

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

# THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. XXXVI. No. 7

17th May 1966

## MIND—TEMPTER AND REDEEMER

It stands proven that Satan, or the Red *Fiery* Dragon, the “Lord of Phosphorus” . . . and *Lucifer*, or “Light-Bearer,” is in us: it is our *Mind* — our tempter and Redeemer, our intelligent liberator and Saviour from pure animalism. Without this principle — the emanation of the very essence of the pure divine principle *Mahat* (Intelligence), which radiates direct from the *Divine mind* — we would be surely no better than animals.

—*The Secret Doctrine*, II. 513

Students of Plato have learnt to look upon Ideas as substantial spiritual entities, dynamic and potent. These Ideas live and breathe and influence, and are veritable Intelligences. Sometimes each idea is pictured as a radiant and shining god, a *deva*. They are collectively *Ishwara*, the Logos.

Theosophy as a Philosophy is idealistic; *i.e.*, it gives to Ideas the important role of creators of all forms. Every event in the world of the senses is but a projection of the mind which ideates images. Historical events and human experiences, races and nations of men, as well as families composed of individuals — all are manifestations of Ideas, divine and human. Immortal Ideas are ancient, constant, consistent and eternal. Collectively, these Living Ideas form the complete Wisdom-Religion or Theosophy.

The universal ideation which is latent in the unmanifested Logos becomes Spirit in the manifested, and, from this, *Manas*, the mind in man, is born. This *Manas*, higher *Manas* as it is called, reflects itself in man and thus produces the lower or incarnated *Manas*. Our object as human beings is to obtain knowledge of the world about us in terms of, or in the light of, the higher *Manas* (a portion or ray of the universal mind). This we cannot do as long as the lower mind is in the condition

it is with most of us. In the average man or woman it is so mixed with kamic elements that so-called thinking is really approaching every object or subject with thought and feeling inextricably intertangled. Yet the two must be separated and the lower mind must become capable of reflecting the higher mind, mirroring it while still in contact with the emotions and the body.

As a Soul each is the moulder of his mind; as a person wearing a body each reflects the activities of his mind, limited and coloured and tarnished by sensuous living very often, but in that body he can and should reflect the lofty ideation and pure imagination of the Soul. The Soul, the self-conscious Thinker, is composed of the very essence of pure knowledge and of true compassion. Its powers to teach and nourish its organ, the mind, should be used; to use them we need some knowledge of man's constitution, of his capacities and of the relationship between soul and mind. But human beings are engrossed, and at the present stage of evolution are taught to engross themselves, in sensuous activities, and so a false value is assigned to the body of senses and organs. The body is not the *summum bonum*, as taught by the materialist, nor is it *maya*, as understood by the false ascetic.

That portion of the mind which has sprung from the sensorium is the slayer of the Real, and the disciple is called upon to slay the slayer. If we analyse, we find that it is not the objects of sense that distract us, but our reactions to those objects. It is not the registering of the phenomena reported by the senses, but attending to the inclinations of the senses that leads by gradual stages to loss of memory and of discrimination. The influences that throw thought into confusion will be found rooted, almost without exception, in personal desires, in selfish likes and dislikes: I see, I like, I want; or, I see, I do not like, I want to avoid this, that or the other object or circumstance. And the personal nature, which should be the servant of the mind, enlists instead the help of its too indulgent master to get this or avert that. The great majority of our thoughts arise out of the multiplicity of personal desires and are concerned with petty interests quite foreign to the permanent aspect of human nature. What wonder that in most men the sea of thought is choppy, the mind ruffled?

The other superior portion of the mind is akin to the Soul — the provider of Light when it is permitted to perform its real function. This Light can be kindled when an attempt is earnestly made to control the sensorium and to purify it, and when the sensuous mind is presented

with the truths about the Higher Mind.

In his *Crest-Jewel of Wisdom* Shankaracharya succinctly puts forward this teaching about the two minds and also about the two aspects of the mind with which each of us has to deal:

Mind is the cause of man's bondage, and in turn of his liberation. When darkened by the powers of passion it is the cause of bondage, and the cause of liberation when pure of passion and darkness.

Mind is the name of the mighty tiger that hunts in the forest glades of sensuous things; let not the wise go thither, who seek liberation.

And again the intimate relation between the soul-mind and the Soul is thus set forth:

This, formed of higher intelligence, is the light that shines in the vital breaths — the pranic currents — and the heart. The Self who stands for ever wears this vesture called *Vignanamāya Kosha* as actor and experiencer.

There is nothing which helps the purification of the lower mind, saturating it with the Light of the higher, as dwelling on the great metaphysical and philosophical concepts in which are rooted the precepts of all the world's great Teachers. But, unless the study of philosophy and metaphysics is related to the problems of daily existence, it remains unpractical. The great philosophy of the impersonal offers clues and keys to every person to better himself.

In the light of this study we come to see that the root cause of all that agitates the mind is selfishness. Because we live personally in the world of personalities we see the cause of our troubles, worries and limitations in other personalities. It is unselfishness — the thoughts and aspirations that transcend the petty concerns of the personality — that quiets the ruffled mind and makes it a clear reflecting pool. And it is Selflessness that characterizes the Perfected Man, whose mind, "like a becalmed and boundless ocean, spreadeth out in shoreless space." When this stage is reached, the higher and lower *Manas* become united once more and the incarnated man comes to be *en rapport* with the Universal Mind.

---

# THE ORIGINAL PURPOSES AND AIMS

## II

[This is the second part of a manuscript article by H. P. Blavatsky, reprinted, in somewhat condensed form, from *The Theosophist* of August 1931. It was written, in 1886, in response to harsh criticism of the Theosophical Society and its President, Colonel H. S. Olcott, by two prominent theosophists, Mohini M. Chatterji and Arthur Gebhard. The first part appeared in our April issue.—EDS.]

The undersigned is an ever patient theosophist, who has hitherto laboured under the impression that no amount of subtle scholasticism and tortured casuistry but would find like the Rosetta stone its Champollion — some day. The most acute among theosophists are now invited to make out in “A Few Words” what the writers or writer is driving at, unless, in plain and unvarnished language, it be — “Down with the Theosophical Society, President-Founder and its Head-Quarters!” This is the only possible explanation of the twelve pages of denunciations to which a reply is now attempted. What can indeed be made out of the following jumble of contradictory statements:

(a) The President-Founder having been shown throughout as a “tyrant,” a “*would-be* Cæsar,” “aiming at *papal* power” and a “Venetian Council of Three,” and other words to that effect implied in almost every sentence of the paper under review, it is confessed in the same breath that the “London Lodge of the Theosophical Society has *completely* ignored the *Rules* (of the Pope Cæsar) published at Adyar!” (p. 4). And yet, the “L.L. of the T.S.” still lives and breathes and one has heard of no *anathema* pronounced against it, so far. . . .

(b) Rule xiv stating that the Society has “to deal *only* with scientific and philosophical subjects,” hence, “it is quite *evident*[?] that the power and position claimed in the *Rules* for the President-Founder and the Gen. Council and Convention are opposed to the spirit of the declared Objects.”

It might have been as well perhaps to quote the entire paragraph in which these words appear,<sup>1</sup> once that hairs are split about the possibly

---

<sup>1</sup> “XIV. The Society having to deal only with scientific and philosophical subjects, and having Branches in different parts of the world under various forms of Government, does not permit its members, as such, to interfere with politics, and repudiates any attempt on the part of anyone to commit it in favour of or against any political party or measure. Violation of this rule will meet with expulsion.” This rather alters the complexion put on

faulty reaction of the *Rules*. Is it not self-evident that the words brought forward, "only with scientific and philosophical subjects," are inserted as a necessary caution to *true* theosophists, who by dealing with politics *within* any Branch Society might bring disgrace and ruin on the whole body — in India to begin with? Has the Society or has it not over 140 Societies scattered through the four parts of the world to take care of? As in the case of "Mahatmas" and "Mahatmaship," active work of the Theosophical Society is confused — willingly or otherwise, it is not for the writer to decide — with Theosophy. No need of entering here upon the difference between the jar that contains a liquid and the nature of, or that liquid itself.

"Theosophy teaches *self-culture* . . . and not control," we are told. Theosophy teaches *mutual-culture* before *self-culture* to *begin* with. Union is strength. It is by gathering many theosophists of the same way of thinking into one or more groups, and making them closely united by the same magnetic bond of fraternal unity and sympathy, that the objects of *mutual* development and progress in Theosophical thought may be best achieved. "Self-culture" is for isolated *Hatha Yogis*, independent of any Society and having to avoid association with human beings; and this is a *triply distilled* SELFISHNESS. For real moral advancement — there "where two or three are gathered" in the name of the SPIRIT OF TRUTH — there that Spirit or Theosophy *will be in the midst of them*.

To say that theosophy has no need of a Society — a vehicle and centre thereof — is like affirming that the Wisdom of the Ages collected in thousands of volumes at the British Museum has no need of either the edifice that contains it or the works in which it is found. Why not advise the British Government on its lack of discrimination and its *worldliness* in not destroying the Museum and all its vehicles of Wisdom? Why spend such sums of money and pay so many officers to watch over its treasures, the more so, since many of its guardians may be quite out of keeping with and opposed to the Spirit of that Wisdom? The Directors of such Museums may or may not be very perfect men, and some of their assistants may have never opened a philosophical work; yet, it is they who take care of the library and preserve it for future generations who are indirectly entitled to their thanks. How much more gratitude is due to those who, like our self-sacrificing theosophists at Adyar, devote their

---

the charge, which seems to conveniently forget that "scientific and philosophical subjects" are not the *only* declared objects of the Society. Let us not leave room for a doubt that there is more *animus* underlying the charges than would be strictly *theosophical*.

lives and give their services gratuitously to the good of Humanity! . . .

To continue: the charges wind up with the following remarks, so profound, that it requires a deeper head than ours to fathom all that underlies the words contained in them. "Is the T.S. a Brotherhood or not?" queries the plaintiff — "If the former, is it possible to have any *centre of arbitrary power?*<sup>2</sup> To hold that there is necessity for such a centre is only a roundabout way of saying that no Brotherhood is possible,<sup>3</sup> but in point of fact *that necessity itself is by no means* proved [! ?]. There have been no doubt Brotherhoods under high Masters" [there "have been" and *still are* — H.P.B.] "but in such cases the Masters were never elected for *geographical* or other considerations [?]. The natural leader of men was always recognized by his embodying the spirit of Humanity. To institute comparisons would be little short of blasphemy. The greatest among men is always the readiest to serve and yet is unconscious of the service. Let us pause before finally tying the millstone of worldliness around the neck of Theosophy. Let us not forget that Theosophy does not grow in our midst *by force and control* but by the *sunshine of brotherliness* and the *dew of self-oblivion*. If we do not believe in Brotherhood and Truth let us put ashes on our head and *weep in sackcloth* and not rejoice in the purple of authority and in the festive garments of pride and worldliness. It is by far better that the name of Theosophy should never be heard, than that it should be used as the Motto of a *papal authority*."

