

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

1976

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

OL. XXXVII. No. 5

17th March 1967

WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE

Strive to get a clear, comprehensive and common-sense view of Theosophy, and to the world give only that view, and the world will appreciate. Never consider yourself as the actor, and think of the real Self.

—W. Q. JUDGE

March 21 always brings to the minds of all sincere students of Theosophy the remarkable life and work of William Quan Judge, for that day, in the year 1896, he closed his life record. Whether we try to understand him as a man or as a worker in the Theosophical field, we find in him one predominant quality—his loyalty and devotion to Theosophy, to Masters, and to H.P.B.; to the teachings, the Custodians of the teachings and their transmitter for our generation. It is this loyalty, this devotion, which stood him in good stead where others failed, and here is something we all can learn from, remembering that not only are the Custodians, the Masters, alive and in physical bodies today, but also that H.P.B. is not dead and gone; she still remains alive, for her heart and vitality pulsate throughout the Theosophical Movement and in every word she wrote.

To know Mr. Judge, the man, we have to take note of the inner and outer environment of the Ego in the Irish borrowed body, and the “NIRMANAKAYA...that blended with him,” as H.P.B. wrote. Everyone has two environments in which he lives: one that is composed of his family, friends, nation, race, etc., and the other his inner environment of secret endeavours, thoughts, feelings and desires. This latter is the more important, for it is the battleground on which takes place the struggle between the spiritual, or egoic, and the personal, the results of which make themselves known later on, perhaps not until

coming lives. They show themselves in the expressions of our feeling-thoughts, namely, our actions, for the latter are the embodiments of the former.

As far as the outer personality of Mr. Judge is concerned, we have been given the picture of a lovable man, kind, sympathetic, "never narrow, never selfish, never conceited." The Irish poet AE wrote that he considered Judge "the wisest and sweetest of any I have ever met. . . . I have more reverence for him than for any other human being I know of." His friends described him as completely trustworthy. "I trust Judge more than anyone in the world," wrote H.P.B. He made many friends, and it is owing to the foresight and endeavours of some of these friends that pure Theosophy is alive today and the original writings of the teachers are still in print.

With regard to his inner environment, we can learn much from a study of his letters and of his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*. There is a statement in the latter book (pp. 4-5) which gives an insight into his character:

What I propose here to myself and to all who may read these papers is to study the *Bhagavad-Gita* by the light of that spiritual lamp — be it small or great — which the Supreme Soul will feed and increase within us if we attend to its behests and diligently inquire after it. *Such at least is the promise by Krishna in the Bhagavad-Gita — the song Celestial.* (Italics ours)

It was just that attitude of trust and loyalty which was fundamental to his life, keeping him always at the heart of the Movement. Through struggles and dark periods of despondency, such as come to every *earnest* student when he begins to feel his unworthiness, he kept on, writing after one such period:

These last days have been a trial to me. Quite vividly the question of sticking fast or letting go has come up. I believe that I have been left alone to try me. But I have conquered. I will not give up; and no matter what the annoyance or bitterness, I will stand.

His trust in H.P.B. was equal to her trust in him. "I will never forget Judge's loyalty and devotion, his unswerving friendship," she declared. And she wrote to him: "Take my place in America now and, after I am gone, at Adyar." She defended him all she could, and about none did she write as she did about him, as in the last of her Five Messages to the American Theosophists.

As for Mr. Judge as a worker for Theosophy and the Theosophical Movement, we find that, though living a troubled life, feeling an exile and alone, he remained steadfast and devoted to the last, filling any place that was vacant in the Work, without looking for results. His chance came when he returned to the U.S.A. from India, at a time when the Theosophical Society was passing through a crisis, and resuscitated the work there from coast to coast. Under his leadership, a spectacular revival of Theosophy took place in America. He founded the magazine *The Path*, which H.P.B. described as "most excellent." "His *Path* begins to beat *The Theosophist* out of sight," she wrote. "*The Path* alone is his certificate for him in Theosophy."

Often ill, always kind, always working, never pushing himself forward, he embodied the spirit of the Movement. When he died his spirit lived on in Robert Crosbie, and lives today in the resuscitated Movement.

Judge's personal attitude towards himself and his sense of responsibility towards the Movement were revealed strongly in the tribulations that came after the death of H.P.B., culminating in the "case" against him. Though he suffered greatly in his person, he refused to harbour hatred towards anyone and did all he could to help his friends also to free themselves from ill feeling. "Forgive, forgive and largely forget," and "Cast no one out of your heart" were his mottoes. He could forgive and forget the personal hurt to himself and act only for the good of the Movement.

It is when he saw that the wrongs being committed were harming Theosophy and the Theosophical Movement that his strength was revealed. He fought hard to prevent the Theosophical Society from straying away from the lines laid down; also to check the development of psychism within the Society, but, unfortunately, psychic traits and tendencies have, since his day, led students into the most dangerous delusions. The evil directed against him finally ruined his health and brought about his death, but not before he had made the administration of Theosophical work in America completely free and independent of the Parent Society, though in friendly relationship with it. This change in the outward form, *not* in Theosophical ideals, aspirations, aims and objects, was an inevitable one, and in making it he but followed H.P.B.'s example, for she, too, had left the Headquarters of the Society at Adyar and begun a new movement in the West on the original lines, with the founding of *Lucifer* and of the Lodge which bore her name.

Mr. Judge's knowledge was stupendous. He had thoroughly imbibed the teachings of H.P.B. and of the Masters, and was able to expound them in his own writings in a simpler, more understandable form. His work along these lines has kept alive the philosophy for us, in its main fundamentals, and our gratitude to him for so doing is great.

One other point which emerges when we try to understand this great man is that he never thought that the Work was *his*. The Work was Masters', and he but tried to help Them with that Work. This was the *real* reason for the opposition he had to face from those who did not have the same loyalty and devotion to the Masters and to H.P.B. that he had, the "charges" against him being only the *apparent* reasons. He had the task of keeping the memory of H.P.B. clean and pure, and of preserving the Teachings as she gave them. The proof remains; during his lifetime he was the life-force which kept the Path straight, and after his death this task fell upon Robert Crosbie, his pupil. It now falls upon all true students of Theosophy who are aware of their responsibility and are awake to the reality that we cannot serve two masters. We cannot serve H.P.B. and Those behind her if we collaborate with those who deny her and Them, by altering Their Teachings and casting aspersions against Them.

Along the path of the true student is sadness, but also there is great joy and hope. Sadness comes from a more just appreciation of the difficulties in one's way, and of the great wickedness of the individual and collective heart of man. But look at the great fountain of hope and of joy in the consideration that the Brothers exist, that They were men too; They had to fight the fight; They triumphed, and They work for those left after Them. Then beyond Them are "the Fathers," that is, the spirits of "just men made perfect," those Who lived and worked for humanity ages ago and Who are now out of our sphere, but Who nevertheless still influence us in that Their spiritual forces flow down upon this earth for all pure souls. Their immediate influence is felt by Masters, and by us through the latter.

—W. Q. JUDGE

RESURRECTION

Resurrection, which is today a festival in memory of the so-called rising of Christ from the dead, is also the Festival of Spring which has been celebrated for untold ages. It symbolizes immortality and shows the operation of the law of cycles and the necessity for the death of the outer form if the inner vitality or life is to be freed.

In Christianity, through the story of the death of Jesus of Nazareth, his burial, the disappearance of his body, his subsequent appearance in his physical body to his followers, ending with his ascension in body to Heaven, there has grown up the idea that at the Last Judgment the dead will be revitalized, and the good or the believers will be taken to Heaven, to remain there for ever, and the wicked or unbelievers will be condemned to eternal punishment in Hell. Thus, the whole idea of Resurrection has been degraded and misunderstood, as has been the conception of Reincarnation and Karma, and it is part of the mission of Theosophy to revive the real meaning of this festival.

The Secret Doctrine (I. 304) tells us, quoting Gerald Massey:

Mythology is the repository of man's most ancient science, and . . . when truly interpreted once more, it is destined to be the death of those false theologies to which it has unwittingly given birth.

If we look at the story of the resurrection of Jesus, we find that the Christian myth is a gross caricature of the old initiation ceremonies practised by the ancient Egyptians and other early civilizations. In these initiations which took place in crypts, caves, temples, the Pyramids and elsewhere, the neophyte underwent a series of physical or psychological trials through which he proved his strength and readiness for spiritual rebirth. It is only through trials that strength can be gauged and full control attained by the inner immortal entity over the personality and over Nature's forces. Says *The Secret Doctrine* (II. 558):

. . . in the Mysteries of Initiation . . . the initiated adept, who had successfully passed through all the trials, was *attached*, not *nailed*, but simply tied on a couch in the form of a *taû* (in Egypt), of a *Svastika* without the four additional prolongations . . . plunged in a deep sleep (the "Sleep of Siloam" it is called to this day among the Initiates in Asia Minor, in Syria, and even higher Egypt). He was allowed to remain in this state for three days and three nights, during which time his Spiritual Ego was said to confabulate with the "gods," descend into Hades, Amenti, or

Patala (according to the country), and do works of charity to the invisible beings, whether souls of men or Elemental Spirits; his body remaining all the time in a temple crypt or subterranean cave. In Egypt it was placed in the Sarcophagus in the King's chamber of the Pyramid of Cheops, and carried during the night of the approaching third day to the entrance of a gallery, where at a certain hour the beams of the rising Sun struck full on the face of the entranced candidate, who awoke to be initiated by Osiris, and Thoth, the God of Wisdom.

It is evident that the Gospel story of the crucifixion, the placing of the body in the sepulchre, the stone across the entrance, the three days between the crucifixion and the resurrection, and the final ascent to "Heaven," has its roots in ancient traditions.

The symbol of the Cross and of "Man Crucified" has a deep significance:

... one of the *seven esoteric meanings* implied in the mystery of Crucifixion... is discovered in the geometrical symbols containing the history of the evolution of man... the primordial system, the double glyph that underlies the idea of the Cross, is not "of human invention," for Cosmic ideation and the Spiritual representation of the divine Ego-man are at its basis. Later, it expanded in the beautiful idea adopted by and represented in the Mysteries, that of regenerated man, the mortal, who, by crucifying the man of flesh and his passions on the Procrustean bed of torture, became reborn as an Immortal. Leaving the body, the animal-man, behind him, tied on the Cross of Initiation like an empty chrysalis, the Ego-Soul became as free as a butterfly. Still later, owing to the gradual loss of spirituality, the cross became in Cosmogony and Anthropology no *higher than a phallic symbol*. (S.D., II. 560-62)

Apart from reminding us of the idea of resurrection or second birth, the Spring Festival shows how death is always succeeded by life, and how spring follows winter, in never-ending succession. The seed sacrifices itself in order that the plant may grow; the plant-life produces the flower which has to die if the fruit is to follow, and within the fruit is the seed for perpetual immortality. Slowly but surely the idea must take root in men's minds that death is an important stage which marks the destruction of form and the regeneration of spirit in a better form — Shiva in his dual aspect as destroyer and regenerator.

