mind, confidence, faith in the physician and in the method used, for example, are all powerful factors, say the

doctors, in the processes of recovery from disease. Commenting on a statement made by Mr. Sinnett concerning mesmerism that "complete touch of the whole hand" is an aid, Mr. Judge said, "*It is, if you think so,*" and also on the statement that "silk and clothing interfere," he repeated: "... again, *if you think so,* that interferes. But properly used, silk and certain plants are more efficacious than the hand"—thus indicating that what one thinks or believes can and does alter the results. Thought thus has the power to help or hinder. It has the power to delay, almost indefinitely, the natural working out of effects. But once the causes for ill-health have been sown, not even the greatest of Buddhas or Christs can *destroy* or bottle up the effects forever. These must inevitably run their courses, even if precipitation be held over until another lifetime. Parabrahm, though "Supreme as CAUSE," according to *The Secret Doctrine*, is "not supreme as effect." How much less so, then, the powers and limitations of finite thought!

It is not that men should neglect their health or abandon right discrimination in the choice of food, but rather that they take to heart the warning that "the body is an object of exclusive care for too many people." The idea intended to be conveyed is that disease is not only a necessary evil of our age—it may even be a friend—and men should think twice before going to *extremes* in their attempts to escape it. Is it not true that better health—physically, mentally and morally—does often follow the sick-bed?

To eat that food which "keeps one free from sickness," is well—but to be of the *sattvic* quality, the choice of sustenance, according to Krishna, must take into account certain other factors which are of equal importance:

The food which increases the length of days, vigor and strength, which keeps one free from sickness, of tranquil mind, and contented, and which is savory, nourishing, of permanent benefit and congenial to the body, is that which is attractive to those in whom the *sattva* quality prevaleth. (*The Bhagavad-Gita.*)

The well-being of the whole man requires, then, that food be of such nature that *the mind* be left tranquil and contented. Yet, the extreme difficulty of preserving such mental equanimity, especially when theoretic systems of eating are adopted, has led Robert Crosbie to say that "when people place their attention in the direction of food, form, or ceremonies, they are almost certain to end in ritualism and the loss of

the real issue, as has happened in too many cases.”

Most of the functions of the body, such as heart-beat, breathing, digestion and assimilation, are automatic, and the organs whose duty it is to perform these functions operate most efficiently when left free and undisturbed by conscious thought. There is a recent newspaper account of an individual who, through experimentation with Yoga practice, learned how to consciously control his lung action. The tragic and unexpected result was that the lungs soon ceased to function except when directed by conscious and deliberate will!

Being devoid of reason, animals never think of health, of the kind of food they shall eat, nor whether certain elements of diet properly combine with others. Guided by instinct, they act naturally in all things and thus preserve their poise and well-being. Krishna, evidently, would have human beings, insofar as is possible, do the same: to select their food, not according to a theory which involves the mind dangerously in the process, but instinctively, according to whether the body finds it congenial and strength-giving. The body knows what it needs and would show the way, if men would only observe its natural instincts and responses; the intellectual man knows not but likes to theorize, and may be led astray.

The problem then of those who undertake to improve their health, who exchange bad habits of eating for good ones, seems to be how to avoid undue mental involvement, how to proceed along the new line as naturally and, one may almost say as unconsciously, as he did before making the change, or before becoming ill. For it is almost certain that when a person becomes *health conscious*, and decides to take the matter into his own hands, he will go beyond the bounds of legitimate conscious interference, will entangle the mind in functions that should be automatic and instinctual, and thus do more harm than good. Might this be one reason, perhaps, why H.P.B. suggested that ailing individuals should “follow the best practical advice they can get,” and why Mr. Judge did not discourage the help of a doctor in case of need?

The present cycle of human evolution is known in theosophical philosophy as the *manasa* period—the period of the mind—in which the intellectual man is tasked with the work of facing and resolving, if he would survive, the problems and lures of incarnated existence upon earth. This, it might well be, is the key to the psychological mystery of our age. The danger is two-fold: first, the tendency to *passivity*, where-

in the individual becomes a follower, obeying blindly the dictates of church, state or medical leaders, and thus relinquishes his right to be strong and great; second, *mental involvement*, wherein the mind, failing to ferret out principles, mistakes *maya* for reality, becomes a fadist or crank, and dies fighting shadows.

