

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. XXXV. No. 7

17th May 1965

THE TRANSFORMING POWER OF WILL

Both will and desire are absolute *creators*, forming the man himself and his surroundings. But will creates intelligently — desire blindly and unconsciously. The man, therefore, makes himself in the image of his desires, unless he creates himself in the likeness of the Divine, through his will, the child of the light.

His task is twofold: to awaken the will, to strengthen it by use and conquest, to make it absolute ruler within his body; and, parallel with this, to purify desire.

Knowledge and will are the tools for the accomplishment of this purification.

—*Lucifer*, October 1887

We speak of Will as a *creative* force. Everything that exists, is the result of the Will of the Spirit in action. Just as every element and characteristic of the whole ocean is contained in every single drop that composes it, so the Will that has produced all is reflected in man. It is the offspring of the Divine, the God in man.

Intellectual understanding of this idea, as of any other, is one thing and practical application another. It is not lack of knowledge from which we suffer most; we suffer chiefly from weakness of will and of determination to apply what we already know. How are we to make the creative aspect of will work in the performance of daily duties?

Creation does not mean making something out of nothing. Every sort of making implies material from which it is made. With canvas and paints, or from a lump of clay or a block of stone, the artist creates; he transforms whatever material he uses into a beautiful work of art. We, too, are called upon to be artists in life; to use our will to change the colour of our acts and make them beautiful.

True it is that the artist is bound by what his medium can or cannot be made to produce — the laws that govern it and the possibilities inherent in it. “You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear,” as the saying goes. But this fact does not make the artist less of a creator. The genius, the truly creative worker, is the one who takes the old material as he finds it and fashions it into something new. By the use of his godlike faculty he forms, as Browning puts it, “of three notes, not a fourth, but a star.” The same old notes that bore us when we hear them as a finger exercise, hold us spellbound in certain combinations devised by the master-musician. The same old words that sound dull and banal in one connection are inspiring in another. That “tincture” (“for Thy sake”) of which the 17th-century George Herbert wrote—

A servant with this clause
 Makes drudgerie divine:
 Who sweeps a room, as for Thy laws,
 Makes that and th’ action fine.

— refers to the really creative element in action. This can be applied in the little acts and events that go to make the sum-total of a man’s life.

Each of us is doing something every moment: we are reading a newspaper or studying *The Secret Doctrine*; we are engaged in work or in recreation; we are sitting or walking, eating or talking. We have to learn to be attentive to each of these functions. In all our activities there is an objective, outer process and a subjective, inner process. The drab, the prosaic, the unromantic aspect of daily life changes when we learn that the deeds we perform are not done by the body but are done by the Soul in and through the body.

Metaphysically speaking, every type of action, including our routine, prosaic and worldly duties, proceeds from and is rooted in an archetype. Every day and as often as we can we should try to recall what action of the Supreme our own functions represent. Whatever our walk in life, whether we be clerks or professional men, manual workers or creative thinkers and writers, we should learn to look for the inner meaning, the spiritual reality, the invisible glory, behind all our visible, mundane and often irksome duties. This is what makes the prosaic poetic, makes the worldly romantic and holy. Our power of Will, Imagination, Thought, Aspiration or Higher Feeling helps us in endowing our works with sacramental value. This is the real meaning of dedicating all our actions to the Krishna within us:

Whatever thou doest, O son of Kunti, whatever thou eatest,

whatever thou sacrificest, whatever thou givest, whatever mortification thou performest, commit each unto me. (*Bhagavad-Gita*, IX. 27)

The routine of hourly existence is not merely our own personal concern; it affects for good or ill our family, friends, co-students. To stem the rising tide of passion, to cut off at the root the sapling of irritation ere it grows into the tree of anger, to check the small greeds lest they develop into veritable giants of possessiveness, to take care of minutes lest hours be misspent — this is what we owe not only to ourselves but also to our fellow beings. In these small efforts we can attain great results.

Students of Theosophy need to aim not only at becoming more efficient as speakers and writers, but also more efficient in doing every task, whether personal duties or the routine work of the Movement. In such performance of plain duties — using our will to transform the mundane into the divine — the world is served and saved and through that performance the student of Theosophy is able to purify himself, to develop the inner spiritual will, and to raise his mind to the level where the Light of Wisdom can shine into it.

If we are but mind, or the slaves of mind, we never can attain real knowledge because the incessant panorama of objects eternally modifies that mind which is uncontrolled by the soul, always preventing real knowledge from being acquired. But as the Soul is held to be superior to Mind, it has the power to grasp and hold the latter if we but use the will to aid it in the work, and then only the real end and purpose of mind is brought about.

These propositions imply that the will is not wholly dependent on the mind, but is separable from it; and further, that knowledge exists as an abstraction. The will and mind are only servants for the soul's use, but so long as we are wrapped up in material life and do not admit that the real knower and only experiencer is the soul, just so long do these servants remain usurpers of the soul's sovereignty. Hence it is stated in old Hindu works, that "the Soul is the friend of Self and also its enemy; and, that a man should raise the self by the self."

—W. Q. JUDGE: Preface to *The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali*

WAS WRITING KNOWN BEFORE PANINI?

[Of late there has been much speculation on the origin and evolution of the art of writing. Even today the erroneous and rather incongruous idea prevails that writing was not known in India till about the fifth century B.C. (see THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 315-16). The following article by "A Chela," first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist*, Vol. V, pp. 18-21, for October 1883, brings out the illogicality of this view.—EDS.]

I am entrusted with the task of putting together some facts which would support the view that the art of writing was known in India before the time of our grammarian — the Shiva-taught Panini. Professor Max Müller puts forward and maintains the contrary opinion ever since 1856, and has the approbation of other illustrious Western scholars. Stated briefly, their position is that the entire absence of any mention of "writing, reading, paper, or pen," in the Vedas, or during the whole of the Brahmana period, and the almost if not quite as complete silence as to them throughout the Sutra period, "lead us to suppose that even then [the Sutra period], though the art of printing began to be known, the whole literature of India was preserved by oral tradition only" (*Hist. of Sans. Lit.*, p. 501). To support this theory, he expands the mnemonic faculty of our respectable ancestors to such a phenomenal degree, that like the bull's hide of Queen Dido, it is made to embrace the whole ground needed for the proposed City of Refuge, to which discomfited savants may flee when hard pressed. Considering that Professor Weber — a gentleman who, we observe, likes to distil the essence of Aryan æons down into an attar of no greater volume than the capacity of the Biblical period — admits that Europe now possesses 10,000 of our Sanskrit texts; and considering that we have, or have had, many other tens of thousands which the parsimony of Karma has hitherto withheld from the Museums and Libraries of Europe, what a memory must have been theirs!

Under correction, I venture to assume that Panini was the greatest known grammarian in India, ranked among the Rishis, and than whom there is no higher in history, whether ancient or modern; further, that contemporary scholars agree that the Sanskrit is the most perfect of languages. Therefore, when Professor Müller affirms that "there is not a single word in Panini's terminology which presupposes the existence of writing" (*Op. cit.*, 507), we become a little shaken in our loyal deference

to Western opinion. For it is very hard to conceive how one so pre-eminently great as Panini should have been incapable of indenting characters to preserve his grammatical system — supposing that none had previously existed — if his genius was equal to the invention of classical Sanskrit. The mention of the word *Grantha*, the equivalent for a written or bound book in the later literature of India — though applied by Panini (in I. 3, 75) to the Veda; (in IV. 3, 87) to any work; (in IV. 3, 116) to the work of any individual author, and (in VI. 3, 79) to any work that is studied — does not stagger Professor Müller at all: *Grantha* he takes to mean simply a composition, and this may be handed down to posterity by oral communication. Hence, we must believe that Panini was illiterate; but yet composed the most elaborate and scientific system of grammar ever known; recorded its 3,996 Rules only upon the molecular quicksands of his “cerebral cineritious matter,” and handed them over to his disciples by atmospheric vibration, *i.e.*, oral teaching! Of course, nothing could be clearer: it commends itself to the simplest intellect as a thing most probable. And in the presence of such a perfect hypothesis it seems a pity that its author should (*Op. cit.*, 523) confess that “it is possible” that he “may have overlooked some words in the Brahmanas and Sutras, which would prove the existence of written books previous to Panini.” That looks like the military strategy of our old warriors, who delivered their attack boldly but nevertheless tried to keep their rear open for retreat if compelled. The precaution was necessary: written books *did* exist many centuries before the age in which this radiant sun of Aryan thought rose to shine upon his age. They existed, but the Orientalist may search in vain for the proof amid the *exoteric* words in our earlier literature. As the Egyptian hierophants had their private code of hieratic symbols, and even the founder of Christianity spoke to the vulgar in parables whose mystical meaning was known only to the chosen few, so the Brahmans had from the first (and still have) a mystical terminology couched behind ordinary expressions, arranged in certain sequences and mutual relations, which none but the initiate would observe. That few living Brahmans possess this key but proves that, as in other archaic religious and philosophical systems, the soul of Hinduism has fled (to its primal imparters — the initiates) and only the decrepit body remains with a spiritually degenerate posterity.¹ I fully perceive the difficulty of satisfying Euro-

¹ Not only are the *Upanishads* a secret doctrine, but in dozens of other works, as, for instance, in the *Aitareya Aranyaka*, it is plainly expressed that they contain *secret doctrines* that are not to be imparted to anyone but a *Dwija* Brahman.

pean philologists of a fact which, upon my own statement, they are debarred from verifying. We know that from the present mental condition of our Brahmans. But I hope to be able to group together a few admitted circumstances which will aid, at least to show the Western theory untenable, if not to make a base upon which to stand our claim for the antiquity of writing. Three good reasons may be postulated for the correctness of the claim — though they will be regarded as circumstantial evidence by our opponents.

I.—It can be shown that Phœnicia was acquainted with writing from the date of the acquaintance of Western history with her first settlements: and this may be dated, according to European figures, 2760 B.C., the age of the Tyrian settlement.

II.—Our opponents confess to knowing nothing whence the Phœnicians themselves got their alphabet.

