



We are all links in the great chain of the Theosophical Movement.
—ROBERT CROSBIE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. L

June, 1962

No. 8

THE BOND OF THEOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

THERE is an obvious common ground for students of Theosophy in the leading ideas of the Theosophical philosophy—Karma and Reincarnation, Cycles, and the Impersonality of Deity. An association can be formed on this ground and cooperative endeavors can be joined. What may be lacking, however, in even an “association” whose members are united by these high themes, is the intensity of purpose that is needed to transform a group of people who have certain common interests into an agency for an actual *movement*.

What supplies this energy, this “drive,” in the areas where it does exist? The question cannot be considered without attention to the nature of the Founders of the Theosophical Movement—a matter which may be neglected or glossed over out of a wish to avoid personality worship. Then there is the question of “authority.” Will a special appreciation of the Founders lead to a failure of students to think for themselves? A complex of issues awaits resolution in such questions.

In the case of H. P. Blavatsky, the balance of her life remains obscure without awareness of her total commitment to the purposes of the Movement. If one will read her Prefaces—to *Isis*, to *The Secret Doctrine*, and to the *Key* and the *Voice*—and certain of her articles, such as “What Is Theosophy?”, “What Are the Theosophists?”, “Is Theosophy a Religion?”, and the compilation, “She Being Dead, Yet Speaketh,” he soon feels the impact of an encounter with extraordinary resolve and single-minded intention. This quality can be recognized, but it cannot be imitated. There are times when her students feel a great deal of this

intensity, simply by reading what she wrote. But perception of what she was, how she worked, and what she did, needs the continual refreshment which only frequent saturation with her writings can supply.

You might say that the real, inner life of a Theosophical association depends almost entirely upon this kind of recognition of the nature of the Teacher by the students who carry on the work. A similar inspiration is found by many in the writings and example of William Q. Judge. The United Lodge of Theosophists is, indeed, an expression of the Theosophical Movement which takes its example from the Founders, while not presuming to imitate them in their role of transmitters of Theosophy.

Students may and do know that they have neither the wit nor the skill, and by no means have achieved the heart, of the Founders of the Movement. But the strength and life of a movement grows out of persistent effort in a given direction, even more than it comes from dramatic achievement. The Founders of a movement have a certain sort of "raw material" to work with, and their abilities and the scope of their vision are appropriate to the tasks inherent in this material. Students who try to carry on what has been begun by the initiators have other material to work with—the raw stuff of their own imperfect natures as well as the problems presented by the world. Each student has his allotment of coarse rind of personal nature to refine, his share of psychic opacities to clear up. What can he do that is like, but not the same as, the Teacher's work? He can be faithful; he can try to generate in himself the consistency that in the teachers was a natural expression of their lives.

Robert Crosbie is honored by students of the United Lodge of Theosophists because he saw the crucial importance of this practical ideal to the future of the Theosophical Movement. He saw that there would be no movement at all unless its supporters learned to drink long and deep at the fountain of H.P.B.'s inspiration, and he pointed to Judge as one who was himself a clear embodiment of that inspiration.

This contribution to the Movement by Mr. Crosbie could be called "esoteric," for the reason that what he saw could not be conveyed by simple utterance or by claims of any sort. It is necessary to experience the steady fire of the teachers' inspiration to grant the truth of what he said. And then it becomes an unmistakable law of Theosophic work. Students who have found this inspiration cannot be diverted from their self-chosen tasks.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

[H. P. Blavatsky launched her English magazine, *Lucifer*, in September, 1887, with characteristic forthrightness, and proceeded immediately to join issue with the dominant superstitions and dogmas of that day—and this. The name of the magazine itself was the first blow for truth, and one-fifth of the first issue is devoted to the “slandered planet,” Lucifer-Venus. The article, “A True Theosophist,” raids the domain of patriotism and, quoting Count Tolstoi approvingly, upholds the principle of non-violence and non-resistance to evil. “Literary Jottings,” in a lighter vein, merrily spikes the absurd inventions of the atomo-mechanist, Haeckel, “that Simian Homer,” whose genealogy of man is characterized as “a romance of Science of the wildest type.” Over the signature, “The Adversary,” the writer (doubtless H.P.B.) exposes the nonexistent creatures on whom the German biologist depends for his theory of man’s animal origin.

We reprint below the greater portion of the opening editorial, last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for August, 1949.—Eds. THEOSOPHY]

WHAT'S in a name? Very often there is more in it than the profane is prepared to understand, or the learned mystic to explain. It is an invisible, secret, but very potential influence that every name carries about with it and “leaveth wherever it goeth.” . . . Carlyle thought that “there is much, nay, almost all, in names.” “Could I unfold the influence of names, which are the most important of all clothings, I were a second great Trismegistus,” he writes.

The name or title of a magazine started with a definite object, is, therefore, all important; for it is, indeed, the invisible seedgrain, which will either grow “to be an all-over-shadowing tree” on the fruits of which must depend the nature of the results brought about by the said object, or the tree will wither and die. These considerations show that the name of the present magazine—rather equivocal to orthodox Christian ears—is due to no careless selection, but arose in consequence of much thinking over its fitness, and was adopted as the best symbol to express that object and the results in view.

Now, the first and most important, if not the sole object of the magazine, is expressed in the line from the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, on its title page. It is to bring light to “the hidden things of darkness” (iv. 5); to show in their true aspect and their original real meaning things and names, men and their doings and customs; it is

finally to fight prejudice, hypocrisy and shams in every nation, in every class of Society, as in every department of life. The task is a laborious one, but it is neither impracticable nor useless, if even as an experiment.

Thus, for an attempt of such nature, no better title could ever be found than the one chosen. "Lucifer" is the pale morning-star, the precursor of the full blaze of the noon-day sun—the "Eosphoros" of the Greeks. It shines timidly at dawn to gather forces and dazzle the eye after sunset as its own brother "Hesperos"—the radiant evening star, or the planet Venus. No fitter symbol exists for the proposed work—that of throwing a ray of truth on everything hidden by the darkness of prejudice, by social or religious misconceptions; especially by that idiotic routine in life, which, once that a certain action, a thing, a name, has been branded by slanderous inventions, however unjust, makes *respectable* people, so called, turn away shiveringly, refusing to even look at it from any other aspect than the one sanctioned by public opinion. Such an endeavour, then, to force the weak-hearted to look truth straight in the face, is helped most efficaciously by a title belonging to the category of branded names.

Piously inclined readers may argue that "Lucifer" is accepted by all the churches as one of the many names of the Devil. According to Milton's superb fiction, Lucifer is *Satan*, the "rebellious" angel, the enemy of God and man. If one analyzes his rebellion, however, it will be found of no worse nature than an assertion of free-will and independent thought, as if Lucifer had been born in the XIXth century. This epithet of "rebellious," is a theological calumny, on a par with that other slander of God by the Predestinarians, one that makes of deity an "Almighty" fiend worse than the "rebellious" Spirit himself; "an omnipotent Devil desiring to be 'complimented' as all merciful when he is exerting the most fiendish cruelty," as put by J. Cotter Morison. Both the fore-ordaining and predestining fiend-God, and his subordinate agent are of human invention; they are two of the most morally repulsive and horrible theological dogmas that the nightmares of light-hating monks have ever evolved out of their unclean fancies.

They date from the Medieval age, the period of mental obscuration, during which most of the present prejudices and superstitions have been forcibly inoculated on the human mind, so as to have become nearly ineradicable in some cases, one of which is the present prejudice now under discussion. * * *

So deeply rooted, indeed, is this preconception and aversion to the name of Lucifer—meaning no worse than “light-bringer” (from *lux*, *lucis*, “light,” and *ferre* “to bring”)¹—even among the educated classes, that by adopting it for the title of their magazine the editors have the prospect of a long strife with public prejudice before them. So absurd and ridiculous is that prejudice, indeed, that no one has seemed to ever ask himself the question, how came Satan to be called a *light-bringer*, unless the silvery rays of the morning-star can in any way be made suggestive of the glare of the infernal flames. It is simply, as Henderson showed, “one of those gross perversions of sacred writ which so extensively obtain, and which are to be traced to a proneness to seek for more in a given passage than it really contains—a disposition to be influenced by sound rather than sense, and an implicit faith in received interpretation”—which is not quite one of the weaknesses of our present age. Nevertheless, the prejudice is there, to the shame of our century.

This cannot be helped. The two editors would hold themselves as recreants in their own sight, as traitors to the very spirit of the proposed work, were they to yield and cry craven before the danger. If one would fight prejudice, and brush off the ugly cobwebs of superstition and materialism alike from the noblest ideals of our forefathers, one has to prepare for opposition. “The crown of the reformer and the innovator is a crown of thorns” indeed. If one would rescue Truth in all her chaste nudity from the almost bottomless well, into which she has been hurled by cant and hypocritical propriety, one should not hesitate to descend into the dark, gaping pit of that well. No matter how badly the blind bats—the dwellers in darkness, and the haters of light—may treat in their gloomy abode the intruder, unless one is the first to show the spirit and courage he preaches to others, he must be justly held as a hypocrite and a seceder from his own principles. * * *

The title chosen for our magazine is as much associated with divine and pious ideas as with the supposed rebellion of the hero of Milton’s “Paradise Lost.” By choosing it, *we throw the first ray of light and truth* on a ridiculous prejudice which ought to have no room made for it in this our “age of facts and discovery.” We work for true Religion and Science, in the interest of fact as against fiction and prejudice. It is our

¹ “It was Gregory the Great who was the first to apply this passage of Isaiah, ‘How art thou fallen from Heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning,’ etc., to Satan, and ever since the bold metaphor of the prophet, which referred, after all, but to an Assyrian king inimical to the Israelites, has been applied to the Devil.”

duty, as it is that of physical Science—professedly its mission—to throw light on facts in Nature hitherto surrounded by the darkness of ignorance. And since ignorance is justly regarded as the chief promoter of superstition, that work is, therefore, a noble and beneficent work. But natural Sciences are only one aspect of SCIENCE and TRUTH. Psychological and moral Sciences, or theosophy, the knowledge of divine truth, wheresoever found, are still more important in human affairs, and real Science should not be limited simply to the physical aspect of life and nature. Science is an abstract of every fact, a comprehension of every truth within the scope of human research and intelligence. "Shakespeare's deep and accurate science in mental philosophy" (Coleridge) has proved more beneficent to the true philosopher in the study of the human heart—therefore, in promotion of truth—than the more accurate, but certainly less deep, science of any Fellow of the Royal Institution.

Those readers, however, who do not find themselves convinced that the Church had no right to throw a slur upon a beautiful star, and that it did so through a mere necessity of accounting for one of its numerous loans from Paganism with all its poetical conceptions of the truths in Nature, are asked to read our article, "The History of a Planet." Perhaps, after its perusal, they will see how far Dupuis was justified in asserting that "all the theologies have their origin in astronomy." With the modern Orientalists every myth is *solar*. This is one more prejudice, and a preconception in favour of materialism and physical science. It will be one of our duties to combat it with much of the rest.

INTERNAL RECOGNITION

The Authority which we recognize is not what men term authority, which comes from outside and which demands obedience, but an *internal recognition of the value* of that which flows through any given point, focus, or individual. This is the authority of one's Self-discrimination, intuition, the highest intellection.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

DAILY PSYCHOLOGY

The Self is the Friend of Self and also Its Enemy.

THIS sentence in the *Bhagavad-Gita* has been often passed over as being either meaningless or mysterious; on one hand worthless to consider, and on the other hand impossible. Some students have, however, made good use of the teaching contained in it. It is a verse that bears directly upon Theosophy as applied to our daily life, and therefore may well be scrutinized.

