

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. XXIX. No. 4

17th February 1959

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

1909-1959

In the work which we have undertaken together, it matters not whether “we” fail or succeed: Our purpose has been and will be that the Work shall go on.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

The 18th of February this year has a special significance for students and Associates of the One United Lodge of Theosophists. It marks the close of a 50-year cycle for this organism born from the Theosophical experience and lifelong devotion of Robert Crosbie to the Masters, Their Message and Their Messenger.

The ideas and principles to which the name “U.L.T.” was given are old, very old; but as an exoteric body — though having its roots in the Occult World — it came into being half a century ago in Los Angeles, nearly 34 years after the founding of the Parent Theosophical Society in New York City. The inauguration of the U.L.T. may well be regarded as having brought back to its original lines the present Theosophical Movement, of which it is an integral part, however limited the recognition of the fact of that accomplishment may be. Robert Crosbie felt the need and took upon himself the task of resuscitating this most serious Movement of the age in its darkest hour, thus affording an opportunity to all who were left floundering by the wreck of the barque of pure Theosophy, which occurred after the deaths of H. P. Blavatsky and W. Q. Judge, to follow the Original Lines with the aid of the Original Impulse, the Original Programme, the Original Teachings.

Since then the Work has gone on. The U.L.T. has advanced steadily since it was formed. Year after year has seen a slow but steady growth in numbers, strength and solidarity. Each year has borne its own harvest of benefits to those actively engaged in the Work and to humanity at large, but each year is also a preparation for wider benefits in years to come. Storms and troubles there have been, to be sure; for no living body that undertakes high objectives can exist without such trials, as the history of the original Theosophical Society plainly shows. But the

Work of the Movement has always continued; nothing has ever been able to interfere with the pursuit of the Objects of the Work, to change the direction of effort or to weaken the resolve of those who have placed Theosophy first in their lives.

There are not many groups of the U.L.T., but there are many Centres in the shape of earnest individual students. During these five decades hundreds upon hundreds have come within the sphere of influence of the U.L.T. and tasted of the life-giving waters of the genuine doctrines of the Wisdom-Religion, and not a negligible number among them have become more alive to the divine intuitions within themselves. Even in those who may not have become earnest in their endeavour to study, apply and promulgate Theosophy, a spark has been lit which may well become a blazing fire in years and lives to come.

Active Associates of the U.L.T. have a special duty to perceive the Lines traced by Robert Crosbie, for thus they will see more and more clearly the depth of the Declaration of the Lodge, the correctness of the methods pursued, of the policy kept ever in view. They need to dwell on the idea that the form of the U.L.T. is not an original creation but is a good and faithful copy of the Great Fraternity of Adepts, who are of One Mind, One Will, One Aim, One Purpose. Its noble Declaration, simply worded but profound in its far-ranging ideas, embodies principles derived from the Great Philosophy.

These principles have worked satisfactorily during the past years, and will continue to benefit us all if we remain true to the Lines laid down at the founding of the U.L.T. in 1909. The letters of Mr. Crosbie, brought together in *The Friendly Philosopher*, contain further amplification of these principles.

“I would like to see the ‘U.L.T.’ *Declaration* known to every Theosophist as to every searcher for Truth,” he wrote. And he called the Declaration, with its signature by the Associates, “a wide departure from anything that exists as an organization.” It

should turn the attention of every open-minded Theosophist from forms to principles. It provides a real basis for study and work. Its reasonableness should awaken many to get busy on themselves. The door is open to all, but we cannot help those who will neither listen nor think.... The fact that “U.L.T.” does not profess attachment to any organization, and that it has no organization of its own, does not appear to have registered with those who would pigeonhole us as well as themselves. We can leave it to time to vindicate the truth. As the years go on, and “U.L.T.” becomes better known by its fruits, it will be more and more difficult for those who have an axe to grind to label us anything but straight-line Theosophists, resolutely declining any connection with any theosophical organization, but always in full sympathy with our fellow-Theosophists of all organizations or of none. Yet we must be watchful to correct the impression wherever it exists that “U.L.T.” is a secession or

succession, or anything but an Association to study and apply Theosophy pure and simple. Can any sincere student observe the things taught and done in the name of Theosophy and fail to see the crying need for just such an Association as "U.L.T."?

To "get back of living persons to the Message and the Messengers" was the *raison d'être* of the U.L.T., and we find the idea of loyalty to *principles*, not to individuals and organizations, constantly reiterated in Mr. Crosbie's letters. In one place he wrote:—

Let "U.L.T." flourish on its moral worth alone. The work we have to do, the knowledge we have to give out, depends on no other names than those of the true Teachers, H.P.B. and W.Q.J. Associates must learn to look to Them, to point to Them and to the Masters whom They served. Nothing else will restore the Movement. Unity is the keynote of our attempt, and living persons, if made prominent, will detract from that attempt, will be attacked, to the injury of the Movement.

The policy and methods of the U.L.T. were therefore instituted to avoid personalities and personal following altogether. Newcomers sometimes find it difficult to understand and appreciate the impersonal standpoint taken, but this is most essential if "the rocks that split the original society into a number of fragments" are to be avoided.

Great is the responsibility of the individual Associates and workers of the U.L.T., for it is they who make up its life. "The course of 'U.L.T.' will be what its Associates make it — no more, no less." What is expected of them is summed up by Mr. Crosbie in these words:—

We have but to keep continually in mind and heart the *original lines* laid by H.P.B. and W.Q.J., namely UNITY first, as a focus for spiritual growth and mutual strength; STUDY, that a knowledge of the Movement, its purpose, its Teachers and its Message may be had; WORK, upon ourselves in the light of that study, and for others first, last, and all the time.

There are some who speculate about the future of the U.L.T. To them the answer is:—

The U.L.T. will go along all right as long as there is some one individual who knows the right lines and will keep them. If the Lodge centres spread by being taken up by people not trained at all in the right line of thought and study, they could very easily go wide of the intention and lead others wrong. . . . H.P.B. found it necessary to lay down the lines along which the psychical currents might flow from the Lodge. In like manner, we in a smaller way have to provide lines of thought and influence along which may flow the spirit and genius of that which we have undertaken. Our Associate cards provide the means of individual adhesion to the principles. They are a form of pledge, and on individual honour. The sum of individual adhesions makes the cohesive body.

"Our cause," wrote a Master of Wisdom, "needs missionaries, devotees, agents, even martyrs, perhaps. But it cannot demand of any man

to make himself either." Each Associate has to determine for and by himself his own duties and obligations, always remembering that "Masters never cease working, and that it is always possible for even the humblest Theosophist who is clear-eyed and humanity-loving to aid Their endeavour."

Theosophy is still engaged in the "battle for *recognition*" of which Mr. Crosbie wrote a year after the founding of the U.L.T. Though it has made much headway in making its voice heard in the world, much remains to be done in the coming years, in preparation for the cycle of 1975. "There are many things to be worked out in connection with the U.L.T." What are needed are warrior-souls, and we can become such by self-effort in devotion, knowledge and right action. "If we give our hearts to the Cause, all the rest will follow."

In the coming years students of Theosophy in India have a special duty — to attempt to restore the glory of their ancient land by spreading broadcast the soul-satisfying philosophy of the Aryans, which alone is capable of awakening the slumbering souls of men, alone is dynamic enough to usher in the reign of high thinking and right living for the masses. The U.L.T. activities inaugurated here in 1929 have steadily increased through the years, and the pure stream of the Theosophical Movement started by H. P. Blavatsky and continued by William Q. Judge has been set flowing again.

In the editorial on "The Individuality of Branches" in the Supplement to *The Theosophist* of November 1882, it was indicated that in the long run it was among the people of India that the good to be done by the Theosophical Movement would mainly be effected. This would be reasonable since, though founded in New York, "the Society... had its roots in this country all the while."

A wish long fostered, a need long felt, by the Associates of the U.L.T. in Bombay came to realization when Theosophy Hall, a picture of which appears at the beginning of this issue, was inaugurated on November 17th, 1957. To what extent this Home dedicated and consecrated to the Masters and Their Cause, the Cause of the Service of Humanity, will be a Centre for the spiritual elevation of the race as a whole, depends on individual Associates who feel energized to place "Theosophy first, and Theosophy last."

The full harvest of our present efforts is yet to ripen. The year 1975 will bring to a close the cycle of the Theosophical Movement inaugurated in the last quarter of the last century, but by no means the end of the Work it set out to accomplish. These coming years before this cycle closes and another begins need to be devoted to preparing the minds of men for the greater "outpouring or upheaval of spirituality" when the time comes for the next Impulse from the Adept Fraternity. In the meantime our strength lies in following the instruction: "Remain staunch to the Master's programme and true to yourselves."

THEOSOPHY AND ASCETICISM

[We reprint below the stenographic report of a talk by Robert Crosbie, first published in *Theosophy* (Los Angeles), Vol. VII, pp. 323-27, for September 1919.—Eds.]

What is the greatest delusion and what causes it? Always one thing: *relative* truth; and its cause is ignorance. There never was a religion, there never was a philosophy, but what embodied relative truth. It is this relative truth which confuses mankind. Men do not see that Truth is *one*; that truth agrees only with truth; that error disagrees with truth and disagrees with error.

Relative truth is the cause of man's becoming involved in a partial view of the universe and of himself. Each man tries to *segregate* truth, by looking only in some given direction. He thinks all is right on this side; all wrong on that. Thus each man makes his own limitations. We say, thus far shall we go, and no farther. As a man thinks, he becomes. If he thinks he is a poor miserable sinner, he certainly will not step beyond the limitation thus self-imposed, until he changes his fundamental ideas. We are always acting upon and affecting each other, in thought and action. So we get a consensus of ideas, and that consensus forms the general impression and the general limitation, of the individual, of a class of men, of mankind generally. This is the barrier that each has to overcome for himself if we are ever to get beyond personal or racial limitations.

Soul means experience. Our "soul" is all the experience we have gained that has brought us up to our present status. So what governs the man, and what governs mankind generally, is the idea and ideas held as to what life is and what the nature of man is. These ideas have differed at different times and among different peoples. We at the present time have ours. Our personal life, our social life, our civilization, have all arisen from the ideas we hold in regard to life. The real question should be with each one of us, Are those ideas true? Do they cover the whole ground? Are they susceptible of improvement? Have the results obtained through them been all that we could wish? What are our ideas of God, of Nature, of Man?

The religion we have nominally adopted has proved a failure. It has not changed human nature in any degree. The good by nature are good under this or any other religion. The bad by nature are bad, whether under our own or any other religion.

There is something wrong with our *basis* of thought and action, for we must remember that it is from our basis and habits of thought that our actions flow; if we have a true basis of thought, then we will certainly have right actions and practices.

Theosophy is not a religion, not a formula or dogma invented by man, but is, as a matter of fact, a statement of the Laws which govern

the intellectual, the psychical, astral and physical constituents of man and of nature. It does not depend upon revelation or authority, but upon its inherent truth and the fact that its truth can be verified by every man for himself. The whole cry of Theosophy is to arouse man to an understanding of his own illimitable nature, so that he may know the action that is necessary to proceed along the truest and highest lines.

