




THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO



Vol. XIV No. 2

December 17, 1943

We are not called upon for judgment, but for right action ; to act rightly ourselves, and by precept and example induce it in others. If we essay this task, it will at once appear that we cannot act rightly unless calmly. We have to cultivate Calmness under all circumstances. Calmness is like a rock ; waves of irritation may dash at it, but cannot affect it ; it can be attained by seeing the necessity for it, and by endeavour which is constant. It comes from " resting in the Real, " which is never moved, but moves all things, sees all, without being involved.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

PUBLISHER'S ANNOUNCEMENT

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT : Established November, 1930. Published monthly by Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay, India.

This Magazine is an Independent Journal, unconnected with any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS : No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, each beginning with the November issue. All subscriptions should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price, \$1, 4s., Rs. 2, per annum, post free.

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

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

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS : Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine, when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts direct to THEOSOPHY COMPANY (INDIA), LTD., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. Those objects are :

- (a) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour ;
- (b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study ; and
- (c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

सत्यान्नास्ति परो धर्मः ।



There Is No Religion Higher than Truth

BOMBAY, 17th December 1943.

VOL. XIV. No. 2.

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|
| Be Natural | .. | 17 |
| Disciplining the Child | .. | 18 |
| Answers—By <i>W. Q. Judge</i> | | |
| General Principles | .. | 20 |
| The Spiritual Matrix and Evolution—By <i>H. P. Blavatsky</i> | .. | 27 |
| The Actor and His Mask | .. | 29 |
| In the Light of Theosophy | | |
| Free-Will and Modern Science | .. | 31 |

AUM

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

BOMBAY, 17th December 1943.

VOL. XIV. No. 2

BE NATURAL!

"Most of our troubles come from not being natural. Of course, we are, in a way, not natural to matter, and so we either rebel against its attractions or succumb to them, instead of just using naturally what offers for our experience. If we were really natural, self-discipline would be as natural as breathing, and all our relationships harmonious and complementary. But what knots we do tie in mind and heart! It would be a hopeless task for individuals if they could not glimpse the issues wider than themselves, and work for a Cause far beyond their own stature."

Nature is Matter or Prakriti; its opposite pole is Spirit or Purusha. As these are two aspects of the One and reach a balance-point in the human kingdom, there takes place there a real struggle for existence and the final survival of man in Spirit or his dispersal in Matter.

The Self of Matter and the SELF of Spirit can never meet. One of the twain must disappear; there is no place for both.

To be natural each of us has to learn to be natural to both Spirit and Matter, using both with the knowledge of the Great Science and becoming Master-Servant of both. Self-discipline implies the Spiritual Controller and the Material controlled, used and elevated. Self-discipline means Self disciplining Matter, Nature or Prakriti in oneself. When a student does not like mortifying his lower nature he denies to himself his right to be the Friend of God, his own Higher Self. To be truly natural is just that.

When worldly people advise the student of Theosophy to be natural, what they imply is—"Be as we are and do what we do, *i. e.*, live the round of sensuous existence with its bitter-sweet, take the cash and let the credit (in more than one sense) go. Have no concern about the Great Hereafter but worry over the hurly-burly here." When Theosophy advises its votaries to be natural it points to the Discipline of Life, of Nature or of Matter plus that of Spirit or Superior Nature.

Krishna is Master of *apara* and *para prakriti*, of the lower and the higher nature, and Ishwara in man likewise should become master of his dual nature.

It is through discipline that individuals could glimpse the issues wider than themselves. A simple single act of discipline like attentively listening to a Theosophical lecture, or reading with a little concentration the Three Fundamental Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine*, has been known to widen and even deepen human perception. It was attentive and devoted listening to the words of the Master which enabled Arjuna to see the worthlessness of his depression, to understand his mental confusion, and to pick up the bow which he had thrown down saying, "I will not fight."

Are we always able to glimpse the issues wider than ourselves or are we tied up in the knots of personal thinking and sensuous longings? Are our mind and heart concerned with the narrow affairs of what we desire and want and of our small world, or are they magnanimous, touching the struggles and hopes of humanity, of which each of us is an integral and a responsible part?

The urge to better the lot of humankind is very general, but that noble impulse is misdirected by false notions rooted in modern knowledge with its dogmatic attitude and its narrow vision. Many blunders surround us on every side and they are not the results of wickedness as much as of

folly and thoughtlessness. A good impulse dashes itself against the rock of a false basis and disappointment and despair are the results.

There is a great deal of talk about escapism: ailing minds and sick hearts find escape in sense thrills as well as in social service. The right type of escapism founded on knowledge and followed out in soul-discipline is called Emancipation. One aspect of Emancipation is escape from the round of material existence, but True Emancipation is engagement in, and not escape from, the round of duty which Spirit renders to Matter by the Grace of Renunciation.

Theosophy shows the way to that attitude from which we can glimpse the issues wider than ourselves and also the correct way to Supreme Felicity.

DISCIPLINING THE CHILD

Theosophy presents very definite guidance for the parent or teacher who recognises his responsibility to the old soul that has come in a new body. It takes seven years in general before the personality has reached the point where the Manasic Ego can take a firm grip on it. Before that day, when real responsibility of the child begins, his elders must prepare the field. The Ego on arrival ought to find its personality a garden, trim and sweet, instead of a rank jungle to be cleared. For that it depends on those who surround the child to provide the right conditions. Every child requires an atmosphere in which its innate good unfolds and grows as naturally as a flower. And every child needs discipline to help it starve out such tendencies brought over from past lives as are out of line with the soul's aim. "The neglected child is the cell whence springs the disease of crime."

The responsibility of the parents cannot be shifted. Motherhood especially is a full-time job and the mother who realises her child's need of the right atmosphere and influence will be slow to relinquish his care to servants or to relatives whose way of life is not inspired by Theosophical ideals. The atmosphere depends largely on how conscientiously the elders try to discipline themselves. However poor the home, it can be clean

and orderly; however plain the food, it can be tastefully prepared and served on time. However many the obstacles the parents have to face, steadiness and courage can be the attitude to life. Children are great imitators. If the elders are broad and tolerant and free from prejudice of race or creed, a child imbibes that attitude as naturally and unconsciously as it breathes in the air.

But everything cannot be left to the atmosphere, even supposing it to be ideal. Discipline is needed one's whole life long. Karma itself is the great disciplinarian for us all. And parents and teachers have to discipline the child or they fail in their trust. Their discipline is only a makeshift until the child, understanding something of his own nature and of the law, can progressively take over the disciplining of himself. But, however temporary, such outer discipline is indispensable. And it cannot begin too young. The Law of Karma must be taught from the dawn of ability to connect effect with cause—and that means long before the child can walk or talk! Before he is a month old he should have learned some valuable lessons. Already rhythmic action, punctuality in time, regular feeding, regular taking up and laying down should have impressed orderliness on the very lives of which the little body is composed. The shout of temper is quite distinguishable from the cry of pain; the baby should have learned that shouting does not bring what it wants or turn aside the cycle.

Consistency in the demands upon the child as he grows older is an aspect of the same orderliness. The same action must not be punished at one time, condoned at another. The parent or the teacher stands in so far as the representative of the moral law. It is never erratic in operation and he must not be in his requirements. As the child grows but is still too little to reason with mild corporal punishment may be necessary. In the first years a slap on the hand may be more effective than an expression of displeasure, to convey a necessary lesson. But no punishment should be given in anger and, from the age of four on, for the parent to fall back upon superior brute strength is to confess moral impotence. Punishment of some kind does sometimes become necessary after that age, not in a vindictive spirit

but as an expression of impersonal law. If a child warned of a certain result of infraction deliberately breaks a rule he must receive the promised penalty. There will be no resentment where the innate sense of justice is not offended. The temporary deprivation of a privilege, sometimes even sending a child to his room to think things over, may bring him to a better resolve for the future. But the punishment must not be such as to injure the child's self-respect.