It indicates two selves, one the enemy and also the friend of the other. Evidently, without the suggestions found in Theosophy, two selves in one person cannot seem otherwise than meaningless, except in those cases, admitted by Science, where there is an aberration of the intellect, where one lobe of the brain refuses to work with the other, or where there is some cerebral derangement. But after a little study of the constitution of man—material and spiritual—as we find it outlined in the Wisdom-Religion, we easily see that the higher and the lower self are meant.

The next injunction, to “raise the self by the self,” clearly points to this; for, as a thing cannot raise itself without a fulcrum, the self which will raise us must be the higher one, and that which is to be raised is the lower.

In order to accomplish this task we must gain an acquaintance with the self which is to be raised. The greater and more accurate that acquaintance is, the quicker will proceed the work of elevating the being who attempts it.

Let us for a moment look at the obstacles in the way, the reasons why, with so many, their understanding of themselves is so plainly deficient.

Everyone knows that he can see the defects in the actions and character of other men better than his own. Some, of course, there are who do not allow that they have defects.

St. James says that a man looketh in a glass and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he is. While I have often doubted this, yet it is true in respect to that looking-glass which is often held up to us by others to see ourselves in. We see for a moment our appearance, and then forget it.

NOTE.—This paper by Mr. Judge was read before the Aryan T.S., June 6, 1890, and appeared in August, 1890, as No. 5 of the Branch Papers issued by the American Section. It was reprinted under the present title, which is our own, in THEOSOPHY for September, 1947.

There are some things, however, as to which it is often impossible for us to know ourselves. Such of our tones as are harsh or disagreeable we often cannot hear as others do. For there is hardly anything so difficult as to really hear our own voice in its entirety of tone and accent. We are so accustomed to it that we cannot tell whether it be pleasing or repellent, musical or discordant. We have to rely upon the statements of those who hear it. Indeed, I doubt seriously if anyone can ever fully hear, in the way those to whom we speak do, the tones of his voice, because it is conveyed to us not only through the medium of the outer ear which receives the vibrations made without us, but we receive it in addition through the vibrations made within all through the skull, and hence it must ever be a different voice for ourselves. So it would not be profitable to pay too much attention to the sound of our voice if we do so to the exclusion of that inner attitude which nearly always determines the tone in which we speak; for if our feelings be kind and charitable, it is more than likely that the vocal expression of them will correspond. The cultivation of the voice, so far as it is possible, can safely be left to those teachers who aim to soften and polish it.

By taking a few examples from among the many about us and assuming that they represent possible defects and peculiarities of our own, we may arrive at something useful in our Theosophic life.

Here is one who will constantly tell you that several others are always very fond of talking of themselves and their affairs, and appear to take no interest in the conversation unless it has themselves for center. And after thus depicting the failing of the others, this person—man or woman—immediately proceeds to show that that is his own particular fault, for from that moment the burden of the conversation is "I" or "my" affairs.

Our next subject is one who talks a great deal about altruism and brotherhood, but would not give a dollar to any good cause. Not perhaps from intentional niggardliness, but from sheer habit of not giving and not helping.

Here is another who exemplifies the prominent defect of the century, inattention. He listens to you, but only hears a part, and then, when repeating what he says he heard you say, he gives a version entirely at variance with yours. Or, listening to an argument or discussion, he only attends to that part which being familiar to him strikes him favorably.

Next we have the bigot who, while exalting freedom of thought and the unity of all men, displays most frightful bigotry.

Then there is another who illustrates a variety of the first to which I referred—the man who wishes apparently only to impose his own views upon you, and is careless about knowing what your opinions may be.

Here is the partisan who favors such a school or sect. Nothing can be said against them, no defect may be pointed out. Partisanship clouds it all.

Now all these are merely samples, but in some degree every one of us has them all—perhaps slightly, but still there. They are all the result of the predominance of the lower self, for they all show a disposition to put the personal *I* to the front. They are the present triumph of the lower self over the efforts of the higher. They may be abated in some degree by attention to their outer expression, but no real progress will be gained unless work upon the hidden plane is begun. Such a defect as that one of not listening long to another man's views, but hurrying to tell him what you think yourself, is one that affects the acquiring of new ideas. If you constantly tell others what you think, you are gaining nothing. For your experience and views are your own, well known to you. The repeated expression of them only serves to imprint them more strongly on your mind. You do not receive any of the new lights that other minds might cast upon your philosophy if you gave them the opportunity.

There are other factors in our constitution which are powerful for the production of faults. Every man has two lines of descent. One is that which comes through his parents and has to do with his mental and physical make-up. This line may run back into the most strange and peculiar places, and be found winding in and out among manners and minds not suspected by us. Suppose your physical line of descent comes through Danes or Norwegians and mine through the French. There will be to some extent a want of sympathy and appreciation on the mental plane between us. Of course this effect will not be apparent if the period of time is long since our blood ran in those bodies, but still there will be left some trace of it. There will be a tendency always for the physical, including the brain, to show the characteristics which result from the preponderance of inherited faculties and dispositions. These characteristics belong wholly to the physical plane, and are carried down from the centuries past by inheritance, affecting the particular

body you may inhabit in any one incarnation. It is your Karma to have that sort of physical environment about your inner self.

Now the obstacles to the perception of truth and to the acquirement of knowledge of self which are in consequence of the physical inheritance, are difficult to perceive, involving much study and self-examination for bringing them to light. But they are there, and the serious Theosophist will search for them. These differences in the physical body, which we will call for the time differences in inheritance, are of the highest importance. They resemble the difference between telescopes or microscopes made by different opticians, and tend to cause us to see truth clearly or blurred, or surrounded by many-colored mists. What we most desire to have is a mental telescope that is not only powerful, but also devoid of the colors which achromatic quality only will dispel.

The second line of descent is that one which belongs purely to the inner man, that is, the psychical line. It is obscure, and, indeed, can only be discovered and defined by an adept or a trained seer whose clairvoyance permits him to see that intangible yet powerful thread which has so much to do with our character. It is just as important as the physical descent, in fact more so, because it has to do with the ever-living man, whereas the physical tenement is selected by or follows upon the actions which the inner man compelled the former body to perform. So it may be altered at any time with ease if we live in obedience to the higher law.

Passing from the broad line of descent in a nation, we find each individual governed also by the family peculiarities and faults, and they are not so easy to define as those that are national, since few men are in possession of any facts sufficient to ascertain the general family tendencies.

Coming down now to ourselves, it is almost axiomatic that each one's mind acts in a way *peculiar to itself*. There is a tendency that daily grows stronger, after our earlier years, for the mind to get into a rut, its own rut or mode of looking at things and ideas. This is of great importance. For the man who has freed his mind so that it is capable of easily entering into the methods of other minds is more likely to see truth quicker than he who is fixed in his own ways.

We must then at once constitute ourselves our own critics and adversaries, for it is not often that anyone else is either willing or capable to take that part for us.

Our first step and the most difficult—for some, indeed, impossible—is to shock ourselves in such a manner that we may quickly be able to get out of, or rather understand, our own mental methods. I do not mean that we must abandon all our previous training and education, but that we shall so analyze all our mental operations as to know with certainty, to easily perceive, the actual difference in method between ourselves and any other person. This is a thing seldom undertaken or accomplished by men nowadays. Each one is enamored of his own mental habits, and disinclined to admit that any other one can be better. When we have become acquainted with this mental path of ours, we are then in position to see whether in any particular case our view is false.

This is the psychological and metaphysical equivalent of that scientific process which classifies and compares so as to arrive at distinguishing differences in things in order that physical laws may be discovered. For while we remain in ignorance of the method and path of our mind's action, there is no way in which we can compare with other minds. We can compare views and opinions, but not the actual mechanics of the thought. We can hear doctrines, but are unable to say whether we accept or reject from right reasoning or because our peculiar slant on the mental plane compels us to ratiocinate wholly in accordance with a mental obliquity acquired by many years of hurried life.

The value of thus understanding our own mental bias so that we can give it up at will and enter into the bias of another's mind is seen when we consider that each of us is able to perceive but one of the many sides which truth presents. If we remain in the rut which is natural, we pass through an entire life viewing nature and the field of thought through but one sort of instrument. But by the other practice we may obtain as many different views of truth as the number of the minds we meet. When another human being brings his thoughts before us, we may not only examine them in our way, but also take his method and, adopting his bias for the time as our own, see just that much more.

It is very easy to illustrate this from ordinary life. The novelist sees in the drawing-rooms of society and the hovels of the poor only the material that may serve as the basis for a new book while the social schemer drives thought of hovels away and sees in society only the means of gratifying pride and ambition, yet the artist can only think of the play of color and arrangement of figures, the harmony that delights his artistic sense.

The plain man of affairs is not attracted by the complex events of every day which have no relation to his business, whereas the student of Occultism knows that very obscure events point to other things yet in the future. In every stratum of society and every art or profession we constantly have it brought home to us that each man looks at any subject from but one or two standpoints, and when a well-balanced mind is found looking at events and men and thoughts freely from all sides, everyone sees at once a superiority in the person, albeit they may not be able to explain it.

But it is in Theosophic study especially that it is wise for us to constitute ourselves our own critics and to adopt as far as possible the practice of leaving our own mental road and taking up some other. The truth is simple and not so difficult to arrive at if we will follow the advice of the Hindu *Upanishad* and cut away error. Error grows largely out of notions and preconceptions educated into us by our teachers and our lives.

The influence of these preconceptions is seen every day among those Theosophists who are seeking for more books to read upon Theosophy. Their minds are so full of old notions which are not violently expelled, that truth cannot be easily perceived. But if they read fewer new books and spent more time in re-reading those first attempted, meanwhile studiously endeavoring to enter into all of the author's thought, much more progress would be gained.

Take, for instance, the *Key to Theosophy*. It is full of all the main doctrines of the Wisdom-Religion, and of hints towards others. Many persons have read the book and then sought another. They say that they have mastered it. Yet if you put to them some questions or listen to their own, it is apparent that only that part of the work which in some way coincides with their own previous training and line of thought has been grasped. Now this is just the part they need not have dwelt upon, because, being like to themselves, it may at any time be understood. But if one will ever stand as one's own critic, then those parts which seem obscure will be attacked, and, being viewed from all sides, may be soon turned into a possession. And just because such has not been the practice, it has come to be the fact that some extremely valuable presentations of doctrine and philosophy remain buried in earlier Theosophical books and magazines, while those who once read them have gone feverishly

on to other works and forgotten that which might have enlightened them.

The Theosophist who delights to call himself practical and logical, an abhorrer of mysticism, should try to see what the mystical Theosophist means, and the mystic one should read carefully the words of the practical member to the end that he may counterbalance himself. A wholly practical or entirely mystical mind is not well balanced. And as long as the logical and practical man in our ranks scouts mysticism and never reads it, so long will he remain deformed and unbalanced in the eyes of those who see both sides, because he is wrapped up in ideas and methods that are only right in their own domain. The attitude of mind proposed is not to be observed only toward our literature and the philosophy studied; it is to be that of every hour and applicable to our dealings with our fellow-men. It will lead us to discern the common failing of refusing to consider the thoughts expressed by another because his or her personality is disagreeable to us. Often in our ranks we can find those who never pay any attention to certain other members who they have decided cannot reason properly or talk clearly.