What has all this to do with Asceticism? Everything. Buddha was an Ascetic. Jesus was an Ascetic. So were the Founders of every great religion or philosophy. We do not hear from them insistence on this kind of food, or that kind of food; this kind of practice or that. From one and all of them we have these essential statements: Love one another; forgive your enemies; do good to them that despitefully use you and persecute you. Or again, William Q. Judge or H. P. Blavatsky — Do you think that they were ascetics, and if so, what kind?

They were ascetics in the truest sense. They never made any pretensions in their actions. They never said, Copy me. They always said, Do not follow me or my path; follow the path I show, the Masters who are behind.

They were ascetics and they had all the power which comes from true asceticism; not through refraining from or denying anything or anybody, but by the acceptance of all, the use of all. For everything in great nature of whatever kind, has been produced by the beings in the world, and is a natural evolution — everything. Where we have erred is in the improper use, the abuse of the very powers which we all possess. The most sacred of all our powers have been sacrificed on the altar of selfishness.

The true ascetic knows that. He knows that men have dugged a pit for themselves by the very power of the Spirit which they are, and that no one above us, however high, can remove men from the ditch they have digged but themselves.

Everyone has some idea as to what asceticism means. We know that monks and nuns have segregated themselves, withdrawn from the world and all participation in its affairs — and for centuries that was considered to be asceticism, and still is by many people.

It has been thought that asceticism consists in renouncing very many of the things that are used in the world. Some imagine that the eating of unaccustomed food is going to produce a spiritual effect; that through this relinquishment they are going to attain some spiritual advantage. The same is true with regard to many other practices.

Might we not well consider the motive of such practices? If one brought up in a certain way, accustomed to certain things, renounces them with the idea that thereby he is going to benefit by that relinquishment, there must be behind that intention and practice a selfish, personal desire. That selfish, personal desire could not by any possibility bring one to a state of enlightenment, regardless of what the practice

might consist in.

If it be food we are thinking of, if we imagine that we will benefit spiritually by eating this and by not eating that, then food is all that we are considering. That is not high thinking, and the mere fact of thinking of one kind of food in preference to another will not lead to any development whatever. There are those who consider that a vegetarian diet, or a diet of nuts, cereals, or some other thing, rather than flesh, would be beneficial to them. Always to *them*. They forget that there are many peoples, the Hindus for instance, who do not eat flesh at all, and yet it cannot be said that the mass of Hindus are in any way spiritual in their development, or any great factors in the advancement of true civilization. We might consider also that animals, many of them, are very strict vegetarians; yet they are not especially spiritual.

It has many times been stated that true asceticism does not consist in the eating or non-eating of any kind of food whatever; nor in any practice whatever; nor in any posture whatever; but consists solely of *an attitude of mind*. Jesus said, To the pure all things are pure; and that was an occult statement, and has been many times repeated. So if we are come to consider asceticism we must look along other lines than those which have been so, unfortunately, generally accepted by people looking for knowledge.

The object of existence is to gain knowledge. The fact of existence as we find it, and our ideas as to what constitutes truth, have been brought about under law, by ourselves. Each one finds himself in that place, mentally as well as physically, which he has prepared for himself as a result of what he has thought and done in the past, in this and other lives. Our present and our future are also under law. Our present is mitigated, and the future may be entirely changed and corrected, by a right attitude toward all things, asceticism included, and then by the right and full performance of duty — true asceticism — in the light of the perception of universal Truth.

A true ascetic is not one who cares whether he eats or doesn't eat, or what he eats; the manner of his incoming and outgoing concerns him but little; that he may be able in every action consonant with human life to do the right thing at the right time and in the right way is what concerns him all the time. He would look to the spirit of the action, and acting as spirit whatever he did in any direction would be for the great end in view, the benefit of all beings of every grade.

In the ancient teachings of the Upanishads a statement is made which we might consider. It is this, that "the work of the ascetic is neither pure nor dark, but is *peculiar to itself*, while that of other men is of three kinds." The three kinds of works alluded to in other men than the ascetic are, first, purity in action and motive; second, dark, such as those of the infernal beings; and third, mixed, that of the general run of men, which are a mixture of pure and dark.

Jesus when he walked the earth was not particular as to what he should do, what he should eat, what he should drink, nor with whom he would associate. We might say with truth that he was an Ascetic, yet he never withheld himself from other men, never desired to do so. His aim was to benefit mankind, and he touched Humanity — his fellow-men — in every possible direction, wherever it was permitted. The true Ascetic must of necessity take that course. He is one who tries to get all the knowledge and all the power that he possibly can, in order that he may lay these at the feet of his fellow-men and do them service. There is nothing forbidden to him in the whole universe. With Saint Paul he will consider that now all things are lawful to him, but all things may not be expedient. He judges of the necessity of any action from the need of the case in hand, and finds that his hand is not stayed in any direction by any rules whatever, or any ideas that may prevail among the men of his time. Every great religious Teacher has come to break the moulds of men's minds from the shackles of relative truth and false ideas as to man, nature and God.

We may dismiss from our minds all ideas of semi-starvation, all ideas of becoming something ourselves. That is something we ought to get deep in our hearts, deep into our natures — a perception of the selfishness of becoming something ourselves, of gaining anything for ourselves. What we ought to strive to do is to do the best we can in every direction for the sake of all others. In so doing we *are* what that doing procures; we strive not to become; we strive to do. There is nothing selfish, nothing personal, in that attitude and action. There is always the endeavour to use our very best knowledge and our very highest powers for the benefit of every other whom we may be able to touch.

The world to each of us is what we make it. What we get out of the world is what we put into it. We cannot get anything else. The world stands to us according to the quality of our attitude towards it, according to the ideas we hold in regard to it. Do we not know that our minds are simply bundles of ideas; many of them false, many of them relative, erroneous — perhaps most of them? We cherish them, look through them, act in accordance with them. Do we not see how needful it is that these brain minds of ours should have a true conception of man's nature, so that by thinking and acting in accord with true conceptions that brain will gradually respond to the real nature of the man himself — Man the Spiritual Being? Then he will not need to know; he will not need anyone to tell him; he will not care what religions and practices have been, are now; or ever will be; for he will know in himself, of himself, and for himself his own nature and the nature of every other being.

THOUGHTS ON UNITY

Why is there today such an urge to unite? Is it the reflection of ideas of Universal Brotherhood and Universal Tolerance, or is it merely an emotional wish for bigger and bigger societies, larger and larger memberships — or is it a feeling that in this way we can combine our efforts towards peace and save the energy being used in fighting and planning for war? Is it a weakening of a former position, or has the old position had its day? If the latter, what is the new position?

Perhaps we can answer these important questions by trying to understand the meaning of unity, tolerance, brotherliness.

Why should men all down the ages have tried to unite? What is unity and how can it be attained? Unity in what and with what? Let us ask ourselves what we want to unite ourselves to and why. There have been and are today many fellowships within which people have tried or are trying to live together in unity and peace, but most of these have failed, or will fail given time, for till now people have not discovered the *foundation of true unity*. A wish to unite is not enough for establishing permanent unity; an urge for tolerance is not enough either.

What is genuine tolerance? H. P. Blavatsky does not advise us to be tolerant towards evil. She advises us to be tolerant towards methods of work, provided the aim is good; but this should not be construed as meaning that the ends justify the means. She says that we must protest against evil and protect the innocent and the helpless; she advises us not to be tolerant towards creedalism but to denounce it severely. Neither does she tell us to be tolerant towards social evils. Far from it. What then is tolerance and how should it be expressed?

What is brotherliness? Are we to show brotherly love towards the narrow religionists, towards those who advocate the killing of a murderer, towards vivisectionists, narcotic racketeers, thieves and criminals? Surely, the answer is: Yes, we must. *But how?* This is the question we must strive to answer. Did H.P.B. and W.Q.J. show brotherly love to those who tried to harm the Theosophical Society? In truth they did. *But how was this love expressed?* We have a duty to protect the innocent and the ignorant from evil; to do so, evil must be exposed. We must warn without being too emotional about it. If in so warning individuals have to be mentioned, we must take care that our understanding of the law of Karma makes us realize in our hearts that, since their sufferings will be acute in future incarnations, our actual feeling for them is not scorn, resentment or hatred but pity and sympathy. *But how shown?*

Associates of the U.L.T. have been given much help through the wisdom of Robert Crosbie. In the U.L.T. Declaration we are given clearly the only true basis for unity: "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching." Unity need not be striven after at all. It either is or it is not; it can never be made to order, never be forced. No amount of agitating for unity will bring it about; in fact this might produce the opposite

tendency. Unity is a natural result and not a cause. It is the result of "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching"; therefore we should try to understand what is meant by "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching" and should look at unity, tolerance and brotherliness from this threefold basis.

How can unity be achieved and maintained unless built upon this threefold foundation of the same *aim* (or units will pull away from each other), *purpose* (or units will wish to divert efforts to so many different causes that strength will be lost), and *teaching* (or divergences in both aim and purpose will begin to arise)? Business firms, for instance, can only unite when their aims, purposes and the commodities in which they deal or the business they transact are the same or similar. Nations, also, can only unite when their aims, purposes and ideology are similar. So, too, in the case of churches.

There can be no unity in the Theosophical Movement until there is a common agreement as to what the teachings of Theosophy are in their broad fundamental principles. If similarity of teachings is not there, *i.e.*, if the teachings the student stands for are not those of *genuine* Theosophy as given in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, the Messenger for the 19th-20th century, all attempts at bringing about unity among the various organizations calling themselves Theosophical are bound to fail. If the disputants were to spend more time in reading and studying the original volumes of *The Secret Doctrine*, there would be less ground for argument.

The advice to "come out from among them, and be ye separate" has to be balanced with Universal Brotherhood, only a nucleus of which students of Theosophy are called upon to form. Students of the U.I.T. should not forget that a nucleus is a vital part of, though seemingly detached from, the main body. A nucleus has its own power to grow as well as to become one with the whole. But this will not be until Nature has taken a hand and herself cut off those units around the nucleus which are not able to unite with the rest.

In our efforts towards peace and fraternity, are we guided by a right concept of tolerance? Indiscriminate acceptance of everything and everyone is not tolerance. The attitude of "namby-pambyness" is but a pseudo-tolerance. This false idea of tolerance would signify, says Mr. Crosbie, "that sin, sorrow, suffering, error, all religions and all philosophies are all right; that everybody is doing the best he can, and the best he knows how to do, and cannot do any different, and that all are steps of learning." What then is tolerance? It is trying sincerely to understand one another's ideas and a readiness to respect them. Intolerance towards evil should not mean intolerance towards the evil-doers. But the strength of a nucleus of brotherhood is to admit none whose threefold basis is not the same one aim, one purpose and one teaching. This is the *only* basis on which a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood can be established. When this fact is not seen the nucleus gets contaminated

and has at last to discard the dissenters, and in the process it weakens itself.