The practical value for us of this idea is that it shows that there

is in us an entity who can enter, leave and re-enter the body; that, in fact, we are twofold beings. The outer is the body of flesh, the inner is the Christ. All evolution is for the purpose of bringing to birth *in* matter-form the Christ within. As *Isis Unveiled* (II. 588) says, "... the omniscience and omnipotence of the spirit and its control over nature's forces may be acquired by the individual while still in the body." St. Paul, the most mystic of the Apostles, spoke of letting the Christ be born in us. To be born again does not mean simply a conscious effort on the part of the one being born, but a new relationship of the inner and the outer, though there is also a kind of conscious effort on the part of the inner. With the help of H.P.B. we can perhaps understand this better.

It will be necessary first to make ourselves realize, as a fact, that there *is* a spiritual Entity standing at the threshold of our personal consciousness. This Entity is the Christ in us.

The next requisite is to have an unshakable belief in our own powers and in the Deity within. Correlated with this is the conception that the God of each one exists within and not outside. This God, Christ, the spiritual Entity, is immortal, and in that immortality lies its strength.

The whole problem, therefore, of life and resurrection is this division of ourselves into two parts—the one we know and the inner immortal Entity whom we do not as yet know. A clearer conception must be obtained of both these aspects, and also of the connection between the two, the voice of conscience.

Everyone knows that in times of stress there seems to be within us a source of strength which enables us to go on, to be courageous, to do the right at all costs. This unknown source has to become for us a place of retreat from where we can begin to look at life without being embroiled in it. This enables us to gain a different attitude towards all things—an attitude which sees the permanent and everlasting behind the impermanent and fleeting. The finding and building of this retreat has to become a prime necessity for us; we must reach a condition where *we know* that this is our real centre. Without this, we can never attain the condition of equipoise which is so necessary for us, nor a condition of self-collectedness.

That which separates us from this retreat is our personal consciousness which consists of petty ideas, passions and the tenacious wish for existence. Therefore H.P.B. tells us:

He who strives to resurrect the Spirit *crucified in him by his*

own terrestrial passions, and buried deep in the "sepulchre" of his sinful flesh; he who has the strength to roll back the stone of matter from the door of his inner sanctuary, he has the risen Christ in him. (The Esoteric Character of the Gospels, p. 2)

If we are to "kill" out the personality and its passions and get rid of the idea of separateness from the Divine Spirit, great personal effort has to be employed all day and every day. This is the process which culminates in regeneration or resurrection. The Christ is buried in the dust and dirt of personal ambition and personal lethargy, of separateness and pride. All these lower traits and tendencies have to be cleared away if the Light within is to shine forth through our personal matter-form.

Spiritual regeneration is "the spiritual birthright of every human being endowed with soul and spirit," wrote H.P.B. (*The Esoteric Character of the Gospels*, p. 14). Therefore it is possible for each one of us to be "resurrected." This body-personality we prize and nurture is but the sepulchre which hides the glory of Christ. The door is closed by the stone of matter which prevents the Christ-spirit from manifesting itself, and the passions crucify the Christ. The idea of crucifixion is not to be limited to a single event, the death of Jesus of Nazareth upon the cross. Every time "we remain deaf to the Voice of our Conscience," says H.P.B. (*Transactions*, p. 69), "we crucify the Christos within us." Passions have to be killed, but that is only half the process; we have also to cultivate the habit of listening to the conscience. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," says the Scripture, referring to Christ locked out of the heart. Evolution implies the shifting of the centre of consciousness from the outer personality to the inner Christ. First believe that the Christ is within; then work to cleanse the temple of the personality, while remaining conscious all the time of this duality which is "us."

The seeds of Godlike power are in us still:
 Gods are we, bards, saints, heroes, if we will.

—MATTHEW ARNOLD

REPLIES TO AN ENGLISH F.T.S.

[This further instalment of "Replies to an English F.T.S." is reprinted from *The Theosophist* for October 1883. The "historical difficulty" raised in Question VI was:

Is there not some confusion in the letter quoted on p. 62 of *Esoteric Buddhism*, where "the old Greeks and Romans" are said to have been Atlanteans? The Greeks and Romans were surely Aryans, like the Adepts and ourselves, their language being, as one may say, intermediate between Sanskrit and modern European dialects.

The reply will be continued in our next issue.—EDS.]

QUESTION VI

"HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY" — WHY?

It is asked whether there may not be "some confusion" in the letter quoted on p. 62 of *Esoteric Buddhism* regarding "old Greeks and Romans said to have been Atlanteans." The answer is—none whatsoever. The word "Atlantean" was a generic name. The objection to have it applied to the old Greeks and Romans on the ground that they were Aryans, "their language being intermediate between Sanskrit and modern European dialects," is worthless. With equal reason might a future sixth-Race scholar, who had never heard of the (possible) submergence of a portion of European Turkey, object to Turks from the Bosphorus being referred to as a remnant of the Europeans. "The Turks are surely Semites," he might say 12,000 years hence, and—"their language is intermediate between Arabic and our modern sixth-Race dialects."¹

The "historical difficulty" arises from a certain authoritative statement made by Orientalists on philological grounds. Professor Max Müller has brilliantly demonstrated that Sanskrit was the "elder sister"—by no means the mother—of all the modern languages. As to that "mother," it is *conjectured* by himself and colleagues to be a "*now extinct tongue, spoken probably by the nascent Aryan race.*" When asked what was this language, the Western voice answers, "Who can tell?" When, "during what geological periods did this nascent race flourish?" the same impressive voice replies: "In prehistoric ages, the

¹ This is not to be construed to mean that 12,000 years hence there will be yet any man of the sixth Race, or that the fifth will be submerged. The figures are given simply for the sake of a better comparison with the present objection in the case of the Greeks and Atlantis.

duration of which no one can now determine." Yet it must have been Sanskrit, however barbarous and unpolished, since "the ancestors of the Greeks, the Italians, Slavonians, Germans and Kelts," were living within "the same precincts" with that nascent race, and the testimony borne by language has enabled the philologist to trace the "language of the gods" in the speech of every Aryan nation. Meanwhile it is affirmed by these same Orientalists that classical Sanskrit has its origin at the very threshold of the Christian era; while Vedic Sanskrit is allowed an antiquity of hardly 3,000 years (if so much) before that time.

Now, Atlantis, on the statement of the "Adepts," sank over 9,000 years before the Christian era.² How, then, can one maintain that the "old Greeks and Romans" were Atlanteans? How can that be, since both nations are Aryans, and the genesis of their languages is Sanskrit? Moreover, the Western scholars *know* that the Greek and Latin languages were formed within historical periods, the Greeks and Latins themselves having no existence as nations 11,000 B.C. Surely they who advance such a proposition do not realize how very *unscientific* is their statement!

Such are the criticisms passed, such the "historical difficulty." The culprits arraigned are fully alive to their perilous situation; neverthe-

² The position recently taken up by Mr. Gerald Massey in *Light* that the story of Atlantis is not a geological event but an ancient astronomical myth, is rather imprudent. Mr. Massey, notwithstanding his rare intuitional faculties and great learning, is one of those writers in whom the intensity of research bent into one direction has biased his otherwise clear understanding. Because Hercules is now a constellation it does not follow that there never was a hero of this name. Because the Noachian *Universal Deluge* is now proved a fiction based upon geological and geographical ignorance, it does not, therefore, appear that there were not many local deluges in prehistoric ages. The ancients connected every terrestrial event with the celestial bodies. They traced the history of their great deified heroes and memorialized it in stellar configurations as often as they personified pure myths, anthropomorphizing objects in Nature. One has to learn the difference between the two modes before attempting to classify them under one nomenclature. An earthquake has just engulfed over 80,000 people (87,903) in Sunda Straits. These were mostly Malays, savages with whom but few had relations, and the dire event will be soon forgotten. Had a portion of Great Britain been thus swept away instead, the whole world would have been in commotion, and yet, a few thousand years hence, even such an event would have passed out of man's memory; and a future Gerald Massey might be found speculating upon the astronomical character and signification of the Isles of Wight, Jersey, or Man, arguing, perhaps, that this latter island had not contained a real living race of *men* but "belonged to astronomical mythology," was a "Man submerged in celestial waters." If the legend of the lost Atlantis is only "like those of Airyana-Vaejo and Jambu-dvipa," it is terrestrial enough, and therefore "the mythological origin of the Deluge legend" is so far an open question. We claim that it is *not* "indubitably demonstrated," however clever the theoretical demonstration.

less, they maintain the statement. The only thing which may perhaps here be objected to is that the names of the two nations are incorrectly used. It may be argued that to refer to the remote ancestors and their descendants equally as "Greeks and Romans," is an anachronism as marked as would be the calling of the ancient Keltic Gauls, or the Insubres, Frenchmen. As a matter of fact this is true. But, besides the very plausible excuse that the names used were embodied in a private letter, written as usual in great haste, and which was hardly worthy of the honour of being quoted *verbatim* with all its imperfections, there may perhaps exist still weightier objections to calling the said people by any other name. One misnomer is as good as another; and, to refer to old Greeks and Romans in a private letter as the old Hellenes from Hellas or *Magna Græcia*, and the Latins as from *Latium*, would have been, besides looking pedantic, just as incorrect as the use of the appellation noted, though it may have *sounded*, perchance, more "historical."

The truth is that, like the ancestors of nearly all the *Indo-Europeans* (or shall we say *Indo-Germanic Japhetidæ?*), the Greek and Roman sub-races mentioned have to be traced much farther back. Their origin must be carried far into the mists of that "pre-historic" period, that *mythical* age which inspires the modern historian with such a feeling of squeamishness that anything creeping out of its abysmal depths is sure to be instantly dismissed as a deceptive phantom, the *mythos* of an idle tale, or a *later fable unworthy of serious notice*. The Atlantean "old Greeks" could not be designated even as the *Autochthones* — a convenient term used to dispose of the origin of any people whose ancestry cannot be traced, and which, at any rate with the Hellenes, meant certainly more than simply "soil-born," or primitive aborigines; and yet the so-called *fable* of Deukalion and Pyrrha is surely no more incredible or marvellous than that of Adam and Eve — a fable that hardly a hundred years ago no one would have dared or even thought to question. And in its esoteric significance the Greek tradition is possibly more truly historical than many a so-called *historical* event during the period of the Olympiades, though both Hesiod and Homer may have failed to record the former in their epics. Nor could the Romans be referred to as the Umbro-Sabbellians, nor even as the *Itali*. Peradventure, had the historians learnt something more than they have of the Italian "Autochthones" — the Iapygians, one might have given the "old Romans" the latter name. But then there would be again that other difficulty: history *knows* that the

Latin invaders drove before them, and finally cooped up, this mysterious and miserable race among the clefts of the Calabrian rocks, thus showing the absence of any race affinity between the two. Moreover, Western archæologists keep to their own counsel, and will accept of no other but their own conjectures. And since they have failed to make anything out of the undecipherable inscriptions in an unknown tongue and mysterious characters on the Iapygian monuments, and so for years have pronounced them unguessable, he who would presume to meddle where the doctors muddle would be likely to be reminded of the Arab proverb about proffered advice. Thus, it seems hardly possible to designate "the old Greeks and Romans" by their legitimate, true name, so as to at once satisfy the "historians" and keep on the fair side of truth and fact. However, since in the *Replies* that precede science had to be repeatedly shocked by most unscientific propositions, and that before this series is closed many a difficulty, philological and archæological as well as historical, will have to be unavoidably created — it may be just as wise to uncover the occult batteries at once and have it over with.

