

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

"There is no Religion higher than Truth"

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

Vol. 65, No. 6

April 1995

PSYCHOLOGY, THE SCIENCE OF THE SOUL

[This article by H. P. Blavatsky appeared in *Lucifer* for October 1896, more than five years after her death.]

ETHICS and law are, so far, only in the phases where there are as yet no theories, and barely systems, and even these, based as we find them upon *a priori* ideas instead of observations, are quite irreconcilable with one another. What remains then outside of physical science? We are told, "Psychology, the Science of the Soul, of the Conscious Self or Ego."

Alas, and thrice alas! Soul, the Self, or Ego, is studied by modern psychology as inductively as a piece of decayed matter by a physicist. Psychology and its mother-plant metaphysics have fared worse than any other sciences. These twin sciences have long been so separated in Europe as to have become in their ignorance mortal enemies. After faring poorly enough at the hands of mediaeval scholasticism they have been liberated therefrom only to fall into modern sophistry. Psychology in its present garb is simply a mask covering a ghastly, grimacing skeleton's head, a deadly and beautiful upas flower growing in a soil of most hopeless materialism. "Thought is to the psychologist metamorphosed sensation, and man a helpless automaton, wire-pulled by heredity and environment"—writes a half-disgusted hylo-idealist, now nappily a Theosophist. "And yet men like Huxley preach this man

automatism and morality in the same breath.....Monists¹ to a man, annihilationists who would stamp out intuition with iron heel, if they could...." Those are our modern Western psychologists!

Everyone sees that metaphysics instead of being a science of first principles has now broken up into a number of more or less materialistic schools of every shade and colour, from Schopenhauer's pessimism down to agnosticism, monism, idealism, hylo-idealism, and every "ism" with the exception of psychism—not to speak of true psychology. What Mr. Huxley said of Positivism, namely that it was Roman Catholicism *minus* Christianity, ought to be paraphrased and applied to our modern psychological philosophy. It is psychology, *minus* soul; psyche being dragged down to mere sensation; a solar system *minus* a sun; *Hamlet* with the Prince of Denmark not entirely cast out of the play, but in some vague way suspected of being probably somewhere behind the scenes.

When a humble David seeks to conquer the enemy it is not the small fry of their army whom he attacks, but Goliath, their great leader. Thus it is one of Mr. Herbert Spencer's statements which, at the risk of repetition, must be analyzed to prove the accusation here adduced. It is thus that "the greatest philosopher of the nineteenth century" speaks:

The mental state in which self is known implies, like every other mental act, perceiving subject and a perceived object. If then the object perceived is self, what is the subject that perceives? Or if it is the true self which thinks, what other self can

¹ Monism is a word which admits of more than one interpretation. The "monism" of Lewes, Bain and others, which endeavours so vainly to compress all mental and material phenomena into the unity of One Substance, is in no way the transcendental monism of esoteric philosophy. The current "Single-Substance Theory" of mind and matter necessarily involves the doctrine of annihilation, and is hence untrue. Occultism, on the other hand, recognizes that in the ultimate analysis even the Logos and Mulaprakriti are *one*; and that there is but One Reality behind the Maya of the universe. But in the manvantaric circuit, in the realm of *manifested* being, the Logos (spirit), and Mulaprakriti (matter or its noumenon), are the dual contrasted poles or bases of all phenomena—subjective and objective. The duality of spirit and matter is a fact, so long as the Great Manvantara lasts. Beyond that looms the darkness of the "Great Unknown," the One Parabrahman.

it be that is thought of?² Clearly a true cognition of self implies a self in which the knowing and the known are one—in which subject and object are one; and this Mr. Mansel *rightly holds to be the annihilation of both!* So that the personality of which each is conscious, and of which the existence is to each a fact beyond all others the most certain, is yet a thing which cannot truly be known at all; *the knowledge of it is forbidden by the very nature of thought.*³

The italics are ours to show the point under discussion. Does this not remind one of an argument in favour of the undulatory theory, namely, that "the meeting of two rays whose waves interlock produces darkness." For Mr. Mansel's assertion that when self thinks of self, and is simultaneously the subject and object, it is "the annihilation of both" —means just this, and the psychological argument is therefore placed on the same basis as the physical phenomenon of light waves. Moreover, Mr. Herbert Spencer confessing that Mr. Mansel is right and basing thereupon his conclusion that the knowledge of self or soul is thus "forbidden by the very nature of thought" is a proof that the "father of modern psychology" (in England) proceeds on no better psychological principles than Messrs. Huxley or Tyndall have done.⁴

We do not contemplate in the least the impertinence of criticizing such a giant of thought as Mr. H. Spencer is rightly considered to be by his friends and admirers. We mention this simply to prove our point and show modern psychology to be a misnomer, even though it is claimed that Mr. Spencer has "reached conclusions of great generality and truth, regarding all that can be known of man."

² The Higher Self or Buddhi-Manas, which in the act of self-analysis or highest abstract thinking, partially reveals its presence and holds the subservient brain consciousness in review.

³ *First Principles*, pp. 65, 66.

⁴ We do not even notice some very pointed criticisms in which it is shown that Mr. Spencer's postulate that "consciousness cannot be in two distinct states at the same time," is flatly contradicted by himself when he affirms that it is possible for us to be conscious of more states than one. "To be known as unlike," he says, "conscious states must be known in succession." (see *The Philosophy of Mr. H. Spencer Examined*, by James Iverach, M.A.)

We have one determined object in view, and we will not deviate from the straight line, and our object is to show that occultism and its philosophy have not the least chance of being even understood, still less accepted in this century, and by the present generations of men of science. We would fain impress on the minds of our Theosophists and mystics that to search for sympathy and recognition in the region of "science" is to court defeat. Psychology seemed a natural ally at first, and now having examined it, we come to the conclusion that it is a *suggestio falsi* and no more. It is as misleading a term, as taught at present, as that of the Antarctic Pole with its ever arid and barren frigid zone, called southern merely from geographical considerations.

For the modern psychologist, dealing as he does only with the superficial brain-consciousness, is in truth more hopelessly materialistic than all-denying materialism itself, the latter, at any rate, being more honest and sincere. Materialism shows no pretensions to fathom human thought, least of all the human spirit-soul, which it deliberately and coolly but sincerely denies and throws altogether out of its catalogue. But the psychologist devotes to soul his whole time and leisure. He is ever boring artesian wells into the very depths of human consciousness. The materialist or the frank atheist is content to make of himself, as Jeremy Collier puts it, "a very despicable mortal...no better than a heap of organized dust, a talking machine, a speaking head without a soul in it...whose thoughts are bound by the law of motion." But the psychologist is not even a mortal, or even a man; he is a mere aggregate of sensations.⁵ The universe and all in it is only an aggregate of grouped sensations, or "an integration of sensations." It is all relations of subject and object, relations of universal and individual, of absolute and finite. But when it comes to dealing with the

⁵ According to John Stuart Mill neither the so-called objective universe nor the domain of mind—object, subject—corresponds with any absolute reality beyond "sensation." Objects, the whole paraphernalia of sense, are "sensation objectively viewed," and mental states "sensation subjectively viewed." The "Ego" is as entire an illusion as matter; the One Reality, groups of feelings bound together by the rigid laws of association.

problems of the origin of space and time, and to the summing-up of all those inter- and co-relations of ideas and matter, of ego and non-ego, then all the proof vouchsafed to an opponent is the contemptuous epithet of "ontologist." After which modern psychology having demolished the object of its sensation in the person of the contradictor, turns round against itself and commits *hara-kiri* by showing sensation itself to be no better than hallucination.