Deal with each child as a unit, and work to bring out his special aptitudes, but do not make the mistake of excusing him from every difficult or irksome task. It is by encouragement in overcoming obstacles that a child can be helped to confidence in his ability to cope with difficulties, to "carry with fortitude the burden of life."

Do not begrudge the child the reactions nature brings him where these cannot be of a serious character. Naturally, playing with matches without supervision is not meant! But suppose the child carelessly starts off without the bus fare he has been given. The wise parent will not call him back for it; he will let the trudge back from the next bus stop teach its own lesson. Or if a child obstinately objects to washing his hands before turning to his painting-book, let the ugly smudges convince him of his unwisdom.

Freedom and self-reliance being the aim, the child should be encouraged to make his own choices as far as possible. The parent's decision might be a better one, but making a decision and getting the reaction is an important means of growth. Whenever possible an allowance should be given for spending-money and later for clothing, and only necessary guidance given.

But when the question is of what music shall be habitually listened to, what books shall be read and what cinemas seen, the parent cannot evade responsibility. The child brought up on real music will naturally turn later from the ugliness and the emotional intemperance of jazz. And the parent can no more let the child read harmful books in his formative years than he can let him eat spoiled food. Indeed, poison for the mind is far more lasting and drastic in its effects than bad food for the body. The "comics"

do great mischief in debasing taste and blunting finer sensibilities. Give the child books which can instruct, uplift and inspire, accounts of travel and adventure and discovery, stories of great Teachers. Present noble patterns for his copying. Whitehead writes that "moral education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness." As well let children train themselves for murder by giving them toy guns and laughing at their playful shooting, as give them for their reading the lives of the international desperadoes the world calls "great." With the problem of the cinema we shall deal in a later issue.

A safeguard against wrong types of activity is to provide legitimate outlets for energy and interest, opportunities for healthful exercise and games of skill. The team spirit has a valuable contribution to make to the co-operative attitude. But the emphasis must be on the clean fun of playing, not upon winning. The competitive spirit that is so bad in education has to be fought upon the playground too. Encourage each to do his best in school or on the cricket field and let it go at that. But the rules must be kept. That cannot be too much insisted on. The rules of the game of life have to be kept. The lesson can be brought home in a game of dominoes or chess.

Creative energy must be given an outlet, as in manual training, and the instinctive love for beauty fostered by encouragement to make something beautiful. Interest in nature should be encouraged and the unity of life made plain.

Some don't's are necessary, but too many are bad. The emphasis should be instead upon the do's. Be unselfish, be truthful, be helpful, be diligent! Insubordination and impertinence cannot be tolerated for a moment, but if the child is brought up rightly from the start respect for parents and teachers should be instinctive. The child's natural sense of responsibility must be fostered and self-examination encouraged from an early age, at first with parental help. Co-operation in the duties of the household must be expected from the day when the toddler can carry a plate safely from shelf to table.

The Timeless Ego's status must be recognised and respected and the child taught to listen for the guidance from within. Appeal to his better nature should be effective in almost every case. The inculcation of the Theosophical attitude to life is the aim of Theosophical discipline, the production of free, unprejudiced, unselfish men and women its natural result. Special attention may be called to "A Word to Parents" in the *Teacher's Manual and Guide to the Eternal Verities* (pp. 65-73).

ANSWERS BY W. Q. JUDGE

[In 1889 was started in New York *The Theosophical Forum* which was devoted to answering questions which were invited. Many persons answered questions, among them W. Q. Judge. We have gathered together all the answers prepared by Mr. Judge and have grouped them according to subjects. Last month we reprinted answers on the subject of "Theosophy and the Masters." In this issue we reprint answers on

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

What is meant in the Proem of *Secret Doctrine* (Vol. 1, page 14,) by the term "bare subjectivity" as contrasted with "Unconditioned Consciousness," for the latter would seem to be "bare subjectivity" itself? It is entirely comprehensible how the Absolute "Be-ness" may be symbolised, on the one hand, by abstract Space, and, on the other, by abstract Motion, but not so readily perceived how Space may be defined as "bare subjectivity" when Motion is contrasted with it as the pure noumenon of Thought.

In the *Proem* cited the author distinctly says under (a) that "speculation is impossible" about the omnipresent Principle, and then to give one way of symbolizing it—which is certainly not definition—proceeds to state that that Infinite Principle is the same as the "unconscious" and "unknowable" of European philosophy, in which, indeed, the *Forum* editor takes delight. She then says it is symbolized in the *Secret Doctrine* as absolute abstract space, which one must conceive of as *space* distinct from all things existing therein; we cannot exclude this, nor at the same time really conceive of it. And in the same way, when we come to regard this omnipresent Principle from the point of view of the root of consciousness, we postulate it as being—in this aspect—*absolute abstract motion*, because consciousness has the quality of motion in it and not the quality of space, since motion has to have space in which to move. So then, having thus vaguely symbolized space, which is not consciousness, we have to say that, on the other hand, considering it as apart from consciousness, it may be said to be "bare subjectivity," although we have to use our consciousness in order to deal with it at all. The editor's question, "Can anyone conceive of abstract colour?", seems peculiar, since it is not foreign to all the schools of Western thought, where many assert—as, indeed, it would appear

they must—that apart from any particular motion or colour we can conceive of motion and colour in the abstract apart from particularization.

(April 1892, p. 2)

In "*Secret Doctrine*," Vol. 1, among the remarks upon sentiency of matter and force, I find this statement—"This consciousness has no relation to our consciousness." Now as all knowledge is the result of comparison, and our "consciousness" being at one and the same time the cause and instrument of knowledge, as acts the process of obtainment and knowledge itself, why does the "*Secret Doctrine*" make affirmations, the data of thought or knowledge being absent?

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

(September 1892, p. 7)

Theosophy holds God to be One and eternal,—Absoluteness itself. The Bible says that man was made in the image of God. Man we understand to be composed of seven principles,—a union of the three higher, the immortal principles with the four lower, those which disintegrate and go back to the dust. Are not all these principles, or parts, which are found in man, found also in God? I ask because some teach "Nothing is but Spirit."

Matter seems to me to be one aspect of Spirit. It comes from something and goes back to its place, and there is no place outside of God.

I have not the hardihood, as the Editor has, to affirm in one breath that we must not speculate on the Infinite, and in the next to give attributes to the Infinite, such as immanency in all things, separability from us, and the like, and, taking his advice to confine ourselves to common-sense and what we can know, I waive the discussion on the question of the Absolute or an infinite God. It is hopeless. The quotation in the question proceeds in use therein upon the assumption of a God who can be understood and described either directly or by analogy or contrast. This is wholly beyond me. But I am quite willing to repeat that the Teachers whom I follow say that the Absolute exists and cannot be discovered nor known; that at the dawning of what is commonly called creation and evolution Spirit and Matter appear in space. This I accept, for it fits in with the logic of the rest of the doctrine. They call this the first differentiation. The assertion—made chiefly by the schools of mind-cure—assumes that spirit only is, but cannot explain nor justify the assumption, which is only, indeed, for the purpose of founding other assertions regarding mere bodily ills of no great consequence except to the weak or those devoted to material enjoyments. It is further taught and seemingly with reason that, in all, seven cosmic differentiations take place, and from these the sevenfold constitution of man is derived. His gross body stands for the whole of gross matter, his astral body for another differentiation, his passions for the energy of the heterogeneous cosmos, his life copies another of the seven, and so on until all are complete. But if you postulate a God, you must put man either in him or outside; and if the latter then your God is not infinite, but has in his universe something that is not himself—for the Infinite must be all. It is much safer to construe these Bible verses in the old Theosophical way, which would in the present instance show that man is made in the image of his God, who is his Higher Self. If the other position is adopted, that of postulating a God and giving him any attributes whatever, then your mind can have no possibility of reach-

ing a conclusion save by the arguments and distinctions made by the schoolmen of Europe and the disputing theologians of India,—and that conclusion may temporarily, say for one life, satisfy you, but it will remain false. It belongs to the great number of the illusions of matter which are ever deluding the mind of man.