Young people today demand freedom to do as they like and to ignore rules and regulations, but they fail to discern the universal principles behind these. If a rule or a regulation is bad, by all means fight it on proper lines — not by accepting it and then refusing to obey it! Do not accept it if you do not want to obey. We are at a cyclic turning point when principles are apt to be lost in favour of “an easy time.” Criticism is a worry to the criticizer and a nuisance to the criticized. But then did not H.P.B. and W.Q.J. serve the Movement by their strong criticism of the prevalent misconceptions? And would the U.L.T. have come to birth if there had been acceptance of partial philosophies and diluted Theosophy?

What should we learn about Brotherhood? All men are brothers. Yes, undoubtedly this is so and unavoidable. The difficulty is in our understanding of the meaning and practice of brotherhood. Would we ask a filthy, verminous beggar to use our bed, or even to come into our house, thus contaminating us physically with his dirt? Or would we, as taught in a Jataka Tale, do as did the king who sent his servants to wash and give clean clothes to the kind-hearted fowler? Would we ask an unrepentant murderer to live with us as a member of our family, disregarding and doing nothing about his undesirable character? Surely, true brotherhood lies in the understanding of the real Root of Brotherhood, which is the fatherhood of God, or of the One Self, and the earnest endeavour so to live that our brother will follow our example. To be a friend with someone is not merely to eat and drink and visit with him; not even to attend the same Lodge. Real friendship and duty may require our suggesting something that may seem to him a criticism. True criticism is pointing to the right or the better course, so that the friend can put facts side by side and see for himself which is better. True brotherhood can only be manifest in a nucleus of those having the same spiritual aim, purpose and teaching; then their thoughts, feelings and actions will be guided by the same philosophy, differing only in the degree of the ability of each to interpret it. The larger Brotherhood, that of the Universe, is only possible and recognizable because of the One Spirit in all, which has nothing to do with actions, right or wrong; it is of another plane entirely.

On this 50th anniversary of the founding of the U.L.T. on February 18th, 1909, it is fitting for all Associates to probe their motives and thoughts and try to see just where they stand; for each man rises or falls by his own endeavour and alertness. None can say: “Master, I was told” this or that.

VICTORY AND DEFEAT

... arise with determination fixed for the battle. Make pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat, the same to thee. . . . (*The Bhagavad-Gita*, II. 37-8)

Each whose mind and heart respond to the Teachings of Theosophy and who intuitively sees the potential blessings to mankind from the spread of those Teachings must, unless wholly self-centred, aspire to fit himself to spread their message, through his living example if not with voice or pen. He very soon becomes aware that this demands self-conquest in an increasing measure if he is not to play the hypocrite, a traitor to himself and to the Cause.

The seemingly paradoxical injunction of Krishna, quoted above, must, however, have puzzled many. On what is our determination to be fixed, if not on victory? On fighting well the good fight, well called the greatest of all wars, against the wiles and machinations of our lower nature. On living well each moment, hour by hour, and doing this because it is right and not because of what we think we may gain from doing so. And this demands that we listen for and obey the orders of the true warrior within, who is ourself, yet infinitely wiser and stronger than ourself as a personality.

Motive is the essential test. Mr. Judge warns plainly that if we "go into this battle from pride, from self-will, from desire to hold our position in the face of the world, from anything but the purest motives, we shall fail." If we are sincere, we cannot be consciously fighting for a future of power and glory. But it is well indeed for us if our whole aspiration, held in all humility, is to do all we can to serve the servants of the Servants of mankind, while ever trying to fit ourselves for worthier performance of such service.

But who can be fully confident that his motive is completely uncoloured or be sure that it will remain so? Though personal pride may be in abeyance when we enrol ourselves for the great battle, may it not reawaken, even when we may have triumphed over every animal instinct and all greed for self-advantage? *The Voice of the Silence* warns:—

Thou hast removed pollution from thine heart and bled it from impure desire. But, O thou glorious combatant, thy task is not yet done. Build high, Lanoo, . . . the dam that will protect thy mind from pride and satisfaction at thoughts of the great feat achieved.

H.P.B. cautions us specifically in regard to vanity, the sense of personal pride, which she says is the last to die in man. In her article, "The Devil's Own: Thoughts on Ormuzd and Ahriman," she writes:—

Let it awake but for an instant, and the seemingly crushed-out personality comes back to life at the sound of its voice, arising from its grave like an unclean ghoul at the command of the midnight incantator.

Five hours — nay, five minutes even — of life under its fatal sway, may destroy the work of years of self-control and training, and of laborious work in the service of Ahura Mazda, to open wide the door anew to Angra Mainyu. (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 7*, pp. 7-8)

Such a catastrophe would be indeed a deplorable setback, deplorable for ourselves and also for the world which so badly needs the help of all who can rise to the heights of impersonal service. But it need not, should not, mean final defeat and we need not add prolonged dejection to the enemies we have to fight, if only we have the necessary stamina to pick ourselves up and renew the fight with vigour, holding our place among the relatively few who have the patience, the “simple perseverance and singleness of purpose” to fight the good fight to the end.

In this battle with our lower nature each has his own handicaps in his weaknesses, his circumstances and surroundings, but we are assured that he who does all that he can and the best that he knows how to do, does enough for the great Masters. Even to hold our ground is sometimes victory.

If we but hold fast in our consciousness the thought of Them and of Krishna, the Spirit in our own heart consciousness, “the Lion our guard, the Sage our guide, the Warrior our sure defense and shield,” we need have no fear of being overwhelmed either by others or by circumstances. So long as our faces are turned in the right direction, we need heed only “the praise or blame of that deity” which, we are told, can never be separated from our *true* self, “*as it is verily that God itself*: called the HIGHER CONSCIOUSNESS.” The sentence of the Supreme Court within is the only one without appeal.

Even when we stand self-convicted, however, we must still fight grimly on, hoping to turn today’s defeat into tomorrow’s victory. There is no real failure but ceasing to try. Victory and defeat, therefore, have to be differently judged by Theosophical aspirants than as the world judges. Thus the man who suffers bravely for a principle or even dies for it is not defeated. The world may never hear of him, yet he has made this earth a better place for all, since none can rise without making the next step easier, in however small a degree, for all his brothers. We have, moreover, Krishna’s assurance in the Sixth Discourse of the *Bhagavad-Gita* that, even though one fails in attaining to perfection in his devotion in a given life, one will, “even unwittingly, by reason of that past practice,” be led and will work on.

H.P.B. tells us, indeed, that those only may be certain of success who are “passion-proof,” “Mystics and Occultists by birth and by right of direct inheritance from a series of incarnations and æons of suffering and failures” (*Raja-Yoga or Occultism*, p. 37).

Nevertheless those who have striven valiantly, though they have advanced but a little on the Way, stumbling and falling often but always picking themselves up and going on, have not failed. Dying with the

confidence of returning to carry on the battle, these as well as the true victors can exclaim with St. Paul, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Truly is it said in *The Voice of the Silence* that "the path that leadeth on, is lighted by one fire — the light of daring, burning in the heart." The same book also tells us for our encouragement and energization:—

If thou hast tried and failed, O dauntless fighter, yet lose not courage: fight on, and to the charge return again and yet again.

The fearless warrior, his precious life-blood oozing from his wide and gaping wounds, will still attack the foe, drive him from out his stronghold, vanquish him, ere he himself expires. Act then, all ye who fail and suffer, act like him; and from the stronghold of your Soul chase all your foes away — ambition, anger, hatred, e'en to the shadow of desire — when even you have failed. (p. 68)

Untouchability, which disfigures Hinduism, was called by Gandhiji "a plague," "a morbid growth" betraying "a woodenness of mind, a blind self-conceit . . . abhorrent alike to the spirit of religion and morality." It is gratifying to note that his stupendous efforts to improve the lot of the millions of Harijans (the so-called "untouchables") in the country are bearing fruit.

It was disclosed by Shri Viyogi Hari, General Secretary of the All-India Harijan Sevak Sangh, in his report to the 26th annual conference of the Sangh held recently in Delhi, that as many as 1,396 temples, 2,028 wells and 1,020 hostels were thrown open to Harijans in various parts of the country during the last few months. He stated that among the temples of national importance in which Harijans were allowed entry were those of Kedarnath, Gangotri, Jamnotri in Garhwal Himalayas, the Vishwanath temple in Banaras, the Bhim Kali temple in Himachal Pradesh and the Krishna Nagar temple in West Bengal.

It is time Harijans were helped to gain their due socio-religious status as the children of the Motherland; but what is needed is a wider recognition and application of the principles of Universal Unity and Causation, Human Solidarity, the Law of Karma and Reincarnation, which would bind not only Brahmins and Harijans, but the whole human family, with this golden chain, into One Universal Brotherhood. Gandhiji wrote:—

The observance of the vow of the removal of untouchability is not fulfilled merely by making friends with "untouchables," but by loving all life as one's own self. Removal of untouchability means love for, and service of, the whole world, and it thus merges into *ahimsa*.

THE TASTE OF BANZO'S SWORD

[Reprinted from *Zen-Flesh, Zen-Bones: A Collection of Zen and Pre-Zen Writings*, compiled by Paul Reps (Charles E. Tuttle Company, Rutland, Vermont, U.S.A., and Tokyo, Japan).—Eds.]

Matajuro Yagyu was the son of a famous swordsman. His father, believing that his son's work was too mediocre to anticipate mastership, disowned him.

So Matajuro went to Mount Futara and there found the famous swordsman Banzo. But Banzo confirmed the father's judgment. "You wish to learn swordsmanship under my guidance?" asked Banzo. "You cannot fulfil the requirements."

"But if I work hard, how many years will it take me to become a master?" persisted the youth.

"The rest of your life," replied Banzo.

"I cannot wait that long," explained Matajuro. "I am willing to pass through any hardship if only you will teach me. If I become your devoted servant, how long might it be?"

"Oh, maybe ten years," Banzo relented.

"My father is getting old, and soon I must take care of him," continued Matajuro. "If I work far more intensively, how long would it take me?"

"Oh, maybe thirty years," said Banzo.

"Why is that?" asked Matajuro. "First you say ten and now thirty years. I will undergo any hardship to master this art in the shortest time!"

"Well," said Banzo, "in that case you will have to remain with me for seventy years. A man in such a hurry as you are to get results seldom learns quickly."

Matajuro was told never to speak of fencing and never to touch a sword. He cooked for his master, washed the dishes, made his bed, cleaned the yard, cared for the garden, all without a word of swordsmanship.

Three years passed. Still Matajuro laboured on. Thinking of his future, he was sad. He had not even begun to learn the art to which he had devoted his life. But one day Banzo crept up behind him and gave him a terrific blow with a wooden sword. The following day, when Matajuro was cooking rice, Banzo again sprang upon him unexpectedly.

After that, day and night, Matajuro had to defend himself from unexpected thrusts. Not a moment passed in any day that he did not have to think of the taste of Banzo's sword.

He learned so rapidly he brought smiles to the face of his master. Matajuro became the greatest swordsman in the land.