This is even more hopeless for the cause of truth than the harmless paradoxes of the materialistic automatists. The assertion that "the physical processes in the brain are complete in themselves" concerns after all only the registrative function of the material brain; and unable to explain satisfactorily psychic processes thereby, the automatists are thus harmless to do permanent mischief. But the psychologists, into whose hands the science of soul has now so unfortunately fallen, can do great harm, inasmuch as they pretend to be earnest seekers after truth, and remain withal content to represent Coleridge's "Owllet," which—

Sailing on obscene wings across the noon,
Drops his blue-fringed lids, and shuts them close,
And, hooting at the glorious sun in heaven,
Cries out, "Where is it?"...

—and who more blind than he who does not want to see?

We have sought far and wide for scientific corroboration as to the question of spirit, and spirit alone (in its septenary aspect) being the cause of consciousness and thought, as taught in esoteric philosophy. We have found both physical and psychical sciences denying the fact point-blank, and maintaining their two contradictory and clashing theories. The former, moreover, in its latest development is half inclined to believe itself quite transcendental owing to the latest departure from the too brutal teachings of the Buchners and Moleschotts. But when one comes to analyse the difference between the two, it appears so imperceptible that they almost merge into one.

Indeed, the champions of science now say that the belief that sensation and thought are but movements of matter—Buchner's

and Moleschott's theory—is, as a well-known English annihilatist remarks, "unworthy of the name of philosophy." Not one man of science of any eminence, we are indignantly told, neither Tyndall, Huxley, Maudsley, Bain, Clifford, Spencer, Lewes, Virchow, Haeckel nor Du Bois Raymond, has ever gone so far as to say that "thought is a molecular motion, but that it is the *concomitant* (not the *cause* as believers in a soul maintain) of certain physical processes in the brain." They never—the true scientists as opposed to the false, the sciolists—the monists as opposed to the materialists—say that thought and nervous motion are the *same*, but that they are the "subjective and objective faces of the same thing."

Now it may be due to a defective training which has not enabled us to frame ideas on a subject other than those which answer to the words in which it is expressed, but we plead guilty to seeing no such marked difference between Buchner's and the new monistic theories. "Thought is not a motion of molecules, but it is the concomitant of certain physical processes in the brain." Now what is a concomitant, and what is a process? A concomitant, according to the best definitions, is a thing that accompanies, or is collaterally connected with another—a concurrent and simultaneous companion. A process is an act of proceeding, an advance or motion, whether temporary or continuous, or a series of motions. Thus the concomitant of physical processes, being naturally a bird of the same feather, whether subjective or objective, and being due to motion, which both monists and materialists say is physical—what difference is there between their definition and that of Buchner, except perhaps that it is in words a little more scientifically expressed?

Three scientific views are laid before us with regard to changes in thought by present-day philosophers:

Postulate: "Every mental change is signaled by a molecular change in the brain substance." To this:

1. Materialism says: the mental changes are caused by the molecular changes.
2. Spiritualism (believers in a soul): the molecular changes are

caused by the mental changes. [Thought acts on the brain matter through the medium of Fohat focused through one of the principles.]

3. Monism: there is no causal relation between the two sets of phenomena; the mental and the physical being the two sides of the same thing [a verbal evasion].

To this occultism replies that the first view is out of court entirely. It would enquire of No. 2: And what is it that presides so judicially over the mental changes? What is the *noumenon* of those mental phenomena which make up the external consciousness of the physical man? What is it which we recognize as the terrestrial "self" and which—monists and materialists notwithstanding—does control and regulate the flow of its own mental states? No occultist would for a moment deny that the materialistic theory as to the relations of mind and brain is in its way expressive of the truth that the *superficial* brain-consciousness or "phenomenal self" is bound up for all practical purposes with the integrity of the cerebral matter. This brain-consciousness or personality is mortal, being but a distorted reflection through a physical basis of the manasic self. It is an instrument for harvesting experience for the Buddhi-Manas or monad, and saturating it with the aroma of consciously-acquired experience. But for all that the "brain-self" is real while it lasts, and weaves its Karma as a responsible entity. Esoterically explained it is the consciousness inhering in that lower portion of the Manas which is correlated with the physical brain.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

[The manuscript here unfortunately breaks off; whether H.P.B. ever finished the article, or whether some pages of the manuscript have been lost we are unable to say.—EDS., *Lucifer*]

THE first and most important step in occultism is to learn how to adapt your thoughts and ideas to your plastic potency.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

WHERE CAN WE FIND GOD?

WHEN H.P.B. began her mission in the last quarter of the last century, she wrote in *Isis Unveiled* how her quest for truth started with the basic question that man throughout the ages has asked himself: "Where, who, what is God?" Our history as a race, ourselves today, and our collective future have a bearing on the answer to this all-important question.

Where can we find God? When looking for God, we have to have a mental concept of who or what God is. Almost everyone would say that the concept of God is the highest and noblest that one can formulate. Some might conceive of Him, or It, as "the total Whole"; others, as a thinking entity extraneous to the Cosmos, who creates and then destroys, and who rewards or punishes his creatures. Still others believe in and offer worship to one or another of the gods and goddesses belonging to their particular pantheon. The Secret Doctrine of the ages advances the philosophical teaching that Deity has no form and is the ever unknown, present everywhere. It is the mysterious power of evolution and involution, the omnipresent, omnipotent and omniscient creative potentiality—the One Reality.

For some, this might seem difficult to understand, but we have to find out for ourselves what is the general idea, or Law, that underlies this concept. There are only two places where we can find God or Deity: without and within oneself; in the world outside and in the world of one's inner being. To know God or Deity, therefore, we must study (1) Nature, and (2) the living human being each of us is.

Deity in whatever form stands for power—the power of creation, preservation and destruction-regeneration. Where in Nature can we find these great powers?

Take the kingdom of the minerals: The creative power here can best be perceived in the formation of crystals and precious stones; the destructive power can be seen in volcanoes and earthquakes; and the preservative force, in the cohesive principle that holds together mountains and continents. These are all magnificent

powers of Mother Earth, who nurtures all beings and provides them with what they need. Nature, therefore, has been called "the body of God," the Deity which is in all Nature's forms.

In the vegetable kingdom, we see the power of creation in the growth of the plant from the life within the seed; and the power of the plant to create seeds for future harvests implies that all three powers are operative. We see also that the sacrifice of the plant-forms keeps animal bodies alive. Herbs, for example, represent the concentration of certain psychic forces, and these open the door to other powers of the natural universe to function and work from the vegetable kingdom through the animal body as medicines and curatives.

In the animal kingdom, there is greater intelligence, enabling the creative, preservative and destructive powers to manifest in a more marked manner. For example, the strength of the elephant may be used for building or for destroying. Insects bring destruction and at the same time help to prevent worse from happening by preserving the balance of Nature. We can see the preservative force of life working through all the kingdoms of Nature, and it is kept operative through the interdependence of the kingdoms. But, whether creative, preservative or destructive, the power comes from *within* the mineral, vegetable or animal being, and is not conferred by anyone or anything outside of the being.

