

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. 41, No. 10

17th August 1971

“SICKNESSES AND WOUNDS”

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for July 1950.
—EDS.]

Are you ready to do your part in the great work of philanthropy? You have offered yourself for the Red Cross; but, Sister, there are sicknesses and wounds of the soul that no surgeon's art can cure. Shall you help us teach mankind that the soul-sick must heal themselves?

THUS wrote the Blessed Master of H.P.B. to a good aspirant who had come to her. Diseases of the body are very many. Effects of Karma, their causes have to be traced. Our philosophy traces them to their roots in the false knowledge which gives a wrong direction to the Will to Live.

Our modern knowledge leads us to seek security in selfishness. The struggle for existence, the survival of the strongest, the destruction of every form of matter — these and other ideas are so vastly misunderstood that the truths which they contain are missed.

There *is* a fierce struggle raging within man as also outside of him; but modern knowledge, seeing upside down, misjudges and misvalues the environment and gives it an undeserved importance.

Survival of the strongest does take place, but it is the human soul and its spiritual vitality which survive; the strongest of bodies decays and dies; so might does not prove itself right on the material plane at any time; the Human Soul's might and right always triumph and of the Soul it might truthfully be said that *Might is Right*. The Right of the Human Soul is to be mighty.

Every form of matter does disintegrate; but modern knowledge,

though it describes to a large extent the process, does not perceive the purpose. Men of modern knowledge would see the purpose and the meaning if they adopted the advice of the ancient Teacher: "Meditation upon birth, death, decay, sickness and error." This is considered morbid, and so not practised. Therefore effects are attended to while the causes are neglected.

In line with the ideas in the above-quoted words and with what is implicit in them is the statement of H.P.B. in *The Key to Theosophy* (p. 242):

We believe in relieving the starvation of the soul, as much if not more than the emptiness of the stomach.

Theosophy, with its foundational doctrine of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, befriends every sincere effort at amelioration of sicknesses and wounds on every plane. But the object of the Theosophical Movement, which ought to be that of every student of Theosophy, is to determine the roots and the causes which produce such diseases. There are those among the students of the present generation (and there have been such in every generation) to whom secular philanthropy appeals. We have no quarrel with them. It is, however, necessary that all of us remind ourselves of the purely spiritual ideas of H.P.B.'s article on the subject, "Let Every Man Prove His Own Work" (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 31*), from which the following is extracted:

The secular philanthropist is really at heart a socialist, and nothing else; he hopes to make men happy and good by bettering their physical position. No serious student of human nature can believe in this theory for a moment. There is no doubt that it is a very agreeable one, because if it is accepted there is immediate, straightforward work to undertake.

Once again the showy side in the outer environment draws away the person who misses the meaning of the aphorism of Occultism — "He who mortifies the self glorifies the Self. He is the benefactor of his fellow-men and the servant of the Race." Study, application and promulgation of the Esoteric Philosophy are the highest form of Service.

We said above that modern men seek security in selfishness. The Security Council of the United Nations fails to secure mankind against hatreds and war because among its members are those who desire security for their own nation and not for the world as a whole. Such members are not prepared to mortify their nationalism and to glorify internationalism. Man, individually, has full security within his own Soul. Those

who recognize this truth naturally find others of the same mind. Mind-souls who ideate internationally and spiritually find security and refuge as well as strength to act unitedly. However small their number, they have a vision of the Heavenly City and can endeavour to build on earth according to the pattern and the plan.

The surgeon's knife and the Red Cross are very necessary and often beneficent in the world of matter and of mortals. But matter and mortality cannot be elevated through transmutation to Spirit and Immortality by the surgeon and the Red Cross, any more than by the economist and the politician.

To heal soul-sickness one needs knowledge of how to operate on egotism, pride and vanity; also, knowledge of how to tend the suffering and then the convalescing patient-soul — our own lower self first and also the lower self of others. Further, one needs knowledge in order to be thrifty in the personal use of Nature's bounty and to be generous in the impersonal use of one's own Soul powers.

The Theosophical Movement is the effort, constantly and consistently made by the Mighty Healers, on behalf of suffering souls. That effort, made in and from the plane of causes, covers every type of effect. It is the "great work of philanthropy" of which the Master wrote.

THE GLORIOUS SUN shines on the evil and the mean man as well as on the good; the earth withholds not her grain and fruits from either high or low or well-disposed or those whose hearts are black with sin. How should we, the image of God, hold back our help or sympathy from those who are in need?

—TIBETAN PRECEPT

MADAME BLAVATSKY ON THE VIEWS OF THE THEOSOPHISTS

[This article by H. P. Blavatsky appeared originally in the London *Spiritualist*, February 8, 1878.—Eds.]

SIR,

Permit a humble Theosophist to appear for the first time in your columns, to say a few words in defence of our beliefs. I see that in your issue of December 21 one of your correspondents, Mr. J. Croucher, makes the following very bold assertions:

Had the Theosophists thoroughly comprehended the nature of the soul and spirit, and its relation to the body, they would have known that if the soul once left the body, it could not return. The spirit can leave, but if the soul once leaves, it leaves for ever.

This is so ambiguous that, unless he uses the term "soul" to designate only the vital principle, I can only suppose that he falls into the common error of calling the astral body, spirit, and the immortal essence, "soul." We, Theosophists, as Colonel Olcott has told you, do *vice versa*.

Besides the unwarranted imputation to us of ignorance, Mr. Croucher has an idea (peculiar to himself) that the problem which has heretofore taxed the powers of the metaphysicians in all ages has been solved in our own. It is hardly to be supposed that Theosophists or any others "thoroughly" comprehend the nature of the soul and spirit, and their relation to the body. Such an achievement is for Omniscience, and we Theosophists, treading the path worn by the footsteps of the old sages in the moving sands of exoteric philosophy, can only hope to approximate to the absolute truth. It is really more than doubtful whether Mr. Croucher can do better, even though an "inspirational medium," and experienced "through constant sittings with one of the best trance mediums" in your country. I may well leave to time and Spiritual philosophy to vindicate us entirely in the far hereafter. When any Oedipus of this or the next century shall have solved this eternal enigma of the Sphinx-man, every modern dogma, not excepting some pets of the Spiritualists, will be swept away, as the Theban monster, according to the legend, leaped from his promontory into the sea, and was seen no more.

As early as February 18, 1876, your learned correspondent, "M.A. (Oxon.)," took occasion, in an article entitled "Soul and Spirit," to point out the frequent confusion of the terms by other writers. As things

are no better now, I will take the opportunity to show how sorely Mr. Croucher, and many other Spiritualists of whom he may be taken as the spokesman, misapprehended Colonel Olcott's meaning and the views of the New York Theosophists. Colonel Olcott neither affirmed nor dreamed of implying that the immortal spirit leaves the body to produce the medial displays. And yet Mr. Croucher evidently thinks he did, for the word "spirit" to him means the inner, astral man, or double. Here is what Colonel Olcott did say, double commas and all:

That mediumistic physical phenomena are not produced by pure spirits, but by "souls" embodied or disembodied, and usually with the help of elementals.

Any intelligent reader must perceive that, in placing the word "souls" in quotation marks, the writer indicated that he was using it in a sense not his own. As a Theosophist, he would more properly and philosophically have said for himself "astral spirits," or "astral men," or doubles. Hence, the criticism is wholly without even a foundation of plausibility. I wonder that a man could be found who, on so frail a basis, would have attempted so sweeping a denunciation. As it is, our President only propounded the *trine* of man, like the ancient and Oriental philosophers and their worthy imitator Paul, who held that the physical corporeity, the flesh and blood, was permeated and so kept alive by the *psyche*, the soul or astral body. This doctrine, that man is *trine* — spirit, or *nous*, soul and body — was taught by the Apostle of the Gentiles more broadly and clearly than it has been by any of his Christian successors (see *1 Thess.*, v. 23). But having evidently forgotten or neglected to study "thoroughly" the transcendental opinions of the ancient philosophers and the Christian Apostles upon the subject, Mr. Croucher views the soul (*psyche*) as spirit (*nous*) and *vice versa*.

The Buddhists, who separate the three entities in man (though viewing them as one when on the path to *Nirvana*), yet divide the soul into several parts, and have names for each of these and their functions. Thus confusion is unknown among them. The old Greeks did likewise, holding that *psyche* was *bios*, or physical life, and it was *thumos*, or passional nature, the animals being accorded but a lower faculty of the soul-instinct. The soul or *psyche* is itself a combination, *consensus* or unity of the *bios*, or physical vitality, the *epithumia* or concupiscible nature, and the *phren*, *mens*, or mind. Perhaps the *animus* ought to be included. It is constituted of ethereal substance, which pervades the whole universe, and is derived wholly from the soul of the world —

Anima Mundi or the Buddhist *Svabhavat* — which is *not* spirit; though intangible and impalpable, it is yet, by comparison with spirit or pure abstraction — objective matter. By its complex nature, the soul may descend and ally itself so closely to the corporeal nature as to exclude a higher life from exerting any moral influence upon it. On the other hand, it can so closely attach to the *nous* or spirit, as to share its potency, in which case its vehicle, physical man, will appear as a God even during his terrestrial life. Unless such union of soul and spirit does occur, either during this life or after physical death, the individual man is not immortal as an entity. The *psyche* is sooner or later disintegrated. Though the *man* may have gained “the whole world,” he has lost his “soul.” Paul, when teaching the *anastasis*, or continuation of individual spiritual life after death, set forth that there was a physical body which was raised in incorruptible substance.