WORLD SERVICE

[We reprint below the second of two lectures delivered by B. P. Wadia in London in June 1921 and published in America the following year in a pamphlet *Growth Through Service*. The first, on "Individual Progress," was reprinted in our January issue. Readers may be reminded that at the time these lectures were delivered the speaker had not yet resigned from the Theosophical Society, to work thenceforth in collaboration with the United Lodge of Theosophists. But most of what is said here about the T.S. and its members is applicable also to the U.L.T. and its Associates.—Eds.]

You will remember that in the first lecture of this series on "The Fundamentals of Theosophy," I spoke on "Individual Progress," and pointed out that in aiming at that progress, our objective should be the same as that of the great Masters, *viz.*, service of the world. That aim is the foundation of all teachings which occultists have given from time immemorial. Therefore, in considering the fundamentals of Theosophy for the service of the world, we want to obtain the particular viewpoint of those Great Servants of Humanity, the Masters of the Wisdom.

Many kinds of activity, many forms of service, are rendered by many types of people in the world of today. Our task in the T.S. is to render a peculiar kind of service, to give a particular type of assistance to the world. As H.P.B. said, "We believe in relieving the starvation of the Soul, as much, if not more, than the emptiness of the stomach." Our aim for the individual members of the Society is, or should be, to enable them to make an all-round *spiritual* progress, so that our task of rendering that specific service may be achieved. Our aim should not be to help the world in the spheres where our members are not competent to hold their own as helpers and assistants. If we undertake a task which is not our own, we fall into the double error of trying to do something which is not our work, while that which is our work remains undone. Our members should find their own sphere of spiritual service.

The reason for this basic idea, that the T.S. should serve the world spiritually and not in other ways, is to be found in the root-idea to which H.P.B. gives expression:—

There can be no real enfranchisement of human thought, nor expansion of scientific discovery, until the existence of Spirit is recognized, and the double evolution accepted as a fact.

What, then, are the fundamental principles which should guide us in the selection of our work as members of the T.S.? It has been well said that to feed the hungry people, to clothe the naked ones of the earth, is a very noble work, but that is not necessarily the work of the T.S.; and I think that is true. Our work is to give that which the Masters gave to the Society for the purpose of helping the world. What

was that? The spiritual knowledge, the Wisdom-Religion, which gives a basis for the true life of the Spirit, which gives us material for building the foundation of the true type of altruism. Thus each individual can serve in terms of his or her own spiritual life. For the T.S. as an organization there never can be a definite programme of outer activity which all members can adopt.

It is sometimes said that there is no definite "programme," no connected scheme of Theosophical activity for the service of the world. How would you draw up a Theosophical political programme, and define the duty of the members of the T.S. in the province of politics? We have in our ranks Conservatives, Progressives and Socialists. What common programme of work can they all adopt? The only way is to leave our members free, so that each may be able to spiritualize his own politics. The day that we produce a complete scheme of activity, the day that we have a precise programme of service of the world, we shall not be a spiritual body, but one more sect fighting other sects, one more body fighting other bodies; the spiritual nature of the Society would lose itself in the struggle of creeds and parties.

Therefore, in reference to the active service of the world, true to its traditions, the T.S. must not adopt any particular programme; it should leave its members free to define their own actional creed and to serve the world according to what they deem to be right. Thus we act up to the primary fundamental of all occult societies and bodies; we place an instrument in the hand of every individual member to determine for himself what for him is the province of spiritual service in politics or in anything else. To grasp the real significance of this proposition, a definition of what is called spiritual life is required.

Now, we have very curious notions and ideas about the spiritual life. We rightly hold that spiritual life means something very precise and definite; but we make it nebulous where precision is required, and become harshly exacting when not necessary. There is a good deal of confusion in the minds of our members in reference to spiritual life and spiritual work.

Spiritual life is the gaining of an attitude, as I was pointing out in the first lecture. Each individual, by his own self-effort, gains an inner attitude; and, because he has evolved up to a certain point, he expresses something which is definitely his own, which profoundly represents his contribution to the spiritual service of his fellows. Spirituality should be understood as that particular attitude to life which enables a man deliberately to conceive the next step he has to take and to act self-consciously in reference to the world in terms of that step. You will see from this, that if a man thinks that it is his business to provide food to the hungry because in that step lies for him the expression of spirituality, that man is serving the world in the right way. It may not be the function or duty of another, but it is his. Everyone must be free to conceive what spiritual life means to him in terms of his own self-effort, to take the next step

in front of him, and to help the world in terms of his self-realization. That, then, is the first general fundamental.

This brings us to the second principle. People have often thought that spiritual service of the world is an effort to grapple with some form of outer activity which is not related to their own individual lives. That is a wrong view. As we study Theosophy in all ages, we find the teaching that a man serves the world first by living his own spiritual life. As H.P.B. says, "It is an occult law that no man can rise superior to his individual failings without lifting, be it ever so little, the whole body of which he is an integral part." A man's service of the world, therefore, is not unconnected with, or unrelated to, his effort at leading his own individual spiritual life. The two are one. It is not an effort to save somebody else's soul, but a supreme effort to save his own; and this constitutes true service of the world. It is the recognition of the sublime fact that in living the life of the day the service of the world is rendered. Thus we give fine scope and a very, very wide field for activity to our members; each one must serve in terms of his own self-expression, not with the help of other people's programmes.

Service of the world in terms of other people's programmes means that we are serving the world as they would serve it. We can never do it satisfactorily, because it is like second-hand knowledge rooted in belief, and belief neither brings inner conviction nor enthusiasm, and without conviction and enthusiasm true spiritual service of the world is not possible. Therefore comes into play the same principle which we were examining in the first lecture, that each one must know *himself* to live his own spiritual life; it is also true that each must know *himself* to render spiritual service to the world.

When we begin to study we find that, in this particular race of ours, people are working with particular constituent principles of their being, and are evolving thereby. In the human kingdom the spheres of experience for different individuals are different, and therefore the methods of utilizing that experience in the province of service are also different for different people. I may be developing a particular principle of my being; another person may be unfolding another principle of his very complex constitution. My service of the world is through the particular principle which I am developing; the other man's business of serving the world is related to the principle which he is unfolding. Therefore, in adopting the plan of service of the world, our duty is to find out with which principle of our complex human being we are dealing at the present moment in this life.

H.P.B. has pointed out that in this Fifth Root-race of ours, the fifth principle in Man, the Mind, is developing. Our function in serving the world is therefore related to this Mind-principle. This, in my opinion, provides a key which most of our members have not learnt to use. People have often said that the T.S. is a highly unpractical body, because it deals with intellectual problems and not with the ordinary affairs of

the practical workaday world. An effort to understand H.P.B.'s proposition ought to be made. Nowadays our members seem very anxious to please the world! Our Lodges and our Sections, in planning their active work, have a tendency to consider only their own individual points of view, and are asking: "What is the world going to say about our programme?" Only a few people ask the very fundamental question: "What are the Masters going to say about this programme of work?"

The Masters who founded the Society *have* a plan of helping the world through the Society; that plan is rooted in laws, is carried out by the knowledge of these laws. Because we are living in the Fifth Root-race, and are developing the Mind-principle, the active service of the world is closely related to it. When we begin to examine and ponder over this aspect of service we meet with a somewhat strange phenomenon: a majority of our members view with suspicion the activity of the Mind. They speak of it as if it is some kind of terrible disease, and you often hear it said: "Well, such and such a man is no good, he is only an intellectual." Now our function is to spiritualize that Mind-principle which is functioning and developing in the race, and it is necessary for us to understand what this Mind race of ours is. Because, if we understand that, we shall be able to understand the rules, the laws which we are seeking, and apply them, each one for himself, in active work.

H.P.B. has hinted at a curious division of this Mind-principle in man. As with many other things, she has said, Mind is sevenfold, there are seven types of Mind. She has tried to suggest a teaching which has not been brought out fully in our studies of Root- and sub-races. She has indicated that this Mind race of ours can be divided in terms of Mind development. The race evolution must not be examined only from the ethnological point of view, but from the psychological point of view. In this whole Root-race of ours, different groups are developing different types of Mind. Therefore there are mental sub-races, as there are ethnological sub-races. You can find, for instance, from that point of view, all the sub-races, from the first to the fifth, in your own British Isles. Take your slum-dweller here in the city of London. According to the ethnologists he belongs to the Teutonic sub-race, but there is a difference in the mind development of the slum-dweller and your highly developed politician, scientist, or artist. From the point of view of the psychological division of the races your slum-dweller is probably a Lemurian, or at most an Atlantean — but certainly not an Aryan. Take our own Society and its membership; we have these different sub-types of mind. Add this consideration — that there are not only sub-races, but also Root-races, all represented among us. There are many of our members who perhaps belong, from the psychological point of view, to the Third or Fourth Root-race; they are dealing with instincts, they are dealing with emotions, instead of with mind. There are perhaps a few who, from that point of view, belong to the Sixth Root-race; they are dealing with the development of the real intuitions — not those things

that are called intuitions, but Buddhi.

This gives us the clue as to the nature of the service to be given to the world by members of the Theosophical Society. Our sphere of service is determined by that aspect of mind which we are developing. Thus H.P.B.'s hint is most illuminating and highly practical. Our members exclaim: "Tell us what to do." Nobody can tell us. A person with real spiritual perception, one who is an occultist, cannot say what other people should or should not do. People have often misunderstood the expression — "the order that comes from the Masters." The Masters never give orders in that sense. We have misunderstood this idea of obedience in following a particular order when it comes. Occultism knows of no obedience; but only of the response which wells up from within as a conviction. Masters' orders carry their own conviction: Their messages are self-luminous; they illuminate the minds and uplift the moral natures of those to whom they are presented.

But let us revert to the idea we were considering; our service must relate itself to that type of the mind which we are unfolding. To put it more generally, it is related to that principle for us to serve the world according to the Masters' way. It is said sometimes, and truly said, that what the Masters need is channels through which They can help the world. But we are not channels when we accept other people's programmes and schemes. Then we become mediums, not the ordinary mediums of spiritualism, but mediums in a very real sense, continuously filling our heads with other people's thoughts, our hearts with other people's feelings, our activity with other people's plans. Thus we are not the channels for the Masters, as we should like to be, because we do not live what we ourselves are, but are trying to live somebody else's life. Therefore, in planning the service of the world, it is well that that portion of our being which is in the process of unfoldment should be made the channel of communication between the world of human beings and the world of Supermen, of the Masters. That is what the Masters want. That is what they have tried to explain in their many letters and writings. Self-expression, therefore, is the fundamental service.