Coming to man, we can see that he is the most powerful of the agents through which the universal threefold power operates. Man can create anything he has the will to create, and at the same time can cause desolation by his interference with Nature's balance. Wars, invasions, pestilences, droughts, famines and the many problems that beset us on all sides are not sent by any God, but are created by man. We are now actively making a world of our own, for our own future. We are self-bent and use the powers of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva—creation, preservation and destruction—all the time.

Theosophy teaches that life has always existed. Prior to our earth-evolution, life existed in other worlds, and it will continue to exist in the future. There is not a single portion of the Universe that

was ever created out of "nothing." The Universe that we live in, and are a part of, springs from a "seed" which was produced from the flowering of the "tree" of a prior universe.

We have the power to destroy forms, and this brings us to the second aspect of our search: the within. Let us look at Nature from within. What is that unknown thing called "Life," which is never destroyed *per se* although the form through which it manifests may be destroyed? It shows itself in constant motion, constant growth and progress. The One Life cannot be seen; only its effects can be seen. It is the great underlying and energizing principle that unites the whole of Nature—all things everywhere are *alive*. Even a corpse is composed of living entities whose job it is to destroy that form and disperse themselves through the rest of Nature where they unite with other forms and find a new field of work and existence. This is Life working everywhere under Law.

The whole of Nature, everywhere, lives, moves, and acts, and is in constant subjection to innate Law. What is Law? Priests have for generations taught that it is "God's decree." According to science, Law is the reaction of one aspect of life in a form on another aspect of life in another form, and no "God" has been known to stop this! Action and reaction are equal and opposite. Theosophy says that our own minds interact in a similar way. Through the power of our choice and our will, we move beyond the human to the super-human stage and begin to visualize that intelligence can rise to ever higher degrees, enabling us to use the great powers of Nature in the production of harmony, while ordinary humans who refuse to act responsibly only produce discord and disharmony.

We can now see that the whole Universe is guided by intelligences who represent, propel and are the Law, whether it is working in an atom or a galaxy, in an amoeba or a Buddha. All the intelligences are at all times using and living under the Laws of Nature. If we did not sow the seeds, we would have no harvest. We have to learn to use Nature's laws and do on this plane what is right and proper; to make application from within without, using universal laws in particular instances.

The One Life ever pulsates in the atom as in the star. It also functions as the One Law. There is no extracosmic, anthropomorphic, personal God. Only the action of the One Law can be seen, ever moving, ever existing, ever destroying and regenerating, ever advancing in harmony towards greater levels of intelligence in life.

Looking at ourselves as we now are, we can see that we may employ our powers in two directions: to refine them to sense spiritual things, or to lower and degrade them in selfishness. We are creators here and now. According to our choice of food, habits, thoughts, actions, we are building a body of a particular type of matter, and we have been doing this for incarnations. Our parents helped us to create anew the form we would need. Gradually we learn to unfold powers and assume control over the within and the without—our own nature and the great Nature around us. When we try to go against it, we become destroyers. The powers of Deity are ours. We are the controllers of thought and of feeling, and have the power to tell truth from untruth. There is a secret place in the heart of every human being, an urge which will not let him forget. The "seed" of Deity in us links us to the Divine Nature around us, everywhere, always, and from this we can draw our inspiration.

It is believed that "God" has the power to reward and punish us. What is it that brings us joy or woe? What else but Law?

By this the slayer's knife did stab himself;
The unjust judge hath lost his own defender;
The false tongue dooms its lie; the creeping thief
And spoiler rob, to render.

(The Light of Asia)

There is an invisible side to the Universe, personified by the gods and goddesses of the theogonies of the past. The whole universe is filled with beings of all kinds, some of which are invisible but real. They are the supporters of the visible universe. But, whether visible or invisible, all, all, is under Law; and, as we investigate, the hitherto unseen becomes evident, and the hidden world of cause reveals itself in its varied, vitalizing relation to our world of effects and visible motions.

Worship of God and prayers are enjoined in all religions. What does this worship mean? It is the process of achieving union with Law, through harmonious action, through the keeping in mind of the subtle aspects of Nature and the primal purpose of manifestation. The whole Universe exists for the development of the Soul; the powers of all Nature can be acquired by the awakened Soul, and thereby he can know himself. To know the primeval "Heavenly Man," the Adam Kadmon of the Kabalists, is to know the Universal One Spirit. Prayers to an outside God are useless, because man is self-made. We are Creators. We are intelligent atoms in and of that primeval, universal Man, as are all other men.

We need to sense the one throbbing heart of the Universe. It pulsates in every atom, manifests in every form, makes for that sense of universal union, of brotherhood or love, and that compassion through which we may sense the totality of the Life of Spirit. The analytical, reasoning brain and mind are among our prized possessions; but the sympathetic, compassionate and understanding heart is of greater importance. We may then begin to sense the existence of the "Wall of Protection" built around humankind by the Adepts and Nirmanakayas who, having freed themselves from the *mayavic* limits of personal selfishness and separateness, live in complete compliance with the Law of Compassion. This "Wall" serves to hold at bay the unnatural powers of destruction that are the resultants of selfishness, isolation and evil.

How are we to seek and know this Compassion? Only by "turning within." Bit by bit, we need to train our mind to understand the heart. Truth, Goodness and Beauty are the three perfections that stand as representatives of the perfect blend and intermingling of all aspects of the One Deity. The God principle is said to be all-knowing, and to produce the beauty and harmony of Nature. Nature undisturbed is beautiful and peaceful; it is only when man makes changes that ugliness results. This civilization of ours is a destruction of beauty—in art, in literature, in architecture; it is crude and inharmonious when compared with Nature. A change is needed. Krishna said, "I am the Ego which is seated in the hearts of all beings." It is the Krishna in our heart that needs to rule, to bring

the needed change and rebuild civilizations in terms of harmony, beauty and compassion, in all aspects of life and work and relationships. It is we, as units, who must make the changes, keeping ever in view the purpose of Life and the reign of Law, so that destruction is changed into re-creation and regeneration and a new cycle is introduced as the old draws to a close.

Truth is Law; it is "*facts as they are.*" Mathematics is the best symbol of truth. Two and two are always four and never more nor less. A straight line always joins two points on a flat plane in the shortest way. "Goodness" in action results when performance is in terms of the proportions of the mathematics of soul life; because we are working in terms of Law, and we would no more harm others than they would harm or take advantage of us. Sentiment will not protect us. We should know and act according to the laws of Nature. We must first look for the good in the innermost recesses of our own heart, and act and live like the gods that we truly are.

We may then ask: "What is the subtler, inner and invisible world behind and within this physical world of ours?" The One Light is in all; in some, it shines more brightly than in others. The natures of Exalted Beings, the Buddhas and Christs of the race, are called luminous. The symbol of shining Light is considered in all religions to be an attribute of the Deity. In every religion, the Sun is taken to be the greatest of the gods. Knowledge is usually symbolized as light, and the subtler beings in the universe, called elementals, are said to be beings of light and colours, as also of correlated sounds—and these have been traditionally worshipped in the sense of reverence given them for the functions they perform.