III.—It can be proved that before the final division and classification of the languages, there existed two languages in every nation: (*a*) the profane or popular language of the masses; (*b*) the sacerdotal or secret language of the Initiates of the temples and mysteries — the latter being one and universal. Or, in other words, every great people had, like the Egyptians, its Demotic and its Hieratic writing and language, which had resulted first in a pictorial writing or the hieroglyphics, and later on in a phonetic alphabet. Now it requires a stretch of prejudice, indeed, to assert upon no evidence whatever that the Brahman Aryans — mystics and metaphysicians above everything — were the only ones who had never had any knowledge of either the sacerdotal language or the characters in which it was reproduced. To contradict this gratuitous assumption, we can furnish a whole array of proofs. It can be demonstrated that the Aryans borrowed no more their writing from the Hellenes or from the Phœnicians, than they were indebted to the influence of the former for all their arts and sciences. (Even if we accept Mr. Cunningham's "Indo-Grecian Period," for it lasted only from 250 to 57 B.C., as he states it.) The direct progenitor of the Vedic Sanskrit was the sacerdotal language (which has its distinct name but cannot be given). The Vach — its *alter ego* or the "mystic self," the sacerdotal speech of the initiated Brahman — became in time the mystery language of the inner temple, studied by the Initiates of Egypt and Chaldea; of the Phœnicians and the Etruscans; of the Pelasgi and Palanquans; in short, of the whole globe. The appellation DEVANAGARI is the synonym of, and identical with, the Hermetic and Hieratic

NETER-KHARI (divine speech) of the Egyptians.

As the discussion divides naturally into two parts as to treatment — though a general synthesis must be the final result — we will proceed to examine the first part, namely, the charge that the Sanskrit alphabet is derived from the Phœnicians. When a Western philologist asserts that writing did not exist before a certain period, we assume that he has some approximate certitude as to its real invention. But so far is this from true, it is conceded that no one knows whence the Phœnicians learned the characters, now alleged (by Gesenius first) to be the source from which modern alphabets were directly derived. De Rougé's investigations make it extremely probable that "they were borrowed, or rather adapted from certain archaic hieroglyphics of Egypt": a theory which the *Prisse Papyrus*, "the oldest in existence," strongly supports by its "striking similarities with the Phœnician characters." But the same authority traces it back one step farther. He says that the ascription (by the myth-makers) of the art of writing to Thoth, or to Kadmus, "only denotes their belief in its being brought from the East (Kedem), or *being perhaps primeval*." There is not even a certainty whether, primevally or archaically, "there were several original alphabetical systems, or whether one is to be assumed as having given rise to the various modes of writing in use." So, if conjecture has the field, it is no great disloyalty to declare one's rebellion against the eminent Western gentlemen who are learnedly guessing at the origin of things. Some affirm that the Phœnicians derived their so-called Kadmean or Phœnician writing-characters from the Pelasgians held also to have been the inventors or at least the improvers of the so-called Kadmean characters. But at the same time, this is *not proven*, they confess, and they know that the latter were in possession of the art of writing "before the dawn of history." Let us see what is known of both Phœnicians and Pelasgians.

If we inquire who were the Phœnicians, we learn as follows: From having been regarded as Hamites on Bible testimony, they suddenly became Semites — on geographical and philological evidence(?). Their origin begins, it is said, on the shores of the Erythræan sea; and that sea extended from the Eastern shores of Egypt to the Western shores of India. The Phœnicians were the most maritime nation in the world. That *they* knew perfectly the art of writing no one would deny. The historical period of Sidon begins 1500 B.C. And, it is well ascertained that in 1250 Sanchoniathon had already compiled from annals and State documents, which filled the archives of every Phœnician city, the full records of their religion. He wrote in the Phœnician language, and was

mistranslated later on into Greek, by Philo of Byblus, and annihilated bodily — as to his works — except one small fragment in Eusebius, the literary Shiva, the *Destroyer* of all *heathen* documents that fell in his way. To see the direct bearing of the alleged superior knowledge of the Phœnicians upon the alleged ignorance of the Aryan Brahmans, one has but to turn to European Universal History; meagre though its details and possible knowledge, yet I suppose no one would contradict the historical facts given. Some fragments of Dius, the Phœnician, who wrote the history of Tyre, are preserved in Josephus; and Tyre's activity begins 1100 B.C. in the earlier part of the third period of Phœnician history, so called. And in that period, as we are told, they had already reached the height of their power; their ships covered all seas, their commerce embraced the whole earth, and their colonies flourished far and near. Even on Biblical testimony they are known *to have come to the Indies by the Red Sea*, while trading on Solomon's account about a millennium before the Western era. These data, no man of science can deny. Leaving entirely aside the thousand and one documentary proofs that could be given on the evidence of *our* most ancient texts on Occult Sciences, of inscribed tablets, etc., those historical events that are accepted by the Western world are only here given. Turning to the *Mahabharata*, the date of which — on the sole authority of the fancy lore drawn from the inner consciousness of German scholars, who perceive in the great epic poem proofs of its modern fabrication in the words "Yavana" and others — has been changed from 3,300 years to the first centuries after Christ (!!), we find: (1) ample evidence that the ancient Hindus had navigated (before the establishment of the caste system) the open seas to the regions of the Arctic Ocean and held communication with Europe; and (2) that the Pandus had acquired universal dominion and *taught the sacrificial mysteries to other races* (see *Mahabharata*, Book 14). With such proofs of international communication, and more than proved relations between the Indian Aryans and the Phœnicians, Egyptians and other literate people, it is rather startling to be told that our forefathers of the Brahmanic period *knew nothing* of writing.

Admitting for the argument only that the Phœnicians were the sole custodians of the glorious art of writing, and that as merchants they traded with India, what commodity, I ask, could they have offered to a people led by the Brahmans so precious and marketable as this art of arts, by whose help the priceless lore of the Rishis might be preserved against the accidents of imperfect oral transmission? And even if the

Aryans learned from Phœnicia how to write — to every educated Hindu an absurdity — they must have possessed the art 2,000 or at least 1,000 years earlier than the period supposed by Western critics. Negative proof, perhaps? Granted: yet no more so than their own, and most suggestive.

And now we may turn to the Pelasgians. Notwithstanding Niebuhr's rebuke who, speaking of the historian in general, shows him as *hating* "the spurious philology, out of which the pretences to knowledge *on the subject of such extinct people* arise," the origin of the Pelasgians is speculated upon to have been either that of swarthy Asiatics (*Pell-asici*) or from some mariners — from the Greek *Pelagos*, the sea; or again to be sought for in the Biblical *Peleg*! The only divinity of their Pantheon known well to Western History is Orpheus, also the "swarthy," the "dark-skinned"; represented for the Pelasgians by *Xoanon*, their "Divine Image." Now if the Pelasgians were Asiatics, they must have been either Turanians or Semites, or — Aryans. That they could not be the former, and *must* have been the last-named, is shown on Herodotus' testimony, who declared them the forefathers of the Greeks — though they spoke, as he says, "a most barbarous language." Further, *unerring* philology shows that the vast number of roots common both to Greek and Latin, are easily explained by the assumption of a common Pelasgic linguistic and ethnical stock in both nationalities. But then how about the Sanskrit roots traced in the Greek and Latin languages? The same roots must have been present in the Pelasgian tongues? We who place the origin of the Pelasgi far beyond the Biblical ditch of historic chronology, have reasons to believe that the "barbarous language" mentioned by Herodotus was simply "the primitive and now extinct Aryan tongue" that preceded the Vedic Sanskrit. Who could they be, these Pelasgians? They are described generally on the meagre data in hand as a highly intellectual, receptive, active and simple people, chiefly occupied with agriculture; warlike when necessary, though preferring peace. We are told that they built canals, subterranean water-works, dams, and walls of astounding strength and most excellent construction. And their religion and worship originally consisted in a mystic service of those natural powers — the sun, wind, water, and air (our *Surya*, *Maruts*, *Varuna* and *Vayu*), whose influence is visible in the growth of the fruits of the earth; moreover, *some of their tribes were ruled by priests, while others stood under the patriarchal rule of the head of the clan or family*. All this reminds one of the nomads, the Brahmanic Aryas of old under the sway of their

Rishis, to whom were subject every distinct family or clan. While the Pelasgians were acquainted with the art of writing, and had *thus* “a vast element of culture in their possession before the dawn of history,” we are told (by the same philologists) that *our* ancestors knew of no writing until the dawn of Christianity!

Thus the Pelasgianic language, that “most barbarous language” spoken by this mysterious people, what was it but Aryan; or rather, which of the Aryan languages could it have been? Certainly it must have been a language with the same and even stronger Sanskrit roots in it than the Greek. Let us bear in mind that the Æolic was neither the language of Æschylus, nor the Attic, nor even the old speech of Homer. As the Oscan of the “barbarous” Sabines was not quite the Italian of Dante nor even the Latin of Virgil. Or has the Indo-Aryan to come to the sad conclusion that the average Western Orientalist will rather incur the blame of ignorance when detected than admit the antiquity of the Vedic Sanskrit, and the immense period that must have elapsed between this comparatively rough and unpolished tongue — when compared with the classical Sanskrit — and the palmy days of the “extinct Aryan tongue”? The *Latium Antiquum* of Pliny, and the Æolic of the Autochthones of Greece present the greatest kinship, we are told. They had a common ancestor: the Pelasgian. What, then, the parent tongue of the latter unless it was the language “spoken at one time by all the nations of Europe — before their separation?” In the absence of all proofs to the contrary, it might have been expected that the *Rik-Brahmanas*, the *Mahabharata* and every *Nirukta* should not be treated as flippantly as they now are. It is admitted that, however inferior to the classical Sanskrit of Panini, the language of the oldest portions of *Rig-Veda*, notwithstanding the antiquity of its grammatical forms, is the same as that of the latest texts. Everyone sees — cannot fail to see and to know — that for a language so old and so perfect as the Sanskrit to have survived alone, among all languages, it must have had its cycles of perfection and its cycles of degeneration. And, if one had any intuition, he might have seen that what they call a “dead language” being an anomaly, a useless thing in nature, it would not have survived, even as a “dead” tongue, had it not its special purpose in the Reign of immutable Cyclic Laws; and that Sanskrit which came to be nearly lost to the world is now slowly spreading in Europe, and will one day have the extension it had thousands upon thousands of years back — that of a *universal language*. The same as to the Greek and the Latin; there will be a time when the Greek of Æschylus (and more

perfect still in its future form) will be spoken by all in Southern Europe while Sanskrit will be resting in its periodical *pralaya*; and the Attic will be followed later by the Latin of Virgil. Something ought to have whispered to us that there was also a time — before the original Aryan settlers marred the purity of the sacred Sanskrita Bhashya among Dravidian and other aborigines admitted within the fold of Brahmanical initiation — when Sanskrit was spoken in all its unalloyed subsequent purity and therefore must have had more than once its rises and its falls. The reason for it is simply this: classical Sanskrit was only *restored*, if in some things perfected by Panini. Neither Panini, Katyayana nor Patanjali created it; it has existed throughout cycles and will pass through other cycles still.

