

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

# THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. 41, No. 8

17th June 1971

## THE DECLARATION OF THE U.L.T. A CHART BY WHICH TO STEER

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for June 1950.—Eds.]

Not only the Egyptians but every nation of the earth began with temples devoid of idols and even of symbols. It is only when the remembrance of the great abstract truths and of the primordial Wisdom taught to humanity by the dynasties of the divine kings died out that men had to resort to mementos and symbology.

—H.P.B.

THE DECLARATION of the U.L.T. is a noble document, fashioned by Robert Crosbie out of the writings of his idealized guru, William Quan Judge. It contains a statement of pregnant exercise:

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

How is an Associate of the Lodge, a student of the great philosophy, to practise the wisdom implicit in this paradoxical statement? Shall he go to a Hindu Temple every Monday, a Buddhist Vihara every Wednesday, a Mosque every Friday, a Synagogue every Saturday, and a Christian Church every Sunday? And, visiting these not wholesome places, what should he do? Cleanse them of their sectarian atmosphere? Such an attempt would be worse than a waste of time.

The second of the three great Objects of the Theosophical Movement points the way. By applying ourselves to a comparative study of ancient and modern religions and philosophies we are able to see the truths of many eras and many places, for truths are always the same and truth agrees with truth, never with fiction or with falsehood.

Some of the cardinal principles observed by sectarians contain mystical intimations. Insight into those is another way by which the student can come to belong to all sects and to none. A few examples may prove helpful.

Many followers of Islam are fanatical because of their hatred of idolatry. They use no idols or images — not even the picture of their great Prophet. If we put aside their narrowness and hatred and enquire into the merit of the idea which dominates them and its real worth and virtue, we should derive some benefit.

If it is true that the Impersonal behind the form is overlooked by the idol-worshipper, the Muslim sectarian, on the other hand, overlooks the place of outer form, which bespeaks the invisible idea and intelligence. If we use the Islamic way of worship of the Formless we may free ourselves from the idols to which we are joined. "Seek in the Impersonal for the Eternal Man," advises *The Voice of the Silence*. In offering his prayers to the Impersonal and Omnipresent Allah the Muslim looks to Mecca, where for him the Truth of the Spirit arose. Is this not reminiscent of the Hallowed White Island of *The Secret Doctrine*? Spaceless Truth has manifested at many and sundry places since millions of years ago the Fathers of the Human Race garbed themselves in matter of Earth.

Take another instance: The pious Sikh reveres the Holy Book, the *Grantha Sahib*. The Word of the Master is all-important with him. Is this not the representation of the idea of Theosophy — from the Teachings to the Teachers? Why have there been so very few among the generations of Theosophists who have understood the true nature of H.P.B., the Messenger? Because they neglected to study the Message. Even those who lived in the atmosphere of her bodily presence saw an "ailing" body, an "angry" psyche, a "strange mixture of high and low," and so on and so forth. Her words and language, heard, charmed and excited the ear but only a few hearts were enlightened by the brilliant conversationalist. By reflecting upon the Sikh's respect for his *Grantha Sahib* the modern student of Theosophy will profit by learning a good practice. H.P.B. is speaking today. Who is listening?

With the Jews it was not only the Law, the *Torah*, that mattered, but also the Prophets. The Law and the Prophets Jesus himself came to fulfil and not to destroy. The Law and the Prophets — the ever-constant and consistent Theosophy, taught generation after generation and cycle after cycle by the Lawgivers, the Prophets, the Messengers.

Truth is not progressive, not evolving. As we progress and evolve we see ever deeper layers of the Body of Wisdom which is Theosophy. *Sanatana Dharma*, the Eternal Religion, is more ancient than the *Rig* and other *Vedas*. The *Torah* existed before Abraham, Moses and David. A long line of true Gurus taught millenniums before Nanak was proclaimed the Guru by his followers because he was pious and holy, saintly and unsectarian; a "Theosopher," to use Mr. Judge's expression.

Robert Crosbie and our Declaration are modern landmarks which indicate ancient, very ancient truths. The Potency of the Declaration is very great. Each Associate, each student, must ponder over it with calmness, in silence, so that what is implicit in it may become explicit.

The Declaration points most clearly to a Way of Living — day by day, face to face with the problems of home, office, club. It points to the Powers of the Self to be developed, which make the practice of Brotherhood natural. It points to the Powers of Knowledge, not only to be studied but also to be assimilated. To live in the spirit of the Declaration is to move as Soul, to set in motion ideas pertaining to the Soul. When we cease to move on the Inner Path of Ideation and Imagination we shall read the letter of the Declaration. If we desire to retain the power of the first Impulse which moved our mind and heart to declare themselves, then we should continue with the task.

The Declaration is a Living Document. It enables us to live. It was fashioned by one who had become a Living Unit by self-effort at Devotion, Knowledge and Right Action. Such never die. They belong to the ages. One such was Robert Crosbie. Here is a message from him which will prepare us all for the U.L.T. Day to be celebrated on the 25th of June:

Students too often regard their personal existence and predilections as one thing, and their student life as another. It is not so. Both are interwoven and interblended at every point. The student should see clearly that his present existence is his opportunity to live and learn, as well as learn to live to the best advantage; it contains and presents the opportunities which, if rejected, will come before us in one form or another until we realize that a step forward can be taken in no other way than by overcoming obstacles, and thus, defects. How wonderfully and perfectly this works, when seen and faithfully applied, the generality of people do not credit or know; but we, as students, should be able to apply the lessons of life on the basis of the knowledge which has been imparted to us and which we recognize.

---

## PSYCHOLOGY, THE SCIENCE OF THE SOUL

[This article by H. P. Blavatsky first appeared in *Lucifer* for October 1896, more than five years after her death. It was reprinted in THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for September 1957.

—EDS.]

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

Alas, and thrice alas! Soul, the Self, or Ego, is studied by modern psychology as inductively as a piece of decayed matter by a physicist. Psychology and its mother-plant metaphysics have fared worse than any other sciences. These twin sciences have long been so separated in Europe as to have become in their ignorance mortal enemies. After faring poorly enough at the hands of mediaeval scholasticism they have been liberated therefrom only to fall into modern sophistry. Psychology in its present garb is simply a mask covering a ghastly, grimacing skeleton's head, a deadly and beautiful upas flower growing in a soil of most hopeless materialism. "Thought is to the psychologist metamorphosed sensation, and man a helpless automaton, wire-pulled by heredity and environment" — writes a half-disgusted hylo-idealist, now happily a Theosophist. "And yet men like Huxley preach this man automatism and morality in the same breath. . . . Monists<sup>1</sup> to a man, annihilationists who would stamp out intuition with iron heel, if they could. . . ." Those are our modern Western psychologists!

Everyone sees that metaphysics instead of being a science of first principles has now broken up into a number of more or less materialistic schools of every shade and colour, from Schopenhauer's pessimism down

---

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

to agnosticism, monism, idealism, hylo-idealism, and every "ism" with the exception of psychism — not to speak of true psychology. What Mr. Huxley said of Positivism, namely that it was Roman Catholicism *minus* Christianity, ought to be paraphrased and applied to our modern psychological philosophy. It is psychology, *minus* soul; psyche being dragged down to mere sensation; a solar system *minus* a sun; *Hamlet* with the Prince of Denmark not entirely cast out of the play, but in some vague way suspected of being probably somewhere behind the scenes.

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

The mental state in which self is known implies, like every other mental act, a perceiving subject and a perceived object. If then the object perceived is self, what is the subject that perceives? Or if it is the true self which thinks, what other self can it be that is thought of?<sup>2</sup> Clearly a true cognition of self implies a self in which the knowing and the known are one — in which subject and object are one; and this Mr. Mansel *rightly holds to be the annihilation of both!* So that the personality of which each is conscious, and of which the existence is to each a fact beyond all others the most certain, is yet a thing which cannot truly be known at all; *the knowledge of it is forbidden by the very nature of thought.*<sup>3</sup>

The italics are ours to show the point under discussion. Does this not remind one of an argument in favour of the undulatory theory, namely, that "the meeting of two rays whose waves interlock produces darkness"? For Mr. Mansel's assertion that when self thinks of self, and is simultaneously the subject and object, it is "the annihilation of both" — means just this, and the psychological argument is therefore placed on the same basis as the physical phenomenon of light waves. Moreover, Mr. Herbert Spencer confessing that Mr. Mansel is right and basing thereupon his conclusion that the knowledge of self or soul is thus "forbidden by the very nature of thought" is a proof that the

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

<sup>3</sup> *First Principles*, pp. 65, 66.

“father of modern psychology” (in England) proceeds on no better psychological principles than Messrs. Huxley or Tyndall have done.<sup>4</sup>

We do not contemplate in the least the impertinence of criticizing such a giant of thought as Mr. H. Spencer is rightly considered to be by his friends and admirers. We mention this simply to prove our point and show modern psychology to be a misnomer, even though it is claimed that Mr. Spencer has “reached conclusions of great generality and truth, regarding all that can be known of man.” We have one determined object in view, and we will not deviate from the straight line, and our object is to show that occultism and its philosophy have not the least chance of being even understood, still less accepted in this century, and by the present generations of men of science. We would fain impress on the minds of our Theosophists and mystics that to search for sympathy and recognition in the region of “science” is to court defeat. Psychology seemed a natural ally at first, and now having examined it, we come to the conclusion that it is a *suggestio falsi* and no more. It is as misleading a term, as taught at present, as that of the Antarctic Pole with its ever arid and barren frigid zone, called southern merely from geographical considerations.

