THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XXXIX—No. 7 **May, 1951**

H. P. B.

August 11-12, 1831—May 8, 1891

REALIZING, *as they do, the boundlessness of the absolute truth, Theosophists repudiate all claim to infallibility. The most cherished preconceptions, the most "pious hope," the strongest "master passion," they sweep aside like dust from their path, when their error is pointed out. Their highest hope is to approximate the truth; that they have succeeded in going a few steps . . . , they think proved in their conviction that they know nothing in comparison with what is to be learned; in their sacrifice of every pet theory and prompting of emotionalism at the shrine of fact; and in their absolute and unqualified repudiation of everything that smacks of "dogma."* —H. P. B.

CONTENTS

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California, U.S.A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by the Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is an independent Journal, unconnected with any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A.

which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(a) To form the nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

1875 - 1950

A U M

The enduring of all ills without petulance and without self-pity;—this is the right Endurance.
—*Crest-Jewel of Wisdom*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXIX **May, 1951** **No. 7**

THE LIBERALISM OF H. P. BLAVATSKY

Men and parties, sects and schools are but the mere ephemera of the world's day. TRUTH, high-seated upon its rock of adamant, is alone eternal and supreme. —H.P.B.

THEOSOPHISTS who are blessed by the liberalism of H. P. Blavatsky's presentation of Theosophy are doubly conscious of their gratitude to her when they find themselves in the midst of rabidly proselytizing religious fanatics, or of those who will associate only with co-religionists lest they become morally contaminated by consorting with the unbeliever. H. P. B. alone had the courage to proclaim the existence of "unconscious Theosophists." She asked no formal declaration of faith of those who came to her. The "signs" which she recognized were not ones that the student, or even the sincere inquirer, manifested consciously. Pledges of loyalty, and assurances of devotion, she knew were not worth the paper on which they were written if they ended there. Better an earnest inquirer who hesitated long before giving his allegiance to a cause, than the enthusiast whose interest falters at the first hurdle. Theosophy needs no creed-props, no dogma-supports. It can stand alone because it is essentially non-sectarian. All Truth is non-sectarian. The laws of Nature which we recognize in the blossoming of flowers, in the migration of birds, in the revolution of the sun and stars, do not depend on our recognition. If some of these have been partially codified, it is only to satisfy the curious or the inquiring mind. These Laws operate though we deny them. And there is the test.

We can learn much from the religious bigot. He makes us take stock of our own position and examine ourselves to see just how

bigoted we ourselves may be, for to be a student of Theosophy is unfortunately not necessarily synonymous with being broad-minded. We may be nominal Theosophists, but unless we practice an all-inclusive Brotherhood which includes the sinner as well as the saint, we have no right to the holy name. The failure of those who flocked about H. P. B. in the early days of the Movement to realize this *sine qua non* of the true Theosophist forced H. P. B. to pronounce the Movement a failure despite fourteen years of her unceasing struggle. She was liberal enough and wise enough to give credit to the "profane" who disagreed with her. Her compassion reached out to embrace her bitterest denouncers. It was to the sick and the searcher that she had come.

The self-reliance, the self-dependence—the reliance on the SELF, dependence on the SELF, which the Buddha had taught and which H. P. B. reiterated untiringly—is the surest strength she left her students. They afford the key which will open the door to that freedom where dogma is unknown, where the only form acknowledged is the Form of the Spirit. To associate day in and day out with those who think as we do, who live as we do, and who adopt even the rules of daily conduct which we approve may be pleasant to some—but it is not going to do us much good. It is positively dangerous. Groups and cliques may grow up among theosophists just as they do among the professors of any religious philosophy, among scientists, literary men, and plumbers. Each little group is satisfied with its exclusive way of life. It condemns all who think and live differently. How often, if we can lay aside our conceit in regard to religion and philosophy, our literary work or our trade, we find more wisdom through a five minutes' conversation with a "stranger," than in endless hobnobbing with confrères of our own "school"! Better a good fighting opposition through which we are forced to examine our own faith than the unquestioned—and often unthinking—corroboration of "yes-men" afraid to think for themselves. In our adversaries we shall find many an unconscious theosophist. And from them we shall learn.

Some theosophical students laugh at the dogma of the churches; they turn deaf ears to the orthodoxy of the Brahmin priest. The Zoroastrian Dastur, the Muslim Mobedh talk themselves hoarse, but with no effect. They are sure they have the truth and nothing but the

truth. They go so far as to tell us they have ALL the truth. Theosophists, too, have the truth, but a great deal that is not true creeps in under the guise of devotion, and we may become as fanatical and as intolerant on our side as do those who damn all who do not accept their faith.

Theosophy does not stand or fall on a question of dogma, nor would it suffer, in one sense, if there were never another lecture, study-class or meeting. Burn the last of Theosophical books—THEOSOPHY would not be affected. There are those who become so engrossed in the importance of the manifested aspect of the Movement that they ignore the Unmanifested Spirit—like the Samkyas who make the Unmanifest Avyaktam their goal, and forget that Mulaprakriti is but a Veil which hides the Real. Their self-imposed discipline becomes an end, not a means. So convinced do they become of the importance of their chosen hour of meditation or of study that they will ignore their most obvious duty to a sick or suffering comrade. They ridicule their Roman Catholic brother who would allow nothing to make him miss his early morning Mass, while they themselves have become morally and physically dependent on regular lectures and weekly meetings—"philosophical pills" without which they fear to weaken before the onslaughts of the world.

Others, reversing the position, feel that Theosophy depends on them and on their faithful acceptance of whatever they hear or read, and forget that we must interpret what we study in terms of others' and our own needs. H. P. B. went out of her way to shock people out of their complacent, non-thinking, and tamasic acceptance of her words. She sought love-inspired cooperation; she had no use for obedience based on fear. In H. P. B.'s Theosophy there is no place for priest or autocrat. Better think wrongly, so we think for ourselves, and come to the right conclusion by our own efforts, than to be spoon-fed with palatable and sweet-tasting tid-bits of philosophy. Better even to be bravely and courageously in the wrong than to have an unreasoned and counterfeit faith—though that faith happen to be in the truth. Life asks that we be hot or cold—the luke-warm she will spew from her mouth!

The Theosophist is a Warrior, ready to fight his own battles on the Path. He does not ask that a Master lead him by the hand and point out all the holes and stones which make dangerous the Way.

He is not afraid to sleep lest he waste time, or to lend his help in a street accident lest he involve himself in the karma of another, or be late to a meeting. He is free from all dogma; ritualism is repugnant to him. The books he will read may be on the "Index" of his comrades, but if he learns from them to appreciate men's hearts the better, it is all he will ask. He forages in book-stores for himself; he does not wait that a book be recommended to him. For him Theosophy is too high and holy to want his support or his allegiance. His love is such that he is humble. It is not Theosophy that can gain anything from him, he reasons. Masters do not need him, neither does H. P. B. But he cannot live a day without them. We are here today, all-important in our own estimation. We shall die, many of us, long before 1975—is the periodic out-giving of the philosophy to suffer for our absence? Will Masters fail to keep their "appointment" because *we* are not there?

There have been times when to proclaim Theosophical truths meant death and worse. To be found reading a philosophical book proscribed by the church sufficed to condemn the reader to years in a dungeon or to be broken on the wheel. It might well become the duty of any of us, even in our present life, to retire to the forest, unknown and unrecognized by the world, to carry on the work of Masters. There would be in that day no *Secret Doctrine,* no *Key to Theosophy,* no *Gathas* or *Upanishads.* We would be without pen or paper. There would be no question of an assembly of friends freely discussing those spiritual truths now so close to our hearts. The only orator we should hear would be the silent beating of our eager heart. We would be forced to care for ourselves, cook our own food over wood-fires, and eat what the forest might afford. Ours the task to remain as silent witnesses of the Truth. Should we then say that Theosophy is *not*—that it has been withdrawn from the world? That Masters have deserted us? Is our Theosophy so weak that it depends on books and meetings? Is the great Movement to be maintained by men and women who live apart and feed on what they call "magnetically clean food," or by even one ardent soul that still aspires? If our moral efficiency depends on all these ephemeral niceties, if our atmosphere is so refined that it can be defiled by the presence of the meat-eater in our midst, then have we not known the Theosophy of H. P. B., who ate when and what she could, and

who, because of her poverty, often went hungry. She laid no stress on rules of diet; she could enjoy no protected hours of quiet. To her a cruel word, an uncharitable act, a lapse in the practice of Brotherhood was infinitely more degrading than pounds of red, or even raw meat eaten by one in dirty rags.

We call ourselves her followers. We use her name day and night, and never tire quoting her words. Are we ready to throw form and ritual, creed and dogma—yes, to the last other-imposed, unreasoned observance—to the winds, that the air may purify them: or blow them beyond our reach? Those of us who would approach Masters' world must divest ourselves of all delusions, especially of that which makes us rely on or put our trust in any support other than the perfectly spontaneous living of the Spiritual Life—a life that becomes impossible the moment we separate ourselves from the meanest of human creatures. For in so isolating ourselves from our fellow-man, we isolate ourselves from the Masters.

> No differences can be observed by the true disciple in any other disciple who is perhaps of a different faith. All pursue truth. Roads differ, but the goal of all remains alike. (*Hindu Chela's Diary*)

Theosophical Fallibility

No true theosophist, from the most ignorant up to the most learned, ought to claim infallibility for anything he may say or write upon occult matters. The chief point is to admit that, in many a way, in the classification of either cosmic or human principles, in addition to mistakes in the order of evolution, and especially on metaphysical questions, those of us who pretend to teach others more ignorant than ourselves—are all liable to err. . . . For a large or even a small work on such abstruse subjects to be entirely exempt from error and blunder, it would have to be written from its first to its last page by a great adept, if not an Avatar. . . . But, so long as the artist is imperfect, how can his work be perfect? "Endless is the search for truth!" Let us love it and aspire to it for its own sake, and not for the glory or benefit a minute portion of its revelation may confer on us. For who of us can presume to have the *whole* truth at his fingers' ends, even upon one minor teaching of Occultism?

—*The Secret Doctrine*

"BLAVATSKIANISM" IN AND OUT OF SEASON

[This article by Mr. Judge was printed by Annie Besant in *Lucifer,* December, 1893, and may be said to represent the culmination of many shorter articles on the relation between Theosophy, H. P. Blavatsky, and the T. S., which were published earlier that same year in Mr. Judge's *Path* magazine. The student who wishes to follow consecutively the major steps of Mr. Judge's continuing discussion should refer to "Authorship of Secret Doctrine," "Glamour, Its Place and Purpose," "Masters, Adepts, Teachers and Disciples," "The Adepts and Modern Science," "How to Square the Teachings," and "A Word on the 'Secret Doctrine'." (These articles have been reprinted in THEOSOPHY: 38: 52; 31: 466; 32: 287; 31: 71; 38: 245 and 56.) The *Path* for November, 1893, printed a piece by Alexander Fullerton in the same vein: "Impolitic Reference—H.P.B.'," while Archibald Keightley's article, "In H.P.B.'s Writings, What is New?" (see THEOSOPHY 37: 538) had already appeared in January, 1893. A passage in *Letters That Have Helped Me,* pp. 103-4, is also suggestive in this connection.
—Eds. THEOSOPHY]

THEOSOPHISTS! let us consult together. Let us survey the army, the field of battle, and the fighters. Let us examine our ways and our speech, so that we may know what we are doing in this great affray which may last for ages and in which every act has a future. What do we see? A theosophical Society struggling as a whole against the world. A few devoted members struggling against the world and some opponents within its ranks. A Society grown to its eighteenth year, after the expenditure of much time and energy and fame by those who have been with it in infancy, those who have come in from time to time, those who worked and left it for this generation. It has its karma like any other body, for it is a living thing and not a mere paper organization; and with that karma is also woven the karma of the units composing it.