Professor Max Müller is willing to admit that a tribe of Semitic nomads — 14 centuries before the year one of the Westerns — knew well the art of writing, and had their *historically and scientifically proven* “book of the covenant and the tables ‘with the writing of God upon them.’” Yet the same authority tells us that the Aryans could neither read nor write until the very close of the Brahmanic period. “No trace of writing can be discovered (by the philologists) in the Brahmanical literature before the days of Panini.” Very well, and now what was the period during which this Shiva-taught sage is allowed to have flourished? One Orientalist (Böhtlingk) refers us to 350 B.C., while less lenient ones, like Professor Weber, land the grammarian right in the middle of the second century of the Christian era! Only after fixing Panini’s period with such a remarkable agreement of chronology (other calculations ranging variously between 400 B.C. and 460 A.D.), the Orientalists place themselves inextricably between the horns of a dilemma. For, whether Panini flourished 350 B.C. or 180 A.D., he could not have been illiterate; for, *firstly*, in the *Lalita Vistara*, a canonical book recognized by the Sanskritists, attributed by Max Müller to the *third* Buddhist council (and translated into Tibetan), our Lord Buddha is shown as studying, besides Devanagari, 63 other alphabets specified in it as being used in various parts of India; and *secondly*, though Megasthenes and Nearchus do say that in their time the laws of Manu were not (popularly) reduced to writing (*Strabo*, XV, 66 and 73) yet Nearchus describes the Indian art of making paper from cotton. He adds that the Indians wrote letters on cotton twisted together (*Strabo*, XV, 53 and 67). This would be late in the Sutra period, no doubt, according to Professor Müller’s reasoning. Can the learned gentleman cite any record within that comparatively recent period showing the name of the inventor of that cotton-

paper and the date of his discovery? Surely so important a fact as *that*, a novelty so transcendently memorable, should not have passed without remark. One would seem compelled, in the absence of any such chronicle, to accept the alternative theory — known to us Aryan students as fact — that writing and writing-materials were, as above remarked, known to the Brahmans in an antiquity inconceivably remote — many centuries before the epoch made illustrious by Panini.

Attention has been asked above to the interesting fact that the God Orpheus, of “Thracia”(?), is called the “dark-skinned.” Has it escaped notice that *he is “supposed to be the Vedic Ribhu or Arbhu, an epithet both of Indra and the Sun”*?² And if he was “the inventor of letters,” and is “placed anterior to both Homer and Hesiod,” then what? That Indra taught writing to the Thracian Pelasgians under the guise of Orpheus,³ but left his own spokesmen and vehicles, the Brahmans, illiterate until “the dawn of Christianity”? Or that the gentlemen of the West are better at intuitional chronology than conspicuous for impartial research? Orpheus was — in Greece — the son of Apollo or Helios, the sun-god, according to corrected mythology, and from him received the phorminx or lyre of *seven* strings, *i.e.* — according to occult phraseology — the sevenfold mystery of the Initiation. Now Indra is the ruler of the bright firmament, the disperser of clouds, “the restorer of the sun to the sky.” He is identified with Arjuna in the *Samhita* and *Satapatha Brahmana* (although Professor Weber denies the existence of any such person as Arjuna, yet there was indeed one), and Arjuna was the Chief of the Pandavas;⁴ and though Pandu the *white* passes for his father, he is yet considered the son of Indra. As throughout India all ancient cyclopean structures are even now attributed to the Pandavas, so all similar structures in the West were anciently

² *Chambers' Encyc.* VII, 127.

³ According to Herodotus the Mysteries were actually brought from India by Orpheus.

⁴ Another proof of the fact that the Pandavas were, though Aryans, not Brahmans, and belonged to an Indian tribe that preceded the Brahmans, and were later on *Brahmanized*, and then outcasted and called *Mlechhas*, *Yavanas* (*i.e.*, foreign to the Brahmans), is afforded in the following: Pandu has *two* wives; and “it is not Kunti his lawful wife, but Madri his most beloved wife,” who is burnt with the old king when dead, as well remarked by Prof. Max Müller, who seems astonished at it without comprehending the true reason why this is. As stated by Herodotus (V.5), it was a custom amongst the Thracians to allow the most beloved of a man's wives to be sacrificed upon his tomb; and “Herodotus (IV.17) asserts a similar fact of the Scythians and Pausanias (IV.2) of the Greeks” (*Hist. of Sans. Lit.*, p. 48). The Pandavas and the Kauravas are called esoterically *cousins* in the Epic poem, because they were two distinct yet Aryan tribes and represent two *nations*—not simply two families.

ascribed to the Pelasgians. Moreover, as shown well by Pococke — laughed at because too intuitional and *too* fair, though, perchance, less philologically learned — the Pandavas were in Greece, where many traces of them can be shown. In the *Mahabharata*, Arjuna is taught the occult philosophy by Krishna (personification of the Universal Divine Principle); and the less mythological view of Orpheus presents him to us as “a divine bard or priest in the service of Zagreus . . . founder of the Mysteries . . .” the inventor “of everything, in fact, that was supposed to have contributed to the civilization and initiation into a more humane worship of the deity. . . .” Are not these striking parallels? And is it not significant that in the cases of both Arjuna and Orpheus the sublimer aspects of religion should have been imparted along with the occult methods of attaining it by masters of the mysteries? Real Devanagari — non-phonetic characters — meant formerly the outward signals, so to say, *the signs used in the intercommunication between gods and initiated mortals*. Hence their great sacredness and the silence maintained throughout the Vedic and the Brahmanical periods about any object concerned with, or referring to, reading and writing. It was *the* language of the Gods. If our Western critics can only understand what the Ancient Hindu writers meant by *Bhutilipi*, so often mentioned in their mystical writings, they will be in a position to ascertain the source from which the Hindus first derived their knowledge of writing.

A secret language common to all schools of occult science once prevailed throughout the world. Hence — Orpheus learnt “letters” in the course of his initiation. He is identified with Indra; according to Herodotus he brought the art of writing from India; his swarthier complexion than that of the Thracians points to his Indo-Aryan nationality — supposing him to have been “a bard and priest” and not a god; the Pelasgians are said to have been born in Thracia; they are believed (in the West) to have first possessed the art of writing, and taught the Phœnicians; from the latter all modern alphabets derive. I submit, then, with all these coincidences and sequences, whether the balance of proof is on the side of the theory that the Aryans transmitted the art of writing to the people of the West; or on the opposite and wholly unsupported one that they, with their caste of scholarly Brahmans, their noble secret sacerdotal and “barbarous” popular vernacular — in the high antiquity, their redundant, high-class literature, their acquaintance with the most wonderful and recondite potentialities of the human spirit — were illiterate for generations upon generations before the era of Panini the grammarian and last of the Rishis. When the famous theorists

of the Western colleges can show us a river running from its mouth back to its spring sources in the mountain nullahs, then may we be asked to believe their theory of Aryan illiteracy. The history of human intellectual development shows that humanity always passes through the stage of ideography or pictography before attaining that of cursive writing. It therefore remains with the Western critics who oppose the antiquity of Aryan Scriptures to show us the pictographic proofs which support their position. As these are notoriously absent, it appears they would have us believe that our ancestors passed immediately from illiteracy to the Devanagari characters of Panini's time.

Let the Orientalists bear in mind the conclusions drawn from a careful study of the *Mahabharata* by Muir in his *Sanskrit Texts* (Vol. I, pp. 390, 480 and 482). It may be conclusively proven on the authority of the *Mahabharata* that the Yavanas (of whom India as alleged knew nothing before the days of Alexander!) belong to those tribes of Kshatriyas who in consequence of their non-communication with, and in some cases rejection by, the Brahmins, had become from *twice-born* — “Vrishalas,” *i.e.*, made *outcastes*. On account of their having rebelled against their sovereign and attacked his capital, they were excommunicated by Sagara who successfully drove them out of Ayodhya, at the suggestion of Vasishtha who was the Chief minister and Guru of Sagara's father. The only trouble in connecting the Pelasgians with, and tracing their origin to, the Kshatriyas of Rajputana is created by the Orientalist who constructs a fanciful chronology, based on no proof, and showing only unfamiliarity with the world's real history, and with Indian history within historical periods.

The value of that chronology — which places virtually the “primitive Indo-Germanic-period” before the *ancient* Vedic period (!) — may, in closing this article, be illustrated with a final example. Rough as may be the calculations offered, it is impossible to go deeper into any subject of this class within the prescribed and narrow limits of a magazine article, and without recourse to data not generally accessible. In the words of Professor Max Müller: “The Code of Manu is almost the only work in Sanskrit literature which, as yet, has not been assailed by those who doubt the antiquity of everything Indian. No historian has disputed its claim to that early date which had from the first been assigned to it by Sir William Jones” (*Hist. of Sans. Lit.*, p. 61). And now, pray, what is this extremely “early date”? “From 880 to 1280 B.C.” — we are told. We will then, for the present purpose, accept this author-

itative conclusion. Several facts, easily verifiable, have to be first of all noticed: (1) Manu in his many enumerations of Indian races, kingdoms and places, *never once mentions Bengal*; the Aryan Brahmans had not yet reached, in the days when his *Code* was compiled, the banks of the Ganges nor the plains of Bengal. It was Arjuna who went first to *Banga* (Bengal) with his sacrificial horse. (*Yavanas* are mentioned in *Raj-dharma Anusasanika Parva* as part of the tribes peopling it.) (2) In the *Ayun* a list of the Hindu kings of Bengal is given. Though the date of the first king who reigned over *Banga* cannot be ascertained, owing to the great gaps between the various dynasties, it is yet known that Bengal ceased to be an independent Hindu kingdom from 1230 after Christ. Now, if disregarding these gaps, which are wide and many, we make up the sum of only those chronological periods of the reign of the several dynasties that are preserved by history, we find the following:

24	Kshatriya families of Kings reigned for a period of	2,418	years.
9	Kaista Kings	250	"
11	Of the Adisur families	714	"
10	Of the Bhopal family	689	"
10	Of the Pala dynasty (from 855 to 1040 A.D.)	185	"
10	The Vaidya Rajahs reigned for a period of	137	"

Years . . . 4,393

If we deduct from this sum 1,230, we have 3,163 years B.C. of successive reigns. If it can be shown on the unimpeachable evidence of the Sanskrit texts that some of these reigns happened *simultaneously*, and the line cannot therefore be shown as successive (as was already tried), well and good. Against an arbitrary chronology set up with a pre-determined purpose and theory in view, there will remain but little to be said. But if this attempt at reconciliation of figures is shown simply as in every other case claimed upon "critical, internal evidence," then, in the presence of these 3,163 years of an unbroken Hindu line of powerful and mighty kings, the Orientalists will have to show a very good reason why the authors of the Code of Manu seem entirely ignorant even of the existence of Bengal — if its date has to be accepted as not earlier than 1280 B.C.! A scientific rule, which is good enough to apply to the case of Panini, ought to be valid in other chronological speculations. Or, perhaps, this is one of those poor rules which will *not* "work both ways"?