The spiritual body is most assuredly *not* one of the bodies, or visible or tangible *larvae*, which form in circle-rooms, and are so improperly termed “materialized spirits.” When once the *metanoia*, the full developing of spiritual life, has lifted the spiritual body out of the psychical (the disembodied, corruptible, astral man, what Colonel Olcott calls “soul”), it becomes, in strict ratio with its progress, more and more an abstraction for the corporeal senses. It can influence, inspire, and even communicate with men subjectively; it can make itself felt, and even, in those rare instances when the clairvoyant is perfectly pure and perfectly lucid, be seen by the inner eye (which is the eye of the purified *psyche* — soul). But how can it ever manifest objectively?

It will be seen, then, that to apply the term “spirit” to the materialized *eidola* of your “form-manifestations” is grossly improper, and something ought to be done to change the practice, since scholars have begun to discuss the subject. At best, when not what the Greeks termed *phantasma*, they are but *phasma*, or apparitions.

In scholars, speculators, and especially in our modern *savants*, the psychical principle is more or less pervaded by the corporeal, and “the things of the spirit are foolishness and impossible to be known” (*I Cor.*, ii, 14). Plato was then right, in his way, in despising land-measuring, geometry and arithmetic, for all these overlooked all high ideas. Plutarch taught that at death Proserpine separated the body and the soul entirely, after which the latter became a free and independent *demon* (*daimon*). Afterward, the good underwent a second dissolution: Demeter divided the *psyche* from the *nous* or *pneuma*. The former was dissolved after

a time into ethereal particles — hence the inevitable dissolution and subsequent annihilation of the man who at death is purely psychical; the latter, the *nous*, ascended to its higher divine power and became gradually a pure, divine spirit. Kapila, in common with all Eastern philosophers, despised the purely psychical nature. It is this agglomeration of the grosser particles of the soul, the mesmeric exhalations of human nature imbued with all its terrestrial desires and propensities, its vices, imperfections, and weakness, forming the astral body — which can become objective under certain circumstances — which the Buddhists call *skandhas* (the groups), and Colonel Olcott has for convenience termed the “soul.” The Buddhists and Brahmanists teach that the man’s individuality is not secured until he has passed through and become disembarassed of the last of these groups, the final vestige of earthly taint. Hence their doctrine of metempsychosis, so ridiculed and so utterly misunderstood by our greatest Orientalists.

Even the physicists teach us that the particles composing physical man are, by evolution, re-worked by nature into every variety of inferior physical form. Why, then, are the Buddhists unphilosophical or even unscientific, in affirming that the semi-material *skandhas* of the astral man (his very *ego*, up to the point of final purification) are appropriated to the evolution of minor astral forms (which, of course, enter into the purely physical bodies of animals) as fast as he throws them off in his progress toward *Nirvana*? Therefore, we may correctly say that so long as the disembodied man is throwing off a single particle of these *skandhas*, a portion of him is being reincarnated in the bodies of plants and animals. And if he, the disembodied astral man, be so material that “Demeter” cannot find even one spark of the *pneuma* to carry up to the “divine power,” then the individual, so to speak, is dissolved, piece by piece, into the crucible of evolution, or, as the Hindus allegorically illustrate it, he passes thousands of years in the bodies of impure animals. Here we see how completely the ancient Greek and Hindu philosophers, the modern Oriental schools, and the Theosophists, are ranged on one side, in perfect accord, and the bright array of “inspirational mediums” and “spirit guides” stand in perfect discord on the other. Though no two of the latter, unfortunately, agree as to what is and what is not truth, yet they do agree with unanimity to antagonize whatever of the teachings of the philosophers we may repeat!

Let it not be inferred, though, from all this, that I, or any other real Theosophist, undervalue true Spiritual phenomena or philosophy, or

that we do not believe in the communication between pure mortals and pure spirits, any less than we do in communication between bad men and bad spirits, or even of good men with bad spirits under bad conditions. Occultism is the essence of Spiritualism, while modern or popular Spiritualism I cannot better characterize than as adulterated, unconscious magic. We go so far as to say that all the great and noble characters, all the grand geniuses — the poets, painters, sculptors, musicians — all who have worked at any time for the realization of their highest ideal, irrespective of selfish ends, have been spiritually inspired; not mediums, as many Spiritualists call them — passive tools in the hands of controlling guides — but incarnate, illuminated souls, working consciously in collaboration with the pure disembodied human and newly-embodied high Planetary Spirits, for the elevation and spiritualization of mankind. We believe that everything in material life is most intimately associated with spiritual agencies. As regards psychical phenomena and mediumship, we believe that it is only when the passive medium has given place, or rather grown into, the conscious mediator, that he can discern between spirits good and bad. And we do believe, and know also, that while the incarnate man (though the highest Adept) cannot vie in potency with the pure disembodied spirits, who, freed of all their *skandhas*, have become subjective to the physical senses, yet he can perfectly equal, and even far surpass in the way of phenomena, mental or physical, the average “spirit” of modern mediumship. Believing this, you will perceive that we are better Spiritualists, in the true acceptation of the word, than so-called Spiritualists, who, instead of showing the reverence we do to true spirits — gods — debase the name of spirit, by applying it to the impure, or, at best, imperfect beings who produce the majority of the phenomena.

The two objections urged by Mr. Croucher against the claim of the Theosophists, that a child is but a duality at birth, “and perhaps until the sixth or seventh year,” and that some depraved persons are annihilated at some time after death, are (1) that mediums have described to him his three children, “who passed away at the respective ages of two, four, and six years”; and (2) that he has known persons who were “very depraved” on earth come back. He says:

These statements have been afterwards confirmed by glorious beings who come after, and who have proved by their mastery of the laws which are governing the universe, that they are worthy of being believed.

I am really happy to learn that Mr. Croucher is competent to sit

in judgment upon these "glorious beings," and give them the palm over Kapila, Manu, Plato, and even Paul. It is worth something, after all, to be an "inspirational medium." It is evident that while Mr. Croucher sees and judges things through his emotional nature, the philosophers whom we study took nothing from any "glorious being" that did not perfectly accord with the universal harmony, justice, and equilibrium of the manifest plan of the universe. The Hermetic axiom, "as above, so below," is the only rule of evidence accepted by the Theosophists. Believing in a spiritual and invisible universe, we cannot conceive of it in any other way than as completely dovetailing and corresponding with the material, objective universe; for logic and observation alike teach us that the latter is the outcome and visible manifestation of the former, and that the laws governing both are immutable.

In his letter of December 7, Colonel Olcott very appropriately illustrates his subject of potential immortality by citing the admitted physical law of the survival of the fittest. The rule applies to the greatest as to the smallest things—to the planet equally with the plant. It applies to man. And the imperfectly developed man-child can no more exist under the conditions prepared for the perfected types of its species, than can an imperfect plant or animal. In infantile life, the higher faculties are not developed, but, as everyone knows, are only in the germ, or rudimentary. The babe is an animal, however "angelic" he, naturally enough, ought to appear to his parents. Be it ever so beautifully modelled, the infant body is but the jewel-casket preparing for the jewel. It is bestial, selfish, and, as a babe, nothing more. Little of even the soul, *psyche*, can be perceived except as vitality is concerned; hunger, terror, pain, and pleasure appear to be the principal of its conceptions. A kitten is its superior in everything but possibilities. The grey neurine of the brain is equally unformed. After a time mental qualities begin to appear, but they relate chiefly to external matters. The cultivation of the mind of the child by teachers can only affect this part of the nature—what Paul calls natural or physical, and James and Jude sensual or psychical. Hence the words of Jude, "psychical, having not the spirit," and of Paul: "The psychical man receiveth not the things of the spirit, for to him they are foolishness; the spiritual man discerneth." It is only the man of full age, with his faculties disciplined to discern good and evil, whom we can denominate spiritual, noetic, intuitive. Children developed in such respects would be precocious, abnormal—abortives.

Why, then, should a child who has never lived other than an animal life; who never discerned right from wrong; who never cared whether

he lived or died — since he could not understand either life or death — become individually immortal? Man's cycle is not complete until he has passed through the earthlife. No one stage of probation and experience can be skipped over. He must be a man before he can become a spirit. A dead child is a failure of nature — he must live again; and the same *psyche* re-enters the physical plane through another birth. Such cases, together with those of congenital idiots, are, as stated in *Isis Unveiled*, the only instances of human reincarnation.¹ If every child-duality were to be immortal, why deny a like individual immortality to the duality of the animal? Those who believe in the trinity of man know the babe to be but a duality — body and soul; and the individuality which resides only in the psychical is, as we have seen proved by the philosophers, perishable. The completed trinity only survives. Trinity, I say, for at death the astral form becomes the outward body, and inside a still finer one evolves, which takes the place of the *psyche* on earth, and the whole is more or less overshadowed by the *nous*. Not even all of the elementaries (human) are annihilated. There is still a chance for some. By a supreme struggle these may retain their third and higher principle, and so, though slowly and painfully, yet ascend sphere after sphere, casting off at each transition the previous heavier garment, and clothing themselves in more radiant spiritual envelopes, until, rid of every finite particle, the trinity merges into the final Nirvana, and becomes a unity — a God.

A volume would scarce suffice to enumerate all the varieties of elementaries and elementals; the former being so called by some Kabalists (Henry Kunrath, for instance) to indicate their entanglement in the terrestrial elements which hold them captive, and the latter designated by that name to avoid confusion, and equally applying to those which go to form the astral body of the infant, and to the stationary nature-spirits proper. I repeat again, it is but the wholly psychical, disembodied astral man which ultimately disappears as an individual entity. As to the component parts of his *psyche*, they are as indestructible as the atoms of any other body composed of matter.