How does it live and grow? Not alone by study and work, but by propriety of method of work; by due attention paid by the members to thought and speech in their theosophic promulgations. Wise workers, like wise generals, survey the field now and then to see if their methods are good or bad, even though fully convinced of the nobility and righteousness of their cause; they trust not only to the virtue of their aim and work, but attend to any defects now and then indicated by the assaults of the enemy; they listen to warnings of those who see or think they see errors of omission and commission. Let us all do this.

It happens to be the fact that most of those who work the hardest for the Society are at the same time devoted disciples, open or non-

professed, of H. P. Blavatsky, but that leaves still a large number of members who, with the first-named, may be variously classified. First, there are those who do not rely at all on H. P. Blavatsky, while not distinctly opposed and none the less good members. Next are those who are openly opposed to her name and fame, who, while reading her works and profiting by them as well as by the work aroused by her in others, are averse to hearing her name, oppose the free assertion of devotion to her, would like now and then to have Theosophy stripped of her altogether, and opine that many good and true possible members are kept away from the T. S. by her personality's being bound up in it. The two last things, of course, are impossible to meet, because if it had not been for her the Theosophical Society with its literature would not have come into existence. Lastly are those in the world who do not belong to our ranks, composed of persons holding in respect to the T. S. the various positions of for, against, and indifferent.

The active workers may be again divided as follows:

(*a*) Moderate ones, good thinkers who present their thoughts in words that show independent and original thought on theosophical subjects, thus not referring to authority, yet who are earnest, devoted and loyal.

(*b*) Those who are earnest, devoted and loyal, but present Theosophy more or less as quotations from H.P.B's writings, constantly naming and always referring their thoughts and conclusions to her, thus appearing to present Theosophy as solely based on her as an authority.

(*c*) The over-zealous who err like the former, and, in addition, too frequently and out of place and time, bring forward the name of H. P. Blavatsky; often relating what it was supposed she had done or not done, and what she said, attributing infallibility to her either directly or by indirection; thus arousing an opposition that is added to any impression of dogmatism or authority produced by other members.

(*d*) Believers in phenomena who give prominence to the wonders said to have been performed by H. P. Blavatsky; who accentuate the value of the whole field of occult phenomena, and sincerely supposing, however mistaken the notion, that occult and psychical phenomena will arrest attention, draw out interest, inspire confidence;

when, in fact, the almost certain results are, to first arouse curiosity, then create distrust and disappointment; for nearly every one is a doubting Thomas who requires, while the desire cannot be satisfied, a duplicate of every phenomenon for himself. In *The Occult World,* the Adept writing on this very subject says that the demand for new phenomena would go on *crescendo* until at last one would be crushed by doubt, or the other and worse result of creating superstition and blind faith would come about. Every thoughtful person must surely see that such must be the consequence.

It is true that the movement has grown most in consequence of the effort of those who are devoted to an ideal, inspired by enthusiasm, filled with a lasting gratitude to H. P. Blavatsky. Their ideal is the service of Humanity, the ultimate potential perfectibility of man as exemplified by the Masters and Adepts of all ages, including the present. Their enthusiasm is born from the devotion which the ideal arouses, their gratitude is a noble quality engendered by the untiring zeal of the soul who brought to their attention the priceless gems of the wisdom religion. Ingratitude is the basest vice of which man can be guilty, and it will be base for them to receive the grand message and despise the messenger.

But does devotion, loyalty, or gratitude require that we should thrust our estimate of a person forward to the attention of the public in a way that is certain to bring opposition? Should our work in a great movement, meant to include all men, intended to condense the truth from all religions, be impeded or impelled by over-zealous personal loyalty? I think not. We should be wise as serpents. Wisdom does not consist in throwing the object of our heart's gratitude in the faces of those who have no similar feeling, for when we do that it may easily result that personal considerations will nullify our efforts for the good of those we address.

Now it is charged in several quarters that we are dogmatic as a Society. This is extremely easy of disproof as a fact, and some trouble has been taken to disprove it. But is there not a danger that we might go too far on this line, and by continuing the disproof too long increase the very belief which we say is baseless? "The more proof offered the less believed" is how often true. Our constitution is the supreme law. Its being non-dogmatic is proof enough. Years of notification on almost every document have prepared the proofs

which every one can see. It would seem that enough has been said on the subject of our non-dogmatism.

But the charge then is altered, and "dogmatism" is supplanted by "Blavatskianism," and here the critics have a slight ground to stand on; here is where a danger may exist and where the generals, the captains, the whole army should properly pay attention and be on their guard. In the words and methods of the various classes of members above mentioned is the cause for the change. I am not directing any remarks to the question whether members "believe in Blavatsky or not," for the charge made is intended to imply that there is too much said about H. P. Blavatsky as authority, as source, as guide; too little original thinking; too much reliance on the words of a single person.

In the years that are gone, necessity existed for repelling mean personal attacks on H. P. Blavatsky's character. To take up arms in her behalf then was wise. Now her works remain. The necessity for constant repulse of attacks on her does not exist. Judgment can be used in doing so. Loyalty is not thrown to the winds when good judgment says there is no need to reply. One of the best replies is to carry on the work in the noble and altruistic spirit she always pointed out. Take, for instance, the almost senile attacks periodically made by the Society for Psychical Research. What good can be possibly accomplished by paying attention to them? None at all, except what results to that body by inflating it with the idea that its shafts have hit a vulnerable spot. Ever since their *ex post facto* agent went to India to play at psychical investigation, they have almost lived by their attacks, for by them, more than anything else, they gain some attention; her personality, even to this day, adds spice to their wide-of-the-mark discussions. Even at the Chicago World's Fair Congress their discussions were mostly given up to re-hashing the same stories, as if they were proud that, even though they knew nothing of psychic law, they had at least discovered one human being whose nature they could not fathom, and desired to forever parade her with the various labels their fancy suggested. But in districts or new publications, where a new attack is made, good judgment may suggest an answer bringing up the statement of charges and copiousness of former answers. Now our work goes on in meetings, in publications, in discussions, and here is where the old idea of repelling attacks may run

into an unnecessary parade of the person to whom in heart we are loyal, while at the same time the voluminousness of her writings is often an excuse for not investigating for oneself, and this leads to quoting her too frequently by name as authority.

She never claimed authority, but, contrariwise, disclaimed it. But few of the theories broached by her were new to our day, albeit those are the key-ideas. Yet these very key-ideas are not those on which the quotations and personal references to her are made so often. She neither invented, nor claimed as new, the doctrines of Karma, Reincarnation, Devachan, Cycles, and the like. These are all exhaustively treated in various literatures—Buddhistic, Jain, Brahmanical, Zoroastrian. They are capable, like all theosophic doctrines, of independent examination, of philosophical, logical and analogical proof. But, if we state them parrot-like, and then bring forward a quotation from H. P. Blavatsky to prove them, has not an opponent, has not any one, member or non-member, a right to say that the offending person is not doing independent thinking, is not holding a belief after due consideration, but is merely acting blindly on faith in matters where blind faith is not required? And if many members do the same thing, it is quite natural that a cry should be raised by some one of "Blavatskianism."

If this were an age in the West where any respect or reverence existed as a general thing in the people, the sayings of a sage could be quoted as authority. But it is not such an age. Reverence is paralyzed for the time, and the words of a sage are of no moment as such. H. P. Blavatsky came in this irreverent time, holding herself only as a messenger and indicator, not as a sage pure and simple. Hence to merely quote her words out of due place will but arouse a needless irritation. It may indicate in oneself a failure to think out the problem independently, an absence of diligence in working out our own salvation in the way directed by Gautama Buddha. What, then, are the right times and places, and which are out of place and time?

When the assembly and the subject are both meant to deal with the life and works of H. P. Blavatsky, then it is right and proper and wise to speak of her and her works, her acts, and words. If one is dealing with an analysis or compilation of her writings on any subject, then must she and what she wrote be used, named, and quoted.

But even at those times her words should not be quoted as and for authority, inasmuch as she said they were not. Those who consider them to be authority will quickly enough accept them. As she never put forward anything as original investigation of hers in the realm of science, in the line of experiments in hypnotism, in clairvoyance, mind-reading, or the like, we ought to be careful how and when we bring her statements forward to an unbelieving public.

But in an assembly of members coming together to discuss theosophical doctrines in general, say such as Karma, Reincarnation, the Septenary Constitution, and the like, it is certainly unwise to give quotation after quotation from H. P. Blavatsky's works on the matter in hand. This is not fair to the hearer, and it shows only a power of memory or compilation that argues nothing as to the comprehension of the subject on the reader's part. It is very easy to compile, to quote sentence after sentence, to weave a long series of extracts together, but it is not progress, nor independence, nor wisdom. On the other hand, it is a complete nullification of the life-work of the one who has directed us to the path; it is contrary to the spirit and genius of the Society. And if in such an assembly much time is given to recounting phenomena performed by H. P. B., or telling how she once said this and at another time did that, the time is out of joint with the remarks. Meetings of branches are meant for giving to the members and enquirers a knowledge of theosophical doctrines by which alone true progress is to come to our movement. New and good members are constantly needed; they cannot be fished out of the sea of enquirers by such a process as the personal history of anyone, they cannot be retained by relations of matters that do not teach them the true aim and philosophy of life, they will be driven off if assailed with quotations.

If there is power in a grateful loyalty to H. P. Blavatsky, as for my part I fully believe, it does not have its effect by being put forward all the time, or so often as to be noticeable, but from its depth, its true basis, its wise foundation, its effect on our work, our act, and thought. Hence to my mind there is no disloyalty in reserving the mention of her name and qualities for right and timely occasions. It is certain that as Theosophy brings forward no new system of ethics, but only enforces the ethics always preached, the claim—if made—that our ethics, our high endeavour, are to be found nowhere

else described save in the works left by H. P. Blavatsky, is baseless, will lead to wrong conclusions, and bring up a reaction that no amount of argument can suppress. No greater illustration of an old and world-wide religion can be found than that provided by Buddhism, but what did Buddha say to his disciples when they brought up the question of the honours to be paid to his remains? He told them not to hinder themselves about it, not to dwell on it, but to work out their own salvation with diligence. (See the *Mahaparinibbana Sutta.*)

That the views held by H. P. Blavatsky herself coincided with this can be seen by reading the pamphlet entitled *The Theosophical Society and H. P. B.,* being a reprint of articles that appeared in *Lucifer* of December, 1890. She requested the reprint, and some of her notes are appended to the articles. In those Bro. Patterson took somewhat the same ground as this article, and she commended it in most positive terms.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

THE DOOR OF DISCIPLESHIP

Buddha, Jesus, and many others before and after them, were treated by their contemporaries as ordinary human beings actuated by similar motives as the rest of mankind. They were opposed by the established interests, religious and otherwise, because the doctrines they taught were destructive of the hard and fast conclusions upon which those interests were founded; their speech and acts, although intended to instruct, enlighten, and benefit, were construed as violations of law and custom, and were frequently characterized as criminal in nature. Even among their immediate disciples, suspicion, doubt, jealousy, fear, resentment and self-interest were to be found, none of which could have had existence had the real nature of the teacher been understood. . . . It is true that all the disciples learned something in spite of their defects, but it is also true that the lack of intuitive perception of the divine nature of their teachers was the most important factor in the failure of those disciples to truly transmit the teachings they had received; for that lack closed the door in themselves through which the divine enlightenment could come.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

"THE KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS-IN-THEMSELVES"

THE doors of the heart are many or few according to the choices we make and the philosophy we follow. The latter may have expanded to include the power to renounce; the factors which rule our choices are not only a philosophy of life, but, in addition, qualities such as harmlessness, humility and altruism—or their opposites. The heart is a center of our being which we have moulded, for the most part, with the careful hand of the sculptor; the mind, another center, we carelessly hold in a state of flux.

