

The Indian Institute of World Culture

6, Shri B. P. Wadia Road

Bangalore, India

सत्यात् नास्ति परो परमः

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

DONATED BY

L.S.S. KUMAR &

SRIMATHI KANTHIMATHI KUMAR

1976

# THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. XXXVII. No. 11

17th September 1967

## “HUMANITY’S GREAT PAIN”

One of the Mahatmas especially concerned in the Theosophical Movement of our era has written of

the one universal feeling, the only true and holy, the only unselfish and Eternal one — Love, an Immense Love for humanity — as a *Whole*! For it is “Humanity” which is the great Orphan, the only disinherited one upon this earth. . . . And it is the duty of every man who is capable of an unselfish impulse, to do something, however little, for its welfare. Poor, poor humanity!

And in *The Voice of the Silence* the “candidate for light” is asked: “Hast thou attuned thy being to Humanity’s great pain. . . ? Thou hast? . . . Thou mayest enter.”

What does attuning one’s being to Humanity’s great pain demand and imply? For one thing, it demands persistent effort to overcome the dire heresy of separateness that weans us from our fellow-men, and recognition of the truth of Madame Blavatsky’s statement that “if there were a real and complete separation between any two human beings, they could not communicate with, or understand each other in any way.”

*The Voice of the Silence* warns repeatedly against the hard-heartedness that is a denial of human brotherhood, and it stresses the common humanity of us all.

That emotional charity has sometimes done great harm, as Madame Blavatsky points out in “Let Every Man Prove His Own Work” (*U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 31*), is undeniable, but in that article she is stressing the need of “knowledge and power and intuition, so that the deeds done shall really be worthy of the ‘Buddha-Christ’ spirit.” She is not

calling for turning a deaf ear to any cry of pain, however well deserved that pain may seem to be.

In the same article, indeed, she declares that every student-practitioner of Theosophy "must be practically philanthropic if he be a theosophist at all," and that "the direct effect of an appreciation of theosophy is to make those charitable who were not so before."

Students of Theosophy especially, however, need to bear in mind the warnings in that pamphlet about the limitations of mere physical philanthropy, which is worthless "apart from the infusion of new influences and ennobling conceptions of life into the minds of the masses." Students of Theosophy have a special responsibility in that connection. Yet even they must remember what Madame Blavatsky also admits there as an absolute fact, "that without good works the spirit of brotherhood would die in the world; and this can never be," adding: "Therefore is the double activity of learning and doing most necessary; we have to do good, and we have to do it *rightly*, with knowledge."

In her Message of 1888 to the Convention of American Theosophists Madame Blavatsky described the function of Theosophists as being

to open men's hearts and understandings to charity, justice, and generosity, attributes which belong specifically to the human kingdom and are natural to man when he has developed the qualities of a human being. Theosophy teaches the animal-man to be a human-man; and when people have learned to think and feel as truly human beings should feel and think, they will act humanely, and works of charity, justice, and generosity will be done spontaneously by all.

We are told in *The Voice of the Silence*:

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

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

And again:

To perish doomed is he, who out of fear of Mara refrains from helping man, lest he should act for Self. . . . Inaction based on selfish fear can bear but evil fruit.

This is clarified in another statement in the same priceless translation from the *Book of the Golden Precepts*, where it is stated that "inaction

in a deed of mercy becomes an action in a deadly sin."

Compassion speaks to him who has become a Bodhisattva and demands: "Can there be bliss when all that lives must suffer? Shalt thou be saved and hear the whole world cry?"

There are suggestive statements on the virtue of compassion in other writings, as in Chapter XXV of the *Gospel According to St. Matthew*, in which Jesus is quoted as saying of the Last Judgment that the righteous would then be told:

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

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

And when they, astonished, would ask when they had done these things, they would be told:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Again, one of the definitions of "true wisdom of a spiritual kind" given in the Thirteenth Chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gita* is "a meditation upon birth, death, decay, sickness, and error." Why is it the part of spiritual wisdom to meditate on these? One possible reason that suggests itself is that, as all are common to human experience, honest consideration of them is bound to bring to us a deepened sense of human brotherhood. As human personalities we have all been born and all must die; declining powers as age advances are for all in varying degrees; sickness, bodily, mental or moral, is experienced by all who have not risen above the level of ordinary humanity; error is something which at one time or another we all commit.

If, as *Light on the Path* reminds us, "the sin and shame of the world" are our sin and shame, how dare we seek exemption from sharing, if only sympathetically, the pain that others suffer? The desire of many to avoid the sight or even thought of others' sufferings is rooted, not, as some may fancy, in tender-heartedness, but in callousness, which seeks to justify withholding such sympathy and mitigation of others' misery as it is in our power to give.

*The Voice of the Silence* speaks of the Arhan's "mental woe unspeakable; woe for the living Dead, and helpless pity for the men of karmic sorrow, the fruit of Karma Sages dare not still"; but we who are far indeed from the Arhan's state of knowledge and purity, can

we without hypocrisy or sinning against brotherhood defend our passing by the man of karmic sorrow, like the priest and Levite in the parable of the good Samaritan, when it is in our power to relieve his suffering, if only by our sympathy, if we can give no more? "The grief which all hearts share grows less for one."

True, Number 12 of the "Aphorisms on Karma" in *U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 21* reads that "Karmic causes already set in motion must be allowed to sweep on until exhausted," but it adds that "this permits no man to refuse to help his fellows and every sentient being."

The section "On Charity" in the chapter "What Is Practical Theosophy?" in *The Key to Theosophy* shows how far from hard-heartedness the genuine Theosophist should be:

The Theosophical ideas of charity mean *personal* exertion for others; *personal* mercy and kindness; *personal* interest in the welfare of those who suffer; *personal* sympathy, forethought and assistance in their troubles or needs. . . . We believe in giving to the money a thousandfold greater power and effectiveness by our personal contact and sympathy with those who need it. We believe in relieving the starvation of the soul, as much if not more than the emptiness of the stomach; for gratitude does more good to the man who feels it, than to him for whom it is felt.

Replying to a query in the Correspondence columns of *Lucifer* for October 1889, as to what we should do for our fellow-men, Madame Blavatsky stated:

Nothing of that which is conducive to help man, collectively or individually, to live — not "happily" — but less *unhappily* in this world, ought to be indifferent to the Theosophist-Occultist. It is no concern of his whether his help benefits a man in his *worldly* or *spiritual* progress; his first duty is to be ever ready to help if he can, without stopping to philosophize.

It is pertinent to reflect upon the fact that it is *Dana*, the golden "key of charity and love immortal," that opens the gate of the very first portal on "the hard and thorny way to Jnana," the corollary suggested being that to the hard of heart that way is barred at the very entrance to the path. For, even to approach that portal, the aspirant is told, he has to live and breathe in all, as all that he perceives breathes in him, to feel himself "abiding in all things, all things in SELF."

Again, *The Voice of the Silence* calls Compassion

the Law of LAWS — eternal Harmony, Alaya's SELF; a shoreless universal essence, the light of everlasting right, and fitness of all things, the law of Love eternal. The more thou dost become at one with it, thy being melted in its BEING, the more thy Soul unites with that which Is, the more thou wilt become COMPASSION ABSOLUTE.

One of the great Masters who stood and stand behind the Theosophical Movement of our era has stated: "The true Theosophist is a philanthropist — 'not for himself but for the world he lives'"; and He added the assurance that "This, and philosophy, the right comprehension of life and its mysteries, will give the 'necessary basis' and show the right path to pursue."

Very pertinent to any consideration of the implications of human brotherhood and service are Mr. Judge's suggestions in his article, "Spiritual Gifts and Their Attainment." He wrote there:

Every impulse from above, every prompting of the Divine within, should meet at once with a hearty welcome and response. If you feel as if something urged you to visit some sick or afflicted neighbour or friend, obey the suggestion without delay. . . . If some pathetic story of suffering has moved you, act on the emotion while your cheeks are still wet with tears. . . . We become one with the Supreme most surely when we lose ourselves in work for Humanity.

And, lest we think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, or say, if only to ourselves, "Behold, I serve!" we have the helpful and humbling reminder in "Musings on the True Theosophist's Path," reprinted from *The Path* in *U.L.T. Pamphlet No. 36*, that, if we desire to labour for the good of the world, it will be unwise for us to strive to include it all at once in our efforts. "If you can help elevate or teach but one soul — that is a good beginning, and more than is given to many."

---

To repeat an evil thing said of another, even without unkind intention, may injure that other as much as a deliberate and cruel slander.

—*Book of Items*

## CONSIDERATIONS ON MAGIC

[This article by William Q. Judge first appeared in *The Path*, Vol. I, pp. 377-380, for March 1887, and was reprinted in THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for May 1943.—EDS.]

We hear a good deal nowadays and are likely to hear still more of occult science. In this regard we may as well accept the inevitable. All things have their day, and all things revolve in cycles; they come and go, and come again, though never twice the same. Even our very thoughts conform to this universal law. The life, the teachings and the fate of Pythagoras are involved in mystery, but the fate of the schools which he established and the followers who succeeded him are matters of history. The slaughter of the Magi stands over against the abuses and abominations which were perpetrated in their name, and doubtless by many styling themselves Magicians.

It is not the object of this brief paper to attempt to define magic, or elucidate occult Science as such, but rather to suggest a few considerations which are of vital import at the present time, equally important to those who utterly deny to magic any more than an imaginative basis, as to those who, convinced of its existence as a science, are, or are to become, investigators. In both the publications and conversations of the day, frequently occur the expressions "black magic" and "white magic," and those who follow these studies are designated as followers of the "*left-hand path*," or the "*right-hand path*." It ought to be understood that up to a certain point all students of magic, or occultism, journey together. By and by is reached *a place where two roads meet*, or where the common path divides, and the *awful voice from the silence*, heard only in the recesses of the individual soul, utters the stern command: "*Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.*" Instead of black and white magic, read black and white *motive*.

The student of occultism is rushing on to his destiny, but up to a certain point that destiny is in his own hands, though he is constantly shaping his course, freeing his soul from the trammels of sense and self, or becoming entangled in the web, which with warp and woof will presently clothe him as with a garment without a seam.