If we can understand the concept of radiance, and of the blazing light of the Sun, we are getting nearer to an understanding of the meaning of "Spirit." Time, effort and thought are needed to understand the formless and the timeless, and to sense that we in our inner nature are of that same essence. Take the concept of the Great Breath, of eternal, absolute motion, from which all life proceeds and into which, finally, all returns, with the experience acquired—only to re-emerge again. And this process is repeated eternally until all beings reach perfection in consciousness and

wisdom.

Such abstractions might fill the ordinary mind with awe, but they warm our heart with hope. We are able to see within all forms the radiance of the One Light—that light which also burns within our own heart. We sense the vastness of space and the eternity of time and motion within our own little life. Turning within to see the living God at the centre of our being, and realizing its oneness with the Self of All, we shall be led to a sense of brotherhood with all creatures, and through that to our own perfectibility in the company of others—all Gods in the making.

THEOSOPHY postulates an eternal principle called the unknown, which can never be cognized except through its manifestations. This eternal principle is in and is every thing and being; it periodically and eternally manifests itself and recedes again from manifestation. In this ebb and flow evolution proceeds and itself is the progress of the manifestation. The perceived universe is the manifestation of this unknown, including spirit and matter, for Theosophy holds that those are but the two opposite poles of the one unknown principle. They coexist, are not separate nor separable from each other, or, as the Hindu scriptures say, there is no particle of matter without spirit, and no particle of spirit without matter. In manifesting itself the spirit-matter differentiates on seven planes, each more dense on the way down to the plane of our senses than its predecessor, the substance in all being the same, only differing in degree. Therefore from this view the whole universe is alive, not one atom of it being in any sense dead. It is also conscious and intelligent, its consciousness and intelligence being present on all planes though obscured on this one.

—W. Q. JUDGE

WORK FOR THEOSOPHY

TOWARDS the close of her career, in her Fourth Message of 1891 to the American Theosophists, H.P.B. summed up the never-dormant wish of her heart in this one sentence: "Be Theosophists, work for Theosophy! Theosophy first, and Theosophy last." Work for Theosophy, or service of our fellow men, is the alpha and omega of Theosophy. Study and application have little meaning without service; together they form the three sides of an equilateral triangle.

The basis of our Philosophy is that humanity is a unit, a Brotherhood. This is implicit in the very first object of the Theosophical Movement. The Great Master is recorded as saying that "he who does not feel competent to grasp the noble idea [of the Brotherhood of Humanity] sufficiently to work for it, need not undertake a task too heavy for him." Following his Chief, the Mahatma K.H. said that this first object is Philanthropy, and added: "The true Theosophist is a philanthropist—'not for himself but for the world he lives.' This, and philosophy, the right comprehension of life and its mysteries, will give the 'necessary basis' and show the right path to pursue."

The triple sacrifice of time, money and work is expected of earnest students of Theosophy who are seriously endeavouring to fit themselves to be the better able to help and teach others. Each has to find for himself the avenue of work that is helpful and for which he is best suited. If the will is there and the spirit of sacrifice energizes the student, then he will always find new avenues of service opening before him. Mr. Judge once wrote (*The Vahan*, August 1891):

Service is rendered in many different ways: by work in the Branches, by spreading literature, by explaining the doctrines and doing away with misconceptions, by contributing money to be used in the work, by constituting oneself a loyal unit if ability and time be lacking; and chiefly always by acquiring a knowledge of Theosophical Doctrines so as to be able to give a clear

answer to inquiry. One could also procure some inquiring correspondent and by means of letters answer questions as to Theosophical literature and doctrines. These are all general answers, while the question requires almost a personal examination. Any work that is sincerely done...with good motive and to the best of one's ability is good Theosophical work.

One grave bar to Theosophical work is "desultory orations and fine talk" by students who do not live Theosophy. None can work for Theosophy effectively unless in some measure, however little, one practises the ethics of Theosophy. Service of others and discipline of self are not opposing forces but are the two wings of the bird of progress, both equally necessary to ascend to the empyrean of Wisdom. There is therefore first our own work, in and on ourselves. We are asked to prepare ourselves, by study and otherwise, to serve the Cause. We do not confer any benefit on the Philosophy or on the Movement by our voluntary service; by working for the Cause, we are also helping ourselves. That service is imperative for the student-aspirant's own growth and progress, for without sacrifice wisdom cannot be obtained.

The aim of our work in the world is to change the Manas and Buddhi of the race. Looking at the present condition of the world, some may feel that the task is a hopeless one—yet we all know that Theosophical ideas have penetrated into the mind of the race and elevated it to some extent. The leaven of Theosophy is spreading, slowly but none the less surely. Our main object is, as H.P.B. put it in *The Key to Theosophy*, "to sow germs in the hearts of men, which may in time sprout, and under more propitious circumstances lead to a healthy reform, conducive of more happiness *to the masses* than they have hitherto enjoyed." The fundamental verities of universal brotherhood, of human solidarity, of karma and reincarnation can be grasped and applied by the simplest mind with transforming and regenerating effect. Ideas which were scoffed at when H.P.B. first presented them are today being accepted, which goes to show that the leaven of Theosophy is having its effect.

Referring to "Methods of Theosophical Work" in his article

under that title, Mr. Judge wrote:

No one method is to be insisted on. Each man is a potency in himself, and only by working on the lines which suggest themselves to him can he bring to bear the forces that are his. We should deny no man and interfere with none; for our duty is to discover what we ourselves can do without criticizing the actions of another....Ramifying in every direction are the levers that move and bring about results, some of those levers—absolutely necessary for the greatest of results—being very small and obscure....Therefore if any member proposes to spread the doctrines of Theosophy in a way that seems wise to him, wish him success even if his method be one that would not commend itself to you for your own guidance. (*Vernal Blooms*, pp. 51-52)

The only one who is absolutely wrong in his method is the one who does nothing. Nor are we to rush madly or boldly out to do, to do, but do what we find to do, and desire ardently to do it. Again in Mr. Judge's words:

...even when you shall not have succeeded in carrying anything out but some small duties, some words of warning, your strong desire will strike like Vulcan upon other hearts in the world, and suddenly you will find that done which you had longed to be the doer of. (*Letters That Have Helped Me*, p. 2)

It has been said that a handful of sincere, devoted, unselfish workers, who are Theosophists by nature and not only in name, all bent on one aim and with one belief, could move the whole world with their thoughts. This is our work in the future, the work traced out for us by H.P.B. and by the Masters.

OFTEN the test of courage is not to die but to live.

—VITTORIO ALFIERI

LET US BE GRATEFUL

If you pick up a starving dog and make him prosperous, he will not bite you. This is the principal difference between dog and man.

—MARK TWAIN

EVERY student of Theosophy should ask himself or herself, Am I lacking in the expression of gratitude? Should it not be cultivated deliberately in the light of the Mahatma's statement that "Ingratitude is not among our vices"?

For the most part, people attempt to practise the social virtues which arise from conventional standards determined by their social environment. Thus, sobriety, urbanity, industriousness, patience, monogamy, etc., are considered proper and looked upon as virtues. Rendering unto Caesar that which is Caesar's is the extent to which most individuals aspire. But much more than this is implied by true gratitude. In Dr. Johnson's opinion, "Gratitude is a fruit of great cultivation; you do not find it among gross people."

Let us consider that someone is kind, generous and helpful to us. For this we should be grateful. But how shall we be grateful? What is gratitude in its moral and spiritual context? While enjoying the things or services received, do we take these for granted as though they were our due? Or do we fear that there might be no more help forthcoming and are therefore servile and submissive? If so, the feeling aroused in us is not of the nature of true gratitude.