That man must indeed be a true animal who has not, after death, a spark of the divine *ruach* or *nous* left in him to allow him a chance of self-salvation. Yet there are such lamentable exceptions, not alone among the depraved, but also among those who, during life, by stifling

¹ Note that "reincarnation" is here used as a term applying only to the *psyche*. This does not reincarnate, it has always been taught, except in the instances given.

every idea of an after-existence, have killed in themselves the last desire to achieve immortality. It is the will of man, his all-potent will, that weaves his destiny, and if a man is determined in the notion that death means annihilation, he will find it so. It is among our commonest experiences that the determination of physical life or death depends upon the will. Some people snatch themselves by force of determination from the very jaws of death; while others succumb to insignificant maladies. What man does with his body he can do with his disembodied *psyche*.

Nothing in this militates against the images of Mr. Croucher's children being seen in the Astral Light by the medium, either as actually left by the children themselves, or as imagined by the father to look when grown. The impression in the latter case would be but a *phasma*, while in the former it is a *phantasma*, or the apparition of the indestructible impress of what once really was.

In days of old the "mediators" of humanity were men like Krishna, Gautama Buddha, Jesus, Paul, Apollonius of Tyana, Plotinus, Porphyry, and the like of them. They were adepts, philosophers — men who, by struggling their whole lives in purity, study, and self-sacrifice, through trials, privations, and self-discipline, attained divine illumination and seemingly superhuman powers. They could not only produce all the phenomena seen in our times, but regarded it as a sacred duty to cast out "evil spirits," or demons, from the unfortunate who were obsessed — in other words, to rid the medium of their days of the "elementaries."

But in our time of improved psychology every hysterical sensitive blooms into a seer, and behold! there are mediums by the thousand! Without any previous study, self-denial, or the least limitation of their physical nature, they assume, in the capacity of mouthpieces of unidentified and unidentifiable intelligences, to outrival Socrates in wisdom, Paul in eloquence, and Tertullian himself in fiery and authoritative dogmatism. The Theosophists are the last to assume infallibility for themselves, or recognize it in others; as they judge others, so they are willing to be judged.

In the name, then, of logic and common sense, before bandying epithets, let us submit our differences to the arbitrament of reason. Let us compare all things, and putting aside emotionalism and prejudice as unworthy of the logician and the experimentalist, hold fast only to that which passes the ordeal of ultimate analysis.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

New York, January 14, 1878.

A CRISIS OF FAITH

THEOSOPHY is the friend of all movements that seek to work in unison for the improvement of humanity and the amelioration of the race. It is therefore ever ready to applaud the altruistic motive, the loving sacrifice and the stern adherence to duty and to justice. A Theosophist is expected to work strenuously for the promotion of brotherly feelings among nations and races. It therefore becomes the duty of all Theosophists to assist in the international exchange of useful arts and products by advice, information and co-operation with all worthy individuals and associations, provided, however, that no benefit or percentage is taken by the Theosophists or their Society for their or its corporate services. If this is the duty on the international plane, the same duty becomes much more imperative for realms which are constantly touched upon in daily life. In many countries, the social condition of large masses of men renders it impossible for either their bodies or their spirits to be properly trained, so that the development of both is arrested. This training and development is one of the express objects of Theosophy and all Theosophical centres have to be in thorough sympathy and harmony with all true efforts in this direction.

Theosophy does not segregate its votaries nor does it invest them with a halo of exclusiveness. The student of Theosophy can and does admire in others the one-pointed effort at virtue and the endeavour to live a life of altruism and holiness. But at the same time that he does all this has he to distinguish between the Path he has chosen and the widely-branched faith and infinite objectives which are adopted by those who follow not the system which Theosophy advocates. However, it often happens that the student's very refusal to be a party to any narrowing dogma has its dangers for unwary feet. There are occasions when even a sincere student gets glamoured by the depth of metaphysical knowledge or by the psychic powers of another. He covets that lucid knowledge; he is enraptured by the play of psychic forces at work. Is this the Guru for whose advent he has been waiting? Not having the capacity to discriminate, he cuts the Gordian knot by labelling the object of his adoration a "Theosophist." By so doing, he proves untrue to his Cause. He forgets that there were, as there still are, men who, though holy and striving after liberation, do not subscribe to the three objects of the Theosophical Movement and who are in disagreement with the Aim, Purpose and Teaching which have formed the basis of the original plan and programme of the Masters. Bending of knees — even in thought

— to persons who owe allegiance to other ideologies and who have other objectives is an expression of a transfer of loyalty — a removal of faith from one vessel and the pouring of it into another. Such reversing of attachments is fraught with great risk to the inner growth which may either get atrophied or become misshapen.

To the earnest disciple, three objects, leading to three courses of daily action, remain paramount. For him, these objects must remain inviolate and cannot be substituted by other practices which subserve other objects. Once he has declared his sympathy for these three objectives, the student is wedded to them and can neither ignore nor bypass them without inviting Karmic reactions. These three objects do not present a choice nor do they invite specialization in any one object to the disregard of the others. Each must claim a share in the waking hours of the disciple's life. In the measure that the student adheres to these three objects, in that measure does he deserve to be called a student of H.P.B. and of her Masters for whom she served as an open window through which they could shed their Light into darkened interiors.

Speaking about the "why" of her efforts, H.P.B. wrote that what she was doing was not for self-gratification, but

only in the hope of training a few individuals to carry on our work for humanity by its original programme when the founders are dead and gone. At present, the main, fundamental object of the Society is 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 Key to Theosophy*, pp. 254-55)

The sowing of the germs was possible only by the implementation of the original programme which in time became crystallized in the three great objects of the Movement. The student had to form an equilateral triangle by the judicious and deliberate observance of each of these three, endowing them with life by his soul-force.

The three objects of the Movement are thus stated by Madame Blavatsky in her *Key to Theosophy*:

I. To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity without distinction of race, colour, or creed.

II. To promote the study of Aryan and other Scriptures, of the World's religion and sciences, and to vindicate the importance of old Asiatic literature, namely, of the Brahmanical, Buddhist, and Zoroastrian philosophies.

III. To investigate the hidden mysteries of Nature under every aspect possible, and the psychic and spiritual powers latent in man especially.

From the great mass of men who hunger for spiritual knowledge, anyone may, if he so chooses, join a working centre of Theosophy if he is in genuine sympathy with these three objects. But the mere act of joining cannot make a Theosophist of him who has no sense for the divine fitness of things, or of him who understands Theosophy in his own sectarian and egotistic way.

The first object of the Movement is the formation of a nucleus which in times yet to come will grow and develop into one vast, compact, living Brotherhood of men. Such a nucleus can only be formed by nucleoles which gyrate round a centre of active cohesive force. That cohesion will be lasting which is free of the pulls of race, colour or creed. To be worthy of being a nucleole — of moving in orbit around a central spiritual entity — one has to enter upon a course of entire renunciation of one's personality. This means that the man has to become an altruist and to make his pride and self-regard bond-maidens to his devotion to the best interest of others. His ideal must be to live a life of abstinence, of self-denial and strict morality, doing his duty by all men. Unless the aspirant makes an effort to achieve this, he does not fall into orbit. He is either loosely connected to the nucleus or strays away into other layers of space.

To a man wanting in his effort, Brotherhood is a word having only an emotional content. This is so because he remains susceptible to the pulls of sympathy and antipathy. He can have no vision of the work of the living brotherhood of White Adepts, for he himself is not linked to their objectives and, where no such link exists, how can the man be expected to produce on earth a copy in miniature of the ideal Brotherhood which exists among the *élite* of Soul and Spirit? It is a truism that well-regulated efforts produce wonders and that mutual aid, sympathy and co-operation can bring down influences from the higher regions. What is required is human material which must be made ready to the Master's hand. A life in which the three objects are woven is the life which is desirable and fit for the great work to be done now or centuries hence. It is not for the aspirant to choose the timing. He is the plough-share and it is the farmer that chooses when and where to put it to use.

Outside of such a nucleus as is envisaged by the first object, no man or institution can expect to produce a universal or even a national

benefit — not even to himself. An individual however high or holy who does not subscribe to the idea of the great White Lodge of living Adepts, one who, moreover, cares for his own salvation and who therefore rejects the ethics of Theosophy must remain outside of the area of occult effort. His faith is not in the inviting of suffering on himself so that others may benefit from his pain. He wants a yardstick to measure his daily progress and if he finds the progress halting, he wants to know the reason why. He may call himself an altruist and a friend of all creatures, but lacks the essentials for a training which, begun in this incarnation, will in some distant life weld him with other volunteers into yet another section of the Guardian Wall which shields mankind, protecting it from further and far greater misery and sorrow.

About the second object of the Movement, Madame Blavatsky wrote in her article on "Chelas and Lay Chelas":

A Lay Chela is but a man of the world who affirms his desire to become wise in spiritual things. Virtually, every member of the Theosophical Society who subscribes to the second of our three "Declared Objects" is such; for though not of the number of true Chelas, he has yet the possibility of becoming one, for he has stepped across the boundary-line which separated him from the Mahatmas, and has brought himself, as it were, under their notice. In joining the Society and binding himself to help along its work he has pledged himself to act in some degree in concert with those Mahatmas, at whose behest the Society was organized, and under whose conditional protection it remains.