Each individual must eventually become his own physician—"Physician, heal thyself," said Jesus—but until this position is reached, until the striver after perfection becomes a knower on his own account, and is wise enough to avoid extremes in self-care, might it not be the better part of wisdom to seek the help of a specialist?

Ideally, the highest and only legitimate function of the Thinker, it might well be, is that of instituting and maintaining harmony on the plane of causation. The manipulation of effects, the guidance and direction of the functions of the body, belong to the lower orders of being and to the Law.

A source of constant mystery to many health-minded Theosophists is the fact that both H.P.B. and Judge suffered themselves to become ill. Why is it, it is asked, that with all their knowledge and power they did not outline a regimen of dieting which, if followed, would lead to perfect health? Why did they not set the example of true hygienic living? There can be little doubt, had perfect physical well-being been the object of their missions, that with the exercise of a small amount of occult power, they could have pushed the body and its health to a far higher degree of perfection than that enjoyed by the average man. But such, evidently, was not their purpose. H.P.B. and Judge preferred to uphold the majesty of the Law, and to demonstrate the old occult maxim that "even the perfect sage has to endure in his bodily frame that which belongs to it through Karma."

H.P.B. and Judge seem to have placed the problem of health in an entirely new dimension—that of humanity as a whole integrated in all its parts. It is not possible, according to their view, to perfect one segment of society while another remains debased, to have spirituality in the home while materialism runs rampant in the school, or, for example, to have brotherhood among nations while sectarianism reigns among creeds, or fair dealing in business alongside corruption in government. Nor can bodily health be greatly advanced while morality, art, and culture lag. All these aspects of the social organism suffer the same debilitating ill. Their cause and cure are one. And it is the aim of theosophical

philosophy to restore to mankind the means—a sane and sound philosophy of life—whereby all phases of human activity may be improved simultaneously.

The hereditary cause of all disease, according to the Founders of the present Theosophical Movement, the root and sustainer of all its numberless forms and manifestations, is a certain “foulness in the blood” of the race which traces back even to Atlantis. Permanent good health, either for the race or for any single unit in it, is not possible so long as this taint remains. Efforts to purify one’s own blood stream by diets and fasts, while no doubt of limited benefit to the individual, are of small value to the race as a whole. Even if one succeeds by this method in warding off disease for a lifetime, what of permanent value has been achieved either for himself or for others? Will not he and all others, upon reincarnating, again inherit bodies of the race? Will not these bodies be filled with the same unhealthy, common human blood? Right thought and brotherly feeling alone have the power to penetrate the world of causes and dislodge the taint locked up in the universal reservoir of human blood.

It is not the individual or determined purpose of obtaining for one’s self a perfect body, which is, after all, only a gross form of *selfishness*, but the self-sacrificial pursuit of the best means of helping all others to know how to “think right and act right,” which constitutes the true Theosophist. “The world,” said Judge, “could get along with what disease there is, if it only turned attention to high ethics and altruistic endeavor. For after a few centuries of right living the nations would have purged themselves and built up a right moral building well founded on the rocks of true philosophy, charity, and love.”

The individual who works unselfishly for others, who devotes his energies to the Cause of Mankind, even though he experiences an occasional illness, is far superior in Master’s eyes, no doubt, to him who gives little or nothing, three-quarters of his time and strength being expended on personal health. And the former, thus constituting himself a channel through which divine energies may flow, will probably be far more healthy in the long run than the latter, or than if he worked for himself alone—for the fountain of health is within, in the unselfish heart and soul of all mankind.

Teach to eschew all causes; the ripple of effect, as the great tidal wave, thou shalt let run its course.

SELF-REALIZATION

That which is finite cannot be perfect.