Much more is implied by the idea of gratitude than can ordinarily be conveyed by the mere expression of thankfulness. Gratitude implies, first, recognition of what is received; and, next, appreciation. It seems difficult to assess the nature of gratitude apart from the use to which the gift or the service is put. Suppose the gift is used in a manner contrary to that intended by the donor, *e.g.*, squandered in gratification of the lower nature. Surely, irrespective of the extent to which the gift is enjoyed or thanks are offered, we could not then consider the recipient grateful.

Recognition plus appreciation approximates gratitude. The

clue to understanding the term and its accompanying action is therefore to be found within these two words: recognition and appreciation. Recognition is an act of remembrance and it is well said that "Gratitude is the conscience of memory."

First, we must recognize that what is given us becomes a responsibility. The gift represents accumulated power which can be used either for constructive or for destructive purposes. The real test whereby we can classify our reaction either in terms of gratitude or ingratitude depends upon whether or not we can appreciate the gift, that is, increase its value. How shall we respond to the service or gift received? If we are truly grateful, then we shall use the gift constructively by appreciating its power and usefulness in its appropriate channel of service. The extent to which we do this, we are grateful, appreciative. On the contrary, if the gift is used in a manner which depreciates its value, we are ungrateful. So gratefulness is characterized by the manner or extent to which the gift is appreciated or increased in value.

Applying this to the Cause of Masters, we are grateful for Their help and inspiration to the extent we appreciate Their gifts by fitting ourselves, "by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others." Thus we see why They aid those who are trying to help Their Cause. For, as we strive to pass on to others what They have given us, we appreciate the knowledge and inspiration we have received. By this means we become worthy of receiving more of Their gifts, Their help, which, in the final analysis, implies further opportunities to help and serve, in a larger circumference, the great orphan—Humanity. In this context, the wisdom of the *Talmud* acquires a greater significance: "Into the well which supplies thee with water, cast no stone."

THE greatest discovery of my generation is that human beings can alter their lives by altering their attitude of mind.

—WILLIAM JAMES

WHY DO WE DENY THE SPIRIT?

IT seems that in modern society we do all that we can to shut out the light of our spiritual consciousness. Leo Tolstoy, in his essay "Why Do Men Stupefy Themselves?" discusses the reasons why our society is so obsessed with intoxicants like alcohol, tobacco and drugs of various kinds. He concludes that it is because men and women dull the mind and prevent their spiritual consciousness from guiding them on the right path. Our conscience, as also the "still, small voice" of our higher consciousness, tells us that most of our pleasures and pastimes are empty and lead us nowhere at all. The more sensitive among us recognize this fact, but do not wish to make the effort that a spiritual life demands of us, nor do we want to face past failures. So we try to shut it all out by the use of "drink and drugs."

There are deeper implications to the whole subject, though. If we are told in all the great world scriptures that the spiritual way of life leads to a state of total bliss and happiness, then why do we not abandon all else and follow it? Surely if man's aim in life is contentment and peace of mind, then he should take readily to anything that purports to give it to him. And surely the experience of centuries should have shown him that those worldly things that are supposed to give happiness have invariably brought only misery and grief to the world in general. Man should have learned his lesson by now!

Unfortunately this is not the case. There are certainly a great many individuals and groups who have learned the lesson and are trying their best to do what is right, but even most of these find life a tremendous struggle and have to fight constantly their lower natures. This is made more difficult as a result of society's obsession with salacious matters. Literature, films and television portray, for the most part, all the lower aspects of human life. A so-called "good" film or book nowadays includes elements of violence, revenge, lust and all the lower emotions. The fact that millions of people sit in a cinema house or at home passively watching scenes of brutal murder, sexuality and gross materiality

is disturbing, to say the least. In some of the modern films depicting the deeds of "serial killers," there are graphic scenes of the butchering of their victims. One can only deduce that there is something very wrong with us as a society that we find it "entertaining" to watch such horrific scenes and have an interest in such insane and debauched characters. It has been said that this is because we have a fascination for evil; but does this have to be glorified? A fascination for evil can only enslave the mind and drag it further down. It can also attract loathsome entities from other planes of existence. As a result of his ignorance, man does not know what he is doing. So why does man deny the Spirit that brings him peace, love and harmony, and encourage those things that increase his fear, lust and selfishness?

To answer this, we need to return to Tolstoy's idea. Is it because we have lived so long an empty, pointless existence that we need to find our excitement in the exploits of others? The education system is based very much on dry facts and does not encourage due reverence for all the great spiritual leaders of humanity. Instead, the media inflict on us all that is harmful to our souls. Those who are in control of TV, films and the arts in general seem to be foisting their degenerate views on the populace. It is worth considering what the karmic effects of all this will be! The wise words of the Maha Chohan come to mind:

The intellectual portion of mankind seems to be fast dividing into two classes: the one unconsciously preparing for itself long periods of temporary annihilation or states of non-consciousness, owing to the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition—a process which cannot fail to lead to the utter deformation of the intellectual principle; the other unrestrainedly indulging its animal propensities with the deliberate intention of submitting to annihilation pure and simple, in case of failure, and to millenniums of degradation after physical dissolution. Those intellectual classes reacting upon the ignorant masses—which they attract, and which look up to them as noble and fit examples to be followed—degrade and morally ruin those they ought to protect

and guide.

Society has also extolled the virtues of work until it has become an obsession with some. All their time is taken up with work and/or family so that they have no time to think for themselves. In their spare time they may sit passively in front of a TV screen and absorb, spongelike, all that is beamed at them. There is hardly any mention of work on a higher plane and nothing is done to cultivate true Wisdom. The argument is advanced that people are being given what they want, and that modern art and literature reflect "reality." The truth is that the materialistic intellectual classes are giving humanity what *they themselves* want, and that the "reality" that they talk so glibly about is so only from a grossly materialistic viewpoint.

Mankind is surrounded by the evils of violence, crime and immorality. One sees them on the streets, one reads of them in newspapers, and one cannot escape them in TV and radio news reports. On top of all this, if one goes to a cinema or reads a work of fiction, these evils are presented there as well! Where is the escape, where is the space to spread one's spiritual wings? The media could be a useful means of promoting topics that inspire and uplift, but at the moment, generally, this is hardly the case, although there are exceptions. But these exceptions are too few to have any real effect for the public good. If the lives of great spiritual leaders were portrayed more on film and TV, the consciousness of humanity would be greatly improved. Films such as those concerning the lives of Mahatma Gandhi and the Buddha are lost in the flood of movies devoted to the exploits of homicidal madmen and amoral "heroes." All this is a far cry from the days when epics like the Indian *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* set noble examples for the populace to follow. Some may say that even these contain violent scenes, but at least there is a clear-cut definition of good and evil. The main heroes contain all the virtues and qualities of the ideal man, and the women are paragons of virtue. The villains are truly evil, but still have a sense of honour. At the deeper level, these tales are symbolic and are designed to appeal to our spiritual intuitions.