Who, upon reading this, and being ignorant that the above piece of rhetorical flowers of speech is directed against the luckless President-Founder, would not have in his "mind's eye" an Alexander Borgia, a Caligula, or to say the least — General Booth in his latest metamorphosis! When, how, or by doing what, has our good-natured, unselfish, ever kind President merited such a Ciceronian tirade? The state of things denounced has existed now for almost twelve years, and our accuser knew of it and even took an active part in its organization, Conventions, Councils, Rules, etc., etc., at Bombay, and at Adyar. This virulent *sortie* is no doubt due to "SELF-CULTURE"! The critic has outgrown the Movement and turned his face from the original programme; hence his severity. But where is the *true theosophical charity*, the tolerance and the "*sunshine of brotherliness*" just spoken of, and so insisted upon?

---

<sup>2</sup> It is the *first time* since the T.S. exists that such an accusation of "*arbitrary power*" is brought forward. Not many will be found of this way of thinking.

<sup>3</sup> No need taking a *roundabout* way, to say that no Brotherhood would ever be possible if many theosophists shared the very original views of the writer.

Verily — it is easy to preach the “dew of self-oblivion” when one has nothing to think about except to evolve such finely rounded phrases; were every theosophist at Adyar to have his daily wants and even comforts, his board, lodging and all, attended to by a wealthier theosophist, and were the same “sunshine of brotherliness” to be poured upon him, as it is upon the critic who found for himself an endless brotherly care, a fraternal and self-sacrificing devotion in two other noble-minded members, then would there be little need for the President-Founder to call upon and humble himself before our theosophists. For, if he has to *beg* for 2 annual shillings, it is in order that those — Europeans and Hindus — who work night and day at Adyar, giving their services free and receiving little thanks or honour for it, should have at least *one meal a day*. The fresh “dew of *self-oblivion*” must not be permitted to chill one’s heart, and turn into the lethal *mould of forgetfulness* to such an extent as that. The severe critic seems to have lost sight of the fact that for months, during the last crisis, the whole staff of our devoted Adyar officers, from the President down to the youngest brother in the office, have lived on *5d.* a day each, having reduced their meals to the *minimum*. And it is *this mite*, the proceeds of the “2 shilling contribution,” conscientiously paid by some, that is now called *extortion*, a desire to live “in the purple of authority and the festive garments of pride and worldliness”!

Our “Brother” is right. Let us “weep in sackcloth and ashes on our head” if the T.S. has many more such *unbrotherly* criticisms to bear. Truly “it would be far better that the name of Theosophy should never be heard than that it should be used as a motto” — not of *papal authority* which exists nowhere at Adyar, outside the critic’s imagination — but as a motto of a “self-developed fanaticism.” All the great services otherwise rendered to the Society, all the noble work done by the complainant, will pale and vanish before such an appearance of cold-heartedness. Surely he cannot desire the *annihilation* of the Society? And if he did it would be useless: the T.S. *cannot be destroyed as a body*. It is not in the power of either Founders or their critics; and neither friend nor enemy can ruin that which is *doomed to exist*, all the blunders of its leaders notwithstanding. That which was generated through and founded by the “High Masters” and under their authority if not their instruction — *MUST AND WILL LIVE*. Each of us and all will receive his or her *karma* in it, but the *vehicle* of Theosophy will stand indestructible and undestroyed by the hand of whether man or fiend.

No; “truth does not depend on show of hands”; but in the case of the much abused President-Founder it must depend on the show of

*facts*. Thorny and full of pitfalls was the steep path he had to climb up alone and unaided for the first years. Terrible was the opposition from outside the Society he had to build; sickening and disheartening the treachery he often encountered within the Headquarters. Enemies around gnashing their teeth in his face, those whom he regarded as his staunchest friends and co-workers betraying him and the Cause on the slightest provocation. Still, where hundreds in his place would have collapsed and given up the whole undertaking in despair, he, unmoved and unmovable, went on climbing up and toiling as before, unrelenting and undismayed, supported by that one thought and conviction that he was doing his duty. What other inducement has the Founder ever had, but his theosophical pledge and the sense of his duty toward THOSE he had promised to serve to the end of his life? There was but one beacon for him — the hand that had first pointed to him his way up: the hand of the MASTER he loves and reveres so well, and serves so devotedly though occasionally, perhaps, unwisely. As President elected for life, he has nevertheless offered more than once to resign in favour of anyone found worthier than him, but was never permitted to do so by the majority — not by “show of hands” but by *show of hearts*, literally — as few are more beloved than he is even by most of those who may criticize occasionally his actions. And this is only natural: for, cleverer in administrative capacities, more learned in philosophy, subtler in casuistry, in metaphysics or daily life policy, there may be many around him; but the whole globe may be searched through and through and no one found stauncher to his friends, truer to his word, or more devoted to real, practical theosophy, than the President-Founder; and these are the chief requisites in a leader of such a movement — one that aims to become a Brotherhood of men. The Society needs no Loyolas; it has to shun anything approaching casuistry; nor ought we to tolerate too subtle casuists. There, where every individual has to work out his own Karma, the judgment of a casuist who takes upon himself the duty of pronouncing upon the state of a brother’s soul, or of guiding his conscience, is of no use, and may become positively injurious. The Founder claims no more rights than everyone else in the Society: the *right of private judgment*, which, whenever it is found to disagree with Branches or individuals, is quietly set aside and *ignored* — *as shown by the complainants themselves*. . . .

“Theosophy first, and organization after.” Golden words, these. But where would Theosophy be heard of now, had not its Society been organized before its spirit and a desire for it had permeated the whole world? And would Vedanta and other Hindu philosophies have been

ever taught and studied in England outside the walls of Oxford and Cambridge, had it not been for that organization that fished them like forgotten pearls out of the Ocean of Oblivion and Ignorance and brought them forward before the profane world? Nay, kind Brothers and critics, would the Hindu exponents of that sublime philosophy themselves have ever been known outside the walls of Calcutta, had not the Founders, obedient to the ORDERS received, forced the remarkable learning and philosophy of those exponents upon the recognition of the two most civilized and cultured centres of Europe — London and Paris?

Verily it is easier *to destroy* than to build. The words “untheosophical” and “unbrotherly” are ever ringing in our ears; yet, truly theosophical acts and words are not to be found in too unreasonable a superabundance among those who use the reproof the oftener. However insignificant, and however *limited the line* of good deeds, the latter will have always more weight than empty and vainglorious talk, and will be *theosophy*, whereas theories without any practical realization are at best philosophy. Theosophy is an all-embracing Science; many are the ways leading to it, as numerous in fact as its definitions, which began by the sublime, during the day of Ammonius Saccas, and ended by the ridiculous — in Webster’s Dictionary. There is no reason why our critics should claim the right for themselves alone to *know* what is theosophy and to define it. There were theosophists and Theosophical Schools for the last 2,000 years, from Plato down to the mediæval Alchemists, who knew the value of the term, it may be supposed. Therefore, when we are told that “the question is not whether the T.S. *is doing good*, but whether it is doing *that kind of good which is entitled to the name of Theosophy*” — we turn round and ask: “And who is to be the judge in this mooted question?” We have heard of one of the greatest Theosophists that ever lived, who assured his audience that whosoever *gave a cup of cold water to a little one* in his (Theosophy’s) name, would have a greater reward than all the learned Scribes and Pharisees. “Woe to the world because of offences!”

Belief in the Masters was never made an article of faith in the T.S. But, for its Founders, the commands received from Them when it was established have ever been sacred. And this is what one of Them wrote in a letter preserved to this day<sup>4</sup>:

<sup>4</sup> In the *Lucifer* article, “Some Words on Daily Life” (reprinted in *U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 22*), this letter is printed with some changes of wording. The text followed here is that used by H.P.B. in her manuscript of the present article.—EDS., THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

Theosophy must not represent merely a collection of moral verities, a bundle of metaphysical Ethics epitomized in theoretical dissertations. Theosophy must be made practical, and has, therefore, to be disencumbered of useless discussion. . . . It has to find objective expression in an all-embracing code of life thoroughly impregnated with its spirit — the spirit of mutual tolerance, charity and love. Its followers have to set the example of a firmly outlined and as firmly applied morality before they get the right to point out, even in a spirit of kindness, the absence of a like ethic Unity and singleness of purpose in other associations and individuals. As said before — no Theosophist should blame a brother whether within or outside of the association, throw slur upon his actions or denounce him<sup>5</sup> lest he should himself lose the right of being considered a theosophist. Ever turn away your gaze from the imperfections of your neighbour and centre rather your attention upon your own shortcomings in order to correct them and become wiser. . . . Show not the disparity between claim and action in another man but — whether he be brother or neighbour — rather help him in his arduous walk in life. . . . The problem of true theosophy and its great mission is the working out of clear, unequivocal conceptions of ethic ideas and duties which would satisfy most and best the altruistic and right feeling in us; and the modelling of these conceptions for their adaptation into such forms of daily life where they may be applied with most equitableness. . . . Such is the common work in view for all who are willing to act on these principles. It is a laborious task and will require strenuous and persevering exertion, but it must lead you insensibly to progress and leave no room for any selfish aspirations outside the limits traced. . . . Do not indulge in unbrotherly comparisons between the task accomplished by yourself and the work left undone by your neighbour or brother, in the field of Theosophy, *as none is held to weed out a larger plot of ground than his strength and capacity will permit him.* . . . Do not be too severe on the merits or demerits of one who seeks admission among your ranks, as the truth about the actual state of the inner man can only be known to, and dealt with justly by KARMA alone. Even the simple presence amidst you of a well-intentioned and sympathizing individual may help you magnetically. . . . You are the Free-workers in the Domain of Truth, and as such, must leave no obstructions on the paths leading to it. . . . [The letter closes with the following lines which have now become quite

---

<sup>5</sup> It is in consequence of this letter that Art. XII was adopted in *Rules* and a fear of lacking the charity prescribed, that led so often to neglect its enforcement.

plain, as they give the key to the whole situation] . . . *The degrees of success or failure are the landmark we shall have to follow, as they will constitute the barriers placed with your own hands between yourselves and those whom you have asked to be your teachers. The nearer your approach to the goal contemplated — the shorter the distance between the student and the Master. . . .*

A complete answer is thus found in the above lines to the paper framed by the two Theosophists. Those who are now inclined to repudiate the Hand that traced it and feel ready to turn their backs upon the whole Past and the original programme of the T.S. are at liberty to do so. The Theosophical body is neither a Church nor a Sect and every individual opinion is entitled to a hearing. A Theosophist may progress and develop, and his views may outgrow those of the Founders, grow larger and broader in every direction, without for all that abandoning the fundamental soil upon which they were born and nurtured. It is only he who changes diametrically his opinions from one day to another and shifts his devotional views from white to black, who can be hardly trusted in his remarks and actions. But surely, this can never be the case of the two Theosophists who have now been answered.