Now aside from all considerations of charity and politeness, there is an occult law much lost sight of, and that is that everyone is led insensibly by Karmic law to address others on these topics and to afford an opportunity to the person addressed of taking a leap, so to say, out of his own favorite way, and considering life as seen through the eyes of another. This is often brought about, if we permit it, through the endeavor to control the irritation or dullness caused by the way in which the other person presents the thought in his mind. But if we refuse to use the opportunity, either by absolutely running away or by covering our minds with a hard coat of indifference, the new and bright idea just trembling into the field of our consciousness is thrown back and lost in the dark recesses of the mental plane. Or, taking another view, we may under Karmic law be the one and only person just then fitted to elucidate our brother's idea, and we remain still the debtor to him if we do not accept the opportunity. On either hand the result is demerit.

Let us, then, conquer self in the field indicated, and thus turn the inward insidious enemy and deceiver into the friend and constant guide.

QUESTION—AND COMMENT

IN approaching the problem of how to study Theosophical texts, the student should certainly first determine the most beneficial or profitable attitude. We are warned against being passive and are also told to avoid accepting statements on someone else's authority. What, then, is the proper mental attitude for the student to assume when reading a book like *The Bhagavad-Gita*—or *The Secret Doctrine*? Does one mental orientation suffice for both?

In the first place, of course, there is something a bit strained in considering the approach to Theosophical texts as a "problem." The most natural means of getting to know Theosophical teachings may simply be that of seeking out, at first, that which is "homogeneous to one's own nature." As to attitudes, we surely must realize that an attitude cannot be adopted if it is not already some part of one's nature. What happens in the light of Theosophical reading is that constructive attitudes towards study which are embryonically present may become more fully developed.

Mr. Judge's suggestions as to the universal applicability of the "three qualities" doctrine of *The Bhagavad-Gita* may be considered here. If a student is dominated by the intellectual quality of *sattva*, he will be looking to Theosophical texts for their beneficial effect on himself—as a purifying agency, a counsel to indefatigable goodness, or a rounding out of a harmonious feeling regarding place and station in life. If the *rajasic* quality predominates, the emphasis will be upon the "profitable" nature of the texts, *i.e.*, in what way insight developed can enhance one's achievements. A corollary to this stance would be a development of a sort of patriotic partisanship in respect to the Theosophical Movement, perhaps based upon the growing conviction that "Theosophical ideas will eventually win." But in both such manifestations of intellectual *sattva* or *rajas* there are lurking elements of the *tamasic*. The partisan Theosophist may "remain inert, considering naught" when faced with the need of discovering a new truth in an old context or an old truth in a new context. The *sattva* attitude similarly can lead to inertia of the mind, though here the emphasis is apt to be upon self-satisfaction, and content with the status quo. Each one of us embodies in degree, all three "qualities."

The "truth seeker" is forever aware of that sort of dynamic tension

which is produced in the mind by paradox. Thus the Theosophical student finds himself compelled to be both a gnostic and an agnostic at the same time, to believe in the disciplines of the mind and the disciplines of the heart without identifying himself exclusively with either. Ideas encountered in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky need be neither accepted nor rejected, for, as H.P.B. herself said, they should be viewed with "attentive expectancy." Exposure to H.P.B. by one who adopts this attitude allows "truths" of many sorts to flow into the life of the mind. The process of Theosophical education depends upon each individual becoming the "initiator." It is the Self which must initiate the self, and gradually the student comes to see that "study" is but one approach to the incessant transformations of outlook and personality which are the substance of soul evolution. Truth, being omnipresent, is not to be discovered in *a* book. However, a book read with reverence for Truth can be a dialogue between the "spirit" of the book and oneself, thus helping to the awakening of a Self which may have been sleeping. This approach to study illustrates one of the ways in which we raise the self by the Self, for it is not only through definable personal effort, but also by active meditational receptivity that the "spiritual intuitions" can flow to the conscious mind.

The questioner mentions two apparently dissimilar books in *The Bhagavad-Gita* and *The Secret Doctrine*, but it is misleading to say that the *Gita* speaks to the "heart" whereas *The Secret Doctrine* addresses itself chiefly to the disciplined intellect. The *Gita*, just as H.P.B.'s writings, "will remain a riddle to the mentally lazy or obtuse," and it is in the context of the perspective on all philosophy and religion which *The Secret Doctrine* affords that the *Gita* can be read for its greatest enlightenment. In this suggestion, too, there is a clue to the characteristic emphasis in study that can be called "Theosophical," for Theosophical study is and always has been by way of correlation. The comparative study of religions and philosophies as pursued under the Second Object of the Theosophical Society was designed to help every aspiring student to open his mind to differing emphases—so that eventual distillations of truth would be *achieved*. *The Secret Doctrine* contains evidence that such distillations, and the attitudes which made them possible, have formed a channel for comprehension from the beginning of time.

It is also at this point that one may see the significance of H.P.B.'s continual denial of exclusive personal responsibility for Theosophic

formulation. The illumination of a principle has nothing to do with claims of authorship, and H.P.B. was always willing, in respect to both *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*, to accept whatever help could be utilized. In her article, "My Books," she wrote: "Even for *The Secret Doctrine* there are about half-a-dozen Theosophists who have been busy in editing it, who have helped me to arrange the matter, correct the imperfect English, and prepare it for print. But that which none of them will ever claim from first to last, is the fundamental doctrine, the philosophical conclusions and teachings. Nothing of that have I invented."

It is from this standpoint, and this standpoint alone, that the question of "authority" in Theosophical texts can be properly considered, for there *is* a special authority in that which represents itself not by one author, but by thousands. The critic who carps at the writings of H. P. Blavatsky as if they were somehow in contention with the writings of various ambitious authors has failed to lift the first veil, and it is likely that he has little desire to go to school to the spirit of truth. Commenting on this perennial problem and discussing the question of "authority" in general, William Q. Judge said in "The Synthesis of Occult Science":

Beyond all necessary and natural obstacles, there is another, *viz.*, that contentious spirit that disputes and opposes every point before it is fairly stated or understood. In the study of the Secret Doctrine it is not a matter of likes and dislikes, of belief or unbelief, but solely a matter of intelligence and understanding. He who acknowledges his ignorance and yet is unwilling to lay aside his likes and dislikes, and even his creeds and dogmas, for the time, in order to see what is presented in its own light and purely on its merits, has neither need nor use for the Secret Doctrine. Even where a greater number of propositions are accepted or "believed," and a few are rejected, the synthetic whole is entirely lost sight of.

What sort of proper "faith" can be sought and employed by the Theosophical student? All the foregoing blends easily with a paragraph from Emerson on the subject of Natural Religion:

We are all believers in natural religion; we all agree that the health and integrity of man is self-respect, self-subsistency, a regard to natural conscience. All education is to accustom him to trust himself, discriminate between his higher and lower thoughts, exert the timid faculties until they are robust, and thus train him to self-help. I think wise men wish their religion to be all of this kind, teaching the agent to go alone, brave to assist or resist a world: only humble and docile before the source of the wisdom he has discovered within him.

THEURGISTS AND THEIR SCIENCE

THEURGY is usually considered to be synonymous with magic. But as every student of *The Secret Doctrine* knows, magic may be of two kinds—white and black, or pure and impure—theurgy being that aspect of the divine science which is derived directly from “the gods.” The term is a compound of two words—*theoi*, “gods,” and *ergein*, “to work,” or God-work.

True magic, or theurgy, as taught and practiced by the ancients, meant far more than is generally understood. This was the transcendental aspect of what is now known as “spiritualism”—the two being the opposite poles, the noble and the ignoble, of a mighty science. Pico della Mirandola, in his *Apology*, says:

True theurgy embraces the deepest mysteries, and the knowledge of the whole of Nature with her powers. While it connects and combines the forces scattered by God through the whole world, it does not so much work miracles as come to the help of working nature. Its researches into the sympathies of things enable it to bring to light hidden marvels from the secret treasure houses of the world, just as if it created them itself.

Iamblichus was the first in the Christian era to found a school of practical Theurgy. Although made up of Alexandrian Platonists, his school was distinct from the schools of Plotinus and Porphyry—the latter being opposed to revealing to an undisciplined public a knowledge of ceremonial magic and of practical theurgy. This difference in viewpoint, or in emphasis rather, formed the basis of the famous controversy between Porphyry and Iamblichus. When Iamblichus expressed his desire to reveal the mysteries hitherto taught only in secret, Porphyry wrote to an Egyptian Initiate by the name of Anebo and asked for clarification of certain points in the Egyptian system with which he was unfamiliar. The letter was answered by Iamblichus himself, under the name of Abammon, and this discussion forms the content of *The Egyptian Mysteries*.

Porphyry, it is evident, was not ignorant of the forces on the invisible side of nature; it was rather his knowledge of them, and of their potentiality for both good and evil, that led to his reluctance in having them revealed. He feared the bad effects that might accrue to those who at-

tempted to practice theurgy without preliminary purification. Porphyry, however, became eventually reconciled to the system of Iamblichus, and, convinced of the need of enlightening the populace on both the dangers and benefits of a knowledge of divine science, he became helper and co-worker in the noble task. In *The Key to Theosophy*, H. P. Blavatsky says:

It was a mystic belief—practically proven by initiated adepts and priests—that by making oneself as pure as the incorporeal beings—*i.e.*, by returning to one's pristine purity of nature—man could move the gods to impart to him Divine mysteries and even cause them to become occasionally visible, either subjectively or objectively. . . . Real *divine* Theurgy requires an almost superhuman purity and holiness of life; otherwise it degenerates into mediumship or black magic. (p. 2 fn.)

There can be little doubt that Iamblichus was moved by the highest of motives and that his teaching was that of *white* magic. His reason for revealing the broad features of the divine science seems to have been twofold: first, he wanted to make known the existence of the invisible side of nature, to indicate the dangers lurking there, and to point out ways and means of avoiding them; second, he wanted to provide a way by which those not initiated into the Mysteries might "effect the divine spark in themselves with the Divine All." His writings, therefore, are found to deal primarily with the invisible side of nature and with the unexplained powers latent in man. Being a Neo-Platonist, he naturally proceeded from universals to particulars, pointing out the differences between beings, good and bad, and the twofold usage of all potencies, forces, and centers in Great Nature. The aim and purpose of this great Initiate is clearly indicated by H.P.B. in *Isis Unveiled*:

What more natural than this vilification of the ancient and experienced theurgists by certain mediums, when we find Iamblichus, the expositor of spiritualistic theurgy, strictly forbidding endeavors to procure such phenomenal manifestations; unless, after a long preparation of moral and physical purification, and under the guidance of experienced Theurgists. When, furthermore, he declares that, with very few exceptions, for a person "to appear elongated or thicker, or be borne aloft in the air," is a sure mark of obsession by *bad* demons. (*Isis* I, 219.)

Iamblichus distinguishes, therefore, between *passivity*, an unhealthy and dangerous condition of the lower mind, on the one hand, and active

receptivity, which is higher manasic, on the other. Warning that passivity leads inevitably to mediumship, with all its lures and temptations, he extolled with equal vigor the positive, willful exercise of all higher faculties and powers, which he called divine Theurgy. Iamblicus writes:

The cycle is completed after it has conjoined the soul to the several parts of the universe, and to the total divine powers which pass through it; then it leads the soul to, and deposits it in, the whole Demiurgus, and causes it to be independent of all matter, and to be co-united with the eternal reason alone. But my meaning is, that it peculiarly connects the soul with the self-begotten and self-moved God, and with the all-sustaining, intellectual, and all-adorning powers of the God, and likewise with that power of him which elevates to truth, and with his self-perfect, effective, and other demiurgic powers; so that the theurgic soul becomes perfectly established in the energies and demiurgic intellections of these powers. Then, also, it inserts the soul in the whole demiurgic God. And this is the end with the Egyptians of the sacerdotal elevation of the soul to divinity.

