

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. XXXI. No. 11

17th September 1961

THE BATTLE FOR RECOGNITION

Although Theosophical ideas have entered into every development of form which awakening spirituality has assumed, yet Theosophy pure and simple has still a severe battle to fight for recognition. . . . There are others among us who realize intuitively that the recognition of pure Theosophy — the philosophy of the rational explanation of things and not the tenets — is of the most vital importance in the Society, inasmuch as it alone can furnish the beacon-light needed to guide humanity on its true path.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

In the days of H. P. Blavatsky many were the attacks made on Theosophy and its organization, the Theosophical Society. Not only did she have to contend with dogmatic religionists, Spiritists and psychical researchers, but also with enemies within the Society who attempted to change the Original Programme inspired by the Original Impulse and to give a different direction to the course of Theosophy. H.P.B. had to struggle against well-meaning but misguided colleagues, observing the rule of justice and mercy towards all. Time and again she pointed out that the philosophy of Theosophy, the Wisdom-Religion, should not be judged and condemned because of the weaknesses, limitations and follies of students of Theosophy.

Many are H.P.B.'s articles and pronouncements correcting the erroneous beliefs about and attacks against Theosophy, and one such, entitled “Philosophers and Philosophicules,” is reprinted in this issue from *Lucifer* for October 1889. In it she explains not only what Theosophy is not but also what it is. A spiritual movement like that of Theosophy cannot but receive attacks. The “battle for recognition” which Theosophy had to fight in the early days of the Movement still continues. It has made much headway in making its voice heard in the world; but the present generation of the human race is no different from that of the 19th century, and attacks still continue to be levelled against Theosophy and its adherents. In H.P.B.'s lifetime, in spite of the difficulties caused by opponents without and within the Theosophical Society, she steered her ship in the right direction and Theosophy

and its Society continued to fulfil their objects. It was after her death that that ship, as she had warned and prophesied, went adrift.

As has time and again been pointed out in this magazine, what passes for Theosophy today in some organizations calling themselves Theosophical is *not* the Theosophy of H.P.B. and of the Masters. What is worse, a large number of members of these organizations do not know the difference between genuine Theosophy and spurious Theosophy. The word "Theosophy" has, through the efforts of misinformed propagandists, fallen into disrepute and many have been biased against it without giving it a fair hearing. Not a few students of Theosophy themselves, instead of recognizing "Theosophy" as a word to be proud of, often fight shy of mentioning it in conversation.

"He who studies Theosophy," H.P.B. states in the following article, "studies *the highest transcendental philosophy.*" Firm conviction of this fact on the part of students of Theosophy will alone carry conviction to others of the profundity and potency of the tenets of Theosophy and of its message of help and hope. But if Theosophists themselves will not study and apply Theosophy and the lessons of Theosophical history, they will be poor and weak exponents. "Our cause," wrote a Master of Wisdom, "needs missionaries, devotees, agents, even martyrs, perhaps. But it cannot demand of any man to make himself either." Each student-server has to determine for himself his duties and obligations, what he shall or shall not do. To the extent of his own enthusiasm and devotion will he succeed in infusing these into others. But it would be a fatal error if in his zeal he should substitute the body for the soul. Theosophy is like the Spiritual Soul and the organization or vehicle engaged in its spread is like the body. The distinction between the two has always to be kept in mind.

The best vindication and promulgation of Theosophy is through the living of the Theosophical life by its students and well-wishers. By their actions are Theosophists judged — and so is Theosophy. H.P.B. once wrote:—

It has been always held that a true Theosophist must have no personal ends to serve, no favourite hobby to propagate, no special doctrine to enforce or to defend. For, to merit the honourable title of Theosophist one must be an altruist, above all; one ever ready to help equally foe or friend, to act, rather than to speak; and urge others to action, while never losing an opportunity to work himself. But, if no true Theosophist will ever dictate to his fellow-brother or neighbour what this one should believe or disbelieve in, nor force him to act on lines which may be distasteful to him, however proper they may appear to himself, there are other duties which he has to attend to: (a) to warn his brother of any danger the latter may fail to see; and (b) to share his knowledge — if he has acquired such — with those who have been less fortunate than himself in opportunities for acquiring it. (THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, Vol. XI, p. 189)

PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHICULES

[The following article first appeared in *Lucifer*, Vol. V, pp. 85-91, for October 1889, and was reprinted in THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for September 1937.—EDS.]

We shall in vain interpret their words by the notions of our philosophy and the doctrines in our schools.

—LOCKE

Knowledge of the lowest kind is *un-unified* knowledge; Science is *partially unified* knowledge; Philosophy is *completely unified* knowledge.

—HERBERT SPENCER'S *First Principles*

New accusations are brought by captious censors against our Society in general and Theosophy, especially. We will summarize them as we proceed along, and notice the "freshest" denunciation.

We are accused of being illogical in the "Constitution and Rules" of the Theosophical Society; and contradictory in the practical application thereof. The accusations are framed in this wise:—

In the published "Constitution and Rules" great stress is laid upon the absolutely non-sectarian character of the Society. It is constantly insisted upon that it has no creed, no philosophy, no religion, no dogmas, and even no special views of its own to advocate, still less to impose on its members. And yet—

"Why, bless us! is it not as undeniable a fact that certain very definite views of a philosophic and, strictly speaking, of a religious character are held by the Founders and most prominent members of the Society?"

"Verily so," we answer. "But where is the alleged *contradiction* in this? Neither the Founders, nor the 'most prominent members,' nor yet the majority thereof, constitute *the* Society, but only a certain portion of it, which, moreover, having no creed as a body, yet allows its members to believe as and what they please." In answer to this, we are told:—

"Very true; yet these doctrines are collectively called 'Theosophy.' What is your explanation of this?"

We reply:—"To call them so is a 'collective' mistake; one of those loose applications of terms to things that ought to be more carefully defined; and the neglect of members to do so is now bearing its fruits. In fact it is an oversight as harmful as that which followed the confusion of the two terms 'buddhism' and 'bodhism,' leading the Wisdom philosophy to be mistaken for the religion of Buddha."

But it is still urged that when these doctrines are examined it becomes very clear that all the work which the Society as a body has done in the East and the West depended upon them. This is obviously true in the case of the doctrine of the underlying unity of all religions and the existence, as claimed by Theosophists, of a common source

called the Wisdom-religion of the secret teaching, from which, according to the same claims, all existing forms of religion are directly or indirectly derived. Admitting this, we are pressed to explain, how can the T.S. as a body be said to have no special views or doctrines to inculcate, no creed and no dogmas, when these are "the backbone of the Society, its very heart and soul"?

To this we can only answer that it is still another error. That these teachings are most undeniably the "backbone" of the Theosophical Societies *in the West*, but not at all in the East, where such Branch Societies number almost five to one in the West. Were these special doctrines the "heart and soul" of the whole body, then Theosophy and its T.S. would have died out in India and Ceylon since 1885 — and this is surely not the case. For, not only have they been virtually abandoned at Adyar since that year, as there was no one to teach them, but while some Brahmin Theosophists were very much opposed to that teaching being made public, others — the more orthodox — positively opposed them as being inimical to their exoteric systems.

These are self-evident facts. And yet if answered that it is not so; that the T.S. as a body teaches no special religion but tolerates and virtually accepts all religions by never interfering with, or even inquiring after the religious views of its members, our cavillers and even friendly opponents, do not feel satisfied. On the contrary: ten to one they will non-plus you with the following extraordinary objection:—

"How can this be, since belief in 'Esoteric Buddhism' is a *sine qua non* for acceptance as a Fellow of your Society?"

It is vain to protest any longer; useless to assure our opponents that belief in *Buddhism*, whether esoteric or exoteric, is no more expected by, nor obligatory in, our Society than reverence for the monkey-god Hanuman, him of the singed tail, or belief in Mahomet and his canonized mare. It is unprofitable to try and explain that since there are in the T.S. as many Brahmins, Mussulmans, Parsis, Jews and Christians as there are Buddhists, and more, all cannot be expected to become followers of Buddha, nor even of Buddhism, howsoever esoteric. Nor can they be made to realize that the Occult doctrines — a few fundamental teachings of which are broadly outlined in Mr. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism" — are not the *whole* of Theosophy, nor even the whole of the secret doctrines of the East, but a very small portion of these: Occultism itself being but one of the Sciences of Theosophy, or the WISDOM-Religion, and by no means the whole of THEOSOPHY.

So firmly rooted seem these ideas, however, in the mind of the average Britisher, that it is like telling him that there are Russians who are neither Nihilists nor Panslavists, and that every Frenchman does not make his daily meal of frogs; he will simply refuse to believe you. Prejudice against Theosophy seems to have become part of the national feeling. For almost three years the writer of the present — helped in this by a host of Theosophists — has tried in vain to sweep away from

the public brain some of the most fantastic cobwebs with which it is garnished; and now she is on the eve of giving up the attempt in despair! While half of the English people will persist in confusing Theosophy with "esoteric *bud-ism*," the remainder will keep on pronouncing the world-honoured title of Buddha as they do — *butter*.

It is they also who have started the proposition now generally adopted by the flippant press that "Theosophy is not a philosophy, but a religion," and "a new sect."

Theosophy is certainly not a philosophy, simply because it includes every philosophy as every science and religion. But before we prove it once more, it may be pertinent to ask how many of our critics are thoroughly posted about, say, even the true definition of the term coined by Pythagoras, that they should so flippantly deny it to a system of which they seem to know still less than they do about philosophy? Have they acquainted themselves with its best and latest definitions, or even with the views upon it, now regarded as antiquated, of Sir W. Hamilton? The answer would seem to be in the negative, since they fail to see that every such definition shows Theosophy to be the very synthesis of Philosophy in its widest abstract sense, as in its special qualifications. Let us try to give once more a clear and concise definition of Theosophy, and show it to be the very root and essence of all sciences and systems.

Theosophy is "divine" or "god-wisdom." Therefore, it must be the life-blood of that system (philosophy) which is defined as "the science of things divine and human and the causes in which they are contained" (Sir W. Hamilton), Theosophy alone possessing the keys to those "causes." Bearing in mind simply its most elementary division, we find that philosophy is the love of and search after wisdom, "the knowledge of phenomena as explained by, and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers and laws" (*Encyclopedia*). When applied to god or gods, it became in every country *theology*; when to material nature, it was called *physics* and *natural history*; concerned with man, it appeared as *anthropology* and *Psychology*; and when raised to the higher regions it becomes known as *metaphysics*. Such is philosophy — "the science of effects by their causes" — the very spirit of the doctrine of *Karma*, the most important teaching under various names of every religious philosophy, and a theosophical tenet that belongs to no one religion but explains them all. Philosophy is also called "the science of things possible, inasmuch as they are possible." This applies directly to theosophical doctrines, inasmuch as they reject *miracle*; but it can hardly apply to theology or any dogmatic religion, every one of which *enforces belief in things impossible*; nor to the modern philosophical systems of the materialists who reject even the "possible," whenever the latter contradicts their assertions.