Meanwhile, peace and fraternal good will to all.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

Ostende, Oct. 3rd, 1886

Corresponding Secretary, T.S.

---

What folly to imagine that by entering any society one might make a short cut to adeptship! The weary traveller along a strange road is grateful even to find a guide-post that shows him his way to his place of destination. Our Society, if it does naught else, performs this kindly office for the searcher after Truth. And it is much.

—*The Theosophist*, January 1881

## THE CONCEPT OF TOLERANCE

Tolerance is a widely used but generally misunderstood word, believed by most people to mean simply not hurting the feelings of others, maintaining the peace at all costs, the policy of "live and let live," etc. Some think a person intolerant when he points out to others holding different views any errors of statement or fact. Quite often it is not what is said, but the tone and feeling behind what is said, that arouses antagonism. If we look at the dictionary meaning of tolerance, we find it described as "liberality towards the opinions of others." This, however, does not call for what Robert Crosbie terms "indiscriminate acceptance of everything and everyone."

We have to distinguish between two types of tolerance. The first is the false and passive tolerance involving the emotions, described by Robert Crosbie as

the attitude of "namby-pambyism" [which] is but a pseudo-tolerance. Carried to its legitimate conclusion, this false idea of "brotherhood" would signify that sin, sorrow, suffering, error, all religions and all philosophies are all right; that everyone is doing the best he can, and the best he knows how to do, and cannot do any different, and that all are steps of learning.

The other type of tolerance is the active tolerance based on knowledge and does not call for a surrender of our convictions or an indiscriminate acceptance of everything. It means simply that no one is to be condemned because of his opinions. "This tolerance does not mean 'fraternizing' with everything and everyone that demands it," as Robert Crosbie points out.

H.P.B. in her *Key to Theosophy* describes what this real tolerance is, saying that we should "*speak the truth at all costs*," if a wrong act is going to injure or endanger others; but if it only hurts the one who commits it, then it is best to remain silent and leave the erring person to his Karma. She put this principle into action when she "*spoke the truth at all costs*" in 1888, 13 years after the founding of the Theosophical Society, by calling it a "dead failure" and a "sham" so far as devotion to its objects and the attainment of brotherhood were concerned. Would we term this "unbrotherly" or "intolerant"? There are times when facts have to be pointed out, however unpleasant they may be. H.P.B. was not unbrotherly in the moral or spiritual sense because she recognized the fact and declared it. If we view this from the emotional standpoint it

would be called intolerant, but that which is true cannot be either uncharitable or intolerant.

H.P.B. further expands this idea and offers us lines of action by pointing out that there is a difference between condemning in words, which is uncharitable, and withdrawing in silent pity from the erring person, thus punishing him, but all the same giving him a chance to repent of his ways. It does not mean refusal of assistance when asked for.

There is a wide difference between speaking the truth with the right feeling, and condemnation. The truth may be spoken when we have perceived the principle involved, based on knowledge, as the correct basis for action, but this does not mean that we can sit in judgment on another. Rather, after having pointed out the truth, having judged the act and not the actor, we must leave the person to see the error of his ways. If, however, he refuses, then we have no choice but to "withdraw in silent pity," leaving him to his Karma.

Mr. Judge enlarges upon the idea of tolerance by showing that it involves both mind and heart. He explains the concept of "withdrawing" by showing that while we must practise detachment so far as our thoughts are concerned — "forgive, forgive and largely forget" — yet it does not mean that we can cast out of our heart those we have withdrawn from; it implies rather that head and heart must work together, the head becoming compassionate and not condemning, and the heart wise, and not emotional. Mr. Judge aptly points out that "men are not made into steel by comfort," and St. Paul said:

If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.

We must, therefore, re-evaluate our ideas on tolerance. We have for too long accepted false ideas without seriously questioning what is involved. The practice of real tolerance goes to the root of our conduct and our relationship with others. To understand the difference between real tolerance and pseudo-tolerance is to have grasped the distinction between the impersonal and the personal.

There is also a wider aspect to this question which we as students of Theosophy need to look into. In the world today, especially in the field of modern medicine, many practices are followed, such as blood transfusion, the injection of foreign material into the body, family planning, etc., as also alcohol drinking and addiction to one thing or another,

against all of which Theosophy takes a definite stand, for definite reasons. Are we afraid of being considered intolerant if we speak the truth in these matters? Robert Crosbie had the following to say on this very important subject:

It is the duty of esoteric students to unmask error and hypocrisy; to face lie with truth; not as *personal* criticisms but as *facts against mis-statements*. . . . Theosophy is in the world for that purpose. We are not to be self-assertive nor flabby; knowing the truth, we speak it and care only for it and that it be as widely known as possible.

H.P.B. waged a constant war against orthodoxy in religion, against materialism and bigotry in modern science, against injurious medical practices, etc. Did she stop pointing to the truth when others did not agree with her, when they ridiculed and maligned her and her Theosophical ideas? No. Had hers been an emotional and personal reaction, a pseudo-tolerant one, would she have spoken as fearlessly and forcefully as she did? Mr. Judge, too, did not stop working when troubles arose around him, but ever pointed to the correct Theosophical principles of action and went on with the work. Robert Crosbie did the same. We also must follow their example, bearing in mind that

Truth agrees only with Truth. So if we firmly believe, and are convinced by fact and reason, that we are in possession of Truth, it would be a false tolerance which would withhold it in the face of error. Truth exists in the world for the purpose of destroying error. Error is dogmatic and does not court close investigation. Truth courts all and every possible investigation, and, calm in its certitude, examines everything upon its merits . . . tests it by the standard of Truth.

---

There are four kinds of tempers: he whom it is easy to provoke and easy to pacify, his loss disappears in his gain; he whom it is hard to provoke and hard to pacify, his gain disappears in his loss; he whom it is hard to provoke and easy to pacify is a saint; he whom it is easy to provoke and hard to pacify is a wicked man.

—JUDAIC SCRIPTURE

## APHORISMS ON KARMA

Immediately we start to think deeply over the Aphorisms on Karma (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 21*) we find ourselves in difficulties. Aphorism No. 1 says: "There is no Karma unless there is a being to make it or feel its effects." This we can understand, for, if action ceases, *pralaya* sets in. As Krishna points out in the *Gita*, "If I did not perform actions these creatures would perish" (Chapter III). Yet we are told in *The Voice of the Silence* that *Shila* is "the key that counterbalances the cause and the effect, and leaves no further room for Karmic action." And we are supposed to learn how to practise this key.

How can we act so as to counterbalance the cause and the effect? How can we remain unattached to the results of action? Since the actor is bound by his action and therefore must receive the effect of it, how can he act so as to leave no room for Karmic action? We are familiar with the *Gita* teaching that we must perform all actions for Krishna alone, but how does this enable us not to feel the effects?

Perhaps an analogy will help. We are familiar with the example of a stone thrown into a pond; the ripples reach the limits of the pond and then return to the centre of disturbance. That is analogous to self-centred action, action whose repercussion comes back to the performer of the act. But if we could imagine the pond to have no limits, no beginning or end, like space, then we would see that the disturbance caused by the action would affect the Whole, without limits; *i.e.*, it would be universally diffused. Therefore actions performed in the name of Krishna, or the all-pervasive SELF, would affect the Whole. The actor would not be the only one benefited, but all would be benefited; as the action would be rooted in infinity, be itself infinite, the results would also be infinite. This means there is no disturbance of harmony throughout the Whole.

There is still need to pause and ponder, for Aphorisms 13 and 27 are difficult to understand:

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.

Measures taken by an Ego to repress tendency, eliminate defects, and to counteract by setting up different causes, will alter the sway of Karmic tendency and shorten its influence in accordance with the strength or weakness of the efforts expended in carrying out the measures adopted.

If effect follows cause without fail, and each man suffers the effects of his thoughts, feelings and deeds, how can any effect be mitigated, that is, be made easier to bear, be lessened in severity? To understand this difficulty we need to view the problem from two points of view — that of the person who performs the act and gets the reaction, and that of the larger area in which the effects are felt, that is, the environment in which they manifest.

We can see that since no man acts alone, the effects of his actions do not fall on him only. This is true not only of evil acts but also of good and ennobling ones. The Great Ones, we are told, shield erring humanity “from further and far greater misery and sorrow” by building around it a mighty “Wall of Protection.” Silently and invisibly, They impress the atmosphere of our earth with Their Ideation and Imagination. Their benevolent acts, having potency for good, can mitigate or make less, though not obliterate, the severity of the effects of our wrongdoings. Even in our immediate environment, we know that those near us can make things easier for us by their kindness and understanding, their strength and support. Even the mere presence of a sympathetic individual helps us for good.

So we have different kinds of effects manifesting together and affecting one another. This combination and interaction of effects goes on all the time because Humanity is one in reality and no one acts in isolation. In this sense, others help or hinder us, make our Karma easier or more difficult to bear, and we do the same to them.

There is also another factor to be taken into account. As we act and go through life we grow in knowledge and understanding and ourselves begin a new line of Karma by setting up different causes. We come to understand that effects have to be accepted and that all that comes to us is the result of our own thoughts, feelings and deeds. Thus, by our own efforts in the right direction we can counteract and mitigate the effects of causes generated by us in the past. In fact, though we do not recognize it, we are always, by our thought, feeling and action, “altering” our own, or another’s, or even a nation’s Karma. We have to take our share in fomenting wars, pestilences, etc.

Is all this preordained? Can the action of Karma be known by anyone? Aphorism 8 seems to imply so:

Its action may be known by calculation from cause to effect; and this calculation is possible because the effect is wrapped up in and is not succedent to the cause.

As the seventh of the Ten Items of *Isis Unveiled* states:

All things that ever were, that are, or that will be, having their record upon the astral light, or tablet of the unseen universe, the initiated adept, by using the vision of his own spirit, can know all that has been known or can be known.

It is "by calculation from cause to effect" that this is possible, provided that the "ultimate division of time in this Universe" is known. Karma is not subject to time, but depends only on the presence of an appropriate vehicle or instrument.