It is the teaching of present-day Theosophy that when Manas, or the mind, of any man, either wholly or now and then, becomes consciously united with Buddhi, the Spiritual Soul, it "beholds God," as it were. Both Porphyry and Iamblichus believed that *theurgy* was the highest and most efficient mode of communication with one's Higher Ego, and that this was achieved through the instrumentality of one's astral body. The Egyptian Hierophants and the Indian Mahatmas could clothe the astral double with the appearance of its Higher Ego, or what Bulwer Lytton terms "the Luminous Self," and confabulate with it. All such operations, needless to say, required not only a condition of absolute purity, but the theurgic invocation had to be performed under the directions of an Adept, who knew how to draw out or evoke only the pure spirits, and thus avoid the evil ones. In such magical rites, the astral double of the individual leaves the physical shell, is made to become the vehicle of the higher spirit, and then, descending again into the body, utters oracles and imparts knowledge. In mediumship, or in obsession, the unfortunate individual becomes the vehicle of whatever spirit he chances to contact.

Both the Old and New Testaments teem with references to white and black magic. Belief in the occult, being common to people in the early centuries of Christianity, laid them open to abuses of all sorts—obsession by evil spirits being one of the most tragic. How else account

for the numerous instances in the Bible of *exorcism*, such as were performed by Jesus and the disciples? The law governing the occult is one for all. Ignorantly used or abused, it leads to mediumship or obsession; wisely operated with knowledge, and under the protecting hand of the Master, the good and pure man could put himself consciously *en rapport* with higher intelligences.

To both the Theurgists and their successors in the Middle Ages, the Rosicrucians, Deity in the shape of Æther (Akasa) pervades all things, and it was called by them "the living fire," the "Spirit of Light," and sometimes *Magnes*. To them, and also to the ancient Magi and Fire-Worshippers, the symbol of the living fire was the Sun, certain of whose rays develop the fire of life in a diseased body, impart the knowledge of the future to the sluggish mind, and stimulate to active function a certain psychic and generally dormant faculty in man. Iamblichus held that, through right motive, thought and feeling, the soul could elevate itself to the realm of the gods, in which case it becomes god-like and is able to know the *above* and the *below*:

She then obtains the power to heal diseases, to make useful inventions, to institute wise laws. Man has no intuitive power of his own; his intuition is the result of the connection existing between his soul and the Divine Spirit; the stronger this union grows, the greater will be his intuition or spiritual knowledge. Not all the perceptions of the soul are of a divine character; there are also many images which are the products of the lower activity of the soul in her mixture with material elements. Divine Nature, being the eternal fountain of Life, produces no deceptive images; but if her activity is perverted, such deceptive images may appear. If the mind of man is illumined by Divine Light, the ethereal vehicle of his soul becomes filled with light and shining.

The Emperor Julian expressed himself thus: "Were I to touch upon the initiation into our Sacred Mysteries, which the Chaldees Bacchized, respecting the *seven-rayed* god, lighting up the soul through him, I should say things unknown to the rabble, very unknown, but well known to the blessed Theurgists."

The third Object of the Theosophical Movement of 1875 is "the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man." The purpose of this Object, along with the other two, seems to have been to prepare the ground, to lay such a basis in morality, knowledge, and self-control, as would fit students, in this or in some

coming cycle, for the study and practice of divine magic. Who knows but that H.P.B.'s wish, in working with the Spiritualists of last century, might have been to find among them at least a few with such natural mystical leanings as could have formed the nucleus of a school of practical Theurgy? Most spiritualists at least, and unfortunately, missed the opportunity; for without guidance such as an occultist of H.P.B.'s stature could give, there was an inevitable drift into mediumship and the worship of lower spirits. And in answer to the question of whether it is possible for a man of well-balanced mind and singleness of purpose, of indomitable energy and perseverance, to become an Occultist or an Adept, H.P.B. said:

He may; but there are ten thousand chances against one that he will fail. For one reason out of many others, no books on Occultism or Theurgy exist in our day which give out the secrets of alchemy or mediæval Theosophy in plain language. All are symbolical or in parables; and as the key to these has been lost for ages in the West, how can a man learn the correct meaning of what he is reading and studying? Therein lies the greatest danger, one that leads to unconscious *black* magic or the most helpless mediumship. He who has not an Initiate for a master had better leave the dangerous study alone. (*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 21.)

SCIENCE AND REALITY

Science, we might say, is the whole body of systematized and objective knowledge; it is very incomplete and very imperfect, but it is indefinitely perfectible. The science of today is definitely and measurably better (closer to the truth) than that of yesterday. The field which science attempts to cover is steadily widening and the roots go deeper and deeper.

And yet that field is limited and the roots do not penetrate as deeply as one would wish. The universe in which we are living is indefinitely larger than the universe of science. It is for that reason that men of science cannot answer the big questions, those questions which interest men most, the fundamental questions which, some people think, should be answered first. Men of science do not feel particularly competent, yet they ask them, as other men do, over and over.

—GEORGE SARTON

PROEM

V

MYSTERY—that which is secret and excites wonder—is never absent from the Universe. “The voidness of the seeming full, the fullness of the seeming void.” In the midst of it Man is—this, only, he truly knows. *What* he is, *how* his consciousness persists, and *why* he has come into Being—he has yet to learn.

There is a chapter in *The Bhagavad-Gita* titled “The Kingly Knowledge and the Kingly Mystery.” Had the title been written in our day, Robert Crosbie suggests in his *Notes*, it would have read, “The Highest Knowledge and the Deepest Mystery.” Ultimate questions on the nature of Man are high and holy, and evoke a feeling of reverence; and the Ancient Mystery is always contemporary.

Mystery focuses the attention, stimulates the imagination, and provokes profound thought, or it tends to stultify, to suspend the thinking faculty and leave the mind in a benumbed state. The powers of mind, having been directed or suffered to flow in conflicting channels, subject our lives to unnatural movements, broken rhythms, unpredictable or inharmonious experiences. Clear-seeing becomes impossible. Inevitable miscellaneous mysteries pervade the network of human existence. *Human nature*, compounded of the demoniac and the divine, is truly a mystery and *within it*, “the inner light which guides men to greatness, and makes them noble,” is an incommunicable mystery, for it sets a seal upon the lips. But, categorically speaking, there is the One ever-present MYSTERY—THAT in which we “live and move and have our being.”

“What is that which was, is, and will be, whether there is a Universe or not; whether there be gods or none?” asks the Senzar Catechism. And the answer made is—SPACE. (*S.D.* I, 9.)

The One Eternal Element, or element-containing Vehicle, is *Space*, dimensionless in every sense; co-existent with which are—endless *duration*, primordial (hence indestructible) *matter*, and *motion*—absolute “perpetual motion” which is the “breath” of the “One” Element. This breath can never cease, not even during the Pralayaic eternities. (*S.D.* I, 55.)

SPACE is the container and *the body of the Universe* with its seven principles. It is a body of limitless extent. . . . (*Ibid.*, 342.)

The Proem—by way of introducing the *unfolding* symbolism of Archaic times—presents the simplest yet profoundest Mystery-symbol:

“An immaculate white disk within a dull black ground.” The dull black ground—abstract Darkness—is the ever UNKNOWABLE. The white disk—*without* point or perimeter, center or circumference—is the KNOWABLE *aspect*, presented periodically as Universal manifestation. “These two, light and darkness, are the world’s eternal ways.”

KNOWLEDGE is represented later in the symbolism as the plane of the Circle—“the only knowledge, dim and hazy though it still is, that is attainable by man.”

True knowledge is of THAT—in Nature and in Man—which, though ever-present and everywhere present, never fully reveals Itself. This primal Mystery constitutes the world of Reality and the world of Maya (illusion), and from this paradox stem the two kinds of truth: *Samvritisatya* and *Paramarthasatya*. According to the *Theosophical Glossary*:

Satya (Sk.) Supreme Truth.

Samvriti (Sk.) False conception—the origin of illusion.

Paramartha (Sk.) Absolute existence.

Samvritisatya—Truth mixed with false conceptions; the reverse of absolute truth—or *Paramarthasatya*, self-consciousness in absolute truth or reality.

The two kinds of truth must be known: the Real and the relatively real. To distinguish between them is the problem. “Maya or illusion is an element which enters into all finite things. Whatever plane our consciousness may be acting in, both we and the things belonging to that plane are, for the time being, our only realities.” As we rise in the scale of development we perceive that during the stages through which we have passed we mistook shadows for realities, and “the upward progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings,” each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached “reality”; but only when we have reached the absolute Consciousness, and blended our own with it, shall we be freed from the delusions produced by Maya.

Knowledge of the mayavic, the constantly changing world, *binds us* to our struggling fellow-men through participation in dreams and fantasies of like nature, the same hopes and fears and misuse of energies. Knowledge of the Real isolates—in a certain sense. In presenting the doctrine of Karma in *The Ocean of Theosophy*, William Q. Judge says:

The individual in race or nation is warned by this great doctrine that if he falls into indifference of thought and act, thus moulding himself into the general average karma of his race and nation, that national and race karma will at last carry him off in the general destiny. This is why teachers of old cried, "Come ye out and be ye separate."

Paradoxically, knowledge of the Real isolates and at the same time *binds back* to the Source—the Real *within* all, known or unknown. The horizon widens, and the perspective grows clear and true.

Preceding the statement of the Three Fundamental Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 14-17), H. P. Blavatsky says: "Before the reader proceeds to the consideration of the Stanzas from the Book of Dzyan which form the basis of the present work, it is absolutely necessary that he should be made acquainted with the few fundamental conceptions which underlie and pervade the entire system of thought to which his attention is invited." What are the predominant phrases in the three respective concepts? "The absolute Reality. One Unity." "Eternity of the Universe. Absolute universality of law." "Universal Over-Soul. Individuality." Each concept presents a way of considering "One-ness."

Reality, in the most abstract sense, is the Unknown. It is the Self-existent PRINCIPLE. And in the manifested world (*S.D.* I, 629), reality is composed of "a unity of units."

Unity implies oneness, especially of varied or diverse elements—oneness due to the interdependence of the parts or individuals, and to the cooperation of all so that each within its proper limits helps in effecting the end of the whole. Unity is maintained by a subtle balance of relationships.

Universe from *unus*, one, and *vertere, versum*, to turn—that is, turned into one, combined into one whole. Immediately following the statement of the Fundamental Propositions, the idea of "universe" is amplified:

This is why the Hindus say that the Universe is Brahma and Brahmâ, for Brahma is in every atom of the universe, the six principles in Nature being all the outcome—the variously differentiated aspects—of the SEVENTH and ONE, the only reality in the Universe whether Cosmical or micro-cosmical; and also why the permutations (psychic, spiritual and physical), on the plane of manifestation and form, of the sixth (Brahmâ the vehicle of Brahma) are viewed by metaphysical antiphrasis as illusive and Mayavic. For although the root of every atom

individually and of every form collectively, is that seventh principle or the one Reality, still, in its manifested phenomenal and temporary appearance, it is no better than an evanescent illusion of our senses.

Universal refers to the "whole" as distinct from the parts that constitute it.