If early in the race he finds it difficult to shake off his chains, let him remember that at every step they grow more and more tyrannical, and often before the goal is reached where the ways divide, the battle is lost or won, and the decision there is only a matter of form. That

decision once made is irrevocable, or so nearly so that no exception need be made. Man lives at once in two worlds: the natural and the spiritual, and as in the natural plane he influences his associates, and is in turn influenced by them, so let him not imagine that in the spiritual plane he is alone. This will be a fatal mistake for the dabbler in magic, or the student in occultism. Throughout this vast universe, the good will seek the good, and the evil the evil; each will be unconsciously *drawn to its own kind*.

But when man faces his destiny in full consciousness of the issues involved, as he must before the final decision is reached, he will be no longer unconscious of these influences, but will recognize his companions: companions, alas! no longer; *Masters* now, inhuman, pitiless; and the same law of attraction which has led him along the tortuous path unveils its face, and by affinity of evil, the slave stands in the presence of his master, and the fiends that have all along incited him to laugh at the miseries of his fellow men, and trample under his feet every kindly impulse, every tender sympathy, now make the measureless hells within his own soul resound with their laughter at him, the poor deluded fool whose selfish pride and ambition have stifled and at last obliterated his humanity.

Blind indeed is he who cannot see why those who are in possession of arcane wisdom hesitate in giving it out to the world, and when in the cycles of time its day has come, they put forth the only doctrine which has power to save and bless, UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD, with all that the term implies.

There may be those who have already in this new era entered the left-hand road. But now as of old, "by their works ye shall know them." To labour with them is in vain. Selfishness, pride and lust for power are the signs by which we may know them. They may not at once cast off disguise, and they will never deceive the true Theosophist. They can, nevertheless, deceive to their ruin the ignorant, the curious and the unwary, and it is for such as these that these lines are penned; and the worst of it is that these poor deluded souls are led to believe that no such danger exists, and this belief is fortified by the so-called scientists, who are quoted as authority, and who ridicule everything but rank materialism. Yet notwithstanding all this, these simple souls flutter like moths around the flame till they are drawn within the vortex. It is better a million times that the proud, the selfish and time-serving should eat, drink and be merry, and let occultism alone, for these pro-

pensities, unless speedily eradicated, will bear fruit and ripen into quick harvests, and the wages thereof is death, literally the "*second death*."

The purpose of Theosophy is to eradicate these evil tendencies of man, so that, whether on the ordinary planes of daily life, or in the higher occult realms, the Christ shall be lifted up, and draw all men unto him.

"Man's inhumanity to man  
Makes countless thousands mourn."

The Christs of all ages have preached this one doctrine: Charity and Brotherhood of Man. To deny the law of charity is to deny the Christ. The Theosophical Society is not responsible for unveiling to the present generation the occult nature of man. Modern Spiritualism had already done this; nor is the responsibility to be charged to the Spiritualists, for these unseen forces had revealed themselves in the fulness of time, and many millions had become convinced, many against their wills, of the reality of the unseen universe. These things *are here*, and neither crimination nor recrimination is of any use. The responsibility, therefore, rests entirely with the individual, as to what he makes of his opportunities, as to his purposes and aims, and as he advances in his course, involved in the circle of necessity, he influences whether he will or no, those whose spheres of life touch at any point his own. *As ye sow, so shall ye also reap*. By and by the cycle will close and both the evil and the good will return like bread cast upon the waters. This is a law of life.

Imagine not that they are weak and vacillating souls who enter the left-hand road: Lucifer was once a prince of light, admitted to the councils of the Most High. He fell through pride, and dragged downward in his fall all who worshipped the demon pride. This is no foolish fable, but a terrible tragedy, enacted at the gates of paradise, in the face of the assembled universe, and re-enacted in the heart of man, the epitome of all. Only Infinite pity can measure the downfall of such an one, only Infinite love disarm by annihilation, and so put an end to unendurable woe, and that only when the cycle is complete, the measure of iniquity balanced by its measure of pain. Occultism and magic are not child's play as many may learn to their sorrow, as many visitants of dark circles have already and long ago discovered. Better give dynamite to our children as a plaything, than Magic to the unprincipled, the thoughtless, the selfish and ignorant. Let all who have joined the Theo-

sophical Society remember this, and search their hearts before taking the first step in any magical formulary. *The motive determines all.* Occult power brings with it unknown and unmeasured responsibility.

If in the secret councils of the soul, where no eye can see, and no thought deceive that divine spark, conscience, we are ready to forget self, to forego pride, and labour for the well-being of man, then may the upright man face this destiny, follow this guide and fear no evil. Otherwise it were better that a millstone were hung about his neck, and he were cast into the depths of the sea.

---

He alone is called a learned man who is well started on the way to self-knowledge; who is forbearing, believes in the inviolability of Dharma and who is not influenced by material considerations

This constitutes the mark of scholarship: adhering to such principles as have been upheld by *shastras* and rejecting those abjured by them; faith in God; and faith in one's task.

He alone is a learned man of whose activities little is known beforehand and of whose determinations people know only after seeing the result.

Men of learning will attempt only those things that they feel they can do; they, however, accomplish what they undertake and they would not treat anything with contempt.

The first mark of a learned man is that he has quick comprehension; he learns things (from many sources) over a long period; knowing their meaning, however, he does not hurry to enjoy their benefit. He does not easily volunteer information for others.

Men of learning do not desire the impossible; nor do they worry about what is lost. In dangers they do not lose their head.

He alone is a learned man who embarks on an action after due deliberation; who does not allow himself to be bogged by his work and who does not indulge in fruitless pursuits.

He is a learned man who does not feel elated when honoured, nor pained when criticized; whose mind is deep and remains unperturbed like the deep waters of Ganga.

Learned men call him great who does not rake up an old feud while at peace; who never becomes conceited; is easily pacified and does not stoop to evil deeds even in his bad days.

—From Vidura's advice to King Dhritarashtra  
(*The Mahabharata*)

## THE THREEFOLD WAY OF THE SOUL

One of the most misunderstood words in modern science and philosophy as well as in the theology of the churches is the word "soul." Everyone talks about soul, yet different people use the word with different implications and meanings, and sometimes they are not at all sure of what they mean when they speak of soul. It is most essential for us to exercise care in our use of words, for much confusion arises when words are used indiscriminately or without proper understanding of their meaning.

To the psychologist, soul means one thing; but the theologian, surrounded as he is by concepts of theology, gives to the word an altogether different meaning. The man who has studied philosophy in the Western world has a different idea of soul from the man who has studied Eastern philosophy. Then again, Theosophy uses the word in a different sense. This has been the difficulty all through the ages. Even in India, where the higher branches of philosophy and psychology have been studied for thousands of years, the same words have been used by different people with different meanings. If we take, for instance, the word *Atma*, the Self, the Spirit, we find that it has been used by the authors of the Vedas, the Upanishads and their Commentaries, each in his own peculiar way. Hence it becomes the first duty of the student to get at the meaning of the word as it is used by a particular author or commentator.

Now what do we mean when we speak of soul? It is useless to speak of the advance, the progress or the growth of the soul unless we are clear in our own minds as to just what the soul is.

The Christian scriptures say that God made man in His own image; also, that God is a Trinity — God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit. The Christian believes that man has a soul, even if he does not clearly perceive the teaching that man *is* a soul. But, in the West, the same logical conclusion is not drawn from this premise that is drawn in the East. Here they say that if God-consciousness is triune — Brahma the Creator, Vishnu the Preserver, Shiva the Regenerator — and if man is made in the image of God, then also must man be triune. We must understand this trinity of human consciousness.

First, it is said that man is *Atma*, the Self, and that the great quality which he manifests as *Atma* is that of Will.

Then man in his second aspect is *Buddhi*, the discerner, he who has the faculty of acquiring that knowledge which will enable him to

discriminate between the true and the false, the real and the unreal.

In his third aspect he is *Manas*, the thinker, whose special function is creative activity. It is this Manas which makes of man a creator.

So, by the power of Atma, we resolve, we will; by the power of Buddhi, we discern and know; and by the power of Manas, we create.

This triune being, with the capacity to will, to know, to create, is a spiritual entity, for he is made in the image and likeness of God; he is divine in his nature, because he is rooted in divine consciousness. The difference between God-consciousness and man-consciousness is that while the latter is a seed in which all divine powers are locked up, the former is the full-grown tree in which all the powers of the seed have become manifest. Hence we, as seeds, are latent Gods, Gods who have still to become patent; and the process by which this is to be accomplished consists in the bringing out of our powers of will, of discernment, of creative activity, so that human will can become divine will, human discernment divine discernment, and the creative activity which is human can become manifest as that creative activity which is divine.

These, then, are the threefold powers of the triune being that each of us is in his higher nature. By the power of our creative activity we create the instruments which would help us to know the universe in which we find ourselves. So, because we are thinkers, we create mind.

At this point we should note one fundamental difference between the philosophy of the East and that of the West. Mind, says the Asiatic Science, is not man; mind is the instrument of man. Mind is not the thinker; mind is the instrument in and through which the thinker works and carries on his activity as a creator. Mind is his creation, his instrument of knowledge.

Now sometimes this mind is spoken of as the soul; at other times it is the thinker, using the mind as his instrument, who is so spoken of; again it is the man who wills, discerns and thinks with the help of his mind who is referred to as soul. The soul, according to Theosophy, is that which has been described as the *creative, active aspect*, the *third* aspect of triune man. The soul, in other words, is the creative actor who creates as his first instrument the mind, in and through which he begins to think.

What does he think? He thinks naturally about those subjects in which he is interested, subjects which pertain to the universe in the midst of which he finds himself. Having created his mind, he begins to perceive the universe of mind. As soon as he perceives it, he wants

to know it, because the nature of the soul is knowledge. Energized by the power of his second aspect, discernment, he creates the instrument by which he can know. The senses come into existence in order that the inner man may contact the outside world and gain impressions. But now he finds that, although he can get impressions, still he cannot make response. Hence he creates something else, the instruments of action or response, spoken of as the sense-organs and the organs of action.