No one knows his mind until he earnestly searches for its roots that he may nourish them and intelligently prune the upward growth; otherwise his mind belongs to the race, religion, and nationality in which birth has placed him. No one plans the development of his mental capacities until the will is strong; otherwise the power to think is centered in the body and its multiple actions and sensations. No one purifies the mind until the doors of the heart begin to open, with the resultant slackening of selfish desire. And none will sacrifice the mind until heart and mind blend; then the spiritual eye begins to see and the intuition awakens. From then on, there is a fundamental change, in which the inner man takes ascendancy over the outer man. As the change progresses, the mind is able to withdraw from the complexity which characterizes all material preoccupations. Dependency upon that which is external to the Self becomes less of a necessity, and the worship of personal gods, saviors and saints, passes into the archaic background. Their worship has always encouraged selfish interest, for although a savior of man teaches the highest ethics, his orthodox worship becomes the blind which obscures the true essence of the ethics taught.

But even when one has advanced far towards true discipleship, self-interest may remain in the heart in sublimated form, and its thieving hands will reach up to the higher planes. When this occurs, the higher mind will be forced again to lie on the bed of conventionality and prejudice until disturbing dreams reawaken it to the struggle ahead. Whence come these dreams? Are they not things in themselves, related to inherent ideas of justice, altruism and divinity, which have been banished through neglect and avoidance? All

must eventually awaken to "the knowledge of things in themselves," or else live on, slaves of Maya, the great illusion. Without this knowledge, one cannot master the intricacies of mental action; the undisciplined mind is a slave of the senses, the producers of relative knowledge. Only a knowledge of the essence of things can free the mind—and the eye of spirit alone sees on the plane of essence. The essence of an idea is the source of its permanency and the determining factor as to whether the many associated impulses shall lodge and remain in higher or in lower manas.

One of the earliest awakenings to the higher life causes the past to take shape like an endless procession through the defenseless mind. It is then that the first awareness of the reality of the inner environment comes upon the ego who, seeing in objective form the evil of his thinking, resolves to become the master rather than the slave in his own house. The inner environment is that of the seven sheaths of the soul, the seven vehicles or instruments relating the ego to the seven planes of being. Through various aspects, these sheaths interpenetrate each other, forming a complete whole which manifests as an intimate relationship between plane and plane. This relationship is seen in its most evident form in the action of the blood which carries oxygen, the agent of the energic sheath, to every cell in the body. Without this agent, life as we know it would not exist. The interrelation of the higher sheaths is not to be found in the chemistry of the material plane, but through metaphysical research based on moral law. In the second chapter of the Gita, as translated by Wm. Q. Judge, there is a sequence which illustrates the point in question: in it the lower man is moved by passion arising in Kama; anger is followed by delusion, memory is torn from manas, and discrimination, an aspect of Buddhi, is lost—and with this loss, all is lost. But it is also shown how this process can be reversed, as it were, so that harmony is restored and the whole man responds to the higher ideation, "embracing wisdom from all sides."

Just as Prana may be said to depend upon oxygen as the physical agent energizing the flesh, so also we find ideation serviced by an appropriate agent. Its source is explained in a phrase in *The Secret Doctrine*: " . . . absolute wisdom mirrors itself in its Ideation; which . . . results in Cosmic Energy (Fohat)" (S.D. 1, 328). Since consciousness is Cosmic Ideation welling up within a vehicle, it is not

difficult to understand that this occult electricity, or Fohat, is the connecting link of the higher sheaths. *The Secret Doctrine* has much to say about Fohat in its cosmic relations, but, remembering that man is the microcosm, we can trace in him an analogous field. Fohat acts within the atoms. As radio waves pass through space to vibrate as pictures on the screen, so Fohat initiates motion within matter which objectivizes higher ideation, not only in the mind, but in the psychic principles of the body cells as well. On the other hand, Fohat may be used as the unifying agent to bring the sheaths in harmony one with the other. There is, therefore, a choice that each has to make: that of working with the subtle occult energy which is able to impress higher ideation upon matter—rendering holy the lower nature—or of yielding to the destructive energy of this same lower man; the one energy illumines the inner man, the other inflames the outer.

It may be argued that to struggle for knowledge of so subtle and unknown an entity is to invite the abyss of nothingness, or to lay oneself open to practices foreign to the true path. But no such struggle is necessary or possible. We are embodied in an energic system which functions automatically. If the system is interfered with, the reaction may release stored-up Karma able to destroy the delicate relationships of the four lower sheaths. And this disturbance may, in turn, cause disaster to the dynamic energies of the mind. Therefore to consciously live in the light of the higher sheaths, the stream of thought must incline towards spirit, and the knowledge released on that plane will reflect automatically and occultly upon the whole series of sheaths. Should such a course be followed, the preliminary effects will be so intangible that they may not be felt for long periods.

He who for the first time desires conscious life in the higher sheaths, is like the infant entering upon its new life, awaiting its growth to supply the necessary control and development of the senses. The aspiring ego must also await growth that will eventually unfold the higher perceptions. And while he waits—the following passage, if pondered, will bring understanding, and remain in the heart as a symbol of truth:

> The Sixth principle in Man, though a mere breath, in our conceptions, is still something material when compared with divine 'Spirit,' of which it is the carrier or vehicle. Fohat, in his capacity of

> DIVINE LOVE, the electric Power of affinity and sympathy, is shown allegorically as trying to bring the pure Spirit, the Ray inseparable from the ONE absolute, into union with the Soul. . . . (*S.D.* I, 119.)

It is toward this union that the teachings of the Elder Brothers have, in all ages, led those who have sought to use the electric power of affinity and sympathy. The teachings are expressed simply for those who tread the humble path, and profoundly for those who are capable of fathoming greater depths. But when all things are seen in the light of spirit, with love for all life, there can be no limit to the disciple's power to serve, for he himself has become a conscious channel for higher ideation. He then feels within him the breath of life, the breath which brings rebirth to both heart and mind. With wisdom, the heart sheds a permanent light, and the mind is concerned with "the Knowledge of things-in-themselves."

THE LIVING FORCES

It is most remarkable that, while honestly confessing their entire ignorance of the true Nature of even terrestrial matter—primordial substance being regarded more as a dream than as a sober reality—the physicists should set themselves up as judges, nevertheless, of that matter, and claim to know what it is able and is not able to do, in various combinations. Scientists know it (matter) hardly skin-deep, and yet they will dogmatise. It is "a mode of motion" and nothing else. But the *force* that is inherent in a living person's breath, when blowing a speck of dust from the table, is also, and undeniably, "a mode of motion"; and it is as undeniably not a quality of the matter, or the particles of that speck, and it emanates from the living and thinking Entity that breathed, whether the impulse originated consciously or unconsciously. Indeed, to endow matter—something of which nothing is known so far—with an inherent quality called Force, of the nature of which still less is known, is to create a far more serious difficulty than that which lies in the acceptation of the intervention of our "Nature-Spirits" in every natural phenomenon. . . . [The Occultists] assert that all the so-called Forces of Nature, Electricity, Magnetism, Light, Heat, etc., etc., . . . are *in esse, i. e.,* in their ultimate constitution, the differentiated aspects of Universal Motion.

—H.P.B.

THE INVISIBLE LINE

I

A YALE University scientist recently completed a two month's experiment of posing as a patient in a mental hospital, and the results—in the opinion of four members of the Yale Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health—open "a new area of psychiatric knowledge," indicating that the whole physical and social structure of our mental hospitals should be restudied. One question raised by the findings is whether or not most neurotic patients "still able to function in some areas of life" would not respond more to treatment outside a hospital than inside. The "patients," it is found, "live in one social world and the staff in another. The patients, therefore, turn inward and build their own social structure which was insulated as much as possible from friction with the hospital routine." The Yale researcher also learned that patients "support, help and even treat each other even if this often means going against a rule of the hospital," and the report emphasizes that the patient spends only five per cent of his time with a psychiatrist and the rest with other patients.*

We cannot but feel that such an experiment is a milestone in modern psychiatric research, and doubtless the material collected by the Yale scientist-"patient" (who kept "an elaborate diary") will supply much food for thought, on the part of psychiatrists in general. Yet there is another audience to be considered and approached: the lay public, which, given the essence of the discoveries made and the records of insights received, might be the better able to cope with the problems of insanity.

In our times the so-called "ordinary person" can no longer avoid the facts of mental illness. Hundreds of thousands are confined to mental institutions; unnumbered millions tread the border-line of psychological unbalance without quite losing hold of their power of discrimination; and there can scarcely be a normal human being who is conscious of the peculiar and tremendous pressures of life in the twentieth century, who does not recognize his own dangerous ignorance of the workings of his inner nature.

---

*New York *Times*, February 2, 1951. The report was presented to the American Orthopsychiatric Association meeting in Detroit, February 22.

For experts in the field of psychology to press forward in their technical experiments and to continue compounding their special formulas for the relief of suffering minds is well and proper. But concurrent with these endeavors should go a definite effort to reach the public with the *general principles* uncovered; these, simply and clearly presented, would serve as "preventive medicine" of the most practical kind, for the alleviation of maladies in their first or germinating stages—before they become the settled illnesses which are so difficult to cure.

The method used by Edward Bach (discussed in last month's issue) might be followed by all pioneers who extend the frontiers of science, especially in matters of health and human welfare. Throughout his career of discovery, Bach conscientiously relayed the essence of his researches to the lay public, insofar as he could secure its attention. His style is simple, even colloquial; he did not have to be "impressive"—his message impresses itself, so palpable is his desire to communicate his convictions and to share the faith in Nature's laws which his work confirmed. The reader of Bach's *The Twelve Healers,* a thirty-page pamphlet describing the "flower remedies" (38 in all), may benefit greatly without even being treated by the tinctures, if he "takes" the Remedies as philosophical suggestions for maintaining equal-mindedness, and works toward health from within without.

One Remedy, for example, is specified "for those who find it difficult not to be anxious for other people"; another belongs to those "who have not sufficient confidence in themselves to make their own decisions"; and a third applies to "those who cannot prevent thoughts, ideas, arguments which they do not desire from entering their minds." Knowing such states of mind to be ultimate *causes* of disease, the thoughtful person will begin to have a self-compelling basis for pursuing the ethics of, say, the *Bhagavad-Gita.* Bach discovered that "those who are quick in thought and action and who wish all things to be done without hesitation or delay" will attach themselves to mental distress or bodily disease in a different manner than do "those who blame themselves," and, again, the characteristic reaction of "those who feel the need to see more good and beauty in all that surrounds them" would not be "normal" for one who is a hard master to himself because he hopes his example "will appeal to others" and thus benefit them. How changed is the aspect of pain, trouble, and illness in the light of this kind of analysis!