Once this pledge is taken, it has to be redeemed. From this point, there can be no looking back, no straying into forbidden or even alien territory. The study of ancient religions and sciences is the field of research that broadens the view and universalizes the mind. It shatters exclusive claims; it shows that centuries and ages back the same Knowledge and Path which the Wisdom-Religion discloses was known and practised by men and even nations; that, in fact, at some remote time in antiquity gods walked the earth and held confabulations with men. Such a study becomes essential for giving a new orientation to the mind. By delving deep into ancient lore, the student tries, in fact, to assess his own vast heritage and trace for himself his lineage from a distant past. This study must sooner or later forge him into a unit within a vaster brotherhood than that commanded by any religion or even all religions put together.

But such a study may have its pitfalls also. All too often the family

and caste *skandhas* (attributes sticking to the man through karmic and atavistic action) overpower the student's leanings towards the Universal, and, failing in his attempts to free himself from these, he seeks to hide his divagations by averring that *his* religion and even its ritual is pure Theosophy. It is thus that orthodoxy driven from one battlefield scores a signal victory on another and more vital front. Failure to give adequate importance to the second object tends to circumscribe and narrow the vision, which then fails to become universalized. Faith in the relevance of the second object diminishes, and, in consequence, there occurs an inversion of values in the student's mind and he tries to assess and evaluate Theosophy by the norms of creeds and castes, sciences and half-baked philosophies. The *sui generis* aspect of the Teachings is not searched for nor recognized. When this stage of a shakiness in faith is reached, the channel of communication with the Theosophical Mahatmas gets closed and so far as the three objects of the Movement are concerned, the student's incarnation has to be written off as a failure.

The third object of the Movement is an aid in fulfilment of the duty to keep alive in man his spiritual intuitions. It is only through intuition that the student can have an abounding faith in the plenitude and correctness of the Teachings. It is this only which can make the neophyte resolute in his task of opposing and counteracting bigotry in every form, whether it be religious, sectarian, scientific or social. He has to destroy, first within himself and then in others, the belief in miracles or anything supernatural. He has to investigate and through that investigation to convince himself and others that psychic and spiritual forces are not the special preserves of any religion and that they are lying dormant in all men. To achieve this, the man has diligently to seek Knowledge of the laws that govern Nature in all its multifarious aspects. This study and investigation is the testing ground of the disciple's faith. Does he get glamoured by phenomena for which he has no answer? For cures of physical ills and for a release from poverty does he rush to soothsayers, astrologers, mediums or priests? After consulting these and maybe finding some easing of the tension, does he sit at their feet, propagate their faith, call them "Theosophists" (possibly to calm an outraged conscience) and, worst of all, advise co-students to go the way he has gone? Does faith need demonstrations which the eyes can see and the ears hear before it can get confirmed? Does the student repeat the mistake of those who in the formative years of the Movement felt that phenomena like astral bell-ringing can win adherents to Masters' Cause? The flame of true Faith is not ignited at ignoble flames, neither

does the possession of lower psychic powers bring one recognition from the Masters.

The student is expected to "investigate," to find the *raison d'être*. He has to understand the vast potencies that reside in each of his sheaths — the physical, the astral, the psychic, the manasic and the spiritual. That investigation must lead him in time to a recognition of the faculty of intuition and the existence in each man of inner sets of senses. When he puts his faith in the reality of that which he has investigated, he may find other Theosophical instructions awaiting him in the same texts from which he distilled his initial knowledge. The new light and the ability to read within the words come from the higher planes of being and are the rewards of a firm unshaken faith in the Teaching and the Teachers.

HE who is single-minded, fixed on the word divine, his steadfast fulfilment of duty will make the knowing soul within him pure; to him whose knowing soul is pure, a knowing of the Self supreme shall come; and through this knowledge of the Self supreme, he shall destroy this circle of birth and death and its root together.

—*The Crest-Jewel of Wisdom*

SLEEP AND DREAMS — A SUBLUNAR MYSTERY

II.—TO SLEEP, PERCHANCE TO DREAM

DREAMS, it is said by many, are illusions, and hence are no proof of the truth of any doctrine. It has to be remembered that the first spiritual evidences to which earnest aspirants to the higher life are referred in ancient schools are the phenomena of dreams. One may question how such common manifestations as sleep and dreams can serve as foundation for the greatest of teachings, namely, the doctrine of immortality. J. Kerning in his *Paths to the Immortal* answers that

we must admire the loving care of the primeval Creative Power inasmuch as it had laid its first proof so close at hand, thereby blessing us with an unceasing call to enter into its school and learn its lessons.

The German philosopher then challenges those who declare the creations of our dreams to be meaningless nothings to name a similar power which works and creates with such ease and vividness and comprehends within itself everything belonging to life. Pointing out that the functions of the inner life are unceasingly active, needing no rest or relaxation, he affirms that man can, at his own pleasure, establish an equilibrium with these functions and control them. "Dreams and voluntary seership," he concludes, "are the two poles of spiritual activity, and upon these are founded the teachings of immortality by all religions."

But before ascending to those empyrean heights let us look at the purpose subserved by sleep. Not only is there the process of house-cleaning (referred to in the previous article), but sleep gives drainage relief and ventilation to submerged emotions, ungratified desires and painful complexes, through dreams. Particularly valuable is this cathartic process today when

The world is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers;
Little we see in Nature that is ours.

In fact, all the complicated conditions of social existence, which during waking life we are obliged to conform to and to resist, are eliminated during sleep; and the psychic life of dreams unrolls freely without the fetters of social laws or the "phantom chasing in the canyons of our deafening cities." Were it not for this sweet balm of sleep,

the average civilized man would have forthwith lost his reason. The psychic pressure built up through the day of tension finds its safety valve in dreams; for the main element in dreams is action or motion, which alone is the true outlet for emotion. Under the influence of our feelings, the body vibrates and trembles. As we cannot express them fully in waking life but bottle them up — excepting, of course, children and savages — they are smothered and therefore sink back into the subconscious where they are smouldering. Unless we are so adaptable or highly evolved as to sublimate our feelings instead of repressing them, dream-life alone affords an escape for these baffled energies.

When we realize that the drive toward equilibrium is a basic phenomenon of all matter, the purpose of our waking thinking is naturally to achieve an equilibrium by adjusting to the environment, or by solving problems, or by satisfying our desires. When this is not fully achieved, we may expect that the dream's counteraction to reality is also an attempt at establishing an equilibrium. By liberating the individual from the laws of time and space, by restoring his full freedom, by satisfying his desires, by giving him release from tensions in the expression of anxieties, the dream is successful in restoring the individual's inner equilibrium. Dr. Werner Wolff in his provocative book on *Dreams* (1952) ably sums up the utility of dreams thus:

All the problems which we have to suppress in our waking thinking, such as those related to our origin and birth, to our ultimate goal and death, to our meaning in life, our suppressed emotions and repressed memories — they all find a release by being thought and translated into a dream reality. They are all communicated, not to other people, but to the dreamer himself, who now has the opportunity to take himself as the most important object of communication, who now can fully play his role, and decide *as if* the world were his own.

The dream world of the average man must obviously be wholly subjective. The salient features of dreams are their extraordinary plasticity, their illogicality, the tendency to vary amazingly without apparent rhyme or reason, their symbolic representation of ideas, and their great imaginative fecundity and dramatic power, the most prosaic persons becoming rivals to Shakespeare, while dreaming.

One is lost in the plethora of material on dreams in the writings of the world's philosophers, poets, thinkers, scientists, theologians, scholars and historians. Previous to the study of the mind on a scientific basis, all kinds of theories were put forward by different schools and

teachers. As with the Darwinian revolution in the last century, the emergence of the psychoanalytical theory as applicable to the field of dreams — marked by the publication of Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* in 1900 — was a great revolution in thought, particularly because it followed after nineteen centuries of Christianity which abandoned the science of dreams to superstition and burnt the interpreters as witches.

But, as in the case of Darwin's theory of evolution, psychoanalysis too has its limitations and its utility has not been more than peripheral compared to the immense effort man has made to explore his state at night, as is evident in non-Christian traditions. More truth seems to be enshrined in the tales of Herodotus, Plutarch, Artemidorus and others than in the many expert studies and ingenious scientific and psychological theories of today, so that one is tempted to agree with H. P. Blavatsky's statement:

Popular folk-lore and traditions, however fanciful at times, when sifted may lead to the discovery of long-lost, but important, secrets of nature.

From Zeno of Citium to Myers of Cambridge runs the same theme that dreams provide the key to the mysteries of life; for, if the Greek philosopher asserted that the study of dreams is essential to self-knowledge, the latter affirmed:

The prime need of man is to know more fully, that he may obey more unhesitatingly, the laws of the world unseen. And how can this great end be attained save by the unfoldment from within, in whatsoever fashion it may be possible, of man's transcendental faculty — by his recognition of himself as a cosmic being and not a planetary, as not a body but a soul?

Antedating Zeno were the aboriginal tribes of the East and West whose art of taking omens from dreams has been studied by many an anthropologist, and Sir Edward Taylor in *Primitive Culture* cites several instances of oneiromancy practised by tribes such as the Zulus, Kamchadals, Greenlanders, Karens of Burma, Algonquins in America and many others. A whole Australian tribe is said to have decamped from their village as one of them dreamt of an owl, which, according to their wise men, forebode an attack from a rival tribe. A part of the theory of dreams in savage psychology is that human souls come from without to visit the sleeper, who sees them in a dream. Dreams are stated to have played a great part in the life of the Bantu tribes, and the subconscious state occupied much of the attention of the Basuto,

a branch of the Bantus. European folklore has preserved curious dream-theories such as the fear of turning a sleeper over lest the absent soul should miss the way back. The idea of the spirit's departure during sleep is not a recent discovery, as it is noticeable also in St. Augustine's narratives (*cf. De Civitate Dei* xviii, 18).