There is a distinction between what is called the sense of sight and the organ which is spoken of as the eye; between the sense of hearing and the ear; between the power to act and the organ of action, the hands. These organs are often spoken of as the instruments through which Karma operates.

Now the mind, the senses and the organs work on each other, and in their interplay they give birth to a fourth factor. We find certain impressions coming through the senses, taken up by the mind, and given back through the organs of action, and this interplay produces that which we speak of as the desire nature.

So man has these four instruments in and through which he works: the senses, the sense-organs, the desire nature and the mind. This fourfold nature assumes an independent activity of its own, and forms what is spoken of as the *lower self*, the *animal soul*. Man is both an individuality and the reflection of the individuality, sometimes called the personality. Let us ponder on this point for a moment, for it has become the cause of great confusion in the world today. In all the processes of psychoanalysis, in the so-called "going down deep into the soul," what "soul" is meant? It is into this *animal soul* that people are digging deep down, the animal soul of the senses, the sense-organs, the desire nature and the lower mind, which often exhibits its own independent powers, its own activities. It is the arousing into activity of this animal soul which people often mistake for the birth of the soul. This animal soul is what is sometimes called "*subconsciousness*."

What is normal consciousness? That which we have called the soul, the third aspect of the man, working through the mind. He speaks of "*my senses, my body, my likes and dislikes, loves and hates*," and has a faculty of his own, ordinarily spoken of as the voice of conscience. This is the voice of the human creator who works in and through the mind when the mind is set free from the slavery which the senses, the sense-organs and the desire nature impose upon it. When the mind is thus enslaved, it becomes the lower mind; once freed of its fetters,

it becomes the higher mind. When it is the higher mind, it becomes the instrument of the creative actor, the man himself; when it is the lower mind, the creative actor sits imprisoned, as it were, because all the faculties of the mind are warped by the desire nature.

What, then, is the difference between the life of this lower or animal soul and the life of the higher or real Soul? The life of the lower soul is complex; it is guided by the desire for possessions. Therefore it is a life of struggle and of distress. The activity of the senses, energized by the desire nature, enables us to desire things; our sense of possession grows strong, we continually want more things, and life becomes more and more complex. The complex life then grows into the life of struggle. But are those who struggle for possessions, and even succeed in gaining them, necessarily happy? Time and again we see that the complex life, leading to the life of struggle, ends eventually, not in happiness, but in distress.

What, then, is the spiritual life? It is the way of the soul, and the reverse of the life of the lower, animal soul. It is the simple life instead of the complex life; the strenuous life instead of the life of struggle; the life in which all activities produce happiness instead of distress. It is not the life of idleness, of withdrawing from the world, but the contrary. Let us examine this threefold life which is the threefold way of the soul.

First, it is the simple life. All of us think we live, but do we really do so? When we begin to examine ourselves, to analyse our minds, thoughts, activities and processes of everyday life, we find that we are continually passing from life to death, not from life to life. For what is death but change?

The simple life, then, is the life with a single purpose, with an ideal where all other considerations and complexities are removed, because our mind's eye is fixed on our ideal. But our purpose must not be of the nature of the world of complexities; it must not be desire for wealth, or for power, or for fame, or for human affection, for these are the purposes of the lower world. Man seeks wealth first of all; then, having gained wealth, he seeks fame; having achieved fame he wants power over the minds of other men; when he has that, he seeks human affection, so that he may find his own image in kin and friends. If we love all people in an ever expanding way, without caring for the return of love, life becomes simple. As long as we love in this way, it is not our concern whether we are loved in return or not. If we love

our neighbour as ourselves, it means that we see all our own qualities manifesting themselves in him.

Then we come to the question of the strenuous life. To go on pouring out love on all people, all things, every month of the year, every day of the month, every hour of the day, every minute of the hour, that is the strenuous life. To see the power of our love energizing other people does not mean running about here and there; it means the power to give steadily and persistently, at every point of space, at every moment of time. We cannot attempt to achieve all this in a short time. Just as it takes years of practice to become a good musician or a good mathematician, so also to acquire the power to love steadily requires time and effort; it is hard, plodding work. How shall we go about it? Krishna answered this question: "By constant practice and absence of desire, or dispassion."

The moment we begin to live like that, then and there we begin to get knowledge; because as we begin to pour ourselves out into others, we begin really to understand all things, all people. When we begin to love in this manner, we find that we need that quality of discernment which knows how to give love. And so we see that the strenuous life becomes discriminative activity; we see all things as aspects of the divine. In other words, it becomes a sacramental life.

There is a wonderful definition of the word sacrament — "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." Therefore we need not consider as sacraments only those rites instituted by the churches. Our very getting up in the morning, refreshed, might be considered a sacred thing. Our work at the office, in the home, behind the counter; our every gesture or word, every line that we write, becomes an outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace if it comes from the man who has resolved rightly. And so our outer life becomes the expression of our soul life; the two blend into one. The man who works with his hands need not stop working with his hands in order to lead the soul life. He begins to live on a different plane because his inner resolution has become different. And from that point of view it does not matter much *what* we do, but it matters very much *how* we do it.

The threefold way of the soul is, then: first, the simple life, with one purpose, to love; second, the strenuous life, with the purpose of discerning and loving with that discernment; and third, the sacramental life, in which all actions are made sacred, because each has been valued

at its own worth, with discrimination.

Then we begin to see what comes out of it: union with the divine — *Yoga*. It means the perception of divinity in all things around us. And so everywhere we see one great consciousness manifesting and acting. "The Universe grows I"; and that is *Yoga*.

Then comes the practical application of our knowledge. We love our neighbour as ourselves, not differently, and the barriers of caste, creed, sect, race, or nation, fall. The entire universe becomes for us one universe. Everywhere we see the all-pervading Supreme Spirit.

The threefold way of the soul we can adopt here and now. We cannot expect to succeed all at once; the time it will take us will be determined by the degree of intensity with which we act now. The spiritual life must begin in the selfsame environment in which we now find ourselves. Every act must be made a sacrament, every sacrifice must bring us joy, not pain. And so we become one with Nature; we become fully cognizant of the universal consciousness working in and through us every moment of our lives.

---

The time is at hand when we may quit the harbour and sail for the open sea . . . . But to launch out into this subject is like embarking on a shoreless ocean that environs the world. It is easy to quit the land, or to loose the horses from the starting-post; but to attain the end or reach the goal is a labour for Hercules. Nevertheless we are bound to attempt the abyss, though as yet we must proceed like young birds that, with the feeble strokes of their new-fledged wings, first essay their strength, and from their nests try the air, the new world which they are to enter.

—SWEDENBORG

## THE HALL OF MIRRORS

There was once a much coveted prize locked up within a lonely castle. It was the only one of its kind on earth, and many were the contestants for its possession. The only qualifications for entering the inner chamber of the castle were extreme Purity and Beauty. One had to be extremely handsome before one could enter within its inner precincts.

Among those who coveted the prize was a prince well known for his beauty and prowess. One day he rode up to the gates of the castle and demanded admission. The gates were opened and he entered a hall—the Hall of Mirrors. All around him were mirrors that threw back his own reflection. The prince looked and stood aghast. For the face that looked at him was a very ugly one, not at all like what he had believed to be his own beautiful visage. Wherever he looked, he saw an ugly face, and it seemed as though a host of beings were mocking at him from all directions. “What!” he cried. “This is a deliberate insult. I will no more of this.” And he turned back in the direction from which he came, greatly upset and angry.

Another prince who was known for his valour and beauty came riding by. He too entered the Hall of Mirrors. Again what the mirrors reflected was ugliness, and not at all the beauty he had imagined to be his possession. “Well, I am surprised,” said he with great indignation. “The world has acclaimed me the most handsome. The world has bestowed upon me prizes beyond measure. I will not return empty-handed.” And he smote the mirrors with all his might. He struck at the door that led within with his sword and armour. All round him there were echoes of mockery. Every blow he dealt, he got back one in return. He could not force the door open, and he returned home much bruised and dejected.

A third came riding and demanded admission. The door of the Hall of Mirrors stood open, and he entered. To his great surprise the face that the mirrors reflected was only half beautiful. The other half was very much distorted and ugly. “How is this?” he cried. He washed his face afresh, he changed his headgear and dress, he smoothed out his distortions, and he tried every means in his power to make himself handsome. But the reflection still remained as it was, half beautiful, half ugly. In the end, he was very much tired. “This is ridiculous,” said he. “Maybe there is nothing to it. Maybe the prize is not of such

great consequence after all." He too returned the way he came, greatly annoyed and scandalized.

A fourth one came, full of eagerness and hope. The doors were opened, and he entered. In the Hall of Mirrors (the mirrors that were held up before him, as it were, by unknown hands) he saw a handsome face, but with a trace of ugliness around it. The door of the inner chamber stood barred, for only extreme Purity and Beauty could open it.

"I am sorry," said he to himself, "I did not know I was still so ugly."

He came out of the castle, but turned not in the direction from which he came. He wandered, searching for that Purity which alone could bring him the Prize he coveted. He looked for it deep within. He looked for its roots, he looked for its seeds. After days of wandering he came back and entered the Hall. He found the face more beautiful, but there still lingered an ugly trace around it.

"I will try again," said he, and plunged back into the secret realm of Search and Strife. He learnt that what makes one beautiful is not so much the external appearance as an inner cleanliness that erases all ugliness — ugliness which is not always apparent, but becomes visible when one enters the contest and covets the Prize. He wandered far and wide until the meaning of Beauty became clear. He found that it is also Harmony and Unity. Its roots lay in Truth and its ultimate end in Perfection. He learnt that it is not enough to *know* Beauty; one should *realize* Beauty. One should destroy its shadows and keep its light. The erasing of the ugliness within oneself requires greater pains than the venturing forth into unknown lands.

The Hall of Mirrors again reflected the heart of the warrior. This time it shone in its pristine purity, for the trace of ugliness had gone. The warrior pushed the sacred door open, and passed within.

---

The flint may remain for myriads of years under water, still it does not lose its inner fire. Strike it with iron whenever you like and out flows the glowing spark. So is the true devotee firm in his faith.