Let us come to another idea arising out of this. Our people often say: "Well, I have such and such work in life; I am so busy that I cannot undertake any Theosophical activity; that is my bad karma." Now, this "Theosophical activity" is one of the greatest of illusions. What is Theosophical activity? Is not the function of taking your morning breakfast a Theosophical activity? Is not attending to your work at your office a Theosophical activity? How can you make a division in the spiritual life? And yet we do make a division when we speak of Theosophical activity. We have simply removed ourselves from one sphere of illusion to another sphere of illusion. We have blamed the orthodox Christian because he regards Sunday as a sacred day when he must go to church, and all the others as secular days when he must do his business. We say that is all wrong; but instead of dividing our week

into two compartments, we divide our days into more than two, and we say: "This thing I am doing — well, that is ordinary life; but if I go to the Lodge meeting to deliver a lecture or listen to one, then that is Theosophical activity." Thus we get away from the spiritual life, from the true service of the world. What we need is the fire of true altruism, which is to live our *natural* life Theosophically, which demands the effort *consciously* to help the growth of that particular principle which is evolving in us. That is the true kind of impetus necessary for spiritual service. I want you to note how this question of service is related to our individual progress. In this connection let me quote *The Voice of the Silence*:—

The selfish devotee lives to no purpose. The man who does not go through his appointed work in life — has lived in vain. Follow the wheel of life; follow the wheel of duty to race and kin, to friend and foe, and close thy mind to pleasures as to pain. Exhaust the law of karmic retribution. Gain Siddhis for thy future birth.

In this teaching lies the method of world-service. We have to go through our appointed work in life; we have to attend to duties and obligations to race and kin; and as Theosophists we have to discharge this by the method indicated in these words, closing our minds to pleasures and pains. He who does not live and serve thus is described as "the selfish devotee." He who does live and serve thus, he is gaining Siddhis for his future birth — an idea that is not yet fully understood.

Next, let us come to the form into which this service should be moulded; there again we find confusion of ideas. If what I have been saying is true, then our duty as active helpers of our fellow men is to put into the existing forms, if such forms are clean, that power of Theosophy which we are evolving from within ourselves. What are we trying to do? Exactly the reverse of this — we are trying to build new forms. But ours is not the task to build unnecessary new forms. We want to spiritualize all spheres of the world, forms which already exist. Therefore you do not want a new political party. You want the spiritual power of Theosophy to influence all political parties, so that it can unite the parties which are fighting and struggling one against the other. Therefore you do not want a new school of art. You want the spiritual power to touch all emotional activities of artists of various schools of thought, so that they can find a common ground, a common basis, for their emotional expression. You do not want a new creed, or a new faith, or a new religion, or a new church — you have enough in this country at any rate. You want the power of the spiritual life felt and realized. . . . We speak of the law of karma, but we do not recognize the fact that the law of karma must be helped to fulfil itself through our spiritual life. We always want to change our karma. But how can we change karma? We can only change karma by the fulfilment of that karma. Many of our members desire to get away from the environment which the law of karma has

created for them and want to contact a new one. This, in a very real and occult sense, leads to caste-confusion, and thus to pain, suffering and failure in activity.

Let us grasp the principle that we must let karma fulfil itself, and not try to fight and change — save the fight that comes from within, and the change which is of the nature of inner conversion. When we begin to speak in terms of fulfilment of the law of karma, we begin to look at the forms with which our karma is related. . . . We try to run away from our duty, and thus commit a wrong. Our attitude should be: "What I did not understand before, through my Theosophy I have begun to understand, and now I am going to let karma fulfil itself." We must work out that idea in life. The notion that we are going to right the world by taking one or another course of activity is one of the greatest of illusions. We cannot affect the course of evolution in the world of forms, save by one method; the world suffers through the obstacles of form, and only one power removes that obstacle; it is the power of life. When you pour fresh life into obstructing forms, they crumble.

We must see, therefore, what our karma has brought us in our life, and endeavour to pour into those forms with which we have contact, the power of the spiritual life, so that the law may fulfil itself. Apply this to your city, country, nation, religion, and you will perceive the truth underlying spiritual service of the world. In helping the world, therefore, we should always keep in mind the fact that our duty is to spiritualize action. Some of our members want to make good karma, as they put it. But that is not Karma-Yoga; that is not treading correctly the Path of Action; that is not "skill in action which is Yoga"; that is not "To abandon *both* good and evil deeds." Thus our personal karma is intimately related to our efforts at serving the world.

Adopt a way of service other than this, and you will find that, when you have finished the task, the world has not moved much further. What we want, therefore, is the power to remove the causes of evils which we karmically contact. To deal with evils in the ordinary way is to deal with effects, and that is not productive of lasting good. Therefore discrimination in action is necessary for the service of the world.

How can we perceive the causes of evil belonging to our own environment, save by the process of inner conversion whereby we have rooted out that evil in ourselves, and thus spiritualize that environment? Do not judge the success of our Theosophical service in a crude material way. "How many members have we got by adopting this particular form of propaganda?" asks our zealous activist. That is a wrong measure. It is not the number of members, but the quality that matters. Proselytism from without gives you quantity; inner conversion gives you quality. Our method should be to live our life and let loose a spiritual power in living that life which will produce inner conversion in the hearts of men. Not by words of eloquence but by words made flesh in life — that ought to be the way. We can do it in terms of that particular principle of our

being which is evolving, because that is the line of least resistance for us. We must react on our own environment and allow our karma to fulfil itself. It is in that sense that Shri Krishna said in the *Bhagavad-Gita*:—

Better is one's own duty, though destitute of merit, than the well executed duty of another. He who doeth the duty laid down by his own nature incurreth no sin.

Congenital duty, though defective, ought not to be abandoned. All undertakings, indeed, are clouded by defects as fire by smoke.

He whose Buddhi is everywhere unattached, the self-subdued, dead to desires, he goeth by renunciation to the supreme perfection of freedom from obligation.

There you have a teaching identical with H.P.B.'s: "Follow the wheel of life; follow the wheel of duty to race and kin." "Exhaust the law of karmic retribution," says *The Voice of the Silence*, and: "Gain Siddhis for thy future birth"; the *Gita* teaches the same lesson of "freedom from obligation." This is the way of service by which we do not incur sin — by not abandoning congenital duty. Other paths take us away from the true spiritual life; and we shall go round about it; but we shall neither make progress ourselves nor help the world to advance spiritually. Therefore we should try to lead the life contacting that very sphere which is our own.

There is a world in which we live as individuals; it is no one else's world; for ordinary individuals Nature makes that world; a true Theosophist ought to build it himself. Create a sphere by letting loose some of the spiritual power and force from within, and from there endeavour to remove the causes of evil in the world. Let other people touch that world of yours, for that touch will lead them to the inner conversion which you yourself have gone through, and enable them to build their own world. That is your service to them and the world.

That is what the Masters are doing; They are trying to raise the members of the T.S. to Their level by a process of inner conversion, so that through us They may help a greater number of human souls — not human bodies. They are endeavouring to draw human souls into Their world; for in that world, beyond the worlds of name and form (*nama-rupa*), all names and forms come into being. There we can deal with causes and effects. That is the World of Will and Wisdom and Creation wherein is determined the destiny of the worlds of effects. Therefore the true Theosophical Service consists in a sincere attempt to master intellectually the scheme of evolution to which we belong, to find our place therein, to apply the teachings of the Ancient Wisdom in reacting on our own environment, and thus, moving from the world within, to affect causes and thereby nullify the evil that encompasses this Sorrowful Star.

IMAGINATION AND SIN

“One single thought about the past that thou hast left behind, will drag thee down . . .”

—*The Voice of the Silence*

Self-examination is an essential part of our discipline. Correctly executed, it is an examination, conscious and cautious, of the lower self in the light of the Higher Self; but how difficult it is in this, as in other disciplines, to keep without deviation to the road ahead! How easy it is to slip unwittingly and by degrees from the extreme of complacency and smug self-satisfaction, through a paralyzing sense of inadequacy and sinfulness, even to the opposite extreme of the kind of self-disgust and self-contempt which urges ascetics to torment the body in an effort at expiation!

More than our sins and failings themselves can a preoccupation with them hold us back. Why grieve about the inevitable? By no miracle can our conceits and egotisms, our inadequacies, our weak and faltering powers of exposition, be transformed suddenly. They are part of the raw material with which we must work. In the grand reckoning they matter little, if we never let go the determination that the Work shall go on.

A mother living in the slums gives birth to a child in the midst of squalor. It is beautiful in her eyes, not lined with her cares or dogged by her weariness. However inadequate she may feel herself to be, it is within her power to nourish her child with her love until the independent life within it perhaps blossoms beyond her strength to destroy some of the ugliness which almost overwhelms her.

We labour to bring to birth a child, a truly united international body of students of Theosophy, which shall know a greater strength than ours to overcome the evils of unbrotherliness in the world. Its strength will be derived from its spiritual heredity, not from our personal weaknesses. But it will be a child created, not begotten. It must first be conceived in our imagination as a spiritual entity. No need to live in our sins and failings. However little we may think we share in the life and work of the Masters, however unworthy of Them the U.L.T. may seem and however feeble our efforts for it may appear, nothing hinders our beginning to live with Them in imagination; nothing hinders our visualization of the U.L.T. as a centre of work for Them; nothing hinders our nourishing it with our love.

PERSONALITY AND IMPERSONALITY

Personality is a mode of expression; impersonality is a mode of expression. The user of each is the consciousness, Manas, lower or higher.

What is the relationship between personality and consciousness, between impersonality and consciousness, and how do the two relationships differ one from the other? It is perhaps here that we, students of Theosophy but not yet real practitioners of Theosophy, need help.

Personality is the name commonly given to what we know of ourselves, the front we present to the world — our thoughts, feelings, capacities and so forth. Uniting these is the “I,” the “I” which separates from the body, feelings, capacities and thoughts at sleep and at death. These things are therefore only a vehicle for the “I” to use and to drop. The “I” functioning in the body uses the bodily organs. It is also used by the organs; for, when pain or sensation of any kind in any organ absorbs it to the exclusion of everything else, it identifies itself with that organ. The same is true of the emotions. The “I” can identify itself with love and hate; in fact we say, “He was not himself,” or, “He has lost control over himself.” The “I” has been identified with and absorbed by the vehicle of emotion. Similarly with ideas and intellect. A man’s ideas may, as we say, run away with him.

The first step for us, therefore, is to become aware of the “I” apart from the vehicles it uses, and then to practise moving it from vehicle to vehicle at will. We do this unconsciously when we try to read a book to alleviate pain or to forget an emotional upset, *i.e.*, we take our consciousness or awareness off it and put it on the book. We need to do this consciously, so that we know the “I” untinged by any vehicle.

But personalities work with other personalities and without a personality we could not live. The personality, therefore, becomes a very important tool for the “I.” It is our means of communication with our fellow beings; it makes heaven or hell, not only for ourselves but also for others. It should never be forgotten that the personality is in training to become a perfect vehicle for the expression of the divine in us.

In determining the relationship of impersonality to consciousness we have other vehicles to consider. It is still consciousness that has to use or express impersonality. As personality is made up of the four lower elements of our constitution, impersonality is made up of the three higher: Atma, Buddhi, Higher Manas. Or, perhaps, to be more accurate, consciousness unaffected has to function through Buddhi and Atma. Buddhi is the vehicle which expresses itself in Compassion; Atma is the Universal Will which supports all things. The awareness of these two by Manas makes for the attainment of the human goal. Then pure consciousness, the condition of pure or abstract awareness, *i.e.*, awareness of itself, learns to use the vehicle of Compassion and to embody the Divine Will. Hence it sees or is aware of the unity of life, both in itself and in all. Therefore it can no longer work for diversified units in opposition to

other units. It is merely a focal point in the world through which Spirit and Compassion, Nature's great Law or Will, can function.