And until such appropriate instrument is found, that Karma related to it remains unexpended. (Aphorism 15)

The appropriateness of an instrument for the operation of Karma consists in the exact connection and relation of the Karma with the body, mind, intellectual and psychical nature acquired for use by the Ego in any life. (Aphorism 17)

In our human vanity we forget that *all* beings are subject to Karma. We are reminded that just as there are those less evolved than ourselves, so there are those who are much more evolved, the Lords of Power and Holy Men, who do not leave humanity alone to sink into greater and greater misery and sorrow. Humanity's Karma is being daily influenced by the collective efforts of generations of Adepts, Mahatmas and *Nirmanakayas*. So the world is affected by the great as by the small, by the good as by the wicked. If one good man could save a city from destruction as in the Bible story, so each individual sways the balance of Karma for the whole.

---

What is wanted is true knowledge of the spiritual condition of man, his aim and destiny. Such a study leads us to accept the utterance of Prajapati to his sons: "Be restrained, be liberal, be merciful," it is the death of selfishness.

—W. Q. JUDGE

## I.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF HOMŒOPATHY

Have the courage of your convictions — dare to be wise.  
—HORACE

To dare, to know, to will, and REMAIN SILENT . . .

—*Isis Unveiled*, I. 67

The physician's high and *only* mission is to restore the sick to health, to cure, as it is termed. — Aphorism 1, *Organon of Medicine*, by SAMUEL HAHNEMANN

Homœopathy, “the Cinderella of Medicine,” has too long been neglected and denied its rightful place as a science and an art of healing, alongside the other systems. Despite the persecution and ridicule to which it has been subjected for over a century and a half by most medical practitioners, it has still survived to emerge as a potent and decidedly useful system of thought and of drug therapeutics in the treatment of the sick. “Truth has its own blazonry; it needs no interpreter,” said the wise Emerson. The truth of homœopathy is intrinsic, self-evident and demonstrable by him who dares and wills to apply its principles and tenets in the healing of the sick. The tree is known by its fruits. The numerous clinical cures homœopathy has effected are a standing witness to its efficacy — cures in the highest philosophical sense of the term, *viz.*, the restoration of disturbed harmony or equilibrium within man, and between man and his environment, of which he forms an integral part.

Despite the overwhelming evidence of such cures, homœopathy is unacceptable to many because of pride, prejudice and pre-conceptions. These stand always in the way of the acceptance of truth. “Modern medicine, while it has gained largely in anatomy, physiology, and pathology, and even in therapeutics, has lost immensely by its narrowness of spirit, its rigid materialism, its sectarian dogmatism,” says *Isis Unveiled* (I. 20). “Theoretically the most benignant, at the same time no other school of science exhibits so many instances of petty prejudice, materialism, atheism, and malicious stubbornness as medicine” (*Ibid.*, I. 88). To deny or reject *a priori*, without prior consideration, is the province of little minds and prejudiced dogmatists. “There is one principle which is a bar against all information, which is proof against all argument and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance — that principle is ‘contempt prior to investigation,’ ” said Herbert Spencer. To those who have closed minds and who decry philosophy we have little to say. For, the practice of homœopathy rests on, has its roots deep in, its philos-

ophy. Homœopathic philosophy is the bed-rock of homœopathic practice. In sober truth, it may be stated: "No philosophy, no homœopathy." True healers down the ages have always been philosopher-physicians, such as the Ayurvedic physicians, as also Hippocrates, Paracelsus, Mesmer, Sir Thomas Browne, Sir William Osler and others.

Dr. Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843) was in line with this ancient tradition; he bequeathed to posterity the science and art of homœopathy, based on a profound philosophy of life, quite in consonance with the Theosophical teachings. The laity is better informed and more readily accepts the truth of the homœopathic system than the learned scientist who rejects everything not perceptible to the physical senses. Those in whom reason has not totally obscured the flickering light of intuition and are philosophically and mystically inclined will certainly be appreciative of this great revolution in medical history, in the field of drug therapeutics. Let truth be tested in the crucible of experience, and no amount of theorizing will invalidate it. The appeal is to pure experience in the laboratory of Nature, and not to reason alone. Prejudice must bow to facts; and facts are stronger than all the materialism and scientific scepticism of the age. And so we proceed. . . .

The sovereign reign of Law in the phenomena of life is the basic truth of Theosophy. Within it are comprehended the known (or unknown) laws of physics, chemistry and biology. The central law on which rests the entire homœopathic philosophy and practice is the LAW OF SIMILARS — a therapeutic principle in Nature: "*Similia similibus curentur*" ("let likes be cured by likes"). It postulates: Diseases are cured by drugs or substances in Nature which have the capacity to excite a similar (not necessarily identical) state when administered to a healthy human being. Here two phenomena occurring side by side can be observed: (1) The phenomena of natural diseases, to which humanity has been subjected; these have been given labels or designations according to the accepted international nomenclature of Western medicine. (2) The phenomena of artificial diseases, which have been induced by drugs through actual experimentation on healthy human beings.

The data obtained through the latter constitute DRUG-PROVINGS, which form the main bulk of the homœopathic *materia medica*. The latter is a compendium of actions and effects of drugs derived mainly from "provings." Before the advent of homœopathy, medical scientists in the West were acquainted with the method of animal experimentation alone. Hahnemann ushered in the "era of human pharmacology" (a term coined by James Stephenson) for the first time in Western medical history. Sure-

ly, the data obtained through animal experiments may not always be applicable to human beings with impunity, as is well borne out by the side effects and toxic effects of modern drugs, sometimes resulting in fatality. The "iatrogenic disorders" induced by drugs and physicians alike are well recognized by modern medicine (Harrison's *Text-Book of Internal Medicine*). In "provings," the drugs are never pushed to such an extent as to produce pathological changes; so that the homœopathic *materia medica* is essentially a collection of human functional pathology. Hahnemann proved 99 drugs during his lifetime (even on himself), and meticulously recorded their actions and effects in his *Materia Medica Pura*. Since his time, the record has been considerably extended by others, so that today we have a huge, bulky *materia medica* comprising 2,000 odd drugs or substances in Nature.

Throughout history, physicians have observed similarities, likenesses, parallels, correspondences, between the spontaneous symptoms of naturally-ill patients and drug-effects on the healthy. The striking similitude of symptoms between cowpox and smallpox led to the discovery of vaccination by Edward Jenner in 1798, as a preventive against smallpox. Thus was evolved the concept of immunization in modern medicine. Symptoms of acute arsenical poisoning resemble symptoms of food-poisoning; those of mercury poisoning, syphilis; the symptoms of quinine when taken by a healthy person simulate malaria, and so on. The vaccination and immunization theory bears a close resemblance to "*similia similibus curentur*" as a curative principle in nature, but the application is different. Through keen observation and experience it has been found that natural diseases and drug-induced diseases (artificial diseases) bear a natural relationship of symptom-similarity. When two similar states are brought together they neutralize each other; the result is cure. Two similar diseases, whether natural or artificial, annihilate each other. Two similarities repel, as do the like poles of a magnet.

The application of the Law of Similars in clinical practice involves utilizing these drugs or substances as remedial agents in the treatment of the sick. It implies *close* matching of natural disease-states with drug-induced diseases. The principle is: like diseases are cured by like remedies in cases that are curable; and are palliated in cases that are incurable. To cure the disease, give the drug that causes it, that mimics it. "Set a thief to catch a thief," as the saying goes. That which causes disease, cures it; that which poisons, heals; that which kills life, restores it — if administered in right proportions. This is the therapeutic law in Nature. Snake venoms and spider-poisons kill; yet they are potent

therapeutic weapons in homœopathy, the former especially in yellow fever and black-water fever. H.P.B. mentions "the magic plant *diktamnion*, or *dictamnus*, the evergreen shrub whose contact is said, at the same time, to develop somnambulism and cure finally of it" (*Isis Unveiled*, I. 264). Iodine causes and cures goitre. All non-homœopathic physicians apply the Law of Similars sporadically and unconsciously. X-rays and radium-therapy used to treat cancer are known to have caused cancer and leukæmia. Medical history abounds in such examples of "unconscious homœopathy."

The Law of Similars was not discovered by Hahnemann; it was already known to the ancients, and he gave due credit to them. The Ayurvedic physicians, as also Paracelsus, Hippocrates and others, were aware of its operation in Nature. Hippocrates propounded the doctrines of both Similars and Contraries. But it is to Hahnemann that goes the credit of evolving and constructing a scientific system of therapeutics based on this law, and harnessing it for curative purposes. The healing principle exists in Nature — *vis medicatrix naturæ*; the physician is only an instrument, an intelligent guide to natural healing processes innate in all organisms. To aid, not hinder, these natural processes is his aim and ideal.

Homœopathy, then, is a system of drug-therapeutics based on this fundamental universal law in Nature — the Law of Similars. It is a "specialized" mode of administering remedies to sick patients — remedies which are found in the kingdoms of Nature, side by side with sickness. Wherever there is disease, there is the remedy close at hand — this is an old belief. Human diseases have their exact counterpart in Nature, not excluding her imponderable realms and forces such as X-rays, electricity and magnetism, light, colour, sound, etc. Within the focus of disturbance inheres the germ of restoration of harmony. Nature spontaneously tends to restore harmony whenever it is disturbed, at its focal point, which is Man. "Dr. Hufeland has written a work on magic," states *Isis Unveiled* (I. 207), "in which he propounds the theory of the universal magnetic sympathy between men, animals, plants and even minerals; also the sympathy existing between the different parts of the body as well as between the parts of all organic and even inorganic bodies."

Homœopathy, therefore, is not a distinct system of medicine, as are allopathy and Ayurveda, each with its own phraseology and theories. All systems use remedies found in Nature, but the mode of application differs in homœopathy, with its width of perspective as regards the concept of disease and the cure of disease, its depth of philosophy, its subtlety in

essence, and conformity to Nature's pattern. It is an additional aid in the therapeutic armamentarium of the practising clinician, and does not supplant other measures in vogue today, save in drug therapy. It is, in a sense, an offshoot of Western medicine, accepting its disease-classification and description, its methods of diagnosis, its juridical and hygienic concepts, its anatomical and psycho-physiological theories. It also accepts ancillary measures to be adopted over and above the curative *Similimum*, measures such as rest, dietetic regimen, nature-therapy, physio-therapy, radio-therapy, hydro-therapy, and mechanical and surgical procedures, in a judicious, well co-ordinated therapeutic programme. The thorough knowledge of other medical sciences is a necessary prerequisite for a homœopath. One ought to be a physician first, a homœopath later, so as to be able to assist the sick in a rational manner, free from prejudice and misplaced zeal. All available methods could be utilized profitably by the prescriber in a manner best suited to the interests of the patient. In fact, the ideal medical science of the future would be a harmonious synthesis of the best in all the existing systems, past and present.