Theosophy claims to explain and to reconcile religion with science. We find G. H. Lewes (*History of Philosophy*, Vol. I, Prolegomena,

p. xviii) stating that "Philosophy, detaching its widest conceptions from both (Theology and Science), furnishes a doctrine which contains an *explanation of the world and human destiny*." "The office of Philosophy is the systematization of the conceptions furnished by Science. . . . Science furnishes the knowledge, and Philosophy the doctrine" (*loc. cit.*). The latter can become complete only on condition of having that "knowledge" and that "doctrine" passed through the sieve of Divine Wisdom, or Theosophy.

Ueberweg (*History of Philosophy*) defines Philosophy as "the Science of Principles," which, as all our members know, is the claim of Theosophy in its branch-sciences of Alchemy, Astrology, and the occult sciences generally.

Hegel regards it as "the contemplation of the self-development of the ABSOLUTE," or in other words as "the representation of the Idea" (*Darstellung der Idee*).

The whole of the Secret Doctrine — of which the work bearing that name is but an atom — is such a contemplation and record, as far as finite language and limited thought can record the processes of the infinite.

Thus it becomes evident that Theosophy cannot be a "religion," still less "a sect," but it is indeed the quintessence of the highest *philosophy* in all and every one of its aspects. Having shown that it falls under, and answers fully, every description of philosophy, we may add to the above a few more of Sir W. Hamilton's definitions, and prove our statement by showing the pursuit of the same in Theosophical literature. This is a task easy enough, indeed. For, does not "Theosophy" include "the science of things evidently deduced from first principles," as well as "the sciences of truths sensible and abstract"? Does it not preach "the applications of reason to its legitimate objects," and make it one of its "legitimate objects" — to inquire into "the science of the original form of the Ego, or mental self," as also to teach the secret of "the absolute indifference of the ideal and real"? All of which proves that according to every definition — old or new — of philosophy, he who studies Theosophy, studies the *highest transcendental philosophy*.

We need not go out of our way to notice at any length such foolish statements about Theosophy and Theosophists as are found almost daily in the public press. Such definitions and epithets as "newfangled religion" and "ism," "the system *invented* by the high priestess of Theosophy," and other remarks as silly, may be left to their own fate. They have been and in most cases will be left unnoticed.

Our age is regarded as being pre-eminently critical: an age which analyzes closely, and whose public refuses to accept anything offered for its consideration before it has fully scrutinized the subject. Such is the boast of our century; but such is not quite the opinion of the impartial observer. At all events it is an opinion highly exaggerated

since this boasted analytical scrutiny is applied only to that which interferes in no way with national, social, or personal prejudices. On the other hand everything that is malevolent, destructive to reputation, wicked and slanderous, is received with open embrace, accepted joyfully, and made the subject of everlasting public gossip, without any scrutiny or the slightest hesitation, but verily on a blind faith of the most elastic kind. We challenge contradiction on this point. Neither unpopular characters nor their work are judged in our day on their intrinsic value, but merely on their author's personality and the prejudiced opinion thereon of the masses. In many journals no literary work of a Theosophist can ever hope to be reviewed on its own merits, apart from the gossip about its author. Such papers, oblivious of the rule first laid by Aristotle, who says that criticism is "a standard of judging well," refuse pointblank to accept any Theosophical book apart from its writer. As a first result, the former is judged by the distorted reflection of the latter created by slander repeated in the daily papers. The personality of the writer hangs like a dark shadow between the opinion of the modern journalist and unvarnished truth; and as a final result there are few editors in all Europe and America who know anything of our Society's tenets.

How can then Theosophy or even the T.S. be correctly judged? It is nothing new to say that the true critic ought to know something at least of the subject he undertakes to analyze. Nor is it very risky to add that not one of our press Thersites knows in the remotest way what he is talking about—this, from the large fish to the smallest fry; but whenever the word "Theosophy" is printed and catches the reader's eye, there it will be generally found preceded and followed by abusive epithets and invective against the personalities of certain Theosophists. The modern editor of the Grundy pandering kind, is like Byron's hero, "*He knew not what to say, and so he swore*"—at that which passeth his comprehension. All such swearing is invariably based upon old gossip, and stale denunciations of those who stand in the moonstruck minds as the "inventors" of Theosophy. Had South Sea islanders a daily press of their own, they would be as sure to accuse the missionaries of having invented Christianity in order to bring to grief their native fetishism.

How long, O radiant gods of truth, how long shall this terrible mental cecity of the nineteenth-century *Philosophists* last? How much longer are they to be told that Theosophy is no national property, no religion, but only the universal code of science and the most transcendental ethics that was ever known; that it lies at the root of every moral philosophy and religion; and that neither Theosophy *per se*, nor yet its humble unworthy vehicle, the Theosophical Society, has anything whatever to do with any personality or personalities! To identify it with these is to show oneself sadly defective in logic and even common sense. To reject the teaching and its philosophy under the pre-

text that its leaders, or rather one of its Founders, lies under various accusations (so far unproven) is silly, illogical and absurd. It is, in truth, as ridiculous as it would have been in the days of the Alexandrian school of Neo-Platonism, which was in its essence *Theosophy*, to reject its teachings, because it came to Plato from Socrates, and because the sage of Athens, besides his pug-nose and bald head, was accused of "blasphemy and of corrupting the youth."

Aye, kind and generous critics, who call yourselves Christians, and boast of the civilization and progress of your age; you have only to be scratched skin-deep to find in you the same cruel and prejudiced "barbarian" as of old. Were an opportunity offered you to sit in public and legal judgment on a Theosophist, who of you would rise in your nineteenth century of Christianity higher than one of the Athenian *dikastery* with its 500 jurors who condemned Socrates to death? Which of you would scorn to become a Meletus or an Anytus, and have Theosophy and all its adherents condemned on the evidence of false witness to a like ignominious death? The hatred manifested in your daily attacks upon the Theosophists is a warrant to us for this. Did Haywood have you in his mind's eye when he wrote of Society's censure:—

O! that the too censorious world would learn
This wholesome rule, and with each other bear;
But man, as if a foe to his own species,
Takes pleasure to report his neighbour's faults,
Judging with rigour every small offence,
And prides himself in scandal....

Many optimistic writers would fain make of this mercantile century of ours an age of philosophy and call it its *renaissance*. We fail to find outside of our Society any attempt at philosophical revival, unless the word "philosophy" is made to lose its original meaning. For wherever we turn we find a cold sneer at true philosophy. A sceptic can never aspire to that title. He who is capable of imagining the universe with its handmaiden Nature fortuitous, and hatched like the black hen of the fable, out of a self-created egg hanging in space, has neither the power of thinking nor the spiritual faculty of perceiving abstract truths; which power and faculty are the first requisites of a philosophical mind. We see the entire realm of modern Science honeycombed with such materialists, who yet claim to be regarded as philosophers. They either believe in naught as do the Secularists, or doubt according to the manner of the Agnostics. Remembering the two wise aphorisms by Bacon, the modern-day materialist is thus condemned out of the mouth of the Founder of his own inductive method, as contrasted with the deductive philosophy of Plato, accepted in Theosophy. For does not Bacon tell us that "Philosophy *when superficially studied* excites doubt; when thoroughly explored it dispels it"; and again, "a *little* philosophy *inclineth man's mind to atheism*; but depth of philosophy bringeth

man's mind about to religion"?

The logical deduction of the above is, undeniably, that none of our present Darwinians and materialists and their admirers, our critics, could have studied philosophy otherwise than very "superficially." Hence while Theosophists have a legitimate right to the title of *philosophers* — true "lovers of Wisdom" — their critics and slanderers are at best PHILOSOPHICULES — the progeny of modern PHILOSOPHISM.

CONTINUITY

In these terrible times when man is warring against man, when suffering and a debasing of ideas and ideals seem to be almost universal and we forget the side of growth, it is a comfort to remember the far worse times of the fall of Atlantis, for we see that, in spite of what seemed the complete collapse of mankind, the human race continued and all that was *real* was not destroyed.

This idea comes to us when we note that in *The Secret Doctrine* (II. 423) H.P.B. says that one MS., from which she quotes extracts, "is said to have been copied from stone tablets which belonged to a Buddha of the earliest day of the Fifth Race, who had witnessed the Deluge and the submersion of the chief continents of the Atlantean race." She says that she has rendered the extracts into more comprehensible language; could we not say, into magnificent language, for the description of that disaster is so vivid and powerful that we pause in wonder while remembering that it was written on stone tablets belonging to a Buddha who watched the happenings so many thousands of years ago.

Linking this up with what is said in *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 273) about the Wise who were saved from that cataclysm, does not the continuity of spiritual things as well as of Life stand out, so that we need not despair? Of the "good" who were saved only the "faint-hearted" perished on the way to safety. A more modern MS., H.P.B. tells us, states that "*the nations that were led away, were as thick as the stars of the milky way.*"

Like as a dragon-snake uncoils slowly its body, so the Sons of men, led on by the Sons of Wisdom, opened their folds, and spreading out, expanded like a running stream of sweet waters. . . . many of the faint-hearted among them perished on their way. But most were saved.

Let us start increasing our faith in ourselves, in the Wise and in the Law!

THE PATH OF ACTION*

[Hadji Erinn was one of the pen-names of W. Q. Judge who printed the following article in his *Path*, Vol. II, p. 247, for November 1887. In it a reference is made to the Theosophical Society as having "passed its probationary period." This was chiefly due to the Teachings given out by the Masters through H.P.B., which inspired and energized a sufficient number of the Society's members to become student-servers. In the process a number failed to move with the Movement of H.P.B., and such did not use the further Teachings of the Masters.]

This article was published in 1887; during the next seven-year period (1887 to 1894), as predicted by H.P.B., a test came to the Society. That happened after her death in 1891. In this test many front-rank members and officers failed, which resulted in the split in the then Theosophical Society. W. Q. Judge and his friends and followers remained true to the Message and the Messenger; his hand of fellowship was rejected by the Adyar leaders, with dire consequences. This historical background should be kept in view by the reader. Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists will do well to study this article and make personal applications — each to himself please! Let each answer to himself if he is, within himself, "a centre of emotional disturbance"; and, again, if he stands to the one United Lodge of Theosophists as "a fibre in his body stands to the whole man." Let each judge himself in the light of this article.]

The Mohammedan teacher directs his disciples to tread carefully the razor's edge between the good and the bad; only a hair-line divides the false from the true. In this the Asiatic took an excellent illustration, for the "hair-line" is the small stroke *alif*, which, placed in a word, may alter the sense from the true to the false.