Well, then, the "Adepts" deny most emphatically to Western science any knowledge whatever of the growth and development of the Indo-Aryan race which, "at the very dawn of history," they have espied in its "patriarchal simplicity" on the banks of the Oxus. Before our proposition concerning "the old Greeks and Romans" can be repudiated or even controverted, Western Orientalists will have to know more than they do about the antiquity of that race and the Aryan language; and they will have to account for those numberless gaps in history which no hypotheses of theirs seem able to fill up. Notwithstanding their present profound ignorance with regard to the early ancestry of the Indo-European nations, and though no historian has yet ventured to assign even a remotely approximate date to the separation of the Aryan nations and the origins of the Sanskrit language — they hardly show the modesty that might, under these circumstances, be expected from them. Placing as they do that great separation of the races at the first "dawn of traditional history," with the Vedic age as "the background of the whole Indian world" [of which confessedly they know nothing], they will, nevertheless, calmly assign a modern date to any of the Rig-vedic oldest songs, on its "internal evidence"; and in doing this, they show as little hesitation as Mr. Fergusson when ascribing a post-Christian age to the most ancient rock-cut temple in India, merely on its "external form." As for their unseemly quarrels.

mutual recriminations and personalities over questions of scholarship, the less said the better.

“The evidence of language is irrefragable,” as the great Oxford Sanskritist says. To which he is answered—“provided it does not clash with historical facts and ethnology.” It may be—no doubt it is, as far as *his* knowledge goes—“the only evidence worth listening to with regard to ante-historical periods,” but when something of these alleged “pre-historical periods” comes to be known, and when what we think *we* know of certain supposed pre-historic nations is found diametrically opposed to *his* “evidence of language,” the “Adepts” may be, perhaps, permitted to keep to their own views and opinions, even though they differ with those of the greatest living philologist. The study of language is but a part—though, we admit, a fundamental part—of true philology. To be complete, the latter has, as correctly argued by Böckh, to be almost synonymous with history. We gladly concede the right to the Western philologist who has to work in the total absence of any historical data, to rely upon comparative grammar, and take the identification of roots lying at the foundation of words of those languages he is familiar with, or may know of, and put it forward as the result of his study, and the only available evidence. But we would like to see the same right conceded by him to the student of other races; even though these be *inferior* to the Indo-European races—in the opinion of the paramount West: for it is barely possible that, proceeding on other lines, and having reduced his knowledge to a system which precludes hypothesis and simple affirmation, the Eastern student has preserved a perfectly authentic record (for him) of those periods which his opponent regards as *ante*-historical. The bare fact that, while Western men of science are referred to as “scholars” and scholiasts, *native* Sanskritists and archæologists are often spoken of as “Calcutta” and “Indian *sciolists*,” affords no proof of their real inferiority, but rather of the wisdom of the Chinese proverb that “self-conceit is rarely companion to politeness.”

The “Adept,” therefore, has little, *if anything*, to do with difficulties presented by Western history. To his knowledge—based on documentary records from which, as said, hypothesis is excluded, and as regards which even psychology is called to play a very secondary part—the history of his and other nations extends immeasurably beyond that hardly discernible point that stands on the far-away horizon of the Western world as a landmark of the commencement of *its* history. Records made throughout a series of ages, based on astronomical chro-

nology and zodiacal calculations, cannot err. [This new "difficulty" — palæographical, this time — that may be possibly suggested by the mention of the Zodiac in India and Central Asia before the Christian era, is disposed of in a subsequent article.]

Hence, the main question at issue is to decide which — the Orientalist or the "Oriental" — is most likely to err. The "English F.T.S." has choice of two sources of information, two groups of teachers. One group is composed of Western historians with their suite of learned Ethnologists, Philologists, Anthropologists, Archæologists and Orientalists in general. The other consists of unknown Asiatics belonging to a race which, notwithstanding Mr. Max Müller's assertion that the same "blood is running in his veins [the English soldier's] and in the veins of the dark Bengalese," is generally regarded by many a cultured Western as "inferior." A handful of men can hardly hope to be listened to, especially when their history, religion, language, origin and sciences, having been seized upon by the conqueror, are now disfigured and mutilated beyond recognition, and who have lived to see the Western scholar claim a monopoly beyond appeal or protest of deciding the correct meaning, chronological date and historical value of the monumental and palæographic relics of his motherland.

It has little, if ever, entered the mind of the Western public that their scholars have, until very lately, worked in a narrow pathway obstructed with the ruins of an ecclesiastical, dogmatic Past; that they have been cramped on all sides by limitations of "revealed" events coming from God, "with whom a thousand years are but as one day," and who have thus felt bound to cram millenniums into centuries and hundreds into units, giving at the utmost an age of 1,000 to what is 10,000 years old. All this to save the threatened authority of their religion and their own respectability and good name in cultured society. And even that, when free themselves from preconceptions, they have had to protect the honour of the Jewish divine chronology assailed by stubborn facts; and thus have become (often unconsciously) the slaves of an artificial history made to fit into the narrow frame of a dogmatic religion. No proper thought has been given to this purely psychological but very significant trifle. Yet we all know how, rather than admit any relation between Sanskrit and the Gothic, Keltic, Greek, Latin and Old Persian, facts have been tampered with, old texts purloined from libraries, and philological discoveries vehemently denied. And we have also heard from our retreats, how Dugald Stewart and his colleagues, upon seeing that the discovery would also involve ethno-

logical affinities, and damage the prestige of those sires of the world races — Shem, Ham and Japhet — denied in the face of fact that “Sanskrit had ever been a living, spoken language,” supporting the theory that “it was an invention of the Brahmins, who had constructed their Sanskrit on the model of the Greek and Latin.” And again we know, holding the proof of the same, how the majority of Orientalists are prone to go out of their way to prevent any Indian antiquity (whether MSS. or inscribed monument, whether art or science) from being declared *pre-Christian*. As the origin and history of the Gentile world is made to move in the narrow circuit of a few centuries “B.C.,” within that fecund epoch when mother earth, recuperated from her arduous labours of the Stone age, begat, it seems without transition, so many highly civilized nations and false pretences, so the enchanted circle of Indian archæology lies between the (to them unknown) year of the *Samvat* era, and the 10th century of the Western chronology.

Having to dispose of an “historical difficulty” of such a serious character, the defendants charged with it can but repeat what they have already stated: all depends upon the past history and antiquity allowed to the Indo-Aryan nation. The first step to take is to ascertain how much History herself knows of that almost prehistoric period when the soil of Europe had not been trodden yet by the primitive Aryan tribes. From the latest Encyclopædia, down to Prof. Max Müller and other Orientalists, we gather what follows: they acknowledge that at some immensely remote period, before the Aryan nations got divided from the parent stock (with the germs of Indo-Germanic languages in them); and before they rushed asunder to scatter over Europe and Asia in search of new homes, there stood a “single barbaric (?) people as physical and political representative of the nascent Aryan race.” This people spoke “a *now extinct* Aryan language,” from which, by a series of modifications (surely requiring more thousands of years than our difficulty-makers are willing to concede) there arose gradually all the subsequent languages now spoken by the Caucasian races.

That is about all Western history knows of *its* genesis. Like Ravan’s brother, Kumbhakarna — the Hindu Rip van Winkle — it slept for a long series of ages a dreamless, heavy sleep. And when at last it awoke to consciousness, it was but to find the “nascent Aryan race” grown into scores of nations, peoples and races, most of them effete and crippled with age, many irretrievably extinct, while the true origin of the younger ones it was utterly unable to account for. So much for the “youngest brother.” As for “the eldest brother, the Hindu,”

who, Professor Max Müller tells us, “was *the last* to leave the central home of the Aryan family,” and whose history this eminent philologist has now kindly undertaken to impart to him — he, the Hindu, claims that while his Indo-European relative was soundly sleeping under the protecting shadow of Noah’s ark, he kept watch and did not miss seeing one event from his high Himalayan fastnesses; and that he has recorded the history thereof in a language which, though as incomprehensible as the Iapygian inscriptions to the Indo-European immigrant, is quite clear to the writers. For this crime he now stands condemned as a falsifier of the records of his forefathers. A place has been hitherto purposely left open for India “to be filled up when the pure metal of history should have been extracted from the ore of Brahmanic exaggeration and superstition.” Unable, however, to meet this programme, the Orientalist has since persuaded himself that there was nothing in that “ore” but dross. He did more. He applied himself to contrast Brahmanic “superstition” and “exaggeration” with Mosaic revelation and its chronology. The Veda was confronted with *Genesis*. Its absurd claims to antiquity were forthwith dwarfed to their proper dimensions by the 4,004 years B.C. measure of the world’s age; and the Brahmanic “superstition and fables” about the longevity of the Aryan *Rishis* were belittled and exposed by the sober historical evidence furnished in “The genealogy and age of the Patriarchs from Adam to Noah,” whose respective days were 930 and 950 years; without mentioning Methuselah, who died at the premature age of nine-hundred and sixty-nine.

In view of such experience, the Hindu has a certain right to decline the offers made to correct his annals by Western history and chronology. On the contrary, he would respectfully advise the Western scholar, before he denies point-blank any statement made by the Asiatics with reference to what is *prehistoric* ages to Europeans, to show that the latter have themselves anything like trustworthy data as regards their own racial history. And that settled, he may have the leisure and capacity to help his ethnic neighbours to prune their genealogical trees. Our Rajputs, among others, have perfectly trustworthy family records of an unbroken lineal descent through 2,000 years “B.C.” and more, as proved by Colonel Tod; records which are accepted by the British Government in its official dealings with them. It is not enough to have studied stray fragments of Sanskrit literature — even though their number should amount to 10,000 texts, as boasted of — allowed to fall into foreign hands, to speak so confidently of the “Aryan first settlers

in India," and assert that, "left to themselves, in a world of their own, *without a past and without a future(!)* before them, they had nothing but themselves to ponder upon," and therefore could know *absolutely nothing* of other nations.