—*The Secret Doctrine*

MEN almost invariably begin at the wrong end in their efforts toward self-improvement. *We* strive to be perfect, meaning by *we* the lower personality which, forever finite and perishable, can never by any possibility become perfect. *We* adopt particular rites, follow special diets, undertake bodily postures, with the firm conviction that *we*, if only we persist, may thereby become perfected.

Delusion of all delusions! All these strivings of the personal man, whatever their form or intensity, are but varying aspects of *Hatha Yoga*—the profits of which, without self-realization as inspirer and support, turn to dust and ashes.

Growth, progress, achievement, on the basis of the personality, cannot endure. We keep only that which we acquire and use for the Whole. "Desire possessions above all," states *Light on the Path*, "but those possessions must belong to the pure soul only, and be possessed therefore by all pure souls equally, and thus be the especial property of the whole only when united."

How, then, is the ideal of human progression and perfection which the Masters of Wisdom exemplify to be achieved? Is it to be reached by reason, by ambition for knowledge and power?

Raja-Yoga, the art of divine living advocated by the Adepts of all ages, begins at the top, with efforts toward *self-realization*. The follower of this system does not strive to be perfect *personally*. He strives to *be* the SELF—using whatever instruments he may possess, be they "perfect" or "imperfect," in the service of that SELF. The more this is done, the more he assumes the position of the unchanging Reality or the Whole, which he really *is*, the sooner will the personality fall into line and become tractable, becoming with each incarnation a better and better instrument of the Soul. The beginning, the middle, and the end of all spiritual evolution, of all permanent growth or unfoldment, is in terms of *self-realization*. As William Q. Judge put it:

Think, think, think on the truth that you are not the body, brain or astral man, but that you are THAT and "THAT" is the Supreme Soul.

ON THE LOOKOUT

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF CANADIAN CHURCHES

"The Hidden Failure of our Churches," feature article in the Feb. 25 *MacLean's* (Toronto, Canada), essays an answer to the following questions: "How powerful an influence does the church really have? How much does it in fact affect not only the world's stated beliefs but its actions? How well is it heeded and obeyed between Sundays? Does it truly cut much ice beyond earshot of the pulpit?" While "statistically" the churches in Canada and the United States appear "to be in good health," says Ralph Allen, writer of the article, the church leaders themselves, "almost without exception," are the first to admit that the statistics are "misleading," for "their control over the conscience and behavior of Western man is seriously shaken and perhaps in imminent danger of being lost, and nowhere is this realized so agonizingly as in the churches themselves."

CONDITION IN QUEBEC

Mr. Allen quotes "an eminent Catholic priest" on the state of church affairs in Quebec, probably the "most thoroughly Christian society outside the Vatican":

If the province were isolated from Anglo-Saxon Canada, if it were truly a Roman Catholic island like Cuba or Spain or Mexico, it would already be on the brink of the same kind of revolution these other Catholic countries have had. On the surface this revolt would be against the political order but in fact it would be against the religious order. And it would not necessarily be a mere polite intellectual revolt. There might be bloodshed. Thousands of Catholics have been allowed to forget that the Church's real concern is for human souls and human welfare, and see it chiefly as an officious nag telling them perpetually when they can take a drink, when they can sleep with their wives, where they should spend their money, what they should teach their children.

A PROTESTANT CHURCH LEADER SPEAKS

Criticism of the churches from within is not limited to "mavericks and malcontents," the article states. As an example, Mr. Allen quotes the Very Rev. Angus MacQueen, past moderator of the United Church, Canada's largest Protestant group:

On the whole the church is not doing a very creditable job. . . . In many areas of her life she is unfit for the tasks of the hour. She is too comfortable and too well adjusted to the status quo, and too ready to equate it with the Kingdom of God on earth. . . . And she is too pietistic and irrelevant in the face of the real stuff of life and great issues of our day—the feeble guardian of personal decency and the fount of tranquility and optimism. . . . The history of the Church is blackened with examples of cowardice, conservatism, worldliness, and pietistic aloofness. Popular religion is very likely to be morally flabby, socially irrelevant, and politically subservient.