(December 1892, p. 3)

In "*Secret Doctrine*," Vol. I, p. 15, H. P. B. says: "This Infinite and Eternal Cause... is the rootless root of all that was, is, or ever shall be. It is of course devoid of all attributes, and is essentially without any relation to manifested, finite being." H. P. B. repeats the statement in other places in her works, and it has been a constant puzzle, for I cannot understand how It can be without relation to manifested being and at the same time be the root, however rootless, of all that was, is, or ever shall be. To my mind the essential idea of "root" is relation, and, as the word is used in the text, the ultimate of all relativity is reached.

I may use the laconic style of the Editor and reply: You are wrong. Not wrong in being puzzled, for that is evident, just as it is a fact that the quotation you make is *not* on p. 15 of *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, but is found on p. 14. A little matter you think this error. Yes truly, but in high metaphysics little errors assume immense proportion, and the mistake as to the page will show liability to the other mistake of not looking into the whole subject. Only a few lines above the words quoted, H. P. B., defining a highly abstruse metaphysical position, lays down the proposition that there is "an omnipresent, eternal, boundless, and immutable PRINCIPLE on which all speculation is impossible." This is the "Rootless Root" spoken of. Its nature cannot be speculated on, although we may say It is, for we have to start from that. Necessarily it is out of relation to manifested things, since relativity begins only upon manifestation. You can perhaps say that this Rootless Root is potential of all things, but not that it is related. The "Rootless Root" is only a means of stating in convenient form what is said in the larger sentence I have quoted, and not to permit disputes as to relativity because of the meaning of "root." That such is H. P. B.'s meaning—in which she agrees with many old philosophers as well as some modern ones—is very clear indeed, for but

four lines above the place where you culled your quotation she asks you to remember that this Principle "antecedes all manifested conditioned being." But long and wordy speculations avail nothing, and unless you take the time to saturate your mind with metaphysics and the relative terminology which every philosophy is compelled to use—especially English—in speaking of things and ideas not relative, and become familiar with time and place for seeing a new meaning in words so materialistic as ours, you will always be puzzled. The word "spirit" is used in English in reference to God, to Man's Soul, to Man's nervous currents, to elementals, to astral shells, to mere alcohol, and to describe simply a quality of an act, all these running up and down the gamut from most gross to highest spirit. Is it to be wondered at that you and the Editor found a difficulty in the question? In Sanscrit you would find no such difficulty. (*April 1893, p. 4*)

Is it a fact, as sometimes asserted in print, that everything in Nature is dual, and that nothing can exist or even be conceivable without its opposite? I don't see the necessity for this.

The Editor's easy disposal of the question is also pure assertion, it seems to me. I can think of no proposition so easy of proof, and of which there is so much evidence in the material, mental, and psychic realms, as the one that duality rules universally in Nature. The Sun is the day ruler, the Moon the night ruler; the first giving direct light, the other reflected beams,—in both cases dual. The day is one side, the night the other; and thus light and dark are a duality. In the earth's travel it brings two opposites—heat and cold. Man and animals are male and female—dualities in sex. The word "male" would not connote its present meaning unless there were its opposite. The magnet—a mundane universality—has two opposite poles, one attracting, the other repelling: they are opposite in position as well as in effect. Indeed, it would be tedious to prolong a list that could be extended over the whole range of nature from the little to the great. In the argument used by the Editor that "Intelligence would be intelligence just as truly if there were no such thing as" its opposite, and in other like arguments

and illustrations, there is pure assumption. The word "intelligence" describes a quality found among men, but "stupidity" is also to be found there, and one is hardly justified in assuming that a time will come when stupidity will be gone from the cosmos, leaving only intelligence, unless it be also assumed that the complete and exclusive prevalence of intelligence is the known object and end to which the universe is tending. Of course optimistic thought may make this assumption but pessimism is as much entitled to construct an opposite one and say that stupidity and chaos are the final end and aim. In order to apply the editor's illustration we must grant the possibility underlying his words "if," but no one knows that intelligence is the quality that shall finally prevail above all, and it is allowable to reunite his sentence thus: "Stupidity would be stupidity just as truly if there were no such thing as intelligence."

We are dealing with Nature wherein there is the duality referred to. Every illustration used by the Editor is in itself a duality and understood only through the existence of duality. To assume the destruction of duality is to reduce into a state of nothingness both as to consciousness and the thing cognized. If we take his illustration of evil disappearing and good prevailing, then there must be assumed for the event a cognizer to perceive the good and to feel its effect, which at once makes the final all-embracing duality of a cognizer and the thing cognized, felt, or perceived. If no cognizer is present, but the Universe is simply goodness and naught else, then we have nothingness once more, since there is no mind or consciousness to note it. But as this is not so, we have to conclude that in the final analysis, whether objects be one or many, there must be a perceiver and that which is perceived.

(*January 1894, p. 2*)

Are Plane and Principle ever interchangeable terms? Can a Principle be said to be a Plane of the working of the next higher Plane, *i. e.* as Buddhi is the vehicle of Atma, or the ethereal double necessary as the bridge for Prāna to cross over to the physical body? May they be said to be analogous to Spirit and Matter, opposite poles of the same thing?

It does not seem to be right to try to interchange these two words, for it will result in mixing up the ideas. A plane is, like a plane surface, quite different from a principle, just as gas is different from the place in which it may exist and be felt. Plane of consciousness is used to designate the stage or metaphysical place the consciousness has reached or may be on or in. But to say that a principle of this plane is a plane for some higher state is very mixed, for it would result that thereby our individuality would be lost and all be reduced to annihilation. Whereas as each individual retains his identity and thus must preserve the identity of his principles, whatever those are, it must follow that his principles are not planes but remain as before principles. However, it must be remembered that the word "principle" is used loosely, and sometimes that which is not such is so called. It is easy and definite to retain the actual meaning of "plane" and not try to mix it with some other word. I cannot see any analogy between these two words and "spirit and matter," inasmuch as *plane* means a place for operation or use and *principle* is that which uses or operates on a plane.

(December 1893, p. 7)

I should like to have explained what is meant by all experience in the *Secret Doctrine*, page 17, where it is stated that it is necessary to pass through all experience in this manvantara before the Divine Spark can be individualized. Does this mean that one must in the human kingdom have experience of each phase of civilization? Must one be a plumber, carpenter, painter, minister, lawyer, physician, etc., before he can reach full consciousness? I am aware that all experience cannot be attained in any way but by repeated re-embodiments, but the stumbling-block in my mind is what is meant by *all* experience. Further, is it necessary to go through the whole school of crime in order to develop strength to progress?

First, experience, under evolution, in and through all nature's kingdoms is a necessity for all egos because they constitute the spirit, spring and impulse of evolution; without them there would be no evolution. Hence all of that general experience is necessary because inevitable; and only by that great experience is individuality attainable. That is so because such is the law of our being.