To comprehend correctly and make out the *inner* meaning of most of them, one has to read these texts with the help of the esoteric light, and after having mastered *the language of the Brahmanic Secret Code* — branded generally as "theological twaddle." Nor is it sufficient — if one would judge correctly of what the archaic Aryans did or did not know; whether or not they cultivated the social and political virtues; cared or not for history — to claim proficiency in both Vedic and classical Sanskrit, as well as in Prakrit and Arya Bhasha. To comprehend the esoteric meaning of ancient Brahmanical literature, one has, as just remarked, to be in possession of the key to the Brahmanical Code. To master the conventional terms used in the Puranas, the Aranyakas and Upanishads is a science in itself, and one far more difficult than even the study of the 3,996 aphoristical rules of Panini, or his algebraical symbols. Very true, most of the Brahmans themselves have now forgotten the correct interpretations of their sacred texts. Yet they know enough of the dual meaning in their scriptures to be justified in feeling amused at the strenuous efforts of the European Orientalist to protect the supremacy of his own national records and the dignity of his science by interpreting the Hindu hieratic text after a peremptory fashion quite unique. Disrespectful though it may seem, we call on the philologist to prove in some more convincing manner than usual that he is better qualified than even the average Hindu Sanskrit pundit to judge of the antiquity of the "language of the gods"; that he has been really in a position to trace unerringly along the lines of countless generations the course of the "now extinct Aryan tongue" in its many and various transformations in the West, and its primitive evolution into first the Vedic, and then the classical Sanskrit in the East, and that from the moment when the mother-stream began deviating into its new ethnographical beds, he has followed it up. Finally that, while he, the Orientalist, can, owing to speculative interpretations of what he thinks he has learnt from fragments of Sanskrit literature, judge of the nature of all that he knows nothing about — *i.e.*, to speculate upon the past history of a great nation he has lost sight of from its "*nascent state*," and caught up again but at the period of its last degeneration — the native student never knew, nor can ever know, anything of that history.

Until the Orientalist has proved all this, he can be accorded but small justification for assuming that air of authority and supreme contempt which is found in almost every work upon India and its Past. Having no knowledge himself whatever of those incalculable ages that lie between the Aryan Brahman in Central Asia, and the Brahman at the threshold of Buddhism, he has no right to maintain that the initiated Indo-Aryan can never know as much of them as the foreigner. Those periods being an utter blank to him, he is little qualified to declare that the Aryan, having had no political history "of his own . . .," his only sphere was "religion and philosophy . . . in solitude and contemplation." A happy thought suggested, no doubt, by the active life, incessant wars, triumph, and defeats portrayed in the oldest songs of the *Rig-Veda*. Nor can he with the smallest show of logic affirm that "India had no place in the political history of the world," or that "there are no synchronisms between the history of the Brahmans and that of other nations before the date of the origin of Buddhism in India," for he knows no more of the prehistoric history of those "other nations" than of that of the Brahman. All his inferences, conjectures and systematic arrangements of hypothesis begin very little earlier than 200 "B.C.," if even so much, on anything like really historical grounds. He has to prove all this before he can command our attention. Otherwise, however "irrefragable the evidence of language," the presence of Sanskrit roots in all the European languages will be insufficient to prove, either that (a) before the Aryan invaders descended toward the *seven rivers* they had *never left their northern regions*; or (b) why the "eldest brother, the Hindu," should have been "the last to leave the central home of the Aryan family." To the philologist such a supposition may seem "quite natural." Yet the Brahman is no less justified in his ever-growing suspicion that there may be at the bottom some occult reason for such a programme. That in the interest of his theory the Orientalist was forced to make "the eldest brother" tarry so suspiciously long on the Oxus, or wherever "the youngest" may have placed him in his "nascent state" after the latter "saw his brothers all depart towards the setting sun."

We find reasons to believe that the chief motive for alleging such a procrastination is the necessity to bring the race closer to the Christian era. To show the "Brother" inactive and unconcerned, "with nothing but himself to ponder on," lest his antiquity and "fables of empty idolatry," and perhaps his traditions of other people's doings, should interfere with the chronology by which it is determined to

try him. The suspicion is strengthened when one finds in the book from which we have been so largely quoting—a work of a purely scientific and philological character—such frequent remarks and even prophecies as: “History seems to teach that the whole human race required a gradual education before, in the fullness of time, it could be admitted to the truths of Christianity.” Or, again: “The ancient religions of the world were but the milk of Nature, which was in due time to be succeeded by the bread of life”; and such broad sentiments expressed as that “there is *some truth* in Buddhism, as there is in every one of the false religions of the world, but...”³

The atmosphere of Cambridge and Oxford seems decidedly unpropitious to the recognition of their Indian antiquity, or the merit of the philosophies sprung from its soil!⁴

³ Max Müller's *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*.

⁴ And how one-sided and biased most of the Western Orientalists are may be seen by reading carefully *The History of Indian Literature*, by Albrecht Weber—a Sanskrit scholiast classed with the highest authorities. The incessant harping upon the one special string of Christianity, and the ill-concealed efforts to pass it off as the key-note of all other religions, is painfully pre-eminent in his work. Christian influences are shown to have affected not only the growth of Buddhism and Krishna-worship, but even that of the Siva-cult and its legends; it is openly stated that “it is not at all a far-fetched hypothesis that they have reference to scattered Christian missionaries!” The eminent Orientalist evidently forgets that, notwithstanding his efforts, none of the Vedic, Sutra or Buddhist periods can be possibly crammed into this Christian period—their universal tank of all ancient creeds, and of which some Orientalists would fain make a poor-house for all decayed archaic religions and philosophy. Even Tibet, in his opinion, has not escaped “Western influence.” Let us hope to the contrary. It can be proved that Buddhist missionaries were as numerous in Palestine, Alexandria, Persia, and even Greece, two centuries before the Christian era, as the *Padris* are now in Asia. That the Gnostic doctrines (as he is obliged to confess) are permeated with Buddhism. Basilides, Valentinian, Bardesanes, and especially Manes were simply *heretical* Buddhists, “the formula of abjuration of these doctrines in the case of the latter, specifying expressly *Buddha (Bodda)* by name.”

THE FOUR PILLARS

Everyone is aware of the importance of the support of a pillar in any construction, whether of an arcade or a balcony, a bridge or a building. Such support is needed at every stage of the work, until the very end. If this is true of any construction on the objective plane, how much more true should it be on the inner planes of being, when making resolves to reach the desired spiritual goal, to steer the barge of life successfully through the ocean of *samsara* to the other shore.

The great Masters of Wisdom and Compassion are known as the Pillars of Peace because they have become embodiments of peace to such an extent that even by reading and reflecting upon their teachings one gets real peace and solace and inner strength. Many a candidate yearns to tread the path indicated by them, but it is necessary to make prior preparations, just as a mountaineer does before determining to scale the heights, with full awareness of his own strength and stamina. To live the spiritual life is an uphill task; it is a difficult climb all the way, from the dark valley of mire to the summit of the glorious light Nirvanic. Hence the need to gauge one's spiritual strength and moral stamina. Madame Blavatsky has given us sound advice worth pondering over before taking the first step:

Every pledge or promise unless built upon four pillars — absolute sincerity, unflinching determination, unselfishness of purpose, and *moral power*, which makes the fourth support and equipoises the three other pillars — is an insecure building. The pledges of those who are sure of the strength of the fourth alone are recorded. (*She Being Dead Yet Speaketh*, p. 11)

Though these four requisites are interdependent and interrelated, it is necessary to recognize the importance of moral power, which supports and equipoises the three other pillars. The moral nature being the most important aspect of man's constitution, without its support one is not able to achieve anything from the spiritual point of view. Just as physical stamina is necessary on the physical plane — otherwise one would collapse at a critical period — so also on the spiritual plane. To face every crisis, to overcome every difficulty, to go through the ups and downs of life, to meet every situation skilfully, to gain wisdom and unfold compassion, in short, to live to benefit mankind and practise the six glorious virtues, one needs moral stamina.

One of the great Masters of Wisdom has said: "You should learn

that you may teach, acquire spiritual knowledge and strength that the weak may lean on you, and the sorrowing victims of ignorance learn from you the cause and remedy of their pain." This shows the great necessity of moral power, of steadfastness and willingness to learn because men need knowledge to remove their ignorance. They are not aware of their own real nature and its source; they are bound down by customs and conventions; they do not understand the cause of their own sorrow and suffering; they have not the right precepts to follow; they do not know the twin doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation, the doctrines of responsibility and hope: and so they naturally need solace and comfort which can only be given by those possessing moral power, those who can take the responsibility of supporting the weak and the downcast. Lord Buddha has made an emphatic statement that *sorrow is*; the cause of all sorrow lies in our passions and desires; therefore the remedy lies in the control of the lower self by the higher Self, for which moral power, with its accompanying three pillars of absolute sincerity, unflinching determination and unselfishness of purpose, has to be acquired.

ABSOLUTE SINCERITY

From the very beginning of the journey one must develop this quality and this virtue. An insincere man deceives himself and others, therefore insincerity would be fatal on the path of truth and wisdom. To be sincere one must practise the second Paramita of *Shila*, "the key of Harmony in word and act, the key that counterbalances the cause and the effect, and leaves no further room for Karmic action." This means obedience and submission to the great Law. Thoughts, words and deeds are in perfect harmony, and therefore there is no conflict. One has to be honest with oneself and with others in order to be sincere. When man is in search of truth, he has to be true to his higher Self, the God within, the divine parent. Absolute sincerity is the way to self-reliance. When an individual has learnt to rely upon himself, others also will rely upon him. Man has to free himself from the bondage of personal Karma, and therefore *absolute sincerity* is essential. One needs to be true to the teachings and loyal to the teachers, adhering to one's conviction to continue with the self-chosen task.

UNFLINCHING DETERMINATION

Unflinching determination is the second pillar of support and strength in spiritual life. One must determine first what one wishes

to do and why, and make due preparations for the great journey, just as it is necessary to prepare for any journey on the physical plane. One must be firm-footed and must have the courage to sustain one's determination. There will be pitfalls on the way, threatening clouds that frighten, dark shadows that oppose; so naturally one will be tempted by Mara to waver and doubt and hesitate. On the spiritual path there is no standstill; one goes forward or backward; therefore, in order to continue on the journey one must have unflinching determination. The practice of the fifth key of *Virya*, "the dauntless energy that fights its way to the supernal TRUTH, out of the mire of lies terrestrial," would be most helpful. To be Theosophists and to work for Theosophy it is necessary to have unflinching determination. To assume a firm position as self-conscious thinkers, immortal Egos, and to work deliberately, making of the personality a refined instrument and a devoted friend, is our task.