—SRI RAMAKRISHNA

## WORSHIP\*

All . . . public worship was exoteric, and the great universal symbols were distorted universally, as those of Krishna are now by the Vallabhacharyas of Bombay, the followers of the *infant* God. But are these popular gods the *true Deity*? Are *they* the Apex and synthesis of the sevenfold creation, man included? Never! Each and all are one of the rungs of that septenary ladder of Divine Consciousness, pagan as Christian.

As the "coats of skin" of men thickened, and they fell more and more into physical sin, the intercourse between physical and ethereal *divine* man was stopped. The veil of matter between the two planes became too dense for even the inner man to penetrate. The mysteries of Heaven and Earth, revealed to the Third Race by their celestial teachers in the days of their purity, became a great focus of light, the rays from which became necessarily weakened as they were diffused and shed upon an uncongenial, because too material soil. With the masses they degenerated into Sorcery, taking later on the shape of exoteric religions, or idolatry full of superstitions, and man-, or hero-worship. Alone a handful of primitive men — in whom the spark of divine Wisdom burnt bright, and only strengthened in its intensity as it got dimmer and dimmer with every age in those who turned it to bad purposes — remained the elect custodians of the Mysteries revealed to mankind by the divine Teachers.

When, moved by the law of Evolution, the Lords of Wisdom infused into [primitive man] the spark of consciousness, the first feeling it awoke to life and activity was a sense of solidarity, of oneness with his spiritual creators. As the child's first feeling is for its mother and nurse, so the first aspirations of the awakening consciousness in primitive man were for those whose element he felt within himself, and who yet were outside, and independent of him. DEVOTION arose out of that feeling, and became the first and foremost motor in his nature; for it is the only one which is natural in our heart, which is innate in us, and which we find alike in human babe and the young of the animal.

Neither the collective Host (Demiurgos), nor any of the working powers individually, are proper subjects for divine honours or worship.

---

\* Collated from *The Secret Doctrine*.

All are entitled to the grateful reverence of Humanity, however, and man ought to be ever striving to help the divine evolution of *Ideas*, by becoming to the best of his ability a *co-worker with nature* in the cyclic task. The ever unknowable and incognizable *Karana* alone, the *Causeless Cause* of all causes, should have its shrine and altar on the holy and ever untrodden ground of our heart — invisible, intangible, unmentioned, save through “the still small voice” of our spiritual consciousness. Those who worship before it, ought to do so in the silence and sanctified solitude of their Souls; making their spirit the sole mediator between them and the *Universal Spirit*, their good actions the only priests, and their sinful intentions the only visible and objective sacrificial victims to the *Presence*.

“When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are . . . but enter into *thine inner chamber and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret*” (*Matt. vi*). Our father is *within us* “in Secret,” our 7th principle, in the “inner chamber” of our Soul perception. “The Kingdom of Heaven” and of God “*is within us,*” says Jesus, not *outside*. Why are Christians so absolutely blind to the self-evident meaning of the words of wisdom they delight in mechanically repeating?

It was the Atlanteans, the first progeny of *semi-divine* man after his separation into sexes — hence the first-begotten and humanly-born mortals — who became the first “Sacrificers” to the *god of matter*. They stand in the far-away dim past, in ages more than prehistoric, as the prototype on which the great symbol of Cain was built, as the first anthropomorphists who worshipped form and matter. That worship degenerated very soon into *self-worship*, thence led to phallicism, or that which reigns supreme to this day in the symbolisms of every exoteric religion of ritual, dogma, and form. Adam and Eve *became matter*, or furnished the soil, Cain and Abel — the latter the life-bearing soil, the former “the tiller of that ground or field.”

Thus the first Atlantean races, born on the Lemurian Continent, separated from their earliest tribes into the righteous and the unrighteous; into those who worshipped the one unseen Spirit of Nature, the ray of which man feels within himself — or the Pantheists, and those who offered fanatical worship to the Spirits of the Earth, the dark Cosmic, anthropomorphic Powers, with whom they made alliance.

It is only in the Fourth Race that men, who had lost all right to be considered divine, resorted to body worship, in other words to phalli-

cism. Till then, they had been truly gods, as pure and as divine as their progenitors.

The third and fourth (*races*) became tall with pride. We are the kings, we are the gods. . . . They built temples for the human body. Male and Female they worshipped. . . . This is the beginning of a worship which, ages later, was doomed to degenerate into phallicism and sexual worship. It began by the worship of the human body — that “miracle of miracles,” as an English author calls it — and ended by that of its respective sexes. The worshippers were giants in stature; but they were giants in knowledge and learning, though it came to them more easily than it does to the men of our modern times. Their Science was innate in them. The Lemuro-Atlantean had no need of discovering and fixing in his memory that which his informing PRINCIPLE *knew* at the moment of its incarnation. Time alone, and the ever-growing obtuseness of the matter in which the *Principles* had clothed themselves, could, the one, weaken the memory of their pre-natal knowledge, the other, blunt and even extinguish every spark of the spiritual and divine in them.

As Krishna truly says — the same words being repeated later by another *vehicle* of the LOGOS — “I am the same to all beings. . . . those who worship me (the 6th principle or the intellectual *divine* Soul, *Buddhi*, made conscious by its union with the higher faculties of *Manas*) are in me, and I am in them.”

Esoteric history teaches that idols and their worship died out with the Fourth Race, until the survivors of the hybrid races of the latter (Chinamen, African negroes, etc.) gradually brought the worship back. The Vedas countenance no idols; all the modern Hindu writings do.

---

Atma is the river; control of passions is the *punyatirtha*. Truth mixed with character and tranquillity constitutes its sacred water. That virtuous action taken after a dip in this water alone leads one to *moksha*; not the dip in the physical waters.

—*Vamana Purana*

## TRUE DETACHMENT

On the path of the spiritual life one of the most essential virtues to be cultivated is true detachment in contradistinction to carelessness, negligence and cold indifference of the nature of *tamas*. In ordinary life, we see the manifold expressions of indifference at all stages and in all circumstances. True detachment is the result of daily and hourly restraint upon oneself, according to the precepts of the holy Scriptures, enabling one to rise above the pairs of opposites. It is the balance point, leading to the success of a spiritual aspirant. True detachment is the cure prescribed by all the doctors of ancient wisdom for many of the ills, physical, mental and moral, to which human beings succumb.

In the Second Discourse of the *Bhagavad-Gita* Shri Krishna points out to Arjuna how giving way to sense-inclinations is the primary cause of all troubles, leading to passion, anger, loss of memory, loss of discrimination and loss of all. There is nothing wrong with the objective world and objective things; they are necessary for evolution. There is nothing wrong with the senses when used as proper channels and instruments for the work of the soul. The mischief starts only when the senses begin to lead and tempt the mind, and drag it down with its owner, the self-conscious thinker, to a lower level, towards the material pole.

In the Third Discourse of the *Bhagavad-Gita*, Arjuna wants to know what propels man to commit offences, seemingly against his will and as if constrained by some secret force. And Shri Krishna answers that it is lust which instigates him; it is passion, sprung from the quality of *rajas*. Man is bound by a hundred chords of desire, for he does not consider what are the necessary actions to be engaged in, what benefit will accrue and to whom. His actions are impulsive and involve him in greater and greater difficulties, from which he does not seem to find a way out.

In the Sixth Discourse of the *Bhagavad-Gita* Arjuna raises the difficulty about the wandering mind, restless and turbulent and difficult to control. Shri Krishna prescribes constant practice and detachment as the remedy for the uncontrolled mind. "To whatsoever object the inconstant mind goeth out . . . subdue it, bring it back, and place it upon the Spirit." So, detaching the mind from sense-inclinations, from lower desires, and placing it upon the Spirit is an excellent remedy for most of the troubles on different planes which afflict human beings

today. The great Teachers go to the causal aspect, and point out the way to uproot the evil for ever.

The fourth of the Divine Paramitas given in *The Voice of the Silence* is: "VIRAGA, indifference to pleasure and to pain, illusion conquered, truth alone perceived." This is true detachment. In order to conquer illusion, to perceive truth, and to rise above the pairs of opposites it is necessary to practise this Divine Paramita, its position being in the middle of the seven. We are not to be indifferent to another's pain or pleasure; there we have to be alert and vigilant to give our very best. *Viraga* is that higher indifference to our own pleasure or pain; it is the doing away with self-centredness. *The Voice of the Silence* again instructs us definitely on this point:

Ere thou canst settle in Dhyana-Marga and call it thine,  
thy Soul has to become as the ripe mango fruit: as soft and sweet  
as its bright golden pulp for others' woes, as hard as that fruit's  
stone for thine own throes and sorrows, O Conqueror of Weal and  
Woe.

It is a beautiful image — to be soft and sweet to another's sorrow and suffering, but to forget our own and be firm with ourselves as the hard stone of the mango. This will lead to true detachment.

We are also asked to conquer illusions. What is illusion? To think of that which is real as unreal, and of that which is unreal as real. All that is transitory and perishable is unreal; the physical body to which so much importance is attached, the personal nature which always seeks gratification, are illusionary because they are constantly changing, whereas the immortal, permanent aspect of our constitution is eternal and changeless. But in our modern civilization most people do not give a thought to their permanent nature, and so they live surrounded by illusions, and evaluate things incorrectly. Once we are in search of truth, the ideation must undergo a complete change, and a new attitude begin to shape itself. What is the truth to be perceived? It is the reality of each one being a ray of light divine, immortal in essence, therefore one with all other sparks of light. The source being the same, the goal is the same also, and everyone works towards that goal under the selfsame law. This can be perceived intellectually, but to live in accordance with it is the task ahead of each one, and a very difficult one too. *Kama*, *krodha* and *lobha* are the three gates of hell. They can be closed for ever through *Viraga*, true detachment, and through constant attention and vigilance to be in communion

with the divine, the Higher Self.