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

---

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

<sup>5</sup> According to John Stuart Mill, neither the so-called objective universe nor the domain of mind — object, subject — corresponds with any absolute reality beyond

sensations, or "an integration of sensations." It is all relations of subject and object, relations of universal and individual, of absolute and finite. But when it comes to dealing with the problems of the origin of space and time, and to the summing-up of all those inter- and co-relations of ideas and matter, of ego and non-ego, then all the proof vouchsafed to an opponent is the contemptuous epithet of "ontologist." After which, modern psychology, having demolished the object of its sensation in the person of the contradictor, turns round against itself and commits *kara-kiri* by showing sensation itself to be no better than hallucination.

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

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

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

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

Indeed, the champions of science now say that the belief that sensation and thought are but movements of matter — Büchner's and Moleschott's theory — is, as a well-known English annihilationist remarks,

---

"sensation." Objects, the whole paraphernalia of sense, are "sensation objectively viewed," and mental states "sensation subjectively viewed." The "Ego" is as entire an illusion as matter; the One Reality, groups of feelings bound together by the rigid laws of association.

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

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

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

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

1. Materialism says: the mental changes are caused by the molecular changes.

2. Spiritualism (believers in a soul): the molecular changes are caused by the mental changes. [Thought acts on the brain matter through the medium of Fohat focused through one of the principles.]

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

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

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

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

---

EVOLUTION is not a compelling force from *without*, but the *impelling* force of Spirit from *within*, urging on to better and better expression. All advancement is from *within*. All the knowledge that we gain, all the experience that we obtain, is obtained and held *within*. Each one, then, is the Seer; all the rest are seen. So, the knowledge that we have to obtain is not information from without, not the thoughts of other men, but an understanding of our own essential nature, which represents every element in the great universe, from the basis of all life to every outward expression, and every possibility of further expression.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

## WHISPERS OF HOPE

Whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God, my God.

—*The Book of Ruth*

WHEN the personal man so speaks to his own true Self, then is he fit to be taken in hand and prepared for the instructions which in time will be his. Not till then.

What is this true Self of man? Where does it dwell? What does it desire? Has it a message for the personality? Rarely does the personal man pause to ask these questions or search patiently for their answers. Rarely does he think it is worth his while to do so. Few are they who really believe in the existence of the Self. To the majority, it does not exist, for it is not demonstrable and seems to obey no human summons to appear and attest. To him who has inherited the cold intellect of the age, the only real goal is the attaining of something which is concrete and which is exclusively his by right of possession and conquest. Each man thus fashions and lives in a world of make-believe with its inverted values and perishable joys. To survive in such a world and savour its joys, the man finds himself compelled to make depredations into other men's territories. To satisfy his hunger, he forages; to rise to eminence, he tramples over the aspirations of others; to still his cravings, he filches that which he covets. It is himself first in all things and everywhere. He sees no wrong in his acts of depredation. He is intensely animal.

Even if the man were to achieve all that he desired, he would still be haunted with the spectres of pain and despair. The record of the lives of heroes and kings is sufficient proof that behind joy and triumph there stand sorrow and frustration, and that after man has quaffed his goblet of happiness he finds within it the drop of poison that adds the bitter to his sweet. If this be the sum total of the average man's sojourn from birth to death, one may readily ask why he should sentence himself to such a weary treadmill of an existence. Why can he not wring from the flitting years of a fast ebbing life the quintessence which must surely exist? If his true Self be there, why does it not stop his spoliating hands; why does it not admonish nor guide nor force its decrees as one does on recalcitrant children? Can it be that we have strayed far from home and in the wilderness have built our pigsty colonies, denying that we had once a resplendent home and that we con-

sorted with the good and the great? May it not also be that the pull of the personal was so strong in us that it tired of the Self's behests to choose the better and not the pleasanter, and that to erase the stigma of disobedience and deliberate wrongdoing it tuned off the higher vibrations and linked itself up to another, albeit a pernicious, channel?

If the man has to some extent been observant of life and of the law of causation that inexorably moved him and those around him, he will have noticed that moral effects follow moral causes with mathematical precision, and that too despite tears and supplications, propitiations and ceremonies. That which man has sown, man has invariably reaped, though the time lag between cause and effect may have been short or long, immediate or deferred over the years. The history of nations shows how over the course of centuries wrongs get righted and how crime and sin bring their own punishment. The coldest of intellect cannot fail to see that man comes but as a result and as a mute testimony of all his pasts. If this dawns on him, he must sooner or later come to the realization that if he could possess himself of noble seeds, he could assure himself of a noble crop by providing the right soil, light and water. It is only when the man attains to a fair degree of certitude in this reasoning that he can venture out upon his delicate experiments with life.

If to reach up to the Self has become the more difficult because of wrong thinking over the years and lives, it must follow that no significant advance can be made without retracing the steps. This itself is an arduous act of discipline. Sooner or later, it will assume the look and semblance as also the essence of austerity. The work of restoring harmony, the willingness to suffer gladly the checks that come under Karmic cycles — these do not come easily to the man. The medicine has the potency to heal, but it is extremely bitter and causes a malaise in the whole system. Fevers have their uses and are often stepping-stones to the throwing out of the undesirable. The beginner has to remember this always lest in the mental fog which fevers are wont to raise he throw away the medicine, become impatient with his regimen and aggravate the very conditions he hopefully set out to ameliorate.

Man can, in his attempt to have a glimpse of the larger life, start work on himself and as a first step start evaluating his actions of each day as it revolves round him. When he does enter upon this discipline, he finds himself bankrupt of norms. He searches for a yardstick and, not finding it, he tries to create one from out of the bits and pieces

gathered from social and religious conventions. He thus begins with a terrible handicap. Worse still, he may develop a propensity for defending his actions. His intellect is keen enough to put inverted values on things, justify wrongs and make excuses for false practices, all which, in saner moments, he knows to be false. Cant and hypocrisy are the greatest dangers to spirituality. Great perils are generated by the man when he attempts to gild a wrong with the colours of virtue. By this, the man not only deludes himself; he becomes an active propagator of a mischievous philosophy of behaviour. He preaches the gospel of evil. He may be unaware of the enormity of his conduct, but that makes no difference to the force of the retributive reaction that must be his. Even under man-made codes, ignorance of law is no excuse.

When the personality-oriented mind touches Theosophy, it intuitively perceives the truth of several of its tenets. It may be that the mind may develop a tendency to shy away from Theosophy because of the wide gap between the ideal as revealed and the low actual level at which the mind finds itself. But, even if the mind turn away entirely from the teachings, it will still carry with it the realization of its own degradation. That memory must sooner or later force an introspection and present a fresh chance for reformation. For the average man who has enough of the milk of human kindness in him, the chances are brighter. He may stay, may probe and question, may start his experiments with truth.

There are seven rules that govern a man's conduct, seven laws which have their moorings in the eternal. In each is found the essence which will give strength to the man who dedicates himself to serve the best interest of his fellow-men. These are embodied in the seven *Paramitas* of *The Voice of the Silence*. The first of these is "charity." Here is one key for universal application, a key by which the actions of a day, a year or a life can be either planned in prospect or judged in retrospect. To begin with, the neophyte will have his own preconceived ideas of charity. He starts at lowly levels and his vision and judgement are by that reason limited. Yet, as he dwells each day (albeit only at the time of reviewing his actions) on the concept of charity as an ideal translated into action, he will find that the *Paramita* becomes alive and he begins to light upon deeper and more universal meanings. Though he may still fail to realize it, the inner sound has begun to impinge itself upon the outer. The Inner Ruler responds. The pupil has asked and he now receives as soon as he has become assiduous in devotion.

When any man engages himself in a deep contemplation of eternal verities, there takes place in him a conjunction between the personal and the individual self. The former unites itself, for however short a time, with its parent. The union brings satisfaction, strength, and a magnetic sympathy. These moments of peace snatched from the long hours of earthly existence can be prolonged and strengthened by the man's efforts to devote himself to the true interests of others. That this must be so can be deduced from the fact that, if the man draws upon an impersonal force and benefits by it, he by that effort assumes to himself the duty of becoming an agent of that force, so that through the impersonal in himself he may spread the impersonal beneficence to whosoever is willing to bask in its warmth. By benefiting from the inflow of impersonal knowledge and power, he becomes a debtor to nature and can requite himself in the only way possible — by helping those who are waging a losing battle with the materialism of the age.

The unveiling of truth is by a series of progressive awakenings. In the process, both light and beauty are revealed, for truth is beautiful and is self-luminous. As progress is made in the practice, however meagre, however halting, of the *Paramitas*, the man begins to understand that the pattern on which he must mould his life has to be put together by none but himself and that the building materials for the erection of the fane must be searched for in the universal and the undying aspects of man and nature. A little perseverance, a little straining towards rectitude, a little administering to oneself of a few ascetic rules (guarding of speech from inflicting injury on others is one such) and the event occurs which confirms the student in his faith. Life recognizes his efforts and compensates. Adoration in one of its aspects is possible and is even unconsciously arrived at.