Now, take any one of such progresses or kingdoms. It was full of variety. Such variations were inevitable and necessary. Curious shapes of animals were evolved in the evolutionary struggle, all necessary in such a struggle to make perfect. But they were only details in a grand whole, like steps on a journey. Does it trouble us, does the question about "all" arise here? If not, why should it arise about mere details of changing human life, not yet perfect, still struggling to attain, to alter, to polish? Plumbers, painters and carpenters are mechanics, as are those in many other more desirable occupations, but all are for mechanical experience due to our, or any, form of civilization. And the ego cannot get intuition of mechanics if it never is put through that sort of experience. "All experience," being thus found in a statement relative to great outlines and objects of evolution, must be considered thus and not as a mere detail. All possible experiences can be put under a few heads and it is those general types of experience we have to pass through. How would an ego know of motherhood and fatherhood if it never had the experience? Telling about them would not suffice. How would it know of governing if it had never governed, nor of submission if it had never been in bonds? There should be no stumbling-block in the word "all."

(December 1895, p. 118)

If every one starts from and returns into "that" (spirit), what is the object of existence in matter? Is this the only way to fulfil the soul's desire?

The questioner should enquire a little further as to the meaning of "matter," for if thereby mere mortal material life is meant, the truth about matter has not been grasped. The worlds of heaven, of the "devas" or "angels," are worlds of matter, and yet such worlds are sought after by those who ask the question under consideration.

Furthermore the occultists hold that *spirit* has not as yet incarnated fully in the existing race, but will do so in future ages; then men can say that they have a spirit. At present the men who are incarnated spirits are Adepts or Mahatmas. Toward the moment of this grand incarnation we

are hastening, and the experience now being undergone is to settle the question whether we will fail. Assuredly all are called to this grand work, but just as certainly some will not be chosen.

(May 1889, p. 8)

Do we begin a new round of embodiments after Pralaya? If the past does not suffice to end the "descent into matter," can we expect the future to do so?

One of the cardinal principles of Theosophy is that evolution by means of manifestation is periodical, one *manvantara* succeeding the preceding one as its logical and natural successor. Hence the present one is the legitimate successor of that which preceded it, is its resultant in every way, but necessarily higher since there can be no going back. It is postulated in the *Secret Doctrine* that the descent into matter changes into the reäscend to spirit in this present round. Those of the race who shall not succeed before Pralaya comes on in attaining to truth will necessarily have to go through whatever reëmbodiment is needed in the succeeding *manvantara*. This is natural, just, and reasonable. Those who attain in the vast stretch of centuries yet before us to the height of power, wisdom, and perfection will not have to go through reëmbodiment unless they wish to do so: it quite likely that a great many of them will, out of love for the new and struggling ones of that future *manvantara*, descend into matter for the help and benefit of those below them. Perhaps by that time, so many millions of years hence, the questioner will have developed so much through struggle and effort as to be quite undismayed by the prospect of another fight with matter then. But certainly now it is looking a long way ahead, seeking for a fanciful idea to dwell on this future possibility in a *manvantara* which is for us inconceivable in time as well as in quality.

(January 1894, p. 9)

Two inferences may be drawn from Theosophical writings with regard to the Ego of man: one, that the Ego is a direct incarnation of a god descended from a higher plane to take up its abode in the human form evolved for its use by Nature; the other, that the Ego is latent until the body is sufficiently evolved, when the Ego gradually awakens to activity. While aware that there is only an apparent contradiction, I should be glad to see the two conceptions reconciled.

Unless the questioner has some special and peculiar meaning for "direct incarnation," there does not appear to be any actual or apparent contradiction between the two inferences stated. What the special meaning is I do not know. Assume that the Ego is a "god on a higher plane," and there is no impossibility in supposing that, coming to this plane, it is so surrounded by the clouds of matter as to become latent or hidden until the time when the form suitable for this plane is evolved. This is the only sort of latency which can be alleged of the Ego. This also is what Theosophical writings say to me, and among those writings I place the *Bhagavad Gîtâ*. In that, Krishna, the Supreme Being, identifies himself with *Ishwara*, who is the Ego "seated in the hearts of all beings." Patanjali also says the same, naming that Ego, who is the Spectator of all things, by the name *Om* or Lord of Glory. The *Secret Doctrine* continues the same view. The Christian view and Theosophy must also agree, since Jesus, in exhorting his disciples to be as perfect as the Father in heaven, must have had in view the doctrine that the Father dwelt in and is Man: otherwise we could not become perfect as he is. I therefore do not see the need for reconciling contradictions which do not exist.

The Ego—meaning thereby the Self, *Ishwara*, Krishna, the Supreme—is unborn, changeless, all-knowing. It knows evolving Nature, the instrument, but the latter comes but slowly to a knowledge of the Self. It is therefore latent only in the sense that there are periods when the instrument, the false personality, recognizes it not. Such a period is the present, when although the body has been evolved by Nature—with the aid of the Ego—we do not know the Ego. Why not, then, if the inferences of the question are right, apply them to the present time? If thus applied, then, under the position thus taken, the Ego is still latent and will be until *Manas* is fully developed in a succeeding round.

To assume that the Ego is latent until Nature has had time to evolve the suitable form is to give to Nature power and consciousness which we withhold from the Ego. Why, then, not call Nature the Ego and do away altogether with the latter? Or you would have to assume a God

beyond and above both Nature and Ego. The universe is either self-existent or it was projected into existence by some being whom we will call God. The Ego either was created by this God or is this God in itself. If the universe was not projected but is self-existent, then it and the Ego are one—God. Hence Nature in “evolving a body” which the Ego chooses to use is only showing forth the action of one of the powers of that Ego. But we can never solve the question of why the Universe or the Ego chooses to have two sides or ends, the negative and positive. All we know is that it must be so. The negative is—Nature, qualities, false personality, matter; the positive is—God, Ego, Spirit, Life.

(December 1894, p. 1)

If our Higher Self was primarily an emanation from the Divine, why the necessity for this pilgrimage of successive incarnations? What advantage does the Ego derive from its association with the mass of matter we call our personality? If it is said that it is for the sake of gaining knowledge and experience in relation to every aspect or manifestation of the universe and on every plane of consciousness, why the necessity of such to what was divine from the beginning, and must from its very nature possess a consciousness of all existence and be in itself the source of all knowledge?

It seems to me very difficult if not impossible to answer this question. It is one of those which the great sages and teachers of the world have refused to answer, on the ground that it was profitless to attempt it when we are unable to understand much simpler matters of consciousness, and, were one able to cognize spirit, the question would not be brought forward. Hence they were accustomed to make enquirers wait until they got more interior light. It would seem as if all one could do would be to give probable reasons why no full answer can be made.

If we say that God is not the universe but is an entity apart, then, placing the spirit of man as a third separate entity, it will be seen, I should think, that for it to descend into the material universe would be a great degradation from our point of view. But it does not follow that our view is correct; we know that our knowledge of material nature is so limited that we often think that degraded which in fact is not, as is perceived

by other minds more comprehensive. Even in the case supposed the spirit might of itself make up its mind to sacrifice and for its own reasons descend into matter. Similarly in life we know there are instances where pure, good, and happy persons take up with relatively degraded conditions for sacrifice or for charity combined with sacrifice. This would be a sufficient answer to the question under the assumptions made, unless we think that our individual opinion of what is and what is not the best thing to do must govern.