The cardinal point of difference between homœopathy and the other systems lies, therefore, in the application of remedies to sick patients in a "specialized" way. It implies three things: (1) The use of remedies whose properties and attributes have been previously ascertained through drug-provings. Hence, empiricism, opinion and conjecture have little place in homœopathic therapeutics. (2) The use of a *single remedy* at a time, as the drug-provings have been so conducted, one drug at a time. Polypharmacy, therefore, is irrational and unphilosophical. (3) The use of the *small dose*.

Initially, Hahnemann used remedies in their "crude" natural state, *i.e.*, in physiological doses, as was the vogue at his time. To his dismay he found aggravation of the symptoms. So he progressively reduced the dose by diluting it with alcohol or milk-sugar, using the mechanical method of trituration and succussion. This he carried to the minimum dose — the ultra-molecular state (sub-physiological dose), and still further to the infinitesimal dose, wherein no drug-material could be detected by known physical or chemical methods. The results were striking: no aggravation of symptoms, yet therapeutic response heartening. Thus was evolved the PRINCIPLE OF POTENTIATION OR DYNAMIZATION in the field of drug therapeutics for the first time in medical history. It is not simple dilution that occurs in the progressive attenuation of the dose, but something more vital, *viz.*, release of the energy or force latent in crude matter. Matter and force are indestructible and convertible. Within the

homœopathic pill or powder lies locked up a "potency" afforded by energy-release through potentization, an electro-magnetic potential of tremendous therapeutic value. This is understandable, for we have the parallel phenomenon of the splitting of the atom and the release of a tremendous explosive power, hitherto unsuspected.

This principle of potentization was applied by Hahnemann to drug-provings as well, opening newer horizons in our understanding of drug-effects. These were as follows:

(1) Substances that were poisonous in their crude natural state became innocuous in potentized form, beyond third centesimal potency; *e.g.*, snake or spider venoms, and metallic poisons, like arsenic.

(2) Substances that were inert in their crude natural state became capable of producing far-reaching effects or symptoms in potentized form; *e.g.*, charcoal, common salt and lycopodium (an inert powder used for rolling pills in allopathy).

(3) Drug-effects pertaining to the mental sphere (emotions and intellect) were elicited in centesimal potencies of 30 and beyond.

(4) Substances insoluble in their crude natural state became soluble in potentized form at sixth decimal potency.

(5) There is no "drug-material," but only "drug-energy" in the diluting menstruum, in the twelfth centesimal potency and beyond.

The preparation of potencies along three scales, of the decimal (1 in 10), centesimal (1 in 100) and millesimal (1 in 1000), by hand or machine, according to the standards laid down in the homœopathic pharmacopœia, constitutes *homœopathic pharmacy*. A high degree of moral integrity is imperative in their preparation, and to preserve their purity from contamination.

The single remedy, the minimum dose and the minimum repetition constitute *homœopathic posology* (the science and the doctrine of dosage). The subtlety of the dose is a stumbling-block to the human intellect, coming in the way of acceptance of homœopathy by many. It is a fertile field for critics, both among laymen as well as among the learned members of the medical fraternity, who are used to massive doses. The homœopathic potency cannot be subjected to the logic of numbers, as it is essentially qualitative, and not quantitative. Even the drug-provings are in the main qualitative, although statistical analysis would enhance their validity.

Further, applying the Law of Similars at the bedside, Hahnemann had gratifying results in the treatment of acute illnesses. However, cer-

tain diseases continued to recur periodically, despite best attempts to select similar remedies. He thought that somewhere in the human organism lay a block to full recovery. He postulated the "THEORY OF CHRONIC DISEASES," that chronic relapsing states were probably caused by a basic defect in the constitution of the patient. There were three kinds of defective susceptible constitutions, which he termed MIASMS: psora, syphilis and sycosis. These chronic diseases have to be treated by chronic constitutional anti-miasmatic remedies, in order to remove the block in the pathway of recovery. In their absence, patients continued to linger in a state of chronic latent ill-health interspersed with acute exacerbations. The miasmatic theory has its parallel in the Ayurvedic theory of *Tridosha* — the three basic constitutions of *Vatta*, *Pitta* and *Kaffa*; and also in the theory of four humours by Hippocrates, wherein diseases were supposed to have been caused by the vitiation of blood, lymph, black and yellow bile.

Homœopathy, then, takes into consideration the individual as a *whole*, and not in parts. The treatment is basically aimed at the individual with the disease, and not at the disease. There are only sick patients, no diseases. And as all individuals vary in their reaction-patterns to the same stimuli, depending on their basic constitution, there is in homœopathy *individualistic* treatment as against *standardized* treatment in allopathy. Homœopathy is a logically evolved system of thought, based on both deductive and inductive logic. It is an intricate art based on experimental science, with a basic philosophy which is consistent with life. It is a specialized knowledge of the application of remedies to patients in a specialized manner, based on a therapeutic law in Nature. The remedies are not homœopathic; it is the application of remedies to the case in hand which makes it homœopathic or otherwise. Homœopathicity is proved by cure. The application of the Law of Similars in clinical practice requires high standards of precision and exactitude. It necessitates the adoption of a special methodology in chronological sequence, starting with meticulous case-taking in order to know the *individual in his illness*, up to the administration of the similar remedy; then the correct interpretation of remedy-reaction with a view to subsequent management. The law is infallible; its application may be fallible and faulty.

Thus, the Four Pillars on which rests and around which revolves the grand fabric of homœopathic philosophy and practice are: (1) the Law of Similars; (2) Drug-provings; (3) the Principle of Potentiation; (4) the Theory of Chronic Diseases or Miasms. In each of these fields Hahnemann's contribution to medical thinking was unique. The best

minds of the profession are drawn to it through its sheer force of logic and through the hard facts observed at the bedside. Homœopathy is still fighting the battle for recognition. It is in a way a reaction to the "therapeutic nihilism" of Hahnemann's time. The selection of a single remedy out of 2,000 odd ones presents a formidable task, taxing the skill and ingenuity of the physician. In this, he is helped by certain symptom-indices or dictionaries, called Repertories. The ultimate court of appeal as to the accuracy of the prescription is always the homœopathic *materia medica*.

Homœopathy as a profession carries a challenge. The possibilities of its art are infinite, within the scope and sphere of its applicability. Its limitations have to be borne in mind prior to instituting therapy. Its view of man as a related body-mind-soul entity places it ahead of the psychosomatic era in modern medicine. It is basically a psychosomatic orientation and approach, as it considers man as an integrated unit of life, consciousness and intelligence, functioning through the *vital force* in the human economy. The difficulties that beset the clinician and the hard work required scare away many new entrants to the homœopathic fold. "It is not for the lazy, the dullard and the mentally obtuse" (Dr. James Tyler James). The ease with which modern drugs can be used under high-pressure advertising media precludes many a physician from leaving the traditional grooves in favour of this truly unorthodox system. Man is a prisoner of contemporary thought, and few dare to rise above it. Twentieth-century medicine has inherited the materialistic outlook of the 19th century, and this obstructs the acceptance of the subtle, dynamic and philosophic aspects of the homœopathic outlook and approach.

Homœopathy is still an anachronism, a premature child of a time that is still to come. The resistance to homœopathy is deeply rooted, historically, psychologically, and spiritually. Homœopathy is part of an approach into the mystery of existence that as an over-all attitude would be necessary complementation to our prevalent, basically materialistic and rational orientation. (Dr. Edward Whitmont, *Homœopathic Recorder*, October-December 1956).

As a result of this split in conscience among physicians, an unfortunate schism has existed in Western medicine for two hundred years. Sir William Osler has called it a "rent in the gown of Æsculapius." This will have to be bridged at the scientific and the philosophical level.

## THE WAY TO CONTENTMENT

Contentment, generally understood, does not appeal to some people who prefer a life of change, chance, hazard, adventure. If they find peace, happiness or contentment coming their way, they consider it to be incidental. To such as these, contentment means a static condition, a dull, humdrum and dead kind of living. Mr. Judge stated that this is a restless age; that, on account of the conflict between the forces of white and black, good and evil, and the rapidity with which things come to pass in this period of evolution, this restlessness is to be found reflected in human beings.

Real contentment has little or nothing to do with the titillation of the lower nature. Theosophy postulates that there are in man two selves, a higher, real Self and a lower, mortal, personal self. It is the contentment resulting from reliance on the higher or spiritual Self which we need to aim at. Krishna indicates that those who have forsaken every desire which enters the heart are happy and content in the Self, through the Self. The Bible speaks of that peace which passeth all understanding, and this is the higher contentment, that which is experienced by the spiritual man in his sincere effort to live the spiritual life. Therefore, this contentment is an experience of the soul, not of the body or of the lower mind and feelings. Arjuna, the pupil — and each of us is that — has reached a point in evolution where he desires to proceed along the path which leads truly to contentment.

The living of the higher, spiritual life demands renunciation of the results of action. The *Gita* speaks also of the right performance of action, of skill in action. The causes of our physical actions lie on planes other than the physical, and we must look for these causes on the plane of thought and feeling. It is this causal plane we need to concern ourselves with, because from the establishment of right and correct causes will follow in due time right and correct actions.

While present-day investigators have attempted to discover the psychological processes of man's mind, they know very little in regard to his heart. Just as the physical life of man depends on his physical heart, so correspondingly his spiritual life depends on his spiritual heart. Every form, every object, has its inner counterpart, its spiritual cause, support or source, and therefore we may say that the spiritual heart is the inner spring of that which we generally call heart actions, heart feelings. The student, Arjuna — any average human soul on the path of spiritual evolution — needs an intelligent heart and a compassionate mind. This

cannot be attained in one life, but diligent efforts continued over several lives bring the individual to the point when mind and heart become one and work conjointly. That gives him a tremendous power which is not possessed by the average person who has used mind and heart selfishly, thus keeping them divorced, with their energy diminished to that extent.

Arjuna, as a soul who has come to a certain condition of self-realization, experiences through this union of mind and heart what the *Gita* speaks of as mental devotion. Because he has determined to conquer life rather than be mastered by it, he is now able to use his thoughts and feelings deliberately, as he wills. He has begun to assimilate the fundamental principle of the whole philosophy — the idea of God or Deity.