However, the winning of a victory is not the winning of a war. Gains have to be won and consolidated. The great enemy of the man (the sum total of his cravings that seem to have an independent existence) may have been scotched in the fight, may have been beaten into a seeming subjugation. Yet, this same enemy is still alive. It will gather strength in secret, will scheme, infiltrate, frighten with nameless horrors or assume pleasing aspects with murder in the heart. Cajolery, temptation, scorn may spring up from unsuspected quarters — from erstwhile teachers; from sons and loved ones; from sense-intoxicating sights and sounds as from the remembered taste of forbidden fruits. Each of these can wield a terrible power. Each can glamour; and, once caught in it, the man loses his active will, turns passive to the vile stimulus and

acts as possessed mediums do — servile to the force that controls.

If the man falters and fails and is burdened down by the memories of his failures past and present, then he will have to climb the path anew till he builds in himself the stamina to put both shame and fear aside. Having then placed himself in the region of the unmoving part of his make-up, he can review his divagations impartially and without personal involvement. He has to reach that fixity of purpose which shall permit him to remain unmoved at the spectacle of his own wrongs so that from his elevated judgement-seat he can appraise the causes of his failings and so find the cure to the weaknesses that beset his lower nature. It is by such exercise that he will build up his strength for the battle that will be joined again and yet again. This ability to assume the judgement seat is the culmination of constant practice and of assiduity in devotion sustained over the days and years and amid the pain and ridicule that the unkindness of mankind is ever ready to pour forth.

Why has the man to go through all these tribulations, this swimming against the current, this incurring of hostility from those very ones he is setting out to save? The answer — if at our stage of ignorance it can be called an answer — is that the indwelling spirit must obtain complete and total mastery and facility of action over all types of matter, from the most refined to the grossest, as over all shades of moods, cravings and emotions. It is when he has achieved this that he can translate action into art, behaviour into benediction. His eyes and organs are no longer attracted or repelled by the turmoil of the outside world. He covets no possessions, he desires no rewards. When thus he is no longer actuated to possess and own, he is called upon to give — abundantly. For the spirit of man owns kinship with the sun. It shines on the just and the unjust, it knows no hatred nor favour. Itself unaffected by changes, it takes upon itself the task of shielding from harm those more unfortunate brethren who are blind and deaf to the sights and sounds of the celestial spheres.

---

UNLESS our race is love-lifted and star-led, what hope have we that war will ever end, and the slum be cleansed, and mankind attain to a collective life that is just and merciful and full of joy?

—JOSEPH FORT NEWTON

## WHAT IS PRACTICAL OCCULTISM?

WHAT, we may ask ourselves, is the governing faculty in mankind, and therefore in ourselves? There is something in us to which we relate all experience, all memory, all expectancy, and by which we determine whether to act or to abstain from acting in every contingency. That is the fact in regard to every man, yet it is perfectly safe to say that not one man in a million is aware of it. To be aware of that fact is the first step in practical occultism.

Let us regard our nature, as each one of us can easily see it to be. We all have a body nature or sense nature by means of which, during our waking life, we are in contact with the Nature around us, both Nature visible and Nature invisible. Within and behind that physical nature of ours we have our psychic nature, our emotional or sensational nature, that part of us which is pleased or displeased, pained or the reverse, by our contact with Nature in every direction. Still within and behind that, there is another aspect of our nature that we know under the general name of reason, that which sees the relation between the object of sense, whatever that object may be, and the sensation aroused by contact with that object. Then, within and behind that there is still another department of our nature which "philosophizes" upon all these things, which wonders what is the use of it all anyhow; when we have eaten all that there is to eat, and of the best, and have drunk all there is to drink, and of the best — in short, have emptied the cup of life — there is a part of our nature which wonders what the final purpose may be and wherefore we are thrust into this pilgrimage.

Just so brief a consideration as that shows that man has a highly complex nature. But, this man of sense and man of emotion and man of reason and man of intuition, or aspiration, is not the real man. Who is the real man? He who perceives through the senses, who suffers or enjoys through his emotions, who traces events to their causes, and who perceives what must of necessity lie behind all cause and all effect.

If we regard our own life and the lives of those about us, we shall find that the pervading influence in us is our psychic nature. Men do not act from a sense of justice. Men do not act from a perception of duty. Men do not act from a perception of reason. We *have* the perception of justice. We *have* the perception of duty. We *have* the perception of reason, but they are not the axis of our daily conduct. Our psychic nature, our emotions, our feelings, our desires, are the fulcrum of our

human life. Men employ their reason — what for? In order the better to gratify their desires and passions and feelings and emotions. Men employ the perception of duty. Why? In order to gain the wherewithal to gratify their desires. Men make use of the sense of justice, the intuitive recognition of the universal providence throughout all nature. Why? In order to excuse themselves, through the tithes of some good done, for the gratification of their desires which are not good.

If we turn to our religion, we shall find that it is a religion of desires. All religions that are believed in by the people are psychic religions. They offer a psychic state — here and more particularly hereafter — to their devotees. They do not offer a condition of justice here or hereafter — whether for the embodied or disembodied soul. The man whose desires are unfulfilled in this life is told by his religion that through certain beliefs and ceremonies he may, after death, go to a state where his desires may be eternally gratified. If, on the other hand, we do not accept those beliefs, do not perform the enjoined rites and ceremonies, we shall go to a place where our desires shall be forever balked.

So we have a perfect example of psychism in the governing motive in human religion. All religions are psychic stimulants, that is to say, their appeal is to the emotional nature, the psychic nature, the desire nature of man. That makes the man psychically drunk — so drunk that his reason is starved, his sense of justice is atrophied. Theosophy has ever come into the world to tell men that if they want to reach to the highest state possible for a being they must make the highest principles of their nature the fulcrum of their actions and the lower and lesser nature the slave and servant to the highest in them.

There is no hope whatever for the divine man in us, for the spiritual man in us, for the just man in us, in Western religion or in Western science. Both alike appeal to the psychic nature. *The Voice of the Silence* begins with these words: “These instructions are for those ignorant of the dangers of the lower *Iddhi*” — a word that means the psychic nature, the psychic powers. If we study history in the light of the several divisions of a man’s nature, then we can understand the long, long cinderpath of woe that humanity has travelled since the dawn of time, and why it is that when those men who make the whole of their nature subservient to what they can see is the highest in them — those great Beings we call our Elder Brothers — why it is that when they come into the world in human guise, humanity has inevitably and invariably ranged itself into three classes: those who

were simply indifferent — by far the larger part; those who worshipped them as gods who could give them what they wanted; and those who hated them as devils out of fear they would take from them what they had, or what they wanted. The history of Christ is not unique. There were many crucified saviours anterior to Jesus of Nazareth. They all came to teach us what is the matter with ourselves. The matter with us is that we are spiritual prostitutes, each one of us. Every day and every hour we are forcing the highest, the noblest, the truest, the most perfect and divine in us into the debaseful menialship of scullion for what we know is an undependable portion of our nature. The Great Ones come to tell us that there is no being who can *see* for us, but that every man is amply able to see for himself; that there is no other being who can *think* for us, but that every man, even the dullest, is amply able to think for himself. They come to tell us of the dangers of the lower *Iddhi*; of the dangers of being guided by our feelings. The crafty man, the able intellectualist, understanding what our nature consists of, can just as easily make us his victims by playing upon the reflected light of our highest and noblest feelings as through our worst. The man who wants to exploit us will appeal to our generosity, and if we are not amenable to that, he will appeal to our greed, and if that does not interest us he has still a third arrow — he appeals to our conservative instinct; and when he goes his way he has our money and we have a stock certificate. Men fail to realize that, because they do not consider this part of our nature which should ever be ruled with an iron hand.

What are our feelings for? What is our emotional nature for? What is the use of the psychic nature? There is the second step in practical occultism: Recognizing that we have a psychic nature, that unconsciously to ourselves we have been dominated by it, that it is that which has wrought ruin for mankind, comes the question: Well, what have we got it for? Of what use is it? The psychic nature, properly used and properly understood, is an infallible diagnostician of the other fellow's state of mind. If I have no feelings of my own I can tell instantly what the other fellow's feelings are. What would not any physician give if, instead of taking the temperature, feeling the pulse, asking his patient a string of questions, ordering this test and that and looking in the books — all of which are second-hand, third-hand or tenth-hand hearsay attempts to find out what is the matter with the patient — if he had some way himself of feeling just what the patient felt, he would know at once what illness he had. The psychic nature is just that — the means

whereby we can directly, instead of indirectly, cognize the nature of the mixtures that constitute the other being. A man's virtues may predominate absolutely at one moment; the next instant his sins may replace the virtues. We do not understand, nor does the man himself recognize, that the seven virtues and the seven deadly sins are aspects of one and the same thing. The sevenfold division of the psychic nature, when understood, when controlled, when in harmony with Nature, corresponds to the seven virtues. When used to infect us with the virus of whatever may be about — seven deadly sins.

What is the secret underlying all this mystery? The Buddha, the Christ and many, many others have taught it. In our time, H. P. Blavatsky has written volumes upon it. Theosophy has been kept alive in the world just to tell people that. To understand the secret we need to delve into the very depths of our own nature, to try to *see* with the highest powers and faculties we have, and then from that seeing, to *think* and to *act*. This is the practical occultism which alone can save any man, and which, if practised, *would* save every man.