In chapter four of the *Bhagavad-Gita*, entitled "Jnana-Yog," of the book of the Religion of Knowledge, the blessed Krishna instructed Arjuna upon the nature of action, saying: "Renunciation of and devotion through works, are both means of final emancipation; but of these two, devotion through works is more highly esteemed (by Him than the renunciation of them"; and, "the nature of action, of forbidden action, and of inaction must be well learned. The Path of Action is obscure and difficult to discern."

In ordinary humdrum life these words of Krishna are true enough but their force is strangely felt in the mind of the devoted student of Theosophy, and especially if he happens to be a member of the Theosophical Society.

That body of investigators has now passed its probationary period

* This article, together with the introductory note, was published in THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for September 1937. — EDS.

so that, as a whole, it is an accepted chela of the Blessed Masters who gave the impulse that brought it into being. Every member of it, therefore, stands to the whole Society as every fibre in the body of any single chela does to the whole man. Thus now, more than ever before, does each member of the Society feel disturbing influences; and the Path of Action becomes more and more likely to be obscured.

Always existing or coming into existence in our ranks, have been centres of emotional disturbance. Those who expect that these perturbations ought now to cease and grow less likely to recur, will find themselves mistaken. The increase of interest that is being taken in the Society's work, and the larger number of earnest students who are with us than at any previous period, constitute elements of agitation. Each new member is another nature added, and everyone acts after his own nature. Thus the chances for being discomposed are sure to increase; and it is better thus, for peace with stagnation partakes of the nature of what is called in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, *Tamogunam*, or, of the quality of darkness. This quality of darkness, than which there is nothing worse, is the chief component of indifference, and indifference leads only to extinction.

Still another element in this equation that every earnest Theosophist has to solve, and which in itself contains the potency of manifold commotions, is a law, hard to define, yet inexorable in its action. For its clearer comprehension we may say that it is shown in nature by the rising of the sun. In the night when the moon's rays flooded the scene, every object was covered with a romantic light, and when that luminary went down, it left everything in a partial obscurity wherein many doubtful characters could conceal their identity or even masquerade for that which they were not. But on the sun's arising all objects stand out in their true colours; the rugged bark of the oak has lost the softening cover of partial day; the rank weeds can no longer be imagined as the malwa flowers. The powerful hand of the God of day has unveiled the character of all.

It must not be supposed that a record has been kept by any officials, from which are to be taken and published the characters of our members. There is no need of that; circumstances taking place in natural order, or apparently from eccentric motion, will cause us all, whether we will or not, to stand forth for what we are.

Every one of us will have to stop and learn in the cave outside of the Hall of Learning, before we can enter there. Very true that cave, with all its dark shadows and agitating influences, is an illusion, but it is one that very few will fail to create, for hard indeed to be overcome are the illusions of matter. In that shall we discover the nature of action and inaction; there we will come to admit that although the quality of action partakes of the nature of badness, yet it is nearer to the quality of truth than is that which we have called darkness, quietude, indifference. Out of the turmoil and the strife of an apparently

untamed life may arise one who is a warrior for Truth. A thousand errors of judgment made by an earnest student, who with a pure and high motive strives to push on the Cause, are better than the outward goodness of those who are judges of their fellows. All these errors made in a good cause, while sowing good seed, will be atoned by the motive.

We must not then be judges of any man. We cannot assume to say who shall or shall not be allowed to enter and to work in the Theosophical Society. The Masters who founded it, wish us to offer its influence and its light to all, regardless of what we may ourselves think we are to sow the seed, and when it falls on stony ground no blame attaches to the sower.

Nor is our Society for good and respectable people only. Now, as much as when Jesus of Nazareth spoke, is it true that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner who repenteth, than over ninety-nine just men who need no repentance.

Remembering then that the Path of Action is obscure and difficult to be discerned, let us beware of the illusions of matter.

HADJI ERINN

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's call to the people of India to cast away distinctions of caste, creed and personal animosity and get out of the "mental prison-houses" in which they lived today appears timely at a juncture when Indians are priding themselves upon their ancient traditions and achievements but have forgotten what their scriptures taught them.

The *Deccan Herald* of August 4th reports the Vice-President stating in reply to a civic address presented to him by the Masulipatan Municipal Council that the essence of our tradition could be summed up in one word, namely, "*Tattwamasi*" (That thou art), implying that there should not be among human beings any distinctions, any greediness, tyranny and injustice to fellow beings. There is only one human race; all other things are subordinate.

The one ideal for man, Dr. Radhakrishnan said, "should be to have mind and heart merged in bliss."

Man is imperfect and he is yet to complete himself. He is floating in a moral and spiritual vacuum. He does not have the inward resources to achieve these ideals. It is, therefore, essential to cast away fissiparous tendencies and group loyalties and cultivate the path of truth and love.

THE BLESSINGS OF TRANQUILLITY

Desire peace fervently. . . . The peace you shall desire is that sacred peace which nothing can disturb, and in which the soul grows as does the holy flower upon the still lagoons.

—*Light on the Path*

Again and again in Theosophical teachings the value, nay, the indispensability of calmness or tranquillity is stressed. One of the Masters wrote:—

It is upon the serene and placid surface of the unruffled mind that the visions gathered from the invisible find a representation in the visible world. . . . It is with jealous care that we have to guard our mind plane from all the adverse influences which daily arise in our passage through earth-life.

“The placid surface of the sea of spirit” is called by Mr. Judge “the only mirror in which can be caught undisturbed the reflections of spiritual things.” And elsewhere he named calmness as “the one thing necessary for the spirit to be heard.”

The Buddha tells us in *The Dhammapada* (verse 96):—

Calm in thought, calm in speech, calm in actions is he who has obtained freedom through true knowledge. He has become tranquil. He is full of repose.

Chuang-Tse, the great Taoist philosopher in ancient China, described the repose of the Sage as “not what the world calls repose,” adding:—

All creation could not disturb his equilibrium: hence his repose. When water is still it is like a mirror . . . and the philosopher makes it his model. . . . The mind of the Sage, being in repose, becomes the mirror of the universe.

And he added further: “Only what is itself still can instil stillness into others.”

Many centuries before Buddha and Chuang-Tse, Krishna had taught that

he who, free from attachment or repulsion for objects, experienceth them through the senses and organs, with his heart obedient to his will, attains to tranquillity of thought. And this tranquil state attained, therefrom shall soon result a separation from all troubles; and his mind being thus at ease, fixed upon one object, it embraceth wisdom from all sides. . . . who doth not practise reflection hath no calm; and how can a man without calm obtain happiness?

As Mr. Crosbie reminds us: “*Thy strength is in thy soul and thy soul's strength is in the calm and not in storm revealed.*” And again he says that “we, who know that the universe exists for the purposes of Soul, can be but momentarily disturbed by anything that may come to

pass." Mental and physical calmness have to be maintained to overcome disturbance, he writes, and he calls upon us to "be steadfast, calm and fearless, as becomes one who doth forevermore endure."

The Buddha names "that quietude of heart which springs from within" among the steps by which His Bhikkhus could attain to hearing "with clear and heavenly ear, surpassing that of men, sounds both human and celestial, whether far or near."

It is not difficult to recognize that, as a Master wrote, "great man is he who is strongest in the exercise of patience," or that "calmness ever present" is a mark of one who has attained to perfection. But for us who are only trying, however earnestly, to work towards that great consummation, how — to paraphrase a beautiful Christian hymn — are we to take from our minds the strain and stress, and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of true peace? How shall we gain that "balmy calmness which is the heart's eye" and which is needed to penetrate the mysteries of nature?

Where shall we turn to gain or regain or maintain tranquillity when outer circumstances and the actions or the attitude of those around us seem almost past enduring patiently? From ancient Greece comes one helpful reminder. "Where can man find a calmer, more restful haven than in his own soul?" Marcus Aurelius Antoninus asked himself; and within himself he found the answer, recognizing that he applied most of all to him "whose inner state is so ordered that he has only to penetrate thither to find himself in the midst of a great peace."

What is this but the "retiring now and then to the quiet place" which Mr. Judge counsels for bringing up good currents and keeping back evil ones? How helpful too in times of stress and strain to keep in mind the gracious assurance of Krishna that He is not alone "the goal, the Lord, the Witness," but also "the Comforter, the resting-place, the asylum and the Friend"! We can well believe the assurance implied in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad's* question:—

Who knows the Soul, and sees himself as it — what should he long for, or desiring what should he fret for the fever of life? . . .

When a man gains the vision of the godlike Soul, the lord of what has been and what shall be, he fears no more.

It is futile to wait for the stress we feel to be relieved by the action of others, when the need is for us to change our attitude, which only we can do. The Masters Themselves could not act against Karma and the Law of Cycles to create conditions that would make of our world "an arcadia for lofty souls." But, as Mr. Crosbie writes, "there can be no cause for worrying over any future. . . . There is need only that we hold all our powers in readiness to make good use of what is brought to us." to bow to the loss under Karma of loved ones and possessions which we cherish, while performing calmly and confidently "what we are able to do, day by day, from day to day."

There is no need to be anxious as to what shall come of our efforts to serve and to promulgate the regenerating message of Theosophy. The results of efforts laid upon the altar of the One Self in us and in all are in the hands of the great Masters and the Law.

In this connection may be found helpful another of the thoughts of the second-century Roman Emperor, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus:—

Traverse . . . this little moment of time at peace with Nature, and reach thy journey's end in all content, as an olive that ripens and falls, blessing the nature that bare it and giving thanks to the tree whereon it grew.

Be as a cliff at whose foot the billows break, and break again; but it stands firm, and by and by the seething waters sink to rest.

Or, as Mr. Crosbie writes:—

Calmness is like a rock; waves of irritation may dash at it, but cannot affect it; it can be attained by seeing the necessity for it, and by endeavour which is constant. It comes from "resting in the Real," which is never moved, but moves all things, sees all, without being involved. . . . These things in themselves do not matter; it does matter that we are unshaken. . . . there is always that place which is never moved, to rest on and in. So with confidence in Them we go forward, and may Peace be ever ours.

A *sine qua non* for maintaining tranquillity is, of course, detachment from pleasure and from pain. The means to such detachment was indicated in an illuminating answer in our Volume XXIV (p. 64) as ceasing to identify Self with the body or with what is experienced:—

The moment the identification is cut off, the body is here if we choose to use it, and pleasure and pain are here if we choose to experience them; otherwise we are outside their sphere of influence. It is difficult for us to get this view, but that is the very purpose of our struggle on earth.

"He . . . is my beloved servant," says Krishna,

who is equal-minded to friend or foe, the same in honour and dishonour, in cold and heat, in pain and pleasure, and is unsolicitous about the event of things; to whom praise and blame are as one; who is of little speech, content with whatever cometh to pass . . . and whose heart, full of devotion, is firmly fixed.