UNSELFISHNESS OF PURPOSE

The third pillar is unselfishness of purpose. Purity of motive, not thinking of one's own gain or glory, is an absolutely necessary requisite. One cannot serve humanity and look to one's own interests at the same time. A clear conscience and a firm desire to benefit humanity would bring an end to all conflicts. Throughout the eighteen discourses of the *Bhagavad-Gita* Krishna stresses the necessity of performing one's duty without any self-interest. It is necessary to examine the motive at the outset, because an impure motive would tarnish both mind and heart. Soul-wisdom cannot be bought or sold. Unselfishness of purpose means a consecrated and dedicated life, and here the first key of *Dana*, charity and immortal love, would be most valuable. The purpose is so high and pure that personal likes and dislikes would be obstacles on the way. Charity, not only almsgiving but also altruism of mind and heart, has to be practised daily, to fulfil the purpose and serve the great Cause. The slightest tinge of selfishness would be an obstacle, as it would disturb the harmony within and around, and go against the great Law.

In our dealings in life, we are expected to fulfil our promises and carry them out to the best of our ability. Does not spiritual life demand as much? When the human ego, the self-conscious thinker, through his own awakening and yearning makes a promise to his own divine parent, the higher Self, a sacred covenant is entered into. The very act brings precipitations from the storehouse of Karma in a greater

mass or with a stronger force; hence the need for the fourfold qualifications. It is necessary to cultivate them day after day, so as to be well-equipped with a moral power which can be used as it is required. If our ideal is to reach the goal of peace and bliss, let us carefully construct the four pillars on a firm foundation so that they may withstand a thousand storms and remain unshaken.

Lift up thy light, O man, arise and shine,
Steadfast while loud the storms of life assail;
Immortal ray of that great Light divine,
'Gainst whose all-power no tempest shall prevail.

Hold high thy lamp above earth's restless tides,
Beacon of hope to those who watch afar.
Falsehood and fear shall pass, but Truth abides;
Thine be the splendour of her deathless star.

Should the world's sin and sorrow round thee rave,
Pierce thou the dark with Truth's undaunted ray,
Send out its light of joy to help and save,
That more and more shine to the perfect day.

I honour him who knows precisely what he wants; who untiringly strides ahead, knowing well the means to his own ends, and how to take them in hand and use them. To what extent his goal may be great or small, might merit praise or blame, that for me is quite secondary. Believe me, the greatest part of all misfortunes, and of all that which may be called evil, has only come into being because men have been too negligent to become well acquainted with their own goals and purposes and, if they have recognized them, to work and strive for their realization. They appear to me much as people who have a notion that a great tower should and could be built, but who, however, are expending no more energy in bringing stones for the foundation than one might need for the simplest hut.

—GOETHE

THEOSOPHY AND THEOSOPHISTS

Are all those who are drawn to Theosophy *true* Theosophists? In the ultimate analysis, they are, but until that ultimate state is reached, they are not.

This is how Madame Blavatsky defines Theosophy in *The Key to Theosophy*:

Theosophy is Divine Knowledge or Science....The real meaning of the term [is] "Divine Wisdom," *Theosophia* or Wisdom of the gods, as *Theogonia*, genealogy of the gods....

Theosophy, in its abstract meaning, is Divine Wisdom, or the aggregate of the knowledge and wisdom that underlie the Universe — the homogeneity of eternal good; and in its concrete sense it is the sum total of the same as allotted to man by nature, on this earth, and no more.

Further to these two definitions we have the following definition of "Theosophia" in *The Theosophical Glossary*: "Wisdom-religion, or 'Divine Wisdom.'...In its practical bearing, Theosophy is purely *divine ethics*."

Is there a difference between "divine ethics" and the ethics taught and practised in the race or nation to which we belong? Divine ethics by its very nature is eternal, universal and impartial in its application. To the extent, therefore, that racial or national morality and conduct are based on universal principles, to that extent do they conform to and are a part of divine ethics. However, we find many "codes of ethics" peculiar to the races and nations that make up our present-day world, and the application of these codes tends more towards separation than towards unity. Here we see the evil of the "dire heresy" of separateness which divides individuals and groups of individuals, nations and races, from one another. This sense of separateness results in unrest and strife, and in a tendency towards war and destruction, instead of towards peace and construction.

Where, therefore, must we start in this search for divine ethics as a basis for morality and conduct? If, as Theosophy teaches, the individual is the "nucleus" for nation and race, then it naturally follows that the search must be an individual one, and must begin here and now, where we are presently situated. All that is good in our family, nation and race must be fostered and embodied within us — first, by desire for it; secondly, by discriminative choice between that which

is "good" and that which is "evil"; and, thirdly, by the study of such books as clearly set forth those ethical values that are universal in their scope and practice.

The basis for true ethics has been clearly enunciated in such books as *The Voice of the Silence*, the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the Sermon on the Mount. They can be traced and found in the ethical precepts expounded by Mohammedan mystics and Sufis; they may also be found in the Jewish and Christian scriptures and other sacred texts of the world. From this it will be seen that the avenues for research are many and varied, but an essential basis for such research, in order to avoid the pitfalls of non-essentials, is a comprehensive and complete study of the Three Fundamental Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine*. This trinity of propositions, once grasped and understood, gives method and direction to our research, and ensures that we follow in the footsteps of our "Predecessors," the Masters of Divine Wisdom and the Embodiments of Divine Ethics.

We have Madame Blavatsky's definition of who a Theosophist is: "Be what he may, once that a student abandons the old and trodden highway of routine, and enters upon the solitary path of independent thought — Godward — he is a Theosophist; an original thinker, a seeker after the eternal truth, with 'an inspiration of his own' to solve the universal problems." This gives the general principle for judging who a Theosophist is. Another statement of H.P.B.'s is more specific: "A Theosophist is who Theosophy does."

If Theosophy is Divine Wisdom or Divine Knowledge, and in its application is Divine Ethics or Divine Morality, then the steps from speaker to practitioner will indicate the many types of Theosophists that there are in the world. Many are Theosophists because they live according to the basic Teachings and Ethics we call Divine Wisdom and Divine Ethics, even though they may themselves be unaware of the fact. There are many others who have recognized the Teachings and the Teachers, and because of this, theirs is the duty of promulgation by word of mouth or pen, and more important still, by action in terms of the Teachings they study and promulgate.

Reverence and humility, contentment and gratitude, the hearing of the Dhamma at due seasons, this is the highest blessing.

—*Mahamangalasutta*

MIRACLES

The essence of H.P.B.'s first book, *Isis Unveiled*, published in 1877, and subtitled "A Master-Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology," is contained in the Ten Fundamental Propositions of Psychology. One of the central ideas of the book is that there is no such thing as a miracle. There must be some deep reasons why H.P.B. first struck this note. H.P.B. is our Guru for this cycle, and the function of the Guru, it is said, "is to readjust, and not to pour in vast masses of knowledge." Let us see what H.P.B. has said to readjust our minds on this subject of miracles.

In *The Key to Theosophy* she writes: "How can you ever expect good results, while you pervert the reasoning faculty of your children by bidding them believe in the miracles of the Bible on Sunday, while for the six other days of the week you teach them that such things are scientifically impossible?"

True to its discipline, science cannot accept something which cannot be scientifically accounted for. Christian theology posits, first, the idea of "divine revelation," and, secondly, the constant interference of "God" in human affairs.

The psychological implications of unquestioned acceptance of "miracles" are numerous and unsuspected. Though the student of Theosophy rejects the idea, he is not always fully aware of the subtle ways in which that old belief affects his thinking.

Curiously enough, the believer in miracles tacitly admits an orderly working of things; if not, how could he speak of miracles, which imply occurrences remote from the usual pattern of life? Another queer thing is that, if "God" is behind everything, then did he make some sort of mistake initially that needs subsequent correction? Or does he want to impress his "poor wretched creatures" with his might and power? A king or prince on earth would be despised if he tried to do that. By distorting the idea of God, by refusing to think and to use his natural gifts, man has generated the misery of his life. Far from being on the way to becoming divine, he is sometimes not even human, but descends to the level of the animal. But man is not the creature of a day. There is the age-old conflict between the inherent ideas burnt into the Soul of infant humanity and the false notions impressed upon man's mind by the various "leaders" of the day. He cannot be at peace with himself as long as he is torn between his innate sense of justice, of the divine fit-

ness of things, and the idea of being born with a sinful nature, an idea which spells injustice. As long as man believes himself to have been born in sin, he is unable to fight and conquer alone; hence he is asked to believe in the necessity of "divine intervention" to redeem him. That is thought to be the greatest of all "miracles." "God" is appealed to, to take off our shoulders our too heavy burdens, to alleviate our ills, to produce rain, to stop natural calamities, and to do this and that *ad infinitum*.

How much more soul-satisfying is Theosophy! H.P.B. spoke, wrote and lived as one who knew, as an Initiate. Her writings are clear, concise, unequivocal; they are the teachings of the Soul, the life-giving waters of the Ageless Wisdom.

H.P.B. agrees with modern science when she writes: "There is no miracle." But the limitation of science lies in this, that it "ignores the fact that there were laws once 'known,' now unknown" to it. We know that the knowledge of science is constantly changing. But H.P.B. went further and outlined the difference between modern and occult science. It is true that our forefathers, if they could see some of our modern gadgets and discoveries, might call them "miracles"; but, unless the invisible aspect of Nature is recognized, will the path followed by science today enable it to understand occult phenomena?

More than hints are given to us in the second and third of the Ten Items from *Isis Unveiled*. On page 635 of Vol. II of the same work we read: "*The trinity of nature is the lock of magic, the trinity of man the key that fits it.*" Magic is in no sense miraculous; it is spiritual Wisdom, and a magician in the true sense is a man made perfect. In the Fourth Item we read: "Magic, as a science, is the knowledge of these principles [of Nature and of Man] and of the way by which the omniscience and omnipotence of the spirit and its control over nature's forces may be acquired by the individual while still in the body." Man is a microcosm of the Macrocosm. There is a natural kinship between man and Nature. Man helps and is helped by Nature. It is said, "If the mineral kingdom did not have a psychic intelligence, men could never use it"; and also, "That which is but a spark in the lower kingdoms grows to be a flame in the higher beings." It is that inner side of Nature which remains to be understood by most scientific men, although today some of them suspect it.

Religion, on the other hand, though it calls "miracles" the work of God and of the host of saints, cannot ignore altogether certain psychic phenomena. These are ascribed to the devil or to those who minister to

him. Hence the burning of witches and other persecutions of the Roman Church.

Man has power; he has also free will. Having acquired mastery over Nature's forces, he can either work with Nature and become a beneficent influence in the world, or work for his own selfish ends and become a Black Magician. There are forces of good and of evil in the Universe. H.P.B.'s *Isis Unveiled* gives instances after instances of the exercise of the white and the black arts. We can think of duality either in terms of white and black or of positive and negative; these two forces pervade manifestation and this is acknowledged in some respect by science. As applied to ourselves, the negative or passive is the surrender of our right to act like gods on earth, while the positive is the constant assertion of this birthright.

