

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. 52, No. 4

17th February 1982

THE STUDY OF THE SECRET DOCTRINE A FEW SALIENT POINTS

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, September 1943.—EDS.]

THE TEACHINGS of the Secret Doctrine are not new or incomplete. These teachings pass from the immemorial past to the unfathomable future. Carved on rock, traced in symbols and glyphs, reflected in the great minds and hearts of Divine Kings and Great Teachers, they are brought to birth in any civilization through the efforts of Those Who Know and those who struggle to know. They are, in fact, the Divine Ideas of the Universal Mind, impressed as archetypal ideas on higher planes of Nature and reflected on to the plane of human consciousness as the Laws of Nature.

The accuracy of the Teachings is assured. H.P.B. gives her own testimony to her “somewhat intimate acquaintance with Eastern depths and study of their science.” And she tells us that what she believes in is: “(1) the unbroken oral teachings revealed by living *divine* men during the infancy of mankind to the elect among men; (2) that it has reached us *unaltered*; and (3) that the MASTERS are thoroughly versed in the science based on such uninterrupted teaching” (*Lucifer*, Vol. V, p. 157). The student must learn for himself to sense this accuracy.

Our study of *The Secret Doctrine* is for this purpose. If we study merely with our senses and mind we can never progress, for we shall only expand our knowledge of this plane of illusion. What we seek to gain is that unfoldment of consciousness which will help us to get a new perception of Nature and of our relationship to the

whole of manifested and unmanifested Nature. Though the scope of *The Secret Doctrine* is so vast and it covers such a multitude of subjects, yet this different faculty aroused in us will give us the capacity to pierce through the details to the underlying thread. Our new perception will be synthetic, universal, impersonal.

Since the Teaching is not new or incomplete but tested and tried, there is only one correct interpretation for each tenet. The applications of the tenets are as varied as the individual characters of men. Since each student must learn for himself, we must needs study first to find out what the Teachings are. Since we need to gain an unfoldment of consciousness we must find out our limitations, our own idiosyncrasies, prejudices and preconceptions, for these will otherwise cloud our judgment. Each of us at first will judge the statements from the standpoint of his own knowledge, experience and consciousness; hence the need to pierce through these and expand our perception through study, practice and reflection.

First let us look at ourselves. Each of us is the product of our own age and civilization and bound by their limitations. However much, in our conceit, we may fight against the statement that "Outside such initiation, for every thinker there will be a 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther,' mapped out by his intellectual capacity" (*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 326), yet it is true. The barriers between the spiritual and the material worlds are broken down at times, under cyclic law, and more facts and mysterious knowledge are given out to mankind; and also when the individual cycle permits it, the student is "initiated into perceptive mysteries." But to reach the latter stage, "Lead the life necessary for the acquisition of such knowledge and powers, and Wisdom will come to you naturally." (*Ibid.*, I. 167)

How shall we begin to know ourselves, to see our limitations and prejudices and preconceptions? We are told that man cannot know himself save through his own shadows cast on Nature, and by the apperception of the reflections which Nature projects in and on him. To understand what we see we must impress our minds with two statements: (1) The only living eternal Reality is Parabrahm and (2) The radical unity of all essence, from star to mineral atom from planet to man and the various parts of man.

Every human being is a manifestation of Deity. It is therefore possible for each to become one with the Infinite. Through the radical

unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of the compounds in Nature, man, who is the copy of the Whole, contains within him centres through which all the forces of Nature may be operated.

Reflection on these ideas breeds faith and conviction; clear vision supplants argument and analysis; realization of a truth is not provable to others.

Since there is this consubstantiality of essence and interdependence of the matter-form aspect of Nature, our efforts to understand must be linked with selfless service. In our efforts to reach union with the Divine, we need to see the Divine in and through everything. Seeking that Divine, we see, faintly at first and more clearly as we go on, the causes behind the multitudinous effects. We see the Circle of Necessity which binds us to life; we see the One Law underlying all laws — Brotherhood; we see that in sacrifice and compassion lie immortal life; we see that through the knowledge of the Law we are free.

The energy of the Divine Will flows through us as we empty ourselves in the Ocean of Life.

The more thou dost become at one with it, thy being melted in its BEING, the more thy Soul unites with that which Is, the more thou wilt become COMPASSION ABSOLUTE.

NAN-IN, a Japanese Zen master, received a university professor who came to inquire about Zen. Nan-in served tea. He poured his visitor's cup full, and then kept on pouring. The professor watched the overflow until he could no longer contain himself. "It is overfull. No more will go in!" "Like this cup," Nan-in said, "you are full of your own opinions and speculations. How can I show you Zen unless you first empty your cup?"

—PAUL REPS, in *Zen Flesh, Zen Bones*

THE SELF IMMORTAL

IMMORTALITY, or everlastingness, must be distinguished from *survival*, for it is quite possible to conceive that some portion of our very complex spiritual and psychic make-up might survive the death of the physical body for a while, and yet itself be subject to gradual decay and death. It is probable indeed that this is what happens to the purely psychic elements in us—to the lower or personal part of the inner man; and that the “messages” of the séance-room, when they do not come from the subconscious minds of the medium or sitters, may be derived from the disintegrating psychic remains of the dead.

If any part of us be immortal and everlasting, it is clear that it cannot be the outer, personal being—the name, bodily form and memory of events which give that personality its shape, as it were, and which are regarded by many as constituting the real man. That personal, habitual self cannot be immortal, for it very obviously came into being in time; and Father Time, as the old Greek fable narrates, devours all his children. The theory, once so widely accepted, that the man who began at birth, will by some supernatural miracle continue to exist for ever, is at once contrary to reason and repugnant to our sense of fitness. Are any of us so pleased with our outer self that we desire to be identified or associated with it for ever? To pass eternity as John Smith or Ram Gopal—what an appalling prospect! No. What is born must surely die; and, if we are to ascertain what in us will survive death, we must first find out what part of us antedated birth, for we may reasonably expect to take with us out of life what we brought with us into life. Now what we brought with us into life was a collection of tendencies, aptitudes, affinities—in a word, character, which has been called “the memory of the soul.” Our deeds and thoughts during life go to modify and develop that character either for good or ill; and, providing there be any survival at all, it is character as thus modified that we shall take with us through the portals of death.

But character itself, though permanent as compared with personality, is yet only relatively so: it is, as we have seen, subject to change and growth, and therefore, like personality, fated to become the prey of Time the Devourer. We must look deeper still into the innermost recesses of our being for an *immortal* principle.

Nothing that is liable to change can be immortal; but, when by introspective thought we analyse our inner nature, and one after another objectivize — or think about — the various elements of which we are compounded, we find that all of them are phenomenal, relative, subject to time and change, and therefore not immortal.

But this is not all. The very conception of ourselves and the universe as a flow of changes, a complex of relativity, would be impossible unless there were at the back of all change and relativity an unchangeable noumenon. If we and the universe were nothing more than temporary compounds of matter or mind, for ever moving from one state or form into another, we could not be conscious of change any more than a man afloat on the current of a river, whose banks were out of sight, could be conscious of motion.

When in introspection we probe deeper and deeper into ourselves, we progressively discover that the body, the emotions, the mind, the will, and so on, with which we begin by identifying ourselves, can all be objectivized, and are therefore not the Self. But, however far we may carry this process, there is still an "I" that is making the analysis, a Self in the background, a subject to which all else is object. In the process of thus dis-identifying the real Self from all possible objects of thought, we have stripped away all the barriers and bounds that shut it in and seemed to separate it from other Selves and from the Universal. The Self is One. In the language of the West, the Spirit is one with God. Or, in the words of a very ancient Eastern scripture:

It [the Self] is the unchanging Eternal, it is the unchanging Supreme. . . . It is the excellent foundation, the unchanging foundation; knowing that foundation, a man is mighty in the eternal world.

Smaller than small, greater than great, this Self is hidden in the heart of man. . . . Understanding this great lord, the Self, bodiless in bodies, stable among unstable, the wise man cannot grieve. . . . He who has ceased not from evil, who stands not firm, whose emotions are not at rest, cannot obtain it by knowledge.

A LONG LIFE may not be good enough, but a good life is long enough. — BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

PROBLEMS OF LIFE

FROM "THE DIARY OF AN OLD PHYSICIAN"

BY N. I. PIROGOFF*

IV

ON MIND AND ITS RELATIONS TO SPACE AND TIME

[Reprinted from *Lucifer*, March and April 1891.—EDS.]

December 3rd, 1879

VERY naturally, an organic (brain) mind like ours must experience a great difficulty in conceiving another higher mind (in the Universe), with no organic basis; and to the modern mind such a concept must necessarily seem very absurd and nonsensical. In our times, it is not the diplomat alone who gets the most easily reconciled to an accomplished fact. In practical life, as well, the best thing is to accept that only which is visible and tangible, and in our investigations of causes and effects, to hold simply to the time-honoured and well-known *cum et post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. However threadbare and persecuted by logic this watchword may be, still it is inevitable in empiricism. For, whenever we experience anything, and reject or confirm one experience by another, still, in sober truth, we do nothing with our empirical or inductive speculations but replace one *cum et propter hoc* by another.