"Calmness ever present" is the ideal. It demands acquiescence in whatever comes to us under Karma. Acquiescence does not mean helpless quiescence or passivity, but acceptance, while trying to turn to good account the seeming ill. "One could be confined in a prison and yet be a worker for the Cause."

The Voice of the Silence tells us: "Both action and inaction may find room in thee; thy body agitated, thy mind tranquil, thy Soul as limpid as a mountain lake." Mr. Judge reminds us that "a steady

mind and heart stands still and quiet until the muddy stream rolls clear." And Mr. Crosbie counsels: "Be like the great bed of the ocean that is never moved though storms may ruffle its surface. . . . Whatever comes, all is well."

As we engage, then, in each duty as it comes, putting our best effort into each, but quietly and without strain, we shall find ourselves able to accomplish more, with a smaller expenditure of energy than if we rush from half-done task to half-done task, and without sacrifice of calmness.

Mr. Judge has written of "the calmness which comes from trying to exemplify Brotherhood," assuring us that, if we are trying to alleviate the sorrows or sufferings of others, we shall find strength coming to us when we need it most. But we must never feel indifferent to others' pain and difficulties, though we must try to cultivate indifference towards our own. To the hard of heart the Way is inexorably barred. The hardness of the mango's stone is advocated only for our own throes and sorrows; for others' woes we are enjoined to be "as soft and sweet as its bright golden pulp." The tears of others that we let fall upon our hearts are never brushed off till the pain that caused them is removed, "these are the streams that irrigate the fields of charity immortal." And only on such soil can grow the "blossom of *Bodhisattva*," which means remaining "unselfish till the endless end." Nor is it only the sufferings of the chosen few that ought to move us to compassion. We have to try steadily to expand our circle of sympathy.

Mr. Judge wrote to a correspondent troubled about the woes of humanity:—

The best stand to take is that it is all right as it is now, and when the time comes for it to be better it will be so. Meanwhile we have a duty to see that we do all we can *in our own place* as we see best, undisturbed and undismayed by aught. . . . Your faith will know that *all* is provided for.

As far as the remediable sufferings of others are concerned, however, we may take that position and feel peace and calmness without hardness of heart only when heart, mind and hands are fully occupied with duties that we may not put aside, and when we are trying our best to help by our own life and example and, to the extent of our abilities and means, are handing on to others the life-giving Teachings to which we have had access and by the light of which we are attempting to regenerate ourselves.

On those conditions only may we hope to have a touch, at our very much lower level, of the consciousness which a Master named as the only possible reward for the task to which Their labours are devoted— the consciousness that They are doing Their duty to humanity.

RAJA RAMMOHUN ROY AS A VOTARY OF TRUE RELIGION

Raja Rammohun Roy, born in the village of Radhanagar in the Hoogly district of Bengal in the year 1772, has left in the annals of Indian history a distinguished record of philanthropic effort and achievement. His public activities in manifold spheres, which started when he was still in his teens, continued till his death in England in 1833. It was to a considerable extent due to the seeds of religious, political, educational and social reforms sown by him that Gandhi was enabled later to inaugurate a non-violent revolution which ultimately led to the liberation of India from foreign domination. In this study, however, will be considered mainly Rammohun's contribution to the religious thought of the world, as religion was the basic urge of his life.

At the time of Rammohun's birth a dense cloud of social and spiritual darkness was brooding over the country. The pure monotheism of the Vedas had been forgotten and was supplanted by the worship of a multitude of anthropomorphic gods. Even the atrocious custom of *Sati*, i.e., the burning of widows on the funeral pyres of their deceased husbands, was left unchecked. The fate of the great religious teachers and movements of his dark age served only to bring into clearer view the evil days which had fallen on the land. Their message of spiritual religion was not understood and their followers soon degenerated into sects, intensifying the very evils which the teachers had striven to eradicate.

Rammohun had to make his way through this darkness, in the beginning without friends or followers. Estranged even from his parents, he sustained himself through the stoutness of his own heart and the vision that he saw afar of a New India to arise from the ruins of the old. He struggled bravely against great odds, undeterred by the envy or antipathy of vested interests, to bring that vision nearer. How well he acquitted himself in the service of his country at an important turning-point in its chequered history will be easy to gauge from an article by Madame Blavatsky, who has put on record her sincere appreciation of his character and qualities. In this article, published in *The Theosophist* for March 1881, H.P.B. mentions him as "one of the purest, most philanthropic and enlightened men India ever produced," and adds:—

His intellectual power was confessedly very great, while his manners were most refined and charming and his moral character without a stain. Add to this a dauntless moral courage, perfect modesty, warm humanitarian bias, patriotism, and a fervid religious feeling, and we have before us the picture of a man of the noblest type. Such a person was the ideal of a religious reformer. Had his constitution been more rugged and his sensitiveness less acute, he might have lived to see far greater fruits of his self-sacrificing labours than he did. One searches the record of his life and work in vain for any evidence of personal

conceit, or a disposition to make himself figure as a heaven-sent messenger.

His father, Rama Kanta Roy, an orthodox Brahmin of means, spared no expense in advancing his son's Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit studies at Patna and Benares, after he had completed his school course of Bengali education. Religiously disposed from childhood, Rammohun at first entertained reverence for his family's household deities, but later his contact with Sufic and Islamic teachings at Patna and with the Vedantic philosophy at Benares made him doubt the wisdom of idol-worship. He pressed his father to let him know his reasons for his faith in idols in a world pervaded by one, formless God. Long and sometimes heated discussions took place between father and son, which failed to satisfy the latter. At last he left the paternal home at the early age of 15. A lone wanderer for three or four years, he bore his trials with Stoic resignation.

The details of his travels are not known. It is, however, certain that he visited Tibet for the study of Buddhism. After the termination of his travels, Rammohun made his home at Benares with his family. He was 24 before he started the study of English. Later he studied Greek, Latin, Hebrew and French as well.

Between the two poles of the extreme religiosity of idol-worshippers and the denial of God by the atheists, Rammohun had to find a golden mean for bringing together all categories of religious thought for the vindication of the brotherhood of humankind under the benign protection of the fatherhood of the One Divine Principle which is the Causeless Cause of man's being on earth, his preserver and regenerator. With the establishment of the Brahma Samaj his aspiration was fulfilled to some extent, but before that consummation came about he spent many years in the study of the various religions, combating through his works the views of the protagonists of the established orthodox cults.

The doubts which arose in his mind as a boy about the propriety of idol-worship became confirmed when he observed the variegated modes of worship of those he met during his travels. He rejected the divergent priestly and sophistic interpretations of religious texts which, for personal ends or reasons of worldly expediency, tried to explain away the meaning of the original teachers and prophets. To understand them he relied upon his own intuition and knowledge of the languages in which the teachings of the different religions were originally recorded.

His first work entitled *A Gift to Monotheists*, written in Persian the State language at the time, is a bold protest against the idolatrous element in all established religions and against corrupt practices unworthy of a man of religion. He says that the concept of One God is distorted and people have fallen into the habit of worshipping angels, elements, idols and other concrete symbols fabricated by their respective religious heads. Thus the One God without attributes is split up

into numerous lesser gods with good and bad attributes, and one humanity is broken into numberless sects. Those who cling to corrupt religious practices delude themselves that because they are in the majority the few reformers who are not in agreement with them must be in the wrong; but Rammohun states that "the truth of a saying does not depend upon the multitude of sayers, and the non-reliability of a narration cannot result from the small numbers of its narrators."

He holds three classes of people responsible for religious degradation: (1) deceivers who, to have a following, invent false doctrines and create disunity among the people; (2) deceived people who, without inquiring into the facts, believe others; (3) those who are both deceivers and deceived; they, having faith in the sayings of another, thoughtlessly induce others to adopt the same doctrines. He adds that those who do not deceive and are not deceived are the wise who have to shoulder the burden of guiding the others.

Rammohun knew that the problem of religious reform was of universal importance, for all world religions had deviated from their pristine purity. But, as far as India was concerned, he was quick enough to grasp that the question of prime importance was to look into the causes of the degradation of the very manhood of his people and to devise ways and means to rectify the tragic condition of their secular life. When he became the personal assistant to Collector Digby he had the opportunity to see that his own people could learn something of value from their English rulers, in such matters as education, civic obligations and the status of women, instead of singing the praises of their ancient civilization and culture which they had long ceased to live up to.

At the same time he realized that the initiative lay with the leaders of the people, not only for moving the administration to introduce reforms, but also for educating the people to see that the time had come to shake off the age-old inertia and work energetically for the reshaping of their destiny by the harmonious blending of their ancient culture with whatever there was of good in the culture of the West. He, therefore, through the different constitutional ways open to him, such as the writing of letters and petitions, the publishing of books, pamphlets, etc., made the authorities know of the legitimate grievances of the people in regard to communal favouritism, iniquitous land settlement and various defects in the operation of administrative orders and laws. By publishing two weeklies, one in Bengali and another in Persian, he was one of the first to enter the field of Indian journalism. He stood up for the freedom of the press as a necessary instrument for bringing closer the rulers and the ruled and for ventilating grievances. Above all he worked for and achieved a measure of success in starting the study of the English language and of modern sciences in addition to the study of Oriental classics.

Every form of injustice and tyranny in any part of the world ex-

cited indignation in Rammohun who, as a votary of one true religion was also a believer in human solidarity. He exulted in the triumph of liberty in any quarter of the globe. Whether it was the fight for constitutional government in Spain, the struggle of the Italians for emancipation from the Austrian yoke, the agitation for good government in Ireland, the conflict over the abolition of slavery in America, or the movement for the amelioration of the condition of Indian women, Rammohun's sympathy poured in unstinted measures on the side of justice and humanity. He felt profoundly that in the gain or loss of one section of humanity all the rest have equal claim.

Rammohun was keenly alive to the urgent need for the amelioration of the condition of Indian women, who were not only denied the rights enjoyed by the men but, in the name of religion, were not even allowed to live if they became widows. When he became a helpless witness to the burning of his brother's widow in 1811 he determined that he would never rest until the custom of *Sati* was rooted out. This happy event occurred after 18 years of strenuous agitation, when a regulation abolishing *Sati* was passed by the Government of Lord William Bentinck.