The most effective manuals on health of body or mind are comparable, then, to the great scriptures themselves—they are direct appeals to man's common sense, to his intuition, and to his feeling of kinship with Nature and his oneness with humanity as a whole. They do not add "new" ideas, so much as they provide *accompanying demonstrations* for the laws of human thought and action which have been taught by every teacher of mankind, in one form after another, from age to age. Each presentation will appeal to certain minds more than to others, but all will be found to corroborate and reiterate the fundamental propositions H. P. Blavatsky called to notice in introducing her *Secret Doctrine.* Psychologically stated, these principles are: (1) the ground of unity in all life and consciousness; (2) the synthesizing law of all experience, thought, and action; and (3) the pervading purpose of all growth and evolution, of which human existence is only one—though a specially important—part. None of these principles can be violated by the human being without some form of un-saneness accruing to him, and the difficulty of distinguishing, in an absolute sense, between the "sane" and the "insane" is due precisely to the fact that there is hardly a man on earth who lives fully according to these propositions, and who is, therefore, completely and at all times *in balance* throughout his whole nature.

A special illustration of the type of general manual that has been described is a small book first published in Glasgow in 1860: *The Philosophy of Insanity,* by "A Late Inmate of the Glasgow Royal Asylum for Lunatics at Gartnavel." Its one hundred and sixteen pages comprise a remarkable treatise on insanity, which for brevity, clarity, suggestiveness, and applicability would be difficult to surpass. Here is not merely the research of a psychologist assuming the mask of lunacy, but the generalizations from first-hand experience of a mind lost and found again. Here is no encyclopedia of myriad and uncoordinated case histories, nor a hand-wringing recital of the details of one man's madness: *The Philosophy of Insanity* may be said to bear out its title, and the economy and restraint practiced by its writer will be envied by many who would not dream of calling themselves insane.

Until it was re-issued by Greenberg: Publisher in 1947, *The Philosophy of Insanity* was an extremely rare volume. Interest in its re-publication arose as the result of Dr. Frieda Fromm-Reichmann's

course on "The Assets of the Mentally Handicapped," which was given for three years at the Washington School of Psychiatry. Dr. Fromm-Reichmann's purpose was to show that "there is, in essence, a difference only in degree and not in kind between the emotional and mental experiences and modes of expression of people who suffer from severe mental disorders (psychoses), persons who suffer from milder forms of difficulties in living (neuroses), and people who enjoy emotional stability (the so-called healthy)." In her introduction to *The Philosophy of Insanity,* she presents the unknown nineteenth-century author as "an outstanding representative of those who have succeeded in turning their mental afflictions into assets":

> Nobody of whom I know among scientific and nonscientific authors has expressed the idea of the essential human likeness between mentally disturbed and emotionally stable people more convincingly and in more beautiful language than did this remarkable recovered psychotic.

Dr. Fromm-Reichmann points out that many modes of expression in the healthy mind have a *two-sided motivation* similar to that observed in the mentally disturbed, and she believes that one of the most far-reaching manifestations of this two-sidedness is "that the very difficulties in living which may constitute mental disorder or emotional handicap on the one hand, may on the other hand become a source for the development of specific assets in the same personality."

With this point of view the theosophist is in full accord, for it is an ancient maxim that there are dual possibilities in every experience. One of the aphorisms on Karma states the matter concisely:

> No man but a sage or true seer can judge another's Karma. Hence while each receives his deserts, appearances may deceive, and birth into poverty or heavy trial may not be punishment for bad Karma, for Egos continually incarnate into poor surroundings where they experience difficulties and trials which are for the discipline of the Ego and result in strength, fortitude, and sympathy.

Of this law, *The Philosophy of Insanity* is a good example, along with Clifford Beers' *A Mind That Found Itself* and Harold Maine's *If a Man Be Mad.** Such autobiographies are of special value, since they represent *considered* experience. We are reminded of the Ghost in *Hamlet,* whom Shakespeare describes as revisiting—

---

* Reviewed in THEOSOPHY 36: 213 and 256.

> . . . the glimpses of the moon,
> Making night hideous, and we fools of nature
> So horribly to shake our disposition
> With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls. . . .

Those who consciously—and, like the Ghost, "in complete steel," figuratively speaking—revisit the "glimpses of the moon" do their part to replace the hideousness and the horror by knowledge and understanding. It is necessary to remove the fear of insanity, for this of itself can derange and dislocate the mind. More, wisdom must be gained for the sake of others, since no man knows when his aid may be solicited by a fellow-being who faces, with a sinking will, the "loss of all." The motive which prompted the writing of *The Philosophy of Insanity* might fittingly be adopted by any one who holds devotion to the interests of others as a paramount aim:

> If it [the book] inspires any worse than widowed wife with courage to persevere, even when the star of hope shines distant and dim —influences any brother to visit and sympathize with a sister whom the world has forsaken—sheds even the faintest ray of light into the deep gloom which droops around the wounded spirit like a pall —arrests the hand armed with the suicidal knife—or sweeps aside the impious breath which would blow into flame that insane spark which, smouldering, lies in breast and brain of every one endowed with reason and with life, then will the dream of my ambition be realized, and I will neither have suffered nor written in vain.

"What constitutes insanity?" asks the writer of a century ago. "This is a question not easily answered, for the line which separates sanity from insanity is invisible and there are as many kinds and degrees of the disease as there are sufferers. In sanity every individual mind has its own peculiar mode of acting . . . [and] Individuality is also strongly marked in insanity." With Platonic directness, the ideal is first defined:

> If we reverse the question and ask what is perfect sanity, we find that before that utopian state can be obtained the mind must be entirely free from all irrational or false forms of belief—must be a fountain which contains, and from which flows, nothing save pure unmingled elemental truth; and also that union of mind and body named man must be in a state of mental and physical perfection—every thought and action in unison with a state of being which we have never known.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—

WHAT can we say to the man who just isn't interested in the idea of reincarnation—who says he doesn't care much one way or the other about coming back? Surely, if reincarnation is as central and important a doctrine as theosophists say it is, it can hardly be a matter of indifference to the inquirer.

As we know from hearing various bizarre versions of the doctrine of reincarnation—rebirth into animals or bugs, or even trees—the word itself conveys no specific idea. Consequently, we do not always need to take literally a man's statement that he is a "non-believer" in reincarnation. Can we not imagine a person being uninterested in the physical process bringing us into body after body here on earth, who yet is a firm believer in the concept of the immortality of the soul? True, the process of reincarnation we consider the most logical method of providing a physical focus for the immortal soul, but what is more important—physical reincarnation or soul continuity?

Do we consider that one who believes in reincarnation is necessarily a philosophical thinker? Belief in rebirth may easily suit a materialist who rejoices in the opportunity for continuing the pleasures of physical existence. Possibly, people may be inhibited from evil-doing by the knowledge that they will return to earth to reap the effects of their actions, but the *philosophical* meaning of the doctrine of reincarnation is not that of *future* births in different bodies, but of an *always-present* immortality of the soul. Indeed, the dignity and inspiration of the idea of immortality should be sufficient in itself to induce right action, without making Karma into a threatening whip for chastising the wrong-doer.

How did the inherent ideas come to be? What does Mr. Judge mean when he says that they were "impacted" on the early races? If those ideas were taught us in the beginning, then it would seem that all subsequent evolution is just a reviewing of lessons already learned.

In one sense, this question is like that of why, if spirit is perfect, does evolution have to take place at all? The fact that a child is brought up to guide his conduct according to certain high principles, inculcated in him from his infancy, is not to say that he will unfailingly carry those principles into activity in his adult life, when the

right decisions will perhaps be more costly to his personal comfort. So why should we consider it a useless and unnecessary repetition to be pursuing, amid the limitations and obstacles of *manifested* life, the truths which we are at home with only on the spiritual plane? It is said, "heterogeneity will always have the upper hand over homogeneity, on this plane of illusions, and the nearer an essence is to its root-principle, Primordial Homogeneity, the more difficult it is for the latter to assert itself on earth." (*Key to Theosophy,* p. 181.)

Certain ideas are inherent in the soul—the "homogeneity"—but they are not inherent in that fusion of soul and matter—the "heterogeneous"—which we call the personality. This is what Robert Crosbie meant when he said that our work is to transform personalities into *living souls.* Every atom of life is part-instrument and part-prison of the Monad within, and as the Monad expresses its potentialities in gradually higher and more complex forms, it is as if the incarnating spirit and the encasing matter came closer and closer together or became more homogeneous, until finally that degree of "cooperation" or fusion was reached which we call the emergence of mind—the "bridge" that brings with it the possibility of complete interaction between the opposite poles, spirit and matter.

Now, we may ask, if the ideas are inherent, why need they be impacted? Yet two different planes of being are involved—the ideas are inherent in spirit, but must be *impacted* in the material basis or instrument used by spirit, just as we need to impact a certain line of action on our bodily lives, to form what we call a habit. The part the Elder Brothers play in this "impacting" is mentioned many times in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* and in *The Secret Doctrine* (see index under "Elect"). Further light is thrown on the process by considering the three classes of monads mentioned by H. P. B.—the "most developed Monads"; those who reach the Human stage in the early Rounds; and finally, the "laggards" who will not reach the human stage at all during this cycle (I, 174-5).

What accounts for these differences in human nature? H. P. B. writes elsewhere (II, 212) that "there were seven tabernacles ready to be inhabited by Monads under seven different Karmic conditions," thus implying that the primary determinant was the status of the incarnating Monad itself. In those made strong from past experience and discipline, the light of spirit flashed down into the form with an

illumination which never faded—in these, the "Elect," the recognition of the True was never to die out. In the intermediate class, that light was not of sufficient power to "ignite" the form, and so in time it became obscured. This is our condition—the inherent ideas, an integral part of the incarnating Host, were impacted in us at the moment of the incarnation, but need to be drawn out "into" the conscious mind by those who inspire us to greatness. With the "laggards," their previous Karma, as monads, was apparently of too short or weak a nature to enable them to send down anything but a wavering and pale light which will not be fanned into flame until a new incarnation takes place, in another cycle of evolution.

Yet even those who "received but a spark" can, by reason of that spark, eventually ignite their whole natures and become beings alight with the Fire of Mind complete.

It is easy to see that irritation at the faults and pettiness of others is of no value to anyone, and that it has a way of multiplying itself on itself, so that we get cumulatively more and more irritated all the time. How stop this vicious circle?

Try an experiment. Take an opportunity, sometime, to talk to the person who arouses our annoyance—to converse apart from everyone else, and with the feeling, deliberately cultivated, that here is a fellow-soul, struggling, like ourselves, with defects and limitations of personality and outlook, whom we might help and who might help us. If possible, draw him out, and encourage him to do the talking—Mr. Judge has commended this, incidentally, as a great step toward self-control and self-knowledge—and command yourself to be, not merely a sympathetic listener, but a *constructive* one.

The talk may be a short one or a long one, but if the attempt is sincere, there cannot fail to be a moment of rapport, when our view of that other fellow-soul changes from a mere intellectual premise to a realization, profound and satisfying, that while we may not be brothers in the kinship of our separate achievements, still we are brothers in the common fact of our strivings. Once this realization has been achieved, it becomes easy to recall it to mind whenever personalities clash and strain. Longfellow gave evidence of this practice when he wrote, "If we could read the secret history of our enemies, we should find in each man's life sorrow and suffering enough to disarm all hostility."

LITERARY JOTTINGS

ON CRITICISM, AUTHORITIES, AND OTHER MATTERS

By an Unpopular Philosopher

THEOSOPHISTS and editors of Theosophical periodicals are constantly warned, by the prudent and the faint-hearted, to beware of giving offence to "authorities," whether scientific or social. Public Opinion, they urge, is the most dangerous of all foes. Criticism of it is fatal, we are told. Criticism can hardly hope to make the person or subject so discussed amend or become amended. Yet it gives offence to the many, and makes Theosophists hateful. "Judge not, if thou wilt not be judged," is the habitual warning.

