

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. 51, No. 11

17th September 1981

PASSIONS VERSUS COMPASSION

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, October 1948.—EDS.]

Desire, in its widest application, is the one creative force in the Universe. In this sense it is indistinguishable from Will; but we men never know desire under this form while we remain only men.

—*Lucifer*, October 1887

THE POWER OF KAMA, the principle of desires and passions, is great. Every tyro in occultism knows this. Its blatant expressions of egotism and pride, of passion and lust, of wrath and envy, of greed and possessiveness, are not difficult to recognize. But the subtlety of Kama is not easily detectable. Of the quality of Rajas, mobility, its chief characteristic is to move. It should circulate in rhythm under the influence of Sattva, the Light of Truth. But it does not. Its motions in matter are erratic.

Kama is described in the *Gita* as the constant enemy of man which envelops everything — from the senses and organs to the soul and the lord. In the *Mahabharata* (*Asvamedha Parva*, XIII) we come upon a description of the subtle power of this principle of desires and passions. The context in which it is described is significant. The story has its meaning and message for every aspirant.

The victorious Yudhishtira, after the War, feels great depression because of the cost in life and limb, the loss in possessions and especially in self-respect. Several sages preach to him, not only to assuage his despondency, but also to impart to him the lesson which victory in war has to teach. Being just and fair-minded and virtuous, Yudhishtira naturally perceives the truth obscured by the winning of the war. Hearing numerous speeches, the eldest of the

five brothers understands that this evil attendant on victory can be mitigated and overcome by the performance of a great yajna-sacrifice. Towards this end he consults his friend and guide, Krishna, whose speech each student should read for himself. Stating that "all crookedness of heart leads to destruction and all rectitude to spiritual excellence," Krishna goes on that "there are two kinds of ailments—physical and mental; they are produced by the mutual action of body and mind and they never arise without the interaction of the two." Further, Krishna points out to Yudhishtira:

Thy Karma has not yet been annihilated, nor have thy enemies been subjugated, for thou dost not yet know the enemies that are still lurking within thine own flesh. Do thou watch and observe the character of thy external and internal enemies. Kama, desires, are as it were the limbs of the mind. Therefore wise men, knowing this, subjugate their desires.

Then Krishna "versed in ancient lore, recites these gathas named Kama-Gita." Kama says:

No creature is able to destroy me without resorting to the proper methods.

If a man knowing my power strives to destroy me by muttering prayers, I prevail over him by deluding him with the belief that I am the subjective ego within him.

If he wishes to destroy me by means of sacrifices with many offerings, I deceive him by appearing in his mind as a most virtuous creature amongst the mobile creation.

If he wishes to annihilate me by mastering the Vedas and Vedangas, I overreach him by seeming to his mind to be the soul of virtue amongst the immobile creation.

If the man whose strength lies in truth desires to overcome me by patience, I appear to him as his mind, and thus he does not perceive my existence.

If the man of austere religious practices desires to destroy me by means of asceticism, I appear in the guise of asceticism in his mind and thus he is prevented from knowing me.

And if the man of learning with the object of attaining salvation desires to destroy me, I frolic and laugh in the face of such a man intent on salvation.

I am the everlasting one without a compeer, whom no creature can kill or destroy.

For this reason, thou too, O prince, divert thy desires to virtue, so that thou mayest attain what is well for thee.

This means that our human kama has to be transmuted and must become the Divine Kama-Deva. Blind cupidity in each must become the all-seeing Eros.

The power of Kama-Deva is concentrated and unitary. It manifests in every kingdom, visible and invisible. It is the propelling force, creative and regenerative, of evolution. It is of the nature of compassion; not the species of human feeling which goes under that name and which has attributes, but that virtue which is without attributes and which is Divine Harmony or Mercy Incarnate, which is omnipresent and omniscient and omnipotent. It is transcendental wisdom, the Light of Everlasting Right which is the True. It is the Mercy-Power which works incessantly in nature and according to Law.

Many students of Theosophy emphasize the effect aspect of Karma by thinking of the Law as rewarding and punishing, and neglect the causal aspect. They emphasize in their own consciousness the truth that Karma is destiny, is fate, from the past, and not exertion in the present. Similarly, in perceiving the justice aspect of the Law they overlook the mercy aspect.

The Power of Compassion functions differently in different kingdoms. Its variant in the human kingdom should be taken up for study and reflection.

Man is triune: with his mind he should become the True, with his heart the Good, with his body the Beautiful. The mistake of the dire heresy overtakes man here also and these three aspects of Deity are seen as separated.

Theosophical aspirants have to learn that this triplicity implies that not only objects created by bodies, but also ideas and virtues have forms. Forms of ideas and images of virtues exist, though these are invisible to the eyes of flesh. They exist as do objects and bodies in this visible but ponderable world.

To become good, to be good, requires knowledge of the True and the power not only to create forms of beauty but to be the Beautiful. "Self-knowledge is of loving deeds the child"; merciful deeds create beautiful character, but it is necessary to possess true knowledge, lest the mind exploited by false knowledge in its turn exploit the beauty of the simple-hearted.

The Masters are Lords of Wisdom as well as of Compassion. By this dual force of Buddhi, controlling the head-learning we acquire wisdom, and controlling the heart-impulses we unfold Compassion. The many virtues of Yudhishtira used by him to benefit the world of the Pandavas prove insufficient; he is told by Krishna:

The time has now arrived when thou must fight the battle which each must fight single-handed with his mind. Therefore, O chief of Bharata's race, thou must now prepare to carry the struggle against thy mind, and by dint of abstraction and the merit of thine own Karma thou must reach the other side of the mysterious and unintelligible mind. In this war there will be no need for any missiles nor for friends nor attendants. The battle which is to be fought alone and single-handed has now arrived for thee. If vanquished in this struggle, thou shalt find thyself in the most wretched plight, and O son of Kunti, knowing this, and acting accordingly, shalt thou attain success. And knowing this wisdom and the destiny of all creatures, and following the conduct of thy ancestors, do thou duly administer thy kingdom.

THREE distinct representations of the Universe in its three distinct aspects are impressed upon our thought by the esoteric philosophy: the PRE-EXISTING (evolved from) the EVER-EXISTING; and the PHENOMENAL — the world of illusion, the reflection, and shadow thereof. During the great mystery and drama of life known as the Manvantara, real Kosmos is like the object placed behind the white screen upon which are thrown the Chinese shadows, called forth by the magic lantern. The actual figures and things remain invisible, while the wires of evolution are pulled by the unseen hands; and men and things are thus but the reflections, on the white field, of the realities behind the snares of *Mahamaya*, or the great Illusion.

—*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 278

THE LIGHT AND THE SHADOW

The oneness of the soul with the Self is already a fact, and not a thing that requires a further effort to bring it about; therefore the recognition of the truth of the text "That thou art" is sufficient to put an end to the personality of the soul, in the same way as the recognition of the piece of rope is sufficient to abolish the snake that fictitiously represents itself in place of the piece of rope. No sooner is the personality of the soul denied than the whole empirical habitual order of life disappears with it, to make up which the lower and plural manifestation of the self falsely presents itself.

—SHANKARACHARYA

THUS the great sage of India presents in a veritable nutshell the kernel of his teachings. It not only contains a theoretical tenet, but is also applicable in daily life. Just as for the good health of the body physical exercise is required, so for the health of the inner man daily regular discipline is equally necessary. The theory, its practice and the result accruing, are all contained in the above-quoted terse exposition. To understand it better we should analyse it and note the following propositions:

(a) Spirit and soul are not one, but two, yet an identity subsists between them; though two, they should never be separated.

(b) Soul and personality are two, not one; and the identification of the former with the latter leads to the death of the soul; they should ever be distinguished and separated.

(c) *Spirit* (That) and soul (thou) are indissolubly linked, and a constant remembrance of the fact will be achieved by the aid of the formula or mantra — That thou art: *Tat tvam asi*.

(d) Such daily practice puts an end to the personality — the *persona* or mask of the soul; the death of the personality frees the soul and enables it to know itself as the Spirit, as omnipresent Life.