Indeed, we must not go too far either in empiricism or in practical life. But where shall we stop? This is a question left for each of us to solve individually and according to our respective frames of mind. But howsoever zealously we may try to limit ourselves to facts and purely inductive theories, we have yet, at every step we take, to reckon with abstract concepts and notions.¹ However inductive a speculation may be, it cannot see light or live without the help of abstraction. Space is a fact, time — a fact, motion — a fact, life — a fact, and nevertheless, space, and time, and motion, and life are — the chiefest and most important abstractions!

Every child measures space, and is able, as long as it is made

* Translated from the Russian, by H. P. B.

¹ Professor Stallo has most admirably illustrated and demonstrated this truth in his *Concepts of Modern Science*—of science honeycombed with metaphysics and pure abstractions.—[TRANSL.]

subject to three dimensions, to judge easily and correctly enough of it; but, with regard to infinite and immeasurable space, the greatest and most practical minds do not feel quite sure as to the number of dimensions that may be applied to it. Mathematicians who now discuss the possibility of a fourth dimension may find, perchance, the necessity, not only the possibility, of also a fifth dimension.²

It is very probable that our brain-mind arrives at all such abstract conceptions as of space, time, etc., by empirical means, and through our external senses. But it ceases to be empiricism when after seeing and sensing the limits of space everywhere, we begin to think also of the limitless. Whether it be due to Kant's categories, or the drawers in the desk of our brain-mind, or any other hidden mechanism in it, the presence of abstractions in such evident realities as are space and time — is likewise a fact. Inevitably and fatally, without seeing or sensing the immeasurable and the limitless, we recognize its actual existence — and the “no-fact” exists as undeniably and as substantially as does any *fact*; and we feel convinced of the existence of the limitless and the immeasurable, far more than ever was Columbus in the existence of America before its discovery. The only difference lies in that we shall, perhaps, never be able to discover our America, as he has discovered his continent.³

December 4th, 1879

It must be kept in mind that our conceptions about space, time and life are totally distinct from common generalizations, as for example our views on man. By that generalization, “man,” we understand no further than the properties undeniably characterizing the human species.

But in the conception of space all the properties of separate spaces, such as dimension, form, contents and so on, disappear. To us (to me, at any rate), whenever thinking of space, it seems that all the spaces and objects known to us through sensuous perception are contained in their turn in that something else — immeasurable, formless, and limitless.

² If Dr. Pirogoff, an eminent scientist, thought so, then occult philosophy can hardly be taken to task and declared *unscientific* in accepting the existence of a seven dimensional space in co-ordination with the seven states of consciousness.—[TRANSL.]

³ Why not, when in the course of natural evolution our “brain-mind” will be replaced by a finer organism, and helped by the sixth and the seventh senses? Even now, there are pioneer minds who have developed these senses.—[TRANSL.]

We find the same in our conception of time; in reality we judge of it only by its motion or progress in space; but besides this actual definition of time, we cognize that without even such motion, that is to say, without any means of calculating time in space, our "I" exists in the present, just as it has existed in the past, and that this same past and present do not exist for the "I" alone, but will likewise exist in its absence.

The conception of the measures of space of time, which involuntarily follows our thought about space itself, and time itself, serves us not to clear our understanding, but to convince us that that which yields to measurement in space and time is not yet necessarily space and time itself.

Nor is our conception of life a simple generalization.

It is related, in my opinion, to the same category as space and time.

The first impulse towards a mental formation of any conception about these three *x*'s, gives us the sensation of our being. This sensation is a fact, of course. But what fact? Can it be classed in the category of those facts which we gather through our external senses, basing it precisely on that most important fact — the feeling of being, without which everything else is meaningless to us? This is a fact *sui generis* and outside of all others.

How the feeling of *being* manifests in animals — is another mystery, as insoluble as the phenomena of our conceptions about space and time. The first impulse comes undeniably from the action of the external world on our senses, but only as an impulse; the real pith and marrow of the sensation of being, and of our conceptions of space and time, lie profoundly hidden in the very *esse* of the life principle itself.

Let us take for an example the moment of the birth of a warm-blooded animal. What is it that causes it to sense its being with the first breath it draws, and utter its first sound of life?

It is the reflex action from the contact of air on its peripheral nerves, or the sudden change in the blood circulation of the newborn child.

This shows that the machine is so adapted that the contact of the external world with its peripheral nerves must inevitably react on the spring which is in the oblongated brain, and which puts into motion the respiratory apparatus, forcing it to draw into itself the

outward air; and this incipient inspiration must reflect itself, in its turn, on *something* that senses, and thus distinguishes itself from the external world. But it is just the relation of that "something" to the mechanism of the animal machine, which is the first x : it is insoluble, because to solve it substantially would require our watching and observing the relation of this first breath to the sensation of being, not only in oneself, or some other animal creature, but also our being able to sense the whole progress through, from its beginning to end. But then, even such an impracticable observation would be found insufficient. For, while sensing, it is impossible to closely observe one's sensation, without thereby altering and destroying it. Daily and hourly, we see men and animals born, and chickens hatched out; and we get so accustomed to life that we begin to imagine (as many do) that it is ourselves who give life to other beings. This is only natural, as life seems to us quite a matter-of-fact, a vulgar event, instead of the mystery it is.

It is hardly possible not to perceive that the difference between the living and the non-living is unnoticeable on the extreme border of life. Before we are taught by personal experience to distinguish life by its trenchant phenomena, we are involuntarily led to attribute (more or less) the same vital sensations as we ourselves experience to everything around us, chiefly to that to which we attribute strength or might. Thus, a child is taught only by experience to distinguish his "I" from the "not I's" around him, and he thinks every object before him as alive as he is himself.

It is, then, by studying and observing that we are led at last to distinguish, more or less rationally, life-phenomena from those of simple being. Even then we learn of no more than the mechanism of various organisms, governed by the same forces that rule being or existent things, *viz.*, by gravity, cohesion, atomic affinity, by electricity, heat and so on. As to the Principle which, in conformity to law, guides the said forces and mechanism toward the preservation of organisms and individuality, and also their relations to the external world—this remains unknown to us. To use a lawyer's phraseology, its essence "is irrelevant to the case" (or investigation), external form only being open to discussion.

As already said, it is our brain-mind alone that is led to the unavoidable conviction of the existence of this first principle of life, in which it finds and from which it traces itself, perceiving also a

rational tendency towards an object, independence and formation according to a pre-existing plan. Our mind, discovering in the most varied manifestations of life its own most vital aspirations, only on an immeasurably higher scale, cannot fail to recognize the primordial and independent being of a higher Principle, acting by the same laws of conformity and creative work as it does itself. Therefore, the being of that Principle must be, to our mind, independent of the matter it rules,⁴ and as primordial and independent of its substantial manifestations (or manifestations in substance) as universal space and time are independent of spatial measurements within space and time. Like space and time, the Life-Principle indwelling in them must be, according to the demands of our reason, primordial, infinite, formless and unconditioned. This self-existent, formless principle of Life shapes, in the primordial and also limitless space and time, every form of substance, and then guides all the other Forces to a struggle for life in that already formed and animated Substance.

But, in however close an agreement with the demands of our mind may be the conviction of the absolute necessity for the existence within and without matter, or substance, of a primordial and independent life-principle, to rule the atoms and guide the forces inherent in them, no clear or definite conception of it will ever be possible to us. Doubt will ever find its way into our mind, and the more and the better we get acquainted with the organization and functions of the organs necessary to life, the more probable it will appear to us that life, indeed, is but the collective function of those organs, and nothing else. Hence, very naturally, our concepts about the independence and co-ordination of the acts of the Life-Principle will appear to us not as facts, but only as the imaginative abstractions of that same mind of ours.

The fact is that our mental activity, once having received an impulse toward a certain direction, does not go astray as easily as we may think; and, moreover, it experiences a difficulty in deviating from its path, proportionate to its satisfaction with the results of its investigation in that once accepted direction. And it is but natural that the results attained with the full participation in them of our external senses should be precisely those that appear to us the clearest, and also the most satisfactory. But, to our regret, it is

⁴ Independent, outside of space and time; but dependent within the latter, on matter and substance alone, to manifest its presence in phenomena.—[TRANSL.]

precisely during inductive and exact methods of observation that we generally lose sight of the fact that if our sensuous perceptions acquire importance at all, it is not really due to themselves but to the *mental* conclusions we draw — let them be conscious or unconscious — from what we see, hear, and sense. And still these conclusions, as all other logical deductions, are no other than pure abstractions, whether conscious or unconscious. Our intellect also perceiving necessarily everywhere and in every fact, only itself outside of itself — acts in the same way during induction as during deduction; both there, where it judges on the data furnished by its senses, and there, where it judges by the representations of its fancy.