But I view God and Man and Universe as one whole. As an unmanifested whole I can only name it the Absolute; when it manifests it becomes what is called Spirit and Matter, still of the whole. Without such manifestation there would be nothing: it would abide in itself as what we should have to call “nothing,” because then there would be neither cognizer nor cognized. Since it is evident that it has manifested, it must follow that it has done so for its own purposes, said by us to be for obtaining consciousness and experience. If so, any “descent into matter” will not be a fall nor a degradation at all, since those are relative terms altogether, and since spirit and matter acting together do so for the one purpose. Man’s present state is described by man to be a fallen one, but that is because living in a world of relative things he has to use terms to describe his present state. It does not follow that he will always deal in such words. When evolution shall have carried the whole race to a point of immense progress, knowledge, and wisdom, the mind of man will see more of truth, and doubtless be well satisfied with all the work and discipline gone through, leading up to the new and better state.

I think questions of this nature arise unconsciously from a sort of dissatisfaction with present environment in the world, and evolution from a desire of personal satisfaction and betterment according to a standard made up from and in a civilization that is based on a fundamental idea of separateness. For if we think we are separate from God and his universe, then alterations of state and condition will be naturally thought of as needful, and the question will arise, “Why did we fall if we were once divine?” I do not admit

that "we were once divine and have fallen"; but say that we are divine and always were, and that the falling is but apparent and due to the personal consciousness which calls that soul which is not and that not which is. We are God, and working out in various personalities and environments the great plan in view, and that plan is well known to the dweller in the body who calmly waits for all the material elements to come to a realization of their oneness with God.

(October 1894, p. 5)

Was the "fall into generation" on the physical plane a normal feature of human evolution, as stated in some Theosophical books; or was it abnormal and not intended by nature, as said in other Theosophical books?

It would be well if every one were to quote when they say, "as said in some Theosophical books," giving name of writer and of book, for it is very unfair to the *Forum* and any writer in it to be compelled to answer to the purport merely of a statement in some volume. The context of such statement might put the whole matter in a different light, or we might find that there was a misquotation.

It cannot be said by a well informed Theosophist that nature has any "intentions," nor should any man have the temerity to claim an acquaintance with those if they existed. If in the writings of some Theosophist a reference can be found to "nature's intentions," the context will certainly show that the words were used figuratively in describing apparently settled natural laws.

It seems to me that the "fall into generation," when explained Theosophically, is not abnormal. Since things are as they are under Karmic Law, according to law and not by chance, there can be no step in it that is abnormal. Besides this, the word "abnormal" is one that is used by us to designate that which appears to be out of the usual course solely because we do not know all the facts and factors. As in the case of the eccentric movements of certain planets, which led to the discovery of another one which had caused the eccentricity. Before the last one was found the movements of the others were certainly abnormal, but ceased to be so considered when

the discovery was made. Hence "abnormal" is a word that describes a thing only relatively and not absolutely.

But H. P. Blavatsky, who is, we suppose, a good Theosophical authority, speaks clearly enough upon our question. In Vol. 2, *Secret Doctrine*, p. 62, line 19, she says: "Moreover, there are two 'Falls' in Theology: the rebellion of the Archangels and their 'Fall,' and the 'Fall' of Adam and Eve. Thus the lower as well as the higher Hierarchies are charged with a supposed crime. The word 'supposed' is the true and correct term, for in both cases it is founded on a misconception. Both are considered in Occultism as Karmic effects, and both belong to the law of Evolution: intellectual and spiritual on the one hand, physical and psychical on the other. The 'Fall' is a universal allegory." And on p. 228 of the same book she gives a more detailed view of the fall of certain of the Dhyanis "whose turn it was to incarnate as the Egos of the immortal, but on this plane senseless, monads," stating in the second paragraph on the same page: "the 'fall of man' was no fall, for he was irresponsible."

Then as if to furnish forth the answer for the question as to the "intentions" of nature, the same author heads her explanation of Stanza II (in the 2nd Vol., p. 52) "Nature unaided fails," and on p. 56, second paragraph, she says: "Thus physical nature, when left to herself in the creation of animal and man, is shown to have failed." If the second volume of the *Secret Doctrine* proves anything about "intentions" in the matter of evolution, it is that nature had none whatever, and, if she had, failure would follow attempt at realization. This subject is interesting and, studied with the help of Madame Blavatsky's book, will be of benefit to the student.

(March 1890, p. 10)

Can we find the God in ourselves before we have realized the Divine Life outside of us?

As there is no such possibility as *divine life outside of us*, for all, heaven, earth, hell and God, are within, the question cannot be answered by either Yes or No.

(April-May 1890, p. 12)

THE SPIRITUAL MATRIX AND EVOLUTION

[The following Editor's (*i. e.*, H. P. B.'s) Note was appended to an article by the well-known Egyptologist and Symbolist Mr. Gerald Massey in *The Theosophist*, Vol. III, p. 81, for December 1881.—Eds.]

Summed up in a few words, this article asks for further information about "elementals"; suggests that they may be what Spiritualists would call "the spirits" of deceased animals; offers this as a new idea for the consideration of Eastern philosophers; and points out that if the adepts of occult science had been privileged to read Darwin they might, with their peculiar powers of clairvoyance, have been able to detect in the elementals, shapes which would identify these as *reliquiæ* of Man's imperfectly developed ancestors.

The comprehension of what occult science really is, has spread in Europe so very imperfectly as yet, that we must not be impatient even with this curiously entangled view of the subject. European mystics, when further advanced in the tedious study of unintelligible books, will often be hardest to persuade that they must go back some distance on the paths they have travelled, before they can strike into those which lead to the fully illuminated regions of Eastern knowledge. They are naturally loth to confess that much time has been wasted; they try to make the fragments of esoteric Eastern philosophy they may pick up here and there, fit into the vacant places in the scheme of things they have painfully constructed for themselves, and when the fragments will not fit, they are apt to think the corners want paring down here and there, and the hollows, filling up. The situation which the European mystic does not realise is this:—The Eastern occult philosophy is the great block of solid truth from which the quaint, exoteric mysticism of the outer world has been casually thrown off from time to time, in veiled and symbolical shapes. These hints and suggestions of mystic philosophy may be likened to the grains of gold in rivers, which early explorers used to think betokened somewhere in the mountains from which the rivers sprang, vast beds of the precious metal. The occult philosophy with which some people in India are privileged to be in contact, may be

likened to the parent deposits. Students will be altogether on a wrong track as long as they check the statements of Eastern philosophy by reference to the teachings and conceptions of any other systems. In saying this we are not imitating the various religionists who claim that salvation can only be had within the pale of their own small church. We are not saying that Eastern philosophy is right and everybody else is wrong, but that Eastern philosophy is the main stream of knowledge concerning things spiritual and eternal, which has come down in an unbroken flood through all the life of the world. That is the demonstrable position which we, occultists of the Theosophical Society, have firmly taken up, and all archæological and literary research in matters connected with the earliest religions and philosophies of historical ages helps to fortify it. The casual growths of mystic knowledge in this or that country and period, may or may not be *faithful* reflections of the actual, central doctrines; but, whenever they seem to bear some resemblance to these, it may be safely conjectured that at least they are reflections, which owe what merit they possess to the original light from which they derive their own.