The early Christian philosophers distinguished between soul and Spirit; in their psychology man was a triad of body, soul and Spirit. Christian theologians materialized the teaching, and the indissoluble link between soul and Spirit was forgotten. In place of the Spirit, omnipresent and therefore within man's heart, an anthropomorphic God without was instituted. From that corrupting influence Christendom is not yet freed. Other theologies have produced a similar

corruption in other lands.

Prayer and praise are offered to an extra-cosmic Personal God, who acts cruelly in spite of his love, and who creates chaos and allows wickedness to flourish in spite of his omniscience. Propitiating such an idol, man has become intensely personal, superstitious and cruel. The physical results of psychical beliefs are even less recognized than are the physiological results of psychological opinions on the human corpus and bodily health. The moral weakness engendered by a belief in an anthropomorphic God is great indeed. Even the achievements of materialistic science have not freed the masses from this folly. Human hearts are empty, as churches are empty, of divinity. The efflorescence of such religious beliefs is to be noticed in our civilization which regards the human personality as sacrosanct. The personality has usurped the authority of the soul and in its borrowed robes rules with cunning and craft. The Spirit has become merely a metaphorical expression, applied for the most part to some undefined force which springs from the personality. Personality is considered to be the parent of the soul and Spirit.

Modern habits and thoughts have led men in a direction opposite from that which Shankara recommended. Personality of the soul is not denied, be it noted, while the Spirit behind and within the soul is denied. When people use the phrase "self-expression," they mean the creative activity of the personal self — the mask of the soul. People make ropes and call them serpents and either fear them like children or juggle with them like snake-charmers.

Man is threefold: (1) animal man, (2) rational man, and (3) divine man. At present the animal man has conquered his rational being to such an extent that the divinity in him has retired into silence and darkness. The rational man must reclaim his lost position; and Shankara teaches that the first act in rational living is for man to deny the place of power to the personality or animal man. We must not, however, overlook the fact, as some false pietists of bewildered soul in India have done, that the animal man possesses power to create. Even the spiritually dead enjoy all their delights; they have intellectual power and attainments, and can be intensely active. As alcohol exhilarates, so animal-creativity produces a sense of exaltation, strong though temporary, and thus people are glamoured and mistake the demoniac for the divine.

The soul of our civilization is *kama-manas*, animal-man. Our

race has yet to learn that *a high development of the intellectual faculties does not imply spiritual and true life.*

The very act of denial which Shankara advocates, if rationally performed, produces a great change in one's attitude to the whole of life. Mere denial of evil or disease produces its own kind of glamour, as also the absolution pronounced on the penitent by a priest. In the rational denial man finds the light of the Father-Confessor within himself, and if he persists in his task he will soon know himself as one newly born.

What stands in the way of the intelligent modern man taking that rational position? Animal delights. To multitudes of men and women these constitute the highest ideal of human happiness. The tireless pursuit of riches, of the amusements and entertainments of social life; the cultivation of graces of manner, of taste in dress, of social preferment, of scientific distinction, intoxicate and enrap-ture these dead-alive.

People generally are not afflicted with maleficence; rarely does a man commit wickedness deliberately and with a set purpose. Quite often man suffers because of a lack of a sense of humour. Modern philosophers and psycho-physiologists are not agreed about the genesis of the sense of humour or about the manner of its expressions. According to the ancients and in the Esoteric Philosophy, man's sense of humour is a constituent of his psychological nature and produces physiological effects. By his thoughts and feelings, by his will-full or will-less actions, each person attracts to himself elementals, which are forces of Nature, personified as gnomes, undines, sylphs and salamanders. These forces manufacture certain "fluids" named humours, one of which disproportionately predominating marks a man as phlegmatic, or sanguine, or choleric, or melancholic. These elemental forces are attracted by men unconsciously to themselves, whereas they are servile agents of the trained occultist. Men and women under the sway of their personal self-centredness are obsessed by these forces which intoxicate them and goad them to chase the shadows of life.

Courage is required in abandoning this broad road of shades for the strait and narrow path of Life. Mortification and sacrifice are needed if a man is to give up his life, so that he may Live.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

MORALITY is not practised because its nature is not understood. What is the foe to this understanding? It is "personality," the separative personal feeling of identity, surrounded by the instinctive animal nature, *kama*, the desire principle, both of which should be used as instruments by the Soul, the real man. Instead, these two lower forces combine to develop not merely self-centredness, but fierce selfishness, the root of the seven deadly sins — pride, wrath, envy, lust, gluttony, avarice and sloth. Thus morality has a much wider field than sexual matters or business integrity.

Sometimes a distinction is made between ethics and morality, though both originally meant much the same — "ethics being the Greek word and "morality" derived from the Latin *mores*. But even though there is no real hard and fast division, morality, in common usage, has generally come to refer more to behaviour in mundane and social relationships that help to maintain law and order and constructive fellowship in any community, while ethics has rather an abstract connotation, *i.e.*, it refers more to the inner nature of man as it expresses itself in action. So we may speak of the principles of ethics and codes of morality. Both are necessary and are not really separate.

Polarity characterizes the whole of life, whether universal or particular. There are always two interdependent poles acting together, the basic duality being that of Spirit/Matter, neither having meaning without the other. It may help if we view ethics/morality as having the same relationship to each other as Spirit/Matter. That is, universal truths have to find expression in particular aspects. Particular ideas or interpretations of facts will be faulty unless they are related to universal truths. Ethics without moral expression are empty abstractions. A "morality" that is not based on the universals of ethics, but is a dead-letter convention, or else distorted by material considerations and pressures, is simply a corpse that endangers the whole of Society.

We can also compare the relationship with that of the Reincarnating Mind-Soul in man, the immortal individuality, and the personality which is its instrument, faulty yet necessary. When the personality becomes properly attuned to its higher self, and is able in all its actions to reflect the higher truly, then we have the Perfected Man.

So when a community "morality" is a perfect expression of universal ethics, as far as it can be, according to the needs of the time and the soul-growth of the people, then it can be said to be in the line of true morality. It should be noted, incidentally, that there are cycles in the development of this, periods of light and darkness, yet with progress continuing.

It is significant that, of the great spiritual Teachers of the past, many have been definitely Lawgivers who have given out codes of morality that embody ethics. Others have been more purely ethical. There is a common aim and purpose, but they each function according to the needs of the time. The Lawgivers included with their teaching the moral relations of the community in mundane life as well, while even the ethical Teachers, such as Buddha, emphasized the fact that the ethics they taught rested upon law, *i.e.*, Spiritual Law.

It is because men have forgotten the aspect of Universal Law (that of Spirit and Nature) that the idea of morality has become meaningless or degraded for so many people. There are those, of course, who, because of their own inheritance from past incarnations, have the ethical principles and moral behaviour absolutely fixed in their characters, so that these have become part and parcel of themselves. It is something they *know* without having to reason or argue about it.

But often the original codes of morality have, later on, been followed blindly and mechanically until they became meaningless, or else they have been fanatically applied in a bigoted way, or considered only in relation to one specialized aspect. Too often they became merely one of the ways by which authoritarian vested interests sought to acquire power, thus producing a revolt against such hypocritical pseudo-morality, in the name of freedom. But this freedom also had its false aspects, its dark side, so that its followers found that, instead of being bound by some outside control, they had become slaves to their own uncomprehended passion nature, with its impulses and urges, dragging the mind with them. It is these impulses that can so easily be manipulated by unscrupulous people, so that "freedom" has to be understood, if it is to lead to the desired fulfilment.

How is mankind to unite the two aspects of its nature, the higher soul and the personality, to make the spiritual ethics and practical morality really one? Theosophy's fundamental teaching is

that LIFE is one in essence, but in manifested existence, with its myriad beings and relationships, its unity in diversity can only be expressed as Brotherhood, working in all the kingdoms, but only self-consciously in man. "Ecology," while reaching towards the ideal, still falls far short of the full significance of Brotherhood.