We have no means of reasoning other than by transferring our consciousness outside of ourselves. Without carrying our "I" into the external world, we would be unable to arrive at a mental conviction in the reality of even the universe we see. The sensuous perceptions of that which is outside us, we share in common with all the animal world, and — who knows — perchance with every organic body too; and it is not conscious or unconscious sensation either — sensation, so to speak, *per contactum* — which we designate as "conviction"!

December 16th, 1879

Yes; in analysing its genesis deductively, our brain-mind becomes soon and easily persuaded — too soon and too easily, I fear — that, after all, it is only a function of its own brain. Observing its chief attribute of ideation, our mind arrives at the conviction that it is simply a collective faculty, and that, therefore, it must be the function of the various parts and the various histological elements of the brain.

That which takes part in the process of ideation is: (1) the faculty — conscious or unconscious — of sensing and receiving impressions (*perceptio*); (2) the consciousness of such impressions — though not invariably, as even during unconscious sensations one can yet think unconsciously; (3) the faculty of retaining impressions (memory), which, again, are not always conscious; (4) the faculty (which I would rather call understanding) of uniting, associating and grouping in a certain order the sensations recorded by the memory and of forming out of them ideas; and (5) to do all this, a *conditio sine qua non* of ideation is necessary; namely, the faculty of pointing out by signs or of transferring into phonetic or

mimetic signs (syllables and words) the impressions received and passed on, in this new form, to memory. Now the combination, grouping and association of impressions, without their being transformed into phonetic and mimetic signs, may be possible, but in this case the relations of this faculty to consciousness become inconceivable to us; then we call such a grouping and association unconscious or instinctual. We have to confess, at the same time, that in this case such definitions do not help us in any way to explain the relations to, and part taken in it by, consciousness. (6) The highest point in the process of our ideation consists of its tendency and faculty to discern the cause and the results, the object and the means (the laws of causation and designment), and to discover the point of union between these, to postulate in every action a motion and an aspiration towards its realization, in short — a tendency and a faculty of creative work. And all this is closely allied in the process of our ideation with the feelings of liberty, determination, and free-will.

All of us believe that we are free to think this way or another, as we will. But on the other hand, each of us feels and knows that there is a limit to this supposed freedom, beyond which ideation becomes insanity. This is because our ideation is subject to the laws of Universal Ideation. Meanwhile, our brain-intellect, knowing of no other ideation than its own, and convinced by experience of its dependence upon its brain, can, in its examination of the external Universe, reach the illusion that there is no other thought in it (the Universe) save its own. This must necessarily happen, unless we feel as strongly convinced of the independent existence of the Universe as we feel sure of our own existence. Otherwise, all that our exploration find therein organized, as if designedly and independently of ourselves, must seem to us no better than a product of our own mind and fancy.

Thus, we find ourselves confined within a magic circle. On the one hand, we do not know in reality any other mind but our own organic mind; on the other, this same mind points out to us the external works of creative intelligence, which testify undeniably to the existence of another mind, with attributes for creation not only similar to, but immeasurably higher than, our own.⁵ And here an involuntary question arises: Is it quite certain that we could not

⁵ The Vedanta philosophy steps out of this "magic circle" by teaching that both our own mind and the Universal Mind (Mahat)—the latter in its acts of differentiation are

walk in any other way than with the help of our legs and feet, or, do we walk only because we are endowed with legs and feet? Is it certain that we can think only with the help of and through our brain, or do we so think only because we have a brain? In seeing the endless numbers of means by and through which given objects are reached in the surrounding Universe, are we justified in affirming that the mind is, and had to be, no more than a function of the brain? Do not we see the bee, the ant, and such like animate beings performing various actions of thought without the help of the brain of the vertebrate animals? Indeed, they offer us instances of an extraordinary perspicacity, of a distinct resolve to reach a given end, and even of a creative capacity. And what is this strange function, which holds in durance the existence of its organ? A pistol-shot guided by that function — and the organ is destroyed! What is this unique function, capable of analysing itself and its organ, like an object, like something external, outside itself? And if our mind finds itself, that is to say, its thought and intelligent creativeness, outside of itself, is it not rather because, as stated, it is only a manifestation of that same higher, universal, vital Principle, present and manifesting in the whole creation? The Universal Thought inherent in that principle coincides, so to say, with our brain-thought which serves it as a manifestation; hence the same attributes and tendencies in both. This coincidence is an evidence that the two kinds of manifestation come from the same common source. Our thought is only individual, precisely because it is organic and a brain-thought, while the other thought manifesting in the Life-Principle of the whole Universe cannot be organic, just because it is Universal. The organic cannot fully comprehend the inorganic. And therefore this vital Principle, as one of the manifestations of this Higher Mind, must remain to us a mystery. *Ignorabimus.*

It seems to me that I am ever jabbering about the Universal Mind and Universal Thought. But where is the Universal Brain? A *thought* without a brain, and without words! How absurd in the mouth of a physician! But why not, if the bee and the ant and the whole animal kingdom think without words? If people will give the name of thought only to the human-spoken, brain-born, and the

imited creations—are illusions. For, as our minds are but the product of the Universal Mind, so is the latter but a differentiated ray of the absolute Mind or No-Mind. The ONE, or Absoluteness, is the only eternal reality.—[TRANSL.]

human-conscious thought, it is their lookout. But for me, our thought is the product of the Universal Mind — and no fortuitous product, either.

December 17th, 1879

The Universe, life, force, space and time, all these are — how shall I call them — well, abstract facts. To call them so, may seem absurd; but since it contains two contradictions, it seems to me to express my views the more correctly, and is just what I want to say. Our notions about the above conceptions, as enumerated, are based on our sensations, hence on a fact. While sensing this, at first, we do not analyse our sensations and thus mistake them *d'emblée* all for one and the same fact. Notwithstanding the absence of analysis, we are still conscious (whether consciously or otherwise, I cannot tell) and acquire the firm conviction that, besides the limited space occupied by ourselves, even besides the limits of the horizons before us, there exists another space, and still another, and so on, *ad infinitum*. The same in the case of time, force, and life, for we do not find in our sensations any definite boundaries. As we do not remember the beginning of that sensation, so we are ignorant of its end. It is only our fancy, and the long series of experiences which familiarize us with the beginnings and the ends of various objects and actions, that cause us to think and speak of the end of the world, the end of life, and so on. But sensations, like the facts we live through, convince us of the contrary, that is, of the existence of the limitless and endless. In the sensation expressed by us by means of the sound or the words "I am," the "I was" and the "I will be" are contained. We feel vividly that the present is but an illusion, that we live only in the past, which is incessantly transformed into the future. And when we desire to guide ourselves, in a way, in our sensations about life, force, space, time and substance in other words, to raise these sensations to the degree of a notion or a definite idea, we do not act as we do in our generalizations. The conception shaped in us concerning the sensations of life, force, time, space, and substance, is not the quintessence of the properties of distinct objects or things, as are our other abstract generalizations. No; this is an abstract fact, outflowing from a sensation of something limitless and infinite, and clashing with that which we usually call an actual fact, *i.e.*, one which owing to its limitations is made

subservient to the verification of the external senses, or any other documentary (for instance, historical) verification.

Whatever we may say of the inevitability of death, even our own life appears to us to be endless. At any rate, until we approach that end, owing to old age or illness — we can hardly conceive of it.

However familiar we may be with matter, through experience, we finally get convinced that all our knowledge of its properties is insufficient to get at a definite conception of substance, with a view toward its limitations. However strong our ideas on the inseparability of force from substance, we are still unable to understand force as a property of matter, but have to admit its independent and limitless existence — as of substance itself — in boundless space and time. Had we ever the same chance, as the astronomers, of defining even approximately the boundaries and measurements of that which seems to be, and is, sensed by us as something endless and limitless, even then, as in astronomy, we should get figures and numbers such as we could never be able to represent to ourselves in reality. What good would be to us the countless milliards and billions? Our conceptions of the figures and numbers would still remain as vague as our notions of the Infinite and the Eternal!

IN this modern age, mysticism once more raises its head. Snatched out of the murk of superstition by deeper and more accurate thinking, it turns calmly on its rescuer and lo, that saving science itself goes mystic. For it cannot escape the universe around it — a universe of living things which sprang somehow from unfathomed beginnings; of forces, such as magnetism and gravitation and electricity, which can be labeled but not really known; of uncanny processes by which the potent magic of thought, stemming strangely from the sodden grey mass of the brain, creates new forms, starts new sequences, sweeps inward to the atom and outward to the galaxies of space. This it sees, and this it reckons with. Never again, perhaps, will chastened science expound the facts of the case with the smugness of old. Like the veriest bumpkin, it now senses the mystery inherent in the nature of things; with the humblest of men it tastes the brew made of wonder, bafflement and awe-struck recognition of all that is yet unexplained.

—DR. R. S. UNDERWOOD

PHYSICAL HEALTH AND ITS METAPHYSICAL CAUSE

THE CHELA'S life-ledger is a record of his health. He makes the record in his mind. It is mirrored in the body. Therefore it is said — health is a condition of chelaship.

Not much is said in written word about this. Fiction about health abounds. Nostrums of kinds are popular. Systems of disease-cures are rampant. But truths and facts remain generally hidden from optimists and pessimists alike.