Jackson S. Lincoln in his study of *The Dream in Primitive Cultures* describes many customs prevailing among the ancient tribes. William MacDougall, who vigorously opposed mechanism and behaviourism, in his two-volume *Pagan Tribes of Borneo* writes of many a young man going to sleep on the grave of some distinguished person, or in some wild and lonely spot, and living for some days on a restricted diet in the hope that a secret helper would come to him in his dreams. When, as occasionally happens, the secret helper takes on the form of an animal, all individuals of that species become objects of especial regard to the dreamer, and sometimes to the tribe. To the Ashanti mind, dreams are caused either by the visitations of denizens of the spirit world or of souls of persons still alive, or by the journeyings of one's own soul during the hours of sleep.

Rich though the Oriental dream beliefs may be, there is no strict uniformity in the theories and hence no key to their understanding. Symbolical dreams in Egypt were usually interpreted by priests and seers. These dream-oracles secluded themselves in temples, the precincts of which were supposed to evoke dreams of revelations from the gods. This practice of seclusion and sleeping in the temples — holy incubation, as it is called — grew in popularity when it became associated with the curing of bodily ills. It is noteworthy that this is the path by which the West is today returning to the study of dreams, after centuries of neglect, by way of psychoanalysis, thus looking at dreams from the therapeutic angle rather than as divinatory light. "The healing art in the temples of Aesculapius, and at the shrines of Egypt and the East, had always been magical," wrote H. P. Blavatsky in *Isis Unveiled* (II. 502).

Discussing this subject in great detail in his *Understanding of Dreams*, Raymond de Becker explains the rationale of "Incubation and Induced Dreams" and observes:

Doubtless these cures were not essentially different from those which occur at places of pilgrimage such as Lourdes. In both these cases therapeutic effectiveness was obtained by a sort of communion with a healing archetype. This will only seem surprising

to people who are ignorant of the effective action of the great symbolic images on the human soul, an action that modern psychotherapy has used with success.

Synesius of Cyrene, following the teaching of Plato, recommended the practice of Egyptian priests who made notes of their dreams in the Temple of Memphis. It was by this means that J. W. Dunne established the fact of his ability to dream of future events. It may be noted incidentally that the publication in 1927 of Dunne's *Experiment with Time* marked the beginning of a change in the public attitude towards dreams, making clear that prophetic dreams are possible, indeed, that they may be rather common.

Synesius, however, deprecated the tendency to ritual in the practice of incubation, lest the form obscure the importance of self-search. Nor should dreamers look to professional interpreters to understand their visions. The Gods, he wrote, are nought save mind, and divination "comes from ourselves — from within — and is a private quality in each individual life of soul." Similar is the teaching of H. P. Blavatsky who observed that "by cultivating the power of what is called 'dreaming,' clairvoyance is developed." No ancient civilization has failed to see in dreams the source of true knowledge. Among the Mayas of Central America, a caste of priests called *Cocom*, meaning the "listeners," practised divination by dreams. There was a similar class among the Aztecs in Mexico, who were, however, given to decadent customs.

From the Egyptian and Greek traditions, the Romans took the practice of looking on dreams with awe and mystification. Artemidorus, who flourished during the reigns of Hadrian and the Antonines, wrote his monumental book on dream interpretation, which has for centuries been the source book for most of the "popular" dream books, and it is stated to have borrowed heavily from the Babylonians and Assyrians who, although imitating the Egyptians, laid greater emphasis on demonology.

The Islamic tradition was evidently derived from the earlier Assyro-Babylonian dream cults. Dream activity was basic to the teachings of the Prophet Mohammed, as he was supposed to have received his divine mission in a nocturnal vision. God communicated the revelation to the Prophet in dreams covering a period of six months. Islam inherited the practice of incubation from the peoples it converted, and made the custom sacred in the rite known as *istiqâra*. The art of divine interpretation itself, dignified as a science, took its place among the higher orders of natural philosophy, and its study gave rise to many *Tabir*

Name or Dream Books in which the nature and import of dreams are discussed with minuteness. These are published in all Islamic languages—Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Urdu.

If it is an Eastern custom "to cleanse one's hands in rose water before taking up the sacred books of poetry," how much more sanctity, circumspection, solicitude and forethought are to be exercised before meeting the pale, ethereal lilies of dreams! How easily can their beauty be marred! How soon their grace shattered! Those who would worship in the innermost sanctuary of dreams, it is warned, should leave at the threshold the shoes which they have worn in the dust of the highways of the world, for the place where they have to stand is holy ground. The bourn that one goes to on leaving this familiar world is a wonderful garden of sleep, faint glimpses of which one catches in Swinburne's introduction to the *Mysteries of Blake*:

One thing is too certain: if we insist on having hard ground under foot all the way, we shall not get far. The land lying before us, bright with fiery blossom and fruit, musical with blowing branches and falling waters, is not to be seen or travelled in, save by help of such light as lies upon dissolving dreams and dividing clouds. By moonrise, to the sound of wind at sunset, one may tread upon the limit of the land, and gather, as with muffled apprehension, some soft, remote sense of the singing of its birds and flowering of its fields.

But the crude and brutal hand of science cannot help dissecting the roses of reverie and lilies of dreams, and a recent article in the *Scientific American* provides an exhaustive account of years of research concerning what has come to be known as "the dream cycle." By brain-wave measurement and by careful observation of the rapid-eye-movement which characteristically accompanies dreams, it has been determined that dreaming is not haphazard. It is further proved that, during a normal night of rest, experimental subjects pass into and leave the world of dreams approximately four times.

Of particular interest is the finding that the first "instinct" of the dreamer is to pass directly into the deep-sleep state. Though the dream level must be crossed in order to reach deep sleep, experiments have shown that human consciousness resists involvement and begins the first cycle of obvious dreaming only after the stage of sleep has been attained and relinquished. In a healthy, normal person the descent—or ascent—into deep sleep is rapid with the first dreaming period occurring when consciousness has approached quite closely to waking.

Obviously the sleeper seeks the condition farthest removed from the persistent bombardment of sensory experience. Then, refreshed by a kind of communion that is in no way measurable by testing devices, consciousness once more moves in the direction of involvement with the problems of waking life — but only for a short time. The first dream-cycle — perhaps the time when the most profound meanings are implanted in dream symbols and experiences — usually occupies only ten minutes. Following this, there is another entrance to the deep-sleep state, though by this time the influence of earthly involvement is stronger and the deep sleep not as deep.

Correspondingly, the next ascent to the dreaming level invites a more protracted involvement — approximately twice as long as that of the dreaming which occurs after the first and deepest sleep. By the time the fourth cycle has been reached, dreaming time has increased by a multiple of four, and the deep sleep is still less “deep.” Here, it seems, we have an appropriate scientific explanation of why it is that the most profoundly important dreams are not easily recalled, for at least three successive periods of increasingly sensory dreaming have intervened and memory is obscured.

It has been proved conclusively by Dr. William Dement of the Mt. Sinai Hospital that all human beings dream, and that the differences of people’s reports are caused solely by their capacity to recall and translate what has occurred during the cyclic passages through the dream-layer of consciousness. If some people assert that they seldom or never dream, it only means that they belong to the “non-recallers’ group.”

As regards what happens if the dream cycle is disturbed, it has been found that the curtailment of dreaming time produces anxiety, irritability, a greater appetite and a gain in body weight. As soon as the subjects of the experiment were allowed their usual dreaming time, they regained their emotional composure.

It is particularly remarkable that dream research indicates a return to the views of many ancient philosophers, as the mechanics of dreaming reported recently fits harmoniously with the viewpoint expressed by Artemidorus *c.* A.D. 140:

Dreams and visions are infused into men for their advantage and instruction. And both sacred and profane histories furnish such a variety of examples concerning the true event of dreams that it would argue incredulity and ignorance not to credit them.

Hippocrates is of opinion that whilst the body sleeps, the spirit is awake, and transported to all places where the body could have access, and it sees and knows all things which the body could know and see when awake, and touches all that it could touch. In short, that it hath all the operations that the body, now asleep, can be capable of when awake.

When it is remembered that one-third of our existence is spent in sleeping and dreaming, this expenditure cannot be considered as a waste, as Kant is stated to have deplored, since it forms an integral and necessary part of our existence — not less natural than our acts of wakefulness, and associated with them by various intermediate phenomena. Eminent neuro-physiologists like Sir John Eccles confess their inability to know what exactly sleep is or what causes it. They affirm that when the brain is asleep, it is in the same state as when a person is anaesthetized, or in a coma, and nerve-cell activity is light. But the brain is also in a similar condition when a person is having convulsions, and this is because of too many driven impulses reaching it.

Somewhere in between [affirms Sir John Eccles] lies the conscious world of wakefulness and control of individuals and their actions. To understand this consciousness is one of the great problems of current research, for the human nervous systems are the most important things in the world.

(To be continued)

THE SUBJECT [of sleep and dreams] is one of enormous extent as well as great importance, and theosophists are urged to purify, elevate, and concentrate the thoughts and acts of their waking hours so that they shall not continually and aimlessly, night after night and day succeeding day, go into and return from these natural and wisely appointed states, no wiser, no better able to help their fellow men. For by this way, as by the spider's small thread, we may gain the free space of spiritual life.