The only way that the minds of men and women can be elevated is by the contemplation of the Good, the True and the Beautiful. It is by reading and meditating on the words of spiritual Sages and Seers that we can communicate with them on a higher level. Like attracts like, and this paints a horrific picture for those who spend their time reading and viewing the acts of psychopaths. It is time that humanity as a whole was reintroduced to a nobler way of life and conduct based upon Brotherhood and Morality. Theosophy set out with that very task in mind and has had some success in society as a whole. But this work does not cease; there is no time for relaxing in our efforts. We can add our mite towards the transformation of society by doing what we can, taking account of our duties in the world. Sending out good thoughts and doing kind deeds will certainly have a beneficial effect on those around us and help to speed up the time when true Theosophists will be in positions of "power" throughout the world. Also the promulgation of facts that will help man to understand his true nature is of inestimable value. Let us do what we can to help and never grow complacent.

PERHAPS in the coming generation of younger psychologists, hopefully unencumbered by university prohibitions and restrictions, there may be a few who will dare to investigate the possibility that there is a lawful reality which is not open to our five senses; a reality in which present, past, and future are intermingled, in which space is not a barrier and time has disappeared; a reality which can be perceived and known only when we are passively receptive, rather than actively bent on knowing. It is one of the most exciting challenges posed to psychology.

—CARL ROGERS

A LETTER FROM H.P.B.

[On November 20, 1887, H.P.B. wrote the following letter from New York to Sir T. Madhava Rao in India, presenting him with a copy of *Isis Unveiled*. The letter was subsequently printed in *The Hindu* of Madras.—EDS.]

PERMIT a woman—whose only claim on your attention is the sincere devotion she bears to your country and her love for its great Hindu race—to present you with her work—the fruit of many years' study. Though born in Russia and under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Greek Church, I have from an early age felt myself drawn towards India as though it were my own country, and to its time-sanctified religion and philosophy as the only teachings that would satisfy the longing of my spirit. Three times I have visited your fairy land; each time I quitted it with regret—with heartfelt distress; the more I studied its philosophies hoary with age and replete with wisdom, the more I saw its peoples and learned to understand the secret meaning of its exoteric worship, the more I felt convinced how utterly both the people and their religion were misunderstood, hence—misinterpreted and shamefully disfigured even by those who should have known them better—from Sir William Jones down to the Sanskrit scholar Max Muller. As to ways and policy on these questions adopted by the so-called "Christian Missionaries," they are beneath contempt. It is against their lies, their shameful behaviour and diabolical hypocrisy in foreign, "heathen" (?) lands as well as to their homes that the greater portion of my work *Isis Unveiled* is chiefly directed. Christian theological dogmas I have ever abhorred, not alone for their unacknowledged robberies of the oldest sacred writings, but also for their debasement of priest and people by the abominable doctrine of the "vicarious atonement." The only "Old Testament" I have revered is the "Vedas"; my only "New Testament" is the *Mahabharata*, Manu and your Vedanta.

I have waited for many years for some man to do justice to India, and by quotations from her sacred literature brand this

Western theology with the stamp of shame. I have waited in vain to find one who had both the knowledge and the courage to say what Truth demanded. Jacolliot, a Frenchman, ex-Judge at Pondicherry, moved by a sincere admiration for India, tried in over twenty volumes to do her religions and people justice. But in his fanatical hatred of all priesthoods, he included the Hindu Brahmans of the temples in the same sweeping denunciation as he gave to the Jesuits. No priest, in his eyes, could be pure and holy. As to other authors—if materialists, they have some official position at stake, perhaps; they know the whole truth about India, they have read but they conceal. Those who are ignorant, defame and denounce the more unscrupulously to hide that ignorance. As to the Christians, the believers in and followers of their meek Jewish God Jesus, they are today led from their tender infancy to believe all the non-Christian people vowed to "eternal damnation" after their death; hence—they damn them during life, and for them to tell the most barefaced lies about the "heathen" is a meritorious and sacred duty.

Finally, tired of fighting Christians in words, I determined that I myself, albeit a woman, a foreigner, and with no pretensions to scholarship, would do the work that others neglected. I came to America, the only country where a woman is entirely free to say as well as a man what she likes upon religious matters, and I have written a work of which a copy is now respectfully offered to Your Excellency for acceptance. It is in two large volumes, one devoted to a comparison of modern science with ancient, the other to a demonstration that this pretended divinely-given Christianity is but a mongrel mixture of various older Eastern faiths. I call the book *Isis Unveiled* because Western people are familiar with the Egyptian goddess who represents nature and its sacred mysteries.

That such a work was needed is proved by the public reception mine has met with. Within a week, it had reached its second edition. That it tells the public and the Christian theology very disagreeable truths is shown by its abuse by the clergy and the church-going hypocrites. The Russian Government has already decreed that it shall not be allowed to cross the frontiers of my native land and its

sale is prohibited. I was just informed that the sacred college at Rome has placed it upon the "Index Expurgatorius." Let these signs indicate to Your Excellency and other sons of India whether I have done my duty in defending them and the religion of their forefathers, as conscience and sincere and affectionate admiration would prescribe.

Christianity is so unspiritual, so rotten at the core, that it is splitting into two great parties of materialists and Christian dogmatists of every colour—one representing blind reason, and the other blind faith. To attempt to save the middle party from the inevitable despair which attends the existence of man's knowledge of the world of spirit, I have contrasted the psychological achievements of your gurus, sanyasis and fakirs with the childish miracles(!) of Christian saints, and the revolting and absurd phenomena of modern spiritualism and its so-called "medium."

In asking Your Excellency to accept a copy of my book which will be forwarded to you by Mooljee Thackersey of Bombay, North Brook Gardens—I offer the only tribute I can pay to a statesman whose character for justice and great ability is known to every lover of India at this side of the oceans, and at home. This reputation has—as Manu expresses it—"made the people run to him as the rivers to the ocean."

Praying that you may be long spared to promote by your public services and private example the interests and welfare of your too long oppressed Motherland, which at the present juncture so much needs the help of her ablest patriotic sons,

H. P. BLAVATSKY

WHEN the fate is adverse, a wise man can always strive for happiness and sail against the wind to attain it.

—ROUSSEAU

W.Q.J. AS I KNEW HIM

[This memorial article contributed by Elliott B. Page after W.Q. Judge's passing on March 21, 1896, was originally published in *Theosophy* (formerly *The Path*) in May 1896.]

IT is nearly fifteen years since I first made the acquaintance of William Q. Judge, the occasion of it being a letter that I had written to H. P. Blavatsky, which letter, after being answered at length, she had sent to her friend and representative in America. This acquaintance resulted in my application for membership in the Theosophical Society of which Judge was then Joint Recording Secretary, and, in due course of time, to my admission.

I shall not go into the details of the intimacy so begun. It is enough to say that, in these years, we have not once lost sight of each other, not once broken off communication. Once, during this time, for a short period, I quite misunderstood him, and, in consequence, doubted the sincerity of his motive in certain actions. It did not take long for me to satisfy myself that I was wrong, and nothing ever occurred to again shake my confidence in his absolute integrity of purpose. For some of the years of our acquaintance, our correspondence was regular and unreserved; but for the last four years, nearly, most of our communication has been personal, much of this period having been spent under the same roof. I have had good opportunity to study the character of the man and I do not hesitate to place my estimate of him on record.