Now the tone of such articles as that we have reprinted above is quite out of harmony with this general estimate of the position. Mr. Massey's mental attitude is that of a power in treaty with a collateral power:—"Give us this and this bit of information which you perhaps possess; we offer you in return some valuable hints derived from Western science. Weld them into your own inquiries, and you will, perhaps, bring out some fresh conclusions." Such an attitude as this is absolutely ludicrous to any one who has had the means of realising, even in a small degree, what the range and depth of Eastern occult philosophy really are. To say that offering knowledge or discoveries of any sort to the Masters of Occult Philosophy is carrying coals to Newcastle, is to say nothing. There may be some small details of

modern science which occult philosophy has not anticipated (centuries ago), but if so, that can only be because the genius of occult philosophy leads it to deal with the main lines of principle and to care as a rule very little for details—as little as for the material advantage or comfort they may be designed to subserve. Such broad conceptions as the theory of evolution, for example, have not only been long ago known to Eastern occultists, but as developed in Europe, are now recognised by them as the first faltering step of modern science in the direction of certain grand principles with which they have been familiar,—we will not venture to say since when.....

“If the Theosophist were also an evolutionist,” says Mr. Massey, “perhaps he would be able to fix the fleeting forms of his vision and perceive some of the spirits of Man’s predecessors on the earth.” If the European scientists whose fancy has for the first time been caught, within these last few years, by the crude outlines of an evolutionary theory, were less blankly ignorant of all that appertains to the mysteries of life, they would not be misled by some bits of knowledge concerning the evolution of the body, into entirely absurd conclusions concerning the other principles which enter into the constitution of Man.

But we are on the threshold of a far mightier subject than any reader in Europe who has not made considerable progress in real occult study, is likely to estimate in all its appalling magnitude. Will any one who has perused with only some of the attention it really deserves the article we published but two months ago under the title “Fragments of Occult Truth,” make an effort to account, in his own mind, even in the most shadowy and indistinct way, for the history of the six higher principles in any human creature, during the time when his body was being gradually perfected, so to speak, in the matrix of evolution. Where, and what were his higher spiritual principles when the body had worked into no more dignified shape than that of a baboon? Of course, the question is put with a full recognition of the collateral errors implied in the treatment of a single human being as the apex of a series of forms, but even supposing that physical evolution were as simple a matter as that how to account

for the final presence in the perfected human body of a spiritual soul?—or to go a step back in the process, how to account for the presence of the animal soul in the first creature with independent volition that emerges from the half vegetable condition of the earlier forms? Is it not obvious, if the blind materialist is not to be accepted as a sufficient guide to the mysteries of the universe,—if there really are these higher principles in Man of which we speak, that there must be some vast process of spiritual evolution going on in the universe *pari passu* with the physical evolution?

For the present we merely throw out hints and endeavour to provoke thought and enquiry; to attempt in this casual manner, a complete exposition of the conclusions of Eastern philosophy in this direction would be like starting on a journey to the South Pole *apropos* to a passing enquiry whether one thought there was land or not.

But we have, perhaps, said enough to meet the somewhat imperfect suggestion in Mr. Gerald Massey’s article to the effect that elementals may perhaps be the spirits of animals or of “missing links” belonging to a former epoch of the world’s history. The notion that in some immaterial shape,—one may use an absurd expression to set forth an absurd conjecture,—the spirits of any living creature can lead a perpetual existence as the stereotyped duplicates of the transitory material forms they inhabited while passing through the earthly stage of their pilgrimage, is to reckon entirely without the very doctrine which Mr. Massey so kindly offers for the consideration of Eastern philosophers. No more than any given material form is destined to infinite perpetuation can the finer organisms which constitute the higher principles of living creatures be doomed to unchangeability. What has become of the particles of matter which composed the physical bodies of “man’s predecessors on the earth.” They have long been ground over in the laboratory of Nature, and have entered into the composition of other forms. And the idea or design of the earlier forms has risen into superior idea or design which has impressed itself on later forms. So also, though the analogy may give us no more than a cloudy conception of the course of events, it is manifest

that the higher principles, once united with the earlier forms, must have developed in their turn also. Along what infinite spirals or gradual ascent the spiritual evolution has been accomplished, we will not stop now to consider. Enough to point out the direction in which thought should proceed, and some few considerations which may operate to check European thinkers from too readily regarding the realms of spirit as a mere phantasmagorical cemetery, where the shades of the Earth's buried inhabitants doze in an aimless trance.

THE ACTOR AND HIS MASK

One of the important teachings of Theosophy is about the human Personality as distinct and different from the Individuality. Says *The Key to Theosophy*:—

We distinguish between the simple fact of self-consciousness, the simple feeling that "I am I," and the complex thought that "I am Mr. Smith" or "Mrs. Brown."

The Personality really means "a long series of daily experiences strung together by the thread of memory," and most of these are not of the human soul, the permanent Individuality.

We Theosophists, therefore, distinguish between this bundle of "experiences," which we call the *false* (because so finite and evanescent) *personality*, and that element in man to which the feeling of "I am I" is due. It is this "I am I" which we call the *true* individuality.

The principal ingredients of the Personality carry within themselves the separative tendencies; the actions of the Individuality are unifying and they bring many, nay, all human souls into harmonious relationship with one another; the very building of the Personality starts with a disturbance in the rhythmic and joyous and painless, because non-separative, dream of the Devachanee. Sex of the body and the colour of its skin belong to the personality; caste and class belong to the personality; race and religion belong to the personality. The Human Soul is neither male nor female, neither plebeian nor patrician, neither black nor white. The forces which divide and compartmentalize humanity into opposing groups belong to the false egoity or

the personality. They are self-reproductive and the amalgamation into a single form produces the illusion of the reality of the personality in so thorough a manner that the very existence of the Soul or the Individuality is overlooked. Thus, for example, in the Hinayana school of Buddhism the teaching about the Five Skandhas—the five groups or bundles of attributes—is so misunderstood by the orthodox that the very doctrine of Reincarnation is explained in an incorrect manner.

Theosophy teaches that the birth, development, decay and death of the Personality is, like all else, according to Karma, the Law of Ethical Causation. Every constituent of the Personality, and the numerous expressions of each of these, spring into being not fortuitously but according to Law. Thus the sex of the personality, the family, the community, the nation and the race to which it belongs; the religious creed and the social status in which it is born and bred; are all laboured for and secured by the Individuality as instruments of further growth and progress. Each one of us determined and created the sex of our present body by our past actions; on certain sub-planes of the world of personality we are fashioning the sex of the future body to be used in our next incarnation; and so with race, creed, caste and colour which, together with sex, form the army of opposition to the formation of a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood.

The Human Soul or the Individuality is Manas, the Thinker. For the purposes of its evolution the instrument of the Personality was fashioned. Its work of focussing itself in a limited sphere has a dual aim: (1) In a limited sphere it is able to focus its light in a more concentrated and less diffusive manner, thus gaining more quickly the experiences of the world of gross matter; (2) working in the limited sphere of the Personality the Soul's function of elevating the matter with which it works is facilitated. Therefore there is nothing radically wrong with the Personality; what is wrong is the false value men and women place upon it, and its consequent false use.

The Five Skandhas, *i. e.*, *Rupa* etc., are the instruments of the Individuality but the tendencies and effects produced when they come in

contact with the world of objects prove disastrous to the harmonious evolution of the Individuality, the energizer. The student of Theosophy is told to weaken his Personality, so that its hold on the inner nature is not disastrous to both the Individuality and the Personality. A philosophic consideration of the relation of the Five Skandhas to the Individuality will considerably help the student in his efforts towards purifying and elevating them.

This mind is the ray of Manas which, entering the foetus in the mother's womb and weaving itself fibre by fibre with its body brings to birth and sets into active life the Personality. The Personality is an assemblage or a bundle of living energies coloured by and held together by that ray. *The Voice of the Silence* calls the manasic reflection or lower manas "the thought-producer, he who awakes Illusion"; that mind is called "the great Slayer of the Real" and the disciple is called upon "to slay the Slayer."