The ancient Indian tradition of self-surrender on the part of a wife gave birth to the custom of self-immolation when the husband was dead. There was a time when widows entered the funeral pyres of their deceased husbands by their own choice, as they were given to believe that such an act of devotion would bring them meritorious fruition in heaven. But in succeeding generations cruel custom commingled with corrupt religion and burning alive became a compulsory imposition sanctioned by the new *shastras*, which came into existence in disregard of the Vedic teachings and the laws of Manu which advised the widows to live an ascetic life of service and self-denial. Rammohun published two treatises in the form of questions and answers between an advocate for and an opponent of the practice of burning widows alive. These treatises were widely circulated with the purpose of forming public opinion against the custom of *Sati* and making known to the English government that, if the advocates of this custom built their case on later *shastras*, their opponents took refuge under the pure teachings of the most ancient *shastras* which form the basis of the real Hindu religion.

Simultaneously with his efforts for the abolition of *Sati*, Rammohun fought for better living conditions for women and especially for decent treatment of the widows and recognition of their right to a share in their husbands' property. He also fought against the evil of polygamy.

Rammohun was also keenly alive to the evils of the caste system. He wrote to a friend:—

The distinction of castes introducing innumerable divisions and subdivisions among them has entirely deprived them of patriotic feeling, and the multitude of religious rites and ceremonies and the law of purification have totally disqualified them from undertaking an

difficult enterprise.

The reformation that Rammohun was thirsting for in the body politic of India had its basis in his strong conviction that the concept of true religion alone can create the appropriate conditions for a life of justice and equal opportunity for all. In spite of the separation of human beings geographically into various political and national groups, their oneness in their physical and spiritual constitution was to him an indisputable fact. The Theosophical doctrine that divinity is latent in man was recognized by Rammohun decades before the Theosophical Movement was launched into the world. According to Professor Monier Williams, he was the first really earnest investigator in the science of comparative theology which the world had produced.

After retiring from government service he made his home in Calcutta, where, in 1814, he established the Atmiya Sabha, an association for the dissemination of religious truths and the promotion of free discussion on theological subjects by learned men of all religions. About the same time he published his translation of the Vedanta with introductory comments, to be followed by translations of some of the more important Upanishads. He considered this to be the most effective means of rousing his countrymen to an appreciation of the monotheistic teachings of their ancient scriptures. The publication of these tracts stirred up intense agitation in Bengal, which spread to other parts of India and even reached the shores of England. Many of his first followers deserted him and he was left single-handed to fight his battle. The spirit in which he bore the arrows of insult and ignominy shot at him is well illustrated by the following extract from the Introduction to the English translation of his Abridgment of the Vedanta:—

By taking the path which conscience and sincerity direct, I, born a Brahman, have exposed myself to the complainings and reproaches even of some of my relations, whose prejudices are strong, and whose temporal advantage depends upon the present system. But, these, however accumulated, I can tranquilly bear, trusting that a day will arrive when my humble endeavours will be viewed with justice — perhaps acknowledged with gratitude.

For five years Rammohun participated in the polemical discussions provoked by the reformist propaganda of the Atmiya Sabha. His next activity was to publish a work entitled *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness*. It was a collection of all the moral and spiritual precepts of Jesus as recorded in the four Gospels, without the narratives of the miracles. *The Precepts of Jesus* was published in the face of the strong national prejudice against Christianity. What induced Rammohun to do so is narrated by him in the Introduction:—

This simple code of religion and morality is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of God... and is also so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the

discharge of their various duties to themselves, and to society, than I cannot but hope for the best effects from its promulgation in the present form.

The immediate effect of this publication was a virulent attack on Rammohun, not by Hindu orthodoxy, but unexpectedly by Baptist missionaries who were angry because of his omission of the portions relating to the miracles, which formed the main plank of their proselytizing activity. They also resented his rejection of their concept of Father, Son and Holy Ghost as three distinct divine personages and his assertion that the teachings of Jesus implied a Unitarian God — one in three. Undeterred by the virulence of the attacks of the missionaries, who called him a heathen meddling in the faith of others, Rammohun published successively three "Appeals to the Christian Public," in which he defended the doctrine of the One God.

In 1828 he formed the Brahma Samaj, the native Theistic Church of modern India, for religious fellowship and worship. The purpose for which the Brahma Samaj was established was given in its Trust-Deed whose terms were, among other things, that the Trustees

shall at all times permit the said building, land, tenements, hereditaments and premises, with their appurtenances, to be used, occupied, enjoyed, applied and appropriated, as and for a place of Public Meeting, of all sorts of descriptions of people, without distinction, as shall behave and conduct themselves in an orderly, sober, religious and devout manner;

For the worship and adoration of the Eternal, Unsearchable, and Immutable Being who is the Author and Preserver of the Universe but not under, or by any other name, designation, or title peculiarly used for, and applied to, any particular Being, or Beings, by any man, or set of men, whatsoever. . . .

And that no sermon, preaching, discourse, prayer or hymn be delivered, made or used in such worship but such as have a tendency to the promotion of the contemplation of the Author and Preserver of the Universe, to the promotion of charity, morality, piety, benevolence, virtue, and the strengthening of the bonds of union between men of all religious persuasions and creeds. . . .

Rammohun was not prepared to encourage idolatry in any way among those who were capable of using their reason for the worship of the inner God. In the Preface to the English translation of the *Ishopanishad* he wrote:—

It cannot be alleged in support of Idolatry, that although a knowledge of God is certainly above all things, still as it is impossible to acquire that knowledge, men should of course worship figured "gods" for, had it been impossible to attain a knowledge of the Supreme Being, the Vedas and Puranas, as well as Tantras, would not have instructed mankind to aim at such attainment; as it is not to be sup-

posed that direction to acquire what is obviously unattainable could be given by the Sastra, or even by a man of common sense. Should the Idolater say, "that the acquisition of a knowledge of God, although it is not impossible, is most difficult of comprehension," I will agree with him in that point; but infer from it that we ought, therefore, the more to exert ourselves to acquire that knowledge.

Rammohun represented in his own personality the best to be found in the doctrines of the three major religions of India, *viz.*, Hinduism, Islam and Christianity. In his mental and moral outlook on life he was a seasoned Theosophist who was engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization. He belonged to no cult or sect, yet belonged to each and all.

Our closing homage to him is an extract from the Presidential Address by Rabindranath Tagore, on the occasion of Rammohun's centenary celebration in 1933 at Calcutta. The poet's grandfather, Dwarkanath, and father, Debendranath, were among the prominent friends and followers of Rammohun. On them fell successively the responsibility of leading the Brahma Samaj movement after Rammohun's passing. Rabindranath says:—

Rammohun came at the very beginning of the Modern Age in our country. Neither foreigners nor natives of the soil could at that time clearly understand what the age stood for. It was Rammohun alone who realized that the challenge of this age is the challenge of a deeper unity. He extended wide his heart, and invited Hindu, Mussalman and Christian there, for in the expanse of his heart there was no lack of space for any one of them. . . . Like time itself he is eternally modern. For his age extends on the one hand towards ancient India, but on the other reaches forward towards the distant future which is yet unattained. . . . It is in him that we find the truth of India. If peoples of our land disrespect him because of the petty vanities of their many communities, and even if they disown him, yet Eternal India, the India of all time, has accepted him as her very own in her inmost heart. Even today his influence lives in shaping the Modern Age.

The Theosophical Movement began far back in the night of Time and has since been moving through many and various peoples, places and environments. That grand work does not depend upon forms, ceremonies, particular persons or set organizations — "Its unity throughout the world does not consist in the existence and action of any single organization, but depends upon the similarity of work and aspiration of those in the world who are working for it."

—W. Q. JUDGE

WHAT IS DESTINY?

What is destiny? Is it some inevitable power by which we are governed? It is. But which "we" is referred to?

Theosophy tells us that the destiny of the human soul is to reach perfection, to reach conscious immortality, and whether this condition is attained in one great cycle of time or in another is immaterial. What is certain is that it must be reached by every human soul. It is a tragedy that we have emphasized the destiny that meets us in any one life and neglected the destiny of the soul, for only the knowledge of soul destiny can give us a long enough vista to ensure our co-operation with the soul in any life on earth.

What is destiny as ordinarily understood? It is those circumstances difficult or otherwise, which we meet with in life, apparently fortuitously, that is, without our conscious volition. It is our "fate." It is the inevitable. Why is it so? Because, according to the laws of the universe any disturbance of harmony has to be restored at the point of disturbance. During the process of disturbance we often feel pleasure; during the process of restoring the broken equilibrium we experience pain. Thus we learn the laws of the universe and in time become their masters.

Two courses of action are open to us while we are learning Nature's laws: either we use those laws unselfishly, remaining in harmony with the whole, or we use them selfishly, for ourselves. In the first case Nature regards us as "one of her creators and makes obeisance, revealing to us her mysteries; in the second, we have to face the consequences of disturbance of harmony.

For those who would learn the laws of life or of the universe, it is necessary first to remember constantly the two kinds of inevitability—the one of the blessed goal; the other of "fate" as we meet it in our personal lives. What is inevitable must be faced. Why is it inevitable? Because it is *necessary*. Nature's laws demand it, and there is no escape. Why should we try to escape it when it points to progression, when it brings harmony, love, knowledge? Only when personal feeling and conceit get in the way do we mind putting right that which we have done wrong.

It is human beings alone who have the privilege of learning from suffering, for only they have the power of conscious choice. There is steady progression from the instinct of the animal, which at its stage always follows the natural law of its being, to reasoned instinct, to will-full choice, till at last intuition is reached. We at our stage have to follow the laws of our being with reason, with mind.

Inevitability seems at first frightening, something from which there is no escape and which is overpowering. But when we meditate on it it brings to life courage and fearlessness. If we keep the final goal in the background of our consciousness, then the temporary difficulties are seen to be but a passing phase. And just as we create all our di-

faculties, so we create all our blessings. The whole field of life and happiness is open to us. We can lift ourselves "higher than Indra," or sink "lower than the worm or gnat." It is up to us. The realization that we get what we ask for, what we work for, gives us a firm ground. No one has the power to hurt us if we act rightly. But all others help us on our way as we help them. Why can others help but not hinder? Because to help is along the line of unity, which is harmony, which is Nature's law. Hindrances are put in our way *by ourselves* (though apparently by others) to show us a vice we still possess or a capacity not yet our own, or a virtue not yet achieved.

Dr. Arnold Toynbee, in his speech to the graduating class of 1961 at Haverford College, Pennsylvania, made the following statements:—

I am aware, of course, of the present-day obsession with projects for conquering outer space. It is one of those contemporary foibles that are common to people on both sides of the Iron Curtain. This is, I believe, a form of escapism, and a dangerous one.

In Russia and our Western countries alike, we are trying to escape into spacemanship from the task of facing the consequences of an ignominious failure of ours on the face of our own planet. This ignominious failure is our persistent inability to live together, in our ancestral common home, as members of one human family, or even merely as good neighbours. In the Atomic Age, the wages of this particular sin will, as we know, undoubtedly be death.

To overcome this common failure of ours is therefore our first task, and, until we have achieved it, it must have priority over every other enterprise.