ON MITIGATING KARMA

It knows not wrath nor pardon; utter-true
Its measures mete, its faultless balance weighs;
Times are as nought, tomorrow it will judge,
Or after many days. . . .

Such is the Law which moves to righteousness,
Which none at last can turn aside or stay;
The heart of it is Love, the end of it
Is Peace and Consummation sweet. Obey!

—*Light of Asia*

Whether we believe ourselves to be immortal, eternal beings in our innermost natures, or whether we do not, the point of view we take will determine (*i.e.*, widen or restrict) our own self-chosen goal, our ideals.

If our Real Self, our Higher Self, is a spark of the Universal Over-Soul, temporarily circumscribed in a form of material flesh for the purpose of learning and experience, then our potential growth is as unlimited as the great Universe in which we live.

If such is the case, then we can begin to look upon the circumstances that affect our forms, sometimes causing pain and sometimes pleasure, in a different way from the man who has not this understanding of the *Unity of All*.

Aphorism No. 12 on Karma reads: "Karmic causes already set in motion must be allowed to sweep on until exhausted. . . ." (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 21*). *The Voice of the Silence* makes a similar statement: "Teach to eschew all causes; the ripple of effect, as the great tidal wave, thou shalt let run its course."

First, then, being limited in power ourselves we have no capacity to change "causes already set in motion," causes whose effects are in the process of manifesting themselves. Can one stop an earthquake, or a tidal wave? No! But one can lift a child out of the way of an onrushing car. The concept of the *right use* of the powers at hand, of circumstances, call them Karmic precipitations, leads us to see that we have *opportunities* — opportunities to employ *now* our powers in meeting the results of our past actions and in creating causes for our future, and our own future is inextricably bound with that of others. Karma has helped to place us where we are, but Karma does not hold us there. In this context, Aphorism No. 12, quoted above, continues: ". . . this permits no man to refuse to help his fellows and every sentient being."

Let us understand this. When we are selfish and concentrated upon

actions that, we hope, will result in *personal* benefits, we form a *centre* on which impinge Karmic effects generated by the Will which our Desire sets in motion. We set ourselves up in isolation from the rest of Nature and the rest of mankind. The forces we generate disturb the harmony of Nature and they serve unconsciously as barriers to the resultant effects, and as mirrors to reflect these back upon the selfish centre *we* created.

When we are unselfish and compassionate, on the other hand, we establish a *universal centre* (*i.e.*, we are in harmony and unity with the Whole), and since such a centre is not *isolated*, there is in fact no particular focus to which the karmic effects of the unselfish act, feeling or thought flow; to the utmost confines of the illimitable Universe they go, harmonizing with the great purposes of *All Life*. Our acting centre is in such cases in harmony with all the other centres of consciousness and of life and with the great LAW, and the effect passes everywhere.

This emphasizes the necessity for self-reform, idealism in practice, unity with others, the learning and study of LAW and laws, so that we may consciously harmonize with our surroundings and “do our whole duty.” Thus we make of ourselves, as we advance on the Path of Compassion, a centre for good, a force that makes for righteousness.

The universalization of our feeling-mind produces emotional detachment from expectations of results — while leaving us free to assist and help others whenever we can. This requires wakefulness and care. Each in his measure can try to emulate the interest in the well-being of others that the Great Ones have. “*The Masters are philanthropists and care only for that.*”

A consideration of this leads us to see why Aphorism No. 13 states:

The effects may be counteracted or mitigated by the thoughts and acts of oneself or of another, and then the resulting effects represent the combination and interaction of the whole number of causes involved in producing the effects.

This, perhaps, appears paradoxical, especially in view of what Aphorism No. 3 states: “Karma is an undeviating and unerring tendency in the Universe to restore equilibrium, and it operates incessantly.”

Note carefully that it is called a “tendency” — not an immutable, rigid and mechanical *force*. It is *undeviating* but can apparently be modified by setting up counteracting causes.

“Mitigate” is a term defined in dictionaries as: “to make easier to bear”; “to render less severe or harsh”; “to alleviate, abate, relieve, diminish.” While we can see that an individual can do this for *himself*,

and mitigate, change and alter the Karma he has stored up for himself, it is difficult to understand how one can change or affect someone else's Karma! Theosophy emphatically asserts that the doctrine of vicarious atonement is "pernicious" and false. This must be so if it is a fact that every act, word or thought has its consequence. Then why this paradoxical statement about another being able to mitigate *our* Karma?

Let us turn for assistance to Mr. Judge's *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita* (p. 67) and note a principle for the understanding of this.

Other beings once known to the man arrive into incarnation at the same time, and bring into action affinities, attractions, and powers that can only act through them and him. Their influence cannot be calculated. It may be good or bad, and, just as he is swayed by them or as his sway the other being, so will work out the Karma of each.

Mitigation of another's Karma is now seen to be a sharing in it — as a parent shares the Karma of the child while rearing it and training it, or a teacher shares that of a pupil, or an employer that of an employee.

Karma is a universal force, and to a greater or lesser extent we *share* one another's Karma. To the extent that *we* are unselfish, to that extent we assume some responsibility for others' Karma in helping them to bear with greater fortitude that which they have created for themselves and are now experiencing.

To achieve the capacity of doing this wisely, the disciple's attention is drawn to the closing comments that Mr. Judge makes in his rendition of Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms*:

Until this state [of true Isolation] is reached, the soul, continually affected and deflected by objects, senses, suffering and pleasure, is unable to consciously partake universally of the great life of the universe. To do so, it must stand firmly "in its own nature"; and then it proceeds further . . . to bring about the aim of all other souls still struggling on the road.

Implicit here is the height of individual achievement of the perfection of wisdom and of compassion. The ideal is offered to us of the state of the *Nirmanakaya*, one who gives up the bliss of *Nirvana* and remains in conscious existence outside of his body after its death, in order to help Humanity. This is the greatest sacrifice one can offer for the sake of mankind.

“SEEING EYE” PEOPLE

Many are, perhaps, familiar with the amazing sensitivity and sensibility to which the “Seeing Eye” organization has brought the dogs trained to accompany and safeguard blind masters. Wonderful and praiseworthy is the patience of their trainers, and beneficent the devotion of the trained dogs to their charges. These four-footed friends of the handicapped render an invaluable service indeed.

But the world also needs, and badly, an ever increasing number of “seeing eye” people.

In *Proverbs* (xx. 12), “the hearing ear, and the seeing eye” are assigned a divine origin.

Jesus is quoted as saying in the Sermon on the Mount:

The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!
(*Matthew*, vi. 22-23)

And again the *Gospel According to Saint Mark* (viii. 18) quotes Jesus as exclaiming: “Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?”

In the *Gospel According to Matthew*, Chapter xxv deals metaphorically with the last judgment. To those honoured by the King, he is quoted as saying:

... I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:

Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

And when those praised ask in astonishment when they had so ministered to him, they are answered: “Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.”

Again in the book of *Revelation*, Chapter iii, the warning is given to “the angel of the church of the Laodiceans”:

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. . . .

... thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked:

I counsel thee to . . . anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.

The Voice of the Silence tells us:

Let thy Soul lend its ear to every cry of pain like as the lotus bares its heart to drink the morning sun.

Let not the fierce Sun dry one tear of pain before thyself hast wiped it from the sufferer's eye.

But let each burning human tear drop on they heart and there remain; nor ever brush it off, until the pain that caused it is removed. (P. 14)

And again in the closing pages of the same priceless little book, Compassion is called "the Law of LAWS — eternal Harmony, Alaya's SELF; a shoreless universal essence, the light of everlasting right, and fitness of all things, the law of Love eternal" (p. 76). And the aspirant is assured:

The more thou dost become at one with it, thy being melted in its BEING, the more thy Soul unites with that which is, the more thou wilt become COMPASSION ABSOLUTE. (P. 76)

. . . Compassion speaks and saith: "Can there be bliss when all that lives must suffer? Shalt thou be saved and hear the whole world cry?" (P. 78)

Who would not recognize the folly of a passenger on a ship shrugging off the report of a fire in the hold, in the puerile assurance that, it not being his ship, his fortune would not suffer by its loss!

John Donne (1573-1631) wrote truly:

Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind . . . never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

The only greatness a man ever entertains is, when becoming conscious of the infinitesimal and accidental nature of his personality, he rises far above it and becomes sensible of the God who is his soul. No man is great who is not greater than himself and does not realize the pettiness and absurd limitations of his own personality.

—EDWARD BELLAMY.

THE SEEDS OF TIME

If you can look into the seeds of time,
And say which grain will grow, and which will not...

—*Macbeth* (Act I, Sc. iii)

The Theosophical Movement for the 19th-20th century was launched by H. P. Blavatsky, W. Q. Judge and others with the three objects set forth by H.P.B. This magazine, too, has the same objects. The third of these objects is the investigation of the unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man. While such investigations are the constant and continual endeavour of students of Theosophy, scientists inquiring into the mysteries of Nature and its forces often stumble unconsciously upon one or another of these unexplained laws and provide the basis for further research and discovery.

Of late there is a distinct and noticeable trend among scientists to delve into the psychology of the human being by studying his subjective states. One sphere of investigation is how circumstances influence our sense of the passage of time. The results of experiments and deductions in this field are outlined in an article titled "Psychological Time" in the November 1964 issue of *Scientific American* (New York). The author, John Cohen, is Professor of Psychology at the University of Manchester.

Like similar inquiries of science, this investigation of modern psychology is based mainly upon man's sensory-motor activity. Ancient psychology, the Science of the Soul, on the other hand, itself served as the basis for physical functionings. It is, therefore, proposed to examine Professor Cohen's article from a philosophical and universal point of view, by the application of the fundamental tenets of Theosophy, so that students might benefit by examining the ever-changing propositions of science (a series of progressive awakenings) in the light of the unvarying fundamentals of the Eternal Verities.