We, the Human Soul, the Thinker, have thought ourselves into male or female sex, white, brown or black skin and so forth. The force of sex, the pride of colour, the fanaticism of creed, etc., are rooted in the mind; where is sex-force in a corpse? Where is pride of race or skin or the inferiority complex due to these in the dead body? It is the lower manas which has fashioned them and sustains them. When the mind withdraws or imposes a new value on these cognate creations they die or assume a different status.

The Personality is the mask of the Real Man, the Thinker, and this mask is composed of the living energies bringing into existence race, creed, sex, caste, colour and other minor factors. Thus the Soul is not the White European or the Black Negro or the Brown Indian; the Soul colours the skin aspect of the Personality. The Soul is not Christian or Muslim or Zoroastrian; the personality fancies itself to be such. Again, the Soul is not of this or the other caste; the meditative introvert mind considering abstractions makes the personality a Brahmana or its active extravert outlook stamps it as a Kshatriya etc.; the four castes of Hinduism are a universal phenomenon.

The Vaishya is abroad and in the Occident especially the exploited Shudra has been retaliating for many a long year.

H. P. B. has given, more than once, the graphic example of the Personality as the actor playing a part:—

Let us call every new life on earth of the same *Ego* a *night* on the stage of a theatre. One night the actor, or "Ego," appears as "Macbeth," the next as "Shylock," the third as "Romeo," the fourth as "Hamlet" or "King Lear," and so on, until he has run through the whole cycle of incarnations. The Ego begins his life-pilgrimage as a sprite, an "Ariel," or a "Puck"; he plays the part of a *super*, is a soldier, a servant, one of the chorus; rises then to "speaking parts," plays leading rôles, interspersed with insignificant parts, till he finally retires from the stage as "Prospero," the *magician*.

Each one of us is an actor on the plane of the personality. We have made ourselves up. Or the make-up is a mask. We are good actors for we identify ourselves with the parts we are playing very thoroughly; but we are not great actors who control and manipulate and create the characters they are playing. Theosophy teaches us to become truly great actors—to handle the part in life, which is ours under Karma, with skill and knowledge.

Each human being belongs to a set or group of actors. Verily the world is a stage—many stages, on which different companies of actors are playing their comedies and tragedies, farces and revues. The Gods and the Sages are the beholders of the pranks and the foibles of humankind—and also of its grand and glorious deeds. Their approval and applause are encouragements to the actors; the distance in feeling and the silence observed by Them act as a sense of depression. The student of Theosophy trying to be a great actor, rivets his attention on the Gods and the Sages while acting with consummate skill his part on the stage of life. And he is bound to secure not only encouragement but inspiration if he remains faithful to the dual task—of acting his part as it should be acted (which implies the practice of Theosophy) and of watching the reactions of the Mighty Audience of his life-deeds.

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

FREE WILL AND MODERN SCIENCE

In these columns we have already drawn attention to the writings of the clear-thinking Chinese publicist Lin Yutang. His latest book, *Between Tears and Laughter*, should be read by every student of Theosophy for the philosophy of post-war world reconstruction it advances. Lin Yutang is a thoroughgoing idealist and humanist and being relentlessly logical he has come to realize the primary place which Karma and moral principles occupy in the affairs of mankind.

Scientific materialism is dead in the sphere of science but the ill effects it spread in the last century still play havoc with the Occidental mind which took that materialism as gospel truth and drew its own conclusions, applying its theories to morals and to politics, to ethics and to economics.

The charge of "materialism" is no mere *cliche*. Materialism is the very stuff and fibre of modern thinking, which dominates all postwar planning and makes a philosophy of peace impossible. Is it not true that almost all our proposals for the future peace stem from the one assumption that the cure for the ills of economic progress is more economic progress? Are we not thinking of peace merely in terms of a free exchange of trade, free flow of material, and "prosperity"? In other words, peace is canned goods, bigger and better canned goods. Peace is a condition where we may sell and sell abundantly. "Heaven" itself is a concrete, fireproof warehouse stocked to the ceiling with canned goods. For the world is now business, political business and economic business. A nation is a concern, a government is only its shop counter, and its diplomats are its travelling salesmen trying to outsell its competitors and beat them to a new market, and its publicists and thinkers are its expert accountants. The audacity of these thinkers of peace hurts my soul.

Who can deny that economic thinking has superseded all other forms of thinking, that economic issues, have obscured all other issues, that we are thinking of nothing but applying poultices to our economic sores, and that our highest spiritual hope is good business and plenty of consumer goods for all? And who can deny that this power and profit motive contains in itself the seeds of future wars? Who can gainsay the fact that we are living in a decade of moral and spiritual bankruptcy and of the elimination of morals from politics? Far from being an empty phrase,

materialism colours 95 per cent. of our effective thinking. In fact it is strangling our thinking.

Materialism practically rested on the concept of Determinism which translated itself as Fatalism on the moral plane. Theosophy has been showing the danger of the fallacies of determinism and fatalism for long years. And now the case has been pithily put by Lin Yutang:—

But while we are arguing about the content of freedom and raising the question whether the concept of human freedom has not changed, we are threatened with another more serious and more fundamental matter, which has come about entirely unnoticed, and that is, *Freedom of the Will has disappeared*. Unless we recapture freedom of the will, we shall not have the strength to restore human freedom, and unless we restore human freedom, we shall accomplish nothing with the Four Freedoms, even if we attain them. Why has the Freedom of the Will disappeared?

As a remedy he directly quotes the Great Buddha. Stating that fatalism is a scientific superstition and tracing the present chaos of Europe to the mechanistic mind, he says:—

Any analysis of the origins of Nazi thought as exclusively Germanic, which excludes the elements of general decay in all western Europe, is self-deceptive....

It can be proved that the world has gone to pieces as a direct result of scientific materialism invading our literature and thought. The professors of the humanities are reduced to the position of finding mechanistic laws governing human activities, and the more rigorous the "natural laws" can be proved to be, and the more freedom of the will is proved to be a chimera, the greater is the professor's intellectual delight.... For scientific materialism must spell determinism and determinism must spell despair. It is therefore no accident that the most admired spirits of our times, not the greatest, but the most in vogue, are pessimists. Our international chaos is founded upon our philosophic despair.

Saying that "Buddha at least understood the freedom of the Will, the power of the human spirit to overcome and transcend the wheel of the material world," he quotes some magnificent verses of the *Dhammapada*.

There is a great deal of common-sense talk in the book on the problem of human freedom, individual and collective. Convinced that man's free-will can operate to humanity's great advantage, Lin Yutang naturally has something fundamental to say about freedom. There has been much sentimental talk about the Four Freedoms. Here is a very Theosophical sentiment:—

It has sometimes seemed to me that we don't need the Four Freedoms, but only one Freedom—Freedom from Humbug. The supreme modern humbug is that the mere possession of facts is a good excuse and justification for dispensing with principles.

Rightly convinced of another Theosophical truth that "the changes in our way of thinking must be basic if we are to be saved," Lin Yutang points to the total absence of a right philosophy of life in modern civilization:—

What surprises me most in western thought is the almost complete absence of a philosophy of peace, by which I mean of peace, not merely as a hope in some utopian future, but peace as a normal condition of living in the present, as applied to the home, the nation, and the world. For instance, the technique of peaceful living, of domestic peace, national peace, and world peace, is hardly ever developed. Western social thought is either economics or political science. To me it is less satisfying than eating a juicy apple.