Though Life is essentially one, it manifests by means of the two interdependent poles of Spirit and Matter, and this duality applies to every aspect, whether vast or tiny, of the whole. This means, in the moral-ethical life, that we should try to reconcile, or blend, what may seem, superficially, to be opposites. We tend to choose one aspect as desirable and to reject the other. In the first of her *Five Messages to the American Theosophists*, Madame Blavatsky wrote:

... the policy you are now following is admirably adapted to give scope for the widest expansion of the movement, and to establish on a firm basis an organization which, while promoting feelings of fraternal sympathy, social unity, and solidarity, will leave ample room for individual freedom and exertion in the common cause — that of helping mankind.

And again she wrote in the Fourth Message:

... it is one of the tasks of the T.S. to draw together the East and the West, so that each may supply the qualities lacking in the other and develop more fraternal feelings among nations so various.

The social order and its morality and legislation — like the personality of an individual being — is a changing, progressive thing not perfect. Yet anyone who has not naturally transcended his duties to family, community and race, and who therefore has still to live in the world, must render to Caesar what is Caesar's, and keep the laws of the community — unless he realizes a greater need in the name of a larger brotherhood, to combat them. Then, however, he must be prepared to pay the price. The final help in trying to understand true morality — which lip-service moralists, fanatics, or the supporters of immorality lack — is the recognition of that universal law, Karma — action-reaction, equal and opposite. Apart from the concept of reincarnation it seems nonsense to state that we reap what we sow. Together they make for logic and justice. Ethics and morality are not pious injunctions, but statements of law. Religion and Science are not opposed, but the two poles of Universal Wisdom.

THE PRESENT SITUATION DISCONNECTEDLY CONSIDERED

[Reprinted from *The Path*, October 1889.—Eds.]

I

FROM NOW ON, the advancement of the Theosophical cause depends largely upon individual work in one or more directions. Concentrated action in this respect is at once desirable and necessary. The enemies of the Society are at present active as never before, and their professed determination to create dissension in the ranks must be met and overcome. The silent defensive policy should be succeeded by positive, aggressive action. Detractors should be met, not on the plane of vituperation, but with clear-cut argument and controversy. The constant misrepresentation and abuse of theosophy and theosophists so often seen of late in the public press arises, it is most charitable to believe, from an entire misconception of the aims and teachings of theosophy. A trifle of effort on the part of members of the Society would set the matter right. Editors are notably fair and impartial, and entrance to the columns of their newspapers in defence of theosophy would not be hard to obtain. It remains for every member of the Society to do what he can in this respect, and the result will be well worth the effort.

II

A true theosophist is never a bad man or woman. This axiom is beyond controversy. A pure mind and far-reaching influence for good are part and parcel of the theosophic character. But ability to do good is frequently allowed to lapse into inactivity, and the well-meaning theosophist merges into the *average person*. The rule of averages, it is fair to say, is not conducive to the advancement and healthy growth of the theosophic cause. The *average person* moves in a rut—travels in a path previously pointed out by the custom of precedent. By simply making a detour and coming back to the old way at the same or another point, a trifle of intelligence may be grasped of what is going on in spheres outside of the accustomed common round. The greatest progress will be made and the largest degree of enlightenment secured, however, in boldly branching out and bidding farewell to all preconceived ideas as to

utility, aye, even pseudo respectability; in proclaiming the social outcast, the criminal, the rich and the poor as of one family; in seeking to raise all to the common level of Universal Brotherhood. That is radical Practical Theosophy.

III

Every walk of life contains elements that may be theosophically solidified. Wealth, position, or attainments are not a bar that need be considered in the theosophic arena; they are ephemeral, personal. On the other hand, theosophic thought and theosophic teaching are for all mankind and are eternal. It has been mistakenly said that theosophy is not for the masses; that intellectuality is the open sesame to the camp of Universal Brotherhood! Monstrous idea! Even a child can grasp with perfect understanding the wholesome truths and noble teachings of theosophy — those truths and teachings that appeal to the common sense of the multitude rather than to the intellectuality of the few.

IV

All great movements have, of a necessity, leaders and teachers of high attainments. It is not designed to belittle intellect or wealth of learning. But these possessions go for nothing without charity, truthfulness, right thinking, right living, and right action. The path of Practical Theosophy is wide; it is narrow; it is straight; it is crooked; but it is never without good. Expect nothing; work without thought of or desire for reward; share your happiness with others; be upright in your dealings with your fellow labourer on life's highway; work for the good of humanity; speak ill of no one; judge the act and not the actor; and last, but not least, strive for consistency as a member of the Theosophical Society. Then will be realized the basic idea of Practical Theosophy and Universal Brotherhood.

—EXETER

THE death penalty degrades the community that permits it.

—*The Clarion*

THE TWENTY-TWO RULES REGARDING THE WILL FROM HERMES

WILL AND HAVE

I. LIFE with its innumerable trials has for its aim, in the order of eternal wisdom, the training of the Will. To will not and to act not, is as fatal to man as to do evil. Man ought, like god, to work without ceasing.

II. It is through the Will that the intelligence sees fit to display itself in the phases of life. If the Will is sacred, the perception is just.

III. To affirm that which is true, and to will that which is just, is to create. To affirm and will the contrary, is to destroy.

IV. When man has discovered Truth and wills to work Justice, nothing resists him.

V. In order to affirm whether a man is, or has been happy or unhappy, discover the direction which his will pursues.

VI. A chain of flowers is more difficult to break in pieces than a chain of iron.

VII. The will of the just man is the image of the will of God, and is a measure which fortifies itself; it commands in emergencies.

VIII. Intelligences whose will is unbalanced are like the abortions of Nature.

IX. Accept relative evil as a means of arriving at absolute good, but will it not and never commit it.

X. In order to acquire the faculty of always commanding yourself, it is necessary that you will with patience for a length of time.

XI. Brave the lion, and the lion will be afraid of you. Know how to govern sorrow, and sorrow will change to happiness.

XII. Anticipate death by devotion. This is not suicide, it is the apotheosis of a sublime will and the prize of the possession of eternal life.

XIII. To pass thy lifetime in willing and seeking for perishable goods, is to dedicate thyself to the eternity of death.

XIV. To will evil is to enslave thyself to death. A perverse will is the commencement of suicide.

XV. To wish good with violence is as unjust as to will evil. Violence creates disorder, and disorder is the foundation of all evil.

XVI. To suffer is to work. All sorrow, accepted in obedience and resignation, is accomplished progress.

XVII. The more the will surmounts obstacles, the more it gains in power. Hope may then unite itself unceasingly to faith.

XVIII. Fear is but indolence of will. Perils frighten only premature natures.

XIX. Light is an electric fire placed by Nature at the service of the Will. It illuminates those who know how to use it, it crushes those who abuse it.

XX. Every will that strives against the Divine decrees is reprovèd by the eternal Judgment.

XXI. When we create phantoms, we bring forth vampires; whosoever gives himself up to error becomes its prey.

XXII. The Empire of the World appertains to the Empire of the Light, and the Empire of the Light is the Throne of the Will. Thus, in a measure, as man perfects his Will may he arrive at seeing everything, that is to say, at knowing everything within an indefinite extensible circle. Happiness is for him the fruit of the knowledge symbolized by the central tree of Eden. But God permits not the gathering of this fruit unless a man is complete master of himself, and can approach it without covetousness.

BE a Columbus to whole new continents and worlds within you, opening new channels, not of trade, but of thought. Every man is the lord of a realm beside which the earthly empire of the Czar is but a petty state, a hummock left by the ice. Yet some can be patriotic who have no self-respect, and sacrifice the greater to the less. They love the soil which makes their graves, but have no sympathy with the spirit which may still animate their clay. Patriotism is a maggot in their heads. . . . There are continents and seas in the moral world, to which every man is an isthmus or an inlet, yet unexplored by him.

—HENRY DAVID THOREAU

SELF-DISCIPLINE

Be not disgusted, nor discouraged, nor dissatisfied, if thou dost not succeed in doing everything according to right principles, but when thou hast failed, return back again, and be content if the greater part of what thou doest is consistent with man's nature, and love this to which thou returnest.