"ACCOUNTING" OF STEWARDSHIP

Mr. Allen surveys the religious field—urban and rural, among laborers and intellectuals, within secular colleges and theological universities—and reaches the following conclusion:

Amid so many shades of opinion and varieties of ferment, few safe generalizations can be applied to the churches in Canada as a whole. By almost every yardstick their real influence in the secular world is declining fast. Against this day they are all trying harder perhaps than at any other time in this century to define their shortcomings, to measure them and take steps to measure up to them.

In 1887, *Lucifer* printed a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in which it warned: "The time is approaching when the clergy will be called upon to render an account of their stewardship." Mr. Allen's article shows an awareness on the part of the Canadian clergy that this time has come.

AMERICAN CONVENTION "ECUMENICALLY MINDED"

The *Christian Century* for Oct. 11 notes a tendency on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Churches in the United States to place less emphasis on divergent opinions regarding points of dogma and more upon the practical aspects of a more liberal policy. Before the convention (which occurred the latter part of September) majority opinion veered sharply away from every unity proposal. With the first three addresses to the Convention, however, "the ecumenical note was struck positively, and the note was heard." Bishop A. C. Lichtenberger, presiding, told the assembly:

The church must be concerned with all that affects man's life in the world—with economics and politics and public morality. Those individuals and groups in our country today who in the name of the gospel

and patriotism tell us that the church must not speak out on public issues do not, I submit, understand the gospel or know the meaning of true patriotism. The church cannot be a refuge from the disturbing and threatening events of our time, a shelter for like-minded people with common religious interests.

IN DEFENSE OF NON-BELIEVERS

The Right Rev. James A. Pike, writing in the April *Coronet* on "The Right to be an Atheist," says:

There is no such thing as an atheist. But there are people who believe they are atheists, and they have as much right to their "religion" as other believers. They are of positive benefit to the church. . . . As a Christian and a bishop I am, of course, interested in the promotion of my faith and church. But I long ago learned that real faith cannot be forced, that real religious allegiance, to be of any worth, must not be compelled. . . . To me, religious freedom is hollow unless it includes freedom to be not "religious."

This freedom is not always fully granted to atheists in our country today. Despite the fundamental guarantees of our Constitution, many state and local laws limit the right of atheists to hold office, teach school, even to testify in court. I earnestly believe that to defend the rights of this group in our national family is to strengthen liberty for all. . . . It's not what a man says he is, but what he puts first in his day-to-day choices that counts.

RECENT REPORT ON CHILDHOOD CANCER

Increase of cancer among children is of major concern to the present physician, according to an article by Dr. John E. Allen in the *Saturday Evening Post*, Oct. 7, 1961. Statistics indicate that:

Cancer has become the most common disease killing children between one and fourteen years of age. Each year more than 4000 American youngsters die of it. The rate is highest between birth and age five. And despite better diagnosis and treatment, childhood cancer deaths are now up 20 per cent over 1945. Of all recorded causes of youth fatalities, including accidents, only cancer is on the rise.

It is not clear from the article why doctors believe that improved control over other childhood diseases explains the increase in cases of cancer from infancy through adolescence.

Many types of cancer, if detected in the early stages, can be cured, yet, at the same time, curative treatment of one disease by radiation may result in the subsequent development of cancer. Dr. Allen gives the

case history of a child who was given X-rays to correct an enlarged thymus gland. Later a lump developed in the throat which was diagnosed as cancer. Dr. Allen states that "although it was common practice years ago to shrink the thymus by X-rays to relieve pressure on the windpipe, medical science now recognizes that a large thymus is normal in infants." Further, Dr. Milton T. Edgerton of Johns Hopkins University is cited as stating that "in forty-seven patients under seventeen years of age diagnosed as having cancer, seventy per cent had a history of previous X-ray treatments of the head, neck or upper chest."

X-RAYS LINKED TO CANCER

Dr. Allen continues:

A similar survey of 180 children with thyroid cancer disclosed that 80 per cent had at some time undergone X-ray treatments—usually for minor conditions which could have been treated more effectively by other means—or which needed no treatment at all. These disorders included the so-called enlarged thymus, adolescent acne, tonsillitis, simple enlargement of lymph nodes, sinusitis, benign tumors of the laryngeal cords, and harmless hemangiomas or birthmarks.