The metaphysical cause of physical health — what is it? It is the Soul's perception that the universe is a *rhythmic* whole. When the mind sees the unity subsisting in nature, it mirrors forth that unity, and order and method, the two prime factors of rhythm, appear. Bodily health manifests as bodily rhythm — in its orderly function and its methodic habits.

The vision of unity in Nature does not come by chance, nor by the grace of God. It is yours as a fruit of toil, and none can deprive you of it. The toil consists in making the mind fit to receive the grace which comes from within, from the Soul, the creative God, superior to devas and angels. The toil becomes a holy task when we glimpse that Guru-Gnyanis are interested in such human endeavour. *Theo*, Soul alone, or *Sophia*, Knowledge alone, fail; but Soul-Knowledge coming from Knowing Souls, illumined minds, invariably succeeds.

You have heard on all sides that mankind suffers from the sin of separateness. This is the negative statement; hear the positive — Macrocosm and Microcosm are one and the same. They are not dual, they are one. This is the Advaita doctrine.

Nature and man are thought of and studied as two separate entities. All who do this are dualists, *dvaitas*. Some turn outwards and attempt to solve the riddle of the universe by observing external phenomena. These we call scientists. Others, of introspective temperament, neglecting the without are centred in themselves and say that they arrive at the knowledge of the whole through a contemplation of their own selves only. These we call ascetics. The true method is the correct blending of the two; it belongs to the true philosopher.

Analogy and correspondence are the two keys which enable th

philosopher to come face to face with the Great Mystery. These two are derivable because of the unity of Nature, and they explain the order and method of Nature.

The famous words of the Delphic Oracle, "Man, know thyself," resound in the immensities of space. They impress themselves on us when we are ready to listen to the Voice of the Great Nature, *Daiviprakriti*.

Man must study himself. Yes, but he cannot know his self in separation from the universal whole, from Life; Atman arises from *Jiva-Atman* and lives in it.

The Macrocosm and the Microcosm are linked, indissolubly linked, like the ocean and the wave. The one reflects itself in the other; the Macrocosm mirrors itself forth in man; the Microcosm is the replica of the omnipresent and boundless Universe. In the human being are focused all the powers and potencies which exist in the Great Cosmos. In the latter exist all the powers and potencies of the Unknowable Absolute.

Therefore is man one with the Absolute Parabrahman, the always-to-be-known God; and he is also one with the manifested Life, the *Verbum* or *Logos*.

The perfectly healthy are those who know in themselves this truth, and are able to exclaim, "*Aham eva Parabrahman*," "I am verily the supreme Brahman." To us who are not perfect they say, "*Tat tvam asi*," "Thou art That," and hearing the first great truth we try to fathom its meaning.

In the Pythagorean School the very form of salutation used bespoke "Health" which included all human blessings. The Pentagram, which served them as a password, was named "Health." Some of them gave to the Quaternion, their most solemn oath, the name of "Beginning of Health." This they did because they were Theosophists — preparing themselves to use perfect health, from which arises Peace for the whole man.

The One is the Parent of the Body, Soul and Spirit; the three are not from the One, they are in the One. In them the One is ever hidden. Therefore be attentive to the fourfold OM.

THEOLOGY AND THEOSOPHY

THEOLOGY is a strange subject when one turns one's mind to consider it. Godlike or Divine Wisdom is what it cannot claim to be. To Theosophy alone can that phrase rightfully pertain. Not only is Theology man-made, but almost every clause of its credo has been fought for in ecclesiastical councils adown the ages, and the formulation of the tenets that emerged from these was often achieved only through bitter wrangling and frequent bloodshed, "men of God" though the disputants were.

Foremost among these we find Eusebius, known as "the father of church history," author of what a modern theologian has called "the most important historical work ever written on Christianity."¹ He became a devotee of the Emperor Constantine, sitting beside him in a place of honour at the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325. Of him Madame Blavatsky has something to say and those who are interested in this particular Church Father should turn to Volume I, page 288, and Volume II, page 327 of *Isis Unveiled*. Apparently not above a little chicanery, Eusebius was intent upon showing that Christianity was not new, was in fact the oldest religion of all which could indeed seem to be the case (though not as proven by Eusebius), for, turning to *Isis* again (II. 211), we read that "the doctrines, ethical code, and observances of the Christian religion were all appropriated from Brahmanism and Buddhism, its ceremonies, vestments, and pageantry were taken bodily from Lamaism."

Take that cynical statement of Voltaire's — "God sent religion into the world. The devil sent theology after it." Perhaps the devil's intervention was due to the fact that theology *per se* is man-made and so inevitably reflects individual theories which had to be fought for by their originators, both verbally in such great conferences as already mentioned and on actual battlefields, persecutions and massacres also adding their weight.

The history of Theosophy, on the contrary, unfolds in perfect peace. Though its depths are fathomless, there is a sense of simplicity that rests the mind, allowing our thoughts to dwell quietly on its few tenets, which so soon convey the impression of being already implanted within us.

¹ *The Myth of Christian Beginnings*, by Professor Robert L. Wilken (p. 53).

How different the confrontation of theology! The first reaction to it on the part of some of us is instinctive opposition. Are not its tenets unseemly? A loving heavenly Father (as represented), one of whose precepts is "Thou shalt not kill," who, none the less, like any heathen deity, demands a victim, a scapegoat, as the price of forgiven sin! It is repulsive — more, it is illogical, and some can be aware of this even in childhood, just as they can sense the truths of Theosophy without knowing how these came to be in their minds. Who was ever born with a knowledge of theology? Rather is it instilled into the child-mind by parents and teachers, pursued at university level, sustained by regular (often enforced) church attendance throughout the years. But the seeds of Theosophy, provided that they lie dormant in the right soil, can be present almost from the dawn of consciousness, needing only to be cultivated to produce unfailing nutriment for mind and spirit. This is recognition of Theosophic truth as something existent in the very centre of our being, something not mentally acquired through study, though study, of course, in the years that follow, will progressively enlighten and enrich.

What is this centre? It is named in the *Chhandogya Upanishad* as "the small lotus of the heart" within "the city of Brahman," *i.e.*, the body, and Mr. Judge says regarding it, "Vain it is to make search without. No knowledge will reach you from anywhere but this small lotus of the heart." (*Vernal Blooms*, p. 195)

Mr. Judge had himself rare mental gifts. His books and letters prove that an hundredfold. But beyond mentality lay that inner wisdom which enabled him to speak so truly, yet so temperately, of religion, as Eusebius (to name him only) was far from doing when he declared fourth-century Christianity to be "none other than the first, most ancient, and most original of all religions discovered by Abraham and his followers, God's beloved." Put alongside that Mr. Judge's words: "Religion is always man-made. It cannot therefore be the whole truth. . . . If religion be of God how is it that we find the same God in his own works and acts violating the precepts of religion?" (*Vernal Blooms*, p. 41). Some of us, when young, have asked that question. We knew that religion bade us forgive our enemies. Yet, as we vexed our parents and teachers by pointing out, God would only forgive *us*, who were born sinners, because Jesus had been crucified — Jesus, himself sinless, named by God as "my beloved son."

Theology has much to answer for. History bears witness to the many evils brought about by it, "religious" wars and such awful slaughters as those of the Cathars and the Albigenses. These would in any circumstances be shocking blots on the pages of history, but that the perpetrators of them claimed to act in the name of religion makes them a thousandfold worse. That religious ardour (if indeed it was that) could so distort the mind is shocking to think of. Better universal atheism than that. Mercifully, however, it is not the only alternative.

So let us turn our thoughts elsewhere. "The Theosophical Society was founded to destroy dogmatism. This," says Mr. Judge, "is one of the meanings of its first object — Universal Brotherhood." He goes on to say, "If our effort is to succeed, we must avoid dogmatism in Theosophy as much as in anything else, for the moment we dogmatise and insist on our construction of Theosophy, that moment we lose sight of Universal Brotherhood and sow the seeds of future trouble." (*W. Q. Judge Series, No. 4, p. 23*)

What has been the flaw in Christian teaching? Too many theologians have "dogmatised," turning their own personal views into tenets to be observed by all who call themselves Christians, claiming to do God's work by eliminating any who thought differently. A shocking example of this was the murder in the fifth century A.D. of the woman philosopher, "the divine Hypatia," carried out on the altar of a Christian church by him who later became Bishop of Alexandria and, eventually, was beatified as "Saint" Cyril.

Enough, though, concerning theology. As Theosophists we can never come to terms with it. Jesus did not, for it was by rejecting the theology of his time and teaching in terms of the doctrines of Manu and Buddha that he brought about his death, through a trumped-up charge. What he did teach, though not to the multitude H.P.B. defines in *Isis Unveiled*. It was the Logia, or secret discourses, given out to his chosen disciples only. Wherefore, "his doctrines," says Mr. Judge, "are at all times in accord with Theosophy" (*W. Q. Judge Series, No. 15, p. 17*); and if orthodox friends cast doubt on our own beliefs we can easily reverse that sentence. "Theosophy is at all times in accord with his (Christ's) doctrines."