—MARCUS AURELIUS

It is a common belief that rich rulers of men, wearing golden garments and swords of steel, reposing in palaces, surrounded by numerous advisers, cannot live the life of the Soul. There is some truth in that belief, as there is in the saying attributed to Jesus that it is as hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven as for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. And yet history has records of spiritual rulers of great kingdoms. Indian history provides the outstanding example of Asoka, the Beloved of his people. In Roman history there is Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (121-180 A.D.) whose character of a true Kshatriya was such that he was accorded almost divine honours after his death. It is recorded that "those who could afford it, had his statue or bust; and many people had statues of Antoninus among the Dei Penates or household deities." Further, it is recorded that at Rome the statue of the Emperor made Saint was placed "on the capital of a column, but it was removed at some time unknown, and a bronze statue of St. Paul was put in the place by Pope Sixtus V."

This saintly and philosophic Emperor kept a journal in which he entered his thoughts, a journal which should be read by every ruler, politician and administrator. He had his own inner life to live, and he recognized what so many politicians of today do not — that unless there is purity of motive, of reason and of emotion, deeds and speeches are bound to be defective and compromising.

Every man, every woman — and not only the leaders — has his or her own life to live. Individual happiness no less than national progress depends upon the discipline of consciousness which each adopts and follows. Most people see the value of a discipline for themselves; many people resolve and adopt some kind of a discipline; but only a few remain true to their resolve and follow out their self-imposed discipline.

For the progress of the country it is highly necessary that our

masses be educated in this serious psychological fact of self-discipline. But it must not be imposed from without; it must be self-imposed. Discipline deepens people's perception, and the perception of the masses passes into their requirements and enables them to formulate their demands; these demands set the pace for the statesmen in the measures they adopt. Thus enslavement of the masses is avoided and the voice of the people is heard and heeded.

But it is not so much for the nation as for the individual that we are writing this: self-chosen discipline is essential for our real happiness as well as for our own progress. We have to adopt the practice of wisdom and the virtues of pure living founded on pure thinking.

Our feelings of respect and of reverence for the ageless Wisdom of our forefathers have been aroused. But it will not do for us to take refuge in the verbal praise of our sires; we need to mould ourselves on their pattern — to think as they thought, to live as they lived, and to raise high the name of our Motherland as the Servant of Humanity, as they did in their eras.

The advice of Marcus Aurelius quoted at the outset of this article is also to be found in the *Gita*. The discipline of life in which the mind is made to follow the perceptions of the Soul, in which human emotions are made pure by correct knowledge, and in which skill in action is attained, is difficult. Many failures overtake us, and this Kali-Yuga civilization is not of any aid to our attempts. And yet, if India is to live out her *Dharma*, her real *Din*, she must have a fair number of her sons and daughters undertake that divine discipline. Krishna gives in the sixth discourse of the *Gita* the definite assurance that by repeated efforts at practice — *Abhyasa* — success can be attained in concentration; and the same applies to what we here call discipline.

Constancy and perseverance are not natural to our civilization where speed is regarded as a great virtue and where, in the words of an old Chinese sage, "A man looks at an egg, and expects to hear it crow."

The struggle against our lower nature requires patience and endurance, for the fight is bound to be protracted. Failures are inevitable, but they provide an impetus. For, he who desires triumph is the one who has seen the failures over which triumph is desired. Perception of failure is the first step towards overcoming them.

The dual nature of man — lower and higher — is recognized by almost everyone. But what is that higher and what constitutes the

lower — this is not recognized. Furthermore, there are two temptations which the earnest practitioner encounters. One comes from the modern scientific camp, the other from the orthodox religious camp.

In the name of science it is sometimes said that man is a compound of complexes, mostly made up of repressions and weaknesses. These cannot and should not be dealt with in a harsh manner, and as suppression is bad, the expression of weaknesses, being more or less natural, may be indulged in. The philosophy of life which does not recognize the Soul, or which gives it a subservient position compared to that of the senses and the brain, is apt to connive at sense indulgence. This is fatal to the spiritual life and to good morals. Modern psychology and psychoanalysis are grave dangers to human integrity, for many of their teachings are founded upon partial and very limited knowledge which is mostly theoretical. To practise on the basis of the mere shifting hypotheses of modern science impairs our very sanity.

The religious temptation is very subtle and arises from the false theological dogma of the Grace of God that forgives sins. This is a demoralizing hope for any man to hold; as God created man's lower nature He is said to be responsible for man's follies, and recognizing this, He Himself has instituted forgiveness of sins by His own Grace which He grants to properly constituted worshippers. This is a dangerous doctrine and a blasphemy.

Discard these two and see the reasonableness of the spiritual doctrine. God and beast meet in man as a result of long past evolution. Man is here to tame the beast with the aid of the God in him.

The scientific dictum explained above is wrong because man is not all beast; the animal nature in itself is dual, for there are ferocious animals and there are harmless creatures, nay more — useful ones. In us are the ferocious tiger, the greedy wolf, etc.; but also in us are the fidelity of the dog, the intelligence of the elephant, the gentleness of the cow. Between these two groups, there is the beautiful but fluttering butterfly, the chirping sparrow, the cooing dove. In our lower nature there is a whole menagerie and to let them all express themselves in the house of the body would be to subject that body to tumult and to conflict which spell — disease, decay, death.

Man is, *par excellence*, the Thinker, and with the aid of his thought he must control and train the vices and weaknesses which

are like the animals in the menagerie. Unaided by real knowledge the mind not only fails in its legitimate task of guiding and controlling, but, further, itself falls prey to the animals. It loses its faculty of thinking dispassionately, that is, free from the animal passions. The mind has the power to transmute vices into virtues. Neither the expression of the animal nature, nor its repression driving in, but instead its transmutation is necessary.

Man, by developing his own natural humanity — the human qualities — succeeds in transmuting vice into virtue; but for this development adequate knowledge of true Eastern psychology is required. One aspect of this knowledge brings out the truth underlying the theological doctrine of Grace. Within man, the Thinker, abides a radiant God — man's Higher Self. It is the guidance of this Higher Self which has to be sought, and when secured it is that high Divine Self who pours into our mind-consciousness the Grace and Wisdom which "rightly ordereth all things."

The quotation from Marcus Aurelius strikes the note of perseverance. Let us not be daunted by repeated failures. Let us determine on what principles we are going to establish ourselves; in the light of which principles we are going to examine our motives as well as our methods of action; and having so determined, let us keep on, encouraged by these noble and inspiring words of *The Voice of the Silence*:

...from the stronghold of your Soul chase all your foes away — ambition, anger, hatred, e'en to the shadow of desire — when even you have failed....

Remember, thou that fightest for man's liberation, each failure is success, and each sincere attempt wins its reward in time. The holy germs that sprout and grow unseen in the disciple's soul, their stalks wax strong at each new trial, they bend like reeds but never break, nor can they e'er be lost. But when the hour has struck they blossom forth.

WE ARE all the flute, our music is all Thine.

—RUMI

“A PERSONAL STATEMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF”

[Reprinted from *The Theosophist*, April 1880.—Eds.]

“A PERSONAL STATEMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF” is the title of a pamphlet now just appearing at Bombay. It is an unexpected, and very unusual piece of literature; and the subject is treated in a way to startle the whole of the Protestant Church, call out an inward chuckle of satisfaction from the Jesuits, and provoke extreme dissatisfaction among the conservative, church-going, Anglo-Indian officials. Yet it is an honest and sincere profession of faith. Simple and dignified, without one word of recrimination against those who will be the first to throw stones at him, entirely heedless of possible consequences, the author — a District Judge, we believe — Mr. G. C. Whitworth, comes out bravely and without ostentation, to tell the truth to the world about himself. He has “come to the conclusion that it is better that every man’s opinions, whether right or wrong, should be known”; and feeling that he “will never reach that state of straightforwardness and simplicity of conversation and conduct” after which he is striving, he does not wish to remain any longer “in a false position,” and hence renounces Christianity publicly and in print.

All honour to the man who is brave and honest in this century of sham beliefs and shameful hypocrisy! — who, regardless of all dangers — and such an act entails more than one — throws off the mask of false pretence that stifles him, with the sole motive of doing what he deems his duty to himself and those who know him.