This evidence tends to confirm the point of view expressed in the pamphlet, *Health and Therapy*, that "mass treatments or preventive practices may confuse the individual's natural path to health."

"SELF-CURE" OF BIRTH TUMORS

An interesting example of the body's ability to heal itself is given in the treatment of hemangiomas, a benign or non-cancerous growth. The *Post* article stated that because of the threat of disfigurement:

Many parents panic and insist that something be done about these blemishes on their children's faces or bodies. Some refuse to believe the truth—that in time nearly all hemangiomas disappear of themselves without becoming malignant.

The article also quotes a report (*British Journal of Plastic Surgery*, 1953) on a seven-year study of 411 hemangioma patients in which it was found that "none received treatment, yet 90 per cent of the tumors disappeared, 7 per cent left merely vague traces, and only 3 per cent failed to involute and vanish."

ORAL POLIO VACCINE

Current status of the Sabin live-virus oral polio vaccine was the subject of an article in the March 27, 1961, issue of *Newsweek*. While this

vaccine has been administered to 100 million people in other countries, the U.S. Public Health officials have waited to assess results of field tests before full acceptance. Now, however, the vaccine is promised for use during the 1962 summer polio season. Surgeon-General Luther Terry explained these delays on the grounds of safety:

The Sabin vaccine is grown in a culture that contains tissue from monkey kidneys. The government requires that all extraneous viruses (other than polio) be strained from the culture. "Dr. Sabin says this isn't necessary," Dr. Terry said. "Our experts say it is. We don't want to take the chance of producing disease in man."

NEW AREA OF PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY

In an article titled "The Psychology of Death" (*International Journal of Parapsychology*, Spring issue) Drs. Irving E. Alexander and Arthur M. Alderstein report results of three recent studies on the reaction of various individuals to the idea of death. An editorial note preceding the report states:

Parapsychological studies have their origin in the efforts of psychological researchers, during the closing decades of the last century, to investigate the possible survival of the human personality after bodily death. Thus, the psychological dynamics of initial parapsychological studies are of particular interest, as are current findings related to this area of inquiry.

The article begins:

Each man learns early in life that someday he must die. What role does this information play in his development? How does it affect his aims, his wishes, his behavior? At the present time our best sources of information on these questions are outside the field of psychology: in literature, philosophy, religion, and medicine. While such sources have yielded rich insights about the meaning that death has for human beings, there has been little attempt to apply scientific procedures to select among these ideas. Perhaps it is time for this further step to be taken.

STUDY ATTITUDES TOWARD DEATH

Drs. Alexander and Alderstein wished to discover whether a general prejudice existed against considering the subject of death; and, if such prejudice did exist, whether or not it depended on the individual's outlook at any given stage of his development. Toward this end, they conducted tests on several age and culture groups, using a series of words

as the basis for measurement of reaction time. The first study sought to establish empirical data on reactions to death; the second, to collect some evidence regarding the child and the concept of death; and the third, to a study of "death Anxiety." Before beginning this specialized study, the doctors set up the following hypotheses:

- 1) Religious subjects when compared with non-religious subjects should show less disturbance in responding to death words on a word-association task.
- 2) Religious subjects should put death words in a semantic space of "good," "potent," and "active" and the values attached to these factors should be more extreme than for non-religious subjects.
- 3) Manifest anxiety as a function of discussion of one's own feelings and attitudes toward death should increase more for non-religious than for religious subjects.

PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTION TO "DEATH WORDS"

The report continues:

The results in general do not support the hypotheses and in this limited test situation cast doubt upon the idea that a religious belief is more effective in reducing death anxiety than any other "solution." We find that each group shows an increased psychogalvanic response to death words, but that the groups do not differ from one another. Both religious and non-religious subjects respond alike in all respects on this task—on their responses to neutral words, as well as to death words. As in our earlier work, there is every indication that death is not an affect-free concept for normal, intelligent, moderately successful young people and this appears to be true no matter what the strength of their religious convictions seems to be.