H.P.B. writes: "The medium is the passive instrument of foreign influences; the adept actively controls himself and all inferior potencies." This is thought-provoking. As personalities, we have an imperative duty to our Ego and to all that lives. To gain knowledge, power and wisdom is our real job in life; that way alone can we fulfil our *dharma*. H.P.B., to whose life of love and self-sacrifice we can never be grateful enough, concludes her Ten Items by stating that "MAGIC is spiritual WISDOM; nature, the material ally, pupil and servant of the magician. One common vital principle pervades all things, and this is controllable by the perfected human will."

Theosophy is true Wisdom; it is the magical path leading to the sanctuary of Nature's secrets. But, says *The Voice of the Silence*, "Unsullied by the hand of matter, she shows her treasures only to the eye of Spirit—the eye which never closes, the eye for which there is no veil in all her kingdoms."

Miracles are the natural effects of the intervention of a cause superior to those which produce ordinary effects.

—*The Path*, April 1890 .

“LUCIFER” CORRESPONDENCE

WORLD-IMPROVEMENT OR WORLD-DELIVERANCE?

[In *Lucifer* for July 1889 H.P.B. published a long communication from Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden, a German scientist, attracted first to H.P.B. and her teachings, and later to Buddhism. His letter, headed with a quotation from the *Dhammapada* and *Sutta Nipata*, drew from H.P.B. some very important statements in the form of Notes. We have condensed Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden's letter to its essentials, but republish H.P.B.'s Notes in full, numbering them for convenience.—EDS.]

You yourself must make an effort. The Tathagatas are only preachers. If a man find no prudent companion, let him walk alone like a king who has left his conquered country behind. It is better to live alone; there is no companionship with the *fools*. Let a man walk alone; let him commit no sin, with few wishes — like an elephant in the forest.

Dhammapada: 61, 276, 329, 330

Sutta Nipata: I. 3. 12 and 13

To the Editor of Lucifer

A very important paragraph which you wrote in No. 3 of your *Revue Théosophique*, published in Paris, May 21st 1889 (pp. 6 and 7),* has caused very serious doubts in the minds of some of your readers in Germany. . . .

You were speaking of Indian “yogis” and European “saints” and said†:

Oriental wisdom (1) teaches us that the Hindu *Yogi* who isolates himself in an impenetrable forest, like the Christian hermit who, as was common in former times, retires to the desert, are both of them nothing but accomplished egoists. The one acts with the sole idea of finding a nirvanic refuge against reincarnation; the other acts with the unique idea of saving his soul — both of them think only of themselves. Their motive is altogether personal; for, even supposing they attain their end, are they not like cow-

* The paragraph referred to is from H.P.B.'s article “Le Phare de l'Inconnu,” a translation of which, from the original French, was published in *The Theosophist*, July, August, September and October 1889. It was reprinted in *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT*, May, June, August and September 1947, and in *She Being Dead Yet Speaketh*, a collection of H.P.B.'s articles.—EDS., *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT*.

† Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden had quoted from the original French. We print here the English translation from *The Theosophist* of July 1889.—EDS., *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT*.

ardly soldiers, who desert from their regiment when it is going into action, in order to keep out of the way of the bullets? In isolating themselves as they do, neither the Yogi nor the "Saint" helps anyone but himself; on the contrary both show themselves profoundly indifferent to the fate of mankind whom they fly from and desert.

You do not plainly say what you expect a true sage to do, but further on you refer to our Lord, the Buddha, and to what *He* did. We readily accept his example as well as his teachings for our ideal rule; but from those stanzas I have quoted above, it appears that what he expected his disciples to do does not quite agree with what you seem to expect from them. (2)

He taught that . . . only those who are striving to deliver (to save or redeem) themselves from all existence (from their thirst for existence), leading the "happy life" of a perfect bhikshu, only those are sages; only those attain nirvana and, when they die, paranirvana, which is absolute and changeless being. (3)

. . . The Buddha taught (like Krishna before him), that the world is "unreality, maya, avidya." . . . *Absolute being* without "form and "name," this alone is true reality, and is worth striving at for a real sage. (4)

Now what did our Lord, the Buddha, do and how did he live? He did not in any way try to *improve* the world. . . . Quite the contrary; he lived in the most *unworldly* manner, he begged for his food and taught his disciples to do the same; he taught his disciples to leave all worldly life and affairs, to give up their families and to remain homeless, like he did and like he lived himself. (5)

. . . None of *us* is a Buddha, and I do not know which of us might be a Bodhisattva; not everyone *can* be one, and not everyone was by the Buddha himself expected to *become* one, as is clearly and repeatedly expressed in the *Saddharma Pundarika*, the principal Mahayana work. Nevertheless, admitting for argument's sake that we were somehow fit to serve as specimen sages for "the world" and to improve "humanity" — now what *can* and what *ought* we to do then? (6)

We certainly can have nothing to do with humanity in the sense of the "world," nothing with *worldly affairs* and *their* improvement. What else should we do, than to be "*profondément indifférents*" [profoundly indifferent] to them, to "*fuir et désertier*" [fly from and desert] them? Is not this "army" which we are deserting just that "humanity" which

the *Dhammapada* rightly terms "the fools"; and is it not just that "worldly life" which our Lord taught us to quit? What else should we strive at then but to take "refuge against reincarnation," refuge with the Buddha, his dharma and his sangha? (7)

... The spiritually or rather mystically highest developed living human individual I know is a poor common weaver and moreover consumptive, who was until lately in such a position employed in a cotton mill that he was as much treated as a dog, like most labourers are, by their joint-stock employers. Still this man is in his inner life quite independent of his worldly misery; his heavenly or rather divine peace and satisfaction is at any time his refuge, and no one can rob him of that. He fears no death, no hunger, no pain, no want, no injustice, no cruelty! (8)

... Humanity, as a *whole*, will always remain comparatively the same "fools" which they have always been. Suppose we had succeeded in establishing an ideal organization of mankind, do you think these "fools" would be any the wiser by it, or any the more satisfied and happy? (9)

... A universe has a beginning and has an end, but others will begin and end after it, just like one day follows the other; and as there has been an endless series of worlds before, thus will there be an endless series afterwards. Causality can never have had a beginning nor can it have an end. And every "world" that will ever be, will always be "world," that is pain and "evil." (10)

Therefore, like Karma, also *deliverance*, redemption or salvation (from the world) can never be any otherwise than "*personal*," or let us rather say "individual." The world, of course, can never be delivered from itself, from the "world," from pain and evil. And *no one* can be delivered therefrom by anyone else. You certainly do not teach vicarious atonement! Or, *can* anyone save his neighbour? Can one apple make ripe another apple hanging next to it? (11)

Now what else can we do but live the "happy life" of bhikshus without wants, without pretensions, without desires? And if our good example calls or draws to us others who seek for the same happiness, then we try to teach them the best we can. But this is another rather doubtful question to us! Not only are we not properly fit to teach, but if we were, we require proper persons to be taught, persons who are not only willing, but who are also fit to listen to us. (12)

In spite of all these difficulties and quite conscious of our own incompetency, we nevertheless venture now to publish books and journals,

in which we try to explain Indian religio-philosophy to the best of our understanding. Thus everyone who has eyes may read it, and who has ears may hear it — if his good Karma is ripening! What else do you expect *us agnams* to do? (13)

... We are fully aware that a true Buddhist and a sage, or — if you like — theosophist, must always be every inch an *altruist*. And when we are acting altruistically, it is perhaps no bad sign in regard to what we some day might *become*; but everything at its proper time: where competency does not keep pace with altruism in development and in display, it might do more harm than good. Thus we feel even not quite sure whether our conscience ought not to blame us for our well-intended but pert work; and the only excuse we can find for our thus giving way to the promptings of our heart is, that those persons who really might be properly qualified, do *not* come forward, do *not* help us, do *not do* this evidently necessary work! (14)

Yours respectfully,

Neuhausen, Munich, June 1st 1889.

HUBBE-SCHLEIDEN

H.P.B.'s NOTES

(1) The editor of *Lucifer* and the *Revue Théosophique* pleads guilty to an omission. She ought to have qualified "*la sagesse Orientale*" ["Oriental wisdom"] by adding the adjective "*ésotérique*" ["esoteric"].

(2) The Western disciples and followers of the Lord Buddha's ethics lay very little stress on the dead-letter (and often fanciful) translations of Buddhist *Sutras* by European Orientalists. From such scholars as Messrs. Max Müller and Weber, down to the last amateur Orientalist who dabbles in Buddhism disfigured by translation and proudly boasts of his knowledge, no Sanskrit or Pali scholar has so far understood correctly that which is taught; witness Monier Williams' fallacious assumption that Buddha never taught anything *esoteric*! Therefore neither the *Dhammapada* nor the *Sutta Nipata* are an exception, nor a proof to us in their now mutilated and misunderstood text. Nagarjuna laid it down, as a rule, that "every Buddha has both a revealed and a mystic doctrine." The "exoteric is for the multitudes and new disciples," to whom our correspondent evidently belongs. This plain truth was understood even by such a prejudiced scholar as the Rev. J. Edkins, who passed almost all his life in China studying Buddhism, and who says in his *Chinese Buddhism*:

(Ch. iii.) The esoteric was for the Bodhisattvas and advanced pupils, such as Kashiapa. It is not communicated in the form of

definite language, and *could not*, therefore, *be transmitted by Ananda as definite doctrine among the Sutras*. Yet, *it is virtually contained in the Sutras*. For example, the "Sutra of the Lotus of the good Law," which is regarded as containing the cream of the revealed doctrine, is to be viewed as a sort of original document *of the esoteric teaching, while it is in form exoteric*. [Italics are ours.]

Moreover, we perceive that our learned correspondent has entirely misunderstood the fundamental idea in what we wrote in our May editorial, "*Le Phare de l'Inconnu*," in the *Revue Théosophique*. We protest against such an interpretation and will prove that it errs in the course of this article.

(3) An exoteric and frequent mistake. Nirvana may be reached during man's life, and after his death in the Manvantara or life-kalpa he belongs to. *Paranirvana* ("beyond" Nirvana) is reached only when the Manvantara has closed and during the "night" of the Universe or *Pralaya*. Such is the esoteric teaching.

(4) Just so; and this is the theosophical teaching.

(5) Quite right again. But to live "like he lived himself" one has to remain *as an ascetic* among the multitudes, or the *world*, for 45 years. This argument, therefore, goes directly against our correspondent's main idea. That against which we protested in the criticized article was not the *ascetic life, i.e.*, the life of one entirely divorced, morally and mentally, from the world, the ever-changing *maya*, with its false deceptive pleasures, but the life of a *hermit*, useless to all and as useless to himself, in the long run; at any rate *entirely selfish*. We believe we rightly understand our learned critic in saying that the point of his letter lies in the appeal to the teaching and practice of the Lord Gautama Buddha in support of withdrawal and isolation from the world, as contrasted with an opposite course of conduct. And here it is where his mistake lies and he opens himself to a severer and more just criticism than that he would inflict on us.