Mr. Whitworth not only tells us what he believes no more in, but also makes a statement of the personal belief that has superseded the Christianity he now repudiates.

Before he was as certain as he now is of what his duty in this question was, he used to wonder what orthodox churchmen would advise him to do. “I have heard,” he says, “of such a thing as stamping out, or trying to stamp out, unbelief from the mind. I suppose the process is to set before yourself the idea that it would be a good thing if you could believe, and then to determine to act on all occasions as though you did, until at length it comes to seem to be a matter of course that you do believe. Now such a course of

conduct seems to me to be wrong. I cannot see how a man is justified in trying to settle by resolution what he will believe, and in stifling instead of fairly examining doubts which may arise as to his past belief. Nor does anyone recommend this course to persons of a different creed to his own...."

"...And though," he says further on, "I would not willingly suggest doubt to the mind of any person happily free from it, and worthily occupied in this world, I can in no degree concur in the opinion that it is necessary to keep up artificial religions for the sake of the unenlightened masses. 'Government by illusion' is an expression I have lately heard. I cannot but think that the bare truth is better. More particularly if you think that a God of infinite power created and governs the world, does it seem unreasonable to suppose that he means those of his creatures that are comparatively wise to invent erroneous notions about him for their more ignorant fellows to believe. We have been so long accustomed to associate such things as worship, prayer, sacraments, and holy offices with religion, that some men seem to fear that, if all these were got rid of, nothing would remain. That is not my experience. It should be remembered that all immoral and dangerous persons are either already without religion — in which case they could lose none if the doctrine of government by illusion were given up — or else that the religion they have has been useless to them."

After that Mr. Whitworth states his present religious belief and says:

"I believe that it is every man's duty to do what he can to make the world better and happier. That is the whole of my creed. I aim at no precision of language. Many other formulas would do as well. So to live that the world may be better for my having lived in it is the one most familiar to my thoughts. The meaning is plain, and there is nothing new in it.... To me it seems absurd to attempt to devise a creed, or even to take, with any fixed resolution of keeping it, a ready-made one. What a man finds in the actual experience of his life to be good, that is what he must believe...."

"Now before I attempt to explain how I find the simple creed I have enunciated better than all the dogmas I once believed, I will refer to certain points on which (though they do not belong to my religion) I shall no doubt be expected, in such a publication as this, to express distinct opinions.

"Such a question is, Do you believe in God? Now I wish to be perfectly frank, but it is beyond my power to answer this question clearly. I certainly did until within a few years believe in God, but then I had a particular conception of him — namely, the being known as God the Father in the Church of England. Now, I am sure we are not warranted in holding that conception, and I have formed no other distinct conception of God. I cannot say I believe in God when the word conveys no distinct meaning to me; I cannot say I do not believe in him when my thoughts seem sometimes to require the use of the name. Perhaps that impression is due only to an old habit. We hear it said that the existence of God is proved by the manifest design of the universe. But what sort of God? Surely one of finite, not of infinite, power. The world is very wonderful; but how can we call it a perfect work? There are some terrible things in it. Perhaps it will be perfect, but time cannot be necessary to infinite power. I heard a preacher once expatiate on God's power and love as shown in the structure of an animal. He took the mole as an example, and explained how its every part was perfectly adapted to the peculiar manner of its life. But what if a ploughman kills the mole? Carefully provided as all its properties were, they all have failed. Then the preacher spoke of the wonderful providence by which some plants are made to purify pestilential air. But we in India know that other plants by their natural decay poison instead of purifying the air. So, what do such examples prove?

"I am not dismayed or distressed at such puzzles, or because I cannot say whether or not I believe in God. The world teaches me plainly that there are countless things which I cannot know....

"My attempt to answer the above question is sufficient to show that I do not believe in the divinity of Christ, or of any other supposed incarnation of God. I add that it is between twelve and fifteen years since I had any such belief."

As to a future life, the author neither affirms belief nor disbelief. He *hopes* we may live after death, but he personally feels *no conviction* of it. "My religion then," he goes on to say, "it may perhaps be said by those devoted to any of the recognized religions of the day, leaves me without any God, without prayer or worship of any kind, leaves me a weak mortal struggling alone with the difficulties of this life. Well, if I hear such things said of my religion, I shall bear it patiently.... While I am writing this in the saloon of

the *Venetia*, this 23rd of November, I can hear the passengers at service, overhead, singing—

‘Leave, ah leave me not alone,
Still support and strengthen me.’

“If some of them are less alone than I, it should not make me discontented, for I know that I am better with my religion than I, the same person, was with theirs. But, notwithstanding those objections which many persons will make, I do deliberately put forward this religion of mine as something better for humanity than any other. . . . I believe that most, or at least very many, men of business, working men, are as I am. If, as a fact, men do not already hold the creed that I do, I do not expect that by anything I can say they will come to do so. But there are two things which I can still hope. I hope that those of my readers who really believe no more than I do, but who in a half-hearted way cling to dogmas, which indeed to them are dead and ineffective, will examine and see what they really do believe and what they do not, distinguishing between those articles of belief which they give effect to in their lives and those they hold merely for want of energy to throw away. And I hope that those who find their actual belief to be less than or different from what their neighbours have been led to suppose it to be, will ask themselves the question whether they ought not in some way or other to remove the misapprehension and make their lives speak truly to all who behold them.

“But there are two classes of persons to whom I can hardly hope to make intelligible the step I am taking in publishing this statement. The first class is the clergy and all persons engaged in teaching and propagating any religion; the second, all idle persons. These two very different classes seem to me to be less likely than other persons to discover that the religions they observe are false if they are false. Rather are they likely, as I conceive, to find them, whatever they are, to be sufficient and satisfactory. In the case of the first, because religion is the business of their lives; and in the case of idle persons, because what they have of religion is better than the rest of their lives. . . . A man’s life and his religion should be one and the same thing. That which is not part of what his life ought to be, ought not to be a part of his religion. And it seems to me quite intelligible that a man whose business is religious teaching should make his life and religion one and the same, though much

of the religion be false, without ever finding the test of true and untrue. If a man's duty is to explain or teach a certain doctrine, he may find it very difficult to make people believe or understand it; but he will not be in a position to say — well, this doctrine may be true or false, but it has nothing to do with my life. It has to do with his life."

The author, explaining how his creed is a better religion for the world at large, than any other, says:

"In the first place this religion seems to me to have the property of being constantly present in a way which other religions are usually not. I do not think it is sufficient to devote an hour, or two hours, or twelve hours a day to religion. I think the whole day should be so devoted. But, in order for that to be, religion must consist of daily life, and there must be no distinction of spiritual and temporal, of religious and secular, of Sunday and week-day, or of priest and people. The fact that one day is to be kept holy, means that others are distinctly recognized as being something less than holy; and the fact that a holier and purer manner of life and conversation is expected in one particular class of men, means that such high attainment, though practicable, is not expected of the bulk of mankind. Of course all men require time, apart from their proper business, for patient meditation and reflection on the tendency of their lives; all men require the advice of others of different experience to themselves; all men should have time for the fun and the pleasure that life affords. But why should some of these things be called religious, and others non-religious or secular? Is the thing good or bad? is the question that my religion asks; and it asks it equally whether the thing be an act of charity or a game of tennis. If religion and daily life are not one and the same, it will happen that the first is sometimes made to give place to the second. If a church catches fire at the time of public worship, the priest and the people must run out. Their religious service is interrupted, but they obey the dictate of a truer religion which bids them save their lives. That which need never be interrupted is the true religion — namely, always to do what is best to be done.

"I next claim for my religion that as a fact it has created in me a greater love of the human race than I had when a Christian. When I thought there was virtue in prayer and religious services, and that my first duty was to save my own soul, my sense of the duty of

rendering service to men and my sense of pleasure at the thought of particular services done to particular persons, whether friends or strangers, were certainly less than they are now. If it be said that the difference in me is due not to the change of religion, but only to the improved perception and knowledge that years bring, I can only reply that the two causes seem to me to be identical. My religion I have neither invented nor selected: it is what my life has taught me.