We speak of the Self within, the God within man. There is nothing higher than man, who is an aspect of the great source of all, the Deific Essence. Realizing himself as one with Life, he sees that there is actually no separateness, and in that realization he gains that mental devotion which shows itself first in devotion to the interests of others. It is very difficult for people ignorant of the oneness of Life and brought up on the idea of an extra-cosmic God to understand how and why they should be philanthropic, altruistic, unselfish and helpful. It is impossible to realize fully our oneness with all life unless we practise that idea. It is impossible to practise that idea unless we theoretically realize it. Arjuna, having forsaken false faiths and taken the true, has come to that point in evolution where he has become a man of vision and has regained the memory of the past to quite an extent; and where there is memory of the past, even to a certain degree, there is also present to that extent an ability to predict the future. Until we have vision we do not have memory; until we have memory, we do not have perspective; until we have perspective, we shall never know how to act, to move to progress and to grow, naturally, as the flower grows.

When the inner plane of thought and feeling is seen as the causal plane, when the process of purification of mind, will and feelings is self-consciously undertaken, outer acts will automatically be in conformity with the inner life. We have got into the habit of taking outward appearances to be the reality. A wealthy man with a beautiful home, with plenty of money, cars, friends; one who is a charming person, respected, admired, in a position of trust, is judged by the world as one of the cultured, educated and "upper" classes. On the contrary, someone who is not only poor but seems to have very few friends, who has no facilities to entertain his friends, has little or no standing or position in a worldly sense, and who is humble and unobtrusive, the world very

frequently looks upon with contempt. We look at the outward form and shell, and however much it may appeal to our senses, it is possible for the inner nature to be full of corruption and dishonesty. And the reverse may be equally true.

Man today oscillates between pain and pleasure, friendship and enmity, love and hate, success and failure, with little or no happiness, peace or contentment. He passes from shadow to shadow, from effect to effect, and when one pleasure passes he restlessly seeks another. And his senses, improperly trained, deceive and betray him on every side.

Or we find another type of person, he whom the Bible speaks of as the lukewarm, who is passive and who does not make any effort to use his mind and his feelings correctly. He drifts until one day he finds himself in the position of the man who steps into a canoe on a summer afternoon, leaving the paddle on the shore, and as he sits dreaming the tide of the ocean begins to recede, and he finally awakens to the fact that he has drifted far away from the shore and is now unable, without paddle or oar, to reach again the shore. And that is exactly what happens to many people. They have drifted, and the tide of life and fate has begun to recede, and before they know it they are carried far away, beyond any hope of attaining that which the *Gita* states is so necessary — Self-Realization, Self-Understanding, on the basis of the Unity and Oneness of Life. The personal-God idea has bred selfishness and separative living. It is only when some great tragedy strikes, or when past efforts make possible a natural awakening, that we can awaken from the lethargy and sleep which the selfish, lower self has plunged most people into, and come under the influence of the Higher Self. It is only our inner, deific Self, the God within, that can finally save us from the continuous weary round of birth and rebirth, ignorance, delusion and degradation.

When, due to past effort, vision comes, though but as a glimpse, how much we are like the foolish virgins in the Bible, who waited too long to trim their lamps! But if we arise and are ready to take a stride forward, then there gradually results that inner conversion which is an experience of the soul. Then, as the *Gita* states, no longer will sins attach themselves to him who now performs right action for the Supreme, which is the All, which is everything; no longer will yearnings torture him, nor earthly joys and woes disturb him. This is Peace! With the conquering of love of self and lust of life, sorrow ends; the old sad count is clear, the new is clean — thus hath a man content!

---

# “LUCIFER” CORRESPONDENCE

## ANSWERS TO INQUIRERS

[Reprinted from *Lucifer*, Vol. II, pp. 155-160, for April 1888.

—EDS.]

*To the Editors of LUCIFER.*

As you invite questions, I take the liberty of submitting one to your consideration.

Is it not to be expected (basing one's reasoning on Theosophical teaching) that the meeting and intercourse in Kama-loka of persons truly attached to each other must be fraught with disappointment, nay frequently even with deep grief? Let me illustrate my meaning by an example:

A mother departs this life twenty years before her son, who, deeply attached to her, longs to meet her again, and only finds her “shell,” from which all those spiritual qualities have fled which to him were the essential part of the being he loved. Even the “shell” itself, by its resemblance to the former body, only adds to his grief by keeping early memories more vividly alive, and showing him the vast difference between the entity he knew on earth and the remnant he finds.

Or take a second case:

The son meets his mother in Kama-loka after a short separation, only to find her entity in a state of disintegration, as her pure spirit has already begun to leave her astral body and to ascend towards Devachan. He has to witness this process of gradual dissolution, and day by day he feels his mother's spirit slip away whilst his more material nature prevents him from joining in her rapid progress.

I subjoin my name and address, though not for publication, and remain,

Very truly yours,

“F.T.S”

EDITORS' REPLY.—Our Correspondent seems to have been misled as to the state of consciousness which entities experience in Kama-loka. He seems to have formed his conceptions on the visions of *living* psychics and the revelations of *living* mediums. But all conclusions drawn from such data are vitiated by the fact that a *living* organism intervenes between the observer and the Kama-loka state *per se*. There can be no *conscious* meeting in Kama-loka, hence no grief. There is no astral disintegration *pari passu* with the separation of the shell from the spirit.

According to the Eastern teaching, the state of the deceased in Kama-loka is not what we, living men, would recognize as “conscious.” It is rather that of a person stunned and dazed by a violent blow, who has

momentarily "lost his senses." Hence in Kama-loka there is as a rule (apart from vicarious life and consciousness awakened through contact with mediums) no recognition of friends or relatives, and therefore such a case as stated here is impossible.

We meet those we loved only in Devachan, that subjective world of perfect bliss, the state which succeeds the Kama-loka, after the separation of the principles. In Devachan all our personal, unfulfilled *spiritual* desires and aspirations will be realized; for we shall not be living in the hard world of matter but in those subjective realms wherein a desire finds its instant realization — because man himself is there a god and a creator.

In dealing with the dicta of psychics and mediums, it must always be remembered that they translate, automatically and unconsciously, their experiences on any plane of consciousness into the language and experience of our normal physical plane. And this confusion can only be avoided by the special study-training of occultism, which teaches how to trace and guide the passage of impressions from one plane to another and fix them on the memory.

Kama-loka may be compared to the dressing-room of an actor, in which he divests himself of the costume of the last part he played before rebecoming himself properly — the immortal *Ego* or the Pilgrim cycling in his Round of Incarnations. The Eternal Ego being stripped in Kama-loka of its lower terrestrial principles, with their passions and desires, it enters into the state of Devachan. And therefore it is said that only the purely spiritual, the non-material emotions, affections, and aspirations accompany the Ego into that state of Bliss. But the process of stripping off the lower, the fourth and part of the fifth, principles is an unconscious one in all normal human beings. It is only in very exceptional cases that there is a slight return to consciousness in Kama-loka: and this is the case of very materialistic, unspiritual personalities, who, devoid of the conditions requisite, cannot enter the state of absolute Rest and Bliss.

*To the Editors of LUCIFER.*

As a very new member of the Theosophical Society I have jotted down a few points which appear to me to be worthy of your notice.

(1) What books do you specially advise to be read in connection with *Esoteric Buddhism*? And any remarks upon them.

(2) Have the Adepts grown or developed to their present state and powers by their own inherent capacities? If so, how far can the steps of

the process be described?

(3) What is known of the training of the Yogees?

(4) What is known of the Root Races of man of which we are said to be the fifth?

(5) What are Elementals — their nature, powers and communication with man?

(6) In what light are Theosophists to regard the whole *account* in the late republication of the T.P.S. of the marriage of the Spirit daughter of Colonel Eaton with the Spirit son of Franklin Pearce?

(7) In the articles on "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels" I observe that as yet no notice has been taken of Prophecy and its alleged fulfilment in Jesus Christ. I have read these with intense interest and regret that I was unable to obtain the first two numbers of LUCIFER.

I am, Yours truly,

J.M.

EDITORS' REPLY.—(1) *Five Years of Theosophy*, or better the back numbers of *The Theosophist*, and *The Path*, also *Light on the Path*.

When the general outlines have been mastered, other books can be recommended; but it must always be borne in mind that with *very* few exceptions *all books on these subjects are the works of students, not of Masters*, and must therefore be studied with caution and a well-balanced mind. All *theories* should be tested by the reason and not accepted *en bloc* as revelation.

(2) The process and growth of the Adepts is the secret of Occultism. Were adeptship easy of attainment many would achieve it, but it is the hardest task in nature, and volumes would be required even to give an outline of the philosophy of this development. (See "Practical Occultism,"<sup>1</sup> in this number.)

(3) Nothing but what they give out themselves — which is very little. Read Patanjali's "Yoga Philosophy"; but with *caution*, for it is very apt to mislead, being written in symbolic language. Compare the article on "Sankhya and Yoga Philosophy" in *The Theosophist* for March.

(4) Wait for H. P. Blavatsky's forthcoming work: *The Secret Doctrine*.

(5) See *The Secret Doctrine*, also *Isis Unveiled*, and various articles in *The Theosophist*, especially "The Mineral Monad" (also reprinted in *Five Years of Theosophy*).

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in *Raja-Yoga or Occultism*.—EDS., THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

(6) The account referred to was quoted to show how absurdly materialistic are the common ideas, even among intelligent Spiritualists, of the post-mortem states. It was intended to bring home vividly the unphilosophical character, and the hopeless inadequacy, of such conceptions.

(7) The subject of "Prophecy" may be dealt with in a future article of the series; but the questions involved are too irritating to the casual Christian reader, too important, and need too much bibliographical research, to permit of their continuation from month to month.

A lady writes from America:

In the fourth number of *Lucifer* on page 328 are the words:

"Enough has been given out at various times regarding the conditions of post-mortem existence, to furnish a solid block of information on this point."

The writer would be glad to be told where this information may be found. Is it in print? Or must one be Occultist enough to find it out in the "Symbology" of the Bible for himself?

"ONE WHO HUNGERS FOR SOME OF THIS KNOWLEDGE"

It is certainly necessary to be an "Occultist" before the post-mortem states of man can be correctly understood and realized, for this can only be accomplished through the actual experience of one who has the faculty of placing his consciousness on the *Kamalokic* and *Devachanic* planes. But a good deal *has* been given out in *The Theosophist*. Much also can be learnt from the symbology not only of the Bible but of *all* religions, especially the Egyptian and the Hindu. Only again the key to that symbology is in the keeping of the Occult Sciences and their Custodians.

---

The golden vase which hides the secret sun is periodically drawn away for him who watches.

—*Old Tibetan Verse*

## FAITH—TRUST AND CONFIDENCE

Probably one of the most elusive yet prevalent innate ideas possessed by all human beings is that unfathomable, unknowable and ever un-reachable idea we call faith.

Faith can express itself in three ways: mentally, according to the ideas that we hold; psychically, according to the emotions we feel and express; and physically, according to the actions that we perform.