Our astronomers have already warned us that spacemanship can never win for the human race as a whole any new worlds to populate. (*The New York Herald Tribune*, July 8th)

According to *The New York Times* of July 23rd, a questionnaire sent out to the membership of the American Astronomical Society is likely to bring to light serious doubts on the part of some scientists as to the wisdom of the proposed United States expedition to the moon. Many astronomers do not believe the first space travellers will contribute much to science.

The fact that not all scientists are hypnotized by the idea of conquering outer space is significant. What is more important for our purpose as human beings is not the conquering of outer space but managing the space in which we live.

DISCIPLINING THE CHILD

How much freedom is a child to have? What are the results of too much or too little freedom? What breeds instability of character, producing the misfits of life, the unruly, the gangster, the torturer?

These are problems that face every parent today and are due partly to the instability of the parents and of present-day life and partly indeed mostly, to the psychiatrist-educationist who is expounding his insecure theoretical ideas of child welfare.

Let us face one fact first: If the way we were brought up was so bad then why are we as good as we are now? Did we somehow learn adaptability, or did we hate our parents and hate life? If the result of our training was bad, then how can our ideas be good? Granted that there are a few who perhaps had an unhappy home with too many restrictions, but, by and large, were we very unhappy? Did the joy of life, contentment and happiness pass us by?

Now we are frightened by the word "inhibition" and fascinated by the word "freedom." Children must be brought up to be free men and women, free to express themselves as they wish, to believe what they like. H.P.B. tells us in *The Key to Theosophy* that she would bring up children with minds trained in logic, so let us apply logic to this idea.

"A child must be free to do what it likes," it is sometimes said. Just how far can a parent apply this sentiment? At what age does the parent let the child decide whether or not to go to school, whether or not to eat its food, whether or not to get up in the morning and to come to meals on time, whether or not to have care given to its hair and teeth? Or are there certain things that the parent decides *must* be done and certain others that do not matter? If one child in the exercise of its freedom hits another, is it to be overlooked? If the child gets hold of the tablecloth, which is so often conveniently within its reach, and pulls hard so that the crockery and food fall to the ground, is the parent to take no notice of it? Life, alas, is full of inhibitions, full of "ought-nots," "cannots" and so on. Would a parent not prevent his child from jumping into a well, or setting on fire anything it wants to?

Life is a school, we are told; and in the early days the parent is the teacher and guardian of the child. If he performs his duty well his example and precepts will be the teacher and the guardian throughout life. What, Theosophically, we need to remember is that it is self-government of the child by the child that we need to work for. He has to be given certain principles of behaviour, a moral code; but he must learn as soon as possible *why* these are desirable. He is an old soul in a new body and wants to learn how to control his body and his feelings, his desires and his thoughts, and, as he has his playthings to learn with in the early stages, so moral ideas gently inculcated become his playthings with which to learn how to live in later life. Very little indeed, is demanded of the parents except to watch, to guide, to help

and live a good, steady life of integrity themselves, so that the home is a place of restful activity, controlled feelings, stimulating conversation, love and enthusiasm. Bring the child up naturally; too much theory undigested is fatal. Think of the future which the child has to face and help him to learn how to face it. Love, real love, is the keynote.

We tend today to demand too much of children. We do not let them develop normally. We either *demand* obedience or *fear* inhibitions, whereas what we need is understanding. The one thing that the child needs more than anything is the feeling of security in the home, security in the parents, and he will find security in the code of manners and of action that exists in the home.

When do we learn to control ourselves? Primarily even before the age of seven. Rhythm in life has started before then.

What do we do with ourselves when we feel irritable, moody, cross? What do we do with a child or teenager?

Freedom is good, restraint is good; licence is bad, too much restraint is bad. Love, naturalness, integrity, security, helpfulness are all due to the child from the parents. Little else matters.

The following item from *Newsweek* of August 7th is worthy of note by enthusiastic users and prescribers of tranquilizers:—

A good many doctors and some laymen have been saying for years that too many tranquilizers are being prescribed for minor emotional disorders. Last week the American Medical Association finally said the same thing, officially. Its Council on Drugs noted that 13 per cent of all prescriptions written by doctors are for "happy pills." It is poor medical practice, the council said, to suppress neurotic symptoms with a tranquilizer instead of correcting the underlying cause. The council recommended that doctors return to the use of barbiturates (which are less toxic than tranquilizers) and reserve the use of tranquilizers for the treatment of serious psychoses or major mental illness.

Not only does accurate knowledge of the effect of tranquilizers and other drugs need to be more widespread, but the important thing is to find out what is at the root of the anxieties, worries and mental depressions that dog the steps of an increasing number of individuals in this our age. Theosophy has always advocated the finding out of the *cause* of any trouble or ailment instead of mere tinkering with the superficial symptoms.

FOOD AS SACRIFICE

[Reprinted from *Theosophy*, Vol. XVI, pp. 65-69, for December 1927.—EDS.]

This immortal thinker having such vast powers and possibilities, all his because of his intimate connection with every secret part of Nature from which he has been built up, stands at the top of an immense and silent evolution.

—*The Ocean of Theosophy*

Man, having broken the harmony of life and brought about a descending cycle, has made himself blind to the oneness of all things. It has been markedly so in that very mundane function of life — eating. Mediæval ascetics despised food and would-be æsthetes, ascetics of our modern day, have affected to follow their example, though they do not know how to fast as the others did.

What has this modern age *not* made of meals, from the extreme of banquets of many courses, with dishes concocted to tempt surfeited gourmands, to the other extreme of nothing to eat, when the mother, for example, alone at home, says, "I can't be bothered to make a meal for myself with no one else here to cook for." Dinners are made functions for "entertaining" people who exchange small talk, useless when not injurious to the reputations of others. In the family, its members bicker and squabble around the table. How many students of Theosophy, even, comprehend the part of food in life, and why the preparation of a meal has been termed a sacred function? Yet hints as to why are multiplied in the teachings, whether in the *Laws of Manu* or the *Bhagavad-Gita*, in the lore of Pythagoras, in the writings of the Neo-Platonists, of Paracelsus, of H. P. Blavatsky, or W. Q. Judge.

And in the first place, indeed, they endeavoured to learn the indications of symmetry, of labour, food, and repose. In the next place, with respect to the preparation of food, they were nearly the first who attempted to employ themselves in it, and to define the mode in which it should be performed.—*Life of Pythagoras*—Iamblichus

Food is necessary to the body. In this regard at least its importance is being more and more understood in the world at large, as witness the developments in the last decade in those circles concerning themselves with "public health." Nutrition research in various laboratories of the greatest American universities has been giving out some facts which certainly approach what has been known for ages in occultism about the relation of food to well-being, the influence of thought and feeling on assimilation, the close link between sunshine and "vitamins." It is even approaching the fringe of the mystery of the path to rebirth in its investigations of what was once designated Vitamin A, now assorted into Vitamins A, D, and E, with various functions to perform in the human organism, the last bound up with sterility.

Terms may vary from age to age but the underlying ideas remain ever the same, truth being consistent and eternal.

No one who does not eat has strength to do works of holiness, strength to do works of husbandry, strength to beget children. By eating every material creature lives, by not eating it dies away.—*Zend Avesta, Vendidad—Sacred Books of the East*

Man's body is composed of mineral, vegetable, and animal substances which are borrowed from the three kingdoms below him and are returned to them.¹ From that food, eaten and transmuted, are the organs materially formed. They are composed of different kinds of elemental lives, all having their relations to different parts of nature.²

Man was considered a macrocosm, and every element in him [writes James Darmesteter in a footnote, p. 187, *Vendidad, Sacred Books of the East*] was supposed to come from a similar element in nature.

Why does man want to eat, to drink and to breathe but because he is related to the elements of the earth, water and air, and must attract these things to his constitution?—*Life of Paracelsus: Hartmann*

A twofold reason is already evident for the eating of food. By it man builds up his body but also he affects the elemental lives that he takes in to send out again, raised or degraded.

From his body innumerable forms go forth, which constantly impel the multiform creatures to action.—*Laws of Manu, Chapter XII, Verse 15—Sacred Books of the East*

Man alone is not the sole concern in this function of life, though our ahamkaric tendency has made us think only of the benefit to ourselves by the taking of food, which builds the various elements into the different organs. There is a benefit to the body, yes; but there should also be a benefit to the elemental lives which thus make entry. All too little is it heeded that as we eat we are affecting those lives, and even by the very manner in which meals are taken.

Some measure of our responsibility to the elemental lives is indicated in that twelfth chapter of the *Laws of Manu*, so much misunderstood by the Orientalists, who have confused "the whole system of transmigrations" with the reincarnation of the Ego.

The twofold purpose of taking food is brought out by Iamblichus when Anebo writes:—

...the Demiurgos does not by any means set food abundant and in reach for all living things in the earth and sea but has implanted want of the same in the races superior to us. Nor has he furnished to the other living things a natural abundance of the necessaries of life. But to the demons he gives food of a quality adapted to their nature, which

¹ W. Q. Judge, *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*, p. 205.

² Robert Crosbie, "Mental Healing and Hypnosis," *Theosophy*, Vol. IX, pages 280 and 283 [*The Friendly Philosopher*, pp. 295-300].

is contributed by us human beings. Hence, if we, through laziness or some other pretext, as is likely, should neglect such contributions, the bodies of the demons will be in want of food, and will experience both privation and disorder.—*The Egyptian Mysteries*

Man does not eat for himself alone, to paraphrase words attributed to a great sage. Another factor is also ignored, which Paracelsus emphasizes together with the others already cited:—

There is something like a fire (energy) within ourselves which continually consumes our form, and if we were to add nothing to our body to supply the waste caused by that combustion, our form would soon die. We continually eat our own selves; we eat our fingers, our heart, our brain, etc.; but in each morsel of food which we eat, there is contained the material required to replace that which has been consumed by that internal fire. Each part of our organism selects what it needs, and that which is superfluous or useless is rejected. The Master in man, who superintends the building up of the organism, supplies every organ with that which it needs. We need not eat bones to cause our bones to grow, nor veins, ligaments and brain, to have those things formed within us.—*Life of Paracelsus*, Hartmann

“It is the Master in man who superintends the building up of the organism” — but how many of us consider that Master in man when at meals?

Mr. Judge was once asked a question on a quotation from the Upanishads. He replied that the self does not exist by reason of food but *in that state* causing the body to be visible and to act through the food used. The translation that caused the obscurity he rephrases thus: “The self exists in close proximity to the heart and causes the body to exist by reason of the food which it takes in for its subsistence.” It means he goes on to say, that if the self were not there, the body would not exist, and that the self procures *vital airs* from the food which the organism life causes to be digested.³

Some call him Agni (Fire), others Manu, the Lord of creatures, others Indra, others the vital air, and again others eternal Brahma.—*Laws of Manu*, Chapter XII, Verse 123—*Sacred Books of the East*

Or in the immortal words of the fifteenth chapter of the *Gita*:—

I enter the earth supporting all living things by my power, and I am that property of sap which is taste, nourishing all the herbs and plants of the field. Becoming the internal fire of the living, I associate with the upward and downward breathing, and cause the four kinds of food to digest.