“This religion has again this advantage that it allows you no rest or permanent happiness except with a sense of duty done. It knows nothing of idle ‘drawing nearer to God.’

“You must not speak of ‘leaving with meekness your sins to your Saviour.’ Your sins are your own, and you cannot leave them to anyone. The best you can do is to outweigh them with good, but get rid of them you cannot. There is no absolution. Think of that when you are disposed to do a bad deed again. If you do it, it will remain for ever. The balance of good, if ever you get a balance of good, will be finally less by reason of that bad debt.”

We verily believe that, though Mr. Whitworth gives no name to his deity, and simplifies his religion so as to make it appear to be hardly a religion at all, yet he is a truer religionist than any Church-going dogmatist. His religion recognizes and worships but the latent divinity indwelling in himself. Like Elijah, he sought for the Lord in the strong wind — but *the Lord was not in the wind*; nor was he in the *earthquake*, nor yet in the *fire*. But he found Him in the “still small voice” — the voice of his own CONSCIENCE, the true tabernacle of man. The author without belonging to our Society is yet a true-born Theosophist — a God-seeker.

THE gradual fading out of the churches will no more inhibit that kind of experience which religious men in all ages have enjoyed, than the lapsing of the Royal Academy will prevent men producing and enjoying greater art. The evolution of religion in the future (if religion is to survive) will therefore be one in which the experience of the great mystics will increasingly become the experience of the man in the street.

—C. E. M. JOAD

THE KINGS OF EDOM

WHO WERE the Kings of Edom referred to in the Bible as having "reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," *i.e.*, in periods of evolution prior to that which started with Adam? Were they human kings of historical times, or do they belong to earlier eras? Or are they purely allegorical? Does a study of the subject reveal the universality of the ancient Wisdom, however much it has been veiled in allegory?

A deeply concealed mystery is to be found in the allegory of the seven kings of Edom. It is sometimes said that these kings symbolize "prior worlds," but *The Secret Doctrine* (II. 706) states that "they are neither the 'worlds that were destroyed,' nor the 'Kings that died' — alone; but both, and much more." We are further informed that they "typify the worlds (or spheres) of our chain during the first Round, as well as the primordial men of this Round. They are the septenary *pre-Adamic* (or before the Third, *Separated Race*) first Root-race." (*S.D.*, I. 375)

As the first Root-race they were "*shadows*, and senseless (they had not eaten yet of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge)." This race was "*imperfect, i.e.*, was born before the 'balance' (sexes) existed, and... was therefore destroyed." (*S.D.*, II. 2)

In fact, during the long progress of evolution,

Worlds and men were in turn formed and destroyed, *under the law of evolution and from pre-existing material*, until both the planets and their men, in our case our Earth and its animal and human races, became what they are now in the present cycle: opposite polar forces, an equilibrated compound of Spirit and Matter, of the positive and the negative, of the male and the female... Therefore the First Root-race of men, sexless and mindless, had to be overthrown and "hidden until after a time"; *i.e.*, the first race, instead of dying, disappeared *in the second race*, as certain lower lives and plants do in their progeny. It was a wholesale transformation. The First became the Second Root-race, without either begetting it, procreating it, or dying (*S.D.*, II. 84)

How was this transformation achieved? They "merged in their own progeny (by exudation)" (*S.D.*, II. 2), and it is in that sense that they were "destroyed." The statement that one King "died and

another reigned in his stead" has to be taken as symbolizing the evolution of the races. We read in *The Theosophical Glossary* that according to the Eastern Esoteric Philosophy, the Kings of Edom were "the symbol of the seven human Root-races, four of which have passed away, the fifth is passing, and two are still to come."

This teaching is also given in St. John's *Revelation* (xvii. 10): "And there are seven Kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come." A similar teaching is also to be found in the *Kabala*.

As for the transformation of one Race into another, we are told (*S.D.*, II. 134) that the First Race was Adam *solus*, sexless. Then came the Second Race of inactive androgynes, Adam-Eve. The Third, the "Separating Hermaphrodite," Cain and Abel, produced the Fourth, Seth-Enos, etc. In *The Secret Doctrine* (II. 715 fn.) we read:

Though we apply the term "truly human," only to the Fourth Atlantean Root-Race, yet the Third Race is almost human in its latest portion, since it is during its fifth sub-race that mankind *separated* sexually, and that the *first man was born* according to the now normal process. This "first man" answers in the Bible (*Genesis*) to Enos or Henoah, son of Seth. (Ch. iv)

It is said in *Genesis* (xxxvi. 43) that the Kings of Edom are the sons of "Esau, the father of the Edomites"; that is, Esau represents in the Bible the race which stands between the Fourth and Fifth, the Atlantean and the Aryan (*S.D.*, II. 705). The Biblical story of Jacob and Esau contains the allegorical history of the birth of the Fifth Race. Who was Esau? He was the eldest son of Isaac and ancestor of the Edomites, who sold his birthright (the privilege of primogeniture) to his brother Jacob, for a mess of pottage. The younger brother, by stratagem, became his father's heir, and Esau, deprived of his heritage, was made to obey his younger brother. The "trick" played by Jacob on the blind father to get his blessing, is revolting until we begin to look upon these characters as the previous races of mankind. Studied in this light, the allegory reveals much about the separation of the Atlantean Race into the good and the evil, and the gradual beginning of the Fifth, our Race.

THE BUGBEARS OF SCIENCE

[This is the concluding part of an article which appeared originally in *The Theosophist* for April and May 1883.—EDS.]

II

HOMOEOPATHY AND MESMERISM

YEARS since Homoeopaths began telling us that extremely small doses of substance are required to produce extremely important effects upon animal organisms. They went so far as to maintain that, with the *decrease* of the dose was obtained a proportionate *increase* of the effect. The professors of this new heresy were regarded as charlatans and deluded fools, and treated henceforward as quacks.

Nevertheless, the instance in hand furnished by Mr. Crookes' experiments with radiant matter and the electrical radiometer and now admittedly a fact in modern physical science, might well be claimed by Homoeopathy as a firm basis to stand upon. Setting aside such a complicated machinery as the human organism, the case can be experimentally verified upon any inorganic substance. No impartial thinker, moreover, would be prepared, we think, to deny *a priori* the effect of homoeopathic medicines. The trite argument of the negator — "I do not understand it, therefore it cannot be" — is worn out threadbare. "As though the infinite possibilities of nature can be exhausted by the shallow standard of our pigmy understanding!" exclaims the author of an article upon Jaeger's *Neuralanalysis* and Homoeopathy. "Let us leave aside," he adds, "our conceited pretensions to understand *every* phenomenon, and bear in mind that, if verification of a fact by observation and experiment is the first requisite for its correct comprehension, the next and most important requisite is the close study by the help of those same experiments and observation of the various conditions under which that fact is made to appear. It is only when we have strictly complied with this method that we can hope — and even that not always — to be brought to correctly define and comprehend it."

We will now collate together some of the best arguments brought forward by this and other impartial writers to the defence of Homoeopathy and Mesmerism.

The foremost and most important factor for the discovery and clear understanding of some given secret of nature is — analogy.

Adaptation of a new phenomenon to phenomena already discovered and investigated is the first step towards its comprehension. And the analogies we find around us tend all to confirm instead of contradicting the possibility of the great virtue claimed for the infinitesimals in medicinal doses. Indeed, observation shows in the great majority of cases that the more a substance is reduced to its simplest form, the less it is complicated, the more it is capable of storing energy; *i.e.*, that it is precisely under such a condition that it becomes the most active. The formation of water from ice, steam from water, is followed by absorption of heat; steam appears here, to say, as the reservoir of energy; and the latter when spent during the conversion of steam back into water shows itself capable of performing mechanical work, such as the moving of heavy masses, &c. A chemist would tell us that, in the majority of cases, to impart energy to substance he has to spend force. Thus, for instance, in order to pass from steam to its compound parts, hydrogen and oxygen, far more expenditure of energy is required than in the process of the transformation of water into aqueous vapour, hydrogen and oxygen appearing relatively as tremendous reservoirs of force. This store asserts itself in the conversion of that vapour into water during the combination of hydrogen with oxygen, either under the appearance of heat-effect, or under the shape of an explosion, or the motion of masses. When we turn to substances chemically homogeneous, or elementary substances so called, we find again that the greatest chemical activity belongs to those elements that are lightest in weight in order to obtain some definite chemical action. Thus, if, in the majority of cases it is observed that the simpler and the more attenuated a substance has become, the more there is an increase of forces in it — then why, we ask, should we deny the same property or phenomenon there, where the masses of substance, owing to their minuteness escape our direct observation and exact measurement? Shall we forget that the *great* and the *little* — relative conceptions, and that infinitude is equally existent and equally unattainable by our senses whether it is on a large or on a small scale?