Individual, Latin *individuus*, signifies that which cannot be divided. It refers unequivocally to "one" as distinguished from all the others. It is a term used in regard to collectives and this makes the term "individuality" a paradox. How can it be "one" and be also inseparably one of a "totality"? *Collectivity*, from the Latin *collectus*, participle of *colligo*, compound of *col* or *con* and *lego* to bind, signifies to bring together, or into one point. "Collectivity" implies brought together by design—as *to collect* implies "an end in view," the idea of directed energies.

Individuality is "acquired" *by design*—by "self-induced and self-devised efforts" throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations (checked by Karma).

Initiation into Knowledge is closely linked with the mystery of Individuality. Wm. Q. Judge, in his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*, speaks of the secret system of initiation:

It is secret, because, founded in nature and having real Hierophants at the head, its privacy cannot be invaded without the real key. And that key, in each degree, is the *aspirant himself*.

One might, perhaps, divide humanity into three great classes: those who do not see beyond their immediate wants or needs, the true mystics, and the many "mystified" who seek for a solution to the mystery of life through outward search alone. In a sense, learning is a limitation as definition is restriction of the mental processes, and each category adopted marks a barrier. And of all that is learned, what is truly worthy of preservation? Rituals are born, conventions bred, misconceptions strengthened and perpetuated. Error holds its head high and walks with haughty step down the Ages—it is no respecter of Time or Truth.

The *Chhandogya Upanishad* tells of Shvetaketu, Arjuna's grandson, whose father says to him:

Shvetaketu, go, learn the service of the Eternal; for no one, dear, of our family is an unlearned nominal worshipper.

So going when he was twelve years old, he returned when he was

twenty-four; he had learned all the teachings, but was conceited, vain of his learning, and proud.

His father addressed him:

Shvetaketu, you are conceited, vain of your learning, and proud, dear; but have you asked for that teaching through which the unheard is heard, the unthought is thought, the unknown is known?

What sort of teaching is that, Master? said he.

His father instructs him in the meaning of "That Thou Art."

Shvetaketu says: But I am sure that those teachers did not know this themselves; for if they had known it, how would they not have taught it to me?

The true mystic is genuinely curious—with "open mind, eager intellect, and an unveiled spiritual perception." He learns from life without, and consciousness within. He senses the Mystery within and without. He "looks for the Enduring among unenduring things"—to use an Upanishadic phrase. What are the illusions that *bind* him to the "here" and "now"—the relatively real? "Time is only an illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration." (*S.D.* 1, 37). But there are moments when Time has no "hold" upon him, even in ordinary life: great trouble, great joy, serious illness, spontaneous sacrifice—these moments come. Perhaps through a concatenation of circumstances, or the inner impulsion of a "divine discontent," or because he dared to face the Mystery which is himself, he becomes aware of the distinction between self-consciousness and consciousness of the Self. Then questions arise that only *The Voice of the Silence* has answer to. It instructs; it gives spiritual strength; it warns of the pitfalls along the Path toward INDIVIDUALITY.

Ere thou canst settle in Dhyana-Marga, "path of pure knowledge" named, and call it thine, thy Soul has to become as the ripe mango fruit: as soft and sweet as its bright golden pulp for others' woes, as hard as that fruit's stone for thine own throes and sorrows, O Conqueror of Weal and Woe.

What the motive? And what the *need*?

Shall he not use the gifts which it offers for his own rest and bliss, his well-earn'd weal and glory—he, the subduer of the Great Delusion?

Nay, O thou candidate for Nature's hidden lore! If one would follow in the steps of holy Tathagata, those gifts and powers are not for Self.

Know that the stream of superhuman knowledge and the Deva-Wisdom thou hast won, must from thyself, the channel of Alaya, be poured forth into another bed.

Know, O Narjol, thou of the Secret Path, its pure fresh waters must be used to sweeter make the Ocean's bitter waves—that mighty sea of sorrow formed of the tears of men.

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.

It is a natural step in the Soul's Pilgrimage to mistake illusion for Reality. It is the Mayavic element *within* that separates him from the Real. Light on this critical mystery is found in "The Synthesis of Occult Science," by Wm. Q. Judge:

Self-consciousness, which from the animal plane looking upwards is the beginning of perfection, from the divine plane looking downward is the perfection of selfishness and the curse of separateness. It is the "world of illusion" that man has created for himself. "Maya is the perceptive faculty of every Ego which considers itself a Unit, separate from and independent of the One Infinite Eternal Sat or 'Being'." The "eternal pilgrim" must therefore mount higher, and flee from the plane of self-consciousness it has struggled so hard to reach.

The first step, or self-conscious approach, towards the Great Mystery is in the natural, intuitive perception that the mystery of the "Universe" is the mystery of "Man." Comprehension of the "mystery" constitutes the whole dignity and duty of man along the Soul's ascent "through all the degrees of intelligence, from the lowest to the highest Manas, from mineral and plant, up to the holiest archangel (Dhyani-Buddha)."

Here, at last, is "no separateness." The Wisdom of the Dhyani-Buddhas is a *collective Wisdom*. "Occult Wisdom, the one real (magical) knowledge dealing with eternal truths and primal causes, becomes almost omnipotence when applied in the right direction. Its antithesis is that which deals with illusions and false appearances only, as in our exoteric modern sciences." H.P.B. suggests the means of attaining this wisdom (*S.D.* I, 199): "It remains with him [man] to attune the three higher states [of consciousness] in himself to the three higher planes in Kosmos."

.

"Thou shalt not separate thy being from BEING, and the rest, but merge the Ocean in the drop, the drop within the Ocean." (*Voice of the Silence.*)

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

HOW are we to understand, accept and apply the proposition that while the progress of the Soul is achieved through self-induced and self-devised efforts, these efforts are "checked by Karma"?

When a young person reaches the point where he begins to envision ideally and to plan practically what he hopes to accomplish in life, he seems at the same time to become aware in a new way of the lives of others. He may then seek in the accomplishments of others a confirmation that ideals *are* realizable. On the other hand, he becomes sensitive to the failures too, and there are many—those who, like himself, once had high hopes and worthy aspirations, and yet did not achieve their goals because they were in one way or another "checked by Karma."

These checks may of course assume any number of forms, for example: illness, poverty, family or community responsibilities, etc. Such may be called "checks" in the sense that they tend to diminish the freedom of a person to express himself in the manner of his own choosing. Yet an even more basic sort of check lies in our limitations, both mental and moral. In so far as we are unable to express in our lives the full wisdom of the Soul, we are all suffering under the constraint of this subtle and ubiquitous form of Karmic "check."

These checks, defined by either circumstances or the limitations of our faculties, often create in us frightening feelings of impotence and frustration. Why should we expect to receive any comfort from the knowledge that it is our Karma to be prevented from attaining our ideals?

In answer, it may be said that one comfort, at any rate, that the doctrine of Karma can afford us is the knowledge that we are not suffering unjustly, "without due process of Law," so to speak. Our "chains" are through our own thought, "our release due to nothing else." Also, if we have faith in the infinite "rightness" of the Law, we will understand that some doors must for a time be closed so that others may be opened. If we were able to pursue freely the activities we most enjoy, we would soon become one-sided indeed, as many in fact have, in spite of the "Good Law."

In addition, through our own limitations, we are apt to become more sympathetic to those of others, and may better understand, in the words

of Mr. Judge, that "we are all bound up together in one coil of Karma and should ever strive by good acts, good thoughts and high aspirations, to lift a little of the world's heavy karma, of which our own is a part. Indeed, no man has any Karma of his own unshared by others; we share each one in the common Karma, and the sooner we perceive this and act accordingly the better it will be for us and for the world."

The exigencies of Karma also help us to get outside of our personalities and view all existence as Soul. Surely what matters to the Soul is not what one does in life, but rather the contact that is made *with* life, whatever the circumstances. Further, this realization does not usually come through our accomplishments, but through our frustrations; it is only when life knocks us down that we gain the strength that comes with *getting up* and going on. This idea is expressed in *The Ocean of Theosophy* (p. 97): "Individual unhappiness . . . may be discipline taken up by the Ego for the purpose of eliminating defects or acquiring fortitude and sympathy."

The real progress of the Soul, we are reminded by H.P.B., is a "series of progressive awakenings." Certainly, those awakenings have nothing at all to do with our occupations. In whatever we do, to speak figuratively, we can always hear the music; we can always be aware of the subtle invisible currents that bind mankind together; we can always sense our place and participation in the whole; in short, we can remember who and what we really are, and what we are here to do.

Perhaps, then, we ought to be grateful for the checks of Karma, for it is simply the separative personality that is being checked, through the guidance of the Soul, who is ourselves. It may very well be that our burning desire to do some special thing in *this* lifetime has to be forcibly checked, in order to safeguard the truer duty of *all* our lifetimes. The *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita* (pp. 45-6) puts it this way: ". . . once resign and all is possible. This will not ruin your life nor destroy any proper ideals; poor and petty ideals had better be at once lost. It may seem that all ideals are gone, but that will be only the first effect. . . . We must be ready to say at any moment under whatever circumstances, whether expected or unexpected: 'It is just what I in fact desired'."

TO CONQUER MATTER

Stoop not down, for a precipice lies below the earth,
Drawing under a descent of seven steps, beneath which
Is the throne of dire necessity. —PSELLUS

IS it enough for man to know that he exists? Is it enough to be formed a human being to enable him to deserve the appellation of MAN? It is our decided impression and conviction that to become a genuine spiritual entity, which that designation implies, man must first *create* himself anew, so to speak; *i.e.*, thoroughly eliminate from his mind and spirit not only the dominating influence of selfishness and impurity, but also the infection of superstition and prejudice. The latter is far different from what we commonly term "antipathy" or "sympathy." We are at first irresistibly or unwittingly drawn within its dark circle by that peculiar influence, that powerful current of magnetism which emanates from ideas as well as from physical bodies. By this we are surrounded, and finally prevented through moral cowardice—fear of public opinion—from stepping out of it. It is rare that men regard a thing in either its true or false light, accepting the conclusion by the free action of their own judgment. Quite the reverse. The conclusion is more commonly reached by blindly adopting the opinion current at the hour among those with whom they associate.

Theology has disfigured ancient Theosophy, and Science ancient Philosophy. Materialism has been, and ever will be blind to spiritual truths. Nothing is eternal and unchangeable save the Concealed Deity. Nothing that is finite, whether because it had a beginning or must have an end, can remain stationary. It must either progress or recede; and a soul which thirsts after reunion with its spirit, which alone confers upon it immortality, must purify itself through cyclic transmigrations.

Every true savant admits that in many respects human knowledge is yet in its infancy. Can it be that our cycle began in ages comparatively recent? To what eminence the race in its progress had several times arrived may be feebly surmised by the wonderful monuments of old, still visible, and the descriptions given by Herodotus of other marvels of which no traces now remain. We can judge, moreover, of the lofty civilizations reached in some periods of antiquity by the historical de-

NOTE.—Collated from *Isis Unveiled*.

scriptions of the ages of the Ptolemies, yet in that epoch the arts and sciences were considered to be degenerating, and the secrets of a number of the former had been already lost.

The first races of men were spiritual, and their protoplasmic bodies were not composed of the gross and material substances of which we see them composed nowadays. The first men were created with all the faculties of the Deity, and powers far transcending those of the angelic host; for they were the direct emanations of Adam Kadmon, the primitive man, the Macrocosm; while the present humanity is several degrees removed even from the earthly Adam, who was the Microcosm or "the little world." At the beginning the human body was of a half-ethereal nature; before the *fall* mankind communed freely with the now unseen universes. But since that time matter has become the formidable barrier between us and the world of spirits. The oldest traditions also teach that before the mystic Adam many races of human beings lived and died out, each giving place in its turn to another. Were these precedent types more perfect? Did any of them belong to the *winged* race of men mentioned by Plato in the *Phaedrus*? It is the special province of science to solve the problem.