Arguments on religion are never desirable and there would be no need for them to occur with our Christian friends if it were not that Christianity "asserts an exclusiveness for itself and a species of

doctrinal intolerance" (*Ibid.*, p. 16), whereas Theosophy is, in Mr. Judge's definition of it, of *every* religion "the essence and concentrated virtue." That, surely, is wholly to the good. Does not it cancel out the need for separate and separative creeds? Does not it make for universal brotherhood, such as Christianity professes to promulgate but nullifies by asserting that it alone can bring this about?

None will deny that Christian workers have done, and are doing, much good, that they have abolished many evils and that not a few of them have laid down their lives for the sake of others. But their teaching compels acceptance of two points from which Theosophy is blessedly free, namely the blood sacrifice of Jesus as the price of "cancelled sin" and the limiting of the inner being's effort and experience to a single lifetime.

Mr. Judge never belittled Christianity, but he bids us "very carefully refrain from confusing [it] with the religion of Jesus. The latter is not the former, inasmuch as Christianity is split up into over three hundred different sects, whereas Jesus had but one doctrine. Pay the highest respect," he goes on, "to the sermons of Jesus, from the remembrance of the fact that in his discourses he but gave forth once again the old doctrine taught to him by the ancient theosophists of whom he was a disciple" (*Vernal Blooms*, pp. 61-62). These words do justice both to Theosophy and to genuine Christianity, not the Christianity of the early Church Fathers and today's theologians with their so assertive and so limited Apostle's creed, but that of the Initiates of its earliest days, notably the Gnostics, whom H.P.B. calls "the inspirers of primitive Christianity," and whom even the hard-headed historian Gibbon describes as being "the most cultured, the most learned and most worthy of the Christian name." (*The Esoteric Character of the Gospels*, p. 50)

As opportunity offers, let us put forward these facts. Otherwise, the field is left to the theologians, two of whom have brought out eighty books within the past three years or so, one over six hundred pages in length, the index alone adding forty-five more. Very learned they are, and, naturally, not without interest, but it is interest only of a certain grade, more a mere curiosity as to how dogmas and theories came originally into existence and how they have been attacked and defended in mighty ecclesiastical conferences, at Nicaea, Ephesus, Chalcedon and elsewhere.

How different our response to H.P.B. and W.Q.J.! They too in-

form the mind, but do so much more. We seem, in reading their words to recover lost memories. There is a familiarity, even though the words may be come upon for the first time. It is simplest, perhaps, merely to say that we feel deeply in accord, whereas, in some of us, theology evokes instinctive resistance.

Fortunately, there is no need for us to study theology. It is not a compulsory subject on which we shall be examined in due course. But there is *great* need to assimilate the teachings of Theosophy so that our inner self may have the nutriment it needs in our present life.

“This is what Theosophy is for, and what it will do,” says Mr. Judge. “It is the reformer of religion, the unifier of diverse systems, the restorer of justice to our theory of the universe. It is our past, our present, and our future; it is our life, our death, and our immortality.” (THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, February 1969, p. 136)

I CLAIM myself to be a Sanatanist. . . . For me, Sanatana Dharma is a vital faith, handed down from generations, belonging even to the prehistoric period and based upon the Vedas, and on the writings that followed them. . . . It would be only partially true to say that the Vedas are the four books which one finds in print. These books are themselves remnants of discourses left by unknown seers. Later generations added to these original treasures, according to their lights. There then arose a great and lofty-minded man, the composer of the *Gita*. He gave to the Hindu world a synthesis of the Hindu religion, at once deeply philosophical and yet easily to be understood by any unsophisticated seeker. . . . I have been seeking literally to live up to the teachings of that book. Whatever is contrary to its main theme, I reject as non-Hindu. It excludes no faith and no teacher. It gives me great joy to be able to say that I have studied the Bible, the Koran, the Zend Avesta and other scriptures of the world with the same reverence that I have given to the *Gita*. This reverent reading has strengthened my faith in the *Gita*. . . . According to the Sanatana Dharma taught by that venerable author, life does not consist in outward rites and ceremonials, but it consists in the uttermost inward purification and merging oneself body, soul and mind in the Divine Essence.

—M. K. GANDHI

UNITY OF KNOWLEDGE

MODERN savants and philologists sometimes conjecture about the common source from which the different religious systems must have sprung, each absorbing the local colouring of its habitation and thus becoming distinct in course of time. This, however, is the teaching of Theosophy, which has been described as "the substratum and basis of all the world-religions and philosophies" (*Glossary*, p. 328). H.P.B. refers to "the universally diffused religion of the ancient and pre-historic world" (*S.D.*, I. xxxiv) and calls it the Secret Doctrine, which terms are equivalents of the Sanskrit *Sanatana Dharma*, Eternal Religion, and *Gupta Vidya*, the Hidden Science. Theosophy is a presentation in part of that Common Source and it attempts to establish not only the fundamental unity of all ancient religions, but also the synthesis of Science, Religion and Philosophy. Theosophy "is not a *religion*, nor is its philosophy *new*" (*Ibid.*, I. xxxvi). It has, however, a double function to fulfil.

Religion is generally considered to be a string of dogmas without scientific validity and a set of practices without rational basis. Theosophy shows that the truths of *true* religion are scientific facts, though modern science may not yet have discovered them all, and that its practices are mostly allegorical dramatization of such facts.

Similarly, Theosophical definition makes science a companion to philosophy; and the logical deductions of science teachings cannot but lead to philosophy.

Once again philosophy is not merely a series of theoretical speculations in the Theosophical system; from philosophical fundamentals are derived ethical rules to be used in the conduct of everyday life, and thus Theosophy endows philosophy with religious warmth.

In harmonizing the claims of science, religion and philosophy, Theosophy aims at restoring the ancient view about the unity of all knowledge.

Many ancient religious books contain the story of cosmic and human evolution, derived from the source referred to above. Because of the abstruse nature of the teachings, allegories and symbols which require a key for a thorough understanding are used, and they are used just as our chemists and mathematicians use their formulae. The key having been lost, these symbols have assumed an esoteric character. Then there are other parts of the old teaching

which are veiled in glyphs and ideographs, for they are too dangerous in the hands of the profane.

Theosophy is not only an exposition of the old synthesis of Science, Philosophy and Religion, but further it attempts to explain the allegories of the old books. It also speaks of the hidden or esoteric aspect of knowledge.

The beliefs of religions are corrupted shadows of old knowledge, religious rites and ceremonies being also corrupted and broken remnants of old traditions. Some of these beliefs and practices may appear to the scientific mind as superstitions, but Theosophy is able to lay bare their esoteric meaning, their rational explanation. Take for example, the belief in heaven and hell (with rewards and punishments, respectively) common to all religions. Science may scorn it but only at the cost of abrogating its own claim to the scientific attitude of mind. Ours is not the only possible world in the universe. In fact, if we would substitute "a plane of existence" for the word "world," it is easily understandable that there are different planes of existence, even in connection with what we call our world. Science itself teaches that we are surrounded by myriads of invisible lives — microbes, bacteria, etc. — invisible by reason of their minuteness. Is it not then equally possible that there may be beings which are equally invisible owing to the extreme tenuity of their texture? Their worlds need not necessarily be above or below our world. Madame Blavatsky explains (*S.D.*, I. 605):

When "*other worlds*" are mentioned — whether better or worse, more spiritual or still more material, though both invisible — the Occultist does not locate *these spheres* either *outside* or *inside* our Earth, as the theologians and the poets do; for their location is nowhere in the space *known* to, and conceived by, the profane. They are, as it were, blended with our world — interpenetrating it and interpenetrated by it. There are millions and millions of worlds and firmaments visible to us; there are still greater numbers beyond those visible to the telescopes, and many of the latter kind do not belong to our *objective* sphere of existence. Although as invisible as if they were millions of miles beyond our solar system, they are yet with us, near us, *within* our own world, as objective and material to their respective inhabitants as ours is to us. But, again, the relation of these worlds to ours is not that of a series of egg-shaped boxes enclosed one within the other, like the toys called Chinese nests; each is en-

tirely under its own special laws and conditions, having no direct relation to our sphere. The inhabitants of these, as already said, may be, for all we know, or feel, passing *through* and *around* us as if through empty space, their very habitations and countries being interblended with ours, though not disturbing our vision because we have not yet the faculties necessary for discerning them.

Just as a room may be filled with the rays of the sun, those of a lamp, X-rays, magnetic and electric vibrations and waves, etc., each interpenetrating but not affecting the others, likewise the same portion of space may be occupied by several planes at one and the same time. The law of analogy and the law of continuity both force us to assume such a plurality of planes or states of existence. If this is admitted, then the "heaven" and "hell" of popular religions are simply different conditions of existence to which the souls of mortals who have "died" here "pass" — though in reality they are alive and right here. A soul, after discarding its material body, finds itself in a state of existence suited to its spiritual requirements. It is in its "heaven" or "hell" according to its old hopes, beliefs and longings of earth life. If it had done good deeds and longed for the joys of "heaven," it finds its "heaven" reproduced by its own imagination. The sinner who dies immersed in the desires and longings of his lower nature and believing in future punishments, would find himself surrounded by "fire and brimstone" images of his own making. The experiences of happiness or suffering are real and help to develop the soul. In this sense, then, "heaven" and "hell" are, Theosophy tells us, real *states* but not places. To quote again from *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 221 fn.):

A world when called "a higher world" is not higher by reason of its location, but because it is superior in quality or essence. Yet such a world is generally understood by the profane as "Heaven," and located above our heads.