It is our various attachments that cause trouble and create false values. Attachment to one's religion, which one considers to be the highest and the best, creates false pride and conflict with others. The soul is above all so-called religions. It is aware only of unity and harmony, love and truth. People show false patriotism by thinking of their own country as the most important in the world, failing to realize that it is but a part of the whole, and that the common good of all should be the aim of everyone. True detachment will lead one to rise above unnecessary attachments to classes and creeds and social position, and to attend to his own duties, *sva-dharma*, whole-heartedly. The closer the union with one's inner God, "the more serene man's destiny, the less dangerous the external conditions." (*Isis Unveiled*, II. 593)

When it is said, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate," it is not meant that we should exclude ourselves from all our fellow beings, but rather that we should separate ourselves from false beliefs and adopt for ourselves a new style of thinking and ideation, on the basis of true unity and harmony. So many sadhus and fakirs leave their homes and families and go into seclusion, shirking their own duties and responsibilities, not realizing that this is the path of selfishness. Detachment must lead to dedication to one's duties, which may be performed without any consideration of the results of such actions. It is by living in the world that true detachment must be attained. Love of God and understanding of the Law must show forth in the service of humanity. In H.P.B.'s article, "Chelas and Lay Chelas" (*Raja-Yoga or Occultism*), the seventh of the qualifications expected in a Chela is given thus:

Calm indifference for, but a just appreciation of everything that constitutes the objective and transitory world, in its relation with, and to, the invisible regions.

In this particular qualification is summed up all the help and guidance one may need for the practice of true detachment. It implies true evaluation of life, the walking of the middle way — not the discarding of this objective world, nor the denial of the invisible regions, but the recognition of the correct relationship between the two. The outer, objective world is but a reflection of the inner, and is to be looked upon with calm indifference, knowingly, deliberately, but at the same time appreciating the passing panorama, learning the many lessons it conveys, with neither elation at the joys, nor dejection at

the sufferings. True appreciation makes us more alive to the needs of others, and more energetic to be the better able to help others and to teach them the Eternal Verities taught by the Sages and Torch-bearers of Truth.

When one has true understanding of religion as a way of life and not merely as the performance of ceremonies and rituals, then necessarily all attachment for the founder of a particular religion also ceases. It is not difficult to comprehend that none of the great teachers and prophets is the only begotten son of God, that they all belong to one fraternity, that they all work with one mind, one will, one feeling for the good of humanity, that they are all engaged, whether in the embodied or the disembodied state, in the spiritual service of the race. Therefore no one is greater or superior to others; all are equally worthy of deep gratitude and reverence from all.

---

What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow man; this is the whole Law: the rest is mere commentary.

Judge not thy neighbour till thou art in his place.

Trust not thyself till the day of thy death.

He who wishes to make a name for himself loses his name; he who does not increase his knowledge decreases it; he who does not learn is worthy of death; he who works for the sake of a crown is lost.

My humility is my exaltation; my exaltation is my humility.

—Sayings of HILLEL

## REPLIES TO AN ENGLISH F.T.S.

[The second part of the reply to Question VII is reprinted here from *The Theosophist*, November 1883.—Eds.]

### QUESTION VII

#### PHILOLOGICAL AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL "DIFFICULTIES"

(*Continued*)

Meanwhile, to all sincere and inquiring Theosophists, we will say plainly, it is useless for anyone to speculate about the date of our Lord Sanggyas' birth, while rejecting *a priori* all the Brahmanical, Ceylonese, Chinese, and Tibetan dates. The pretext that these do not agree with the chronology of a handful of Greeks who visited the country 300 years after the event in question, is too fallacious and bold. Greece was never concerned with Buddhism, and besides the fact that the classics furnish their few synchronistic dates simply upon the hearsay of their respective authors — a few Greeks, who themselves lived centuries before the writers quoted — their chronology is itself too defective, and their historical records, when it was a question of national triumphs, too bombastic and often too diametrically opposed to fact, to inspire with confidence anyone less prejudiced than the average European Orientalist. To seek to establish the true dates in Indian history by connecting its events with the mythical "invasion," while confessing that "we look in vain in the literature of the Brahmans or Buddhists for any allusion to Alexander's conquest, and although it is impossible to identify any of the historical events related by Alexander's companions with the *historical tradition* of India," amounts to something more than a mere exhibition of incompetence in this direction: were not Prof. Max Müller the party concerned — we might say that it appears almost like predetermined dishonesty.

These are harsh words to say, and calculated no doubt to shock many a European mind trained to look up to what is termed "scientific authority" with a feeling akin to that of the savage for his family fetich. They are well deserved, nevertheless, as a few examples will show. To such intellects as Prof. Weber's — whom we take as the leader of the German Orientalists of the type of Christophiles — certainly the word "obtuseness" cannot be applied. Upon seeing how chronology is deliberately and *maliciously* perverted in *favour* of "Greek influence," Christian interests and his own predetermined theories — another, and

even a stronger term should be applied. What expression is too severe to signify one's feelings upon reading such an unwitting confession of disingenuous scholarship as Weber repeatedly makes (*Hist. Ind. Lit.*) when urging the *necessity* of admitting that a passage "has been touched up by *later interpolation*," or forcing fanciful chronological places for texts admittedly very ancient — as "otherwise the dates would be brought down too far or too near!" And this is the key-note of his entire policy; *fiat hypothesis, ruat cœlum!* On the other hand Prof. Max Müller, enthusiastic Indophile as he seems, crams centuries into his chronological thimble without the smallest apparent compunction.

These two Orientalists are instances, because they are accepted beacons of philology and Indian palæography. Our national monuments are dated and our ancestral history perverted to suit their opinions; and the most pernicious result ensues, that History is now recording for the misguidance of posterity the false annals and distorted facts which, upon their evidence, are to be accepted without appeal as the outcome of the fairest and ablest critical analysis. While Prof. Max Müller will hear of no other than a Greek criterion for Indian chronology, Prof. Weber (*op. cit.*) finds Greek influence — his universal solvent — in the development of India's religion, philosophy, literature, astronomy, medicine, architecture, etc. To support this fallacy the most tortuous sophistry, the most absurd etymological deductions are resorted to. If one fact more than another has been set at rest by comparative mythology, it is that their fundamental religious ideas, and most of their gods, were derived by the Greeks from religions flourishing in the north-west of India, the cradle of the main Hellenic stock. This is now entirely disregarded, because a disturbing element in the harmony of the critical spheres. And though nothing is more reasonable than the inference that the Grecian astronomical terms were inherited equally from the parent stock, Prof. Weber would have us believe that "it was Greek influence that just infused a real life into Indian astronomy" (p. 251). In fine, the hoary ancestors of the Hindus borrowed their astronomical terminology and learned the art of star-gazing and *even their zodiac* from the Hellenic infant! This proof engenders another: the relative antiquity of the astronomical texts shall be henceforth determined upon the presence or absence in them of asterisms and zodiacal signs; the former being undisguisedly Greek in their names, the latter are "designated by their Sanskrit names which are translated from the Greek" (p. 255). Thus "Manu's law being unacquainted with the planets," is considered as more ancient than Yajna-

valkya's Code, which "inculcates their worship," and so on. But there is still another and a better test found out by the Sanskritists for determining with "infallible accuracy" the age of the texts, apart from asterisms and zodiacal signs: any casual mention in them of the name "Yavana," taken in every instance to designate the "Greeks." This, apart "from an *internal* chronology based on the character of the works themselves, and on the quotations, etc., therein contained, is the only one possible," we are told. As a result — the absurd statement that "the Indian astronomers regularly speak of the Yavanas as their teachers" (p. 252). *Ergo*, their *teachers* were Greeks. For with Weber and others "Yavana" and "Greek" are convertible terms.

But it so happens that *Yavanacharya* was the Indian title of a single Greek — Pythagoras; as Shankaracharya was the title of a single Hindu philosopher; and the ancient Aryan astronomical writers cited his opinions to criticize and compare them with the teachings of their own astronomical science, long before him perfected and derived from their ancestors. The honorific title of Acharya (master) was applied to him as to every other learned astronomer or mystic; and it certainly did not mean that Pythagoras or any other Greek "Master" was necessarily *the* master of the Brahmans. The word "Yavana" was a generic term employed ages before the "Greeks of Alexander" projected "their influence" upon Jambudvipa, to designate people of a younger race, the word meaning *Yuvan* "young," or *younger*. They knew of Yavanas of the north, west, south and east; and the Greek strangers received this appellation as the Persians, Indo-Scythians and others had before them. An exact parallel is afforded in our present day. To the Tibetans every foreigner whatsoever is known as a *Peling*; the Chinese designate Europeans as "red-haired devils"; and the Mussalmans call everyone outside of Islam a *Kaffir*. The Webers of the future, following the example now set them, may perhaps, after 10,000 years, affirm, upon the authority of scraps of Moslem literature then extant, that the Bible was written, and the English, French, Russians and Germans who possessed and translated or "invented" it, lived in Kaffiristan shortly before their era, under "Moslem influence." Because the *Yuga Purana* of the *Garga Sanhita* speaks of an expedition of the Yavanas "as far as Pataliputra." therefore, either the Macedonians or the *Seleucidæ* had conquered all India! But our Western critic is ignorant, of course, of the fact that Ayodhya or *Saketa* of Rama was for two millenniums repelling inroads of various Mongolian and other Turanian tribes, besides the Indo-Scythians, from beyond Nepal and the Himalayas. Prof.

Weber seems finally himself frightened at the Yavana spectre he has raised, for he queries: "Whether by the Yavanas it is really the Greeks who are meant . . . or possibly merely their Indo-Scythian or other successors, to whom the name was afterwards transferred." This wholesome doubt ought to have modified his dogmatic tone in many other such cases.