To me, it appears almost unnecessary to write anything about the man who has so lately passed away. His work and his life have been far more eloquent than any words of mine can be, and such records should be enough to transmit his name to posterity along with those of the other teachers who have laboured unselfishly for the human race. If any there be too blind to see that his life was devoted to others, and not to his personal interests, why labour to clear the vision of those who, after all, will not care to see?

There is not one act in the life of William Q. Judge that has come under my observation, that savours of selfishness or of a desire to further any personal end. He has been accused of ambi-

tion, and of taking unfair means to accomplish his desires; but it is only necessary to review the acts of his chief accusers to see that, in these accusations, they have voiced the desires and devices of their own hearts, and that the untruth and guile which his false friends sought to fasten upon him have flowed from their own lips and from their own pens in a flood as wide, as deep, and as black as the Styx of their combined and perverted imaginations. His life, during the last few years, has been a fight against the saddling of a priesthood upon the Society for which he lived. The cry of "no theosophical Pope," heard after the Boston Convention of April, 1895, was only the howl of chagrin set up by those whose plans for a Pope and an intellectual aristocracy had been defeated by this bold and necessary movement.

Perhaps I am not qualified to pass on the merits as an occultist of the man whose memory I hold in such grateful esteem; but I can, at least, speak of what has passed before my eyes in the ordinary affairs of life, and in these affairs I have invariably found him to be the soul of unselfishness, honour, generosity, and all the other virtues that men hold so dear in other men. The severity which some saw in him was on the outside, only. He was not always patient with folly and faintheartedness, yet even these drew from him pity rather than condemnation, and nothing except deliberate cowardice persisted in, and treachery to the Cause itself, seemed to place the offender outside the pale of his present sympathy and attention.

He was singularly free from the vice of constantly seeking to explain and justify his actions. He believed in doing the present good act, in carrying out the present good intention, leaving the result where it belonged. Even when something occurred which, apparently, called for particular explanation and justification, he usually neither explained nor justified. The most striking example of this, of which I have any knowledge, grew out of a letter that I received from him in 1887, in which letter was folded another on different paper and written, in blue, in the hand made so familiar by reason of the frequent "exposures" of "so-called Mahatmic messages." The enclosure was directly in explanation of a matter

that was no more than hinted at in Judge's own letter, and when I wrote, making a jocular allusion to his effort at precipitating a letter for my benefit, he answered, in a direct, straightforward way, that he had done nothing of the kind and would not; but, contrary to his usual custom, he gave a theory of how such things might be accomplished. Some years afterwards we met in St. Louis and I showed him the letter and the enclosure. After turning the papers over for a moment, he looked me straight in the face and said, in the simplest manner, "I can't explain it. It's a dead give-away." And there the matter rested. But for my certain belief in his integrity I might have doubted him then, might have given some heed to the cry of "fraud" later. Years after the occurrence, I found out, independently of Judge, the truth about the matter and my faith in his sincerity was abundantly justified.

Among all my friends and acquaintances, William Q. Judge was least wasteful of time. He seemed never to rest, for work was his rest. And yet he was not, in any sense, an unsociable man, and during a visit that he once made to Cincinnati where I first met him, he seemed more a schoolboy bent on having a good time than the man he really was. During the last few years, he seemed to become more and more absorbed in his work, and yet, much as he was struggling through, and it was enough to appal the ordinary hard-working man, he never hesitated to take on some other burden if it appeared to promise well for the movement in which he was so thoroughly wrapped up. Notwithstanding the busy life that he led, he was one of the most accessible men that I ever knew, and one of the few who was always ready to accept a suggestion. He did not know everything, and was aware of the fact, but he did know how to utilize the material that he found ready to his hand. If he could not get just what he wanted in help or in any other matter, he took what offered and made the most of it. He was intensely loyal to his friends and gave each one an opportunity to show their true colour. That some who were supposed to be his friends finally proved otherwise is nothing to his discredit. He let them expose their own weaknesses, their own love of personality rather than principle, and when some of them mounted a highly moral platform that ill

accorded with their own deeds in private life and wrote beautiful platitudes on "Truth and Occultism," he hardly took the trouble to express the contempt that such Pharisaical utterances must have awakened in his mind.

Though he was always the same kindly friend to me, never in all these years writing or speaking a harsh word to me, I am aware that in his intercourse with the many people whom he met, "the Irish boy" sometimes came between himself and others. To those who were aware of the real inner life of the man this is enough explanation for the apparent contradictions and failings on the everyday plane of life that he shared in common with the rest of mankind. That he ever deliberately wounded or deceived anyone is unthinkable to me, and there are yet others who knew him far better and more intimately than I. Let them speak, each for himself, each from his own standpoint, yet I feel that the summing up of it all will be: "One of the world's benefactors and great friends has departed; he was our friend, he was the friend of all. If we are to show our appreciation of his friendship and his life we will try to carry on the work, each one according to his ability." The matter is very plain, the opportunity is waiting for each one, and if I may be allowed to say it, I think that any work that comes to hand, no matter how slight it may appear, is much better than waiting for something grand to do. If the little tasks are shirked the grand ones will never come within our grasp.

—ELLIOTT B. PAGE

WE regard only *moral* asceticism as necessary. It is as a means to an end, that end being the perfect equilibrium of the *inner* nature of man, and the attainment of complete mastery over the body with all its passions and desires.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

The subject of time has become increasingly a preoccupation of modern thinkers. The historically developed ideas about the nature of time still linger and people cannot wipe clean their minds and think fresh because they find themselves inside a system of space-time which they do not fully understand.

George Zebrowski's reflections on the nature of time (*Omni*, October 1994) come very close in some respects to the Theosophical position.

There is no time [he writes]. There never *was* any time, and there never *will* be any time. Time as a separate thing does not exist. Language itself seems to defy our attempts to understand time. Phrases such as "the beginning of time," or "when time began," serve only to reinforce our intuition that time is forever, that it could not have had a beginning. There may be different varieties of time, as there are differing kinds of infinities, but "time always was, is, and ever shall be." To imagine a time without time, a space beyond space—eventless time and the sheer nothingness of purely empty space—seem to be logical and psychological impossibilities....

As with concepts of space, the two main intuitions about time are: that time is an absolute, eternal container in which all things happen; and that time is nothing by itself, and cannot be understood apart from physical processes. Variants of absolute and relational theories of time have attempted to assimilate or accommodate each other's features in a variety of ways....

What we call time began with the expansion of our universe. The time before that was a different kind of time; what comes after our universe will be a different kind of time. Somewhere, there may be an eternity that our intuition tells us must be real in order to support the different kinds of time. This kind of time must always be there....

We can only know time's aspects, but not time itself, which is a conceptual illusion; only the specific aspects are real.... Time, like space and gravity, must be expressed as part of a relationship whose terms cannot be defined independently of the relationship.

Time is not understandable as a separate entity. It is a quality that emerges when we have the initial conditions of our universe.

The sooner we can hammer home the fact that time and space are aspects of that Reality which lies beyond, the better for us. For, the evolution of man's nature demands the transformation of this time-space sense into the sense of the Eternal, the transmutation of the limited personal outlook into that of impersonal universality. The first creates its own phantasmagoria of illusion, the second gains "the right perception of existing things, the knowledge of the non-existent." In the experience of the mystic, past, present and future merge in the Eternal Now.