Psychological time is defined by Professor Cohen as "the subjective time that for each person is more or less independent of objective time." To the timepiece of the mind, an hour sometimes seems like a minute, or a minute like an hour. Philosophically, "our ideas on duration and time are all derived from our sensations according to the laws of Association" (*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 43-44). The sense of time arises from the unregulated activity of memory, imagination and thought—the attention of Self, the Perceiver, diffused over the three planes of action. *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 37) further states that "time is only an

illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration, and it does not exist where no consciousness exists in which the illusion can be produced." According to Dr. Ivor B. Hart, "in the language of Western mathematics, time is a function of consciousness."

Psychological time has many aspects, and the first that Professor Cohen considers is the historical attitude toward time. Men's ideas of time and what it represents have changed through the ages. In antiquity men regarded time as expressing power, opportunity and plenitude; but later it came to be looked upon as the bearer of misfortune, decay and decrepitude. What is of interest is the philosophical and metaphysical basis for this change of attitude.

To gain the understanding needed, the traditions of ancient Greece and India may be looked into, for the chronology of the ancient Greeks was borrowed from India. Kronos symbolizes "Infinite Time" or endless duration in Greek thought. Indian tradition speaks of infinite time or eternity as *Kala*. According to the Esoteric Philosophy, nothing has true existence save in duration (*S.D.*, I. 36). Here we have the clue to the concept of plenitude, which also implies opportunity and power.

The mutilation of Uranus by his son Kronos is an allegorical representation of Absolute Time or Duration becoming the finite and the conditioned. Kronos cuts down with his scythe even the longest and (to us) seemingly endless cycles, which, commencing with a moment, go to make up the vast astronomical periods, called by the ancient Indians *yugas*, *kalpas*, *manvantaras* and *Brahmandas*. These cycles which are related to the motion of the orbs in the firmament are influenced by the actions of humanity and result in various other major and minor cycles, such as those of the rise and fall of civilizations and cultures. *Kala* is a cycle of time, as also a name given to Yama, the god of the dead and the king of the nether world; he is the embodiment of the race which was the first to be endowed with consciousness (*Manas*), without which there is neither the nether world nor the heavenly world. All this refers not only to the "decay-death" impression regarding time, but also to the concept of time as a function of consciousness, and to the eternal duality of manifestation.

Biological clocks, or living beings' innate sense of time, are next considered by Professor Cohen. The ability to wake up "at a preappointed time, often just a few moments before the alarm clock goes off," is given as a familiar human illustration of such a mechanism; and an example

in animals is the ability to time entry into and emergence from hibernation.

These phenomena are caused by the associative power of memory, and memory is one of the results of time. H. P. Blavatsky states in *The Key to Theosophy* (p. 122) that memory is "simply an innate power in thinking beings, and even in animals, of reproducing past impressions by an association of ideas principally suggested by objective things or by some action on our external sensory organs."

In another place H.P.B. wrote:

No manifestation . . . can ever be lost from the *Skandhic* record of a man's life. Not the smallest sensation, the most trifling action, impulse, thought, impression, or deed, can fade or go out from, or in the Universe. We may think it unregistered by our memory, unperceived by our consciousness, yet it will still be recorded on the tablets of the astral light. . . . There are cells in our brain that receive and convey sensations and impressions, but this once done, their mission is accomplished. These cells of the supposed "organ of memory" are the *receivers* and *conveyers* of all the pictures and impressions of the past, not their *retainers*. Under various conditions and stimuli, they can receive instantaneously the reflection of these astral images back again and this is called *memory*, *recollection*, *remembrance*: but they do not preserve them. (*Lucifer*, October 1891)

This could be linked with what science has discovered about internal biological clocks, which work independently of external factors.

Professor Cohen reports the work of several investigators who have tried to explain the discrepancies between psychological time and clock time by relating inner clocks to the temperature and diseased condition of the body. About the unbalanced health of the body W. Q. Judge says:

Health of the body as a whole depends on the integrity of all its parts, and more especially upon their harmonious association and co-operation. A diseased tissue is one in which a group of individual cells refuse to co-operate, and wherein is set up discordant action, using less and claiming more than their due share of food or energy. (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 3*, p. 16)

Hence, it is only natural that during illness there should be a departure from the normal reactions of the consciousness, giving rise to discrepancies between clock time and the private computation of time. Opium, hashish and drugs such as LSD and mescaline produce similar

results. To the experiments cited by Professor Cohen one more may be added — how electrical shocks can result in the prolongation of time.

The third aspect of psychological time that Professor Cohen considers is the estimation of time intervals by people. On the basis of the work of Ernst Mach, Ernst Meumann and others, three properties of man's inner clocks have been examined: (1) the length of the brief interval of time that can be judged most accurately; (2) the interval of time during which a series of stimuli may extend and yet be experienced as "unitary"; and (3) the minimum perceptible duration between two excitations.

In regard to the first of these factors, experiments reveal that the apparent duration of a brief interval is influenced by the intensity of the stimuli that delimit it. The more intense are the stimuli, such as sounds, the shorter the interval seems to be. When there is a break in the "stream of consciousness," as when one dozes off while travelling, judgment of the time interval becomes very erratic. This is almost the repetition of an occult axiom, for, as stated in an earlier paragraph, time "does not exist where no consciousness exists."

Experiments involving the second property of inner clocks provide the basis for a definition of the "psychological present" and point to the relativity of human sensory powers with respect to any discriminatory experience. On the question of what may be regarded as the "present," *The Secret Doctrine* states:

...the sensation we have of the actuality of the division of "time" known as the present, comes from the blurring of that momentary glimpse, or succession of glimpses, of things that our senses give us, as those things pass from the region of ideals which we call the future, to the region of memories that we name the past. (I. 37)

No less pertinent and provocative are the words of a Sage quoted in the second volume:

O present moment! Knowest thou not that thou hast no parent, nor canst thou have a child; that thou art ever begetting but thyself? ... Thus, are the Past, the Present, and the Future, the ever-living trinity in one — the Mahamaya of the Absolute IS. (II. 446)

After examining briefly the third property of man's inner clocks, the minimum perceptible duration between two excitations, Professor Cohen goes on to examine the relation between time and estimates of

distance. Experiments have revealed that not only are estimates of distances influenced by the time intervals that delimit them, but also that estimates of time are affected by distance. These effects can be considered as related to the idea of the "velocity of time" — the rate of motion with which we pass through experiences. So one realizes that time is a very unstable and unreal thing, wholly dependent on our consciousness for its existence.

In regard to the brief interval of time that can be judged accurately, referred to above, the commentary of Vyasa and the notes of W. Q. Judge on the 53rd verse of the third book of Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms are most illuminating. The verse reads:

A great and most subtle knowledge springs from the discrimination that follows upon concentration of the mind performed with regard to the relation between moments and their order.

The relevant portions of Vyasa's commentary state:

The time taken by an atom in motion in order to leave one point and reach the next point is a moment... the continuous flow of these is a sequence... days, hours, minutes are combinations of these by a mental process giving a structure which follows as a result of perceptions or of words... The sequence has its essence in an uninterrupted succession of moments. This is called time by experts in time.

W. Q. Judge writes:

Patanjali speaks of ultimate divisions of time which cannot be further divided, and of the order in which they precede and succeed each other. It is asserted that a perception of these minute periods can be acquired, and the result will be that he who discriminates thus goes on to greater and wider perception of principles in nature which are so recondite that modern philosophy does not even know of their existence.

The faculty of knowing the ultimate divisions of time has been acquired by the Elder Brothers of Humanity, who are endowed with power over space, time, mind and matter. Their work is to preserve the true philosophy, and they need the help of companions to rediscover and promulgate it.

The concluding portion of John Cohen's article deals with the concept of the future. The entire psychic life of human beings is permeated with the thoughts of things to come, with premonitions, anticipations

and hopes for the future. The author mentions two characteristics of thoughts about futureness. First, one's orientation toward future events is often characterized by a "gradient of tension"; the heart beats faster as the clock emphasizes that a fateful moment draws near. Second, there is a sense in which one's psychological future mirrors one's subjective past; in this sense, "the further ahead one looks, the more the vision of a millennium resembles the golden age of the mythical past."

The waggish words of Shakespeare's Rosalind (*As You Like It*, Act III, Scene 2) are full of import:

Time travels in divers paces with divers persons. I will tell you who time ambles withal, who time trots withal, who time gallops withal, and who he stands still withal.

She goes on to say that time "trots hard with a young maid between the contract of her marriage and the day it is solemnized." Time ambles with a priest "lacking the burden of lean and wasteful learning" and also with a rich man "knowing no burden of heavy tedious penury." Time gallops "with a thief to the gallows," and it stays still "with lawyers in a vacation; for they sleep between term and term, and then they perceive not how time moves." All this pertains to the memory aspect of the function of time, considered above.

The perusal of the eternal ideas herein set forth might induce a reader to ask: "What does it matter if Kronos mutilates Uranus, or if Kala leads to Yama; if knowledge and memory and the loss of both come from Krishna; if moments and their sequence produce the illusions of past, present and future. Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." Such are really and truly caught in the webs of delusion!

To these we say: "Beware! you are under the great illusion that you are as an individual distinct from others. This attitude of separateness will make of you 'the playground of Samvritti, origin of all the world's delusions.'"

Is there no hope? Yes, there is. And that is the overcoming of the illusions of life, including that of time, by concentrating attention on the "beginningless and endless WHOLE, or that which ever was, is, and will be."

ACCURACY

If, as Theosophy teaches, the Universe is built on the laws of mathematics — geometry according to Plato, numbers according to Pythagoras — then all of us have the task of realizing the ramifications of this idea in our lives.

How can we do this so that we can “get all our sums right and make our buildings stable in life?” One way has been shown to us in Theosophical literature, that is, to be accurate in all we do or say.

What is accuracy? It is doing all things at the right time, at the right place, and without being anxious as to the results. These three conditions are inseparable. Jesus asked us to “render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s and unto God the things that are God’s.” Shakespeare said that “there is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.” If we use these principles, all will be well; if not, all will not be well. *Ecclesiastes*, Chapter I, tells us: “To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven.” Emerson tells us that if we do not pay the right price then we do not get the thing we want but get something else. He also says that “the beautiful laws of time and space once dislocated by our inaptitudes are holes and dens.” Therefore anything not done at the right time, in the right place, and in the right manner disturbs the harmony of Nature.

Though we often do not realize it, punctuality in all things does not merely deal with the time element but has its root in accuracy.

These ideas have become so familiar to us as words that we think of them as trite sayings and do not pay enough attention to them in daily life. Nor do we realize sufficiently that we are creatures of habit, and therefore if we make a habit of accuracy in thought, word and deed, we shall become accurate; if we make a habit of punctuality we shall become punctual; if we make a habit of harmonious and impersonal motives we shall in time attain to this end.