But, drive out prejudice with a pitch-fork, it will ever return. The eminent scholar, though staggered by his own glimpse of the truth, returns to the charge with new vigour. We are startled by the fresh discovery that Asuramaya,<sup>3</sup> the earliest astronomer, mentioned repeatedly in the Indian epics, "is identical with 'Ptolemaïos' of the Greeks." The reason for it given is, that "this latter name, *as we see from the inscriptions of Piyadasi, became in Indian 'Turamaya,' out of which the name 'Asuramaya' might very easily grow; and since, by the later tradition, this 'Maya' is distinctly assigned to Romaka-pura in the West.*" Had the "Piyadasi inscription" been found on the site of ancient Babylonia, one might suspect the word "Turamaya" as derived from "Turanomaya," or rather *mania*. Since, however, the Piyadasi inscriptions belong distinctly to India and the title was borne but by two kings — Chandragupta and Dharmasoka — what has " 'Ptolemaïos' of the Greeks" to do with "Turamaya," or the latter with "Asuramaya," except, indeed, to use it as a fresh pretext to drag the Indian astronomer under the stupefying "Greek influence" of the Upas Tree of Western Philology? Then we learn that, because "Panini once mentions the Yavanas, *i.e.*, . . . Greeks, and explains the formation of the word 'Yavanani,' to which, according to the *Varttika*, the word *lipi*, 'writing,' must be supplied," therefore the word signifies "the writing of the Yavanas," of the *Greeks* and none other. Would the German philologists (who have so long and so fruitlessly attempted to explain this word) be very much surprised if told that they are yet as far as possible from the truth? That — *Yavanani* does not mean "Greek writing" at all, but any foreign writing whatsoever? That the absence of the word "writing" in the old texts, except in connection with the names of foreigners, does not in the least imply that none but Greek writing was known to them, or that they had none of their own, being ignorant

---

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Weber is not probably aware of the fact that this distinguished astronomer's name was simply Maya (मया); the prefix "Asura" was often added to it by ancient Hindu writers to show that he was a Rakshasa. In the opinion of the Brahmans he was an "Atlantean" and one of the greatest astronomers and occultists of the lost Atlantis.—T. SUBBA ROW

of the art of reading and writing until the days of Panini . . . (theory of Prof. Max Müller)? For Devanagari is as old as the Vedas, and held so sacred that the Brahmans, first under penalty of death, and later on of eternal ostracism, were not even allowed to mention it to profane ears; much less to make known the existence of their secret temple-libraries. So that by the word *Yavanani*, "to which, according to the *Varttika*, the word *lipi*, 'writing,' must be supplied," the writing of foreigners in general, whether Phœnician, Roman, or Greek, is always meant. As to the preposterous hypothesis of Prof. Max Müller that writing "was not used for literary purposes in India" before Panini's time (again upon Greek authority), that matter has been disposed of by a Chela in the last number of this Journal.<sup>4</sup>

Equally unknown are those certain other and most important facts, fable though they seem. *First*, that the Aryan "Great War," the Mahabharata, and the Trojan War of Homer — both mythical as to personal biographies and fabulous supernumeraries, yet perfectly historical in the main — belong to the same cycle of events. For, the occurrences of many centuries, among them the separation of sundry peoples and races, erroneously traced to Central Asia alone, were in these immortal epics compressed within the scope of single dramas made to occupy but a few years. *Secondly*, that in this immense antiquity the forefathers of the Aryan Greeks and the Aryan Brahmans were as closely united and intermixed as are now the Aryans and the so-called Dravidians. *Thirdly*, that, before the days of the *historical* Rama, from whom in unbroken genealogical descent the Oodeypore sovereigns trace their lineage, Rajpootana was as full of direct post-Atlantean "Greeks," as the post-Trojan, subjacent Cumæa and other settlements of *pre-Magna Græcia* were of the fast Hellenizing sires of the modern Rajpoot. One acquainted with the *real* meaning of the ancient epics cannot refrain from asking himself whether these intuitional Orientalists prefer being called deceivers or deceived, and in charity give them the benefit of the doubt.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> "Was Writing Known Before Panini?" reprinted from *The Theosophist*, October 1883, in *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT*, May 1965. — EDS.

<sup>5</sup> Further on, Prof. Weber indulges in the following piece of chronological sleight of hand. In his arduous endeavour "to determine accurately" the place in history of "the Romantic Legend of Sakya Buddha" (translation by Beale), he thinks "the special points of relation here found to Christian legends are very striking. The question which party was the borrower Beale properly leaves undetermined. Yet in all likelihood (!) we have here simply a similar case to that of the appropriation of Christian legend by the worshippers of Krishna" (p. 300). Now it is this that every Hindu and Buddhist has

What can be thought of Prof. Weber's endeavour when, "to determine more accurately the position of *Ramayana* (called by him the 'artificial epic') in literary history," he ends with an assumption that "it rests upon an acquaintance with the Trojan cycle of legend . . . the conclusion there arrived at is that the date of its composition is to be placed at the commencement of the Christian era . . . in an epoch when the operation of the Greek influence upon India had already set in!" (p. 194). The case is hopeless. If the "internal chronology" — and external fitness of things, we may add — presented in the triple Indian epic, did not open the eyes of the hypercritical professors to the many historical facts enshrined in their striking allegories; if the significant mention of "black Yavanas," and "white Yavanas," indicating totally different peoples, could so completely escape their notice;<sup>6</sup> and the enumeration of a host of tribes, nations, races, clans, under their separate Sanskrit designations in the *Mahabharata*, had not stimulated them to try to trace their ethnic evolution and identify them with their now living European descendants, there is little to hope from their scholarship except a mosaic of learned guesswork. The latter *scientific* mode of critical analysis may yet end some day in a consensus of opinion that Buddhism is due wholesale to the *Life of Barlaam and Josaphat*, written by St. John of Damascus; or that our religion was plagiarized from that famous Roman Catholic legend of the eighth century in which our Lord Gautama is made to figure as a Christian Saint; better still, that the Vedas were written at Athens under the auspices of St. George, the tutelary successor of Theseus. For fear that anything might be lacking to prove the complete obsession of Jambudvipa by the demon

---

the right to brand as "dishonesty," whether conscious or unconscious. Legends originate earlier than history and die out upon being sifted. Neither of the fabulous events in connection with Buddha's birth, taken exoterically, necessitated a great genius to narrate them, nor was the intellectual capacity of the Hindus ever proved so inferior to that of the Jewish and Greek mob that they should *borrow* from them even fables inspired by religion. How their fables, evolved between the second and third centuries after Buddha's death, when the fever of proselytism and the adoration of his memory were at their height, could be *borrowed* and then appropriated from the Christian legends written during the first century of the Western era, can only be explained by a German Orientalist. Mr. T. W. Rhys Davids (*Jataka Book*) shows the contrary to have been true. It may be remarked in this connection that, while the first "miracles" of both Krishna and Christ are said to have happened at a Mathura, the latter city exists to this day in India — the antiquity of its name being fully proved — while the Mathura, or Maturea in Egypt, of the *Gospel of Infancy*, where Jesus is alleged to have produced his first miracle, was sought to be identified, centuries ago, by the stump of an old tree in the desert, and is represented by an empty spot!

<sup>6</sup> See Twelfth Book of *Mahabharata*, Krishna's fight with Kala-yavana.

of "Greek influence," Dr. Weber vindictively casts a last insult into the face of India by remarking that *if* "European Western steeples owe their origin to an imitation of the Buddhist topes<sup>7</sup> . . . on the other hand in the *most ancient Hindu edifices* the presence of Greek influence is unmistakable" (p. 274). Well may Dr. Rajendralala Mitra "hold out particularly against the idea of *any* Greek influence whatever on the development of Indian architecture." If his ancestral literature must be attributed to "Greek influence," the temples, at least, might have been spared. One can understand how the Egyptian Hall in London reflects the influence of the ruined temples on the Nile; but it is a more difficult feat, even for a German professor, to prove the archaic structure of old Aryavarta a foreshadowing of the genius of the late lamented Sir Christopher Wren! The outcome of this palæographic spoliation is that there is not a tittle left for India to call her own. Even medicine is due to the same Hellenic influence. We are told—this once by Roth—that "only a comparison of the principles of Indian *with those of Greek* medicine can enable us to judge of the origin, age and value of the former . . ."; and "*à propos* of Charaka's injunctions as to the duties of the physician to his patient," adds Dr. Weber, "he cites *some remarkably coincident expressions from the oath of the Asklepiads.*" It is then settled. India is *Hellenized* from head to foot, and even had no physic until the Greek doctors came.

---

All our dignity consists in thinking. Let us labour then to think well; for this is the gist of morals.

—PASCAL

---

<sup>7</sup> Of Hindu *Lingams*, rather.—ED. [ *The Theosophist* ]

## ROOM FOR FREEDOM

The urge for freedom is inherent in every being, for it results from the inner impetus to unite oneself with the One Self, and this is the object of evolution. It shows itself in the human being through the power to choose, which is both a burden and a joy. Yet when we come to the position when we want to escape from some of the bonds that are binding us, we do not know how to act.

When we think on this problem we find that there are three courses open to us: either we can do nothing about the conditions in which we find ourselves; or we can burst the bonds, or we can act within the bonds. This last course is the only one which succeeds and is of help to us in the long run: We have to learn to be free *within* the bonds.

In a world of duality, there are two methods of approach to this kind of freedom—one that of the arrogant who do what they want in spite of the bonds, and often succumb under the strain; the other, the recognition of the bonds as an opportunity Karma affords us to pay off past debts and improve our character. For example, if we want to practise patience, the best opportunity to do so comes when we are bound by others and prevented from acting as we wish. This method is the only one which will give us true freedom. It is analogous to accepting a law of the material universe; once we know it, we can employ it to our own advantage.

Another advantage of this method is that we begin to see the difference between ourselves as perceiver and sufferer and the environment in which we live and perceive and suffer. Once this difference is seen, we begin to realize that it is our duty, not to alter the environment, but to get whatever benefit we can from it. It is ours under Karma; therefore we have something to learn from it. It is better to think of it as something from which we can learn rather than as the paying off of a debt from the past. If we just pay our debts, we are beginning on the Path of Liberation; if we learn while paying them, we are on the Path of Sacrifice.

But the path of the student is one of paradox, we are told. We often hug the old environment even when Karma brings us the opportunity to get out of it. The path of duty is difficult to find, for we are enmeshed in traditions of what is right to do. There come times in our life when our environment has to be left, but in most cases this

is only the material environment. All great Teachers have told us to "come out from among them and be separate." We can see an example of this when we consider religious ceremonies and traditions which we have outgrown *mentally*. Is it not hypocritical to obey the old traditions or perform the old ceremonies when we have seen their uselessness? Ought we to be hypocrites in order to please our family and friends?