The same belief in the pre-existence of a far more spiritual race than the one to which we now belong can be traced back to the earliest traditions of nearly every people. In the ancient Quichè manuscript, the *Popol Vuh*, the first men are mentioned as a race that could reason and speak, whose sight was unlimited, and who knew all things at once. The discoveries of modern science do not disagree with the oldest traditions which claim an incredible antiquity for our race. But, notwithstanding the hypotheses of geologists, we are beginning to have almost daily proofs in corroboration of the assertion of the ancient philosophers. They divided the interminable periods of human existence on this planet into cycles, during each of which mankind gradually reached the culminating point of highest civilization and gradually relapsed into abject barbarism.

One thing, at least, has been shown in the Hebrew text: that there was one race of purely physical creatures, another purely spiritual. The evolution and "transformation of species" required to fill the gap between the two has been left to the anthropologists. We can only repeat the philosophy of men of old, which says that the union of these two races produced a third—the Adamite race. Starting as a pure and per-

fect *spiritual* being, the Adam of the second chapter of Genesis, not satisfied with the position allotted him by the Demiurgos (who is the eldest first-begotten, the Adam-Kadmon), Adam the second, the "man of dust" strives in his pride to become Creator in his turn. Evolved out of the androgynous Kadmon, this Adam is himself an androgyne; for, according to the oldest beliefs presented allegorically in Plato's *Timæus*, the prototypes of our races were all enclosed in the Microcosmic Tree. Divine spirit being considered a unity, however numerous the rays of the great spiritual sun, man has still had his origin like all other forms, whether the organic or otherwise, in this one Fount of Eternal Light. Thus sharing the nature of both its parents, the Adamite race is equally adapted to an existence in the material and spiritual worlds. Allied to the physical half of man's nature is reason, which enables him to maintain his supremacy over the lower animals, and to subjugate nature to his uses. Allied to his spiritual part is his *conscience*, which will serve as his unerring guide through the besetments of the senses, for conscience is that instantaneous perception between right and wrong, which can only be exercised by the spirit, which, being a portion of the Divine Wisdom and Purity, is absolutely pure and wise. Its promptings are independent of reason, and it can only manifest itself clearly when unhampered by the baser attractions of our dual nature.

Many men have arisen who had glimpses of the truth, and fancied they had it all. Such have failed to achieve the good they might have done and sought to do, because vanity has made them thrust their personality into such undue prominence as to interpose it between their believers and the *whole* truth that lay behind. The Greek, Egyptian, and Chaldean philosophers held, with the Hindus, that God had infused into matter a portion of his own Divine Spirit, which animates and moves every particle. They taught that men have *two souls*, of separate and quite different natures: the one perishable—the Astral Soul, or the inner fluidic body—the other incorruptible and immortal—the *Augoeides*, or portion of the Divine Spirit; that the mortal or Astral Soul perishes at each gradual change at the threshold of each new sphere, becoming with every transmigration more purified. The Astral Soul is placed between matter (body) and the highest intellect (its immortal Spirit or *nous*). Which of those two will conquer? The result of the battle of life lies between the triad. It is a question of a few years of physical enjoyment on earth and—if it has begotten abuse—of the

dissolution of the earthly body, being followed by death of the astral body, which is thus prevented from being united with the highest Spirit of the triad, which alone confers on us *individual immortality*. Or, on the other hand, of becoming immortal mystæ; initiated before the death of the body into the divine truths of the after life. Demi-gods below, and GODS above.

The Divine, the highest and *immortal* spirit, can be neither punished nor rewarded. To maintain such a doctrine would be at the same time blasphemous and absurd, for it is not merely a flame lit at the central and inexhaustible fountain of life, but actually a portion of it, and of identical essence. It assures immortality to the individual astral being in proportion to the willingness of the latter to receive it. So long as the *double* man, *i.e.*, the man of flesh and spirit, keeps within the limits of the law of spiritual continuity; so long as the divine spark lingers in him, however faintly, he is on the road to an immortality in the future state. But those who resign themselves to a materialistic existence, shutting out the divine radiance shed by their spirit at the beginning of the earthly pilgrimage, and stifling the warning voice of that faithful sentry, the conscience, which serves as a focus for the light in the soul—such beings as these, having left behind conscience and spirit, and crossed the boundaries of matter, will of necessity have to follow its laws.

Matter is as indestructible and eternal as the immortal spirit itself, but only in its particles, and not as organized form. The body of so grossly materialistic a person as above described having been deserted by its spirit before physical death, when that event occurs the plastic material, astral soul, following the laws of blind matter, shapes itself thoroughly into the mold which vice has been gradually preparing for it through the earth-life of the individual. Then, as Plato says, it assumes the form of that "animal which it resembled in its evil ways" during life. "It is an ancient saying," he tells us, "that the souls departing hence exist in Hades and return hither again and *are produced from the dead*. . . . But those who are found to have lived an eminently holy life, these are they who arrive at the pure abode above, and dwell on the upper parts of the earth" (the ethereal region). In *Phaedrus* again, he says that when man has ended his *first* life (on earth), some go to places of punishment *beneath* the earth. This region below the earth, the kabalists do not understand as a place inside the earth, but far more

material.

If there is such a thing as existence in the spiritual world after corporeal death, then it must occur in accordance with the law of evolution. It takes man from his place at the apex of the pyramid of matter, and lifts him into a sphere of existence where the same inexorable law follows him. And if it follows him, why not everything else in nature? Why not animals and plants, which have all a life-principle, and whose gross forms decay like his, when that life-principle leaves them? If his astral body becomes more ethereal upon attaining the other sphere, why not theirs? They, as well as he, have been evolved out of condensed cosmic matter, and our physicists cannot see the slightest difference between the molecules of the four kingdoms of nature. With Plato, the lower types were but the concrete images of the higher abstract ones. The *soul*, which is immortal, has an arithmetical, as the body has a geometrical beginning. This beginning, as the reflection of the great universal Archæus, is self-moving, and from the center diffuses itself over the whole body of the Microcosm.

From Kapila, the Hindu philosopher, who many centuries before Christ demurred to the claim of the mystic Yogins that in ecstasy man has the power of seeing Deity face to face and conversing with the "highest" being, down to the Voltaireans of the eighteenth century, who laughed at everything that was held sacred by other people, each age had its unbelieving Thomases.

Man, the most perfect of organized beings on earth, in whom matter and spirit, *i.e.*, *will* are the most developed and powerful, is alone allowed to give a conscious impulse to that principle which emanates from him; and only he can impart to the magnetic fluid opposite and various impulses without limit as to the direction. Both Van Helmont and Paracelsus agree as to the great potency of the will in the state of ecstasy; they say that "the spirit is everywhere diffused; and the spirit is the *medium* of magnetism"; that pure primeval magic does not consist in superstitious practices and vain ceremonies but in the imperial will of man. It is not the spirits of heaven and of hell which are the masters over physical nature, but the soul and spirit of man which are concealed in him as the fire is concealed in the flint. The theory of the sidereal influences on man was enunciated by all the mediaeval philosophers.

The ancient philosophy affirmed that it is in consequence of the mani-

festation of *will*, termed by Plato "the Divine Idea," that everything visible and invisible sprang into existence. As that Intelligent Idea, which by directing its sole will-power toward a center of localized forces called objective forms into being, so can man, the Microcosm of the great Macrocosm, do the same in proportion with the development of his will-power. The plan of the structure to be erected is in the brain of the Architect, and reflects his will; abstract as yet, from the instant of the conception it becomes concrete through the atoms which follow faithfully every line, point, and figure traced in the imagination of the Divine Geometer. As God creates, so can man create. Given a certain intensity of will, and the shapes created by the mind become subjective. Given a more intense and intelligent concentration of this will and the form becomes concrete, visible, objective; the man has learned the secret of secrets; he is a Magician.

Plato acknowledges man to be the toy of the element of necessity, which he enters upon in this world of matter: he is influenced by external causes, and these causes are *daimonia*, like that of Socrates. Happy is the man physically pure, for if his *external* soul (body) is pure, it will strengthen the second one (astral body), or the soul which is termed by him the "higher mortal soul," which though liable to err from its own motives, will always side with reason against the animal proclivities of the body. The lusts of man arise in consequence of his perishable material body, so do other diseases; but though he regards crime as *involuntary* sometimes, for it results, like bodily diseases, from external causes, Plato clearly makes a wide distinction between these causes. The fatalism which he concedes to humanity, does not preclude the possibility of avoiding them, for, pain, fear, anger, and other feelings are given to men by *necessity*, "if they conquered these they would live righteously, and if they were conquered by them, *unrighteously*."

The spiritual or *inner* man is one thing, and his terrestrial, physical casket another. That physical nature, the great combination of physical correlations of forces ever creeping on toward perfection, has to avail herself of the material at hand; she models and remodels as she proceeds, and, finishing her crowning work in man, presents him alone as a fit tabernacle for the overshadowing of the Divine spirit. But the latter circumstance does not give the right of life and death over the animals lower than himself in the scale of nature, or the right to torture them. Quite the reverse. Besides being endowed with a soul—of which

every animal, and even plant, is more or less possessed—man has his immortal *rational* soul or *nous*, which ought to make him at least equal in magnanimity to the elephant, who treads so carefully, lest he should crush weaker creatures than himself.

If the "spirit," or the divine portion of the soul, is pre-existent as a distinct being from all eternity, as old philosophers all taught, and if it is the same and nothing more than the metaphysically-objective soul, how can it be otherwise than eternal? And what matters it in such case whether man leads an animal or a pure life if, do what he may, he can never lose his individuality? This doctrine is as pernicious in its consequences as that of vicarious atonement. Had the latter dogma, in company with the false idea that we are all immortal, been demonstrated to the world in its true light, humanity would have been bettered by its propagation. Crime and sin would be avoided, not for fear of earthly punishment, or of a ridiculous hell, but for the sake of that which lies the most deeply rooted in our inner nature—the desire of an individual and distinct life in the hereafter, the positive assurance that we cannot win it unless we "take the kingdom of heaven by violence," and the conviction that neither human prayers nor the blood of another man will save us from individual destruction after death, unless we firmly link ourselves during our terrestrial life with our own immortal spirit.

The occult doctrine recognizes a certain possibility, albeit so rare and so vague that it is really useless to mention it. Even the modern occidental occultists deny it, though it is universally accepted in Eastern countries. When, through vice, fearful crimes and animal passions, the disembodied spirit has fallen to the eighth sphere—the allegorical Hades, and the *gehenna* of the Bible, the nearest to our earth—he can, with the help of that glimpse of reason and consciousness left to him, repent; that is to say, he can, by exercising the remnants of his will-power, strive upward, and, like a drowning man, struggle once more to the surface.

Swedenborgians believe, and arcane science teaches, that the abandonment of the living body by the soul frequently occurs, and that we encounter every day, in every condition of life, such living corpses. Various causes, among them overpowering fright, grief, despair, a violent attack of sickness, or excessive sensuality may bring this about. The vacant carcass may be entered and inhabited by the astral form of an adept sorcerer, or an elementary (an earth-bound disembodied human

soul), or very rarely, an elemental. Of course, an adept of white magic has the same power, but unless some very exceptional and great object is to be accomplished, he will never consent to pollute himself by occupying the body of an impure person.