—W. Q. JUDGE

LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MIND

"I WOULDN'T really mind if only I could define it!" He made an emphatic gesture denoting half annoyance, half disgust, and sat down.

"What is the matter with you?" asked one of our group. He had just come into the room out of the rain and had overheard the last sentence.

Our friend looked up with a degree of hope in his eye: "Well, you're new for the moment; perhaps you'll have some ideas! I've exhausted everyone here, and am getting nowhere."

"Fine, but what is the problem?" asked our newcomer.

One of the girls in the group threw wide her hands and said in a tone of exasperation: "He's just discouraged because he can't find the right words to clothe his ideas. He wants to know what 'thought' is — that's all: What is 'thought'?"

"True," murmured my neighbour, who had been silent for a while, apparently lost in "thought." He raised his head and looked around at us. "Let me try to recapitulate all we've said." He turned to the newcomer who had by now shed his raincoat and was sitting near the door. "Our despairing young friend came in from college about an hour ago; he'd been listening to a lecture on Mind. He wanted to know what the 'Mind' is, what 'thought' is, and whether 'thought' is different from 'feeling.'"

"Yes," interjected the inquirer, "and ever since all the answers, suggestions and ideas have only succeeded in confusing me worse than ever. Incidentally, do you think animals think too?"

"Wait a minute; go slowly," said my neighbour. "Let's not add to the confusion by introducing another subject. Let's deal with 'thought' and 'mind' first and then we can go to the consciousness of the animals."

"Oho!" one of us from across the room exclaimed. "Now we have 'consciousness' also!"

"Surely," said our friend. "'Consciousness,' or 'perception,' implies the witnessing of an event. Further, there must be a 'perceiver' (or witness) to observe. Now, it is a well-known axiom in science that any change in time, space or motion can be accurately evaluated only by some 'perceiver' who is stationary. Change cannot perceive change. Do you agree?"

We all nodded assent. Our troubled friend raised his head and cocked a wary eye at my neighbour, who continued slowly: "So, if there is a 'perceiver' in each one of us, which is by definition stable and able to evaluate all kinds of subjects that are presented to his awareness (or 'consciousness'), it keeps a record of these somewhere, and this we sometimes refer to as 'memory,' 'remembrance,' or 'recollection.'"

"Aren't all these terms synonymous?" asked another of the girls.

"Not quite," answered our friend, "because they represent different kinds of effort in bringing back impressions left by past events. But shall we leave a closer definition of these powers of the Mind" — he interjected this hastily, and raised a hand to still rising questions — "until later. Let me," he added, "finish this brief analysis before you offer objections to my use of words. I used the word 'consciousness' a while back because it covers the whole range of awareness, of impression, of memory, if you please. It is a power which continues unbroken and links past, present and future — wait a minute, *please!* — I mean the impression left of a past event, the present witnessing of events, and the anticipation of the future."

"Memory or anticipation are not thinking, though," interjected our original inquirer.

"True," answered our friend, "but the process of thinking uses them, doesn't it?"

A grudging "I guess so" was the answer.

"Now let me pass to another idea: If we can change our minds, then *WE* are not the mind. The mind is subordinate to *US*. If we observe many feelings and desires and can change them, then *we* are not our feelings or our desires, but are something other than and superior to those."

"Then what about 'will'?" asked the newcomer from the door. "Will is certainly a power that can be used by the 'real I,' something we could call *MYSELF* — not the petty, selfish self — I mean the Perceiver, the Thinker within."

"There we go again!" — this in despair from our original inquirer. "I can't seem to get the distinction between feeling, thought, perceiver and mind. 'Will,' too, is most difficult to define. In class we speak of 'motive' and 'behaviour' and we say through observation that 'motive' arises because of needs and wants (which I guess you would say in your terms are 'feelings' — right?) or because of some external stimulus. 'Behaviour' is the result of others' actions impinging on us, or our needs

coming to the surface to secure our survival or comfort, or something necessary or pleasant to us. 'Motive' is the kind of action that we then generate to secure for ourselves — or for others whom we love or need — necessities or pleasant circumstances."

"I see," said the newcomer from his place by the door. He got up and walked slowly into the centre of our little circle, looked down at our inquirer with his troubles, made a small odd gesture, and added: "Let me see if I can add something to what you have said. Maybe we can adjust the two viewpoints. They may even be saying the same thing in a slightly different way. Many of the motivational and behaviouristic schemes and points of view could be summed up, almost humorously, in two phrases: 'I want,' and 'You shouldn't.'" We all laughed, and he continued slowly: "I don't mean to be trite, but there is something far more serious and deeper to consider. The whole of Nature lives evidently under many laws and the one vast all-embracing LAW of the Universe that unites *all* beings into a single *whole*. Some may contest this, but taking the largest, widest viewpoint, as also the most distant in time, both backwards and forwards, we can guess that there is a purposiveness to evolution. Some philosophers have used the idea of 'perfection' to denote an ultimate goal. Others have spoken of Universal Brotherhood as an actual fact in Nature, so that there is the interaction of so many diverse forms. One thing is evident: LIFE and PURPOSE as well as INTELLIGENCE run through all."

"I must contest that," said a new voice from behind him. "What do you mean by 'intelligence'? Can you say an atom is intelligent? Or a stone? Or a plant? Or an animal? Would you not rather use the word 'intelligence' in regard to humans only?"

"Human intelligence is of a different kind from intelligence in the lower kingdoms," answered our friend, "but my use of the word included all forms of intelligence. Intelligence is the capacity to note, to perceive, and to react within the framework of law, time and space, regardless of the level of consciousness of the being."

"Oh dear!" one of the girls murmured, interrupting.

Our friend smiled slightly, and said: "Let me make it simple. Take any form, mineral, vegetable, animal, or one of the several elements, whether singly or in combination. Would you not agree that the individual atoms must have gained experience over an appreciable period of time, and in various environments?" We all nodded agreement. "Now we all know," he continued, "that the nature of the atom is electromagnetic,

and that it is made up of electrons, protons, neutrons and other particles, much like a miniature solar system. We are thus speaking of sensitive impressionable things, which can register experience — and this forms a kind of memory. Agreed?”

A puzzled look on some faces assured him that he had gone beyond the depth of some.

“I don't see what is the use of an atom registering impressions or memories,” exclaimed our original inquirer. “Of what consequence is an atom anyhow?”

“If you will agree,” our friend rejoined, “that the atom *may* be impressionable, and *may* be living and moving, and *may* have a purpose since it exists in Nature, then it follows that everything, however vast or however small, exists for *some* purpose, was started for some definite reason, and, logically, would be progressing through experience to some defined goal.”

He paused, to let that sink in. Several nods from around the room encouraged him to go on: “I'd like to suggest that there are three main lines of evolutionary progress working through Nature as we know it: One is the developing consciousness of form, or ‘matter.’ This is a kind of memory of experience gained which is impressed by LIFE on the sensitive nature of the atom. The second is that very LIFE as a universal, causal power or force — some might use the word ‘SPIRIT’ or ‘ABSOLUTE-NESS’ — since it would be really impossible to describe it.”

“*Neti, neti, neti,*” someone murmured.

“Correct: not this, or this, or this, as the Vedic sages said; indescribable Source, and yet potency as a universal power or motive force propelling all beings to evolve. Third, in between, is the intelligent medium: Mind in Nature as the eternal link between motivating Spirit and matter that is acted upon. Without the power to perceive, to evaluate, to will, to feel, to understand, the whole evolutionary process would be an exercise in futility. In one sense it is Universal Mind focused in mankind, as the ever-active developing consciousness-awareness in Nature.”

“But that still does not answer my original difficulty,” said our inquirer. He added: “I see that if your thesis is correct, the mind is a power to correlate experience, and apparently also to perform a kind of self-evaluation. I think,” he said with more excitement in his voice, “that I begin to see some daylight. On the one hand it notes feelings

as 'likes' and 'dislikes,' as 'needs' and 'duties.' But, to conceive of 'duties' would mean a higher faculty, would it not?"

"Correct," answered our friend, "The mind is dual in its nature because of its intermediate position between Spirit-Life and Matter-desire. Memory is the intelligence of past experience. When fully awakened, we could call it the power of apperception in full flower."

"This will need some thinking about," said another among us, and several nodded their heads in agreement. I could hear the pen of one scribbling rapidly over a piece of paper as he strove to set down the ideas as they flowed forth. He raised his head briefly to ask: "Would you say that 'mind' and 'thought' are different from 'animal consciousness' or derived from that?"

"Different, different," one of the girls exclaimed. "Would you say that the genius of a Leonardo da Vinci is the result of a form of evolved animal consciousness only? Something must be seriously wrong with our thinking if we believe it to be so, or possibly with our ability to understand ourselves." She continued, "I think I begin to see. If the mind is dual because of its position, then the 'lower mind' would relate to consciousness in matter or in form, and would serve to gather into one centre the experiences of all the atoms and cells and structures of matter that go to make up the body and its separate or corporate experience." Her voice quickened in enthusiasm and she responded to an encouraging nod from our friend. "In fact we could call this the *incarnation* of the mind into form, or self-consciousness wedded to the matter that is all around it and through which it experiences. Then," she continued more slowly, "the action of the higher aspect of the mind is impersonal in nature. We mentioned 'duties' a while ago. Anyone who knows about duties knows that they are not always what we would *like* to do, but are things we know *have* to be done. That means that the higher good prevails over the lesser inclinations. I wonder," she closed on a musing note, "if this is what is meant by the triumph of mind over matter?"