It is precisely because Theosophists would themselves be judged and court impartial criticism, that they begin by rendering that service to their fellow-men. Mutual criticism is a most healthy policy, and helps to establish final and definite rules in life—practical, not merely theoretical. We have had enough of theories. The *Bible* is full of wholesome advice, yet few are the Christians who have ever applied any of its ethical injunctions to their daily lives. If one criticism is hurtful so is another; so also is every innovation, or even the presentation of some old thing under a new aspect, as both have necessarily to clash with the views of this or another "authority." I maintain, on the contrary, that criticism is the great benefactor of thought in general; and still more so of those men who never think for themselves but rely in everything upon acknowledged "authorities" and social routine.

For what is an "authority" upon any question, after all? No more, really, than a light streaming upon a certain object through one single, more or less wide, chink, and illuminating it, *from one side only.* Such light, besides being the faithful reflector of the *personal views* of but one man—very often merely that of his special hobby—can never help in the examination of a question or a subject from all its aspects and sides. Thus, the authority appealed to will often prove but of little help, yet the profane, who attempts to present the

---

Note.—This article by H. P. Blavatsky appeared posthumously, in *Lucifer,* September, 1892.—Eds. Theosophy.

given question or object under another aspect and in a different light, is forthwith hooted for his great audacity. Does he not attempt to upset solid "authorities," and fly in the face of respectable and time-honored routine thought?

Friends and foes! Criticism is the sole salvation from intellectual stagnation. It is the beneficent goad which stimulates to life and action—hence to healthy changes—the heavy ruminants called Routine and Prejudice, in private as in social life. Adverse opinions are like conflicting winds which brush from the quiet surface of a lake the green scum that tends to settle upon still waters. If every clear stream of independent thought, which runs through the field of life outside the old grooves traced by Public Opinion, had to be arrested and to come to a standstill, the results would prove very sad. The streams would no longer feed the common pond called Society, and its waters would become still more stagnant than they are. Result: it is the most orthodox "authorities" of the social pond who would be the first to get sucked down still deeper into its ooze and slime.

Things, even as they now stand, present no very bright outlook as regards progress and social reforms. In this last quarter of the century it is women alone who have achieved any visible beneficent progress. Men, in their ferocious egotism and sex-privilege, have fought hard, but have been defeated on almost every line. Thus, the younger generations of women look hopeful enough. They will hardly swell the future ranks of stiff-necked and cruel Mrs. Grundy. Those who today lead her no longer invincible battalions on the war-path, are the older Amazons of respectable society, and her young men, the male "flowers of evil," the nocturnal plants that blossom in the hothouses known as clubs. The Brummels of our modern day have become worse gossips than the old dowagers ever were in the dawn of our century.

To oppose or criticize such foes, or even to find the least fault with them, is to commit the one unpardonable social sin. An Unpopular Philosopher, however, has little to fear, and notes his thoughts, indifferent to the loudest "war-cry" from those quarters. He examines his enemies of both sexes with the calm and placid eye of one who has nothing to lose, and counts the ugly blotches and wrinkles on the "sacred" face of Mrs. Grundy, as he would count the deadly pois-

onous flowers on the branches of a majestic *mancenillier*—through a telescope from afar. He will never approach the tree, or rest under its lethal shade.

"Thou shalt not set thyself against the Lord's anointed," saith David. But since the "authorities," social and scientific, are always the first to break that law, others may occasionally follow the good example. Besides, the "anointed" ones are not always those of the Lord; many of them being more of the "self-anointed" sort.

Thus, whenever taken to task for disrespect to Science and its "authorities," which the Unpopular Philosopher is accused of rejecting, he demurs to the statement. To reject the *infallibility* of a man of Science is not quite the same as to repudiate his learning. A *specialist* is one, precisely because he has some one specialty, and is therefore less reliable in other branches of Science, and even in the general appreciation of his own subject. Official school Science is based upon temporary foundations, so far. It will advance upon straight lines so long only as it is not compelled to deviate from its old grooves, in consequence of fresh and unexpected discoveries in the fathomless mines of knowledge.

Science is like a railway train which carries its baggage van from one terminus to the other, and with which no one except the railway officials may interfere. But passengers who travel by the same train can hardly be prevented from quitting the direct line at fixed stations, to proceed, if they so like, by diverging roads. They should have this option, without being taxed with libelling the chief line. To proceed *beyond* the terminus on horseback, cart or foot, or even to undertake pioneer work, by cutting entirely new paths through the great virgin forests and thickets of public ignorance, is their undoubted prerogative. Other explorers are sure to follow; nor less sure are they to criticize the newly-cut pathway. They will thus do more good than harm. For truth, according to an old Belgian proverb, is always the result of conflicting opinions, like the spark that flies out from the shock of two flints struck together.

Why should men of learning be always so inclined to regard Science as their own personal property? Is knowledge a kind of indivisible family estate, entailed only on the elder sons of Science? Truth belongs to all, or ought so to belong; excepting always those

few special branches of knowledge which should be preserved ever secret, like those two-edged weapons that both kill and save. Some philosopher compared knowledge to a ladder, the top of which was more easily reached by a man unencumbered by heavy luggage, than by him who has to drag along an enormous bale of old conventionalities, faded out and dried. Moreover, such a one must look back every moment, for fear of losing some of his fossils. Is it owing to such extra weight that so few of them ever reach the summit of the ladder, and that they affirm there is *nothing* beyond the highest rung *they* have reached? Or is it for the sake of preserving the old dried-up plants of the Past that they deny the very possibility of any fresh, living blossoms, on new forms of life, in the Future?

Whatever their answer, without such optimistic hope in the ever-becoming, life would be little worth living. What between "authorities," their fear of, and wrath at the slightest criticism—each and all of them demanding to be regarded as infallible in their respective departments—the world threatens to fossilize in its old prejudices and routine. Fogeyism grins its skeleton-like sneer at every innovation or new form of thought. In the great battle of life for the survival of the fittest, each of these forms becomes in turn the master, and then the tyrant, forcing back all new growth as its own was checked. But the true Philosopher, however "unpopular," seeks to grasp the actual life, which, springing fresh from the inner source of Being, the rock of truth, is ever moving onward. He feels equal contempt for all the little puddles that stagnate lazily on the flat and marshy fields of social life.

H. P. B.

THE SUPREME TRIAL

From times immemorial every initiate before entering on his supreme trial of initiation, in antiquity as at the present time, pronounces these sacramental words . . . "And I swear to give up my life for the salvation of my brothers, which constitute the whole mankind, if called upon, and to die in the defence of truth. . . ."

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS

On Everyday Questions

THE Thirteenth Chapter of the *Gita,* "Devotion by Means of the Discrimination of the Kshetra from Kshetrajna," encourages the student to refer both to other portions of the *Gita* and to correlative texts and notes while pondering the central philosophical, psychological and moral issue of Egotism. That "Ahankara" may be expected to remain one of the crucial and immediate problems in the ordering of one's thinking about one's self, is certainly indicated historically by the fact that alternating cycles of religiosity and materialism have really been based on arbitrary or over-simplified "solutions" of the Egotism problem. For example, the escape - from - the - world impulse of all flesh-mortifying cults, whether located in India or represented in the history of the Western churches, has been the conviction that the body, or Kshetra, must be expunged from the spirit, or Kshetrajna, before there can be peace of mind. With such, the "crushing out of desire" becomes identified—and confused—with the slaying or crushing of one's natural physical or emotional structure. On the other hand, the materialists who are determined to fully enjoy the beauties afforded by the senses and feelings engage themselves in attempts to eliminate the Kshetrajna—that voice of spiritual intuition which they know under the term conscience. Both such religionists as those mentioned and the materialists desire to destroy Antaskarana, but for the wrong reasons, prematurely, and in the wrong way. They remain much involved in Ahankara, one might say, because they are not ready to learn from Ahankara.

One characteristic difference between the more conventional forms of Eastern occultism and that occult synthesis presented by H. P. Blavatsky is that while both accept the necessity for escaping the bonds of *maya* or illusion, Theosophy insists that this must be done through *action,* and that the greatest reward of escaping Maya is literally a greater freedom *in* action.

At this point we may speculate upon the aptness of the word *Theosophy,* itself, for the term suggests a divine—*i.e.,* permanent—center of every conscious being, and in a sense Theosophy may be regarded as the one and only doctrine of immortality. If there is

truly something "divine"—indestructible—within man, individuality is not to be escaped, but can only be *extended.* If, on the other hand, one assumes that everything in the manifested world is illusion *per se,* reality is only to be attained when one eliminates his own center of individual perception entirely. Submergence in the "all," as a final goal, is often recommended by those who either cannot or do not wish to believe in the immortality of the soul. Similarly, those who exclusively exalt a life of the senses cannot or do not wish to believe in the immortality of the soul. If the soul be real, it cannot be ignored during life, the voice of spirit stilled, without destruction of even what we call "happiness." Of course, if we claim the "soul" to have no existence beyond death, attempts to ignore the inner voice would be sensibly conceived.

Neither praising egotism, nor condemning individuality and originality in persons, the theosophist is encouraged by all Theosophical devotional books to approach the matter in quite a different light. We might say that the Theosophical approach, being essentially integrated with the concept of soul evolution, leads one to consider any quality of man's nature from the standpoint of function. What is the function of egotism? Is it only to be considered as a blight destroying the spiritual harmony which might otherwise prevail? Is it an instinct prompting us to find the most in that limited happiness which the emotions promise us?

There are many ways in which we could actually conceive of egotism as having a function. As Chapter Thirteen indicates, Ahankara is one of the "great elements" which make up the bodily vehicle. We might also say that it is *the* great element, for it expresses, among other things, all those "lower" forms of intelligence which collaborate to produce the feeling that newer and greater experiences may come for the psycho-physical man. The energy of egotism is supplied by forms of life within the body which are aspiring, in their own way, towards wider horizons of experience. The evils of egotism do not arise because of the presence of these energies, but through our failure to find ways for using and controlling them, ways sufficiently purposeful to serve the needs of both body and soul.

Modern psychology assists us at this stage of the discussion by indicating that the full expression of both the physical and emotional man may be suppressed, twisted or disturbed by an "ego-complex."

Exaggerated egotism, we are told, gives rise to such complex delusions as those of paranoia, and the paranoiac not only distorts the meaning of his relationship to his fellows, fearing persecution and hate—and feeling these emotions himself toward others—but also the body itself may be led to develop tangible illnesses via the psychosomatic effects generated. And yet, unless there is the possibility of egotism within man, he does not exist as a man. To put it in another way, unless all the elements which naturally conjoin soul and body are present, and unless man is able to make those moral choices which revolve around the problem of self-centeredness, he no longer exists as a *human* being. Egotism, because it is "functional" in the special sense described, is certainly a rewarding subject for study. At one extreme, egotism demonstrates man's tremendous powers of self-determination, by indicating how narrow one mind can make the confines of our universe, while the same power of self-identification raised above its lower or instinctual forms of expression may furnish the soil out of which universal compassion may grow.

In Chapter the Thirteenth, one of the most helpful sentences in respect to egotism occurs on the second page, where we find egotism equated with a "self-identifying attachment for children, wife, and household." The term *self-identifying,* as rendered from the Sanscrit by William Q. Judge, is particularly interesting if we consider something other than its extreme. *Unless* we are able to "identify" ourselves with other beings, with their aspirations and their failings, their hopes and fears, we shall never have direct understanding of the world of persons in which we live. The power of self-identification is invaluable, providing it is not made absolute in terms of attachment. If one is completely bound up in a feeling, an idea, or a person, he loses that very perspective which enables him to learn from the self-identifying power as *used* consciously by the spiritual self.