Attention is invited to the distinction between Duration and Time made by H.P.B. in *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge* (pp. 9-14):

Duration *is*: it has neither beginning nor end. How can you call that which has neither beginning nor end, Time? Duration is beginningless and endless; Time is finite....Time can be divided; Duration—in our philosophy, at least—cannot. Time is divisible in Duration—or, as you put it, the one is something *within* Time and Space, whereas the other is outside of both....Existence has limited and definite periods, whereas Duration, having neither beginning nor end, is a perfect abstraction which contains Time. Duration is like Space, which is an abstraction too, and equally without beginning or end. It is in its concreteness and limitation only that it becomes a representation and something. Of course the distance between two points is called space; it may be enormous or it may be infinitesimal, yet it will always be space. But all such specifications are divisions in human conception. In reality Space is what the ancients called the One invisible and unknown (now unknowable) Deity.

The debate about whether criminal behaviour is genetically determined has once again been revived. In Britain, the prestigious CIBA Foundation hosted a conference of geneticists, psychologists and anthropologists on "The Genetics of Criminal and Anti-social Behaviour."

Over the past decade, researchers have claimed that human behaviour can be seen in biological terms; that schizophrenia, alcoholism, manic depression and violence are all linked to particular genetic defects. But, so far, attempts to link specific human behaviour to specific genes have failed woefully, writes Kenan Malik in *The Independent* (London). Nor is the argument put forward by some researchers that genetic heritage works together with environmental factors to influence behaviour tenable. There is more to us than genes and environment, Malik argues. "Humans are uniquely social beings," and "human social behaviour actually reflects our capacity to overcome our biological heritage."

Aggression in human beings [Malik writes] is not a natural attribute, but is socially created and socially defined. The very term "anti-social behaviour" attests to that. But the norms of social behaviour vary across time and between societies. What is acceptable behaviour in one society or one age is a crime in another. In such circumstances, the idea that crime is determined by our innate nature has no meaning.

The argument that the environment and genetics together determine behaviour also diminishes the social character of human life. Many scientists have toiled to establish what proportion of a particular behaviour is hereditary and what proportion is determined by the environment.

But human beings are not the passive sum total of their genetic or environmental influences; our behaviour is shaped by a proportion of one and a percentage of the other. We are active shapers of the world. Unlike animals, humans can act purposively: we make our environment and, in so doing, transform the relationship between biology and the environment. The relationship between human beings, our environment, and natural attributes is mediated by society. Any scientific investigation that fails to take this into account can have but a poor understanding of human behaviour.

Conceding one's mistakes and saying "I am sorry" does not come easy to many people and often requires strength of character.

Strained relationships, lifelong grudges and bitter vengeance between individuals, groups of people and even nations, are all too common in our "civilized" life; yet so many of these could have been avoided altogether or been mitigated with a genuine apology. In most cases of failed or avoided apologies, it is egocentricity that stands in the way.

In *Psychology Today* for January/February 1995, psychiatrist Aaron Lazare, M.D., writes of the results of his studies in the healing nature of apology:

If done correctly, an apology can heal humiliation and generate forgiveness. Yet, even though it's such a powerful social skill, we give precious little thought to teaching our children how to apologize. Most of us never learned very well ourselves.

Despite its importance, apologizing is antithetical to the ever-pervasive values of winning, success, and perfection. The successful apology requires empathy and the security and strength to admit fault, failure, and weakness. But we are so busy winning that we can't concede our own mistakes....

Whatever the motive, what makes an apology work is the exchange of shame and power between the offender and the offended. By apologizing, you take the shame of your offence and redirect it to yourself. You admit to hurting or diminishing someone and, in effect, say that you are really the one who is diminished—I'm the one who was wrong, mistaken, insensitive, or stupid. In acknowledging your shame you give the offended the power to forgive. The exchange is at the heart of the healing process....

Far and away the biggest stumbling block to apologizing is our belief that apologizing is a sign of weakness and an admission of guilt....In fact the apology is a show of strength. It is an act of honesty because we admit we did wrong; an act of generosity, because it restores the self-concept of those we offended. It offers hope for a renewed relationship and, who knows, possibly even a strengthened one. The apology is an act of commitment because it consigns us to working at the relationship and at our self-development. Finally, the apology is an act of courage because it subjects us to the emotional distress of shame and the risk of

humiliation, rejection, and retaliation at the hands of the person we offended.

As the world becomes a global village, apologies are growing increasingly important for peaceful resolution of conflicts at national and international levels as well.

Speaking at the Indira Gandhi Conference on "Redefining the Good Society," held in Pune last December, Dr. P. C. Alexander, Governor of Maharashtra, stressed the importance of spiritual values in all our activities—"a dimension which has been the main sustaining force of our ancient Indian civilization." The erosion of these values, he said, "can have disastrous consequences on our society." (*Bhavan's Journal*, January 31, 1995)

Clarifying the concept of spirituality and spiritual values, Dr. Alexander observed:

When I speak of spiritual values it should not be misunderstood to be meaning "other-worldliness" or "escaping from the realities of life." That is the Western perception of Indian spirituality. The Indian perception of spirituality is what Dr. Radhakrishnan has described as the growth of the soul from age to age in search of truth and goodness. The continuous search of truth and goodness is not merely for the sages doing *tapas* in the caves or on snowclad mountain tops, but is equally so for the ordinary man engaged in the ordinary pursuits of life as an active member of society. Spirituality doesn't necessarily mean renunciation or *sanyas* or being always "plunged in thought."...

Several other great civilizations of the world which flourished along with Indian civilization in the centuries past, declined and disappeared while ours survived because the values on which it was nurtured were values which never lose their validity or relevance by the march of time. To quote Dr. Radhakrishnan again, "achievements of the body and mind are not enough for the growth of a civilization, acts of spirit and morality are equally essential. Excellence in literature, art, astronomy, algebra, medicine, etc., is no doubt a manifestation of a vibrant civilization, but this by itself does not make a civilization great or durable. Something

more is required to make a civilization great and durable and that is, the strength of its values."...

These spiritual values were not metaphysical abstractions or complicated conundrums which only pundits or logicians could unravel; these were simple truths which an ordinary man could comprehend and practise if only he had the will to do so....

While we speak with pride about these great values which till now have served to sustain our civilization, we also know that today they stand in great danger of erosion and distortion.

Although double standards, untruth, intolerance, religious and caste fanaticism and hatred are prevalent today, yet all is not lost. It is by no means easy for the people to come out of their stupor, yet as stressed by Dr. Alexander, the task is not impossible. There still is a lingering desire for a better life; the basic concepts of truth and goodness have not altogether eroded.

FOR all men one rule holds good—live the purest and most unselfish life you possibly can—cultivate alike your mind and heart—detach your mind as far as possible from worldly pleasures, worldly desires, worldly objects, and set your heart as undividedly as your strength permits on doing good to all living things. If you thus reach, or have in the past lives by similar exertions reached, a certain stage of spiritual awakening, you will find others more advanced from whom you will receive encouragement and some little help (though in the main each soul has to work out its own road); if you meet none such, then you know that you have not reached the stage at which such encouragement is desirable, and you have only to persevere in the right path, quite sure that in the inexorable sequence of cause and effect that dominates the universe, you will, if not in this, at least in the next life, reach the gateway that leads to the higher life. The way may seem long and weary—but never despair; it leads to the everlasting condition, and to these sooner or later according to your own exertions and deserts *you* will attain.

—*The Theosophist*, September 1884