We appeared to have gone far afield. Our original inquirer turned to the friend who had been taking notes and asked to see what he had written. A moment of quiet descended over our group, broken by a few low-voiced dialogues in various corners of the room. He handed back the papers and said, slowly: "I seem to get this clearly: Humanity, that is, 'man,' is a mind-being with independence. All forms are intelligent, but mankind alone is able to reflect about itself. Apparently we

can do this because in one aspect of the mind our thoughts can be impersonalized and directed towards an understanding of the laws of Life — I guess I'll have to use the word 'Spirit' as it seems to cover the purposiveness of evolution. Thinking is a faculty; it includes the use of the memory of the past. It includes will or volition in so far as one makes decisions now concerning the direction of our choice — and if we are to choose rightly, then we need to know a lot more about Nature, her departments, her laws, the relations of various kinds of beings; in fact, we have to become continual and attentive students!"

My neighbour picked up a little book he had brought, and the gesture interrupted our inquirer, who then motioned to him to read what he evidently thought was appropriate. "Vigilance is the path to Life Eternal. Thoughtlessness is the path to death. The reflecting vigilant die not. The heedless are already dead.' This," he continued, "is from the *Dhammapada* — the record of the spoken words of the Buddha, over 2,500 years old, and He goes on to say: 'Fools and witless persons give themselves to sloth. The wise value vigilance as their best treasure.'"

"Exactly," said our inquirer, now become a thoughtful reflector. "I see that the higher mind then is wedded to the 'universal mind,' or, perhaps, that spiritual self-consciousness is wedded to universal self-consciousness."

My neighbour nodded affirmatively and rose to his feet to get ready to leave. It had stopped raining. He opened the door, hesitated a little, half turned and looked back at us, saying: "If we want to know what fire is like we would have to experience it, get within its range. Our consciousness, a more experienced form of life, has entered into close union with a lower form of life — it is not a union of matter, but a union of *consciousness*. As long as this union lasts, the consciousness of the higher is *partly* absorbed or identified with the consciousness of the lower. The consciousness of the lower is *fully* identified with the consciousness of the higher, and thus is gradually raised to the condition of 'conscious Godhood.' When we think in terms of the Universal SELF, not in terms of mere liking and disliking, then that is the Higher Mind at work."

REINCARNATION

[The following is from a private letter written by Damodar K. Mavalankar to William Quan Judge. It was first published in *The Platonist* and was reprinted by H.P.B. in her *Theosophist* for June 1884 under the caption we use above. Mr. Judge himself reprinted it in *The Path* for January 1896 under the title "Some Views of an Asiatic."

The answer given to the question put by Mr. Judge, "What is Reincarnation?" will sound strange and irrelevant to the hasty reader and the casual student. Careful study and some reflection will reveal the metaphysical basis of transmigration and metempsychosis.—Eds.]

You ask me what is my belief about "reincarnation"? Well, as it is a complicated question, I must give you a plain statement of my full belief. To begin with, I am a Pantheist. I believe that *the whole universe is God*. You must, however, well understand that the word "God" does not convey to me any meaning attached to that word by the Westerns. When I say "God," I understand it to be nature or universe, and no more. Therefore I might more appropriately be called a "naturalist." To my mind there is no possibility of the existence of an extra-cosmical Deity. For if there were, the harmony or equilibrium of nature could not be preserved, and the whole universe, instead of being one harmonious whole, would be a Tower of Babel. This harmony can be kept only by the working of the Immutable Laws of Nature. And if the laws of nature be immutable, they must be blind, and require no guiding hand.¹ Hence the existence of an extra-cosmical Deity is impossible. This is, as far as I can understand, the chief teaching and principle of Aryan philosophy. As the position is logical, I must accept it in preference to the Semitic theory, which rests on blind faith alone.

Some of the Pantheists recognize the existence of two distinct entities, *viz.*, Matter and Spirit. But thinking deeply over the subject has led me

¹ As this sentence is likely to be misunderstood, the attention of the reader may be drawn to the article on "The Metaphysical Basis of *Esoteric Buddhism*" published in the last month's *Theosophist* [reprinted in THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for February 1963]. What is meant is that the *inherent* impulse acts blindly, *i.e.*, without any *extraneous* or *extranatural* power meddling with it as a "guide" or in any other way.—ED. [*The Theosophist*]

Allowance must be made all through for a lack of complete knowledge of the English language. What is here meant is that the inherent impulse acts according to its own laws without any *extra-cosmic* power meddling with it as a guide.—ED. [*The Path*]

to the conclusion that their position is not quite logical; for, as far as I can understand, there can be but one Infinite entity and not two. Call it either matter or spirit, but it is one and the same. Who can say that this is spirit and that matter? Take an instance: ice is a gross form of matter. If a little rarefied it will be water, which is still matter. Higher still, it is vapour; still matter. Higher, gas; it is still matter. Further, it becomes ether, but it is still matter; and then you may go on *ad infinitum*. Thus becoming more and more sublimated, it will reach its climax by the way of spiritualization. But still it does not become nothing. For if it does, there must come a time when the whole universe will be nothing. If it is so, it is not infinite, as it has an end. If it has an end, it must have had a beginning; if it had a beginning, it must have been created; and thus we must assume the existence of an extra-cosmical Deity, which, as said above, is not logical. Then we thus logically find that this highest sublimated form of matter cannot be nothing. In this case matter has reached that climax of sublimation or spiritualization when any further action would make it grosser, not finer. What is commonly understood by the word *spirit*, then, is nothing but that highly etherealized form of matter which we, with our finite senses, cannot comprehend. But it is still matter, inasmuch as it is still something and liable to be grosser.

There is then *only one* eternal infinite existence, call it either spirit or matter. I will, however, call it by the latter name, as that is most suited in its common understanding for what I am to state. Matter, as you know, we call *Maya*. Some say that this thing does not really exist; but I do not agree to that. In my opinion, it is called *Maya simply on account of these transformations*. It is never steady. The process is ever working. The one infinite agglomeration of matter is in some of its modes becoming grosser, while in others becoming more sublimated. The circle is ever turning its round. Nothing goes out of that circle. Everything is kept within its bounds by the action of the centripetal and centrifugal forces. The *forms* are changing, but the *inner substance* remains the same.

You will ask: "What is the use of being good or bad if our souls in proper time will be etherealized?" But what is the soul? Is it material or immaterial? Well, it is material for me, and there is nothing immaterial, as said above. As far as I can think, it is an agglomeration of all the attributes together with that something which gives us the consciousness that we *are*. But in the case of the ice, it was not sublimated

until touched by heat. The centripetal force was strong in its action, and it required the centrifugal force to refine the ice. Just so with man. The action of the centripetal force keeps us to our gross forms, and if we have to etherealize ourselves, we must supply the centrifugal force, which is our *will*. And this is the first principle of Occultism. We must study and know the forces of nature. Every result must be in proportion to the cause producing it. We are every instant emitting and attracting atoms of matter. Now, a person who is not an occultist will have various desires, and unconsciously to himself he will produce a cause which will attract to him such atoms of matter as are not suited for his higher progress. The same way, when he is emitting others, he may give them such a tendency that they will mix with others evilly inclined; and thus other individualities, which are thus formed, will have to suffer for no fault of theirs. But an occultist directs both. He is the master of the situation. He guides them, and by knowing their action he produces such conditions as are favourable to his obtaining of "Nirvana."²

But what is Nirvana? By Nirvana I mean a *state*, and not a locality. It is that condition in which we are so etherealized that instead of being merely a mode of the Infinite Existence, as at present, we are merged in totality, or we become the *whole*. Another thing about the advanced occultist is that he is in a better position to benefit humanity.

The particles of which I am formed have always existed; yet I do not know in what form they existed before. Probably they have passed through billions of transformations.³ Why do I not know these? Because I did not supply the force that would have prevented the disintegration of my individuality.⁴ I will, if I attain Nirvana, remain there, till the action of the force that put me there ceases; the effect being always in proportion to the cause. The law of Exhaustion must assert itself.⁵

² It is said that Buddha attained to Nirvana before he left this earth, hence he was always free.—ED. [*The Path*]

³ That all the particles of the matter of our universe have passed through millions of transformations, and been in every sort of form, is an old assertion of the Adepts. H.P.B. in *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* points this out as showing how the Adept may use matter, and it will also bear upon the protean shapes the astral matter may assume.—ED. [*The Path*]

⁴ This word is used to mean the personalities; the person in any birth. Since the letter was written, *individuality* is much used to mean the indestructible part.—ED. [*The Path*]

⁵ If this be right—and I agree with it—Nirvana has to come to an end, just as Devachan must; and being ended, the individual must return to some manifested plane or world for further work.—ED. [*The Path*]

In passing through this process of etherealization, you all along give a certain tendency to the particles of which you are composed. This tendency will always assert itself; and thus in every cycle, or reincarnation, you will have the same advantages which you can always utilize to be free soon, and by remaining longer in the Nirvana state than the generality of humanity, you are comparatively free.⁶ So every consciousness, which has been once fully developed, must disintegrate, if not preserved by the purity of its successive Egos till the Nirvana state is attained. Now I believe that the full development of my consciousness as Krishna is possible only on this earth,⁷ and therefore if I die before that is done, I must be reborn here. If I reach the Nirvana state, even though I am in another body, I shall know myself as Krishna.

Now I suppose this is sufficient for you. It is difficult to put such ideas on paper. Such things are to be understood intuitively.