And now, leaving aside all such arguments that can be tested only by scientific rule, we will turn to far simpler evidence, one generally rejected, just because it is so common and within the reach of everyone's observation. Every person knows how much is required of certain odours to be smelled by all. Thus, for instance,

a piece of musk will fill a great space with its odour, there being present in the atmosphere particles of that odoriferous substance everywhere, without a decrease either in the bulk or the weight of the piece being in the least appreciable. We have no means, at any rate, of verifying such a decrease — if there be one. We also all know what strong effects may be produced upon certain sensitive organisms by certain smells, and that these may induce convulsions, swoons, and even a condition of dangerous coma. And if the possibility of the influence of infinitesimally small quantities of certain odoriferous substances upon the olfactory nerve need not be questioned at this stage of scientific enquiry, what ground have we in denying the possibility of like influence upon our nerves in general? In the one case the impression received by the nerves is followed by a full consciousness of that fact; in the other it eludes the testimony of our senses; yet the fact of the presence of such an influence may remain the same in both cases, and though beyond the reach of immediate consciousness, it may be admitted to assert itself in certain changes taking place in our organic functions without attributing the latter — as our allopaths will often do — to chance or the effect of blind faith. Everyone can feel, and become cognizant of, the beatings of one's heart, while the vermicular motion of the intestines is felt by no one; but who will deny for that, that the one motion has as great an importance and as objective an existence as the other in the life of an organic being? Thus, the influence of homoeopathic doses becomes perfectly admissible and even probable; and the cure of diseases by occult agency — mesmeric passes and the minutest doses of mineral as well as vegetable substances — ought to be accepted as an ascertained and well verified fact for all but the conservative and incurable apostles of negation.

To an impartial observer it becomes evident that both sides have to be taken to task. The homoeopaths, for their entire rejection of the allopathic methods; and their opponents, for shutting their eyes before facts, and their unpardonable *a priori* negation of what they are pleased to regard without verification as a quackery and an imposition. It becomes self-evident that the two methods will find themselves happily combined at no distant future in the practice of medicine. Physical and chemical processes take place in every living organism, but the latter are governed by the action of the nervous system to which the first place in importance has to be

conceded. It is but when a substance is introduced into the organism in a greater or lesser considerable quantity that its direct, gross, mechanical, or chemical effect will be made apparent; and then it acts rapidly and in an immediate way, taking a part in that or in another process, acting in it as it would act in a laboratory vessel, or as a knife might act in the hand of a surgeon. In most cases its influence upon the nervous system acts only in an indirect way. Owing to the smallest imprudence an allopathic dose, while it restores to order one process, will produce disorder in the functions of another. But there is another means of influencing the course of vital processes: indirectly, nevertheless very powerfully. This means consists in the immediate, exceptional action upon that which governs supremely those processes — namely — on our nerves. This is the method of homoeopathy. The allopaths themselves have often to use means based upon this homoeopathic method, and then, they confess to having had to act upon a purely empirical principle. As a case in hand we may cite the following: the action of quinine in intermittent malarious fever will not be homoeopathical; enough of that substance must be given to poison, so to say, the blood to a degree that would kill the malaria micro-organisms, that induce, through their presence, the fever symptoms. But, in every case where quinine has to be administered as a tonic, its invigorating action has to be attributed rather to the homoeopathic than allopathic influence. Physicians will then prescribe a dose which will be virtually homoeopathic, though they will not be ready to admit it. Thus, incomplete and perhaps faulty in its details as the instance given may be found upon strict analysis, it is yet believed as proving that the incurable, *a priori* denial of the effects of homoeopathic treatment is less due to the uncompromising rules based upon scientific data, than to a loose examination of those data by means of their analogies.

The recent and interesting experiments by the well-known zoologist and physiologist of Stuttgart, already mentioned — Professor G. Jaeger — give a brilliant and triumphant corroboration to the righteous claims of homoeopathy. In the author's opinion the results obtained by him being amenable to a correct interpretation in figures, "*place homoeopathy at once as a branch of medical science based upon exact physiological data and inferior in nothing to the allopathic methods.*" Professor Jaeger calls his own method *Neural-*

analysis. We will treat of it, as embodied by him in a pamphlet bearing the epigraph: "figures prove" (*Zahlen beweisen*), in our next number, making extracts from the best reviews of it by scientific men.

III

The following is a summary of various reviews upon Dr. Jaeger's *Neuralanalysis* in connection with homoeopathy.

The *Neuralanalysis* is based upon the application of the apparatus known among the physicians as the *chronoscope*, whose object is to record the most infinitesimal intervals of time:¹ one needle making from five to ten revolutions in a second. Five revolutions are sufficient for a neuralanalytical experiment. This needle can be instantaneously set in motion by the interception of the galvanic current, and as instantaneously stopped by allowing its flow again. So great is the sensitiveness of the instrument, that a chronoscope with ten revolutions in a second is capable of calculating and recording the time needed for a pistol ball in motion to cross the space of one foot. The means used for this experiment is as follows: during its transit, the ball, acting upon the wire, shuts out the current, and a foot further on, it breaks another wire, and thus stops the current altogether. During this incredibly short space of time, the needle is already set in motion and has crossed a certain portion of its circuit.

The *Neuralanalysis* consists in the measurement of that for which astronomers have a term of their own, but Dr. Jaeger calls *Nervenzeit* — "nerve-time."

If, while observing the moment of the appearance of some signal, one had to record that moment by some given sign — say by the bending of his finger — then between the appearance of the said signal and the bending of the finger, a certain lapse of time will be needed in order that the impression upon the nervous tissue of the eye should reach through the optic nerve the brain, and thence expand itself along the motory nerves to the muscles of the finger. It is this duration, or lapse, that is called *nerve-time*. To calculate it by means of the chronoscope, one has to carefully observe the position of the needle; and, never losing sight of it, to intercept by a

¹ Such as the duration of luminous impressions upon the retina of the eye—for instance.

slow wave of the hand the galvanic current, and thus set the needle in motion. As soon as the latter motion is observed, the experimenter rapidly stops it by liberating the current, and takes note again of the needle's position. The difference between the two positions will give the exact "nerve-time" in so many parts of a second. The duration of "nerve-time" depends firstly on the condition in which the conductivity of the nervous and muscular apparatus is at the time: this condition being thoroughly independent of our will. And secondly, it depends on the degree of intensity of the attention and the force of the will-impulse in the experimenter; the more energetic is the will or desire, the greater the attention, the shorter will be the "nerve-time." To make the second condition easier — an exercise is necessary by means of which is developed a habit — known in physiology as the law of co-ordinative motions or of nearly simultaneous action. Then one single will-impulse will be sufficient to produce two motions — the act of intercepting and that of releasing the galvanic current. Of these two motions which appear both at first as deliberate, the second will become through exercise and habit involuntary, so to say instinctive, and follow the first independently. Once the habit acquired, the "nerve-time" when calculated by the chronoscope becomes very little dependent upon will, and indicates chiefly the rapidity with which the excitement is spread along the nerves and muscles.