Faith is either expanded or dwarfed by the early training we receive from our parents, teachers and friends, because one expression of faith is the trust and confidence we place on others.

Faith finds its fullest expansion when our trust or confidence is placed on and reciprocated by one who has developed the Wisdom of Compassion, which arises from a search after Truth, through the service of others. Fortunate indeed are we when we contact the teachings of such a one, for then our faith is elevated from a purely emotional basis to an ideative impersonal one.

From belief to knowledge is a gradual growth, quickened by the disciple's faith, trust and confidence in the Teacher, and therefore in his willingness to check, test and verify his own observations and experiences in the light of the Teachings studied and applied. Such testings and verifications take place in the mind, feelings and physical nature of the sincere student, slowly freeing his or her faith from dependence on fixed moulds of thought, feeling or action, and gradually directing it towards the objectives of Truth and Service.

From dependence to independence is a step on the Path to Self-enlightenment, and this is the Path of Transformation from blind faith to reasoned faith based upon knowledge of the true. (See *The Key to Theosophy*, Indian ed., pp. 215-220.) The further step from independence to interdependence takes the disciple through the "Hall of Learning," called in *The Voice of the Silence* "the psychical world of super-sensuous perceptions," where the passions and desires clothe themselves in their most alluring forms; but each such form has a serpent coiled underneath. This is a testing period for the disciple, one in which his faith is fully tried. What will stand him in good stead is his steadfastness and implicit trust and confidence in the Teacher whom yet he does not see, but whose Teachings he is taught to use independently, yet with an increasing sense of that type of dependence which has at its basis the idea of Universal Brotherhood, and which grows into Interdependence.

From the Hall of Learning we come to the Hall of Wisdom; from the

Teachings, to the Teachers. Where are the Teachers to be found? This is the question that all sincere seekers after Truth ask at some time or other. The answer is available for those who want it, provided they are intuitive enough to accept the advice given to them by Mr. Judge in his article "Yours Till Death and After, H.P.B.," and by Mr. Crosbie in "A Friend of Old Time and of the Future." The following extracts from these two articles need to be pondered over:

[From "Yours Till Death and After, H.P.B."] Such has been the manner in which our beloved teacher and friend always concluded her letters to me. And now, though we are all of us committing to paper some account of that departed friend and teacher, I feel ever near and ever potent the magic of that resistless power, as of a mighty rushing river, which those who wholly trusted her always came to understand. Fortunate indeed is that Karma which, for all the years since I first met her, in 1875, has kept me faithful to the friend who, masquerading under the outer *mortal* garment known as H. P. Blavatsky, was ever faithful to me, ever kind, ever the teacher and the guide. (*Vernal Blooms*, p. 3)

[From "A Friend of Old Time and of the Future"] As such does William Q. Judge appear to me, as doubtless he does to many others in this and other lands.

The first Theosophical treatise that I read was his *Epitome of Theosophy*; my first meeting with him changed the whole current of my life. I trusted him then, as I trust him now and all those whom he trusted; to me it seems that "trust" is the bond that binds, that makes the strength of the Movement, for it is of the heart. And this trust he called forth was not allowed to remain a blind trust, for as time went on, as the energy, steadfastness and devotion of the student became more marked, the "real W.Q.J." was more and more revealed, until the power that radiated through him became in each an ever present help in the work. As such it remains today, a living centre in each heart that trusted him, a focus for the Rays of the coming "great messenger." (*Vernal Blooms*, p. 1)

---

# THE DIVINE VIRTUES

## DHYANA

We are coming towards the end of the struggle to master the *Paramita* virtues. Recognizing that all the virtues are interdependent and have to be practised simultaneously, we are now nearing the fruition of that attempt to concentrate without which no progress would so far have been made. On this *Paramita* Path, the further we go the harder the effort that is needed; and we are warned that the full cultivation of *Dhyana* needs the greatest effort on our part.

This *Paramita* comes after the development of "dauntless energy," for we come to a struggle so difficult that we need in full measure courage and energy, active and rigidly defensive. We can perhaps sense the difficulty if we realize here and now that the hardest thing we have to control is our mind and thoughts, and *Dhyana* has to do with the control of thoughts. Our thoughts pertain sometimes to the lower self and sometimes to the higher Self. But there is a SELF which is greater still, for it is the Universal SELF. Contemplation on this SELF carries the ascetic who practises it far above this plane of sensuous perception and out of the world of matter. To attain to *Dhyana*, we are told, is to become like a transparent alabaster vase through which shines forth the flame of *Prajna* that burns within. It is the flame of Wisdom-Compassion that radiates from Atma, the SELF, the Supreme Spirit.

We are asked to become "ALL-THOUGHT" and yet exile all thoughts from out our Soul. That is our difficulty. How can we retain our individuality and at the same time feel ourselves "ALL-THOUGHT"?

Just as we struggled while passing through the *Dana* gate to feel the unity of all life in ourself, so here we are trying to perform the same feat with regard to thoughts. We are trying to reach *Paramartha* — "self-evident or self-analysing reflection." The whole question of self-reflective consciousness which we read about in the First Fundamental Proposition is hard to understand. Ordinary concentration-contemplation-meditation should help us to see that here we have a focal point of attention which reflects those conditions of the higher world that are beyond our ken. We fail when we try to put our experience on that plane into words of this plane, that is, words which embody our own personal experience rather than the actual experience undergone at that higher stage. By effort, repeated effort, we have the assurance of Krishna that we shall reach that stage.

We need to distinguish between ordinary knowledge and pure knowledge or knowledge in itself, things as they are and not as they appear. No fraction of our own ideas should be allowed to interfere with the reflection or shining outward of the pure light within. Therefore we are told to make hard our soul "against the snares of *Self*."

The words "ceaseless contemplation" are mantramitic when thought about. They remind us of Shiva, "the Spirit of limitless contemplation," "the Universal Spiritual Essence of Nature." "The adept sees and feels and lives in the very source of all fundamental truths," which is the Spirit of Shiva, the Great Contemplator, the Patron of all Yogis.

"Absorbed in the absolute self-unconsciousness of *physical Self*, plunged in the depths of true Being, which is no being but eternal, universal Life, his whole form as immovable and white as the eternal summits of snow in Kailasa where he sits, above care, above sorrow, above sin and worldliness, a mendicant, a sage, a healer, the King of Kings, the Yogi of Yogis," such is the ideal Shiva of *Yoga Shastras*, the culmination of *Spiritual Wisdom*.

This reminds us of the Solitary Watcher as described in *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 207-8).

The alabaster vase which we are, and which was created by us through countless births, must be pure in order that the glorious light within may shine outwardly. Any taint or blemish, any personal thought, feeling or act, affects the whiteness and transparency of that vase. But the vase must be able to withstand the force of ALL-THOUGHT, must be porous to it. The idea of strength-energy comes in here, the dauntless energy which preserves the stability of the vase. To change the analogy, the Divine Wisdom we have attained must, like a stream, be poured forth into another bed, must be used for the service of others, and not be kept for oneself. This is the porous quality of the vase and it is only possible to achieve it when *Dana* is practised in full measure throughout the Path.

We are now at the very beginning of what will blossom countless ages hence into such a condition.

---

Never look down to test the ground before taking your next step: only he who keeps his eye fixed on the far horizon will find his right road.

—DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD

# STUDIES IN THE HEART DOCTRINE

## IV.—YOGA—A STUDY IN UNION

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, Vol. XVI, p. 91, for May 1946.—Eds.]

There is one mathematical science, one psychological science, which is Theosophy. Just as the circle or nought represents no number — or all numbers — so Life is one whole, containing all possible parts. Wherever one finds a harmonious collection of parts, there is the potential whole. This is Yoga, union. All manifested life represents disunion, separateness, parts.

All struggle, misery, action is the effort to reassemble the parts, broken fragments of the Whole. Good is synthesized Unity; evil, separateness. Ethically, Brotherhood stands as a fundamental law basically resting in the idea that in essence we are One. Realization through practice of this idea is a Vision which enables the Seer to focus his mind-feeling to see in true perspective.

Thus, we have one Number, many numbers; one Life, many lives; one Cause, many effects; one Compassion, many loves; one Universe, many worlds; one Sun, many suns; one Deity, many gods; one Perfection, many imperfections; one Absolute, many manifestations; one Word, many words, speech and the Tower of Babel; one Power, many powers; one "Creation," many creatures.

Man is One, a Whole, his many lives are broken fragments. Man, in any one life, brings out a small portion of himself, the Real Being. He struggles to find the lost, stolen or broken parts. Among the rubbish, in the dust heap of ages, men fight, grab, screaming, pushing — "This is mine"; "That is yours"; "I won't take it"; "I must have it." Life closes, man remains a misfit, conglomerate mass, patchwork. He is unable to think truly, to feel purely, to act wisely, a psychological cripple whose frame is shattered, the parts broken or missing which might transmit the unbroken flow from his Real Self to the weary, lost self he has become.

Eventually Man can return to the Source, not separate but whole, complete. As the *Gita* phrases it, "not separate in the separate objects seen." Life after life, seeking for union, he regains one by one the lost parts, creates new ones out of the old (lessons learned), adjusts the parts to fit the true pattern, or smelts the segments in suffering and

torture. Finds solace in discerning a part in the heart of a friend, resentment at seeing other parts in the mind of an enemy. Would refuse to acknowledge this, but there is a saying in Theosophy: "My own comes back to me."

Final smelting in a crucible of many trials resolves a substance, pure and unalloyed. Out of the trials of the heat of fire emerges his own Form, myth of the Phœnix repeated. This is rebirth, Soul awakening — so-called conversion. All mind parts regained by true thinking, all heart parts by pure feeling; Mind and Heart in Yoga, union; found are the Truth, the Way, the Light of the Heart Doctrine.

---

#### THE LINK

As the words of a verse  
 Are linked with rhyme,  
 With the same devotion  
 I shall hold you in my soul.

The bounds of my heart will quiver  
 With the chant of your glory;  
 The notes will be caught in my life  
 In ever varied joy,  
 As the words of a poem  
 Are linked in rhyme.

In the midst of all love and devotion  
 I shall seat the King of my heart;  
 In the midst of your wide universe  
 You will abide with me,  
 As the words of poesy  
 Are linked in rhyme.

—RABINDRANATH TAGORE

## IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

For countries such as India where Christian missionaries are still functioning, the Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity and the Declaration on Non-Christian Religions are among the most relevant and most important of the Second Vatican Council's documents. As *The Examiner*, a Catholic newspaper and review, published from Bombay, states editorially in its issue of March 5, the Council's approach was throughout

a positive one, more intent on looking at the good points and positive values in other religious and even a-religious systems and institutions, rather than starting on a witch-hunt for heresy and error. Whether the Church likes it or not Catholicism is a minority religion in the world and so far little purpose has been served by the Church huddling on herself and adopting a defensive and an antagonistic attitude towards the rest of the world. . . .