In a similar manner Theosophy explains the religious belief in gods, angels, spooks, etc. Science already admits that there is nothing "dead" in the universe. The mental is not derived from the physical, but the two series run concomitantly in such wise that every level of development in the physical is represented by its corresponding mental process. Theosophy insists upon the law of continuity and the correlation of the physical and the psychical. In

the words of *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 607):

...if we can conceive of a world composed (for *our* senses) of matter still more attenuated than the tail of a comet, hence of inhabitants in it who are as ethereal, in proportion to *their* globe, as we are in comparison with *our* rocky, hard-crusted earth, no wonder if we do not perceive them, nor sense their presence or even existence.

It further states (I. 276):

It is on the acceptance or rejection of the theory of the *Unity of all in Nature, in its ultimate Essence*, that mainly rests the belief or unbelief in the existence around us of other conscious beings.

Theosophy thus supplies the key to the interpretation of fundamental religious truths.

When we turn to the achievements of modern science we find that many of its theories are inadequate unless illumined by the philosophic conceptions of Theosophy. Here again we can only illustrate our contention by taking an example or two regarding the ultimate nature of the universe. The latest utterances of men of science engender the hope that a time will soon come when the wisdom of the ancients will be justified by scientific labours. If this happens, the credit must go to Theosophy for having steadily pointed out that wisdom all these years — in spite of the calumny of H.P.B. and misunderstanding of her teachings. "Matter has disappeared, is now a well-worn scientific tag. Space has come to be the one great reality of the universe for science, and time also, since motion involves time. H.P.B. gave the philosophy of this conception in *The Secret Doctrine* in 1888. Naming the "one absolute Reality which antecedes all manifested conditioned being" as Be-ness, she wrote:

This "Be-ness" is symbolized in the *Secret Doctrine* under two aspects. On the one hand, absolute abstract Space, representing bare subjectivity, the one thing which no human mind can either exclude from any conception, or conceive of by itself. On the other, absolute Abstract Motion representing Unconditioned Consciousness. (I. 14)

Also, on p. 37, there is a fine exposition of the inseparability of Time and Space and the conception of Duration; one would mistake it for a passage in a modern work on Relativity!

But further, what is the nature of this reality — the inner stu

of this Space itself? On the admission of a scientist, "The stuff of the world is mind-stuff. . . . The mind-stuff of the world is, of course, something more general than our individual conscious minds, but we may think of its nature as not altogether foreign to the feelings in our consciousness." And Bertrand Russell, in his *Analysis of Matter*, said that part of the contents of a man's brain consists of percepts, thoughts and feelings, and since his brain also consists of electrons, we are compelled to conclude that an electron is a grouping of events and . . . some of the events composing it are likely to be some of the mental states of the man to whom the brain belongs."

Theosophy, with a firmer grasp of the *principles* which underlie cosmic evolution, amplifies science by defining space itself, and Motion in space which is the life-process, evolution or manifestation. Since Divine Mind in Nature is still matter for conjecture and speculation on the part of scientists, H.P.B.'s explanations of what the Hindus called Mahat, Cosmic Intelligence and Akasha clarify our vision on the subject.

On the one hand Theosophy removes the dust of the ages gathered on old religions; on the other it removes the many accretions which confuse the issues of science; and it performs the dual function by the aid of a philosophy at once profound and practical.

Verily, Theosophy may well be called the "Thread Doctrine" (*S.D.*, I. 610):

Like *Sutratman*, in the Vedanta philosophy, it passes through and strings together all the ancient philosophical religious systems, and reconciles and explains them all. We say now it does more. It not only reconciles the various and apparently conflicting systems, but it checks the discoveries of modern exact science, and shows some of them to be necessarily correct, since they are found corroborated in the ancient records.

IN SOME WAY OR ANOTHER we are part of an all-embracing psychic life, of a single "greatest" man.

—C. G. JUNG

THE IDEAL AND THE PRACTICAL

II

[Reprinted from *The Path*, December 1891.—Eds.]

ALTRUISM truly will have to be realized and expressed in action during our journey to the great goal, but it cannot be called the great goal itself. It may be a means, a necessary means, but it is not the only means. The very word, too, has a ring of coldness in it, and there must be many who require to light the flame of the love and devotion at a more fervent centre than any thought of Humanity can kindle! Indeed, is the Humanity of today either in the individual or in the mass such as to elicit either our love or our worship? Scorn, loathing, and pity seem more like the emotions raised in contemplating alternately its meanness, its vice, and its suffering. True it is that none are so fitted as the Occultist to return the world's scorn with princely interest, for none are lifted so immeasurably above the world with its bounded vision and its trivial aims, but though scorn may only be the reflex action which would make it exactly commensurate with the intensity of worship in the soul, it is of the very essence of separateness, and it must be remembered that all sense of separateness has to be killed out. The scorn must be replaced by an infinite compassion. But how is this to be done? The divine alone provides a bridge for the scattered fragments. It is only through the Deity—the Perfect—the All-pervading—the Unutterable Essence of our own inmost Being—that man can truly become one in love and worship with his fellow-man. Yoga is the watchword, Yoga is the means, Yoga is the end. It is written, "Counsels of perfection are the aliment of all strenuous souls," and one who in this bitter and arid desert of illusion has once seen the vision of the holy grail can never cease to thirst for its draught of sacramental wine.

Union being, then, our watchword and our aim, we must not too much cast down at the apparent disunion which seems to precede the attainment of each stage in the progress. It is sad beyond expression, the feeling of disunion when the ardent affections of childhood and youth are gradually dissipated through the failure of the friends to respond to the newer ideals before us. The closest earthly union of all—that of the married souls—would indeed so fill

whole horizon of life with bliss that it would far more than compensate for the sad severance of the other ties, but when this also is denied, there often rises in the heart a feeling of loneliness and homelessness so accentuated as to be almost too bitter to bear. But is not this merely the prelude to the heart's greater expansion? To the soul's wider vision of its object and its end? It is long indeed before the "great orphan" Humanity can claim its own in us, before we are capable of giving birth even to the germ of that world-wide sympathy which so infinitely transcends all personal claims, and which, when grown to full stature, is the very blotting out of self, is the very gate of Heaven!

The practical person may here step in and say that this identification of self with Humanity can only be achieved by practical work for the race in everyday human life. Doubtless the race needs its champions and deliverers today as of old. Let Hercules again step forth, girded to cleanse the Augean stables! Let the troubled and careful Martha continue her work of service! There are many labourers wanted in God's vineyard. But let not the hands that work say to the brain that guides them, "We have no need of thee." The practical person has work to do in the world: let him do it! but "counsels of perfection" were not written for him! It is the same old problem of "Meditation and Action" which so few of the western people are yet fit to grasp—within the quietistic term meditation being embraced all the battles of the hidden life, including the "great battle."

A pointed illustration of Europe's incapacity for right thought may be found in Draper's great work, *The Intellectual Development of Europe*. Words are of course mere counters which may bear different significations in different ages, or to different individuals in the same age, but no mere juggling with the counters will account for a fundamental difference of conception as to the thing, and when a writer (and the point is only accentuated when the writer is so distinguished for ability and wide-mindedness) uses the word quietism as synonymous with apathy, it is similar to mistaking the top rung of a ladder for the bottom one—an absolute perversion of vision. A little knowledge of the Vedic philosophy teaches that the active emotional nature of one lit with the fire of Passion ("Rajas") is greatly superior to the apathy of one sunk in the ignorance of Sloth ("Tamas"), but far above the passionate nature stands

the one who has transferred his energy from the outer on to the inner plane, and has thereby attained some amount of equilibrium, some amount of self-control. When the inner struggle is continued with such intensity — aided and guided by the concentration on the Supreme — that all outer things lose their importance, a stage of “quietism” is reached which in external appearance may resemble the debased apathy of the ignorant boor, but does it not imply absolute perversion of vision to mistake the sublime heights of Serenity (“Satwan”) for the depths of ignorant sloth? It must be apparent that the above misunderstanding is no mere verbal difference, and can only be accounted for by the fact that a material-minded race is incapable even of believing in the existence of states of spiritual exaltation.

Before the battles of the inner life all else truly sinks into unreality, and the great teacher whom the Western people honour has in the story of Martha and Mary left a record of his thoughts on the subject of “Meditation and Action” which may be summarized in the lesson that it is greater and nobler and better *to be* than *to do*, that the race is ultimately more benefited by the thinking of the thoughts and the living of the life than by all the actions of all the philanthropists. The real battle has to be fought within, and any finding of external spheres of energy or beneficence is a mere postponement of, though it may be a necessary preliminary to, the awful struggle.