The second portion of the same sentence is also worth special consideration. That "self-identifying attachment" for one's home or family is dangerous precisely because it *destroys* self-awareness, our immortal perceptiveness. We cannot have the "constant unwavering steadiness of heart," which this chapter further recommends, unless we make our judgments on the basis of something more than the shifting demands of intra-personal life. Those who live chiefly in

their children, or only in their husbands or wives, do not live as completely intelligent beings, since they allow themselves to be controlled, so to speak, by the actions and thoughts of another. Yet, conversely, the parent, husband, or wife who is completely unable to identify himself or herself, through understanding, with the problems of intimate associates also lives in an isolated world. The soul, then, needs one kind of "isolation" permanently, and another kind of isolation, never.

We might recommend passages occurring in Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms,* the *Dhammapada,* and *The Voice of the Silence* as extensions of the development that is here suggested as characteristically Theosophical. In the *Dhammapada's* "Canto of Mind," Buddha instructs in this way: "He who possesses a mind untouched by evil, a mind serene, that has risen above merit and demerit, will have nought to fear as he is vigilant." Here the implication is clearly that we are able to rise above merit and demerit to *control* of the mind, and may then live in the great happiness of truth in the freedom truth brings. This state is not stipulated as being out of this life, away from the sphere of egotism, but the implication is rather that it may be within our familiar rounds of activities and relationships. In Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms,* we discover that ignorance is listed as the source of all evil:

"Ignorance is the notion that the non-eternal, the impure, the evil, and that which is not soul are, severally, eternal, pure, good and soul.

"Egoism is the identifying of the power that sees with the power of seeing."

> *i.e.* It is the confounding of the soul, which really sees, with the tool it uses to enable it to see, viz., the mind, or—to a still greater degree of error—with those organs of sense which are in turn the tools of the mind . . . ."

Here again is a discipline designed for controlling the energies of Ahankara, something which would be entirely unnecessary if Patanjali held that all one had to do was mortify the flesh and pass away from bodily existence.

In *The Voice of the Silence,* finally, we are told not to destroy the lower self, but to "destroy the path between the two" selves—the higher and the lower—which is "antaskarana." How does one destroy the path between? There are two ways. One is by obliterating one of

the two areas joined, which makes the path superfluous, and thus no longer a path. Or one can obliterate the path by merging the area of lower and higher self in a synthesis dictated by awakened spiritual perceptions. These spiritual perceptions, however, we are ceaselessly reminded by H. P. Blavatsky, are never awakened but only thwarted by escapism and isolationism. The true Isolation, as described in the last of the Yoga Aphorisms, is "the reabsorption of the qualities which have consummated the aim of the soul, or the abiding of the soul united with the understanding of its own nature." Thus Isolation becomes, from the point of view of soul, an aspect of universal brotherhood or compassion.

"The Coil of Karma"

"If another by altruistic service benefits one, is not such action vicarious and inconsistent with Karma?"

W.Q.J.—A common error, which arises from incompletely viewing the doctrine of Karma, is the idea that we interfere with Karma when we benefit another. The question is equally applicable to the doing of any injury to another. It cuts both ways; so we might as well ask if it is not inconsistent with the law and vicarious for one to do any evil act which results harmfully to a fellow creature. In neither case is there vicarious atonement or interference. If we can do good to our fellows, that is their good Karma and ours also; if we have the opportunity to thus confer benefits and refuse to do so, then that is our bad Karma in that we neglected a chance to help another. The Masters once wrote that we should not be thinking on our good or bad Karma, but should do our duty on every hand and at every opportunity, unmindful of what may result to us. It is only a curious kind of conceit, which seems to be the product of nineteenth century civilization, that causes us to falsely imagine that we, weak and ignorant human beings, can interfere with Karma or be vicarious atoners for others. 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 Vahan*, August, 1891

DO WE WORK FOR "HUMANITY"?

[The following communication sets out graphically a common dilemma: how to be devoted to humanity—all of it—when individual segments thereof are far removed in attitude and ideas. Is it hypocritical to believe or declare that one is trying to act for the sake of the whole of mankind, so long as various specific portions of the humanity are beyond his reach and do not seem open to his help? Other readers are invited to add to the suggestions given by the Editors in the Reply.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

FOR one who grows up in a theosophical atmosphere, and who has gained the inner conviction that theosophical principles are true, there is always the task of re-evaluating the ideas and impressions we gained in childhood and youth, and which, at that time, appeared to be the natural models of the theosophic-way-of-life. I have in mind some of those sayings which become part of the vocabulary of all of us who have received a theosophical education. A friend of mine but recently remarked with great fervor that she wished to "work for humanity," and this, or something like it, is often said by all of us. There are, perhaps, a dozen different ways in which we say that the end of all theosophical work is to "help and teach others." We take for granted that the ideas of karma and reincarnation will "save the coming races," and this is self-evident to the one who knows something of Karma and reincarnation. Such remarks express the spirit which compels a man to share with others what he feels will bring peace, understanding and happiness, and I do not deny that they are true. I simply question, or rather, am puzzled by, what is really understood by "working for others," by "humanity." What do we mean by "humanity"? Is *it* what we are trying to reach? In assuming, even unwittingly, that our individual and united efforts are good for the whole (for that is what they logically appear to be), is there not a danger of feeling settled and secure in the thought that our work, as we do it, embodies the highest purpose?

The more I mature (or think I do!), the more I feel a cleavage between myself and humanity. I was struck by a sentence in Judge's *Letters,* taken out of context, where he says: "What do you care what

happens to a million souls?" I've been wondering how much I do care. Actually, humanity in the mass becomes increasingly less interesting, or worthwhile to "work for." And every day that passes makes it more so. Perhaps I can best illustrate what I mean by recounting a recent experience, which is typical of many. Lately, I have been working in a small shop, waiting on the trade, where the same customers come in once or twice a week. This naturally enables us who work there to come to know these people in that semi-casual way which is reserved for relationships which are all on the surface. But even with this limitation, any number of these people—possibly because they have nothing else to do—will tell you of the things which move them, which are most important in their lives.

In this way, I was told by a middle-aged lady of the precautions she was taking against a possible atomic attack. While waiting for her to make up her mind as to the purchase she wished to make, I listened to the detailed story of how she was reconverting her garage into a bomb-proof shelter; of the thousand dollars she spent for the proper cement, insulation, air vents, and whatnots, in order to make this sepulchre for the preservation of her "life." While she was talking, I glanced at her husband, whose breath was heavy with cheap wine. I had often wondered why he drank so much, but I realized suddenly that this was probably the only avenue of escape he knew of. I focussed again on my customer, and became aware of my own thought: Oh, you miserable woman—is it for you and the hundreds like you that the "soul-satisfying philosophy of the Aryans" is intended? Is it for you, who stand there, consumed in fear of the demise of a body which already shows signs of decay; for you, who move in self-content, not knowing how to love, not knowing how to give something of yourself to another? Yes, indeed, you probably will be "saved," while more truly *human,* that is, thoughtful, people will perish. Yes, I made judgments, not of her as a person, but of that common race-mind attitude she represents. And it was suddenly borne in upon me that "working for humanity" has a hollow ring.

My puzzle is not *this* lady, who will obviously live or die happily in her bomb-shelter, but what she stands for. What do we theosophists conceive when we use the time-worn phrase, "working for humanity"? This lady *is* part of humanity, part of myself! Yet when she gave me an opportunity to comment directly upon her observa-

tions, I realized that a theosophical perspective was out of the range of her comprehension, and that, at best, it would take a long, long time—with intimate, direct contact—to help bring about in her a freedom from fear.

Is it a mistake to feel, as perhaps we tend to, that the abstract concept of "humanity" is something toward which we can effectively work? In this case, and in many like it, a change can be brought about only by personal, direct effort, if it can be brought about at all. I'm not suggesting that the individual and united efforts of theosophists will not, and do not, leaven the psychological outlook of the race as a whole. But is it not better, as Mr. Judge suggested, to set up an impulse of work, for the sake of *work,* because *we* feel it necessary, and not out of regard for any object, even the abstract object of the welfare of Humanity? To state that we are "working for others," or that we wish to "serve others," might carry with it an element of self-delusion, unless those others are touched and affected by our personal, direct efforts. It seems to me that our own experience shows that whatever enlightenment we receive comes from some kind of contact, physical, psychical, or mental. These avenues to perception are not completely intangible; they partake of the elements in which we presently find ourselves incarnated. They are the means which evolution presents for further growth. If, in the process of our own growth in understanding Theosophy and the human equation, or through the enlargement of our own sensitivity, we are able to aid another's perception, well and good. But to set for ourselves the goal of serving humanity in the abstract, can only lead to eventual discontent on our part, and a hopeless confusion for those who try to help. At least, so it seems to me.

REPLY

"Working for humanity" may well seem a worn-out phrase, even, perhaps, a shibboleth, so vague and sentimental are the general notions of both *work* and *humanity.* Yet in this simple phrase is also the power of a fundamental purpose, and the concepts attached to it, though they are incompletely defined in many cases, are still the ex-

pression of an inherent idea—the brotherhood of man. To define and verify such an idea is a constant necessity. This, in fact, is the business of philosophy. But the definition, the recognition, or the arousing of underlying ideas is neither a short nor an easy task. If intellectual analysis or someone else's theorizing could turn the trick, the logic of a Socrates or a Confucius would suffice for all men, for all time to come. The fact is, that no matter how convinced we may be of the reasonableness of Universal Brotherhood (or the "divine grace" of the doctrine), we cannot, in a burst of logic, attain to a *realization in action* of the ideal held.

The question of what we mean by "working for others" is a useful one, but no one answer can be expected to last for the remainder of our life—to say nothing of future incarnations. Every inquiry into our basic purposes in existence, into our so-called convictions and motives, and the methods we employ in embodying our principles in daily life, must be only one of a series. It might even be said that unless we find ourselves recurring to such examinations of intent, direction, and goal, we cannot hope to expand our idea of self, nor to teach ourselves how to be the better able to serve the interests of the whole. Just because we wonder anew at the real significance of a familiar phrase, it does not follow that the expression has no meaning: simply, it is time *we* evolved a deeper meaning and assigned ourselves a more comprehensive field of action.

The above communication asks how the philosophy of Theosophy can be brought to those who are bound up in some form of personal fear. Is not the student's first problem, in this instance, how to convince *himself* that "everything is possible," that there must be something to do, some way to help? It is axiomatic that unless such a problem can be solved on the basis of the theosophic philosophy, that philosophy will never enable students to even begin the formation of a "nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color." Possibly, we underestimate the power of a sincere *desire* to help, which is, in one sense, the "power of a vow." Do we always know just when and how and why we are of service to another? Must *we* know of our help, in order to help? Would it not be taking Krishna's explicit advice if we learned to fulfill our own duties and responsibilities without attaching ourselves to specific results we wish to have come about, or

are afraid will not arrive? How often, by the way, is our impression of another person's "closed mind" an accurate perception, and how often is it the reflection of *our* feeling of helplessness and hopelessness, or the result of some special narrowness in our own mind?