THE WHEEL of life moves on; a wheel of which the spoke is the understanding, of which the pole is the mind, of which the bonds are the groups of the senses, of which the outer rim is the five great elements, of which the environment is home; which abounds in old age and grief, and moving in the midst of disease and misfortune, it rotates in space and time.

—ANUGITA

⁶ The comparison made is with the general run of men in all races. They are not free at any time. In the writer's opinion there is a certain amount of freedom in being in Nirvana; but he refers to other and secret doctrines which he does not explain.—ED. [*The Path*]

⁷ This has always been accepted, that only on earth could we unify the great potential trinity in each, so that we are conscious of the union, and that when that is done, and not before, we may triumph over all illusions, whether of name or form, place or time, or any other.—ED. [*The Path*]

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

The old practice of "dowsing" — water-divining or locating water by some innate feeling which the diviner is not generally able to explain — has of late aroused much public interest. Such persons when passing over underground currents or pockets of water feel its presence, and there have been well-authenticated accounts of the phenomenon from all around the world. Governments and local authorities and farmers, in places where finding water may be vital and difficult, pay good money for the services of a water-diviner. Nor is water the only thing to which this technique applies. It is used also to look for minerals, and bodies buried by a landslide or a mine disaster, and for archaeological remains. More, it is said to work not only on the ground, but over a map, thus enabling the area of search to be narrowed in advance.

An article on "Dowsing: Fact or Fiction?" by Anthony Lejeune (*The Daily Telegraph Magazine*, April 23) describes the experiments conducted by him and brings out how little present-day investigators understand about this phenomenon. "Dowsers," he writes,

do not by any means agree about what they are doing or how they do it. They use rods and pendulums and pieces of wire; a few of them even say they need nothing at all, but just hold out their hands. They argue among themselves about whether the phenomenon is physical — that is, whether some emanation from the hidden water or mineral acts directly, not on the rod (no one believes that), but on their muscles — or whether it is a form of clairvoyance or extrasensory perception. The prevailing view is that the explanation cannot be purely physical, since that would not account for the ability to dowse over a map and hardly for the variety of things found.

Some dowsers like to carry a "sample" of what they are looking for, but this, they say, is rather to help concentrate their minds than as a form of sympathetic magic. Another dispute, over which dowsers divide fairly evenly, is whether this is a faculty which everybody possesses and which needs only to be cultivated; or whether a lot of people, but not all, possess it; or whether it is a rare talent.

Experience has shown that dowsing experiments under test conditions often do not succeed, yet the fact remains that there are many successful dowsers the world over. "Why do people pay more attention

to a few artificial tests than to a lifetime of successful work for hard-headed clients?" one woman dowser asks.

What makes some persons susceptible to certain influences? As suggested in *The Theosophist* for April 1885, the preponderance of the watery element in particular individual constitutions may lead to a more perceptible effect on the rod in their hands. But many diviners do not use any instruments; they simply feel the presence of water. A paragraph in *Theosophy* for December 1927 declares that the divining rod is never necessary except

to arouse the confidence of the inner psychic man. The work is done through the perceptive affinities of the unseen — not Higher — self, with the powers and substances of Nature. Given full knowledge of self and nature, no such objects are needed; powers of this kind are exerted by the unaided soul — in some quarters.

The ability some people have to dowse over a map points to the same subtle link between the map and the region it represents as between a photograph and the person pictured in it.

In her article "Miseducation of Children" (*The Times of India*, June 24), Sarla Mukhi deplors the top-heavy and largely bookish curriculum in Indian schools and colleges and the learning by rote that it encourages. Apart from its ineffectualness, the burden that such mugging places on the student impairs his mental health and leaves him bored and baffled. Today, there is some realization of the inadequacies of higher education. But, "when thinking is not part of the academic system that has nurtured a young person for eleven years in school," the author asks, "how is it possible for him to begin to think independently at the college level?"

The faulty system begins at the primary stage, where the foundations of learning are laid. So great is the stress on formal learning in our institutions that reproduction of matter committed mechanically to memory is often mistaken for intelligence. Little care is taken to find out whether the child is doing any thinking.

True education is a far more challenging process. It entails thinking, asking questions, debating and discriminating. Then alone can the mind grow independent enough to pursue real knowledge through a lifetime. . . .

Unless we give children the opportunity to experience situations of many different types . . . and above all to ask questions

about their experiences, they will not learn to think in those early years while the thrill of discovery lasts. If the thrill vanishes under the soulless impact of an unimaginative system of education, the critical faculties atrophy and the mind becomes increasingly reluctant to make any independent effort....

Encourage children to think from their earliest years and they will be more responsive to the demands of higher learning, when the time comes, than those who have from the age of five or six memorized and recited the notes given by their teachers. Such notes are a great disservice to the cause of education. They provide a smoke-screen for ignorance to the naturally lazy child. Many a skilled memorizer has done well until exposed to the vital necessity of thinking for himself. The keen, active and inquiring child on the other hand finds all the joy of learning vanish if he is imprisoned in the strait-jacket of learning by rote....

As a famous psychologist has said, "For every student who thinks clearly and has difficulty in communicating his thoughts verbally, there are easily a hundred others who say things they have not thought through." This is the crux of the problem of education and the root cause of later disaffection and conflict. Millions of rupees are being wasted on turning out spuriously educated young men and women who feel no commitment, debate no major issues, respond to no cause except those that entail blind slogan-mongering.

This is in line with the real objects of education as outlined by H.P.B. as far back as 1889, in the section on "Theosophy and Education" in her *Key to Theosophy*, where she states: "Children should above all be taught self-reliance, love for all men, altruism, mutual charity, and more than anything else, to think and reason for themselves. We would reduce the purely mechanical work of the memory to an absolute minimum, and devote the time to the development and training of the inner senses, faculties and latent capacities."

The concept of Universal Brotherhood is catching on and is fast becoming part of the thinking of modern man. Writing on "Training Young Minds," in *Bhavan's Journal* for May 30, Mrs. A. F. Balabrega stresses the role of education in fostering the idea of Universal Brotherhood:

Every single man is linked with every other man from the highest to the lowest and with all living creation as well as with

the entire physical and spiritual worlds in one wholeness. Every nation has developed something according to its nature and evolution of race, and each has something to contribute to and something to learn from the other for the benefit of all.

Education throughout the world should therefore create in the hearts of mankind a new kind of patriotism, born of mutual understanding, tolerance and compassion, and develop into Universal Brotherhood, without distinction and difference, and beyond any flags or geographic boundaries. This may eventually transmute political dominations, racial discrimination and economic exploitation and blot out the constant reminiscences of cruelties of past wars and revolutions which are only aggravating hatred, greed and selfish nationalism.

In bettering the individual through self-development and self-knowledge, education should start with developing a positive and constructive attitude to life.

Children should be trained in mutual love, respect and forgiveness as members of one great family all over the world; they should be taught always to try to put themselves in the place of others they criticize or envy, and to realize that these others may have a heavy cross to bear, even if it is different from theirs.

They should be taught to realize that "killing" for any cause or for any ideology, however righteous it may be claimed to be, is only a way to war and violence and does not promote the peace for which the world is longing.

A timely article on "Non-violence in Action" by Pyarelal, who had spent the best part of his life with Gandhiji, analyses the roots of non-violence, how it can be made effective in action and cultivated through a constructive programme. (*Sarvodaya*, July 1971)

Ahimsa or non-violence [he writes] is not the name of a particular form of action. It is the quality of our action that constitutes Ahimsa. If our action lacks that quality, it will not show the power that is non-violence, although outwardly it may have the form of non-violent action. In other words, it is not the act itself but what lies behind the act that makes it non-violent. . . .

What is Ahimsa? It is the power that manifests itself in us when we develop an awareness of oneness of life. It cannot be taught by

word of mouth. But it can be communicated by the personal example of one who has himself experienced it....

Non-violence or Ahimsa is soul force as opposed to physical force or brute force, and superior to it. It is at work everywhere, every moment, even in nature in the raw where the law of the jungle is supposed to prevail. It is the law of our being. We have all experienced it one time or another....

To cultivate the power of Ahimsa we need to have the innocence of a child, the purity of heart like a child's, a child's unsophisticated faith in its mother.

There is, however, one difference. In the case of a child its innocence is its unerring guide. But we, who have eaten the fruit of knowledge, need knowledge for our unerring guidance. Man is an odd mixture of the angel and the brute. Knowledge is that which enables us to know the angel from the brute in us....

To cultivate the power of Ahimsa we have to identify ourselves with all that lives, to make the joys and sorrows of others our own. We must feel the good or harm done to others as good or harm done to ourselves. And this awareness should be so keen that when they suffer we actually suffer with them, just as the whole body feels the pain when any member of it is bruised....

Self-denial, joyous and joy-giving, that our love for others can evoke in us is the only true measure of our love. The five basic spiritual disciplines — truth, non-violence, *i.e.*, returning good for evil, non-possession or voluntary poverty; non-stealing, and complete self-control — are thus five corollaries of the law of universal love, otherwise known as Ahimsa. They are also the test points on which our practice of that law is tested. Ceaseless practice of these spiritual disciplines constituted Gandhiji's striving or *tapasya* for Ahimsa....

There is none of us, I believe, who, if he looked around him, would not find someone less privileged and less able to face life and its problems than he. Let every *Shanti Sainik* [fighter for peace] make it a point to look up one such and try to make his today better than his yesterday, his tomorrow better than his today.... Each little step taken in this way will indicate the next and clear the way for it.... The regulation of relationships among the *sainiks* in their camp or in their own homes can serve as a university *par excellence* for the cultivation of the power of Ahimsa.