These difficulties come to us because we are halfway between the old conditions and the new way of life; we have not yet reached the point of "no-return." We have not absorbed *why* we ought not to conform. We have not realized the effect on others for good if we do not conform. We only try to avoid what would be troublesome, emotionally, for us. Few of us wish to be pioneers in a line of action which will bring us unpopularity!

Freedom in, and not freedom from, such conditions will depend on us, and on our inner conviction and humility and sympathy. The scornful, pugilistic attitude only brings trouble and suffering to ourselves and others. Such attitude results when we are *not sure* of ourselves.

Sometimes we feel bound by family duties and are unable to free ourselves from them. What is a family duty? The relationship between parent and child alters completely after the child reaches the full age of responsibility. The most difficult task for parents is to give up their sense of responsibility at this stage. Advice is all that can, and should, be given. Parents should not make demands upon their grown-up sons and daughters, or burden them with duties and responsibilities. The relationship should have been throughout one of friendship and helpfulness. If this has been achieved, then the sons and daughters will willingly take on the responsibility of doing all they can for those who have done all they could for them in the past. The young should learn to be grateful; the parents should learn to be grateful. But the "demand idea" of youth to age and age to youth should stop. It breeds unhappiness and becomes the steel bonds that bind both parents and sons and daughters. True bonds are those of love and sympathy, of sacrifice and helpfulness.

But, whatever happens, the one who is bound has to act. The only really wrong method of trying to gain freedom is to "put up" with the bonds and grumble all the time, to fight against them, or to work grudgingly within them with hatred in the heart. To grumble at conditions will not change them but will warp our emotional nature and degrade the mind. A man can have no attachment to that on which

he does not think. To think about any condition in order to change it for the better is one thing; to brood and grumble over it is quite another. To work grudgingly within the bonds is to destroy the whole basis of right action. The thought-feeling behind action has to be clean and pure if the action is to bear good fruit. If not, the fruit will be poisonous, and hatred will spring up, not only in our own hearts, but in those who are making our bonds.

Let us stop blaming our environment. Let us alter it, or use it, or leave it, without complaint, but with sympathy, basing our actions on love.

---

In the grove of the temple and in the shadow of the citadel I have seen the freest among you wear their freedom as a yoke and a handcuff.

And my heart bled within me; for you can only be free when even the desire of seeking freedom becomes a harness to you, and when you cease to speak of freedom as a goal and a fulfilment.

You shall be free indeed when your days are not without a care nor your nights without a want and a grief,

But rather when these things girdle your life and yet you rise above them naked and unbound.

—KAHLIL GIBRAN

## FOR EARNEST WORKING MEMBERS

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, Vol. IX, pp. 161-62, for September 1939.—Eds.]

He who would be a true Theosophist must bring himself to live as one.—H.P.B.

There could be no greater work than that in which we are engaged.—ROBERT CROSBIE

In numerous places in her writings H.P.B. gave warnings that the Society which was founded as a vehicle of the Movement she inaugurated would split if its members did not fulfil certain conditions and did not live up to the principles of the philosophy she taught.

Soon after her passing in 1891 difficulties arose, her injunctions were not heeded, the Society split and kept on splitting. The soul of that body, that is, the Theosophical Movement represented by the Message-Teachings of the Masters, passed on to express its power and work its beneficence in other ways. There is a good parallel in history: the work of Jesus failed through the folly of the organizers of the Church who took His name but rejected His Teachings; then His Message reincarnated in the Neo-Platonic Movement inaugurated by Ammonius Saccas. Similarly (only very much more rapidly than in that era) the U.L.T. founded by Robert Crosbie provided a vehicle for the Message-Teachings of H.P.B.

On what rock did the Parent Society split? It failed directly because prominent leaders led the membership astray by misunderstanding and misinterpreting the position of W. Q. Judge and his efforts to strictly adhere to the Original Programme and to remain true to the Original Impulse. But what made those leaders lose thus their balance? The answer is to be found partly in the fourth and the fifth messages of H.P.B. to the American Convention held in Boston in April 1891 — only a month prior to her passing. In those messages H.P.B. warned student-servers of the Cause, and also recorded her estimate of W. Q. Judge. The two went together: in the fourth message she advised the general membership to be watchful of moral weaknesses, lapses and consequent disunity; in the fifth, she once again put on record her esteem of and confidence in W. Q. Judge. Those warnings were disregarded, even in face of what W. Q. Judge said as precept and did as example; all that is a matter of Theosophical history, with which

we are not concerned here. But we are directly and intimately concerned with H.P.B.'s instruction as to how her Masters' programme and plan can be followed. Robert Crosbie in establishing the U.L.T. had in mind and heart the Original Impulse and the Original Programme; he tried to carry out H.P.B.'s injunction to W. Q. Judge —

*Remain staunch to the Master's programme.*

Not only did H.P.B. warn student-servers against pitfalls, but further she indicated what her followers and successors should do in guiding the Movement aright. In the closing section of *The Key to Theosophy* H.P.B. names certain qualities, without which she prophesied the Parent Society "will drift off on to some sandbank of thought or another, and there remain a stranded carcass to moulder and die." Those qualities and qualifications Mr. Crosbie possessed in an eminent degree, and he used them in establishing the U.L.T. What are those qualities and qualifications? They are:

- (1) Degree of selflessness  
of earnestness  
of devotion
- (2) Technical knowledge of the esoteric doctrine, which is most important.
- (3) Unbiased and clear judgment in the guidance of the Movement by those on whom falls the duty to carry on the work.

Robert Crosbie resuscitated the dying Movement: students of Theosophical history can know this for themselves by glancing at the position of Theosophy in 1909; the tendencies which had already developed, throwing out the writings not only of W. Q. Judge but of H.P.B. into the limbo of forgetfulness, were giving birth to other bizarre and untheosophical notions which have caused the name of Theosophy to be ridiculed and degraded.

To those he was helping and training Mr. Crosbie wrote:

The letters written to you are the results of observation, experience, study and application of the philosophy of Theosophy, and as such must be of use to others in like case with your own. So must also be the results of your own efforts, and those of all other sincere students.

It was in 1909 that Mr. Crosbie, experienced in the wayward activities of Theosophical organizations and perceiving the causes which broke them, started *de novo* his career as a Theosophical Servant,

punctilious to attend to the central idea of Masters' programme — to study and promulgate the Message brought by H.P.B. He looked upon that Message as a chart, in which directions for personal discipline and for changing the mind of the race are to be found. He wrote:

There is no need to grope, nor stagger, nor stray, for the chart that has led many to the goal is in your hands in the philosophy of Theosophy.

Theosophy is a Message, which should be made accessible to all without intermediaries or would-be interpreters; which should be presented as delivered, and its existence as an all-inclusive philosophy continually held forth.

In many places and in different ways Mr. Crosbie emphasized this idea, as the central plank of the U.L.T. He anticipated adverse criticism and was prepared for it; but he had determined to go forward, confident that strict and loyal adherence to the teachings of H.P.B. and W. Q. Judge cannot but benefit the individual aspirant as well as the mind of the race.

Associates of the U.L.T. do not look down upon other bodies using the name Theosophical; they have learnt and are learning what Mr. Crosbie taught about the "various stripes" of Theosophy. He wrote:

The tendency to say more than is useful to the newcomers is a common one in the beginning, but is gradually overcome when it is seen to minimize inquiry. We should push nothing, while responding to everything. We would not use force if we could, because each mind has to be free to choose; otherwise there would be no true progress. And I think this is a good attitude to be taken in the matter of questions concerning theosophical claims and exponents. These various stripes must have their place in the great economy of consciousness — they must have, or people would not be attracted by them, would not seize and hold on to them. When the particular "stripe" does not bring the devotee the expected result in knowledge, then a further search is indicated to the mind so caught. Every person really waked up by such claims or exponents will touch us sooner or later, if we hold to the straight line. On this, Mr. Judge once wrote: "By our not looking at their errors too closely, the Master will be able to clear it all off and make it work well."

The U.L.T., therefore, has no quarrel with anyone, and recognizes that there are sincere persons in every society. If we write on this particular point today it is because the turn of the seasons brings many

of us back to the starting of a new cycle of yearly work for the Cause, and all U.L.T. Associates like to remind themselves of the central plank of their platform.

“U.L.T.” is a name given to certain principles and ideas; those who associate themselves with those principles and ideas are attracted to and bound by them only.

Attracted to and bound by the central principle-idea that we must make Theosophy a living power in our lives and that we must labour devotedly to disseminate the teachings of Theosophy, we do require to remind ourselves of the dangers and pitfalls which surround us, and of the ways shown by H.P.B., Mr. Judge and Mr. Crosbie to avoid them.

Last month<sup>1</sup> we wrote about Associates asking certain questions to themselves; they were about becoming “the earnest *working* members”; the above is specially written for those who are, as for those who are determined to become, such “earnest *working* members.” Both these classes of Associates will find in the above tabled words of H.P.B. the necessary guidance: those who consider themselves earnest working members will do well to check their belief about themselves in the light of that triad of needs; those who aspire to become earnest working members will find in that triad a plan to work upon. Wrote W. Q. Judge:

We are not working for some definite organization of the new years to come, but for a change in the Manas and Buddhi of the Race.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> See “Are You One?” reprinted in THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, August 1967.—EDS.

## IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

Until recently, anthropological theory rested on the premise that the human mind evolved gradually from savagery to civilization. The stages in this intelligent growth were clearly identified: the Old Stone Age, the New Stone Age, the Copper, Bronze and Iron Ages. A Frenchman, Claude Lévi-Strauss, who occupies the chair of social anthropology at Paris' Collège de France and has gained a place of increasing importance in the world of ideas, discards this notion as a complacent and self-serving modern myth (*Time*, June 30). He has devoted his professional career and seven books to the proposition that the human intellect has been fully operative, and in the same fundamental pattern, since the creation of human society. Whatever man is today, Lévi-Strauss insists, man already was. "A primitive people," he believes, "is not a backward or retarded people; indeed it may possess a genius for invention or action that leaves the achievements of civilized peoples far behind." In short, Lévi-Strauss has asked man to open a profound new dialogue with himself.