And he arrives at the truth of Karma as a means of correct understanding of modern chaos and the way out. The whole of Chapter 2, entitled "Karma," should be carefully read and pondered over by students of Theosophy; they at least do not "hate to ponder over the imponderables." He states:—

The Indian conception of Karma somewhat scares us with its exactitude. Truth pays (it makes us happy) and justice pays, and, if Indian metaphysics is right, freedom of the soul pays enormous dividends. Actually Buddha and the Brahmins never talked so vulgarly, but they meant substantially the same thing. We are willing to consider the imponderables if we can be made to see that they produce results, and if we can prove that action and reaction are equal in the moral as well as the physical realm. And so the word "Karma" has come to mean for me a means of restating a spiritual concept of history, of asserting the reality of moral causes and effects over against

economic causes and remedies. Unless this is understood, our discussion of peace and war can never rise above the level of swine-and-slop economics....

We cannot hear the scream of the radish, nor can Hitler reckon the "karmatic" currents set up by outraged and cut-up Europe. But history will make these plain enough in time when their effects become evident. And Hitler is not going to escape history. In other words, he is not going to escape the Wheel of Karma. I really wish Hitler were a Buddhist. He would have been a little more subtle. What the Germans never really understand is metaphysics, all Teutonic tomes to the contrary.

It is, however, not Hitler alone who ignores the karmatic currents of history. We of the Allied nations do not admit that such karmatic currents of "imponderables" exist, and we are not providing for them, being contented on the strictly swine-and-slop level of the war and peace planning. We simply have no conception of Karma.

Reminiscent of a passage of H. P. B.'s in *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 646, are these words of Lin Yutang's:—

There is a pattern of things invisible, of karmatic currents in human history, that can be seen only with the eyes of the mind. Sometimes it is given to poets to foretell the future, not by astrology, but by acquaintance with the laws of the spirit. To such extraordinary minds, these laws become so vivid that they assume the character of a "vision."

Well, those who understand the infallible Law of Karma are fortunate inasmuch as they rest with faith in Justice to right every wrong while they assist the turning of the Great Wheel to produce Harmony, which is Righteousness. Karma means action; labour, not laziness; deeds performed by mind, by speech, by hands are forces which are building the future. Shakespearian wisdom is:—

Our bodies are gardens, to the which our wills are gardeners; so that if we will plant nettles or sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender of herbs or distract it with many, either to have it sterile with idleness or manured with industry; why, the power and corrigible authority of this lies in our wills. If the balance of our lives had not one scale of reason to poise another of sensuality, the blood and baseness of our natures would conduct us to most preposterous conclusions; but we have reason to cool our raging motions, our carnal stings, our unbitted lusts.

U. L. T. PAMPHLET SERIES

1. *Is Theosophy a Religion?* . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 2. *What Theosophy Is* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 3. *Universal Applications of Doctrine and The Synthesis of Occult Science.* . . . W. Q. JUDGE
 4. *Castes in India* . . . D.K. MAVALANKAR
 5. *Theosophy Generally Stated* W. Q. JUDGE
 6. *Karma* . . . W. Q. JUDGE
 7. *Ormuzd and Ahriman* . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 8. *Reincarnation in Western Religions* . . . W. Q. JUDGE
 9. *Reincarnation, Memory, Heredity* { H. P. BLAVATSKY
W. Q. JUDGE
 10. *Reincarnation* . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY
W. Q. JUDGE
 11. *Dreams* . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY
W. Q. JUDGE
 12. *Mind-Control* . . . { D.K. MAVALANKAR
W. Q. JUDGE
 13. *Mediatorship* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 14. *H. P. Blavatsky* . . . W. Q. JUDGE
 15. *On The Secret Doctrine* . { H. P. BLAVATSKY
W. Q. JUDGE
 16. *The Secret Doctrine Instructions* . . . { W. Q. JUDGE
and others
 17. *Truth in Modern Life* . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 18. *Culture of Concentration* . W. Q. JUDGE
 19. *Hypnotism* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 20. *Kosmic Mind* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 21. *Overcoming Karma* . . . W. Q. JUDGE
 22. { *What Are the Theosophists?* H. P. BLAVATSKY
Some Words on Daily Life . A MASTER OF WISDOM
 23. *Christmas* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 24. *Cyclic Impression and Return* W. Q. JUDGE
 25. *Memory in the Dying* . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 26. *The Origin of Evil* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 27. *The Fall of Ideals* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 28. *On the New Year* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 29. *A Master's Letter*
 30. *Karma—The Compensator* . W. Q. JUDGE
 31. *"Let Every Man Prove His Own Work"* . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 32. { *The Dual Aspect of Wisdom*
Who Possess Knowledge? . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 33. *The Great Master's Letter*
 34. *Living the Higher Life* . . W. Q. JUDGE
 35. *Theosophy and Education* . H. P. BLAVATSKY
 36. *Musings on the True Theosophist's Path* . . . W. Q. JUDGE
- Texts for Theosophical Meetings*

BOOKS

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

Isis Unveiled

Centenary Anniversary Edition. A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1877. Two volumes bound in one.

The Secret Doctrine

A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1888. Two volumes bound in one.

The Theosophical Glossary

A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1892.

Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge

The Key to Theosophy

Raja-Yoga or Occultism

The Voice of the Silence

Five Messages to Theosophists

By W. Q. JUDGE

The Ocean of Theosophy

Letters That Have Helped Me

Echoes from the Orient

The Bhagavad-Gita

Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita

The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali

An Epitome of Theosophy

By ROBERT CROSBIE

The Friendly Philosopher

Answers to Questions on The Ocean of Theosophy

OTHER BOOKS

Light on the Path

Because

Eternal Verities

"No-Man's-Land"

The Laws of Healing—Physical and Metaphysical

Where Are the Dead?—Theosophy vs. Spiritualism

Index to The Key to Theosophy

Index to The Secret Doctrine

The U. L. T.—Its Mission and Its Future

MAGAZINES

Theosophy — Los Angeles XXXIIInd volume

The Aryan Path — Bombay XIVth „

The Theosophical Movement „ XIVth „

Prices may be had on application to the United Lodge of Theosophists.

The United Lodge of Theosophists

DECLARATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence should be addressed to

The United Lodge of Theosophists

51, MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD, BOMBAY, INDIA.

OTHER LODGES

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| LOS ANGELES (7), CALIFORNIA, U. S. A..... | Theosophy Hall, 245 W. 33rd Street |
| BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A..... | Masonic Temple Building |
| SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A..... | Pacific Bldg., 4th and Market Streets |
| NEW YORK, N. Y., U. S. A..... | 22 East Sixtieth Street |
| SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A..... | Theosophy Hall, 1434 Tenth Street |
| SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A..... | 505 Commonwealth Building |
| PHOENIX, ARIZONA, U. S. A..... | 32 North Central Ave. |
| PASADENA, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A..... | 329 East Green Street |
| PHILADELPHIA, PA., U. S. A..... | 2012 Delancey Street |
| WASHINGTON, D. C., U. S. A..... | 709 Hill Building, 17th and Eye Streets |
| LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA..... | 424 Richmond Street |
| LONDON, ENGLAND..... | 17 Great Cumberland Place, London, W. I. |
| PARIS, FRANCE..... | 14 rue de l'Abbé de l'Épée 5e |
| AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND..... | 24 Vondelstraat |
| PAPEETE, TAHITI..... | Rue du Docteur Fernand Cassiau |
| MATUNGA, BOMBAY, INDIA..... | Putla House, Bhaudaji Road |
| BANGALORE CITY, INDIA..... | "Maitri Bhavan," 15, Sir Krishna Rao Road, Basavangudi |
| SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA..... | Federation House, 166 Philip Street |