Let it be acknowledged that on the whole this new approach is a recent departure. The history of the relations of Catholicism with Protestants, Orthodox, Muslims, Jews, Hindus and others has on the whole been one of conflict and opposition, although here and there and now and then significant exceptions, who tried to adopt a more positive approach, were to be found. Christianity's relationship with Mohammedanism has been marked by long centuries of bloody warfare and so has the relationship between Catholics and Protestants. The attitude of Christian missionaries towards Hinduism has on the whole been a deprecatory and condemnatory one, concentrating mainly on the dark side of Hinduism. . . .

A declaration such as that on Non-Christian Religions is unique in conciliar history or for that matter in the history of the Church. That the Church in Council should openly and publicly take a stand that is no longer condemnatory and deprecatory of other religions but rather positive and friendly, inviting them all to a dialogue, and emphasizing what is common rather than what divides is an altogether unusual event, but it is also indicative of the new approach of openness that was characteristic of the mind of the Council and of the Church in the modern world.

This change of attitude towards non-Christian religions and movement towards "dialogue" is accompanied by a rethinking of the Church's missionary policy. *The Examiner* in its issue of March 12 discusses the relationship between "mission" and "dialogue." Is the missionary's work

merely to convert, to persuade others to accept the message that he wants to preach? If it is, then it implies that he has got something that those among whom he goes have not got; it presupposes an attitude of superiority on the part of the missionary. Such an attitude would hinder rather than help the progress of the "dialogue." The new thinking is that,

by seeking out all that is good and true and valuable in the Non-Christian Religions, the Catholic missionary or layman who is engaged in the dialogue can point out and show how Christianity does not demand a rejection of these valuable graces and insights, that when these graces and insights are compared with the dross that exists in these religions it becomes clear that this dross has to be purged if the Non-Christian religions are to be true to themselves and that all these valuable insights and graces are still far from being complete and perfect and that they can be led to their perfection and completion in Christianity.

Is the Christianity of the Churches so complete and perfect that it can lead other religions to their perfection and completion? Does it not need to be purged of dross, as much as other religions, if it is to be true to itself? The word "Christianity" itself needs to be redefined. Christianity can never hope to be understood, H.P.B. wrote, "until every trace of dogmatism is swept away from it, and the dead letter sacrificed to the eternal Spirit of Truth, which is Horus, which is Crishna, which is Buddha, as much as it is the Gnostic Christos and the true Christ of Paul." The growth of the Christian Church from the few first followers of the spiritual life as taught by Jesus into the rich body of today, a mass of dogmas and doctrines, ritual and ceremonies, is sad to contemplate. In spite of the renewal in Christianity that we hear so much of today, until all dogmas and doctrines are tossed overboard and the true teachings of Jesus restored, Christianity will remain what it is — a way of life the very antithesis of that advocated by Jesus.

---

*Science Digest* for February describes a Soviet research team's experiments to "give birth" for the first time to a human baby which has spent its full nine-month gestation period in a test tube. These experiments are a continuation of work done by an Italian doctor, Daniele Angelo Petrucci, who abandoned his attempts to produce a test-tube baby after the Vatican condemned the project with the following comment: "God surrounded the act of creation of a human being with the most supreme assistance of love, nature and conscience. It would be most monstrous to violate these conditions."

The Russian scientists who have taken over Dr. Petrucci's work have succeeded in keeping a foetus alive outside a human womb for as long as six months. Dr. Petrucci categorically says that it is just a matter of a short time before a human being leaves his umbilical test tube and begins to grow on his own, like any other infant. According to his calculations, the first test-tube baby will be "born" no later than Christmas, 1966.

An editor's note in the *Science Digest* states that it describes the work of bringing artificial babies to birth "*without endorsement,*" simply "in order to inform its readers on an extraordinary development in biological research." The very researchers who are helping with experiments in this field are questioning their desirability. Dr. Petrucci himself is quoted as saying: "We are having a population explosion today. So really there is no need to produce babies in a test tube. Besides, children should be raised by parents — not by scientists."

It is not difficult to visualize the potentialities for harm that experiments such as these contain, if for no other reason then because of their unnatural character. Is man an evolving animal or an unfolding god? Are conception and birth and the human sex relationship that first developed at the midway point of evolution, some 18,000,000 years ago, mere animal functions or a microscopic reflection of the divine act of creation? Practices such as birth control by artificial means and the producing of babies in a test tube are but the outcome of a worldly idea of sex. It needs to be realized that true family life has its own essential lessons. It is a discipline as well as a joy, for it leads towards the path of spiritual growth. Employment of unnatural means thwarts that growth.

---

Another outcome of materialistic science, which looks on man only as a more highly developed animal and treats the creative powers in him on its own animalistic principles, can be seen from an article on "Genetics and the Survival of the Unfit" by Lucy Eisenberg (*Harper's Magazine*, February 1966).

With eugenics once again becoming a subject of "respectable" scientific investigation, there is a large group of scientists today who believe that our descendants will be feebler and less fit physically if we do not practise eugenic planning and go in for selective breeding. These scientists are of the opinion that defective genes that were once eliminated by the death of their carriers are, with the conquest of more and more hereditary diseases, now being maintained and passed on to future generations.

The spokesman for eugenic planning is the geneticist, popular author and Nobel laureate, Herman Muller.

Muller's program [writes Lucy Eisenberg] involves a total departure from our present ideas and conventions about marriage and children. Like all believers in positive eugenics, his great hope is that society will improve its genetic stock by adopting the techniques of animal husbandry and breeding only from the best sires and dams.

To this end, he has evolved a plan called AID, Artificial Insemination from Donors. He proposes that banks be established where the sperm of various extraordinary men will be stored. When a woman decides to have children, she will then choose sperm from the donor whose qualities she most admires. "How many women," Muller cried when he launched his plan in 1935, "would be eager and proud to bear and rear a child of Lenin or Darwin! Is it not obvious that restraint, rather than compulsion, would be called for?"

Because of this chance remark Muller has been taunted for years, even by his friends. For the fact is that choosing a sire from among many more or less celebrated men is fraught with complications. . . . There is also a great deal more to be learned about gene linkage and function before the results of a "breeding program" can be predicted with success.

Herman Muller's plan, which, fortunately, finds little support today, is so similar to Mr. Grant Allen's proposal "for producing sound children out of sound — because *unmarried* — mothers, whom he urges to select, for every new babe a fresh and well-chosen father," that we can do no better than quote H.P.B.'s comment on it:

Is the learned theorist talking here of men and women, or discussing the brute creation, or are the human and animal kinds so inseparably linked in his scientific imagination as to disable him from drawing a line of demarcation between the two? . . . We abandon him willingly his "sires," as, in anticipation of this scientific offer, men have already made animals of themselves ever since the dawn of civilization. . . . But we protest against the same offer to women to become *nolens volens* "accredited mares and heifers." Nor are we prepared to say that even our modern loose morals would publicly approve of or grant Mr. Allen the "freedom" he longs for, "for such variety of experimentation," without which, he says, it is quite "impossible to turn out the

best results in the end *for humanity.*" *Animal* humanity would be more correct, though he explains that it is "not merely a question of prize sheep and fat oxen, but a question of begetting the highest, finest, purest, strongest, sanest, healthiest, handsomest, and *morally noblest citizens.*" We wonder the author does not add to these laudatory epithets two more, *viz.*, "the most respectful sons," and men "proudest of their virtuous mothers." . . .

Finally, his arguments about "sexual selection" being "more capricious and dainty in man than in any other species of animal" are pitiable. Instead of proving this "selection" "sacred and divine," he simply shows that *civilized man has descended lower than any brute* after all these long generations of unbridled immorality. ("Diagnoses and Palliatives," reprinted in *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT*, July 1965)

---

An article by Dr. Joyce Brothers printed in *The Times of India* of April 3, 1966, under the title "Those Good Old Days!" states in part:

A feeling of nostalgia for the past is today at its peak. Never before were so many people involved in attempting to recreate the mood of an earlier period.

A magazine has even appeared on the stands this month called "P.S." whose avowed purpose is to look at "what we've been through and figure out what it's done to us." Why?

Nostalgia, if not king, is certainly crown prince of the nuclear age. What's behind the headlong rush backward? What does all this indicate about us and our time? There are several factors involved. Basically, the age in which we find ourselves is both more frightening and less personal than any which preceded it.

For the first time we hold in our hands the power of ultimate destruction. As science threatens to take over, individuals feel themselves more and more simply ciphers in a system beyond their control. . . .

What we are doing with our run on Nostalgia is reacting to the tensions of life in the faceless world of the machine. Psychologists have found that during fear, stress and uncertainty people seek to recreate a time when life was good for them, when things were both simple and safe. . . .

Is it healthy to yearn for the good old days? Like almost everything else — it all depends on how and why. While fantasy can be creative and useful, relieving the unavoidable tensions of life in

our highly complex society, constant concern with the past can indicate serious disturbance. Chances are, too, that the person who is incessantly rattling on about how great things used to be really did not think they were so great while they were happening.

This is the tendency of the immature — to ignore the past, be impatient with the present and demand the future. The mature well-adjusted person, instead, learns from the past and is concerned for the future but lives in the present.

---

Much concern has been expressed over the recent wave of violent and disorderly behaviour in some parts of India, but there is as yet no attempt to diagnose its root cause. Economic and political unrest and the food problem could hardly be called the main reasons, considering that there was much violence for the sake of violence, and those taking part in it were not all under-fed and under-privileged people. Nor are outbursts of violence peculiar to India. Thinkers in many affluent countries are predicting that the richer their societies become, the more violent they may get, unless the "primordial" factors are tackled. They argue that the amenities of modern civilization have not completely stilled man's ancient instinct for action and adventure, and that the big challenge today is to find what John Fischer recently called "substitutes for violence."

As Mr. Fischer points out, planning for plenty and larger police forces alone will not banish the spectre of violence. The problem, according to him, is one of devising new goals in the pursuit of which youth will find outlets for its basic instincts for action. Addressing himself to American leaders and educationists, he asks:

Has any university looked into the possibility of using prospective students to do some of the (college) building? Has Ladybird Johnson calculated how many husky youngsters might be deployed, axes in hand, to chop down billboards along our highways and replace them with trees? (*The Times of India*, April 10)

There is limitless scope in India for work of this type. But finding outlets for the physical energies of the youth of the country alone will not help. It is their *minds* that need to be cultivated and developed in the right direction. The importance of a proper and sane system of education cannot, therefore, be too strongly emphasized.

---