How can we unite these two processes? How can we learn to be impersonal? We usually interpret the conception of impersonality as hardness, a lack of love for others, of consideration for others. Not recognizing the unity of all Life, we act without reference to others, without feeling. The relationship of consciousness to personality and impersonality needs to be understood. The difference between the two states of consciousness needs to be grasped. It is, of course, the relationship between higher and lower mind, the "I" of the personality and the "I" of the Ego illuminated by Atma-Buddhi. Only when the "I" of the personality can see itself as a separate entity from the lower vehicles and at the same time see itself as the representative of its parent Ego can any real impersonality come to birth.

Even so we are in life in order that the higher can begin to function through the lower, and the first step towards impersonality is not action; action is the last step. The first step after the separation of the feeling of "I" from its vehicles is to begin to use the vehicle called *Antas-karana*, that bridge or link between the lower "I" and its parent source. This can be done by turning the awareness or consciousness towards the parent and trying to view everything in the mind from the universal point of view. When from the top of a mountain we look into the valley we can see the overall picture; isolated things appear not isolated but in relationship to the whole picture. So from the universal, *i.e.*, impersonal, viewpoint we see events in relationship to one another. The "I" on the mountain top is unrelated to a great extent with that which it sees below; the impersonal "I" is unrelated to some extent with the many ordinary things and the events of life as they affect the individual. But it is related, and intimately so, with these things as part of a pattern. It sees the combining threads; it sees where help can be given from the viewpoint of the whole and not in terms of personal preference. Not being actively concerned with things from a personal viewpoint, it can act impersonally, *i.e.*, universally. To think of impersonality as universality is a great help, for then we can reach upwards to universal Feeling, Love, Compassion.

Our trouble starts when we come down again to the personal level; for immediately, as when we come down from the mountain, we see the details and lose the overall picture. Also outer things begin to react on our vehicles and we find ourselves losing our vision. Hence the need to train our vehicles in all the virtues and in self-sacrifice here and now, so that they do not obstruct us when the higher "I" wishes to act through them. Remember, the Christ and the Buddha had to have personalities. Such personalities as theirs were the result of thousands of lives of training. Let us treat the personality with respect; let us use it for the good of all, not by "acting" a part but by practising the virtues with it and by learning to use it as a vehicle.

MAN'S SEVEN PRINCIPLES

THE LIFE PRINCIPLE

Life in a form implies that in due course death will ensue — but death of form is not the end of life. This represents a puzzle in this most evasive of problems. Experience is quite definite in its dictum that life ceases at death. But observation and experiment support the inductive generalization that life, as such, cannot be destroyed. This conclusion is embodied in the law of the conservation of energy; it is seen that other forms of life or energy — worms, parasites, gases, chemical changes — supervene after the death of any form.

The puzzle hinges on the question of the origin and maintenance of complex forms. It is recognized that the phenomena of living action occur always in relation to some form of life; and when that form ceases to function, living phenomena — of that form, *per se* — cannot manifest. This is all that we observe. From this, the physicist, the chemist and the traditional biologist conclude that life is only a by-product of special, limited conditions; advanced biology, however, uncovers “new” knowledge that challenges the old materialistic position; while Theosophy presents the most advanced viewpoint on this subject. Let us consider the Theosophic teachings first, and then trace the steps of modern development that are leading gradually, inevitably, to the Theosophic conclusion.

Life is not the result of the operation of the organs, nor is it gone when the body dissolves. It is a universally pervasive principle. It is the ocean in which the earth floats; it permeates the globe and every being and object on it. It works unceasingly on and around us, pulsating against and through us forever. When we occupy a body we merely use a more specialized instrument than any other for dealing with both *Prana* and *Jiva*. Strictly speaking, *Prana* is breath; and as breath is necessary for continuance of life in the human machine, that is the better word. *Jiva* means “life,” and also is applied to the living soul, for the life in general is derived from the Supreme Life itself. *Jiva* is therefore capable of general application, whereas *Prana* is more particular. It cannot be said that one has a definite amount of this Life Energy which will fly back to its source should the body be burned, but rather that it works with whatever be the mass of matter in it. We, as it were, secrete or use it as we live. (*The Ocean of Theosophy*, pp. 40-41, Indian ed.)

Considering more specifically the relation of Life to the physical body, our attention is called to the fact that the body is made up of a number of infinitesimal “lives,” each of which is a sensitive point. They make up the cells, but are forever moving throughout the whole body and extending, too, beyond its limits to a measurable distance.

Their action, forced forward by the Life Energy, holds the explanation of active existence and of physical death. The destroyers and the

preservers among these lives war upon each other from birth until the destroyers win. In this struggle the Life Energy itself ends the contest because it is life that kills.

It is said that "the infant lives because the combination of healthy organs is able to absorb the life all around it in space, and is put to sleep each day by the overpowering strength of the stream of life." Since, however,

it exists around us like an ocean in which we swim, our power to throw it off is necessarily limited. Just when we wake we are in equilibrium as to our organs and life; when we fall asleep we are yet more full of life than in the morning; it has exhausted us; it finally kills the body. Such a contest could not be waged forever, since the whole solar system's weight of life is pitted against the power to resist focussed in one small human frame. (*Ocean*, p. 39)

The student raised in the traditions of orthodox biology finds it difficult to accept this teaching at first sight. He is aware of a basic contradiction somewhere; and, on closer analysis, isolates the source of this conflict in one of the fundamental suppositions of old biology — "Protoplasm is the physical basis of life." From this premise it is generally deduced: (a) that life is to be found only where there is protoplasm; and (b) that life is dependent upon, and a by-product of, previously existing "right conditions." To one who accepts this theory as a basis of judgment, the Theosophical teaching must appear as an "upside-down" idea. But during his study of the human principles the student learns to use his own discrimination, and this discrimination results in a growing respect for the statements of Theosophy and a healthy scepticism towards the facile judgments of the materialistic system — particularly as the new "scientific" knowledge usually tends to undermine the formerly impregnable wall of materialistic beliefs.

For instance, consider the case of "dead" and "living" matter. This hypothesis, deriving chiefly from the concept of protoplasm as the basis of life, ruled as law until less than 20 years ago. In 1935, with the publication of the results of Dr. W. M. Stanley's research on the tobacco mosaic disease, the time arrived for the scrapping of this concept. The following is quoted from *New Worlds in Science*:—

The "virus," long known to be the carrier of diseases beyond the reach of medicine, so inconceivably small that it passed the finest filters, now appears to be a substance that is neither alive nor dead. Crystalline in the form developed by Dr. Stanley from tobacco mosaic disease, it is, by all accepted definitions, inanimate. But under the proper conditions — of which the presence of suitable living cells is the most important — this inert crystal suddenly leaps into action and within a short time has multiplied itself by billions. . . .

With the unavoidable acceptance of this significant demonstration,

wherein an inanimate substance takes on the reproductive characteristics of "living" matter, the scientific imagination immediately set off with enthusiastic determination to nullify the barrier between "dead" and "living" matter which, paradoxically enough, had represented one of the pillars of its orthodoxy, only "yesterday." Whether this new atmosphere of friendly enquiry encouraged the emergence from their pigeonholes of older, similar observations, or whether fresh chemical facts were being discovered under the inspiration of this deepened perception of living phenomena — it is significant that only four years after the public announcement of Stanley's discovery chemistry was supplying additional data to show clearly how flimsy was the intellectual barrier that divided "dead" from "living" matter.

The following is taken from Waldemar Kaempffert's *Science Today and Tomorrow* (1939). Citing the old, familiar "signs" that presumably "proved" the presence of life, he wrote:—

To be alive a thing must move spontaneously, you say. A locomotive does that. . . . Lifeless matter cannot eat, it may be argued. Can't it? Bring a drop of chloroform near a glass particle coated with shellac. Something extraordinary happens. The drop flows around the particle, devours it, digests the shellac and then, most wonderful of all, actually rejects the indigestible glass particle! A living amœba can do no more. . . . Surely lifeless matter does not grow. Throw a lump of copper sulphate into a dilute solution of potassium ferrocyanide. A brown envelope develops. It throws out upward-growing runners. In half an hour the solution is filled with a "plant" that closely resembles seaweed — something that has grown in a very real sense. . . . Dozens of inorganic crystals thus grow and reproduce their kind.

One cannot but admire the frankness of these men of science in admitting their former errors and in performing such a complete *volte-face*; but it leaves the student somewhat bewildered until, turning to the Philosophy of Theosophy, he finds the following statement which succinctly explains the status of inorganic and organic matter, and its relation to life:—

Life is ever present in the atom of matter, whether organic or inorganic — a difference that the occultists do not accept. Their doctrine is that life is as much present in the inorganic as in organic matter: when life-energy is active in the atom, that atom is organic; when dormant or latent, then the atom is inorganic.

Considering the important fact that all Theosophical statements are claimed to be verifiable, while biological hypotheses are often of the nature of inductive inference, the student's mind frames the question: Is there any form of experimental knowledge that can more closely approach the Theosophic position? He suddenly remembers the "electrical architect" of Burr and Northrop, "who moulds and fashions the

individual after a specific predetermined pattern, and remains within the body from the pre-embryonic stages until death.”¹ Reflecting on the conclusions which they reached, and the method used, a basic conviction arises within him which is illuminating.

While orthodox biology seeks for generalizations derived from physicochemical correlations, the newer biology experiments with bio-electrical phenomena. And, since the findings of Burr and Northrop are conclusive that physical-plane appearance, growth and continuity are dependent upon a pre-existing electromagnetic pattern, it becomes clear that physicochemical research, as such, will never solve the mystery of Life. The answer must be sought in the relationship between this magnetic pattern-body and the living nature of “electricity.”

It is heartening to note a substantial advance along this line of thought in a Research Report published by the Electronic Medical Foundation of San Francisco, which reviews unusual work being done by specialists. Among them is Dr. H. S. Burr, already mentioned. The reporter asks him what the developing theory of electricity as related to Life might mean. His answer is:—

What does this mean for all of us, for you and me? It means that the scientists have uncovered some clues to the ultimate mystery of life, that for the first time we are part of a universal whole. It means that all living things . . . as well as all the rest of the stuff of which the universe is made, are what they are because within everything are a whole set of forces which can be measured by meters and other electrical gadgets. These forces determine what you and I are and do — but since they are of an electrical nature, no single thing, living or non-living, can ever be separated from all the rest. Electrical energies bind us all together into a single whole.

Except for the untheosophical suggestion that scientifically measurable forces can of themselves determine what any human being is or does, the above quotation seems to represent a step towards the statement of Theosophy that

Light is Life. . . . Both are electricity — the life principle, the *anima mundi*, pervading the universe, the electric vivifier of all things. . . . Within its beams lie the beginnings of all physical and chemical action, and of all cosmic and spiritual phenomena . . . it gives life and produces death, and from its primordial point gradually emerged into existence the myriads of worlds. (*S.D.*, I. 579)

The analogy between this living process and that of utilizing the electric current in machinery is striking. The underlying principle in regard to electricity, for the engineer, is simply that it exists. It pre-exists. The craftsman is not naïve enough to imagine that his appliance or motor “creates” the electric power; he merely learns to use this pre-existent force. Light bulbs burn out, motors wear out, but this mysterious

¹ See the article on “The Astral Body” in the January issue of this magazine.

power is indestructible. Thus does practical experience confirm analogically the Life process.