Long, intimate, and direct contact with another human being may allow education to a remarkable degree, or it may confirm each participant in his private prejudices: all depends upon whether the contact is a harmonizing of opposites—the cooperative "ignition" of contrasted personalities—or merely a passive combination of inactive elements. But, by the same token, there would seem to be no reason why even the briefest contact should not be alive and of moment. Is it not conceivable that as we fathom the subtler aspects of "work for humanity," we shall discover in the simplest and smallest human events—as well as in the great programs for the betterment of human life—profound occult opportunities to "do as the gods when incarnated do"? In the words of a Master quoted by H.P.B.: "Feel yourselves the vehicle of the whole humanity, mankind as part of yourselves, and act accordingly." The "all-moving Akasa by reason of its subtlety passeth everywhere unaffected"—is this not a hint as to how a true motive and desire to benefit all men may reach all, despite our inability to follow its path of influence or discern its exact means of travel?

The key to complete work for humanity will always be a man's ability to give and receive instruction in every circumstance and with each other human being he contacts. The advice given by William Q. Judge centers attention on self-preparation, removing at once the tendency to despair over, or to turn aside from, those who seem beyond our present capacity to aid:

> Make yourself in every way as good an instrument for any sort of work as you can. Every little thing I ever learned I have now found out to be of use to me in this work of ours. Ease of manner and of speech are of the best to have. Ease of mind and confidence are better than all in this work of dealing with other men—that is, with the human heart. The more wise one is the better he can help his fellows, and the more cosmopolitan he is the better, too. . . . When the hour strikes it will then find you ready; no man knows when the hour will strike. But he has to be ready.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Brothers and Enemies

Above and beyond all national boundaries, geographical and cultural, lies the common Humanity of man, mostly forgotten or ignored in our age of analysis and specialization. Being prone to classify the differences between men, we are slow to perceive that just as all lands are one beneath the seas, so all mankind, regardless of individual peculiarities of mental and moral "terrain," are joined—beneath the waves of human passions—in one whole, the substratum of Oneness. All wars, on this view, are internecine conflicts—fights between brothers—so that, in truth, whoever wins is also part-loser, because he is one with his "enemy." This principle is ancient, yet since it has been neglected so long, its accompanying demonstrations are becoming grimmer and grimmer. War has now arrived at the point where not only the soldiers and civilians of the enemy nations are sacrificed, but even the civilians on "our side" are laid on the altar of military necessity.

"The Age of the Big Trap"

One grim illustration was delineated by Norman Cousins in an editorial in the Feb. 10 issue of the *Saturday Review of Literature.* Writing from Taegu, the key city in South Korea, Mr. Cousins focussed attention upon Korea—not upon the bitterly-fought-over areas where the two warring forces meet, but upon the much more tragic and significant "battlefield" where some two million refugee Koreans are finding new dimensions in the word "liberation." In Taegu, some 750,000 Koreans had aggregated, and more were constantly streaming down from the North, for Taegu is the "funnel" to the southern tip of Korea—"the farthest you can go before the battlefield runs into the sea." They came to Taegu, Cousins explains because "they expect that the Americans will help them find food and refuge somewhere." According to another report, about a quarter of the two million refugees found room in camps in the south; the rest were on their own, in what Mr. Cousins calls "the Big Trap."

"WITH BLAZING INTENSITY"

Taegu, Mr. Cousins believes, "can tell you more about our age and the world we live in than a convention of historians. This is where the principal problems of the twentieth century come into sharp and dramatic focus. And this is where the predicament of the individual in our time is defined with blazing intensity." In the classroom of Taegu, he says, are 750,000 teachers, who "know all there is to know about war, political terror, hunger, homelessness, and heartbreak." Mr. Cousins relates—

> All day I watched them—countless thousands of them—as they pressed into Taegu. . . . They kept coming and coming, clogging the heart of the city, and they put down their bundles and waited. Near the large area of the railroad station they jammed the main thoroughfares, making it difficult for the rolling machines of war—the lorries and supply trucks and darting jeeps—to get through.

"A HEART-BREAKING DECISION"

During the night, Cousins reports, the authorities made a "heart-breaking decision," and the next morning he returned to find an American M.P. directing the fast-moving traffic on a street virtually empty of people. When he inquired of an M.P. how this had come about, he was told that the Koreans had been sent back north:

> I was certain I had misunderstood him and asked him to repeat.
>
> "Just like I said, mister. North, north, north. Orders came through last night."
>
> I could hardly believe it. "We didn't send them back into that hell?" I asked. "You're not serious?"
>
> "Look, mister," he said with some irritation, "I only told you what I know. Traffic was all fouled up. Orders came to clear them out. . . . Most of them are trying to get back into the city again but they tell me the road up there is pretty well sealed off."
>
> The M.P. remained silent a moment. He had a faraway look as though he had seen something he was trying hard to forget.

"WATCHING HARD"

> "You oughta be able to figure it out for yourself," he said. "It was plenty rough. It turned my stomach. First the Korean police tried to get them up off their bags and on their feet so's to start moving. But soon as the people realized what was up they sat down

hard and closed their ears. Then the police waded into them like they was so much cattle, working them over with the butt ends of their guns and clubs, screaming and yelling at them, and shoving them forward. Once they started moving the toughest part was over . . . the police kept riding herd until the street was cleared and they were out of the city." He looked at me, then turned away.

"Okay, mister, you needn't look at me like I did it. No one could do nothing about it. You couldn't do nothing if you tried. That's just it in this mucked-up war—people getting the hell kicked out of them no matter what they do or where they turn and no one can do nothing. I kept wanting to yell out at the Korean police as these people were being pushed back towards the Commies. I wanted to say, 'Stop shoving. . . . These are the people we're supposed to be liberating, remember? Put down those rifle butts and leave these people alone, leave 'em rest.'

"Sure, it was easy to want to say it . . . but who would listen? What good would it do? So I watched hard, like you're watching me now."

"The Individual in Retreat"

No doubt the authorities in Taegu could do no better than they did, without jeopardizing their military position, and the significance of this tragedy lies deeper even than the "heart-breaking decision" which denied food and rest and shelter to those starving hundreds of thousands of human beings. For those who "watched hard" just reading about the Taegu incident, Mr. Cousins suggests a broader meaning to the quandary:

> Taegu is symbolic of our time as is perhaps no other city in the world, not excluding Hiroshima. It symbolizes most of all the individual in retreat and without refuge. It symbolizes the Age of the Great Trap—a trap which not only awaits but pursues the individual. One by one the escape hatches are being closed down. Man's sanctuaries are becoming increasingly rare, increasingly remote. Instead there are clubs and rifle ends to beat him back. He is being ground down into impersonal animation.

It seems undeniable that as man's powers increase, his choices become more cataclysmic, and soon, perhaps, no longer will be found any outward "sanctuary" in which he can hide from the results of ill-chosen policies. The ultimate sanctuary is that of knowledge and altruism—we are faced with a "scientific" destruction, or a truly scientific brotherhood based on the immutable law or karma.

"THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PEOPLES"

It is dangerous to accept the idea that if people obstruct the path of a machine, the people—and not the machine—must be removed. To defend this on the ground that the machine is moving in order to "liberate" the people, is to subscribe to a form of the end-justifies-the-means fallacy, for, regardless of what noble end may have been in view, we have automatically glorified the machine and devalued the man. What would we think of a fireman who, trying to put out the blaze in a burning building, forced the fleeing inmates back through the doorway into the fire, because they were obstructing the progress of the fire engines? The lengths to which such an inverted view of human values can go are, or should be, familiar to all—in this age of concentration-camp psychology and "democratic" witch-hunting. Some readers will recall, in this connection, Dwight Macdonald's "The Responsibility of Peoples," and Hannah Arendt's "The Concentration Camps" (reviewed in THEOSOPHY 33: 269 and 37: 9, respectively).

"MOBILIZATION FOR MERCY"

Cousins' plea for a demonstration that we are as eager to save lives as we are to take them, is therefore in order. He suggests a mass emigration of the homeless Koreans: "It would require an armada of ships that would dwarf Dunkirk, and many nations would have to come forward to offer a haven until such time at least as the world becomes sane again. It would be the largest operation in the name of mercy and simple justice in our age." How many "non-Koreans" would approve such an Operation Refuge, a "mobilization for mercy," as Cousins calls it? And how far would generous impulses carry over into decisive action? A report to the New York *Times Magazine* (Feb. 11) stated that of the one million blankets promised by the United Nations for Korean relief, only 78,000 had been received; of a thousand tents promised, fifty arrived, although the 7000 C.A.R.E. packages *individually subscribed for* were all received. Relief agencies on the spot had to be "largely advisory" in function: "Although their members feel the plight of the refugees acutely, they are handicapped by limited functions and lack of means. As one observer said: 'The refugees can't eat advisers'."

"The Man Who Wants to Help"

The tragedy of the Korean refugee problem is that the situation should have to be helplessly "tolerated." But, Cousins declares—

> the greatest tragedy of all, perhaps, is the fatal separation between man caught in the great trap and man who wants to help but cannot. Consider the case of the American M.P. completely hemmed in by legalisms and uniforms and regulations and conditions beyond his control. "I couldn't do nothing about it," he said, and he was right. His helplessness was formalized, certified, underwritten by society itself. The problem is not proximity; indeed you are close enough to touch, but no matter how close you get there is no contact. It is a nightmare in which the drowning man reaches out to grasp an outstretched hand only to find nothingness, in which, too, the man in the boat reaches out to help only to find himself shrouded in futility.

"The man who wants to help"—what must he do if he is to escape from this expanding web of helplessness and futility? What lines of karma bring a man into such a position that "watching hard" seems all that is left for him to do? Surely the only means of changing one's situation is by *individual action* in whatever sphere one finds himself in: if we would war effectively against totalitarianisms and collectivisms, it must be in our own immediate surroundings, by individual assumption of responsibility, and through the determined performance of direct deeds of justice and mercy, "*personal* exertion for others; . . . *personal* sympathy, forethought and assistance in their troubles or needs," in the words of *The Key to Theosophy.*

"Reaching the Universal Mind"

It is something to respond to a general appeal on behalf of a group of people caught in a shocking disaster, whether of war, famine, epidemic, storm, earthquake, fire, or flood. In great emergencies, mass misery is reported around the world, and special efforts can be summoned to relieve extreme want and deprivation: the "hundred neediest" cases are generally taken care of. But no social realist considers this an adequate solution, nor does "emergency handling" uncover the origin of human disasters. The rudimentary cause once discovered, each individual would be able, day by day, to so act as to diminish—where now he unwittingly increases—the sum of tragedy and suffering, and man would cease "*generating national Karma,*" with its terrible results in "Big Traps."

To those sincerely desirous of reversing the current of national Karma, at no matter what cost to their personal feelings, H. P. Blavatsky has some trenchant words on the "*real* occultism" toward which the theosophical philosophy can lead its students. In her article, "Occultism versus the Occult Arts" (THEOSOPHY 31: 156) she asks, "while the heart is full of thoughts for a little group of *selves,* near and dear to us, how shall the rest of mankind fare in our souls? What percentage of love and care will there remain to bestow on the 'great orphan'?" Yet, H. P. B. declares, "he who would profit by the wisdom of the universal mind, has to reach it through *the whole of Humanity* without distinction of race, complexion, religion or social status."