The Lord Gautama was never a *hermit*, save during the first six years of his ascetic life, the time it took him to enter fully "on the Path." In the "Supplementary account of the three religions" (*San-Kiea-yi-su*) it is stated that in the *seventh* year of his exercises of abstinence and solitary meditation, Buddha thought, "I had better eat, lest the heretics should say that Nirvana is attained in famishing the body." Then he ate, sat for his transformation for six more days, and on the

seventh day of the second month obtained his first *Samadhi*. Then, having "attained the perfect view of the highest truth," he arose and went to Benares where he delivered his first discourses. From that time forward for nearly half a century, he *remained in the world*, teaching the world salvation. His first disciples were nearly all Upasakas (lay brothers), the neophytes being permitted to continue in their positions in social life and not even required to join the monastic community. And those who did, were generally sent by the Master to travel and proselytize, instructing in the doctrine of the four miseries all those with whom they met.

(6) Our correspondent is too well read in Buddhist *Sutras* not to be aware of the existence of the esoteric system taught *precisely* in the *Yogacharya* or the contemplative Mahayana schools. And in that system the hermit or yogi life, except for a few years of preliminary teaching, *is strongly objected to* and called SELFISHNESS. Witness Buddha in those superb pages of *Light of Asia* (Book the Fifth) when arguing with and reprimanding the self-torturing Yogis, whom, "sadly eyeing," the Lord asks:

"... Wherefore add ye ills to life
Which is so evil?"

When told in answer that they stake brief agonies to gain the larger joys of Nirvana, what does he say? This:

"Yet if they last
A myriad years... they fade at length,
Those joys... Speak! Do your Gods endure
For ever, brothers?"

"Nay," the Yogis said,
"Only great Brahm endures: the Gods but live."

Now if our correspondent understood, as he should, these lines rendered in blank verse, yet word for word as in the *Sutras*, he would have a better idea of the esoteric teaching than he now has; and, having understood it, he would not oppose what we said; for not only was self-torture, selfish solicitude, and life in the jungle simply for one's own salvation condemned in the *Mahayana* (in the real esoteric system, not the mutilated translations he reads) but even *renunciation of Nirvana for the sake of mankind* is preached therein. One of its fundamental laws is, that ordinary morality is insufficient to deliver one from rebirth; one has to practise the six Paramitas or cardinal virtues for it: (1) Charity, (2) Chastity, (3) Patience, (4) Industry, (5) Meditation, (6) In-

genuousness (or openness of heart, sincerity). And how can a *hermit* practise charity or industry if he runs away from man? Bodhisattvas, who, having fulfilled all the conditions of Buddhahood, have the right to forthwith enter Nirvana, prefer instead, out of unlimited pity for the suffering ignorant world, to renounce this state of bliss and become *Nirmanakayas*. They don the *Sambhogakaya* (the invisible body) in order to serve mankind, *i.e.*, to *live a sentient life after death* and suffer immensely at the sight of human miseries (most of which, being Karmic, they are not at liberty to relieve) for the sake of having a chance of inspiring a few with the desire of learning the truth and thus saving themselves. (By the bye, all that Schlagintweitt and others have written about the Nirmanakaya body is erroneous.) Such is the true meaning of the Mahayana teaching. "I believe that not all the Buddhas enter Nirvana," says, among other things, the disciple of the Mahayana school in his address to "the Buddhas (or Bodhisattvas) of confession" — referring to this secret teaching.

(7) The quotation with which our correspondent heads his letter *does not* bear the interpretation he puts upon it. No one acquainted with the spirit of the metaphors used in Buddhist philosophy would read it as Mr. Hübbe-Schleiden does. The man advised to walk "like a king who has left his conquered country behind," implies that he who has conquered his passions and for whom worldly *maya* exists no longer, need not lose his time in trying to convert those who will not believe in him, but had better leave them alone to their Karma; but it certainly does not mean that they are fools intellectually. Nor does it imply that the disciples should leave the world; "Our Lord" taught us as much as "the Lord Jesus" did, the "Lord Krishna" and other "Lords," all "sons of God" — to quit the "worldly" life, not *men*, least of all suffering, ignorant Humanity. But surely neither, the Lord Gautama Buddha less than any one of the above enumerated, would have taught us the monstrous and selfish doctrine of remaining "*profondément indifférents*" to the woes and miseries of mankind, or to *desert* those who cry daily and hourly for help to us, more favoured than they. This is an outrageously selfish and cruel system of life, by whomsoever adopted! It is neither Buddhistic, nor Christian, nor theosophical, but the nightmare of a doctrine of the worst schools of Pessimism, such as would be probably discounted by Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann themselves!

Our critic sees in the "army" of Humanity — those "fools" that the *Dhammapada* alludes to. We are sorry to find him calling himself *names*, as we suppose he still belongs to Humanity, whether he likes it

or not. And if he tells us in the exuberance of his modesty that he is quite prepared to fall under the flattering category, then we answer that no true Buddhist ought, agreeably to the Dhammapadic injunctions, to accept "companionship" with him. This does not promise him a very brilliant future with "the Buddha, his dharma and his Sangha." To call the whole of Humanity "fools" is a risky thing, anyhow; to treat as such that portion of mankind which groans and suffers under the burden of its national and individual Karma, and refuse it, under this pretext, help and sympathy — is positively revolting. He who does not say with the Master, "Mercy alone opens the gate to save the whole race of mankind," is unworthy of that Master.

(8) And yet this man lives *in*, and with the world, which fact does not prevent his *inner* "Buddhaship"; *nor* shall he ever be called a "deserter" and a coward, epithets which he would richly deserve had he abandoned his wife and family, instead of working *for them*, not for his own "dear" self.

(9) This is no business of ours, but that of their respective Karma. On this principle we should have to deny to every starving wretch a piece of bread, because, forsooth, he will be just as hungry tomorrow!

(10) And therefore, *Sauve qui peut*, is our correspondent's motto? Had the

"All Honoured, Wisest, Best, most Pitiful,
The Teacher of Nirvana, and the Law,"

taught the heartless principle *Après moi le déluge*, I do not think that the learned editor of the *Sphinx* [Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden] would have had much of a chance of being converted to Buddhism as he is now. Very true that his Buddhism seems to be no better than the exoteric dry and half-broken rind, of European fabrication, of that grand fruit of altruistic mercy, and pity for all that lives — real Eastern Buddhism and especially its esoteric doctrines.

(11) No; but the apple can either screen its neighbour from the sun, and, depriving it of its share of light and heat, prevent its ripening, or sharing with it the dangers from worms and the urchin's hand, thus diminish that danger by one-half. As to Karma, this is again a misconception. There is such a thing as a *national*, besides a personal or *individual*, Karma in this world. But our correspondent seems to have either never heard of it, or misunderstood once more, in his own way.

(12) *Fais que dois, advienne que pourra*. [I do what I have to do,

come what will.] When did the Lord Buddha make a preliminary selection in his audiences? Did he not, agreeably to allegory and history, preach and convert demons and gods, bad and good men? Dr. Hübbschleiden seems more Catholic than the Pope, more prim than an old-fashioned English housewife, and certainly more squeamish than Lord Buddha ever was. "Teach vicarious atonement?" certainly we do not. But it is safer (and more modest at any rate) to make too much of one's neighbours and fellow-men than to look at everyone as on so much dirt under one's feet. If I am a fool, it is no reason why I should see a fool in everyone else. We leave to our critic the difficult task of discerning who is, and who *is not* fit to listen to us, and, in the absence of positive proof, prefer postulating that every man has a responsive chord in his nature that will vibrate and respond to words of kindness and of truth.

(13) We expect you not to regard everyone else as an "*agnam*" — *if* by this word an *ignoramus* is meant. To help to deliver the world from the curse of *Avidya* (ignorance) we have only to learn from those who know more than we do, and teach those who know less. This is just the object we have in view in spreading theosophical literature and trying to explain "Indian *religio*-philosophy."

(14) An apocalyptic utterance this. I think, however, that I dimly understand. Those who are "properly qualified, do *not* come forward, do *not* help us, do *not do* this evidently necessary work." Don't THEY? How *does* our pessimistic correspondent *know*? I "guess" and "surmise" that they do, and very much so. For had the T.S. and its members been left to their own fate and Karma, there would not be much of it left today, under the relentless persecutions, slander, scandals, purposely set on foot, and the malicious hatred of our enemies — *open* and *secret*.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

All creatures, being essentially Spirit, strive (consciously or unconsciously) to realize their spiritual being through contact psychical and physical with all manifested nature; some by meditation; some by service; some — mistakenly — by selfishness through separateness. While all paths lead to the Supreme, it is only when the Permanent as distinguished from the Perishable is realized, that erroneous paths are forsaken and the true Path followed.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

An all-India colloquium on ethical and spiritual values as the basis of national integration, organized by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, was held in Bombay from December 30, 1966, to January 2, 1967. The colloquium was divided into various sections: Ethical and Spiritual Values, Power and Morality, National Integration and Group Consciousness, Employer-Employee Relations, Science and Technology, Law and Judiciary, World and India, Religion and Secularism, Economic Order, Literature and Fine Arts, Woman and Marriage, Education and Youth, Mass Media, Sanskrit and Unity of India.

“A re-appraisal of our sense of values is indeed timely today,” said Dr. Radhakrishnan’s message to the colloquium. “We have to make a conscious effort to avoid all disruptive tendencies and to preserve our sense of unity as a nation. The best way of achieving this is by emotional integration based on common concepts of our moral and social obligations to our fellow men and of our duties as members of the nation as a whole.”

Swami Ranganathananda of the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta, who presided over the Ethical and Spiritual Values Section, used in his opening speech (*Bhavan’s Journal*, January 29) an apt simile. Like the cement that holds together separate bricks so as to produce the integrated structure of a building, ethical and spiritual values help to hold together separate individuals in a social organism, which then ceases to become a mere collection of separate individuals, like the building which has ceased to be just a pile of separate bricks.

The problem of fostering ethical and spiritual values in a society raises the question of the source of these values. Swami Ranganathananda discussed the two broad viewpoints which prevail in this field: The first holds that matter or outer nature is the focus of all values, and this leads to undue emphasis on the possession and enjoyment of material wealth and the satisfaction of objective wants; the second insists that “all rational ethical theories should derive their sanction not from any external source but from human nature itself, from human nature which has been subjected to a thorough investigation from the surface to the depths. A rational theory of ethical values must be based on a total philosophy of man.” Indian spiritual thought holds that all values are created by the human individual from out of the depths of his nature through the intelligent manipulation of his material environment. The more man seeks these values within him, the more he grows and devel-

ops intellectually and morally, as also in his outer nature.