We can now see how this Life Principle is one of the basic factors in producing health or disease of the human body. The reader is first referred back to the opening paragraphs wherein the roles of the "destroyers" and the "preservers" are described; and then to the following statement:—

Were it [Jiva or the Life Principle] to become . . . but for one single instant inactive, say in a stone, the particles of the latter would lose instantly their cohesive property, and disintegrate.

In the average life span of 70 years, the first five periods of seven years each are devoted to the building-up process of the body. During this time, the cohesive strength forces the lives to contribute to the normal health and unity of the growing form. After this cyclic peak is passed, however, the innate unifying power begins gradually to wane; it is then that weaknesses and diseases supervene, until death marks the time for the disintegration of the form. Part of the secret of health lies in helping to maintain the "balance of power" in favour of the form as a whole.

Two other factors of importance in the preservation of health are the attitude of the mind and the power of the human will: "One common vital principle pervades all things, and this is controllable by the perfected human will" (*Isis Unveiled*, II. 590).

The normal life expression of the average man consists in cultivating pleasurable sensation as well as emotional satisfactions; in this pursuit, the reserves of the unifying aspect of the life-force are drained and depleted; and the "destroyers" manifest in the breakdown of resistance to disease.

On the other hand, imagine the emancipated Soul, intent upon the path of Soul-knowledge and performing his *dharma* in the body. Here there is no drenching of the nervous system with wave upon wave of life-energy like the attacks of shock troops upon a wall of resistance. Rather might we see the steady quality of heart-felt aspiration building up a reservoir of life-force, transmuting its quality to the realm of spiritual dynamics. For "the human brain is an exhaustless generator of the most refined quality of cosmic force out of the low, brute energy of Nature" (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 29*, p. 3). The Adepts, whatever the age of their bodies, are all said to be in perfect physical as well as mental health (*Isis*, II. 595).

The student should concentrate his thought on the fact of the existence of these Ideal Men, Adepts, Masters. For They *are* facts in Nature and the very embodiments of the teachings of Theosophy. Such as They now are, we may become, through study and effort. But it is impossible to travel far along this road to knowledge without an understanding of Man's Seven Principles.

FUN AND LAUGHTER

“People don’t *want* warnings, they want fun,” writes the editor of *The Bookseller* in its issue for October 1958, and he proceeds to record again the need for the unprejudiced, the sane and balanced view that, down the ages, has raised opposition to idiotic extremes of formalism and false autocracy:—

It is not that people are entirely frivolous and unable to think about serious things. They’re just tired of fear and threats and prophecies of disaster. Ever since one writer predicted the end of civilized man after the first atomic explosion, the doomsters have been dinning it into our ears that our descendants will have three arms — if we live to have descendants — or that the world will be reduced to radioactive ashes. . . . Of course it hasn’t happened. Civilized man still goes his uncivilized way, and the more frenziedly the Jeremiahs howl at him the more he turns to laughter. How could he endure life otherwise? It’s a good thing that he can find escape in laughter, but laughter is more than an escape: it’s a weapon against pompous gloom peddlers, and even against tyrants. Ridicule can often prick the bubble of extravagance.

Why shouldn’t we laugh? In this so-called “civilization”—or rather veneered barbarism with literate overtones, hiding greater depths of mental and moral obscurity — the ability to laugh at *oneself* is about the only sign that a part of the world is still sane. Anything that drives us out of our own particular megalomania and shows how ridiculous *we* seem to others is a real blessing. It is indeed extraordinary, and a phenomenon of the age in which we live, that so many “readers” are being led by so few “thinkers” — and that most of these so-called “thinkers” purvey moral sop to conceal their own selfish ends. How many politicians really mean what they promise? How many of them carry out that which they verbally undertake? How many of the masses that elect and make them prominent even remember what they have vowed to do? Or have the strength to say: “You promised! Now, you fulfil”? And, if necessary, expose the inner corruption of self-interest?

But even laughter, so prized, is being taken advantage of. These self-interested “thinkers,” leading the blind masses by their noses, use humour as a “blind.” “While people laugh at themselves, they are not going to look too closely at us,” they say — and they are right. Our modern systems of education turn children into sensation-loving sots, into readers who waste their time in perusing trash, to the greater profit of the publishers who see not further than their purses. *Maya*-illusion and glamour, pretence and charm, thrill and fear, anxiety and suspense — all these feelings enthral the lower thinker, blind him, prevent him from being able, in the light of the Higher Thinker, to laugh at himself and with others in the true spirit of friendliness and compassion.

True laughter should be informative and reformatory; should restore perspective, elevate the awareness, sharpen acuteness, restore harmony,

build understanding and tolerance of others. Only he who is prideful, vain, position-conscious, power-desiring, has no sense of humour or of the fitness of things and cannot laugh. His, indeed, is a dreadful condition of such self-interest that he cannot step away from himself and take a different view of things.

Suppose, from time to time (and perhaps, eventually, several times a day), we were able to step away from ourselves (our *lower selves*) and ask: "Are my plans secure? Do I harmonize with others? Are these long-term or really short-term affairs? Ten years from now will I be honoured or despised for present acts, feelings and thoughts? Do the Laws of Nature stamp with approval that which I intend?" If we were to ask ourselves all this, it would serve to give us the necessary time to plan and work constructively.

It would give the person who was inclined to impulsiveness the time to be calm — not to destroy the energy of impulse, but rather to see that it is correctly and helpfully channeled. He who had pride, stubbornness or vanity would perhaps ask himself: "Is my Higher Self proud of this plan? Is this part of the Original Programme of the Brotherhood of all Beings? Am I vain of being a co-operator with Nature? Or is this really too limited, too circumscribed to my own temporary profit, so that ten years from now neither I nor anyone else will think at all well or highly of it, if they think of it at all?"

He who is inclined to hoard money, or to spend it all upon himself or his family, or to store it up for his sons or his community — would he not begin to ask: "Truly, when does money have value in these days when we hear so much of diminishing returns, dwindling values, economic depressions? Does not the true value of money lie in spending it? Does not money have its fruitful return in the joy and pleasure, in the ease and comfort that it provides to others? Can I and my sons, family, community and nation be secure in our wealth when other sons, families, communities and nations are in a worse position than I and mine? Surely others will see the difference, they will envy me, and presently they will try to equalize things by taking away from me that which I hold unjustly in excess. Is it *unjust*? Well, *I* work harder than most — or, *I* am more shrewd. Don't *I* justly deserve this?" "You do," would observe the student of Theosophy, "but how long can you keep it? When death comes, you cannot take it with you. So, why not behave like a wise trustee? Why not spend what you have judiciously — for others, for your country (which should be the world), for your community (which should embrace all religions and communities), for your sons (who should be educated to think and to earn, to plan and to work, as you did and do, and to whom a little misfortune might prove a great benefit in the long run).

Laughter is called the greatest of medicines. It clears the selfish minds and feelings of men of their mists; it opens, for a while, a pathway to higher perspectives. It serves at such times to reunite the wandering

ambassador (the lower mind entangled in "things" and in the loss of "things") to his King: the Higher Mind — all-seeing, all-knowing, the eternal spectator over the wanderings of our little lives, ever ready to help, calm, dignified, friendly, tolerant, brave with wisdom, envisions of Truth.

"People don't want warnings, they want fun," says our writer. But, even in their fun, let them take one friendly warning — let their laughter be free and clear; let it not be nasty, mean or sneaky. It shows bad taste to laugh, far less to rejoice, at the discomfiture even of an enemy. It is one thing to "laugh with"; quite a different thing to "laugh at." There is a laughter of the lower order, of which one should be really ashamed; that is not for Man, the unfolding god, but for creatures degraded to conditions lower than the beasts of the jungles, whose prey are the unwary, the ignorant, the innocent. Let our laughter be that of "sweet fun" which restores sanity — the sanity of truth and of wisdom that sees beneath the seeming incongruity of things their fundamental unity.

According to Raymond Dart, retiring Professor of Anatomy at the Witwatersrand University Medical School, Johannesburg, finds at two prehistoric sites in the northern Transvaal have proved the existence of a Bone Age in the history of man, antedating the Stone Age by "probably hundreds of thousands of years." His theory is based on a collection of more than 30,000 bones which are supposed to have been used by "ape men." The discovery by the well-known paleo-anthropologist, Dr. J. T. Robinson, of the supposed "first primitive bone implement ever to be found," estimated to be between 500,000 and 750,000 years old, is said to support Professor Dart's theory (*Sunday Chronicle*, Bombay, December 28th, 1958).

In considering any new discovery it is best to refrain from jumping to conclusions and from confusing theories with facts. It has, for instance, been found that certain tribes in Alaska were fishing and hunting with bone implements during the early part of this century. It is a Theosophical truism that savages and civilized men have lived side by side, as they do now, down the ages. There is much historical and archæological evidence for this. We can see the absurdity of jumping to conclusions when we imagine archæologists and anthropologists of the future, upon finding the remains of present-day Alaskan fishermen and their walrus-bone fish hooks, deducing that these belong to antediluvians!

On the other hand, students of Theosophy welcome discoveries, and deductions from them, that break away from the arbitrary and misleading orthodox Biblical chronology which is still believed in by some.

THE MAN OF THE FUTURE

Chemistry and physiology are described by Madame Blavatsky as the two great magicians of the future who are destined to open our eyes to the great physical truths. Of late, physics has stolen the limelight with the rapid developments in electronics and rocketry and the utilization of nuclear energy. It is not realized, generally, that these developments are largely technological, *i.e.*, are the utilization of fundamental discoveries in matter and energy made in the early part of this century and the closing part of the last. The principles of rocketry go back further still to the work of Newton about 300 years ago.

This is pointed out in a striking article, "The Man of the Future," by Dr. Philip Siekevitz, in the September 13th issue of the New York weekly, *The Nation*. In it is described briefly some of the recent fundamental work in biology. Apparently, while we have been preoccupied with trying to avoid the destructive use of nuclear energy, a new test of our intelligence and good will is developing behind the scenes — the use of powers to control heredity, which Dr. Siekevitz believes will be placed in our hands in the course of time.

Again, according to Madame Blavatsky (*The Secret Doctrine*, II. 699), the first law in nature is uniformity in diversity, and the second, "As above, so below." The cell, the basic unit of living organisms, gives a striking illustration of the first. Dr. Siekevitz introduces us to the beautiful simplicity of its economy whereby, out of its foodstuffs, it provides a common pool of energy and a common pool of elementary substances for all the bewildering complexity of the compounds it synthesizes and the functions it performs. There is a basic pattern in the cell, whether it is in the human eye or in the liver of the rat, or whether it is the single cellular organism, the amœba. The cell produces a modification in this basic pattern to fit the function it is called upon to perform: the determination of heredity, the development of the complete organism from the single fertilized cell, the differentiation of function in any particular organ, and so on.