It is only by slow degrees that the lesson contained in each pregnant paradox of *Light on the Path* is painfully learned through payment of heart's blood. First in the book but last in realization comes the rule (No. 5): “Kill out all sense of separateness.” When the disciple has learned this in its entirety he is one with Humanity for he is one with God. But the painful process is described in the antithesis, “Yet stand alone and isolated, because nothing that is embodied, nothing that is conscious of separation, nothing that is out of the Eternal, can aid you.” It is this standing alone that is the hard task, but it must surely be the prelude to the greater expansion of the whole nature, it must surely be a step nearer to the merging of the self in the All! Bitter beyond description is the learning of the lesson, when the whole passion of the passionate nature is concentrated in the cry — the unavailing cry — for the sympathy of the friend, for the love of the lover. It is poor co

colation to say that to find content in these things would be to satisfy the immortal hunger upon husks. It is a very mortal and human hunger that cries out. Nevertheless it is but reasonable to admit that only by such means can the mortal hunger be replaced by the immortal, that only by such terrible strangling of our personal human desires can man attain to the wider sympathy, the greater wisdom, and the all-embracing love of the God.

Many, O weary pilgrim, may be thy journeys back to earth, many thy tortures on the ever-recurring wheel of life, many thy shrinkings of soul from the terrors of the "dire probations." But take courage, Lanoo, and keep the fire burning, the fire that burns within, for its light must grow and must increase, until when the last great battle shall be won, "its light will suddenly become the infinite light," and then to thee may be addressed the words — words that may even convey to our still earth-bound understanding some faint description of that indescribable achievement — the realization of the loftiest conceivable *ideal* as an absolute *practical* fact;

Behold! thou hast become the Light, thou hast become the Sound, thou art thy Master and thy God. Thou art THYSELF the object of thy search: the VOICE unbroken, that resounds throughout eternities, exempt from change, from sin exempt, the seven Sounds in one, THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE.

—PILGRIM

I SEE everywhere in the world the inevitable expression of the concept of infinity. It establishes in the depths of our hearts a belief in the supernatural. The Greeks understood the mysterious power of the hidden side of things. They bequeathed to us the word "enthusiasm" — *en theos* — a god within. Happy is he who bears a god within — an ideal of art, of science. All are lighted by reflection from the infinite.

—PASTEUR

HUMAN AND ANIMAL MAGNETISM

[Reprinted from the "Letters to the Editor" column of *The Theosophist*, December 1883.—EDS.]

BEING a student of Animal Magnetism, and having some experience in the same, I for myself and many more like me take the liberty of offering the following questions in *The Theosophist*.

Dr. Dod, in his able lecture, says that it is the nervo-vital fluid when introduced into the brain of a subject that places the latter in the magnetic state. The chief source of the fluid is electricity. Is the fluid electricity alone or something in combination with electricity? If it were alone, can we with a battery as is used in other electrical experiments bring a subject to the magnetic sleep? If that fluid be in combination with something else, is that something else known? If so, what is it? The questions mentioned above being of great importance to all students of the divine science, will plead for my taking up valuable space in the Journal.

Yours truly,

H. HARDY

BOMBAY

10th August

Vice-President, Aryan Legends

Investigating Society

ANSWER — The Magnetic force in man is not the same force as the electricity of modern science, although having a great similarity in its operations to that subtle agent. The second principle of man — *prana* or vitality — is the one concerned in the production of mesmeric phenomena, and a careful consideration of what has been said about that principle in these columns may be studied with profit in this connection. The mesmeric fluid or vitality is matter in a subtle supersensuous state and permeates the whole of the outer man from the constituents of which it is generated by the action of the spleen — an organ quite unknown in its functions to science. One of the arguments advanced by the German atheist Struthers against the existence of an intelligent God is the presence of this "useless organ," as he considers it, in the human body. This point no theistic man of Science could disprove. But irrespective of a "personal god," as all occultists know, there is nothing useless in Nature. The spleen is the reservoir of animal magnetism and the original centre of the force which evolves the astral man. Considering the long ages for

which all knowledge of these things, theoretical or practical, has disappeared from Europe, it is no wonder that in the Western world, under the well-known physiological law, the spleen should have fallen into a state of atrophy.

D. DHAR K.
(A Chela)

STUDY of Theosophy . . . makes every man respect his religion the more. It furnishes to him a sight that can pierce through the dead letter and see clearly the spirit. He can read all his religious books between the lines. If we view all the religions in their popular sense, they appear strongly antagonistic to each other in various details. None agrees with the other. And yet the representatives of those faiths say that the study of Theosophy explains to them all that has been said in their religion and makes them feel a greater respect for it. There must, therefore, be one common ground on which all the religious systems are built. And this ground, which lies at the bottom of all, is truth. There can be but one absolute truth, but different persons have different perceptions of that truth. And this truth is morality. If we separate the dogmas that cling to the principles set forth in any religion, we shall find that morality is preached in every one of them. If I, therefore, wish to place my humble services at the disposal of the world, I must first begin by working for my country. And this I could not do by remaining in my caste. I found that instead of a love for his countrymen, the observance of caste distinction leads one to hate even his neighbour, because he happens to be of another caste. I could not bear this injustice. What fault is it of anyone that he is born in a particular caste? I respect a man for his qualities and not for his birth. That is to say, that man is superior in my eyes, whose *inner* man has been developed or is in a state of development. . . . If it were not for this distinction [of castes] India would not have been so degraded. . . . If such is the case, why should we still stick to that custom which we now find not only impracticable but injurious? If I were to observe outwardly what I did not really believe inwardly, I was practising hypocrisy. . . . Theosophy has taught me that to enjoy peace of mind and self-respect, I must be honest, candid, peaceful and regard all men as equally my brothers, irrespective of caste, colour, race or creed. This, I see, is an essential part of religion.

—DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

Modern research on the effects of stress has concentrated on the dramatic events of life: the death of a near and dear one, divorce, marriage, retirement, etc. This research, however, has largely ignored the effect of daily hassles — the petty annoyances, frustrations and unpleasant incidents in our everyday life — which add up to more grief than life's major stressful events. These little hassles range from getting stuck in a traffic jam to losing a wallet, from an argument with a teenage son to a dispute with a superior or a subordinate at work. A year-long study by a professor of psychology, Richard S. Lazarus, and his colleagues at the University of California at Berkeley, shows that these daily annoyances have a greater effect on our moods and our health than the major misfortunes of life.

In *Psychology Today* for July 1981 appears an article by Professor Lazarus on the results of his study. The author, who is currently working on a major analysis of research on stress and health, writes:

The impact of hassles on our physical and mental health depends to a great extent on their frequency, duration, and intensity. A person's response to a given hassle depends on a variety of other factors: personality, coping style, other sources, and how the rest of the day has gone. When someone is under pressure, petty problems that otherwise might be ignored — a broken shoelace, for example — can have a much greater effect than if they had occurred at less anxious times.

For that reason, the particular hassles cited by the people we surveyed are less important than their overall intensity and the individual reactions to them. And though our data do not yet allow us to say this, we suspect that some of the impact of hassles stems from their personal meaning and significance or from our ineptness in coping with certain interpersonal difficulties. . . . Psychological stress resides neither in the situation nor the person; it depends on a transaction between the two. It arises from how the person appraises an event and adapts to it. . . .

Assessing the effects of daily hassles led us to consider the effects of uplifts, their positive psychological counterparts: pleasant, happy, or satisfying experiences like hearing good news, getting a good night's rest, solving a difficult problem. Just as negative stressors or hassles can cause physical and psychological

changes that may result in illness, we think that uplifts may serve as emotional buffers against the same disorders. . . . When we added the information from the mood scales and daily logs of emotions to the data on hassles, we found that particularly for men, the more hassles and the more negative emotions, the worse a person's subsequent health. Our results strongly suggest that hassles trigger unpleasant emotions, which, in turn or in combination, have an adverse effect on health.

Contrary to our expectation, uplifts did not seem to have much buffer effect on the impact of hassles in this study. In fact, for women, uplifts seemed to have a negative effect on emotions and on psychological health. . . .

We should be cautious in generalizing from our results. But we do feel we have demonstrated that the small defeats and troubles of our daily lives may cause as much harm as the great ones.

That physical and psychological health are interconnected is not a new discovery but rather a reaffirmation of the ancient principle that mind and body are interactive and interdependent, a principle that has always guided the intelligent medical practitioner. Present-day researchers, of course, say nothing about the astral body as the thought-sensitive matter or medium through which emotional disturbances, precipitated either by little hassles or major events, reach the plane of physical manifestation.

In general, modern research in this field brings evidence to support the prophecy made in *The Secret Doctrine* in the last century that "chemistry and physiology are the two great magicians of the future, who are destined to open the eyes of mankind to the great physical truths." One suspects that H.P.B. here meant as well "psycho-physical truths," for the revelations of the new branch of medicine uniting physiology and psychiatry answer to this description. Specifically, the research findings provide factual substantiation to such discussions as "Psychic and Noetic Action," by H.P.B. (*Raja-Yoga or Occultism*), and "Culture of Concentration," by W. Q. Judge (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 18*).