Let us look at truthfulness as accuracy. Do we systematically ask ourselves what is the truth in this or that circumstance? Do we wonder in our minds whether in such-and-such conditions we can tell an untruth? Do we realize that even a “white lie” is a breakage of universal law? Do we say, “Oh, in this case, for the sake of another, I will speak an untruth and will take the effect on myself”? How foolish we are! We must take the consequences, whether we will or not, but do we know what those consequences are going to be? If we lie, thinking that by so doing we

are helping another, have we in fact helped him? Can a good effect come from a bad cause? Will not that person have to meet the same conditions again?

As in all things there are further sides to this question, for the spiritual life is a paradox. Our work is to obey the highest we know while accepting the fact that others may work according to other ramifications of the law.

Accuracy is the opposite of carelessness, inattention, slovenliness, untidiness, unpunctuality and wrong motives. It can be practised in everything in our daily life, for not only is nothing in the daily routine unimportant, but this is the field where we create and meet Karma.

Accuracy is the opposite of criticism and more in line with discrimination. Criticism is personal in most cases, in terms of one's own ideas and background. Discrimination is impersonal and in terms of judgment according to law. Criticism should only be applied to our own characters and ideas — the beam in our own eye — while discrimination should be used in reference to the actions or ideas of others.

Accuracy leads to the development of that central point of consciousness which is the beginning of true self-consciousness.

How are you to see into a virtuous soul and know its loveliness?

Withdraw into yourself and look. And if you do not find yourself beautiful yet, act as does the creator of a statue that is to be made beautiful: he cuts away here, he smooths there, he makes this line lighter, this other purer, until a lovely face has grown upon his work. So do you also: cut away all that is excessive, straighten all that is crooked, bring light to all that is overcast, labour to make all one glow of beauty and never cease chiselling your statue, until there shall shine out on you from it the godlike splendour of virtue, until you shall see the perfect goodness surely established in the stainless shrine.

—PLOTINUS

REFLECTIONS ON "THE SECRET DOCTRINE"

VII

The Universe is worked and *guided* from *within outwards*. As above so it is below, as in heaven so on earth; and man — the microcosm and miniature copy of the macrocosm — is the living witness to this Universal Law and to the mode of its action.

—*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 274

By the study of this law of the inner unfolding outward, we might begin to penetrate the seeming chaos of daily life, and see order where we once saw only confusion.

By a gradual forgoing of personal pleasures, ambitions, and pursuits, we may cause to arise within our life a stillness, a place from which to watch. We might begin to experience a kind of neutrality in which we see the whole world as if it were unfolding inside ourself. And with this, who knows but that the without becomes the within, and that the boundary of responsibility is drawn by the width of our perception?

For, if *The Secret Doctrine* is a mirror held up to the inner side of life, then its proof or disproof must lie within. That is, we can plumb its depths only by that assimilation which habitual study brings about, and by the effort to exemplify that which the study has revealed. Since the results of each person's study are patterned by the nature of his particular needs, the yardstick by which to judge and the act of judgment are both within our consciousness.

The test of excellence within our experiment is how devoted we have been in relation to what we understand by the word devotion. For who can decide whether our waking hours have been absorbed in Theosophical endeavour but ourselves? Who can tell but we ourselves how well we have held the line we set out upon, what has been remembered and what forgot?

Of course, one might object that all this is too utopian; that we must go to the grocery, or wash dishes, or care for the children, and therefore cannot really absorb our consciousness in making Theosophy come alive in men's minds.

But is this objection as real as it seems? After all, a traveller renders to his vehicle the attention it needs, but he does not lose the remembrance of where his journey tends. He does not become hypnotized by the relative freedom or restriction of his situation, for these apply to appearance and not to our perception. For if the experiment of ab-

sorbing our consciousness into the stream of Theosophy is not built on appearance, then we can take the neutral attitude of the "Watcher" or the "One who waits." The freedom of our lifetime's meditation cannot be taken from us by the ebb and flow of circumstance. We, in a life surrounded by restrictions, might well say to ourselves, "This distraction and confinement of circumstance is the outer effect of an earlier line of consciousness, the outcome of my own self-devised and self-chosen seed of thought."

If we begin to accept responsibility for everything that occurs in the sphere of our perception, regardless of who is the instrumental cause; if we can begin to act upon the hypothesis that we are responsible for all the good and evil that travels into our life, then we may begin to recognize and reconnect with our past. Who knows but that Nature, in her cyclic wisdom, is repaying us visibly for that which we ourselves have sown at another time? If so, then we might consider that this mirror always holds before us an opportunity to expand our understanding, and this despite the pain or pleasure it may present.

By working on the idea that the world which we perceive is our own self-chosen problem simply because we perceive it, lines of cause and effect can be brought together and can begin to give vision to the mind, convincing the reason and warming our enthusiasm so that our effort becomes firm and steady despite the wax and wane of outer effects. By a disinterested effort to assimilate the stream of consciousness which *The Secret Doctrine* presents, we build that fire within the mind which will consume the personal life, using it as fuel for growth. Yet it would seem that this becomes possible only when we approach *The Secret Doctrine* in a neutral and ungrasping sort of way, with no preconceptions of what, how much, or when our effort will mature. In fact, it may well be that a kind of destruction of old mental habits and thought patterns has to occur before we can see in *The Secret Doctrine* anything but a typographical nightmare — and a boring one at that!

With time, its study might lead to our acceptance of everyday problems as illustrations of our past. It might convince us that injustice is a problem whose key lies within rather than without; and thus we might abandon value-judgments as unworthy of our stretch in the crucible of incarnation. We might begin to grasp more surely the idea that we are the microcosm of the macrocosm, and therefore can grasp the truth of an idea subjectively before we can analyse or expound it. We might come gradually to see that an imposing barrier to

our ability to understand a spiritual teaching and transmute that understanding into service is our identification with our body, its senses, and personality. We might begin to see that most of what we once thought was knowledge is not now worth pursuing, and that much of what we have acquired is so much extra luggage.

This last idea might be applied to Thoreau, for he was one who saw how ridiculous we become in overburdening ourselves with possessions; and he was much too subtle to limit this idea to wealth alone, but realized that it could run on into the realm of the intellect where men so load themselves with polish that they lose the concept of devotion. They are brilliant and overwhelming on the surface, but lack depth and are unable to inspire and feed the growth of others. The fire of intuition, on the other hand, may well transcend any one individual and spread to others because it transcends the perishable quaternary and belongs to a plane where all are One. The kind of depth which makes it possible for us to awaken along these more universal lines of thought leads us to a philosophy that will turn to bread upon assimilation rather than stone.

One of the reasons Thoreau thought highly of the Upanishads might be traced to his recognition that Self-knowledge is a primary quest of man. Possibly the pain of some earlier life had whittled away his ability to be entranced by the visible, for he took the time to see what inner light there might be within, what life might be unfolding there. Maybe it was this that led him to the Upanishads as an encouraging voice from the outside world; a voice that did not say "follow us" but "follow your Self"; a teaching that upheld the dignity of man as the microcosm or miniature of the Universe — the point from which all points are known.

The dignity of man and the importance of self-knowledge shine from the Upanishads in a thousand ways. In fact, we might say that the nuance of this idea enveloping the Upanishads like some great overtone convinces our mind more surely than any of its specifics. The following passage and commentary from the *Chhandogya Upanishad* seem to bear a strong sense of this overtone:

That which is the subtle essence (the root of all) this whole world has for its self. That is the true. That is the self. That art thou. . . .

Tat tvam asi: that art thou. This famous text emphasizes the divine nature of the human soul, the need to discriminate between

the essential self and the accidents with which it is confused and the fetters by which it is bound. He who knows only what is of the body or mind knows the things that may be his but not himself. The text "That art thou" applies to the inward person, *antah purusha*, and not to the empirical soul with its name and family descent. . . .

Rangaramanuja interprets *tat tvam asi* as affirming that the principle of God is common to both the universe and the individual. *That* means God having the entire universe as his body, *thou* means God having the individual soul as his body. The principle of God is common to both.

In the *Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana* (III. 14. 1-5) when the deceased reaches the Sun-door, the question is asked, Who art thou? If he answers by a personal or a family name, he is subject to the law of karma. If he responds "Who I am is the light thou art. As such have I come to thee, the heavenly light," *Prajapati* replies: "Who thou art, that same am I; who I am that same art thou. Enter in." (RADHAKRISHNAN: *The Principal Upanishads*, pp. 458-59)

Of the relation between the intellect and the heart there is an interesting story. Narada approached Sanatkumara and said, "Teach me, Venerable Sir" — to which he was answered: "Come . . . tell me what you know. Then I will teach you what is beyond that."

The story is introduced to show that the supreme good cannot be accomplished without a knowledge of the Self.

Narada is he who gives the knowledge of the Supreme Self. . . . *Sanatkumara* is represented in Indian tradition as the eternal child. *Brahma-vaivarta Purana* makes out that he is eternally a child of five years, who did not undergo the usual *samskaras*, a pupil of the very God, *Narayana*. . . .

Harivamsa confirms this view. "Know me only to be a child just as I was born and so the name *Sanatkumara* was given to me." The learned Narada goes to the unlearned Sanatkumara for instruction. For self-realization, practice of virtue and love to all creation are necessary more than scriptural lore. *Vamana Purana* makes out that Sanatkumara is the son of virtue. . . . (*Ibid.*, p. 468)

But we might remember in considering this quotation in relation to the law of unfolding from within without, that virtue, to be real, arises from Self-knowledge; that the civic virtues can, at best, only

lead one to the cathartic virtues, which each has to recognize and implement for himself.

The six virtues furnish, so to speak, the soil, water, and heat by which Self-knowledge moves from the latent to the active and transforms the body into the "Tree of Knowledge." Especially might this be if we think of the "transforming of the body into the Tree of Knowledge" as a movement of Consciousness from one vehicle into another, so that we might come alive in a way not limited by shape, location, or time. Maybe such a possibility might be seen as man's incorporeal nature.

However, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Judge as well as H.P.B. and others make plain that we must, if this grand potential of man is to become more than a potential, begin to live for and on behalf of *everything*, except ourselves as embodied beings. It is this thinking of ourselves as if we were somebody that kills our incorporeal capacity, thus making us dead men on those levels transcending the physical body and its senses. Of course, to take up virtue as if we were striking some bargain with Nature would be useless, for an incorporeal being can no more strike a bargain than the omnipresent deity can be extra-cosmic. Thus, the attitude would impede the work and render it ineffective.