Most food is eaten heedlessly as to its higher nature. The Master in man — the spiritual power of concentration — cannot, then, be the superintending this function of the building up of the organism. What

³ W. Q. Judge, *Letters That Have Helped Me*, Vol. II, p. 40 [Indian ed., p. 97].

a meal proceeds along the lines of thoughtless automatism, how can the elemental lives making sacrifice receive due benefit? How can the self procure vital airs from the food which only the one life can cause to be *digested*?

Our twentieth-century way of taking meals is therefore one more in place for change and betterment with those to whom Theosophy is first in life. They, indeed, can "try and set up a habit in that material unit whereby we may as incarnated beings know the self."⁴ In proportion as the unity of the One Life in all creatures is comprehended by those to whom food may become sacrifice, the cycle rises.

Significant words are italicized by H.P.B. in a quotation she makes from Homer's *Odyssey*, Book VII:—

Our gods appear to us when we offer them sacrifice . . . *sitting themselves at our tables, they partake of our festival meals*. Whenever they meet on his travels a solitary Phœnician, they *serve to him as guides*, and otherwise manifest their presence. We can say that *our piety* approaches us to them as much as crime and bloodshed unite the Cyclopes and the ferocious race of Giants.—"Elementals," reprinted in *Theosophy*, Vol. V, pp. 407-8 [*Raja-Yoga or Occultism*, second edition, p. 106]

To help the smallest creature upon its upward way is the sacred duty of every student of Theosophy. Food taken when the Master in man presides at a meal is one of the means of serving the whole of Life.

"Nourish the Gods," says the Third Discourse of the *Gita*, "that the Gods may nourish you. A thief is he who enjoys what has been given unto him but offers not a portion unto them. Those who dress their meat but for themselves eat the bread of sin, being themselves sin incarnate." As we understand at each meal that food is indeed sacrifice, due portion is offered to the gods, for the Master in man is there. The manifold meaning of that much discussed sentence from the same discourse is more apparent:—

Beings are nourished by food, food is produced by rain, rain comes from sacrifice, and sacrifice is performed by action.—*Bhagavad-Gita* (p. 24)

In man as in nature it is the action which is sacrifice that makes to rise the Waters of Life producing the food by which beings of all classes are nourished when the *Sun* is there.

"Anon the gods descend, and then they return to heaven," wrote Mr. Judge on one occasion.⁵ Elsewhere, he points out how in a descending cycle when the ideal family life becomes rare, learned and great spirits retire to other spheres. But the case will begin to be reversed by the action of *one* philanthropist who becomes unselfish and intelligent enough to set an example. The way is paved for the advent of an

⁴ W. Q. Judge, *Letters That Have Helped Me*, Vol. II, p. 40 [Indian ed., p. 97].

⁵ W. Q. Judge, *Letters That Have Helped Me*, Vol. I, p. 34 [Indian ed., p. 21].

ascending cycle because the Akasa becomes affected by the impulse forcing itself gradually, with accumulated interest and redoubled power upon others. The noble example becomes a precedent. And — “Gnanibless the noble man.”⁶

Knowing that, under the great cyclic laws which govern us, periods arrive even in the worst of ages when good examples of living imprints on the astral light cause effects ever increasing in intensity until at last the “gods” before referred to begin in distant spheres to feel the force of those good actions and to return again to help mankind on the recurrence of a better age, he implores Arjuna to be the very first to set the good example.

In such an age as this, the ritualistic sacrifice of a different age which has indeed a magical effect becomes *a sacrifice to be performed by each man in his own nature upon the altar of his own heart.*—W. C. Judge, *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*

The influence of prevailing social standards on racial and other prejudices was discussed by a group of sociologists meeting at the Unesco Youth Institute in Gauting, Federal Republic of Germany, from February 27th to March 3rd. *Universitas* (Vol. 4, No. 2) contains an account of the discussions.

The experts, who came from various countries, analyzed in the discussions the nature of discrimination and prejudice from various viewpoints. There was general agreement that prejudice is not innate and that although psychological factors as well as influences in early life are important, people generally tend to conform to the behaviour and attitudes accepted by the majority.

In this context, the experts drew attention to the influence exercised by governments, public opinion, the press, community leaders, schools and other institutions. They stressed especially the role of the school in combating discrimination, and the importance of training teachers not only to master techniques aimed at fighting prejudice but also to encourage actively tolerance and impartiality.

The Gauting meeting recommended that Unesco should carry out a sociological survey in a number of countries, which would serve as a basis for a thorough study of all aspects of prejudice and discrimination. The meeting also recommended the establishment of a Unesco Clearing House on Intergroup Prejudice. This clearing house might, in the long run, send demonstration teams to various countries to assist schools and in particular teacher-training establishments, in the development of their programmes for combating prejudice and discrimination.

⁶ “Living the Higher Life,” reprinted in *Theosophy*, Vol. I, p. 301; also Vol. X, p. 446 [U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 34].

EXTRACTS FROM UNPUBLISHED LETTERS

Our students may not be succeeding 100 per cent in living Theosophically, but are they not sincerely trying? The Esoteric Philosophy does enable us to give practical guidance to individuals and they are taken care of as they arise. We are not looking out for men of great learning, but for men of strong hearts. Only a few take advantage of U.L.T. activities, true; but see what has been accomplished! There *are* individual U.L.T.ers who are endeavouring to reshape their characters, hearts, minds and lives, by the only right way—self-induction; what is perhaps lacking is a sense of unity and solidarity, not only felt and accepted but also expressed and demonstrated. That is the rub.

Among all workers for and servers of Theosophy the requirement is twofold—(1) right Theosophic education and (2) solidarity among themselves. If you, as well as others, in fact all, realize that Theosophy is a *definite* system of Knowledge, precise and accurate, a little examination will clearly show you why it is that we religiously stick to certain few books and exclude others. Solidarity among co-students and co-workers is highly essential. Generally, it has not been practised in the past and hence the innumerable failures. It becomes one's duty to assimilate the Teachings, as well as the co-students and co-servers, *in the right way*.

The real drawback is lack of real deep unity among the labourers in the field. One has to go on with faith in the Wisdom and Love of the Blessed Ones. How numerous are the obstacles They have to remove! Each person opines he knows, finds faults in others and with what is being done. If each minded his own business and did his or her best and sustained a friendly, though vigilant, attitude our work would prove itself. Our real strength is in our Philosophy and in our faith and devotion to the great Holy Ones. We are not geniuses but are capable of becoming true geniuses using this twofold strength. There is too much egotism, too much talk and failure to “make of pride and self-regard bondmaidens to devotion.”

As to love and trust among students—it is rare everywhere. The term “brother-pupils” implies two factors: brotherliness and pupilage. One without the other cannot work. See that passage in the *Voice* about disciples and the strings of the *vina*, echoing the Master-Guru. Music is not composed of chords only but is also the harmony of discords. There are five fingers on one hand; each finger is different in shape, power and function, but the wrist is there.

As you say, lack of unity and solidarity among student-servers is strange and yet it is not. Human egotism means, does it not, that

the ego-element is enveloped by pride. By analogy, the lower Manas separating itself from its parent, the higher Manas, enters into a new incarnation. It is a ray of the higher and yet the moment it is enveloped by the old *skandhas* it becomes different. It is no more the same. Thus it is the material *skandhaic* or *tanhaic* substance which makes for *Ahankara*, the "I"-making tendency. Egotism, conceit, pride and its brood, love for possessions (represented by money) and the urge to creativeness (represented by sex) — these are the causes for disunity, discord, disharmony. It is not difficult to comprehend this, but most difficult to apply the remedy. The dire heresy of separateness is the south pole of the divine unity of Atma which is the north pole — substance and essence, metaphysically; evil and good, morally. Does one love oneself more than the One Self? To detach ourselves from the lower and to attach that lower self to the Higher Triad is the whole story. Two or three people can create havoc with their pride and conceit. This discord-disunity in the lower is a reflection of the Harmony made by the seven Rays or seven Lodges or seven Hierarchies. That Harmony exists at the Centre, but in lower spheres it remains to be established. So, primarily in this as in so many other matters, the work is upon ourselves — each one of us.

With this task is also intimately connected the perception of the harmony between the metaphysical and the ethical and the arising *spontaneously* of the knowledge within. The Inner Ego is made up of the substance of knowledge, as the *Voice* says.

It is not only a saddening but a ghastly experience to see friends betraying our confidence, shattering our hopes for them and above all injuring themselves, throwing away opportunities, etc. True, men and women come and go, but the River of Wisdom continues to run — there are cycles when it merely trickles and cycles when it flows full and fast. Our Theosophical failures do not see their own spiritual adversity, as the poor do not really know the deep import of their economic poverty. See H.P.B.'s article, "Let Every Man Prove His Own Work." You are not only perceiving the causes of defection and failure but are also hitting upon the right remedy — "To appear as nothing in the eyes of men."

About workers: what makes a worker a true one? Fire and knowledge. In some there is the fire of devotion and of altruism, but there is lack of knowledge and a streak of *tamas*. In others there is knowledge, a fund of information, but they lack fire, ardency, a feeling for wisdom and for humanity. Then there is the third factor — character. If you will take care of your psychic nature and begin to apply the four basic rules of *Light on the Path*, or the instruction in the first five pages of the *Voice* in two or three years' time you will not only have outer silence but also the inner silence of calmness which is active peace. Ambition and pride have made short work of many. Go on as you have been going.

on and the rest will follow as the dawn after the night.

If half a dozen workers, possessing different qualities, were to unite, the labour of love would produce fine results. What one has, the other has not; but unity is lacking. The closing section of the *Key* is most useful; what is needed is selflessness, earnestness, devotion, knowledge, unbiased judgment. Once again one person may not be found possessing all these qualities, but five possessing one each would be an excellent substitute, provided there were unity and brotherliness. Talk and gossip make short work of people.

The non-offending man is surrounded by a sphere that repels the evil others would do to him — even after many births.

The man who finds matters for suspicion in others is one who is not true himself.

Ask not about a person's descent, but ask about his conduct.

Disappearing through the eye, objects cease to exist as such and become ideas alone.

As all objects enter the mind as thoughts and are seen by it as thoughts alone, so in the thought of the mind is the bond to many lives.

Consciousness and recollection are not in the head alone, but are found in every atom, each in its own degree.