Interaction between human beings in a society provides a field for the working out of ethical values. Ethics, therefore, is inseparable from the social context, and *vice versa*. It is the cementing factor referred to above, uniting man with man in society. The moral impulse finds expression in an outward movement of love and concern for other men. Progress for man, Swami Ranganathananda brought out, is progress in unselfishness, social feeling, non-aggressiveness and inner fulfilment. These ethical values are the products of the spiritual growth of man. This is the specific field of human evolution. All ethical values, Swami Ranganathananda said,

are essentially spiritual values; they proceed from the trans-sensual dimension of the human personality. This dimension, which stimulates the *dharmika* or ethical sense, is beyond the reach of animals and of such humans who, like animals, are content to live at the sensate level. . . . In actual fact, however, no human being is entirely without this stimulus; everyone receives "intimations of immortality," as Wordsworth expresses it, some time or other in his life. But it is stifled by his sensate nature which is the venue of life-stagnation for individuals as well as societies; creative life lies just above this level.

In order to achieve quality, the tyranny of this sensate nature has to be overcome. That is the work of spiritual education; part of this education is achieved in the social context through the ethics of mutuality and interdependence.

The proceedings of the two international conferences on survival after bodily death, sponsored by the Parapsychology Foundation of New York, held recently in London and Saint Paul-de-Vence, France, are reported in the *Newsletters* of the Parapsychology Foundation for July-August and September-October 1966. The conferences attracted several scholars, teachers and students from the fields of parapsychology, psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, anthropology, philosophy, medicine, genetics, physics, chemistry, mathematics, religion, and other studies. The participants representing so many varied fields reflected the present wide-spread interest in the survival issue. But, lacking the true knowledge of man, investigators seem to be arguing round and round the subject, without making much headway.

At the London conference, Mrs. Eileen J. Garrett, President of the

Parapsychology Foundation, noted her skepticism of "proof" of survival based on the traditional methods of the conventional sciences, and reminded the participants that the human spirit has an immense, unexplored potential which surpasses the limitations of time and space.

Mr. W. H. Salter, former president of the Society for Psychical Research, London, remarked that "even if we had the most fully conceivable evidence of survival, which we are far from having at present, there might still be something in survival which could not be discovered by inquiry into the natural order of things — which is a limitation of psychical research."

Professor H. H. Price, Emeritus Professor of Logic, Oxford, noted that investigation of survival had bogged down and that present-day investigators were no nearer a solution than were their predecessors 50 years ago. The problem, he said, "cannot be settled by purely philosophical considerations. The evidence of the biological sciences and other normal evidence is quite unfavourable to the survival hypothesis, but paranormal evidence seems favourable."

The survival issue was discussed at the two conferences from different points of view, such as: Christianity and mystical theology, reincarnation, mediumistic communications with the "dead," body-mind relationship, space-time concepts, precognition and telepathy, the memory function, the evolutionary viewpoint, the testimony of poets, and the data computers might yield in the future!

While present-day investigators talk in terms of "survival," the fundamental conception of Theosophy is expressed by the word "immortality." Both words imply that there is something more than physical existence, but there the resemblance ends, for their meanings are at opposite poles. The first lays the emphasis on this material life from which something survives, while immortality has in it the idea of something beginningless and endless, not limited to a particular form or manifestation — an altogether nobler conception.

Those who talk in terms of survival hold subconsciously the old materialistic notion of man as So-and-So, born on such-and-such a day. It is this limited personality of the present incarnation that the great majority think to be the man himself, when it is merely his outer garment. The spontaneous choice by the Spiritualists and others of the word "survival" shows that they have no real conception of man as an Immortal Soul. For that which is immortal can never be said to survive; it always is.

Anyone whose interest is centred in this egotistic, personal existence is bound to think in terms of "survival." "Immortality" can never be applied to the personal nature, which had a beginning in time and space, and which cannot remain stable even for one short hour. Part of it survives death for a short time, as one member of a family survives the others, to succumb eventually. The conception of the Immortal Soul is a difficult one for all of us whose minds are impressed with the materialism of centuries. But it must be grasped. Hence the importance of the study of Theosophy which enables us to see the real Self in us, distinct and separate from its vehicle.

The distorted concept of life after death that prevails today can be seen from an experiment in "immortality" now under way in the United States. A professor of psychology died in Los Angeles last month, at the age of 73. With his prior permission, a chemical was injected into his veins after his death to prevent blood-clotting, and the body was immediately cooled to a very low temperature and sealed away in a metal tube surrounded by liquid nitrogen. In this condition, it is believed, the metabolic processes will come to a stop, the cells will remain in a state of suspended animation, not amounting to death or disintegration, and, after several years, when medicine and surgery have evolved new techniques to cure the disease of which he died, the body will be removed, slowly restored to a higher temperature, the corrective operations carried out, and he will be resuscitated! (*The Times of India*, February 5)

Denial of soul is leading scientists into the delusion that the mystery of life and death will be better understood when the biological sciences have sufficiently advanced! Those who hold this view, point in support to the well-attested instances of resuscitation of persons certified to be biologically dead. That resuscitation is possible under certain conditions is beyond question, but only as long as the inner man has not extricated himself for ever from the outer body.

The scientific physician who denies both astral body and spirit, and admits the existence of nothing more than the life-principle, judges death to occur when life is apparently extinct. When the beating of the heart and the action of the lungs cease, and *rigor mortis* is manifested, and especially when decomposition begins, they pronounce the patient dead. . . . The kabalists say that death occurs at the instant when both the astral body, or life-principle, and the spirit part forever with the corporeal body. . . .

Thus, the question at issue is not whether a *dead* body can be resuscitated — for, to assert that would be to assume the possibility of a miracle, which is absurd — but, to assure ourselves whether the medical authorities pretend to determine the precise moment of death. (*Isis Unveiled*, I. 482)

The cryogenic experiment outlined above is reminiscent of animal hibernation, which makes some species of mammals and reptiles go into a period of prolonged inactivity. In this connection, H.P.B. has said:

If we die — save accident — of old age, it is because the tissues of the body are worn out by the wear and tear of life: the blood loses its power of free circulation; the bones get ossified, and men die. But if you have discovered the great physiological and psychological secrets of nature, and know why some animals in cold climates hibernate and sleep without awakening from four to six months in the year, without eating, drinking, or breathing either, and yet return to life full of vigour and rejuvenated; and if you learn from some fakirs the secret of being buried alive for six months and then taken out from their coffin as a corpse, which after a few manipulations comes back to life — this is historically and beyond doubt proved — then you may say that you have discovered or learnt one of the grandest mysteries of life and death.

How many states of matter are there? In their book *Seven States of Matter* (Walker, 1966), Westinghouse Research Laboratory scientists, Milton Gottlieb, Max Garbuny and Werner Emmerich note that of the immense quantity of matter in the universe, only a small fraction exists in the form of solids, liquids and gases. Beyond these three states, familiar in everyday life, there are many others which, say the scientists, are not only hard to classify, but possess properties vastly different from those normally encountered. Most stellar matter is said to be in the plasma state. Plasma can be described roughly as a gas consisting of electrically charged particles. It is referred to as a fourth state of matter because it differs radically in its properties from ordinary gas.

Like everything else in the universe, matter too is septenary (*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 10 fn.). What scientists are now beginning to admit, esoteric teaching has asserted from time immemorial. "Matter, to the Occultist, it must be remembered, is that totality of *existences* in the Kosmos, which falls within any of the planes of possible perception" (*S.D.*, I. 514). Beyond the matter of our terrestrial objective conscious-

ness exists "MATTER . . . in *super-sensuous* states — states, however, as fully objective to the spiritual eye of man, as a horse or a tree is to the ordinary mortal" — and it is in these states that we must seek for the ultimate causes of light, heat, sound, cohesion, magnetism, etc. (*S.D.*, I. 515). We learn also that

Astral matter . . . is fourth state matter, having, like our gross matter, its own "protyle." There are several "protyles" in Nature, corresponding to the various planes of matter. The two sub-physical elemental kingdoms, the plane of mind (*manas*, the fifth state matter), as also that of *Buddhi* (sixth state matter), are each and all evolved from one of the six "protyles" which constitute the basis of the Object-Universe. The three "states," so-called, of our terrestrial matter, known as the "solid," "liquid," and "gaseous," are only, in strict accuracy, *SUB-states*. (*S.D.*, II. 737)

Nardi Reeder Champion's interview with Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, published in the January *Reader's Digest* (Indian edition), reveals the views of this well-known minister of the church on the question man today is asking: "Is God dead?" There are those who claim that belief in God is irrelevant in modern life. Dr. Fosdick, who has had more influence on the religious life of America than perhaps anyone else in this century, has this to say:

I thoroughly disagree with "God is Dead" theology. But I think there are many concepts of God that *should* die. People are ready to get rid of the God who bores them to sleep or scares them to death. For many years God was a kind of pillow to lie down on — the God Who Will Take Care of Everything! . . .

We have to leave primitive concepts behind as man advances. Certainly the King of Glory ruling the universe from a golden throne is dead. The God That Walked in the Garden in the cool of the day — the man-size anthropomorphic God — is dead, too. And the God of the Gaps is quite dead — that was the one who accounted for everything man could not comprehend or control, from dreams to thunderstorms.

In our modern world the God Who Is On Our Side has to die, as must the God of Battles who would have us kill for his sake. What place has such a God in the age of the bomb? But perhaps the God most difficult to bury is the one who makes things come out right. It takes real maturity to get rid of him!

Then how should we think of God? Dr. Fosdick's reply is:

All of us are up against it when we try to comprehend God, because we can't jump outside our own experience. Can we say anything that is adequate to describe God? Of course not! We can no more delineate God than we can pour the ocean into a cup. Nevertheless, even a cupful of the ocean reveals its quality. So we go on trying to express what we think is true about God's quality in symbols drawn from our own life....

The nub of the whole question about the nature of God lies in the answer to this question: where do we think in our own lives we touch the near range of God? I believe we come close to God wherever there is beauty, love, integrity, truth. So often if you ask people where God is, their thoughts go shooting off among the stars; but it is deep down within human life that we find God. *God is love and he who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him.* The simple truth is that we discover the Divine wherever love illumines life....

Even people who are afraid of the word God are aware of spiritual values, and spiritual values are as important now as they ever were.... It is very difficult to realize that God's word does not come to man through magical handwriting on the wall, or spelt out on stone tablets, but from the inner counsel of the heart.... It hurts to face the fact that we cannot push off on a kindly deity the tasks we must perform ourselves....

I believe there is mind behind the universe, purpose running through it, ultimate meaning in it, and destiny ahead of it. Affirmation of God is, at the very least, the affirmation of these four factors. And denial of God is the denial of all four, leaving the universe mindless, purposeless, ultimately meaningless, a dead-end street....

What a man sows he indeed reaps. Sow friendliness and reap friendship. Sow unselfishness and reap an enlarged life. Sow goodwill and reap a better world for our children. Sow worship—the uplift of the heart towards the Highest—and reap open-hearted responsiveness to things Eternal.