One might say that eventually we must come to the point of desiring to work for others, not to get ahead, but because we cannot think of anything else worth doing.

What renders a person incompetent on the plane of passion and desire? What is it that makes one a failure at selfishness? Maybe there are two things that happen: (1) exhaustion of the *need to know* within a plane of experience, and (2) the discovery of the Teacher. However, for us to see the inevitable character of this discovery we have to consider the idea that man is, as an inner being, a unity that transcends the multiple aspects of his nature, and also that the field of perception is a unity despite its manifold appearance. When the conditions are right the student can no more avoid discovering the Teacher than water can avoid arising as steam.

In a sense we might think of there being only One Teacher and One Way out of bondage to sentient life, and that those who serve the function of Teacher are *personifications* of the Way. We might say that they volunteer their life in a world where there is no more learning for them in order to save those whose neutrality in the world of senses brings them near the boundary line of that plane; for once the boundary of

transition arrives, we are ready to *try* to become impersonal workers for the ALL of life as if it were ourself — we are ready to sacrifice the point to the circle.

The crucifixion of the animal within may well go on long after our disillusionment and divorce from the obvious selfishness and evanescence of everyday life, for no sooner do we begin to *test* our desire to help mankind than we realize how deep and hidden are many things in ourselves which are pernicious to the development of others. For instance, two aspects of separatism that often go along with a superficial shine of altruism are pride and ambition. It would seem that there is nothing quite so enticing to our sense of progress as to be more unselfish than everyone else, yet can we say that this is a forgetting of self, an erosion of that peculiar sense of being a “special being” inside a shape and form that we label “I”? Can we really make this “I” unselfish in any way other than erasing our remembrance of it? This may be akin to H.P.B.’s idea in “Occultism versus the Occult Arts”:

Let them know at once and remember always, that *true Occultism or Theosophy* is the “Great Renunciation of SELF,” unconditionally and absolutely, in thought as in action. It is ALTRUISM, and it throws him who practises it out of calculation of the ranks of the living altogether. “Not for himself, but for the world, he lives,” as soon as he has pledged himself to the work. Much is forgiven during the first years of probation. But, no sooner is he “accepted” than his personality must disappear, and he has to become *a mere beneficent force in Nature*.

It is only “with a mind clear and undarkened by personality, and an assimilation of the merit of manifold existences devoted to being in its collectivity (the whole living and sentient Universe),” that one gets rid of personal existence, merging into, becoming one with, the Absolute, and continuing in full possession of Paramartha.

—*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 54

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONERS

[Reprinted from *The Path*, Vol. X, pp. 385-87, for March 1896.—EDS.]

M.G.T.S. — Will you kindly advise me in question department, how to strike the happy medium between Egoism or Egotism and the development of inner selfhood?

Ans. — This question cannot be properly answered, because you have put an indefinite question. It is not clear what you mean by a happy medium between development and the Self or Ego. The happy medium is generally between two courses. If by Egotism you mean the personal lower self, then it is said by all sages that there is continual war between it and the Higher Self until one or the other is the victor. As also what you mean by "Inner Selfhood" is indefinite, no reply based on that term, that would be useful, could be made. But if you want to know how to make a compromise, so to say, between the lower self — for that is what I assume your terms Egoism and Egotism to mean — it can only be pointed out that there can be no such truce: if attempted it would merely mean that the lower self would remain master, and the Higher Self wait for a new and better resolution. This is the state of most people, ever compromising, always allowing the lower self to have the upper hand, forever waiting for some later day when they intend to give the Higher the reins of government — but that day will never come under such a course.

J.H.M. — On page 234 of the November issue it is stated that parentage is not merely for bringing an Ego into this life, but for wider and greater reasons. Please say what some of these reasons are.

Ans. — If it is held that parentage is only and solely for the purpose of furnishing a body for an Ego, then responsibility of parent to child is at an end, and the child also is relieved of all obligations and responsibilities to the parents. This view is held by some, and, sad to say, by some of those F.T.S.'s who follow mechanical Theosophy. To my mind it is a monstrous proposition. It would also negative the doctrine of Karma and destroy the vast and wonderful continuity of things and forces relating to the human being. The child has far-reaching karmic relations with the parents, as they also with the child. The discipline and joys that come through children are karmic on both sides. If the child is a wicked one, it is the Karma of the parents also. Again, the incoming Ego requires a certain line of family so as to get the needed sort of

body. In many and various ways, then, parentage can be seen to be more than a mere door to this plane.

B.R.C. — I am unable to lecture; I cannot write good papers, and I do not seem to learn much at branch meetings. Is it any use for me to attend them?

Ans. — It must largely depend on your motive for attendance and on your actual interest. Do you go to learn or to help? If you go to learn, it is written by H.P.B. that half a dozen people meeting regularly and working harmoniously can learn more in six months than a solitary student can in two years. If you go there to help, the answer is different. If you believe in the power of thought, any experienced lecturer will tell you what an immense help it is to have even one intelligent and sympathetic listener; you not only give him ideas but you help also the enquirers present, by your sympathetic thought, to understand what is said. Wherever you are, you are a centre of force, and it is your own fault if you are useless anywhere.

E. E. Knight. — Please inform me where I can find out about the meaning of the Society's emblem, and also about the many other signs and hieroglyphs found in our books.

Ans. — In the first volume of the *PATH* (May 1886, p. 51) you will find an article on the subject of Theosophical symbolism. But in order to find out all you want it will be necessary to wade through many books, because the subject is so large and difficult. In H.P.B.'s *Secret Doctrine* there is a great deal about symbols, and that is one of the best places to look. Your questions cover so many departments of symbolism that they could not be answered here, as proper treatment would mean the writing of a book.

—W.Q.J.

The "great" commitment all too easily obscures the "little" one. But without the humility and warmth which you have to develop...to the few with whom you are personally involved, you will never be able to do anything for the many... Love would remain powerless against the negative forces within you, if it were not tamed by the yoke of human intimacy and warmed by its tenderness.

—DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

EXTRACTS FROM UNPUBLISHED LETTERS

It is one of the tests that every one of us has to go through to see that the world is not too much with us. A new proportion between the inner and the outer is necessary as a first step so that the outer may ultimately become a reflection of the inner.

Look within, for there you are strong and resourceful. That within is apt to be forgotten, for memory is a trickster. Remember, "Thou art That." To remember that, "Let not thy senses make a playground of thy mind."

What you *need* now is regular and steadfast study and practice of the Discipline. Some of you are so immersed in the outer life and work that mind and heart get neglected. So you better give yourself a Theosophical chance of regular meditation and self-examination.

I know you will be anxious these days; this also will pass away. It is we, each one of us, who should stabilize ourselves — taking a firm position with the end in view. Live within by the aid of study, work for others, and unfold the Unity in your own heart. The United Spirit of Life which is should be recognized, be realized. This is *Metta* — Divine Impersonal Pity and Compassion.

You must seek the archetype for every typical action and thus get hold of the Law of Analogy and Correspondence. Of course it is taxing; and that is because we are surrounded by mundane vibrations of the five senses and the five organs. In the midst of illusions we are touching the Real. Every word is used both in prose and poetry; and, just as good and noble prose is poetry of its kind, so every prosaic and mundane thing has its poetic and spiritual roots.

What are the methods by which we can obtain the art of sacrifice? Now it all depends in what sense the word "sacrifice" is used. If it is used in the ordinary sense of sacrificing oneself for the good of others, then it comes in the moral sphere of action in day-to-day living. But if the word sacrifice is used in the sense of *yagna*, then it applies to every action and every deed of ours. However trivial it may be, it can be made sacramental or holy by a right kind of knowledge which is available. Spiritual knowledge can be utilized to make every act a sacred and a holy act, and the distinction between the secular and the sacred is done away with and every secular act becomes sacramental.

Let us hold on to the principle that whatever his temperament — lower psychic or higher spiritual — the probationer meets his trials and tests and stands or fails. Judge and Damodar succeeded where so many others failed. None, none can escape the “probation.”

Inner Egoic strength comes fast and strong if we study regularly and attentively. You *will* gain that strength and the balance which follows it in the course of time. Do not lose heart; be courageous and persevering.

How are you? I don't mean bodily; for, on that I do get reports. How are you within yourself? A very, very big portion of your ailment is rooted in your Kama-Manas and there no doctor, no Master, can do anything save give advice and make suggestions. You alone have to do the needful. Why not take advantage of your bodily disability and work on and with your mental attitude and outlook? Get well soon, but thoroughly well.

It is gladsome news that you have returned to your city and are eager to participate in the Work there. It is necessary, however, to note the changes in your health, and unless you are quite well and strong enough I hope you will not overdo things. Our devotion to work ought to enable us to be discriminative and to prompt us to recognize our duty to our physical body and its health, without which proper service cannot be rendered on this plane. If, therefore, in your laudable enthusiasm you feel zealous to act and to do, I hope you will check yourself and go with care and deliberation.

Pranic currents are what are absorbed by the Astral *Nadis* and *Chakras* from the Ocean of *Jiva*. They circulate in the astral body as blood circulates in the gross body. As a result of circulation these currents absorb and assimilate our thoughts and feelings as blood does our bodily food. Then animal magnetism results. *Prana* absorbed from *Jiva* is healthful; in conjunction with the prevailing thought-feeling-moods, animal magnetism is generated. It is through the last named that our “lives” go out, with our personal stamp upon them.

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

Although the mysterious force of magnetism has evaded exact measurement and explanation, experiments continue to show that it is universally operative. All living beings are affected by the earth's magnetism; all are in fact living magnets.

The movement of migratory birds and their sense of direction are now being linked to biomagnetism. Investigations of the magnetic responses in insects as well as studies of the effect of magnetic fields on the growth rates of plants show that the unseen force of magnetism cannot be ignored. Magnetic storms have coincided with a higher incidence of nervous and mental diseases. Some 40,000 cases of this nature studied over a five-year period indicate a link between geomagnetism and human behaviour. Even more significantly, variations in the natural magnetic field intensity have been related to psychiatric disturbances. Since magnetism is inseparably connected with electricity and since biological processes are now interpreted in electro-chemical terms, it is thought necessary to probe deeper into the effect of heavenly bodies on human behaviour—in the light of science and not of superstition (*The Times of India*, March 31).

The true Occultists assert that there is no phenomenon on earth entirely unconnected with magnetism and electricity. That is why we are asked to acquire an intimate and practical knowledge of these two forces. Unless we gain a familiarity with their effects in and upon Nature and man, we shall not know anything of the great phenomenon of life itself. Electricity and magnetism bind the cosmos together and in their ceaseless motion penetrate every atom in the Universe.