Occultism admits of no outside saviour, whether it be God or anyone else. Over against the conception of a God who favours some and punishes others, who is partial and who can be bribed — over against that set this conception: that everything in this universe proceeds from one and the same Source and is identical with that Source. The moment we throw away the concept of an unjust God, we can begin to see the fundamental honesty, the unswerving justice in Nature. There is something that stands under and back of everything — call it the One Substance. Substance means, literally, that which stands under. We need to revise our understanding of these concepts. Take the forms there are in Nature. What an immense variety of human bodies there is! They all come from the same matter. There is no such thing as the blue blood of one and the low blood of another. The laws under which a good body is born and exists are the same as the laws under which poor bodies are born and exist. The laws under which the most complex and finely organized bodies exist are the same as those under which the simplest or coarsest bodies exist — all under One Law, all from One Substance.

But let us get behind matter — the formative — get behind compounds to the elements from which those compounds derive, get behind elements to the One Essence. There is an omnipotent — in the sense that all powers come from it — and omnipresent and eternal Reality of which everything that is, is a modification, a representation, an expres-

sion, an embodiment. This One Reality excludes nothing, includes everything.

There is the object of practical occultism: To demonstrate the identity of man with the Absolute Principle and also with the Deity as we see It manifested in Nature — not merely the identity of man, but the fundamental identity of everything that is. There is no room for anybody to say — “You are of a different material than I, that is why you are as you are; God made me weak, God made you strong; God made me bad, God made you good; God damned me, God saved you.” There is no reason for religion, as religion is known, no reason for the fellow who is seeking to get the best of it for himself. Where there is no judge to be bribed, what is the use of accumulating bribes? Where Nature cannot be fooled, what is the use of working to accumulate the paraphernalia of deception?

Now we come to the third step in practical occultism: Granted there is one Matter from which all these bodies have sprung; granted there is one Intelligence from which all these minds have sprung; granted there is one Supreme whose action we call Law — granted all that, how comes this vast variety? If there is but One Essence it follows that the minutest portion of that One Essence has in it the potentialities of any other portion, has in it all the potentialities of the whole. Let us revert to a physical illustration: One drop of water has in it all the potentialities that exist in the whole ocean, that exist in the entire waters of our globe. Granted the power to grow, with the whole universe for soil and nourishment, what sets limits to the growth of anything? Nothing in the world but that being's ignorance, or its knowledge. We can do anything if we know how to do it. Having done it and reaped the consequences, we realize in some cases that although we had the power, it were wiser not to have used it; and that in some of the things we did *not* do, it were wiser that we had.

Knowledge is available in the universe, and just as the presence of one drop of water compels the immediate perception of an ocean of water, so one single perception of Truth by any being compels, through that eyelet-hole of Truth, the perception of the infinite ocean of Knowledge. Just think of the countless things we do not know and that we need to know. We know we *could* know them, yet we do not make the effort to learn them. We rely on somebody else learning them for us.

The race, then, is physically lazy, spiritually blind, intellectually indolent. Why? Because it has been taught to live in, to think about, to feed, to rely on, the psychic nature. We are not lazy in gratifying

our desires if we have the wherewithal to do so. We are not lazy in seeking that wherewithal if we lack it. In most of our actions, the motive power generally is — desire.

So, then, the difference in beings does not lie in the difference of their Source. All are from the same Source. It does not lie in the difference of the law under which each being becomes what he is. It lies, for the beings below man, as also for man himself, in their ignorance, and our ignorance is quite different from theirs. The creatures in the lower kingdoms have no moral nature, yet the principle of desire is their stimulus to action. Man does have a moral nature, an intellectual nature, yet he allows his desires to guide him. It is well known that one can so manipulate the vegetable kingdom that it will yield an enormous plant and no fruit, so with man's nature. We have delivered our souls in pawn to the enormous augmentation of a principle which belongs to the kingdoms below us and not to us at all. To recognize that is practical occultism.

Nature is forever throwing the individual back on himself to teach him the lesson of his own responsibility. When a man acknowledges his divinity, not as an endowment but as an inherency; when he acknowledges his equality before the law of his own being with any other being; when he knows that he has but to sow, and as he sows, so shall he reap — when a man knows those things he becomes his own God. He is ready to choose for himself instead of having some book, some authority, some sect, some party, some politician, some *desire* do his choosing for him. He is ready to act in accordance with his own choice of what is duty, of what is right; and having acted, to abide the consequence, fearing no god or devil, knowing there is not a being anywhere in all the cosmos who can make him reap what he did not sow, who can keep him from reaping what he did sow. Then he sees that the differences are not differences in substance or in essence; they are differences in states, conditions, limitations, degrees of intelligence and non-intelligence.

What does the word "Spirit" mean? The highest state of the One Substance. What does "hell" mean? The lowest state of the One Substance. What does "desire" mean? An intermediate state of the One Substance. What does "intelligence" mean? The next state to Spirit — but it is all the One Substance. Our bodies have not the intelligence that our senses have. Our senses have not the intelligence that our desires have. Our desires have not the intelligence that our reason has. Our reason has not the intelligence that our moral sense, our spiritual sense

— our intuition — has. If there is but One Substance then a spiritual being is a being who dwells in amity with the whole of Nature because he knows he is identical with it; who dwells in unity with the One Life regardless of the forms that the One Life may inhabit. The result is that such a being may have a body, but all his actions on earth are spiritual actions. He has senses, but the use of his senses is a spiritual use. He has a mind, but the use of his mind is a spiritual one.

There being One Substance, there being One Law, all beings are from time to time on the plane of Spirit — the plane of clear perception, the perception of the unity of all, the fundamental identity of all. Now suppose a being acts, or thinks, or feels, for a *part*? That is a cause. What happens instantly? He is off the plane of Spirit. That is the effect. Apply fire to ice, what happens to ice? Off the plane of ice, on the plane of water. Apply fire to water, what happens to water? Off the plane of water, on the plane of steam. Apply more fire — off the plane of steam, on the plane of vapour. All the time one and the same thing. What gets a being off the plane of Spirit? Separative action, partial action; the non-perception of the all, the momentary forgetfulness of the unity of the One Life. Once off the plane of Spirit, what does he see? He sees only that part which in his mind's eye takes the place of the whole. What else could he see? How could a man who has lost his discrimination know what is the right side up and what is upside down; what is the real Key to the Scriptures and what a skeleton key? The answer is, he can't. One who is off the plane of Spirit does not know it. He is on the plane of a *part* and does not know it. He keeps acting in accordance with his preference, his partiality, and pretty soon he is off the second plane, on to the third, and so on down, down, down, till he reaches the lowest plane of all — the plane of the mythical Satan, in the heart of every one of us. What is a devil? A devil is a spiritual being who has become constitutionally incapable of thinking of anybody but himself. What is a god? A god is a being who has become constitutionally incapable of thinking of himself, of acting for himself. Once a person begins acting on a narrower and narrower plane, he reaches at last that point where he says: "Me, first, last and all the time. What do *I* want? What can *I* have? What will become of *me*?"

Our intellectual and psychic nature has been developed out of all proportion to our moral progress. The moral nature is the balance principle of the seven. When a physical structure is built at ever so slight a cant, when it rises to that height where the centre of gravity falls

outside the base line, down comes the structure and great is the fall. So with our civilization. Has it not built a veritable Tower of Babel? Have we not come to that very point that the graphic parable tells about in the race that preceded ours?

Practical occultism is the study of God *in* Nature, not outside of Nature; the study of God in ourselves, not some place else; the assumption of responsibility, not irresponsibility. An outside God is an irresponsible being; the indwelling God is a God of responsibility. We cannot reform the world save and except by reforming ourselves. We cannot reform ourselves by praying, by psychic invocations, or by rites and ceremonies; these only result in making us lose such vestigial remnants of the spiritual nature that were there.

We need to promulgate the only gospel there is — the gospel that man is inherently divine; that he has to sow and has to reap the consequences of his sowing. He must sow with his eyes wide open, responsibly, and know that in future he will reap as he *now* sows. To teach men the unity of the One Life; to teach men the law of Karma — sowing and reaping; to teach men the divinity in themselves; to teach men that any and every one of us may become like unto a Buddha or a Christ; that every hell is of our own making, every woe and sorrow of our own producing; that we must turn our divine power upwards and make the physical, the psychic and the intellectual subservient to the divine man — that is our allotment.

That is the only practical occultism there is. All that any man can do for another is to set these things before him for his consideration. That is teaching by precept. And the other method is to teach by example, by oneself leading the Life. As a man does that, he begins to find out that there are other moods and tenses of the Holy *Verbum* than are writ in the grammar of our actions; that the Elder Brothers live and move and have Their being in this very world of ours; that there is such a thing as rapport with the spiritual side of our nature, just as definite, just as sure, as our rapport with the physical side of Nature. There is nothing psychic about it; it comes from the perception of the One Life, the perception of the divinity in all things, the perception of the divinity which is oneself, and then action upon a divine basis. In the words of Sri Krishna:

He, O Arjuna, who by the similitude found in himself seeth but one essence in all things, whether they be evil or good, is considered to be the most excellent devotee. (*Bhagavad-Gita*, VI. 32)

---

## STRAY THOUGHTS

[Reprinted from *The Path* for February 1888.—EDS.]

HE who loves the Whole, attracts all the units. He who hates one unit, repels the Whole, for in every unit the Whole is contained. One creature unloved has power to exclude me from the "Kingdom of Heaven," where I can only enter by being one with the Whole.