This doctrine of the possibility of losing one's soul and, hence, individuality militates with the ideal theories and progressive ideas of some spiritualists. They will never accept the kabalistic doctrine which teaches that it is only through observing the law of harmony that *individual* life hereafter can be obtained; and that the farther the inner and outer man deviate from this fount of harmony, whose source lies in our own Divine spirit, the more difficult it is to regain the ground. As to the fact of the possible death and obliteration of the human personality by the separation of the immortal parts from the perishable, it is taught of the above that a strong aspiration to retrieve from his calamities, a pronounced desire, will draw the "lost soul" once more into the earth's atmosphere. Here he will wander and suffer more or less in dreary solitude. His instincts will make him seek with avidity contact with living persons.

These spirits are the invisible but too tangible magnetic vampires; the subjective *dæmons* so well known to mediaeval ecstasies, nuns, and monks, to the "witches" made so famous in the *Witch-Hammer*, and to certain sensitive clairvoyants, according to their own confessions. They are the blood-dæmons of Porphyry, the *larvae* and *lemures* of the ancients; the fiendish instruments which sent many unfortunate and weak victims to the rack and stake. Origen held all the dæmons which possessed the demoniacs mentioned in the New Testament to be *human* "spirits." It is because Moses knew so well what they were, and how terrible were the consequences to weak persons who yielded to their influence, that he enacted the cruel, murderous law against such would-be "witches"; but Jesus, full of justice and divine love to humanity, *healed* instead of killing them. Subsequently our clergy, the pretended exemplars of Christian principles, followed the law of Moses, and quietly ignored the law of Him whom they call their "one living God," by burning dozens of thousands of such pretended "witches."

Physical death, as elucidated by a Swedenborgian minister, or the death of the body, is a provision of the divine economy for the benefit of man, a provision by means of which he attained to the higher ends of his personal being. But there is another death which is the interrup-

tion of the divine order and the destruction of every human element in man's nature, and every possibility of human happiness. This is the spiritual death, which takes place before the dissolution of the body. "There may be a vast development of man's natural mind without that development being accompanied by a particle of love of God, or of unselfish love of man."

When one falls into a love of self and love of the world, with its pleasures, losing the divine love of God and of the neighbor, he falls from life to death. The higher principles which constitute the essential elements of his humanity perish, and he lives only on the natural plane of his faculties. To all that pertain to the higher and the only enduring phase of existence he is as much dead as his body becomes dead to all activities, delights, and sensations of the world when the spirit has left it. This spiritual death results from disobedience to the *laws of spiritual life*, which is followed by the same penalty as the disobedience of the laws of the natural life. But the spiritually dead have still their delights; they have their intellectual endowments and power, and intense activities. All the animal delights are theirs, and to multitudes of men and women these constitute the highest ideal of human happiness. The tireless pursuit of riches, of the amusements and entertainments of social life; the cultivation of graces of manner, of a taste in dress, of social preferment, of scientific distinction, intoxicate and enrapture these dead-alive. But, the eloquent preacher remarks, "these creatures with all their graces, rich attire, and brilliant accomplishments, are dead in the eye of the Lord and the angels, and when measured by the only true and immutable standard have no more genuine life than skeletons whose flesh has turned to dust." A high development of the intellectual faculties does not imply spiritual and true life. Many of our greatest scientists are but animate corpses—they have no spiritual sight because their spirits have left them. So we might go through all ages, examine all occupations, weigh all human attainments, and investigate all forms of society, and we would find their *spiritually dead* everywhere.

ON THE LOOKOUT

COMPASSION—REPLACING MORALITY

The movement for world-wide abolition of the death penalty for crimes, either intersocial or international, has received tremendous impetus during the past five years. Even the most casual research in public libraries reveals that psychiatrists, penologists, and law-makers are clearly united in opposition to the underlying assumptions upon which capital punishment rests. This, from the Theosophical point of view, seems to be evidence that, despite a present preoccupation with the defenses and techniques of atomic warfare, a "series of progressive awakenings" has occurred in respect to the traditional biases of the "punishment" outlook. Few criminologists and penologists, however, establish a connection between the relinquishment of the punitive view of morality and a more philosophical conception of ethics, than that supplied by traditional Christianity. One exception appears, perhaps somewhat inadvertently, in a volume produced for college and legal libraries under the title *Capital Punishment*, edited by Grant S. McClellan and published by the H. W. Wilson Company in 1961.

"GOD'S WILL"

Mr. McClellan's task was to assemble leading articles featuring arguments against the death penalty for the Wilson series, "The Reference Shelf." His Preface begins:

Capital punishment is at once a "universal" problem and a very "individual" one. Ideas of the nature of God's will, reality, and human life are all at issue. Earlier generations were confident in dealing with these matters. It was assumed that God approved of punishment by death, and man invoked such punishment in the name of the state as God's agent.

Today we are not so sure, though the best defense of capital punishment still rests, at the deepest level, on a religious foundation. This is, of course, not surprising; life and death still remain the great mystery of the universe. If man, even collectively as the state, takes another life, questions about the sacredness of life are raised, no matter how heinous a crime the individual may have committed against another individual or society. It is only during the last century or a little

more that this concern has grown. That itself tells us something about our beliefs, our regard for human beings, the state of civilization today.

WAR AND EXECUTION RELATED

Arguments against the legal means by which a life is taken for a life—or as punishment for other crimes than murder—are presented in a book titled *Capital Punishment—A World View*, by James Avery Joyce, a specialist in international law (Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York). Mr. Joyce attempts to relate the psychology of atomic bombing in warfare with the psychology of capital punishment. In the Introduction to *Capital Punishment*, Mr. Joyce calls attention both to the proposals currently before United Nations councils respecting the dubiousness of the right of any state to inflict death and to rejection of the prospect of the mass liquidation implied by the threat of modern nuclear weapons. Mr. Joyce writes:

When the human race is facing imminent incineration by its own hand, as it is today, the only question which really matters is whether we can snatch a long enough reprieve from our self-appointed executioners to enable us to abolish the collective death penalty which reliance upon nuclear weapons has imposed upon every living creature on this planet.

Equally relevant to this universalist approach has been the application of psychiatric research—still in its early stages—to a proper understanding of man's collective criminality. When all is said and done, it is the emotional drives within *individuals* which motivate a group to "punish" wrongdoers or to seek scapegoats for their own fears and frustrations in the delinquencies of other groups.

VENGEANCE AND FEAR

One of the concluding chapters of *Capital Punishment* suggests Mr. Joyce's central thesis: that the issues of prospective warfare and the issues of the execution of the individual criminal are essentially the same. He writes:

On the international level—following up the United Nations survey, which is expected to be completed in 1962 or 1963—the abolitionist forces in all the nations can ensure, if they so will, that the next United Nations Congress on the Prevention and Treatment of Crime, which is scheduled to meet in 1965, has the topic of Capital Punishment and its alternatives inscribed high on the agenda, at last!

In the final analysis, of course, it is less the legal procedure which handles the social deviant, *after* the wrong has been committed, that matters, than the kind of society which made him what he is. To refuse

to *kill* the evildoer, who is in rebellion against that bad society, may well make that society a little better and safer. In his essay, *Neither Victims nor Executioners*, Albert Camus declared: "People like myself want not a world in which murder no longer exists (we are not so crazy as that!) but rather one in which murder is not legitimate."

When each state makes that elementary change in its system of law, in its way of life, so that "murder is not legitimate," the biggest step of all will have been taken towards the prevention and treatment of crime.

"BALANCE OF TERROR"

Dr. Jerome O. Frank, of Johns Hopkins University, is one of many psychiatrists who have called attention to the relationship between the means of war and the means of execution. Whenever the preventive argument has been passed upon "terrorizing" the potential offender, whether individual or ideological and international, we encounter nothing more than the vestigial remnants of a vengeful morality. Dr. Frank, writing in *Sanity and Survival*, discusses the "balance of terror" concept which still involves the contemporary military mind. In commenting on the "balance of terror" concept, Mr. Joyce remarks: "This grotesque theory is based on the same assumptions regarding deterrence which continue to sustain the death penalty against recalcitrant individuals. Yet it can no longer be denied that unconscious and irrational impulses, rooted in the individual's failure to adjust to the real world around him, form the basis of that hysterical competition in mutual annihilation which has brought forth these boomerang weapons."

NATIONAL TESTIMONY

Few citizens of the United States are aware of efforts currently made by a minority of congressmen to abolish the death penalty for all federal crimes. Legal library research, however, tells the story of a persistent campaign carried on before committees of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. A subcommittee of the 86th Congress considered at length a proposal for abolition of the death penalty within the United States, and reports on the hearing cover 180 pages of testimony. More and more frequently in such surveys, the outlook of the contemporary psychiatrist finds expression, and it is apparent that those who oppose the death penalty during tenure in public office are able to make increasing use of the uniform arguments of psychologists. A 1960 hearing on the national abolition of capital punishment before the Com-

mittee of Judiciary of the House of Representatives, for example, includes points made in an article by C. Gordon Post, a professor whose training in the psychological sciences is considerable.

THE TREND TOWARD ABOLITION

At that time, the Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, insisted that the following paragraphs be "read into" the congressional record:

There are certain trends certain facts certain observations which cast serious doubt upon the claim that the death penalty is a general deterrent.

There has been a trend toward abolition of the death penalty for civil murder. The states which have either abolished capital punishment by law or have allowed it to fall into disuse by a policy of reprieve are as follows: Austria (1950), Belgium (1863), Denmark (1930), Finland (1949), West Germany (1949), Holland (1870), Iceland (1944), Israel (1954), Italy (1948), Luxembourg (1822), Nepal (1931), Norway (1905), Portugal (1867), Romania (1864), Sweden (1921), U.S.S.R. (1947), the Argentine (1922), Brazil (1891), Colombia (1910), Costa Rica (1880), Dominican Republic (1924), Ecuador (1897), Honduras (1894), Mexico (1928), Panama (1903), Uruguay (1907), Venezuela (1863), and Queensland (1922).

Of the 49 States of the Union, there are 8 in which the maximum penalty for murder is life imprisonment: Michigan (1846), Rhode Island (1852), Wisconsin (1853), Maine (1887), Minnesota (1911), North Dakota (1915), Alaska (1957), and Delaware (1958).

In Western Europe, it will be observed, only Spain, France, and the United Kingdom continue to make use of the death penalty for civil murder, and in the last named state, its application has been curtailed by the Homicide Act of 1957.

This movement or trend, if such it may be called, must indicate that in the minds of many peoples there has been, and is, great doubt as to the general deterrent effects of the death penalty. (Serial No. 21.)

WHO PAYS THE PENALTY?

From a Theosophical standpoint, some of the most significant material dealing with congressional debate on the death penalty appears in the *Congressional Record* for 1959. After introducing House of Representative's Bill 870—the proposal to abolish the death penalty for federal offenses—Mr. Multer asked for inclusion in the record of an article by Daniel M. Berman (in the *New Jersey State Bar Journal*, Winter, 1959). Here is a forthright raising of questions which Theosophists

feel can only be answered by reference to William Q. Judge's discussion on the fate of executed criminals (*Ocean*, p. 48). Mr. Berman writes:

Statistics, buttressed by logic, indicate the futility of capital punishment as a deterrent. But there is an additional, tragically ironical possibility to consider: its existence may actually tend to boost the murder rate. A disturbing indication of this was furnished by the British, who began an 18-month suspension of death penalty at the end of 1955. During the moratorium, the Home Office reports, the number of murders was almost 10 per cent below what it had been during the preceding year and a half. And, during the 18 months after the hangman's vacation ended, the number of murders jumped more than 25 per cent.