Lévi-Strauss had expected to find primitive and ignorant peoples frozen in cultural patterns which, like the toys of childhood, civilization had long since put by. Instead, he found his intellectual peers. The Bororo, a naked tribe of the Brazilian interior, introduced him to a concept of life "that might have been taken from the most sophisticated human thought." Whenever a native dies, the Bororo believed, "an injury is done not only to those near him but to society as a whole."

The difference between the so-called primitive and civilized mind, according to Lévi-Strauss, is that, while the former abhors change, the latter not only welcomes it but also endorses it. Mindful of the flow of time, civilized societies place different values on the past, the present and the future, and constantly consult the past as a reference by which to measure the next cultural advance. But the distinction between the two views of time, says Lévi-Strauss, is not a measure of intelligence: "It is quite certain that no culture is absolutely stationary. All peoples have a grasp of techniques which are sufficiently elaborate to enable them to control their environment." Civilized societies, he says, "traffic in ideas; the savage hoards them up."

Down the centuries, it has been believed that, because of their differences, men are not equal. There is no room for this position in Lévi-Strauss's view of humanity. "Respect for others," he writes, "springs

spontaneously and naturally in man, long before reasoning and its sophistries come into play." He maintains that

insofar as man is worthy of respect, it is not just civilized man of today or the future, it is the whole of mankind. Identification with all forms of life, beginning with the most humble — this principle, in a world where overcrowding makes mutual respect more difficult and that much more necessary, is the only one which can permit men to live together. In a cultivated society there can be no excuse for the only real inexcusable crime of man, that of considering himself abidingly or momentarily superior; be it for reasons of race, culture, conquest, service or merely expediency.

The Theosophist would doubtless concur that humanity did not begin in savagery and grow intellectually till it reached the present "enlightened" era. Differences in intellectual capacity, however, cannot be denied, though humanity is one in its origin spiritually and physically. Savagery and civilization have always coexisted. To understand the intellectual difference between the Aryans, the Semites and other civilized peoples and such savages as the South Sea Islanders, the Bushmen and some African tribes, we need to go back to the time when the light of mind was given to mindless men. "While incarnating, and in other cases only informing the human vehicles evolved by the first brainless (*manasless*) race, the incarnating Powers and Principles had to make their choice between, and take into account, the past Karmas of the *Monads*, between which and their bodies they had to become the connecting link" (*S.D.*, II. 318 fn.). Some of the higher creators entered the mindless human forms of the Third Race; some projected a spark; some deferred till the Fourth Race. This "solves the secret of the subsequent inequalities of intellectual capacity, of birth or social position, and gives a logical explanation to the incomprehensible Karmic course throughout the æons which followed" (*S.D.*, II. 161). In the majority of mankind, *Manas* or mind is not even yet fully developed.

Those tribes of savages, whose reasoning powers are very little above the level of the animals, are not the unjustly disinherited, or the *unfavoured*, as some may think — nothing of the kind. They are simply those *latest arrivals* among the human *Monads*, which *were not ready*: which have to evolve during the present Round, as on the three remaining globes . . . so as to arrive at the level of the average class when they reach the Fifth Round. . . .

The "sacred spark" is missing in them and it is they who are the only *inferior* races on the globe, now happily — owing to the wise adjustment of nature which ever works in that direction — fast dying out. Verily mankind is "of one blood," *but not of the same essence*. We are the hot-house, artificially quickened plants in nature, having in us a spark, which in them is latent. (S.D., II. 168, 421 fn.)

---

Scientists claim that recent experiments have given them "new insight" into the working of the human brain. The persons who participated in the studies had undergone surgical separation of the right and left hemispheres of their brains, an operation designed to control their very severe epileptic seizures. Neurosurgeons at the California College of Medicine found that by severing the *corpus callosum* — the bundle of nerve tissue that joins the brain hemispheres — they could prevent a seizure arising in one hemisphere from spreading to the other, and thus greatly diminish its severity. The patients so treated, it is said, experienced "no noticeable change in temperament, personality or general intelligence."

Dr. Michael S. Gazzaniga, Psychologist at the University of California, Santa Barbara, who has been doing "split-brain" studies over the last five years, has described his findings in the August issue of *Scientific American*. His experiments show that the brain is actually two brains, each able to act independently and to perform advanced mental functions; further, that in many situations the right-hand side of the divided brain does not know what the left-hand side is doing, and *vice versa*. "The two halves might even have separate thoughts and separate emotions," says Dr. Gazzaniga. The psychologist discovered, however, that one hemisphere could give hints to the other hemisphere on what the former was doing.

Theosophy teaches that the brain is merely an instrument of the mind on this physical plane. Dr. Gazzaniga's experiments show that so long as the instrument is not wholly impaired, the mind may still function through it. H.P.B. wrote in *Transactions* (p. 64):

The brain is such a complex thing, both physically and metaphysically, that it is like a tree whose bark you can remove layer by layer, each layer being different from all others, and each having its own special work, function, and properties.

If the complexity of the brain extends to the "metaphysical," then it must have "layers" which the scalpel cannot reach, and these layers might possibly connect mind and body when the brain is divided surgically or even when portions of the brain have been removed. The normal functioning of the brain, depending as it does on "vibrations" (*Vernal Blooms*, p. 158), involves processes of which physiology knows but little.

---

This spring, Professors Donald Turcotte of Cornell and E. Ronald Oxburgh of Oxford made public the results of a study which shows that the continents surrounding the Atlantic Ocean are drifting apart at a rate of two inches a year. What is more, say the scientists, if this continues, the American continent is going to bump into Asia some 100 million years from now. (*Science Digest*, June 1967)

The continental drift theory holds that at one time earth's land masses were clumped together in a single chunk, that is floated atop gigantic "cells" of slowly circulating molten rock which pulled it apart into "continents" that gradually drifted to their present positions on the globe. And they are still on the move.

Basis for the original theory is the curious fact that the western coast of Africa fits neatly into the contours of the east coast of South America; so do parts of Europe and the U.S.A. — like pieces of a giant jig-saw puzzle. Further, the areas have similar biological histories.

First advanced in 1912 by a German scientist, Alfred Wegener, the theory fell into disrepute in the 1930's but has recently come back with a flourish, due to startling new discoveries that appear to support it.

Besides the Turcotte-Oxburgh data, Dr. J. Turzo Wilson of the University of Toronto, a noted geophysicist, revealed to a conference in New York in April that he had found Cambrian fossils in Eastern Connecticut and Massachusetts that belong to the Cambrian beds of Western Europe. His data give more weight to the drift theory.

What causes the shifting of continents? *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 640) gives a hint:

It is absolutely *false*, and but an additional demonstration of the great conceit of our age, to assert (as men of science do) that all the great geological changes and terrible convulsions have been produced *by ordinary and known physical forces*. For

these forces were but the tools and final means for the accomplishment of certain purposes, acting periodically, and apparently mechanically, through an inward impulse mixed up with, but beyond their material nature. There is a purpose in every important act of Nature, whose acts are all cyclic and periodical. But spiritual Forces having been usually confused with the purely physical, the former are denied by, and therefore, have to remain unknown to Science, because left unexamined.

---

The belief that death shall come to those who touch the tomb of a Pharaoh grew soon after Tut-Ankh-Amen's tomb was opened in the Valley of the Kings in 1922. The mysterious deaths of the Earl of Carnarvon, who financed the excavation, and 14 others concerned in the opening of the tomb and subsequent investigations were referred to in the short article, "A Bone That Scared a Knight," in our August 1937 issue.

Newspapers narrated recently the story of another death, attributed to the curse of Tut-Ankh-Amen. Mohamed Ibrahim, Director of Egyptian Antiquities in Cairo, agreed, though reluctantly, to let some of Tut-Ankh-Amen's treasures be shipped to Paris for a four-month exhibition. Soon afterwards his daughter had a serious accident, which he regarded as a warning. He had a second warning when he dreamed that if he did let the treasures leave Egypt he, too, would have a serious accident. This worried him, and when he met the French Ambassador and the Under-secretary of the Ministry of Culture in Cairo he told them about the dream. He was persuaded that the curse was "a silly story" and he agreed the treasures could go. The same day he met with a road accident and died two days later in a Cairo hospital.

Mr. Judge recorded that in every case elementals have guard over hidden treasure (*Vernal Blooms*, p. 138). And some elementals are described as being "of horrible malignity." The events that followed the opening of Tut-Ankh-Amen's tomb and the removal of treasures therefrom would seem quite possibly ascribable to elemental guardians of the treasure.

---

Dr. Heinz E. Lehmann, professor of psychiatry at McGill University in Montreal, Canada, believes that the pressures of the accelerating pace of Western society are either causing or aggravating many physical as well as mental illnesses. (*Science Digest*, June 1967)

We are more hurried than our parents were [says Dr. Lehmann]; we are also probably exposed to much greater stimulation than we were originally constructed for. . . . In the Western world of today stresses, tensions and emotional onslaughts seem to have replaced hunger and infection, the great hazards of yesterday. . . .

Most physicians today acknowledge the existence of psychosomatic illness. . . . the volume of research findings is truly overwhelming.

According to Dr. Lehmann, studies have shown that emotional turmoil not only can cause ulcers and headaches but can increase the effect of germ-caused illnesses. Man, observes the professor, will have to learn to control his "runaway emotions."

---

The drive launched by the British Humanist Association for the abolition of compulsory religious instruction in controlled schools has relevance to attempts here in India to introduce some kind of moral and religious education. The Association believes that religious instruction "in the sense of putting the Christian religion before. . . . pupils with the backing of the school's authority" should not be included in the syllabus. Not that the Association is against moral instruction. But it would like such instruction to be independent of any particular religion. (*The Times of India*, August 21)

In multi-religious India, the position is even more complicated. If it is decided that religious education is to be imparted, then what religion or religions will be taught? All of them or only the major ones? Who is to decide which of them are major? And by what criteria? On the other hand, even people who do not have any religion profess and practise a moral code. There should be good reasons why they do it. The study of those reasons may be the ground on which people of all faiths may meet, in a multi-religious and politically secular State.

---