"Love" is not desire of possession, but a type of that universal interchange which gives and takes, takes and gives, in continual evolution and perpetuation of Harmony. It is the divine essence seeking perfect equilibrium, in the human soul.

*"In his place I might do worse."* To say this with my whole heart is truly to love my neighbour.

Resistance is better than indifference. Our opponent is nearer our centre than the friend who listens courteously and forgets. Opposition is a sign of life. Do not revile it: pass it by. A mightier than we shall conquer it: his name is Death.

A "wicked" man is one whom the Law puts to more severe tests than myself. When I see one who commits great wrongs, I hear in my heart that medieval cry: "Make way for the Justice of God!" To be unjust is in itself the greatest punishment. When the Law passes judgment upon man, its justice is injustice avenging itself upon its creator.

As in politics the neutrals are the enemies of all, so those who are inactive in soul reject both "good" and evil, and fall into the gulf of oblivion.

Why do we pride ourselves upon our virtues? They are sterile, or they would have generated somewhat higher than virtue. A virtue which cannot become the mother of all virtues is an abortive Truth.

Pain is the effort of nature to restore its lost harmonies; therefore pain is joy. Joy is the effort of nature to disturb the proportions of harmony by the exclusive appropriation of a selected note; therefore joy is pain. These together are the second lesson of life. The first is sex, itself a permitted discord whereby true harmony is better conceived.

The devout mind may sink a plummet into the soul. It cannot sound those depths. But it can awaken and arouse them, and they will go through some heavenly motions which mind may understand and record.

True Will is an instinctive motion of soul towards spirit.

No Karma is "bad" Karma. What we call evil fortune is simply nature's effort at readjustment.

Falsehood has ever a larger following than Truth. But the followers of Falsehood represent numbers only, while those of Truth stand for unknown quantities.

High places are points of culmination. Princes can only be judged by the general applications of laws. The subtle alchemy of royalty transmutes the heart's essences from volatile to deadly.

If you wish to destroy Karmic effects, destroy the fixed consciousness of "yourself." Live in the universal life and you will only inherit the universal Karma. This is "good," for the Karma of the manifestation is to return to the manifest.

When we *conceive* the highest ideal of the Deity, we consciously enter its Being. When we have *realized* this ideal, the Deity consciously enters our Being. The ultimate of Being is one.

—JASPER NIEMAND, F.T.S.

---

It is a fundamental doctrine of Theosophy that the "separateness" which we feel between ourselves and the world of living beings around us is an illusion, not a reality. In very deed and truth, all men are one, not in a feeling of sentimental gush and hysterical enthusiasm, but in sober earnest. As all Eastern philosophy teaches, there is but ONE SELF in all the infinite Universe, and what we men call "self" is but the illusionary reflection of the ONE SELF in the heaving waters of earth. True Occultism is the destruction of the false idea of Self, and therefore true spiritual perfection and knowledge are nothing else but the complete identification of our finite "selves" with the Great All. It follows, therefore, that no spiritual progress at all is possible except by and through the bulk of Humanity. It is only when the whole of Humanity has attained happiness that the individual can hope to become permanently happy — for the individual is an inseparable part of the Whole.

—*Lucifer*, March 1889

## THE IDEAL OF SACRIFICE

IT IS rarely recognized today that sacrifice lies at the root of the manifested universe and is exemplified in every incarnation of the human soul. To keep the ideal of sacrifice before the minds of the early races of humanity, the great Sages of the past gave them symbolical representations and allegorical dramas in which bloodless sacrifices were enacted. It was very much later that those symbolic dramas were degraded into animal sacrifices in the name of religion. That happened when the priests, desiring to exploit the masses, substituted this grossly material and cruel practice for the true, joyous act of creation that real sacrifice is. The *Bhagavad-Gita* nowhere demands animal sacrifice, but speaks of offering in sacrifice a leaf, a flower, a fruit, or water, in a spirit of devotion. The great Buddha fought the ghastly degradation of animal sacrifice. It was one of the noblest acts in the career of the Prophet Mohammed that he succeeded in abolishing the abomination of human sacrifice in Arabia. The very ancient *Yasna* scripture of the Zoroastrians, all but a fragment of which has been lost, is a symbolical representation of the rite of true sacrifice. Now it has been overlaid with wrong interpretations, but studied with the help of even a little of the knowledge of Nature and Nature's laws which Theosophy gives, the true meaning may be perceived.

Sacrifice is but an aspect of one of the fundamental laws in Nature — the law of interdependence. The visible and invisible cosmos is one whole and nothing is separated from anything else. Even the most distant stars are related to our tiny earth. The human kingdom depends on the lower kingdoms and they in turn on man, all together making up the great pulsating rhythm or harmony of Nature, in which man plays an important part. Everywhere there is give and take; life throughout the universe is sustained by the act of sacrifice. But, outside the human kingdom, sacrifice is spontaneous. It is in the human kingdom that it assumes a deliberate and responsible expression.

Because of the widespead misery and suffering prevalent today, we recognize that it is necessary for every one of us to give something in service or in wealth, or what it can procure. Each one must sacrifice something in his life. This to be effective must be done in terms of spiritual knowledge — an inner creative activity. Man's power of free will and volition is a terrific power, for it makes it possible for him to break the universal harmony. When he violates the law of brother-

hood he reaps misery and agony for himself and for the whole of humanity; chaos results.

The rhythm of life may be violated by acts of commission or by acts of omission. It is not enough that we simply refrain from evil; that is a negative form of goodness. If we are failing to create love, reverence, charity and nobility by our thoughts, feelings and actions, we are breaking the laws of Nature and of our own being. "Inaction in a deed of mercy becomes an action in a deadly sin," says *The Voice of the Silence*. Or, as Ruskin put it, "The man who is not actively kind is cruel." No passivity is possible in spiritual progress.

Sacrifice of material things is most commendable, but it cannot be compared with the sacrifice of spiritual knowledge — the spreading of instruction about the way of life that gives peace and joy.

Madame Blavatsky wrote in the first of her Five Messages to the American Theosophists:

Theosophists are of necessity the friends of all movements in the world, whether intellectual or simply practical, for the amelioration of the condition of mankind. We are the friends of all those who fight against drunkenness, against cruelty to animals, against injustice to women, against corruption in society or in government, although we do not meddle in politics. We are the friends of those who exercise practical charity, who seek to lift a little of the tremendous weight of misery that is crushing down the poor. But in our quality of Theosophists, we cannot engage in any one of these great works in particular. As individuals we may do so, but as Theosophists we have a larger, more important, and much more difficult work to do. . . . The function of Theosophists is to open men's hearts and understandings to charity, justice, and generosity, attributes which belong specifically to the human kingdom and are natural to man when he has developed the qualities of a human being. Theosophy teaches the animal-man to be a human-man; and when people have learned to think and feel as truly human beings should feel and think, they will act humanely, and works of charity, justice, and generosity will be done spontaneously by all.

Many people with good motives try to serve, but because they lack spiritual knowledge they make blunders and often bring about more misery than they set out to relieve. Spiritual knowledge is necessary in every sphere of life.

When people make a sacrifice for others they often feel self-righteous. This arises through misunderstanding of the fact that when we sacrifice for others we are not primarily obliging them but merely fulfilling our own *Dharma* and co-operating with the rhythm of Nature. True sacrifice is a corollary of the Law of Unity. Life itself is a sacred and holy sacrament when it is lived in terms of spiritual truths.

For living a life of true sacrifice and service we must remember that the Universe is one living whole and that Spirit is present everywhere. The energies of Soul enable man to show forth that sacrifice and to obey the law of his own being. The tools he uses are the activity of his hands, his brain and his heart, and also the energies of his own Soul.

If man is the performer of sacrifice, why need he have an outside priest? No sacrificial rite which priests are paid to perform can be beneficial. Instead of depending on outside ceremonies, each man must become his own priest and recognize life as a religious rite.

There is in reality no division between that which is sacred and that which is secular. All life is sacramental. The compartmentalization of life is the curse of our civilization. Not only followers of various sects, but even those who have emancipated themselves from creedal limitations make a distinction between service performed for the community and ordinary activities. The whole of life is one. In the silent performance of our own duties, with an attitude of consecration, of self-responsibility and self-understanding, observing the rhythm of life, we serve all Nature. We thus transform our duties from drudgery into inspiring actions, through which our lives become luminous and all beings are benefited. To take an example: A petty clerk in his office can be an altruist, serving his community, his country and the whole of humanity, if he works with a pure and attentive mind and a noble and unselfish heart, keeping himself energized spiritually so that he observes punctuality, accuracy and efficiency in all that he does. Humdrum details, like keeping his pen, paper and ink clean, making his handwriting clear and legible, steadily observed in the right spirit make his life a spiritual drama in which every act is a true sacrifice. He is serving not only his employer, but also his city and country. He is helping Nature by keeping his mind alert, his heart pure, his fingers mobile, his work tidy. Such a clerk is a patriot and a philanthropist. Were the scavenger and the scholar, the professor and the politician to do their appointed tasks in the same fashion, the world would become a different place from what it is now.

All of us must regard the outside tools of our profession as also our inner faculties as channels of spiritual sacrifice. Beginning where we are and performing our own duties, we shall become capable of performing the rite of true spiritual sacrifice, the offering of our actions to our spiritual ideals. Then we may come to the realization of what Krishna meant when He called Himself "*Adhiyajna*," "the Great Sacrifice," the Soul offering itself as a sacrifice within this body of flesh and blood.