"A CONTAGION"

The experience of most other abolitionist countries and States also indicates the possibility that there is a contagion between executions and capital crimes.

The reasons for this are by no means clear. Perhaps capital punishment, by diminishing respect for human life, actually breaks down a most formidable barrier to murder. Or perhaps the explanation is that an execution glorifies both the killer and his deed. How else can one interpret the common phenomenon of innocent men confessing to murders? Why else does the number of murders seem to rise on the nights executions take place?

"NEW HORIZONS IN CRIMINOLOGY"

A volume with this title, edited by historian Harry Elmer Barnes (Prentice-Hall, 1959), undertakes to refute the irresponsible contention that the majority of the people of the United States, exerting their democratic privilege, insist that the death penalty be retained. Instead, the Barnes volume indicates that only a minority—including a sensation-loving press—seems determined to foment the "vengeance" approach:

Recent trends in public sentiment against capital punishment represent also a broader realization that correction is more important to society than is punishment. Contrary to what had been presumed to be true, that the majority of the American people are in favor of capital punishment, we find that in a poll conducted in 1958, fifty per cent of those asked for their opinion stated they were opposed to the death penalty, forty-two per cent were in favor, eight per cent expressed no opinion.

Encouraging as are the results of this sampling of American opinion, there is still far too much irrational resort to vengeance and retributive justice. Not until scientific concepts of corrections have thoroughly penetrated the education and religious processes will the American

people accept the thesis that brutal methods dealing with those who flout the law are anachronistic and futile.

TRAGIC FOUNDATION

A survey of recent literature on capital punishment in the *Nation* for March 10th by Hugo Adam Bedau concludes:

The long and the short of it is that capital punishment stands today solidly on public ignorance of the commonplaces of criminology, penology and the law. Undercut that ignorance and the practice will totter uneasily, for it is in fact supported solely by the inarticulate passions for vengeance. Death penalties should not be left standing on the supposition that they have any better foundation.

BIOLOGIC CLOCKS

An article in the February issue of *The American Journal of Medical Sciences*, "Periodic Fever, An Entity," by Hobart Reimann, utilizes fifty-two cases as source material. Of particular interest to Theosophists as an illustration of the "Second Fundamental" is the discussion of the significance of cyclic recurring fever:

Probably because of its esoteric aspect, scant attention has been paid to periodicity so often in 7 or multiples of 7 days. The words "like clockwork," "weekly," "once a month," "every other Saturday," often appear in patients' histories. This remarkable temporal behavior was noted by Ask-Upmark and emphasized . . . by Richter.

Following this paragraph is a table showing length of cycles by days, for 123 patients with periodic disorders characterized by fever. Preponderance of cycles is at 7, 14, 21, and 28 days. The article continues:

As one explanation to account for periodic disorders, Richter postulates the existence of "biologic clocks" specifically located in various places in the body. In periodic fever, a clock in the central thermoregulatory area may be out-of-order. To account for periodicity, some disruptive influence on timing presumably changes their smooth running to a synchronized rhythm. They then still beat inapparently in the interims, but suddenly express themselves overtly by repeatedly provoking in unison different episodic disorders depending upon which clocks are involved. Brown goes a step further by proposing that biologic or "living" clocks in nature depend upon and oscillate with fundamental geo-physical ones and are counterparts thereof. The theory may have a bearing on Ask-Upmark's "biological week." Whatever the cause of periodic disorders in general and of periodic fever in particular may be, the enigma will persist until some new and different means are devised to unravel the mystery of cyclicity.

COL. H. S. OLCOTT—BUDDHIST APPRECIATION

The New York *Herald Tribune* for Feb. 18 carried a feature article under the title, "Buddhist Homage—for an American," by Martin Berck, which reveals the extent to which Olcott's travels in Ceylon left a permanent impression upon the Buddhists of that land. So peculiar were the windings of destiny in respect to the Theosophical Movement of 1875 that the largely spontaneous "inspiration" provided by the central figures in the original T.S. has become obscured. But H. P. Blavatsky showed an unvarying appreciation for the contributions to the Theosophic Cause on the part of her co-founders and co-workers. Despite Col. H. S. Olcott's intermittent doubt as to the authenticity of some aspects of H.P.B.'s presentation of Theosophy, she upheld him always—as a friend and fellow disciple. Students familiar with her article "Our Three Objects," written for *Lucifer* in 1889 at the time when *The Key to Theosophy* made its appearance, will note ample evidence of regard for and loyalty to Col. Olcott—most particularly in respect to his endeavor to theosophize Buddhist culture.

But to continue with Mr. Berck's feature article: Dr. G. P. Malalarekera, permanent representative of Ceylon to the United Nations, called attention to the memorable work of Col. Olcott in a UN press interview on the anniversary of Col. Olcott's death. Despite the obscure tangle of formal Theosophical history, it is evident that Col. Olcott was strongly moved by altruistic intentions. He came to Ceylon to encourage the devotees of Buddhist faith to revivify their essential teachings, which had become merely traditional for so many and which were also threatened overtly by the determination of the emissaries of the British Empire to "Christianize" the peoples of that land.

OLCOTT THE EDUCATOR

Olcott's devotion to the true Buddhist cause is aptly summarized by Mr. Berck:

Despite treaties to the contrary, all remaining Buddhist schools under the British were turned over to Christian missionaries. And with few exceptions both Roman Catholic and Protestant mission schools demanded that their pupils embrace Christianity. So complete was this educational monopoly that until 1925 the evidence is that every professional man in Ceylon was a Christian.

Olcott perceived that Ceylon's greatest disability lay in its lack of Buddhist schools for Buddhist children. He organized a Buddhist

Theosophical Society in Colombo. He jounced through jungle roads by bullock cart at night to lecture in thatched-hut villages during the day and collect funds for schools. He did more than raise money; he raised spirits. Sharpening half-forgotten rites and principles to teach children, he prepared a Buddhist catechism.

The Buddhist Theosophical Society, which continues to this day to be the largest Buddhist educational organization, fostered hundreds of schools throughout Ceylon. The ancient faith gained new life through his efforts, and repercussions were felt in Japan, Thailand and Burma.

"IDEAS HAVE CONSEQUENCES"

Students of Theosophy who have been introduced to H. P. Blavatsky by way of Robert Crosbie and the Declaration of ULT may sometimes be unaware of Mr. Crosbie's intention in respect to Col. Olcott—that a basic loyalty be shown for his creative efforts and accomplishments. Differences of individual opinion and dissensions are irrelevant in this context, and it is in the context of appreciation that H.P.B. wrote the following paragraph in "Our Three Objects":

The President of our Society, Col. Olcott, has traversed the whole of India several times, upon invitation, addressing vast crowds upon theosophic themes and sowing the seed from which, in time, will be garnered the full harvest of our evangel of brotherhood and mutual dependence. The growth of this kindly feeling has been proven in a variety of ways: first, in the unprecedented gathering of races, castes and sects in the annual Conventions of the Theosophical Society; second, in the rapid growth of a theosophical literature advocating our altruistic views, in the founding of various journals and magazines in several languages, and in the rapid cessation of sectarian controversies; third, in the sudden birth and phenomenally rapid growth of the patriotic movement which is centralized in the organisation called the Indian National Congress. This remarkable political body was planned by certain of our Anglo-Indian and Hindu members after the model and on the lines of the Theosophical Society, and has from the first been directed by our own colleagues; men among the most influential in the Indian Empire. At the same time, there is no connection whatever, barring that through the personalities of individuals, between the Congress and its mother body, our Society. It would never have come into existence, in all probability, if Col. Olcott had suffered himself to be tempted into the side paths of human brotherhood, politics, social reforms, etc., as many have wanted him to do. We aroused the dormant spirit and warmed the Aryan blood of the Hindus, and one vent the new life made for itself was this Congress. All this is simple history and passes unchallenged.

CLARITY FROM CHAOS

As readers of Lookout are aware, the past few years have witnessed a change of tone and emphasis regarding popular references to Theosophy, with the attitude of honest questioning replacing that of negative moral judgments regarding the original T.S. Col. Olcott was one of those who served, in a distinctly karmic manner, as an agent for the revivification of the Wisdom Religion. His life of theosophic effort was crowned by his accomplishments in education in the Far East, and it is for this reason that Buddhists throughout the world have taken note of his demonstration of practical Theosophy. Another paragraph from the Martin Berck article:

Olcott organized a school for the panchamas, the untouchables, the first of its kind in India. With palm-leaf manuscripts, he founded a library, giving impetus to a revival of sanscrit. Branches of the Theosophical Society budded and bloomed across the subcontinent, and beyond. In many ways it served as a precursor to the Indian national movement. Early Congress party leaders were drawn to the society. One was a Brahmin, Motilal Nehru, whose son was Jawaharlal.

THE FIGHTING BEHAVIOR OF ANIMALS

"Fighting between members of the same species is almost universal among vertebrates, from fish to man," declares Irenaus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, writing in *Scientific American* for December, 1961. The reasons for such action by animals are described:

Animals of the same kind, occupying the same niche in nature, must compete for the same food, the same nesting sites and the same building materials. Fighting among animals of the same species therefore serves the important function of "spacing out" the individuals or groups in the area they occupy. . . . Fighting also arises from competition for mates, and thus serves to select the stronger and fitter individuals for propagation of the species.

Unlike human beings, the animal does not fight to kill, and while aggressive behavior seems "natural" in the animal kingdom, it also seems more "reasonable" than the battles of mankind. The article continues:

Fights between individuals of the same species almost never end in death and rarely result in serious injury to either combatant. Such fights, in fact, are often highly ritualized and more nearly resemble a tournament than a mortal struggle. If this were not the case—if the

loser were killed or seriously injured—fighting would have grave disadvantages for the species. The animal that loses a fight is not necessarily less healthy or less viable; it may simply be an immature animal that cannot withstand the attack of a mature one.

VICTORY ACHIEVED

Descriptions are given of fights between fish, lizards, snakes, oryx antelope and others. In some cases the battle is ended when one party takes flight, in which case the opponent does not pursue. At other times an attitude of submission is taken, generally presenting a vulnerable point to the stronger member of the pair, and further attack is inhibited. Still another method, ritualistic in nature, assures slight damage, or at least avoids a fatal outcome. The ceremony is described:

Most animals depend neither on flight nor on surrender to avoid damaging fights. Instead they engage in a ceremonial struggle, in the course of which the contestants measure their strength in bodily contact without harming each other seriously. Often these contests begin with a duel of threats—posturings, movements and noises—designed to cow the opponent without any physical contact at all. Sometimes this competition in bravado brings about a decision; usually it is preliminary to the remainder of the tournament.

CAN WE LEARN FROM ANIMALS?

The concluding application of this study as it concerns man shows an awareness by Dr. Eibl-Eibesfeldt of the moral aspect of this problem:

It should be emphasized that aggressiveness is not the only motive governing the interaction of members of the same species. In gregarious animals there are equally innate patterns of behavior leading to mutual help and support, and one may assert that altruism is no less deeply rooted than aggressiveness. Man can be as basically good as he can be bad, but he is good primarily toward his family and friends. He has had to learn in the course of history that his family has grown, coming to encompass first his clan, then his tribe and his nation. Perhaps man will eventually be wise enough to learn that his family now includes all mankind.

ERRATA

The following important corrections should be noted in "A Study in Karma" which appeared in the April issue: (1) *for* Quality (first word) *read* Duality; (2) in the first sentence of last paragraph on page 266 *for* "intermittent vertical dynamic which is the karmic cycle" *read* "intermittent vertical dynamic which is the positive factor of the karmic cycle."