RELIGION AND THE MORAL NATURE

The results of this study, then, appear to support a conclusion that religious beliefs do not necessarily reach to the moral level of man's nature. That is, religion does not in general provide grounds for *philosophical* attitudes on the subject of death, so that, in adopting a personal view of death, a man is very much "on his own." Gordon Allport, we may recall, found much the same gap between religion and morality in his study of *The Individual and his Religion*, stating: "The relationship between personal religion and morality is admittedly complex. . . . On the whole, in dealing with individual cases, one is more impressed by the apparent separation of moral standards from religion than by their dependence upon it." The effort to decrease the existing gap between

moral and philosophical concepts and psychological attitudes, or personality patterns of reaction, is one aspect of "practical" Theosophy.

"PHYSICIANS FEAR DEATH"

Under this misleading title (or so it seems to us), the September *Science News Letter* reports a study by Dr. Herman Feifel, psychologist of the Veterans Administration Outpatient Clinic. The article notes:

Reluctance to discuss this taboo subject [death] was encountered, not in patients, but in the physician and hospital authorities. When, finally, with the almost surreptitious help of a staff physician, Dr. Feifel was able to interview a small number of seriously ill patients, he met with refreshing frankness and cooperativeness.

We call the title "misleading" because, as the foregoing excerpt shows, it is not so much that doctors "fear" death as that they are reluctant to *discuss* the subject—whether from personal dedication to the art of prolonging life or from fear of the effect which the discussion of death may have on a seriously ill or "terminal" patient. Dr. Fiefel's study, however, showed the latter fear to be unsubstantiated, for discussion with patients regarding their personal attitude towards death seemed to have a "distinctly psycho-therapeutic effect on some of the patients.

CONCEPT OF CONTINUITY OF CONSCIOUSNESS ESSENTIAL

Regardless of how an individual reacts to definitive theories of after-death states, one fact emerges from spiritualistic manifestations, psychological explorations, and philosophical speculations: the possibility, even the probability, of a continuity of consciousness. This is the point emphasized by Robert Crosbie in considering "What Survives after Death?" He answers:

The *man himself*, with all his tendencies, with all his experience. The *Thinker*, the Soul, is what survives, is what can never be extinguished, can never itself suffer, can never be involved, is always of its own nature, no matter what conditions a man may become involved in for the time being. Conditions, whether of joy or suffering, must have an ending; but the *One* who enjoys, the *One* who suffers, the *One* who feels, changes not at all. That which survives is our very selves—all that we call ourselves—the self who wakes, who dreams, who enjoys, who goes into different states, through all the worlds. . . .

What is it that survives? WE survive, as conscious beings, with all the powers of perception, with all that we have ever gained, and thus

shall it ever be. There is no cessation for us. . . . (*The Friendly Philosopher*, p. 252.)

AGE OF TOOLMAKING MAN INCREASED

Just as Dr. Johannes Hurler's "finds" in Italy pushed back the age of man to a "humanoid" type existing between 10,000,000 and 15,000,000 years ago (Lookout for October, 1958), Dr. Louis Leakey's finds of two years ago in East Africa show that man was already a toolmaker at least 1,750,000 years ago, according to a recent New York *Times* science column. The dating was done by two geologists at the University of California at Berkeley. The news article states:

The ancient man whose age they have established is *Zinjanthropus boisei*, found two years ago in East Africa by Dr. Louis Leakey of Coryndon Memorial Museum, Nairobi, Kenya. This anthropologist had estimated the age of *Zinjanthropus* as "more than 600,000 years." Even at that age the creature was considered the oldest for which clear evidence of toolmaking has been found. The new date for *Zinjanthropus* . . . is based on a potassium-argon radioactive dating process.