Light has been thrown on some of the intricacies of the ways of the cell; much remains in darkness, but such is the pace of progress that Dr. Siekevitz believes that "we are approaching the greatest event in human history, even in the history of life on this earth, and that is the deliberate changing by man of many of the biological processes." He adds:—

Theologians will protest, but it is certainty itself that man will play God. For if man's brain can conceive of a God, it can conceive of the workings of this God. And if we have this most miraculous of the instruments of the universe, why should we not use it?

Dr. Siekevitz pleads for a more intelligent use of the by-products of scientific research, for a revolution in our social and political institutions to match the revolution in our knowledge and power. If we can determine

the future we must know what the future should be. The question: "What creature should he become?" will replace "What creature is man?"

In a world in which the worship of collective power at the expense of the individual is undermining the liberal tradition, we can visualize all too easily the possible consequences of a power to determine heredity. Some of us would call for a halt in our headlong technological progress so that we might catch up politically and morally. We are entangled in a web in which the interwoven threads are our insatiable desire to know, expanding industry's demand for ever-increasing resources of power and improved techniques, and the fear of another country's predominance in economic and military might.

Ignorant as we are, we dare not take comfort in the hope that man will find it impossible to intervene at the physical level between the normal workings of Karma and his body, in order to determine his heredity. Dr. Siekevitz's retort to the theologians states in another way and in a different context the truth of Mr. Judge's remark in his article on Karma, reprinted in *U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 6*: "It must be remembered that Nature is all bountiful and withholds not her hand. The demand is made, and the supply will come." He adds: "But at what cost?"

Once we can conceive of the possibility of control of the biological processes and direct sufficient imagination, intelligence, drive and material resources to that end, history shows that we are likely to succeed. But at what cost? How much better for us if some of the effort were diverted to encouraging the intelligent use of the wealth we have, to overcoming the barriers which separate us and the fears which bedevil us? This amounts to saying that things could be better if they were different, and by itself this does not help us. We have to work with humanity as it is because we helped to create the conditions in which it finds itself.

Hope lies in the fairly large number of men who, like Dr. Siekevitz, are alive to some of the issues confronting us. Danger lies in the kindly opiate of nature which, that we may not be too fearful or despondent, dulls, after long familiarity, our sense of the urgency of these issues, so that we turn away from them. We fear, however, that the hope would be a forlorn one if the fundamental question were ever "what creature should man become?" There is little in the recorded history of mankind to give us confidence that it will agree on that. No! The fundamental question is and ever will be: "What *is* man?"

Catastrophe blights his hopes. Hope springs eternally. Faiths are proven false. Faith ever sustains him. There is a love which, in the words of Shakespeare,

... alters not with his [Time's] brief hours and weeks,
But bears it out even to the edge of doom.

What is the source of this mysterious power in man? Like the waters

of a spring, if tainted, it will flow clear again. If dammed at one point it will gush forth at another.

Theosophists! You have glimpsed the Man Eternal. Hold fast to that vision, for in time he will subdue the creature. Surrender neither to despondency nor to false hopes but be faithful to your true Self. The beauties of music, of literature, of painting, of sculpture, and the lives of heroes bear witness to our creative power and to the miracle of our brain. So do Belsen and Hiroshima. The day must come — we hope it will be soon, but it may be late — when men will seek the source of all power. Then they will cease to abuse it.

Peter Viereck made a plea for “inwardness” in the *Saturday Review* for November 1st under the title “The Unadjusted Man: Last Refuge of Civilization’s Secret Fires.” He sees unadjustment to the age and adjustment to the ages as reciprocal sides of the same coin. “The meaningful moral choice,” he writes, “is not between conforming and nonconforming, but between conforming to the ephemeral, stereotyped values of the moment and conforming to the ancient, lasting archetypal values shared by all creative cultures.”

The American educator praises the “impractical” humanistic and spiritual studies for the understanding of man’s inner nature which they give, but his main thesis is the need of individual resistance to the prevailing overadjustment that sacrifices genuine inner spontaneity to well-adjusted mass mediocrity. He pronounces the substitution by novelist and poet of technique for art as the most corrupting development in their fields. The test of real inspiration, he says, is pain. Not, he explains, “mere” physical pain,

but the exultant, transcending pain of selfless sacrifice. The test is that holy pain, that brotherhood of sacrifice, that aristocracy of creative suffering of which Baudelaire wrote . . . in a free democracy the only justified aristocracy is that of the lonely creative bitterness, the artistically creative scars of the fight for the inner dimension against outer mechanization. . . .

And he warns that “without spiritual know-why, you lose even your technical know-how,” predicting that “the world through trial and error will come to see . . . the material necessity of antimaterialism.”

The spread of the Theosophical Movement will hasten the coming of that day.

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

Dr. Ian Stevenson, in a thought-provoking article, "Scientists with Half-closed Minds" (*Harper's Magazine*, November 1958), shows how scientific progress has been and is being hampered by the way men of science themselves react to "new" ideas and attack major discoveries without even glancing at the evidence. Hypnotism, for instance, was, not so long ago, attributed by many leading scientists either to imposture or to bad observation, and in so doing they "forgot the rules of their own calling." Dr. Stevenson names many scientists who have suffered from the incredulity of their colleagues. The circulation of the blood was once vigorously denied; the revolution of the Earth around the Sun was scoffed at; and at the first demonstration of Edison's phonograph before the Paris Academy of Sciences all the scientists present declared that it was impossible to reproduce the human voice by means of a metal disc.

Examples of "stupid hostility from fellow scientists," which is still being encountered, could be multiplied. Such hostility, Dr. Stevenson states,

should not occur at all among scientists. For it was science that once fought religion for freedom of inquiry and belief. In its original victories — and some of its more recent ones too — science defeated attempts to censor ideas. The principle of expanding knowledge replaced that of closed revelation. What had seemed to be a body of established facts was challenged and succeeded by a new body of facts based on observation rather than on reason and authority. But in the process a confusion arose between science and that body of newly discovered facts.

As science has progressed, more and more facts have become established with reasonable certainty — with enough certainty unfortunately to stimulate the illusion that science is chiefly a body of knowledge. The current body of scientific knowledge differs markedly from that of the seventeenth century, and the comparison shows the transience of our concepts. Yet we frequently overlook this and identify science with current knowledge. Those who forget that science is fundamentally a method and not a collection of facts will righteously challenge new concepts which seem to question old facts. . . .

To accomplish anything worthwhile in science (and in nearly everything else), one has first to persuade oneself that things may be different from what they seem. . . . The wish not to believe can influence as strongly as the wish to believe. Most of us most of the time practise Paley's recipe for obstruction: "There is a principle, proof against all argument, a bar against all progress . . . which if persisted in cannot but keep the mind in everlasting ignorance — and that is, contempt prior to examination."

Students of H. P. Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled* will be reminded of the closing words of the first Volume devoted to Science, ancient and modern:—

The few elevated minds who interrogate nature instead of prescribing laws for her guidance; who do not limit her possibilities by the imperfections of their own powers; and who only disbelieve because they do not know, we would remind of that apothegm of Narada, the ancient Hindu philosopher:

“Never utter these words: ‘I do not know this — therefore it is false.’ ”

“One must study to know, know to understand, understand to judge.”

Despite the abundant evidence that the imagination of the mother can affect the unborn offspring, some doctors and scientists are mental die-hards. In their article, “Life Before Birth,” condensed from *McCall's* in the November *Reader's Digest*, Dr. Herbert Thomas and Bruce Bliven opine:—

The umbilical cord is the only connection between the mother and the fœtus. The cord contains no nerves, and since the nervous systems of mother and fœtus are entirely separate, nothing the mother thinks or perceives can affect her offspring. This is why the age-old superstitions about pre-natal influence are false.

What is considered “superstition” by materialistic physicians — who complacently reassure anxious mothers against the possibility of pre-natal influence, and so encourage them to indulge every emotion and fancy, to the detriment and sometimes lasting injury of the coming offspring — is nevertheless a fact of frequent occurrence, recognized down the ages. In *Isis Unveiled* (I. 384-403) H.P.B. sets together medical and other evidence from Judæa, Greece and Rome in the pre-Christian era, mediæval Italy, Belgium and England, to 19th-century France, Great Britain and the United States. She cites authority after authority and gives nearly a score of instances, some in her own experience, of birthmarks projected by the mother's imagination in the reptile, bird, animal and human kingdoms.

She quotes Eliphas Levi as stating: “Pregnant women are, more than others, under the influence of the astral light, which assists in the formation of their child, and constantly presents to them the reminiscences of forms with which it is filled.” H.P.B. explains that the expectant mother's

pores are opened; she exudes an *odic* emanation which is but another form of the *akasa*, the electricity, or life-principle, and which, according to Reichenbach, produces mesmeric sleep, and consequently is *magnetism*. Magnetic currents develop themselves into electricity upon their exit from the body. An object making a violent impression on the mother's mind, its image is instantly projected into the astral light, or the universal ether, which . . . is the repository of the *spiritual* images of all forms, and

even human thoughts. Her magnetic emanations attract and unite themselves with the descending current which already bears the image upon it. It rebounds, and repercussing more or less violently, impresses itself upon the foetus, according to the very formula of physiology which shows how every maternal feeling reacts on the offspring. (*Isis*, I. 395)

W. Q. Judge wrote in *Echoes from the Orient*:—

Nothing in the material world endures absolutely unchanged in itself or its conditions, even for the smallest conceivable portion of time. All that *is*, is forever in process of *becoming* something else. This is not mere transcendentalism, but is an old established doctrine called, in the East, “the doctrine of the constant, eternal change of atoms from one state into another.”

This is the *Nitya Pralaya* referred to in *The Ocean of Theosophy* (Chapter V) and in *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 371) and explained as “the change which takes place imperceptibly in everything in this Universe from the globe down to the atom — without cessation.”

Biological research has corroborated the idea that the body undergoes constant change and renovation. Once considered to be altogether inert, the human skeleton has recently been shown to be subject to continual turnover, just as are other parts of the body, such as the skin (*Sunday Statesman*, December 7th). Bones, it is now recognized, are continually wearing out and being replaced in the normal human skeleton. Using a new technique for handling radioactive calcium data, devised in laboratories of the U.S. National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, scientists have demonstrated that, in both the adult and the growing skeleton, there is taking place an actual physical destruction of structural bone units and their replacement by new bone formation. Normal adult bone formation, they have found, results in the deposition of approximately 600 milligrams of calcium daily, an amount approximating its average daily dietary intake.

Theosophically considered, the perpetual change of atoms, disintegration of molecules, and hence change of forms, are the natural opposite of *Nitya Sarga* — constant creation or evolution. The creative and preservative force of life maintains a *continuing* pattern in the midst of physical change. Also, if we can keep our identity in spite of our changing bodies, is there not here evidence suggesting the existence of an immortal ego, changeless in the changing forms and the permanent recorder of all experience?