Professor A. R. Wadia, in his article, "On Philosophical Synthesis" (*Philosophy East and West*, Vol. XIII, No. 4), considers Indian philosophy to be markedly different from European and American philosophy; the two are rooted in different traditions and imply a different outlook on life.

Whereas philosophy in Europe, since the days of Thales in ancient Greece, has set out on an independent quest after truth, says the author, in Indian philosophy tradition has the upper hand. Proof based on authority, *i.e.*, authorized by the Vedas and the Upanishads, constitutes the logical basis of Indian philosophical systems.

Secondly, the author points out that while European philosophy has

built itself up on the foundation of the virile Græco-Roman civilization, with its sense of joy and beauty, Indian philosophy has sought the explanation of suffering, which is universal. This explanation it has found in the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation. These doctrines, which have permeated not merely the philosophy but the whole life of Indians, are, says Professor Wadia, almost completely absent from European philosophy. The concept of *Moksha* or *Mukti*, *i.e.*, freedom from further rebirths, which constitutes the crown of Indian philosophy, is also totally absent from European philosophy, for where the idea of reincarnation is not accepted, the question of *Moksha* does not arise. Indian philosophy is pragmatic in the sense that it believes that the highest knowledge is not an end in itself but a means to the end, which is *Moksha*.

In recent years, ever since Indian philosophy has come to be studied in the West, the question has arisen whether it can be reconciled with Western philosophy. Professor Wadia is of the opinion that it would be difficult to bridge the gulf between the two, for their outlook on, and approach to, philosophical problems is radically different.

He closes his article with the observation that

while Asians and Africans in the pride of their newly won freedom from the dominance of the West seem to leave the moorings of their own past, Europeans and Americans, however few they be, tired of the hurry and skurry of Western life, turn to India and China to seek that peace which has been the essence of philosophic life, whether in the East or the West. Their example may rouse the Easterners to appreciate the glory of their own philosophic thought. . . . Whether it will lead to a real logical synthesis of thought will still remain an open question.

Is there in truth such a thing as Eastern or Western philosophy? As Professor Wadia admits, such expressions logically can have no philosophical value, if by philosophy we mean a quest for truth. Truth is neither Eastern nor Western; it is universal and transcends the boundaries and limits of all schools of thought. To the extent that these share a particular truth they are synthesized. The synthesis of Eastern and Western philosophies, therefore, is not to be effected by Easterners assimilating Western ideas or *vice versa*. It is to be effected rather by men and women who adopt the attitude of intellectual universalism, who transcend the limitations of Eastern and Western thought, and who seek to join, not East and West, but truth to truth. It is a task for

truth-seekers, those who do not stop to ask where the truths were first propounded and whether they carry the Eastern or Western or any other label.

“In the Light of Theosophy” for February 1965 referred to the “new Reformation” taking shape in Christianity today. Further evidence of the searching, questing, critical spirit of the times in matters religious is provided by the recently published controversial book, *Objections to Roman Catholicism*. What is significant about it is that nearly all of it is written by lay English Roman Catholics—something that would have been inconceivable but a few years ago.

The book’s editor, Michael de la Bedoyère, writes that he is fully aware that some of the views expressed by the six contributors, two of whom are women, “will be violently criticized by many of our clergy and laity, but unless the growing number of fully educated spiritually and morally puzzled lay Catholics speak out, religion will remain cut off from the changing world in which we live.”

One of the contributors to the book, Mrs. Magdalen Goffin, writes on “Superstition and Credulity” in the Roman Catholic tradition, and one of the points she tackles is the Church’s views on Hell:

In the past all Christians believed in Hell in principle and enjoyed describing it in terms as grisly and crude as those employed by many Roman Catholics today. When enough people realized that, whatever the fate of those who repudiate God, a doctrine which implies that the Creator is less good than the creature must be false, then that doctrine has to be abandoned. Not without hesitations and quibbles, however, for the price of the abandonment was heavy.

Rome is not yet prepared to pay it. Faithful to her view of revelation, she constantly and consistently preaches what she has received. In whatever imagery it is clothed, the existence of hell is still taught as part of the Faith without accepting which no Catholic can see God—a god whom, if he believed what he was told, no one in his senses would wish to see. Nor, apart from some pitiful efforts here and there to minimize the number of the lost, has she tried to dilute its significance.

How Roman Catholicism revolves round stupidity and superstition is further illustrated by Mrs. Goffin in her criticism of the teaching about baptism. Her attack on the Church’s obsession with rules, regu-

lations and superstitious taboos reveals how credulity and superstition play upon the popular mind and lead to practices at which reason revolts.

Another objection to Roman Catholicism is discussed by Mr. John M. Todd, author and publisher, in his essay "The Worldly Church: Political Bias, Autocracy and Legalism." It is the objection that the Church, in accepting its involvement in the world, has institutionalized itself in it. "Canon Law," he writes, "has been put in the place of truth and charity of the gospel. In the place of moral conscience stand rules and ecclesiastical authority."

The influence and application of this authority is discussed by Mrs. Rosemary Haughton in her essay on "Freedom and the Individual":

Still in fashion is the habit of mind by which those in authority in the Church do not deliberately deny freedom to the laity but simply assume that it does not and cannot exist. And the laity, in large numbers, make the same assumption. . . . Intelligent response is simply not expected, mute obedience is all that is required. In the last few years I have heard with my own ears one remark from the pulpit which is not at all unusual: "When the priest speaks to you he is in the place of God. Whatever he says you must believe and obey, for it is God who speaks through him. . . ."

Another contributor to the symposium, Mr. Frank Roberts, a lecturer in education and psychology, looks in closer detail at religious education in the Catholic Church and points out that the damage done to children's minds by fostering notions of guilt and punishment at an early age may be irreparable in later life. The idea of Confession as a means of correction, the belief that the nature of punishment is that of retaliation and that God "pays one back" for sin, instilled from early childhood, characterizes the Catholic's religion for the rest of his life. Mr. Roberts considers this to be a puerile attitude, one which is "least suited to any spiritual crisis" and which "hinders the development of the kind of Christianity which trains men to be a leaven in society."

Have the true teachings of Jesus the Christ any place in the elaborate structure of the Roman Catholic Church? The Editor's Note in the Correspondence columns of H.P.B.'s *Lucifer* for June 1888 states:

As to the *rules of life* taught by Jesus, if the Roman Church had ever accepted them, surely she would never have invented the infamy called the Inquisition; nor would she have slaughtered, in her religious fury and in the name of her God, nearly 50,000,000

of human creatures ("heretics") since she came to power. As to her *rules* and ethics, she may *pretend* to teach people to "forgive their enemies from their hearts," but she takes good care never to do so herself. Nor can Christian endurance or "renunciation of self" ever reach the grandeur in practice of the Buddhist and Hindu devotee. This is matter of history too. Meanwhile, "God the Father," if this person could be conveniently consulted, would surely prefer a little less "lip-love" for himself, and a little more heartfelt sympathy for Humanity in general, and its suffering hosts in particular. "Little Sisters" and Big "Christian Brothers" do frequently more mischief than good, especially the "Nursing Sisters," as some recent cases can show.

The quest for happiness is eternal. But what is happiness? What are its essentials? In a broadcast on "Viewpoints of Happiness" from the Delhi station of All India Radio (*Akashvani*, March 28), the problem was discussed by a man and a woman — both qualified to speak — from their respective points of view.

Shri Khushwant Singh pointed out in his talk that the first impact of any triumph, like success in an examination or in the field of sport or on a public platform, was exhilarating; such triumph gave one a certain amount of pleasure, but it passed too quickly and the word happiness could not be used for such exhilaration which depended on other people's reactions. Happiness must arise from within oneself and must be more than a mood of exhilaration produced by worldly success.

The speaker also countered the view that happiness is the feeling of being in love. "Happiness," he said, "should not be dependent on another person, however perfect; it is not a chela-guru relationship. *Nirmoha*—detachment, at least to other human beings, is an essential prerequisite of happiness."

What then is happiness? According to Shri Khushwant Singh, it is realized in those experiences which, when one tries to summon up memories of bygone days, flash upon the inward eye and become the bliss of solitude; they are the reservoir from which one draws the nectar of life. Happiness thus "is the state of mind in which a person finds himself in tune with the world about him."

Dr. Kapila Vatsyayan, speaking from a woman's viewpoint, drew a distinction between a man's and a woman's attitude to life. A woman, she believes, has more of the quality of "otherness" or "unself-consciousness"—that is, the capacity to forget herself in her attempt

to please others. Such unself-consciousness, Dr. Vatsyayan said, was the essence of happiness. The really happy person is he who is not searching for happiness. The forgetting of oneself to reach out is not easy for those who have to strive for it.

Love, not as mere attachment but in its higher aspect, unites and brings about release from self-consciousness; it makes one forget oneself. The yogi seeks such release through transcendence of self in love for or identification with the All.

In our society the essential question, "What is Happiness?" or "What is Love?" is evaded. Love and happiness, according to Dr. Vatsyayan, are also Truth, and truth is found in suffering as well. In Mary Webb's words, "the springs of joy" are only to be found "in pain's deep forest where sweet love is planted." One has to experience this to believe it.

In the higher phases of Bliss, indeed, pain and pleasure become one feeling. The "Path of Woe" accepted by the great Buddhas of Compassion who sacrifice themselves for the sake of others is also the Path of Happiness.

This magazine has often drawn attention to the perils of pesticides. An instance of what a vicious chain man's thoughtlessness starts is provided by the finding of the United States Department of the Interior that penguins and seals in the remote Antarctic have minute quantities of DDT in their bodies (*The Times of India*, April 16). How animals that spend their entire lives thousands of miles away from human civilization could get contaminated by man-made pesticides is now explained by experts on the basis that DDT has entered the "aquatic food chain."

The chain begins with the microscopic plants and organisms of the oceans known as plankton, and ultimately travels to the shrimp and fish on which the Antarctic animals feed. Marine organisms taking up DDT and other pesticides washed by rivers often concentrate the poison many times over. One study showed that oysters accumulated DDT residues 70,000 times the amount of the pesticide found in their immediate environment. The smaller fish are eaten by the larger fish which in turn are eaten by a big bird like the sea-hawk. Largely due to poisoning by pesticides, the sea-hawks on the American east coast have almost become extinct. Even the creatures of the Antarctic are now threatened by the indiscriminate use of pesticides.