ZINJANTHROPUS NOT HOMO SAPIENS

Dr. T. Dale Stewart, of the Smithsonian Institution, told the *Times* interviewer by telephone that he considered the new date "a very important contribution" and stated that "the emergence of toolmaking 1,750,000 years ago seemed to him easier to fit into the picture of human evolution than the 600,000-year figure." He also commented: "Everyone seems to see in *Zinjanthropus* a type that could be pretty close to the line, if not actually in the line, of human evolution." According to the *Times*:

Zinjanthropus, of course, was not a man of the modern species. That is, he was not *Homo sapiens*. The creature was capable of walking erect. Its hands were freed for such tasks as making extremely primitive cutting tools from pieces of quartz rock. But *Zinjanthropus* had a small brain in comparison with that of modern man.

Anthropologists consider it probable that the larger brain and higher intelligence evolved as primitive man-like creatures learned to use tools and that other basic essential of humanity—a communication by speech. Such a course of evolution seems more reasonable starting nearly 2,000,000 years ago than it would at the faster evolutionary pace required if the process started only about a half million years ago, Dr. Stewart reasoned. . . . Since no animal species other than man both makes and uses tools, Dr. Leakey defines *Zinjanthropus* as a man.

NEW DATE APPROACHES THAT OF ESOTERIC TEACHING

This new date pushes the evidence of toolmaking back from the Pleistocene into the Pliocene (Tertiary) and begins to approach the age of man, as given by H. P. Blavatsky (*The Secret Doctrine* II, 709 *et seq.*). In a footnote on page 714, H.P.B. says:

Those who feel inclined to sneer at that doctrine of Esoteric Ethnology, which pre-supposes the existence of Man in the *Secondary Age*, will do well to note the fact that one of the most distinguished anthropologists of the day, M. de Quatrefages, seriously argues in that direction. He writes: "There is nothing impossible in the supposition that he (Man) may have appeared on the globe *with the first representatives of the type to which he belongs in virtue of his organism.*"

This statement approximates most closely to our fundamental assertion that man preceded the other mammalia.

"LIVING THE HIGHER LIFE" NOT BY WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

A Theosophical student and researcher of long standing has detected an error for which THEOSOPHY was responsible in 1923 and has repeated until the present: "Editor's Notes" on reprints of "Living the Higher Life," an article signed "Murdhna Joti" and published by William Q. Judge in the *Path* for July and August, 1886, have all incorrectly assumed that Murdhna Joti was one of the several pen names of Mr. Judge.

Our correspondent, Mr. Willem Roos, calls attention to source material showing that "Murdhna Joti" was actually Bowaji, a Hindu member of the Society. Mr. Roos cites a letter by H.P.B. to Mr. Judge (unpublished, the manuscript being in the possession of the Pasadena Theosophical Society) which is highly critical of some things said by "Murdhna Joti" in the article "Living the Higher Life." With this letter, H.P.B. sent to Judge an article by A. P. Sinnett in which the latter's views of the shortcomings of "Living the Higher Life" are developed at length.

REPRINTED

Mr. Judge published Sinnett's article, adding a defense of Murdhna Joti's work. As background concerning the context of this article, the current issue of THEOSOPHY provides both Sinnett's paper and Mr. Judge's comments. (In reading the latter note, it is possible for the present student to see how the assumption of a Murdhna Joti-Judge

identification was made, since Judge explains his reasons for adopting a wide variety of pseudonyms; he had few articles from other pens.)

Mr. Roos also speaks of evidence (drawn from *The Mahatma Letters*) that the author of the first of the three "Fragments of Occult Truth" was Allan O. Hume, not H.P.B., the remaining "Fragments," signed "Lay Chela," being by A. P. Sinnett. However, since the first three installments appeared in the *Theosophist* without signature, and since H.P.B. edited the magazine, it may be assumed that she took editorial responsibility for what was said. The content of these early articles of the series, moreover, suggests unusual resources and unusual inspiration. Further ground for believing that H.P.B. wrote the first three "Fragments" is provided by the fact that the editors of *The Modern Panarion* reprinted them in that work as from the pen of H. P. Blavatsky.

NOTE

Attention has been called to the fact that a discrepancy exists between the price listed, for S.D. *Index* and the combined *Secret Doctrine* and *Index*, on the inside cover of *Health and Therapy* and on the back cover of THEOSOPHY. Prices, of course, are subject to change without notice, but the current price will always be found on the back cover of this magazine.