Energizing himself by Compassion, the spirit and essence of philanthropy, altruism and selflessness, the Emancipated Soul on the threshold of final *Nirvana* performs the supreme Sacrifice of remaining with the darkness of the world and radiating the Light of Wisdom of his own Diamond-Heart. He sacrifices himself for the sake of mankind, though but a few elect may profit by the Great Sacrifice. Such an one not only remains with the world but incarnates among the men on earth; free, he assumes the bondage of flesh; above Karma, he shoulders the responsibility of contacting causes and effects; beyond the influence of yugas and cycles, age by age he is one with their vicissitudes. Says Krishna:

I produce myself among creatures, O son of Bharata, whenever there is a decline of virtue and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world; and thus I incarnate from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of righteousness. (*Bhagavad-Gita*, IV. 7-8)

Contemplation on such a Great Sacrifice kindles the fire of devotion in the human heart. As the child's first feeling is for its mother, so the first spiritual aspiration of the awakening inner nature is for the Spiritual Preceptor or Guru who embodies and expresses that devotion through his sacrifice. At his Flame we can kindle our little lamp and, protecting it against the winds of impurity, the fogs of superstition, the mists of sense-attraction, the biting snows of selfishness, we march forward to the goal of Compassion Absolute which is the Great Sacrifice.

---

HOLD fast in silence to all that is your own, for you will need it in the fight; but never, *never* desire to get knowledge or power for any other purpose than to give it on the altar, for thus alone can it be saved to you.

—W. Q. JUDGE

# ZOROASTRIANISM

## IN THE LIGHT OF OCCULT PHILOSOPHY

### I

[This is the first part of an article by H. P. Blavatsky that appeared originally in *The Theosophist* for June 1883. The concluding portion will appear in our next issue.—EDS.]

THE FOLLOWING LETTER having been sent to us from a Parsi gentleman, we publish the paragraphs containing his queries *seriatim* as in the original, but separating them with a view of making our answers more comprehensible. This arrangement, we hope, will always simplify the work, and help the reader to a far clearer understanding of both the questions asked and the answers given, than it would, had we published the letter without any break whatever, or answered the queries as usually done, by referring the readers to foot-notes.

Will you or any of your contributors tell me whether Zoroastrianism, regarded from the standpoint of Occult philosophy, is in itself monotheism, pantheism, polytheism or atheism? I have not been able to ascertain it from the learned lecture of Col. Olcott on the "Spirit of Zoroastrianism."

The answer depends upon how the question is put. If we are asked what is Zoroastrianism, loosely and indifferently referred to as Magianism, Mazdaism, Fire-worship and Parseeism, then we answer — "it is all that which you say." It is "monotheism, pantheism, polytheism," and even "atheism," when placed in contradistinction to modern theism — its respective qualifications depending upon the epoch named. Thus, if we had to describe broadly the origin of this religion from the standpoint, and upon the authority of the Occult teachings, we would call it by its original, primitive name, that of Magianism. Locating its first development in those vast regions which would have to be described as the whole area between the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Okhotsk in its length, and that which stretches through the unexplored deserts between the Altai and the Himalayan mountains in its breadth, we would place it back at an epoch undreamt of by modern science and, therefore, rejected by all but the most speculative and daring anthropologists.

We have no right to give out in this journal the correct number of years, or rather of ages upon ages, since — according to the doctrines

of the Secret Science — the first seeds of Magianism were sown by the hand of the BEING to whose duty it falls to rear, nurse and guide the tottering steps of the re nascent human races that awake anew to life on every planet in its turn, after its periodical “obscuration.” It goes as far back as the days of our local *Manvantara*, so that the seeds sown among the first “root-race” began sprouting in its infant brain, grew up, and commencing to bear fruit toward the latter part of the second race, developed fully during the third<sup>1</sup> into what is known among Occultists as the “Tree of Knowledge” and the “Tree of Life” — the real meaning of both having been, later on, so sadly disfigured and misinterpreted by both Zoroastrians and Christians. But we can inform our correspondent of the following: Magianism, in the days of its full maturity and practice,<sup>2</sup> and long ages before the first of the 12 great religions, its direct offshoots — mentioned and feebly described by Mohsan Fani in the *Dabistan* — ever saw light, and even much anterior to the appearance of the first devotees of the religion of Hush-ang, which, according to Sir W. Jones, “was long anterior to that of Zeratusht (See *Asiat. Res.*, Vol. II, pp. 48-49), the prophet of the modern Parsis — that religion, as we can undeniably prove, was, “ATHEISM.” At any rate, it would be so regarded now, by those who call Kapila and Spinoza, BUDDHA and our MAHATMAS, Brihaspati (of the Charvack) and the modern Adwaites, all alike, *nastikas* or atheists. Assuredly no doctrine about a *personal* God, a gigantic man and no more (though a number of so-called *divine beings* were and are still recognized) was ever taught by the true Magi.” Hence Zoroaster — the *seventh* prophet (according

---

<sup>1</sup> One who has studied the “Fragments of Occult Truth” knows that our present race is the *fifth*, and that we have two more to pass through before we reach our end — on this planet.

<sup>2</sup> “Throughout the Middle Ages nothing was known of Mazdianism but the name of its founder, who from a Magus was converted into a Magician, a master of the hidden sciences,” says James Darmesteter, who knows as much as his exoteric science will permit him of the former; but being wholly ignorant of *esoteric* sciences, knows nothing of the latter at all and therefore blunders greatly. One could not be a *Magha*, a Magus-priest, without being, at the same time, what is now known under the vulgar term of “Magician.” But of this later on.

<sup>3</sup> Let it not be understood that we here speak of the “Magi” in general, whether we view them as one of the Medean tribes (?) as some Orientalists (Darmesteter for one), relying upon a vague statement of Herodotus, believe, or a sacerdotal caste like the Brahmans — as we maintain. We refer but to their initiates. The origin of the Brahmans and the Magi in the night of time is one, the secret doctrine teaches us. First, they were a hierarchy of adepts, of men profoundly versed in physical and spiritual sciences and occult knowledge, of various nationalities, all celibates, and enlarging their numbers by the transmission of their knowledge to voluntary neophytes. Then when their numbers became too large to be contained in the “Airyanam Vaego,” the adepts

to the *Desatir*, whose compilers mixed up and confused the 14 Zoroastars,<sup>4</sup> the high priests and initiates of the Chaldean worship or Magian Hierophants — the 13th) — would be regarded as an *atheist* in the modern sense of the word. All the Orientalists with Haug at their head, agree to say that in the oldest, or the second part of the *Yasna*, nothing is said or fixed of the doctrine regarding God, nor of any theology.

The lecture has elucidated many obscurities and absurdities in the Avesta, from the standpoint of Occult philosophy. But they are so few that the youths whom the Colonel took to task have, I am convinced, become no wiser. Can any one tell me whether the Colonel meant that in order to understand their religion, the Parsee youths should study Yogism and Occultism?

Our President never meant that they should *practise* "Yogism." All that he urged upon them was that before they scoffed at their own religion, of which they knew so little, and became either modern agnostics or out-and-out corporealists, they should study Zoroastrianism as a philosophy, and in the light of esoteric sciences, which alone could teach them the truth by giving the correct version of the meaning of the various emblems and symbolisms.

The learned Colonel said the Parsees are the heirs of the Chaldean lore, and that the Chaldean and the Hebrew Kabala would throw considerable light on the meaning of the Avesta. Can anyone tell me where and in what language these books are to be

---

scattered far and wide, and we can trace them establishing other hierarchies on the model of the first in every part of the globe, each hierarchy increasing, and finally becoming so large, as to have to restrict admission; the "half-adepts" going back to the world, marrying and laying the first foundation of the "left-hand" science or sorcery, the misuse of the Holy Knowledge. In the third stage the members of the *True ones* become with every age more limited and secret, the admissions being beset now with new difficulties. We begin to see the origin of the Temple Mysteries. The hierarchy divides into two parts. The chosen few, the hierophants—the *imperium in imperio*—remaining celibates, the *exoteric* priests make of marriage a law, an attempt to perpetuate adepts by hereditary descent, and fail sadly in it. Thus we find Brahmans and Magi, Egyptian priests and Roman hierarchs and augurs enjoining married life and inventing religious clauses to prove its necessity. No need repeating and reminding the reader of that which is left to his own knowledge of history, and his intuitions. In our day we find the descendants, the heirs to the old wisdom scattered all over the globe in small isolated and unknown communities, whose objects are misunderstood, and whose origin has been forgotten; and only two religions, the result of the teaching of those priests and hierophants of old. The latter are found in the sorry remains called, respectively, Brahmans and Dasturs or Mobeds. But there is still the nucleus left, albeit it be so strenuously denied, of the heirs of the primitive Magi, of the Vedic *Magha* and the Greek *Magos*—the priests and gods of old, the last of whom manifested openly and defiantly during the Christian era in the person of Apollonius of Tyana.

<sup>4</sup> See *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, pp. 128-9.

found, and whether these works are not also so much allegorical as to require the aid of Occult philosophy to understand their true meaning?