"UNROMANTIC FOUNDING FATHER"

The English publication, *The Manchester Guardian Weekly,* is one of a rare species—a periodical edited and written for adults in the twentieth century—and its American correspondent, Alistair Cooke, is, appropriately enough, part of a vanishing race—the contemplative reporter. Week by week, Mr. Cooke serves up national events, United States Congress doings, political campaigns, and court rulings in a highly individual, but factually impartial, style. He has been known to invoke a principle in the midst of telling what "happened," and he customarily suggests a broader perspective on people and events than emerges out of ordinary journalism. He is, therefore, definitely unfashionable, for he does not flourish that clever cynicism which reduces people to caricatures or stereotypes, nor does he observe events with the "smart" newsman's tired impatience at naïve believers in "Things to Come." It must further be admitted that Mr. Cooke, despite his profession, has a happy sense of humor.

Among this correspondent's special pieces, recently, was a series on the California Gold Rush, which would probably have been as revealing to the average American as to a Britisher, and this is true also of an article in the March 22nd *Guardian,* commemorating the birth of James Madison on March 17, 1751. First Mr. Cooke calls Madison the "most unromantic of the Founding Fathers," and then he spins a true romance out of the quiet life of "the little withered applejohn," showing how Madison helped establish a "new order of ages" by "the daily pressure of his political imagination, the rein of his common sense, his vast and always available knowledge of the

hazards of all preceding republics, and the unflagging vigilance which kept him pleading for practical federal compacts while the colourful men around him lunged into heroic campaigns for regionalism, civil war, an American church, the sovereignty of Virginia."

"Almost Freakishly Untypical"

Madison, Mr. Cooke shows, was something of an anomaly:

> He was the son of a tobacco proprietor and almost freakishly untypical of the hunting, cock-fighting, junketing life around him. At an early age he crept off like a mole to Princeton, where he imbibed philosophy and classics from his teachers, Anglophobia from a Scot—President Witherspoon,—and the history of government from his own night-time reading. He took three hours' sleep a night and effectively broke his health, so that thereafter he was a victim of sympathy. His flickering health was a constant theme of his friends and the colleagues who bothered to care. We can only say, therefore, that he died prematurely at the age of eighty-five.
>
> The only boyish thing about him from about the age of eighteen on seems to have been that he deliberately planned appalling paperwork that would qualify him for becoming the composer of the laws of a modern nation. He started with the Egyptians, did not overlook the political insights that might accrue from writing his own commentary on the Gospels, moved on through Greece and Rome, and the Italian Mediterranean republics to an exhaustive study of the British Constitution. All this absorbed him in the five years when the colonies were rousing themselves to rebellion.

"The Ravishing Prospect"

> At the back of his mind was the grand and ravishing prospect of the Constitution. But he knew that the road to the mountain top must be dug and graded inch by inch. We tend to gaze at the Constitution to-day as at Grand Canyon: the cooled majesty of an original upheaval of earthquakes and bubbling lava. But the structure of it seemed antiquarian and impractical to most of the men who ratified it. Patrick Henry was speechifying for state-supported clergymen while Madison was doggedly maintaining that an established church was a bad idea. When the Revolutionary War was over, it was not the new nation but the separate States that inflamed men's loyalties.

The crowning achievement in Madison's career of indirect "direct action" began as a disagreement between Virginia and Maryland over navigational rights on the Potomac river. Madison "seized the chance to weaken the sovereignty of the feuding pair by securing, in

a little meeting at Mount Vernon," an agreement permitting free navigation and trade on the river, and a common tariff. Pennsylvania and Delaware having asked to join the discussion, Madison "saw the occasion of the constitutional convention spring to life":

> Why stop at the adjoining states? Why not invite all thirteen to a discussion about trade rights throughout the whole nation? From this modest Mount Vernon Compact grew the conference on trade, "the rivers and harbours congress," which history knows as the convention that composed and adopted the Constitution.

A Few Hidden Factors

Wm. Q. Judge has spoken in his *Echoes from the Orient* of great national figures such as Bismarck, Washington, Lincoln and Grant, whose elevation to positions of responsibility is not completely explicable on the face of the historical facts, but who nevertheless showed singular powers upon assuming their special roles in human events. He remarks that their discovery, their power, and "their astonishing grasp upon the right men for their purposes" were not due so much to "trained intellect or long preparation in the schools of their day," as to certain "unseen Adepts, who crave no honors, seek no publicity and claim no acknowledgment" in this work for the future races and for man's best and highest good.

This theory of history naturally means more to those who, through the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and Mr. Judge, have learned something of the purposes of the Theosophical Adepts, and of the course of the Theosophical Movement in the various eras of human progress. But the need for *some* theory to explain the more than curious coincidences in the early days of the American nation must be clear to many others who have never heard of the "Adepts in America in 1776." The life of a man like James Madison would be something of a miracle, without the doctrine of reincarnation to account for his gifts and character, and those who wonder at the fortunate providence which brought such far-reaching success to his minority projects, the fact of "unseen Adepts" may be helpful to consider.

"The Perfect Sister"

Still another intriguing side-light on history—this time in the field of literature—is afforded by a brief portrait of "Dorothy Wordsworth: The Perfect Sister" in the *Atlantic* last December. The writer,

George Mallaby, is introduced as the author of a volume on Wordsworth, and the *Atlantic* piece displays the friendly spirit of one who has loved his subject enough to understand its finer themes. The five years from 1797 to 1802 Mr. Mallaby terms "a lustrum of sympathy and love and achievement which were proof against worldly accidents and tribulations"—a time when Wordsworth, his sister Dorothy, and Coleridge were "an undivided and indivisible unity."

> The bond between these three persons [he writes] was spiritual —"three persons and one soul," Coleridge rightly called them. The bond was not, so far as all were concerned, intellectual: Miss Wordsworth was never that. She was sensitive, percipient, but in no sense a "bluestocking." Coleridge and Wordsworth were intellectual, Coleridge formidably so. Together they discussed and philosophized: when Dorothy was with them, they saw and felt. What she gave to her brother she gave to Coleridge also:—
>
> She gave me eyes, she gave me ears;
> And humble cares, and delicate fears;
> A heart, the fountain of sweet tears;
> And love, and thought, and joy.

"A True Communion"

It was Dorothy Wordsworth more than her brother, in Mr. Mallaby's opinion, "who mistrusted 'the meddling intellect'." Dorothy having undergone no basic intellectual training, he points out, "her diaries and her letters are fresh, spontaneous, and natural, not at all elaborate, self-conscious, or stylized, not even carefully and deliberately composed." No more than intellectual affinity did "physical attraction, as it is usually understood, play any part in the strong communion of these three":

> A true spiritual union is so rare that men have come to dispute its possible reality, and there have consequently been many attempts to explain away this exceptional trinity in terms of sex. . . . Such stuff is shallow and vulgar.
>
> So far as I can judge, Dorothy was not "in love," in the ordinary sense of the term, with anyone. She loved Wordsworth and Coleridge, it is true, loved them equally perhaps at one time, and certainly in the same way. She knew, by instinct and by a divine gift of sympathy, what they were striving for and she understood that, without her delicate perception, her sensitive and tender approach, they were too much given to "disputing," to argument and theory. She saw for herself the moods in which they were happiest and most creative and she knew that it was her presence which induced these

> moods. They told her so. . . . There was nothing physical about it. She was surely too busy, too preoccupied, too enchanted, to give much thought to that side of her life. She was creating poets and beyond that she had no desire.

"AN APPROPRIATE INSTRUMENT"

Coleridge, Mr. Mallaby believes, liked Dorothy "for her sensitive perceptions, her ready sympathy, her natural eager demeanor. . . . She was a companion, bright, amusing, sympathetic, high-spirited, sensitive; she was a link with Wordsworth, of whom in the ardor of his admiration he stood a little in awe. She interpreted the one to the other, not consciously or deliberately, but by understanding both she realized the harmony of their thought and feeling. That was her true position, and if she could have married Coleridge, if there had been that passionate bond between them, her relationship with her brother would have been altered and there would have been no 'three persons and one soul'."

The later history of all three, after the five years of close communion, is of sadness and decline, but certainly this portrait of the Wordsworths and Coleridge is by way of being a commentary on the karmic Aphorisms which read:

> In the life of worlds, races, nations, and individuals, Karma cannot act unless there is an appropriate instrument provided for its action.
>
> And until such appropriate instrument is found, that Karma related to it remains unexpended.

It is Mr. Mallaby's thought that Wordsworth and Coleridge found in their "perfect sister" that "spiritual element which transmuted into poetry the powerful feelings that worked within them," and in one sense, therefore, Dorothy Wordsworth's function was the same as James Madison's. Both drew ungathered energies to a focus, and thus brought *powers* into play, where before were only forces awaiting guidance and concentration. The vital energies that the two poets would otherwise have dissipated in arguments *á deux* were made to serve the greater whole of mankind by the workings of Dorothy Wordsworth's "delicate spirit," just as the fiery loyalties the men of the Revolution would have continued to squander on "States' rights" became, under the ministrations of a frail student of government, the necessary bond of federal union.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles (7), Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, C. HOLLAND.....Keizersgracht 411
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA.....15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY (4), CALIFORNIA.....Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY, INDIA.....51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LONDON (W. 1), ENGLAND.....17 Great Cumberland Place
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA.....424 Richmond Street
LOS ANGELES (7), CALIFORNIA.....245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY (19), INDIA.....Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK CITY (22).....22 East Sixtieth Street
PARIS (5), FRANCE.....14 Rue de l'Abbé de l'Epée
PHILADELPHIA (3), PENNSYLVANIA.....1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA.....32 North Central Avenue
SACRAMENTO (14), CALIFORNIA.....1237½ H Street
SAN DIEGO (1), CALIFORNIA.....307 Orpheum Theatre Bldg., 524 B Street
SAN FRANCISCO (3), CALIFORNIA.....860 Pacific Bldg., 4th and Market Streets
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA.....1543 Morgan Avenue
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.....Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON (8), D. C. .....2653 Connecticut Ave., N. W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

ISIS UNVEILED, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
THE SECRET DOCTRINE, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
INDEX TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE, for students	3.00
THE SECRET DOCTRINE *and* INDEX	11.00
THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
THEOSOPHICAL GLOSSARY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE	2.50
THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPFD ME, new and enlarged edition	3.00
THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
PATANJALI'S YOGA APHORISMS	1.50

Other Books:

THE FRIENDLY PHILOSOPHER, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON THE "OCEAN," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
THE ETERNAL VERITIES, for children, new edition	2.00
TEACHER'S MANUAL AND GUIDE TO THE "ETERNAL VERITIES"	2.50
"BECAUSE—" FOR THE CHILDREN WHO ASK WHY	2.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.)	.75
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, written down by "M.C."	1.50
OCCULT TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES, a volume of Indian tales	3.00
THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, 1875-1950	5.00

Pamphlets:

THEOSOPHY SIMPLY STATED (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
CONVERSATIONS ON THEOSOPHY, including the "Three Fundamental Propositions" of the Secret Doctrine	.10
REINCARNATION AND KARMA, containing the "Aphorisms on Karma" by Wm. Q. Judge	.10
THOUGHTS FOR THINKERS, a helpful essay	.10
WHAT IS DEATH?	.10
THE VOCATION OF LIFE	.10
THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS, a statement of its history, purpose and methods	.25
FIVE MESSAGES TO AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
EPITOME OF THEOSOPHY, by William Q. Judge	.25
ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT, by William Q. Judge	.25
MORAL EDUCATION, new and enlarged edition	.50
A CHRISTIAN AND A THEOSOPHIST	.25
THE LAWS OF HEALING, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
STATES AFTER DEATH, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
CYCLES OF PSYCHISM, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
HYPNOTISM—A PSYCHIC MALPRACTICE	.25

Prices subject to change without notice

Correspondence, orders etc., should be addressed to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California
22-24 East 60th Street, New York (22), New York