The pros and cons of abortion are still being debated and it has become one of the fundamental moral issues of our time. While the debate is arousing more excitement in the Western world, the prob-

lem today is a global one. *Life* magazine (November 1981) publishes the results of a poll in the United States to find out where women stand on this issue that affects them so directly. While many women protest against any infringement upon their authority over their own bodies, there is an increasingly vocal lobby of those who insist that abortion is murder and should be outlawed.

Medical men and other experts today are agreed that human life begins not at birth but at the moment of conception. Among those quoted in *Life* is Dr. Bernard Nathanson, obstetrician and author of *Aborting America*.

Theoretically [he states] life begins at conception, although the earliest point at which we can detect the presence of the hormone HCG in the bloodstream — about nine days after conception — is the practical point at which we can say that life begins. Using new technology, we can see that the fetus behaves like any and all of us. If you make a loud sound, its heart speeds up; if you poke it with a needle, it jumps. It is the accumulation of these human qualities, responses, appearances and, for all we know, psychology, that convinces me that this is in fact human life.

Dr. Leon Rosenberg, chairman of the department of human genetics at Yale University School of Medicine, is of the opinion that

... this is such a metaphysical concept. Of course, a new life is generated when the egg is fertilized by the sperm; but the ovum is already a living cell, and so is the sperm. I know of no scientific evidence which bears on the question of when actual human life exist. Science, per se, doesn't deal with the complex quality called "humanness" any more than it does with such equally complex concepts as love, faith or trust. Without experiments there is no science, no way to prove or disprove any idea. I maintain that concepts such as humanness are beyond the purview of science because no idea about them can be tested experimentally.

In reply to a query, H.P.B. characterized foeticide as an "immoral and dangerous practice," "a crime against nature," and added:

The crime committed lies precisely in the wilful and sinful destruction of life, and interference with the operations of nature, hence — with KARMA — that of the mother and the would-be future human being. . . . Of course the sceptics of whatever class

will sneer at our notions and call them absurd superstitions and "unscientific twaddle." But we do not write for sceptics. We have been asked to give the views of Theosophy (or rather of occult philosophy) upon the subject, and we answer the query as far as we know. (*The Theosophist*, August 1883)

If a survey of students of Bombay University's different colleges shows any indication, the present student body is as tradition-bound in matters of marriage, sex, drugs, religion and the value system as the earlier generation. The survey, based on a questionnaire filled up by 630 students of different disciplines from 13 colleges in a wide area, was conducted by a team of volunteers guided by Professor M. B. Ghorpade. Though it has its limitations, it does help to discover the undercurrents of thinking in the younger generation in a sensitive area like Bombay where the flow of ideas and changes is rapid and gradually spills over to the other parts of the country. (*The Times of India*, December 24, 1981)

While the students continue to be conservative in many respects, the only concession they seem to have made — and a laudable one at that — is in the matter of intercaste marriage. The traditional constraints of caste and religion seem to be loosening at least in this matter, with a mere 14 per cent preferring to stick to the conservative view. Yet, 27 per cent continue to favour an arranged marriage, with 35 per cent commending it in parts. Their attitude thus implies the still strong bonds of the family in their lives.

A good majority (72 per cent) view sex from the traditional angle and in this respect they are in a different world from that of their western counterparts. They would very much look for "virginity and chastity before marriage and utmost faithfulness after the vows are taken." The crusaders for the western liberal attitude have increased from eight to 14 per cent since the earlier 1974 survey, but they seem to be confined to the upper crusts of society who have been exposed to western ways of life.

Likewise, there is no big change in the attitude to drugs and stimulants: the majority (52 per cent) continue to condemn them and only 13 per cent favour them — that too as "a necessary evil of modern life."

The sway of God and religion, however, continues to be very strong, with 63 per cent believing that God is the Decider, meting

out rewards; the rest, though believing in God, are uncertain about the role of this Divine Power in our lives. Only six per cent are outright atheists. The majority (65 per cent), though believing in religious equality and tolerance, are equally convinced that neither religion nor rites are outdated or irrelevant, with 13 per cent opposing them.

Self-centredness and dubious business morality — the value systems of industrial societies — seem not to have reached the younger generation yet. Some 67 per cent vote for altruistic values, feeling that these should guide their lives. Only 15 per cent reject them as irrelevant to the present times.

Yet industrialization has left its scar on the young minds. There is deep pessimism, disillusionment about life and inability to comprehend its meaning. More, twice as many girls as boys (13 and seven per cent) suffer from severe symptoms of dejection, gloom and maladjustment.

FRAME (Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments), with its head office in London, has as its objective the promotion of research methods that replace, or reduce, laboratory animal usage. It is through the efforts of such organizations that the ethics of animal experimentation are being questioned and techniques like cell culture are now coming into use in hospital laboratories and research institutes as also in industry. There is evidence of fast-growing appreciation of FRAME not only in the U.K. but also in many other parts of the world, and it receives frequent inquiries from organizations far and wide seeking advice and information on "alternatives." It is now trying to fund a multi-laboratory Research Programme on *in vitro* cytotoxicology, the aim of which is the development and validation of cell cultures as alternative systems in toxicity testing.

FRAME considers Parliamentary publicity and support to be of paramount importance because, however successful the scientific search for "viable alternatives" might be, their final implementation and the resultant benefit to animals and to the public would be in the hands of the regulatory authorities, who lay down the specific testing requirements for new products. Since its representatives' two meetings with MPs in the House of Commons early in 1981, a FRAME Parliamentary Group has been formed. MPs in the

Group have undertaken to advance FRAME's cause by every means at their disposal within Parliament, and this is a welcome move.

The FRAME international publication, *Technical News* (No. 4), focuses on the debate on animals or "alternatives" that is gaining momentum:

An important point in the history of the use of animals in science has been reached. Legislation upholds the over-use of animals in tests of dubious relevance while valid non-animal methods are becoming more available. The use of animals in research is becoming increasingly undesirable on scientific, economic and social grounds. . . .

The time has come for scientists and legislative bodies to review the situation and decide what measures are to be taken. Non-animal "alternatives" will surely play an increasingly important role in the future.

In any discussion of "alternatives" it is important to remember the working definition: an "alternative" is a technique that replaces or reduces the use of animals in experiments while providing data that is as good or better than that obtained using animals. Inherent in this definition is that by adopting an alternative technique a fundamental gain in biological knowledge is obtained.

Theosophists, being "the friends of all those who fight against cruelty to animals," must welcome the work of organizations such as FRAME.

A lecture by the Revd. Barnabas Lindars, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester (published in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, Spring 1981), discusses "The New Look on the Son of Man." The "Son of Man" is an unusual form of self-reference in many of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the New Testament, and the way in which it is used, Revd. Lindars suggests, implies that it is something more.

The phrase [he says] has exceptional importance for the problem of christology. It is one of the few items of evidence which we have for the way in which Jesus understood himself. So it is not at all surprising that it has been at the centre of scholarly debate ever since the rise of biblical criticism. The spate

of books and articles on the subject shows no sign of diminishing. . . .

Those few sayings which pass the test for authenticity have great importance both for research into the historical Jesus and for the hermeneutical quest. For they give some small openings into the impenetrable area of how Jesus thought about himself and about his message and his relation to God. Moreover the intricate relationship between the development of Son of Man sayings and the primitive attempts at confessional formulation helps to bridge the gap between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith. . . .

There is an elusive quality about Jesus, which I believe is not merely a matter of intractable historical problems, but is part of his authentic personality and is one facet of his genius. His ironical references to a man, to anyone, to someone else, when he means himself remain as teasing and tantalizing as the Son of Man problem itself.

Apropos of this, the following from *Isis Unveiled* is suggestive:

The religion of the masters — the idolatrous Babylonians and Assyrians — was transferred almost bodily into the revealed Scripture of the Captives, and from thence came into Christianity. . . . We find Ezekiel addressed by the likeness of the glory of the Lord, "as Son of Man." This peculiar title is used repeatedly throughout the whole book of this prophet, which is as kabalistic as the "roll of a book" which the "Glory" causes him to eat. It is written *within* and *without*; and its real meaning is identical with that of the *Apocalypse*. It appears strange that so much stress should be laid on this peculiar appellation, said to have been applied by Jesus to himself, when, in the symbolical or kabalistic language, a prophet is so addressed. . . .

The "Son of Man" is an appellation which could not be assumed by any one but a kabalist. Except, as shown above, in the *Old Testament*, it is used but by one prophet — Ezekiel, the kabalist. In their mysterious and mutual relations, the Aeons or Sephiroth are represented in the *Kabala* by a great number of circles, and sometimes by the figure of a MAN, which is symbolically formed out of such circles. This man is Seir-Anpin [Adam Kadmon, the "Heavenly Man," the Logos], and the 243 numbers of which his figure consists relate to the different orders of the celestial hierarchy. (II. 231-32)