The lecturer stated a fact. More even than the Brahmans are the Parsees heirs to Chaldean wisdom, since they are the direct, though the latest, offshoots of Aryan Magianism. The Occultists are very little concerned with that apparent difficulty that the Magian "Chaldees" with all their priests and initiates, whether of the Medes, the Scythians, or the Babylonians are regarded by the Orientalists as of Semitic origin, while the ancient Iranians are Aryans. The classification of those nations into Turanians, Akkadians, Semites and what not, is at best arbitrary. The word "Chaldean" does not refer merely to a native or an inhabitant of Chaldea, but to "Chaldeism," the oldest science of astrology and occultism. And in that sense the Zoroastrians are the true heirs to Chaldean wisdom, "the light which shineth in darkness," though (modern) "darkness comprehended it not," and the Parsees themselves know nothing of it now. The Hebrew Kabala is but the loud echo of the Chaldean; an echo which passing through the corridors of time picked up in its transit all kinds of alien sounds that got mixed up with the original keynotes struck beyond the epochs known to the present profane generations; and thus it reached the later student of Hebrew lore as a confused and somewhat distorted voice. Yet, there is much to learn in it, for him who has the patience and the perseverance required, since first of all he would have to learn the *Gemantria*, *Notaricon* and *Themura*.<sup>5</sup> When speaking of the Kabala, the Lecturer meant by it the *universal*, not any special, esoteric system, already adapted to a later exoteric creed as is at present the Jewish secret science. The word "Kabala" is derived from a Hebrew root meaning reception of knowledge; and practically speaking it refers to all the old systems handed down by oral transmission, and is very nearly allied to the Sanscrit *Smriti* and *Shruti*, and the Chaldaic *Zend*.<sup>6</sup> There would be

<sup>5</sup> The Jewish methods of examining the Scriptures for their hidden meaning.

<sup>6</sup> Of course, as found out by the Orientalists, the word "Zend" does not apply to any language, whether dead or living, and never belonged to any of the languages or dialects of ancient Persia. (See *Farhang-i-Jehangiri*, the Persian dictionary.) It means, as in one sense correctly stated, "a commentary or explanation," but it also means that which the Orientalists do not seem to have any idea about, *viz.*, the "rendering of the esoteric into exoteric sentences," the veil used to conceal the correct meaning of the *Zen-(d)-zar* texts, the sacerdotal language in use among the initiates of archaic India. Found now in several undecipherable inscriptions, it is still used and studied unto this day in the secret communities of the Eastern adepts, and called by them—according to the locality—*Zend-zar* and *Brahma* or *Deva-Bhashya*.

little use for the Parsee or Hindu beginner to study only the Hebrew or even the Chaldean Kabala, since those works upon them which are now extant are written either in Hebrew or Latin. But there would be a great deal of truth unearthed were both to apply themselves to the study of the identical knowledge veiled under the exoteric symbolisms of both the Zend-Avesta and the Brahmanical books. And this they can do by forming themselves into a small society of intelligent earnest students of symbolism, especially the Zend and Sanscrit scholars. They could get the esoteric meanings and the names of the works needed from some advanced chelas of our Society.

The Colonel recommends the translating of prayers. Does he mean that the translation of prayers in their present state will better enlighten the youths? If not, then does he imply that the meaning of the whole Zend-Avesta can be made intelligible and philosophical by the aid of a thorough Occultist?

It is precisely what he meant. By a correct translation or rather a correct explanation of their liturgical prayers, and a preliminary knowledge of the *true* meaning of even a few of the most important symbolisms—generally those that appear the most meaningless and absurd in the sight of the modern Zend scholars, as the dog, *e.g.*, which plays such an important part in Parsee ceremonies<sup>7</sup>—the “Parsee youths”

---

<sup>7</sup> Compare the so-called “*Akkadian* formulae of exorcism” of the earliest periods known to the Orientalists to which the collection of charms and amulets belong (in truth very *late* periods) with most of the injunctions found in *Vendidad* (*Fargard* XIII) concerning the dog. It seems almost incredible that even the dullest among the Zend scholars should not perceive that verse 163, for instance (same *Fargard*), which says, “For no house could subsist on the earth *made by Ahura* (in this case the “house”—not the earth—made by Ahura) but for those two dogs of mine, the shepherd’s dog and the house dog”—cannot refer really to these animals. The commentary made in it (*Saddar* 31, *Hyde* 35) is absurd and ridiculous. It is not, as it says, that “not a single head of cattle would remain in existence but for the dogs,” but that all humanity, endowed as it is with the highest intellect among the intelligences of the animal kingdom, would, under the leadership of Angramainyu, mutually destroy themselves physically and spiritually, but for the presence of the “dogs”—the two highest spiritual principles. The dog Vanghapara (the hedgehog, says the commentator!), “the good creature that from midnight (our time of ignorance) till the sun is up (spiritual enlightenment) goes and kills thousands of the creatures of the evil spirit” (*Farg.* XIII, 1), is our spiritual conscience. He who “kills it” (stifles its voice within himself) shall not find his way over the Chinvat bridge (leading to paradise). Then compare these symbolisms with those of the Akkadian talismans. Even as translated by G. Smith, distorted as they are, still the *seven* dogs described as the “blue,” the “yellow,” the “spotted,” etc., can be shown to have all of them reference to the same seven human principles as classified by Occultism. The whole collection of the “formulae of exorcism,” so called, of the Akkadians is full of references to the seven evil and the seven good spirits which are our principles in their dual aspect.

would acquire thereby the key to the true philosophy that underlies their "wretched superstitions and myths," as they are called by the missionaries who would fain force upon the world their own instead.

Prayer is repugnant to the principles of atheists. How then does the learned Colonel reconcile his advice to the Parsees to throw better heart into their prayers? Does he also mean that Occult philosophy will justify the prayers in Zend Avesta, offered to the sun, the moon and almost all the supposed pure things of the creation? If he thinks that the fixing of attention upon such objects is conducive to being freed from worldly desires and thoughts, does he think also that these views or prayers will be believed in, or acted upon, by the present generation?

Colonel Olcott was never an atheist "to our knowledge," but an esoteric Buddhist, rejecting a *personal* God. Nor was *genuine* prayer — *i.e.*, the exercise of one's intense will over events (commonly brought about by blind chance) to determine their direction — ever repugnant to him. Even prayers as commonly understood are not "repugnant" in his sight, but simply useless, when not absurd and ridiculous as in the case of prayers to either stop or bring about rain, etc. By "prayer" he means WILL, the desire or command *magnetically* expressed that such-and-such a thing beneficent to ourselves or others should come to pass. The sun, the moon and the stars in the *Avesta* are all emblematical representations — the sun, especially — the latter being the concrete and most appropriate emblem of the one universal life-giving principle, while the stars are part and parcel of the Occult sciences. Yima never "prayed" but went to "meet the sun" in the vast space of heavens, and bringing down with him "the science of the stars, pressed the earth with his golden ring and forced (thereby) the 'Spenta Armaiti' (the genius of the earth) to stretch asunder and to bear flocks and herds and men." (*Farg.* II. 10)

But, since not everyone knows in our day "the science of the stars," nor are there many Zend scholars, the best course to be pursued is to make at least a beginning by having the "prayers" translated. The Lecturer, as far as we are aware, did not mean to advise anyone to believe in, or "act upon," the *modern* prayers in their present liturgic, exoteric form. But it is just because they are now muttered parrotlike, remaining incomprehensible to the great majority, that they have to be either correctly rendered, or, bringing on finally indifference and disgust, abandoned very soon to utter oblivion. The word "prayer" received its modern significance of a supplication to a Supreme or some

inferior divine being only when its once widely known and real esoteric meaning had already become clouded with an exoteric veil; after which it soon disappeared, enshrouded beneath the impenetrable shell of a badly digested anthropomorphism. The Magian knew not of any *Supreme* "personal" individuality. He recognized but Ahura, the "Lord" — the seventh Principle in man — and "prayed," *i.e.*, made efforts during the hours of meditation, to assimilate with, and merge his other principles, that are dependent on the physical body and ever under the sway of Angra Mainyu (or matter), into the only pure, holy and *eternal* principle in him, his divine monad. To whom else could he pray? Who was "Ormuzd" if not the chief *Spenta Mainyu*, the monad, the god-principle in us? How can Parsees consider him now in the light of the "one Supreme God" independent of man, since even in the sorry remnants of the sacred books of Mazdianism there is enough to show that he was never so considered? They are full of his shortcomings, lack of power (during his dependent individuality in connection with man), and his frequent failings. He is addressed as the "maker of the *material* world" in every question put to him by Zarathushtra. He invokes Vayu (the Holy ghost of the Mazdeans), "the god-conqueror of light (or true knowledge and spiritual enlightenment), the smiter of the fiends (passions) all made of light,"<sup>8</sup> for help against Angra Mainyu; and, at the birth of Zarathushtra, he entreats Ardvi-Sura Anahita<sup>9</sup> that the newly born should not abandon but stand by him in his eternal struggles with Ahriman.

(*To be concluded*)

---

O THOU sweet nature of the unborn light, purify my mind and enlighten my understanding so that I may be conscious of thee!

—MEISTER ECKHART

<sup>8</sup> *Yast.* xv, 3.

<sup>9</sup> Begging the pardon of our European Sanscritists and Zend scholars, we would ask them to tell, if they know, who was the Mazdean goddess Ardvi-Sura Anahita. We maintain and can prove what we say, that the said personage implored by Ahura, and Saraswati (the Brahmanical goddess of Secret or Occult wisdom) are identical. Where is the philosophy of the Supreme God, "the omnipotent and omniscient—ALL" seeking for the help of his own creature?

## IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

In an article in *Culture and Life* for January 1971, Soviet Academician A. Mikhailov writes of the "Meanderings of the North Pole":

Over 70 years ago, it was noticed that the Earth's geographical North Pole is not fixed, but is subject to very slight, though complex, oscillations. It transpired that the full period of oscillation about a certain mean point is 14 months. During this time, the pole changes its position by 0.2 seconds of an arc, which is about 6 metres on the surface. This period of free oscillation, as it is called, is a consequence of our planet's mass distribution.

It then transpired that the pole is subject to yet another kind of movement, this time a forced one, lasting up to one year. It is caused by seasonal meteorological disturbances — principally by the ariable load of large masses of air on the continents, and by deposits of snow and ice. Thus, the total displacement of the pole has been as much as 10 metres a year from the mean position. It takes the form of an alternately expanding and contracting spiral. . . .

Several dozen observatories in both hemispheres were set up to carry out observations on the "wanderings" of the pole. This global observation network was responsible for the discovery of yet another subtle phenomenon. It was found that the mean position of the geographical North Pole itself is also moving in a definite direction over the Earth's surface. Special research was devoted to this phenomenon by Soviet astronomer Alexander Orlov. Results established that the North Pole is moving towards North America — Labrador, to be precise — at a rate of 11–13 centimetres a year. . . .

. . . additional analyses had to be made of data from observatories at other latitudes, including those in the southern hemisphere. It was ascertained that other points on the Earth's surface are also taking part in the general movement. In other words, there can be no doubt that the whole of the Earth's crust is shifting. . . .

It is reasonable to ask, what is the cause of this extraordinary drift of the poles? It is hardly likely that anyone would care to attempt a precise answer, but these "meanderings" seem principally to be due to the fact that the Earth's crust is no more than a thin envelope covering our planet and is sliding over the elastic substance underneath known as the mantle.

*The Secret Doctrine* teaches that the polar lands were tropical about the middle of the Miocene period:

Suffice, then, to us the strong probability that a people, now unknown to history, lived during the Miocene period of modern science, at a time when Greenland was an almost tropical land.

(II. 12)

Thus, as the disturbance is attributed by geologists and astronomers to "an extreme eccentricity of the Earth's orbit," and as the Secret Doctrine attributes it to the same source, but with the addition of another factor, the shifting of the Earth's axis — a proof of which may be found in the *Book of Enoch*, if the veiled language of the Puranas is not understood — all this should tend to show that the ancients knew something of the "modern discoveries" of Science. Enoch, when speaking of "the great inclination of the Earth," which "is in travail," is quite significant and clear. (II. 144-45)

---

The following is from the "Current Topics" column in *The Times of India* of April 3:

Conflict and its resolution constitute an endlessly fascinating subject, of interest not only to social anthropologists and psychologists but to laymen who take a world view and of course to all wielders of power. In the United States where there is possibly more need to understand the subject than elsewhere because of the widespread war psychosis, an undergraduate course has just been set up to study the anatomy of peace, the first such institution in that country to do so. Many disciplines are involved and the core curriculum covers seven courses including peace and revolution, human behaviour and world economic geography.

While analytical studies of this kind are useful, nobody will be fooled into thinking that a climate of peace can be brought about by finding out the reasons for war-mindedness, any more than affluence can be ushered in by a discourse on the meaning of poverty. Man's innate aggressiveness has first to be recognized as a fact of life and the history of his evolution from the cave and tribal days to the complexities of today's corporate society has to be studied in depth. The basic question will still remain: will it ever be possible, even in the remote future, to eliminate greed and competitiveness from the face of the earth? Only an incurable optimist will believe that it can be done.

Is aggressiveness really innate in man? Have greed and competitiveness always prevailed, and can they never be eliminated? Is man but a glorified animal, ever obeying the law of the jungle and sharpening his teeth and claws for continual combat? Experts who met last year under Unesco auspices to study human aggressiveness found that it is not innate at all and declared it to be obsolete as a way to solve human problems. (See "In the Light of Theosophy," July 1970). We have H.P.B.'s statement that

for the first three and a half Root-Races, up to the middle or turning point, it is the astral shadows of the "progenitors," the lunar Pitris, which are the formative powers in the Races, and which build and gradually force the evolution of the physical form towards perfection — this, at the cost of a proportionate loss of spirituality. Then, from the turning point, it is the Higher Ego, or incarnating principle, the *nous* or *Mind*, which reigns over the animal Ego, and rules it whenever it is not carried down by the latter. In short, Spirituality is on its ascending arc, and the animal or physical impedes it from steadily progressing on the path of its evolution only when the selfishness of the *personality* has so strongly infected the real *inner* man with its lethal *virus*, that the upward attraction has lost all its power on the thinking reasonable man. In sober truth, vice and wickedness are an *abnormal, unnatural* manifestation, at this period of our human evolution — at least they ought to be so. The fact that mankind was never more selfish and vicious than it is now, civilized nations having succeeded in making of the first an ethical characteristic, of the second an art, is an additional proof of the exceptional nature of the phenomenon. (*The Secret Doctrine*, II. 110)

---

An article by T. M. P. Mahadevan in *The Illustrated Weekly of India* for March 21 poses the question: "What Is New in Hinduism?" "The question under discussion," the article states,

does not admit of any simple or easy answer. What is called Hinduism is a complex phenomenon, and very old too. It has succeeded in surviving to this day in spite of heavy odds in its long stretch of history, because of its power of resilience. A class of the sacred texts of the Hindus goes by the name *Purana*, wherein the doctrines of philosophy and religion are unfolded in myths and legends. The term "Purana" has been interpreted to

mean "what is old, and yet new" (*pura api nava*). In this sense, Hinduism may be regarded as *purana*, as what is ancient and yet modern.

Readjustment and renewal in response to challenges which it has had to face, from time to time, have been characteristic of Hinduism. While the supreme truth is unchangeable because it is supra-temporal, what falls within time has to change, as otherwise there will be stagnation. And so, the Hindu *sastras* have recognized the need for changing what fall within the temporal process, and have even laid down the *modus operandi* of change. Those who are competent by virtue of their wisdom and experience — the sages — are the leaders in matters religious. It is they who can make changes which will be conducive to the gaining of the supreme good. There is no place for obstinate dogmas or obsolete conventions, even in religion. A religion that does not permit questioning and enquiry will perish. The Hindu leaders have never intended that beliefs should be blind or practices unthinking. There is a verse in the *Yoga-vasishta* which says: "What is reasonable should be accepted, even if it comes from a child; all else must be rejected as useless even if it came from the first-born Brahma." . . .

The article refers to passages in the Upanishads and the *Bhagavad-Gita* as examples of the critical spirit in the early phase of Hinduism, and to great teachers like the Buddha, who came not to found a new religion, but to reform Hinduism. Shankara and Ramanuja reformed the religious cults by removing excrescences and by casting out the non-essentials, and similar cleansings have been going on in subsequent centuries also. Saints such as Basava, Ramananda, Kabir, Nanak, Mirabai, Chaitanya, Tulsi Das and Tukaram, all laid stress on true devotion and on the need for freedom from bigotry and narrowness.

Referring to the present renaissance of Hinduism, the article states that it may be said to have started in the last century, by which time the West had come to the East. Leaders and reformers like Rammohun Roy, who founded the Brahma Samaj in 1828, and Swami Dayananda Saraswati who started the Arya Samaj movement in 1875 gave the lead that the people needed. Reference is made to Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, who came to India in 1875, as also to Mrs. Annie Besant, as among those who accelerated the pace of the Hindu renaissance. From men like Sri Ramakrishna, Swami Vivekananda and Gandhiji, too, Hinduism received a great awakening. There are functioning today Hindu organizations and movements which owe their origin

to leaders who are acclaimed as saints by their followers, and among the latter are not only Hindus but also others.

“What is new in all this?” the article asks, and answers:

Obviously, nothing could be altogether and absolutely new. Even the so-called total revolutions do not start with a clean slate. The search for “The Year One” of any revolutionary era is a futile task. The old cannot be obliterated, or completely excluded. And yet, the ageless spirit can and does find new modes of expression. This is what has happened, and is happening, in the case of Hinduism. While, on the one hand, there are attacks on Hinduism, even from within, on the other, we have visible signs everywhere of the spirit of Hinduism being regenerated by authentic leaders who are alive to the needs of our times.

While the achievements of H. P. Blavatsky to revive the ancient heritage of India have been recognized, though not fully, even outside of Theosophical circles, the labours of her colleague, W. Q. Judge, in the cause of Hinduism have received scant recognition. There is today an awakening of interest in Hinduism in the West, notably in America, and this is due, in no small measure, to his efforts. Calling the Lodge he founded in New York the “Aryan Lodge,” he used the pages of his *Path* magazine, and later established the Oriental Department, to bring to the notice of the United States public the great worth of Oriental religions, especially Hinduism. His English renditions of Patanjali's *Yoga Sutras* (1889) and of the *Bhagavad-Gita* are still in great demand. India, too, benefited by his work. Following the example of H.P.B., he advocated that special effort should be made to effect a spiritual renaissance in India, not along sectarian lines, but by bringing to light the soul-satisfying philosophy of her ancient sages. This noble and uplifting philosophy alone can drive out degrading superstition and still more degrading brutal materialism from the country and elevate and save it.

---