The gods, oh man, are not without; they reside within you, and their earthly domination is among the fleeting atoms of your body.

Matter having passed through millions of forms has acquired an irresistible tendency to seek for an ideal form constructed by intelligent thought.

The disappearance of virtue and philosophy is only for a time, the souls possessing them will return again bringing both with them.

—Aphorisms from *The Path*

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

Prime Minister Nehru's appeal to educators, at the inauguration of the Tenth Annual Session of the World Confederation of Organization of the Teaching Profession in New Delhi on August 1st, to consider seriously why education had not succeeded in eliminating violence and hostility from the minds of men and nations brings home to us the responsibility of education in cultivating the spirit of tolerance.

Education must show us the way to solve world problems, but, as Mr. Nehru pointed out in his address to the 400 delegates and observers from about 70 countries, reported in the *Deccan Herald* of August 2nd

we find the most highly educated nations and peoples in the world, who have all advantages of technical education and who have succeeded in a large measure in getting rid of some of the ancient evils which humanity has suffered, like poverty, not only do not get on with each other but are full of violent hostility towards each other.

Mr. Nehru deplored the "narrow tribal outlook" which still governs highly civilized nations who looked upon the world as some kind of "a projection of their thinking. If the world does not function in that way, they are dissatisfied and angry." He added that

the world is a very delightful and beautiful place, but it is not uniform. It differs, human beings differ, their thinking differs, even to some extent their urges differ. The concept of introducing a measure of uniformity everywhere, regimenting people's thinking or living to one mould is neither easy nor desirable.

Therefore, one has to come to the conclusion that there are many ways of living, many ways of thinking; that there are many facets of the truth we see, not only the one which we, in our limited minds, have only very partially grasped.

It is a basic issue, how far we think in our pride that we possess the ultimate understanding of truth or reality and the way of life and everything and how far it is up to us to impose it on others. . . .

In this world, we have to tolerate each other. We must not imagine that it is our duty to push somebody aside, sit on his chest and force him to do as we would like him to do.

If perhaps that aspect of life was a little more understood and appreciated, it would help a little at least in lessening the conflicts of today.

The preamble to the Unesco constitution states that "wars begin in the minds of men," and therefore it is men's minds that education should try to influence. The prime necessity in the world is to direct people towards thinking in terms of peace and co-operation and understanding and not in terms of the type of international life which we lead today. The threat to human progress posed by bigoted thinking is a very serious one.

Sentiments similar to Mr. Nehru's were expressed by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan while declaring open the newly-constructed Centenary Buildings of the Madras University. People talked of "national integration," he said; but how could that come, he asked, so long as children fresh from the "mint of nature," who had so much of generosity and fellow-feeling and sympathy, were "indoctrinated into ideas that they belonged to this caste or that, this community, this province or that religion"? What is needed now is that education should teach them habits of behaviour and must make them dignified and decent human beings.

Education should not merely be the imparting of information. "To be human, to be civilized and to be decent," the Vice-President said, "is to look upon another man, whatever be his caste, community, race or religion, with friendship, respect and dignity."

We must be untouched, as the Gita says, without being unconcerned. We must always be warm-hearted and never be sentimental. We must look upon problems which afflict other people as our own problems. In things necessary — unity; in doubtful things — tolerance; and in all things — charity — that should be the attitude, and that is the attitude which a truly well-bred, civilized human being will adopt. I hope the Madras University will promote a new quality of human beings — a quality where a human being considers himself first and foremost as a member of the humanity and not of this or that creed, religion, caste or community, and feels, wherever humanity suffers, he suffers.

Most of the crimes committed in this world are due to social restrictions and unhappiness. We must try to remove these. Man's inhumanity to man and tyranny over man must all slowly and gradually disappear. (*Deccan Herald*, August 3rd)

It stands to reason that education fails unless it inculcates the love of one's neighbour and the feeling of mutual interdependence and brotherhood. What better antidotes to sectarianism, to race and colour prejudice, to all invidious distinctions, of caste and class, of wealth and natural endowments, can there be than teaching the children the four links of the golden chain which should bind humanity into one family, *viz.*, universal Unity and Causation, Human Solidarity, the Law of Karma and Reincarnation?

"In the Light of Theosophy" for November 1960 carried an item on the discovery by Dr. L. S. B. Leakey, British anthropologist, of the skull of a primitive man, along with some crude stone implements, in Tanganyika's Olduvai Gorge. Leakey named him Zinjanthropus (East Africa Man) and announced that he was at least 600,000 years old. Two California geologists, Jack F. Evernden and Garniss M. Curtis, using a new potassium-argon dating technique to determine the age of

the rock strata where *Zinjanthropus* was uncovered, have now established that this fossil find was really 1,175,000 years old.

This pushing back of the age of man, first announced by the National Geographic Society, has been widely reported the world over. *Newsweek* of August 7th states that the news

broke upon the world of anthropology with a resounding crash. Man was almost twice as old as any textbook indicated, and three times as old as any fossil evidence suggested. Every anthropology text was suddenly out of date, and man's concept of his origins and early evolution was radically altered.

The consensus of opinion among anthropologists is that the discovery makes human evolution easier to understand.

Newsweek reports Dr. Leakey as having stated that

when we discovered the *Zinjanthropus* skull, I already knew that it was more than 1 million years old. But I cautiously claimed it was "more than 600,000 years old" so as not to upset my colleagues. Scientists are odd chaps. They would be staggered if I revealed that date without double-checking, triple-checking, and cross-checking.

The National Geographic Society has announced that Dr. Leakey also may have discovered at the Tanganyika site remains of a man-like child even more ancient than *Zinjanthropus*. Drs. Evernden and Curtis are pursuing the same atomic dating process to determine the age of the child.

Major revisions in the sciences of geology and human evolution will no doubt take place on the basis of this discovery, and that is a hopeful sign; but modern anthropologists are still far from accepting the 18 million years assigned to the "human" period by occult science. The day might not be far when modern science will stumble upon this fact and also collect the necessary data to prove that humanity did not begin in savagery but that civilized races and "Stone Age" men have always existed side by side.

Dr. Ian Stevenson's essay on "The Evidence for Survival from Claimed Memories of Former Incarnations," the winning essay of the contest in honour of William James, brought out in pamphlet form, contains informative and useful data, though it does not offer any firm conclusion about reincarnation. The author, who is the chairman of the department of neurology and psychiatry in the University of Virginia School of Medicine, surveys, in the first part of his paper, the types of evidence adduced in favour of reincarnation — evidence such as childhood geniuses and inequalities in the distribution of human talents, statements made by ostensible discarnate communicators, statements

made by mediums and sensitives regarding the prior lives of the persons who consult them, and the attractions or repulsions felt by many persons towards certain countries, people, names, food or other objects, possibly related to memories of former incarnations.

Dr. Stevenson writes that he has studied several hundred accounts of apparent memories of prior births, in some of which at least the information adduced has been checked against known or discovered facts. He reviews some examples of the more important types of these claimed memories in which it was possible to identify the apparently remembered person and to show that the facts allegedly remembered matched in several items the corresponding facts of the life of the deceased person.

In the second part of his essay, Dr. Stevenson discusses the various hypotheses which occur to him as deserving consideration in evaluating the data from these cases of apparent former memories. These hypotheses are: (1) fraud; (2) derivation of the "memories" through normal means with subsequent forgetting of the source; (3) dispositions and memories carried over from the past of the human race and contained in that portion of our mind which is hidden from access except under special circumstances; (4) information acquired through clairvoyance or telepathy and then claimed to have been "remembered"; (5) the reading of the records of past happenings that are imprinted on the astral light or the tablet of the unseen universe; (6) precognition; (7) communication from a surviving personality or part-personality; (8) the temporary possession by a discarnate personality of the body of a living person, who then begins to identify himself with the former; and (9) reincarnation. Dr. Stevenson considers reincarnation

the most plausible hypothesis for understanding the cases of this series. This is not to say that I think they prove reincarnation either singly or together. Indeed, I am quite sure they do not. But for each of the alternative hypotheses I find objections or shortcomings which make them for me unsuitable explanations of all the cases, although they may apply to some. . . .

The evidence I have assembled and reviewed here . . . does justify, I believe, a much more extensive and more sympathetic study of this hypothesis than it has hitherto received in the West. Further investigation of apparent memories of former incarnations may well establish reincarnation as the most probable explanation of these experiences. Along this line we may in the end obtain more convincing evidence of human survival of physical death than from other kinds of evidence.

Are there not other ways of establishing reincarnation as a fact when investigating apparent memories of former births? Without a study of what man is, what the universe is for and what the goal of all evolution is, reincarnation can hardly be understood. To deny reincarnation is to deny order and justice in the universe, to deny that life has any purpose. W. Q. Judge calls it "a doctrine the most noble of all,

and with its companion one of Karma . . . it alone gives the basis for ethics." It is unfortunate that hypnotic experiments involving memory regression have become associated in the public mind with this noble doctrine. Such experiments can provide no factual proof of reincarnation. Apart from its dangers, the use of hypnotism as a possible means for recovering memories of a prior life is based on a faulty view of the implications of the rebirth theory.

In a recent address, the acting Governor of West Bengal, Shri Surajit Lahiri, himself an eminent jurist, spoke strongly in favour of retaining the death penalty. "If murder was committed in cold blood," he said, "after careful premeditation and preparation, society could legitimately infer that it was no good trying to reform the criminal and that he could not with safety be allowed to live." His thesis boils down ultimately to faith in the deterrent value of capital punishment.

As research in penology and criminal psychology advances, experiments in many countries are favouring the doing away of capital punishment and the adoption of redemptive and corrective measures in tackling the question. Nations that have abolished the death penalty have not witnessed a spate of murders. As for the neurotic and psychopathic type of criminal who may have juridically committed a murder but is in such a mental and emotional condition that the onus of moral responsibility cannot be rightly laid on him, the present emphasis is on psychiatric and other treatment rather than on the infliction of the ultimate penalty.

Much can also be said against detention in prison for long periods. The leading article in the *New Statesman* of June 23rd stated that

the majority of convicted murderers who are not executed do not again fall foul of the law. Only an infinitesimally small proportion ever again get mixed up with violence: in Belgium, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Switzerland together, a total of six convicted murderers in the last 30 years have committed a crime of violence (not murder) after release. Murderers whose behaviour does not fall in this pattern are in most instances mentally deranged and should in all cases be detained for treatment until they are medically fit to be released again among their fellow men.

Murderers who show themselves to be beyond reform and are likely to be a continuing danger to society may be detained indefinitely; but according to the *New Statesman*, such permanently dangerous killers form a tiny handful. The average murderer can be released with safety to the public after a short sentence, for "it is important to a civilized society that justice is tempered with mercy and that no man shall be allowed to rot in jail once he has succeeded in making himself fit for freedom."