Hitherto, only the mean quantity of "nerve-time" was generally paid attention to; but Dr. Jaeger remarked that it was liable to considerable fluctuations, one rapidly succeeding the other. For instance, taking one hundred chronoscopical measurements of "nerve-time" one after the other and at short intervals, say, every ten or twenty seconds, we get rows of figures, considerably differing from each other, the changes in the quantity of those figures, *i.e.*, the fluctuations in the duration of nerve-time being very characteristic. They can be represented in accordance with a certain graphic method, by means of a curved line. The latter as showing the results of all the measurements taken one after the other, Dr. Jaeger has called the "*detail-curve*" (*Detailkurve*). Besides this, he constructs another curved line, which shows those figures that will remain when, putting together all the subsequent observations ten by ten, the mean result is obtained out of every decade. The latter result of ten observations he calls *Decadenziffer* or the "decade figure." Thus

the neuralanalytical curves give us a general view in figures of the state of our nervous apparatus, in relation to the conductivity of their excitation and the characteristic fluctuations of that conductivity. Studying by this means the condition of the nervous system, one can easily judge in what way, and to what extent, it is acted upon by certain definite external and internal influences, and, as their action under similar conditions is invariable, then *vice versa*, very exact conclusions can be arrived at by the characteristic state of the conductivity of the nervous system as to the nature of those influences that acted upon the nerves during the said chronoscopic measurement.

The experiments of Jaeger and his pupils show that the aspect of the neuralanalytical curves — which he calls “psychogrammes” — changes, on the one hand, at every influence acting upon the organism from without, and on the other — at everything that affects it from within, as, for instance, pleasure, anger, fear, hunger or thirst, etc., etc. Moreover, peculiar characteristic curves are formed, in correspondence to every such influence or effect. On the other hand one and the same person, experimented upon under the same conditions, gets each time, under the influence of some definite substance introduced into his organism, an identical psychogramme. The most interesting and important feature of the *Neuralanalysis* is found in the fact that the choice of the means resorted to for the introduction of various substances into the human organism has no importance here whatever: any volatile substance, taken within, will give the same results when simply inhaled, it being quite immaterial whether it has or has not any odour.

In order that the experiments should always yield results for purposes of comparison, it is strictly necessary to pay a great attention to the food and drink of the person experimented upon, to both his mental and physical states, as also to the purity of the atmosphere in the room where the experiments take place. The “curves” will show immediately whether the patient is in the same neuralanalytical disposition with regard to all the conditions as he was during the preceding experiments. No other instrument the world over is better calculated to show the extreme sensitiveness of human organism. Thus, for instance, as shown by Dr. Jaeger, it is sufficient of one drop of spirit of wine spilled on a varnished table, that the smell of varnish filling the room should alter considerably

the psychogrammic figures and impede the progress of the experiment.

There are several kinds of psychogrammes, the olfactory one being called by him the *osmogramme* from the Greek word *osmosis*, a form of molecular attraction. The osmogrammes are the most valuable as giving by far the greater and clearer results. "Even the metals" — says Jaeger — "show themselves sufficiently volatile to yield most suggestive osmogrammes." Besides, whereas it is impossible to stop at will the action of substances introduced into the stomach, the action of a substance inhaled may be easily stopped. The quantity of substance needed for an osmogramme is the most trifling; and leaving aside the enormous homoeopathical dilutions, the quantity has no real importance. Thus, for instance, when alcohol has to be inhaled, it makes no difference in the result obtained whether its surface covers an area of one square inch or that of a large plate.

In the next number it is proposed to show the enormous light that Jaeger's discoveries of this new application of the chronoscope throws upon homoeopathy in general, and the doubted efficacy of the infinitesimal doses in countless dilutions — especially.²

THE SUM TOTAL of unsolved mysteries will always remain immeasurably greater than the sum of our discoveries. There are biologists who are convinced that they or future generations of scientists will ultimately find the key to life in all its manifestations, if only research perseveres. They are to be pitied. For they have never experienced that sense of profound awe in the face of the workings of nature, some of which will for ever elude comprehension, even by the mind of man.

—KARL VON FRISCH

² This intention appears never to have been carried out.

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

The traditional legal definition declared death as the point when respiration and circulation cease. A few years ago this definition was discarded and a person was said to be dead when his brain stopped functioning. Now the matter is once again being debated. According to *New Scientist* (July 23), "the question whether 'brain death' is an adequate reason to declare a person clinically and legally dead has transcended metaphysics as more 'brain dead' patients have been kept breathing and pumping blood by artificial respirators."

A panel of scholars, doctors, lawyers and others constituting the American presidential commission appointed to study ethical questions in the life sciences, has now proposed a new definition. The rule of thumb would allow a doctor to pull the plug on a patient if there is "irreversible cessation of all functions of the entire brain, including the brain stem."

According to Theosophy, when the body begins to get cold and the man appears dead, all the forces of body and mind rush through the brain. The real man is busy in the brain and lives his whole life over again. Not until his work there is ended is the person really dead and the remaining principles detach themselves from the physical corpus.

... the man is not dead when he is cold, stiff, pulseless, breathless, and even showing signs of decomposition; he is not dead when buried, nor afterward, until a certain point is reached. That point is, *when the vital organs have become so decomposed, that if reanimated, they could not perform their customary functions*; when the mainspring and cogs of the machine, so to speak, are so eaten away by rust, that they would snap upon the turning of the key. Until that point is reached, the astral body may be caused, without miracle, to re-enter its former tabernacle, either by an effort of its own will, or under the resistless impulse of the will of one who knows the potencies of nature and how to direct them. The spark is not extinguished, but only latent — latent as the fire in the flint, or the heat in the cold iron. (*Isis Unveiled*, I. 483-84)

That everything in nature has its two aspects, the light and the dark, the beneficent and the maleficent, is borne out by studies of

snake venom's therapeutic uses. Throughout man's history, reptiles have been used for medicinal purposes, but with modern science stepping in with its sophisticated laboratory techniques, not only has knowledge of the immense variety to be found in snake venoms widened, but also men's eyes have been opened to the wider therapeutic possibilities of these venoms. The deadliest snakes are, paradoxically, the most effective providers of medical wonders.

An article by John O'Rourke in *Let's Live*, entitled "Fangs of Mercy," states:

From their fearsome fangs medical pioneers have extracted sera against snakebite itself. But this was only a beginning. A whole array of remedies and palliatives is now being compounded from the venom of snakes. Benefits to mankind are incalculable, with still more to come....

"Venoms have powerful physiological properties," declares Dr. Daniel Drachman of Johns Hopkins University, adding that they have opened a whole new field of research on our nervous systems.

Researchers using various snake venoms have found fresh clues to the causes of baffling afflictions ranging from myasthenia gravis to migraine headaches. Venoms are being used among other things to treat high blood pressure; to relieve the agonies of cancer, arthritis, leprosy, etc.; to study rare diseases like amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; to help control bleeding in haemophiliacs; and, during surgery, to dissolve blood clots without the dangers of haemorrhaging. It has been discovered, further, that when venoms are broken down and their toxins removed, they can actually repair damaged nerve endings. Homoeopathic doctors have been in the vanguard of these developments and have made extensive use of reptile venoms.

The article continues:

We have come a long way in the century since a German pioneer, Constantine Herring, astonished his Indian hosts by inviting the bite of a deadly bushmaster so he could begin developing a serum for snakebite. Yet we may stop short of recapturing the awed reverence with which Egyptians, Greeks and Romans — and the ancient Semites and Mesopotamians, along with modern Indians, Burmese and Siamese — regarded snakes (even though we have dubbed a constellation *Serpentis*). No one is likely to equal the brilliant Aztec plumed serpent.

Medicine still pays symbolic tribute to the snake in the form

of the serpent-entwined wand of Aesculapius, god of the profession. In the Orient, medical and religious beliefs have merged. . . .

Whatever reptiles' nutritional or therapeutic values, "the most easily assessed benefit man derives from snakes is their consumption of animal and insect pests," notes Hal H. Harrison in *The World of the Snake*. Snakes help to control our dangerous rodent population. . . .

Is the once-despised snake suddenly a friend to be honoured? That may be going too far, for the poison that heals can also kill. But perhaps we can agree with the wisdom of the Koreans, who say: "The value of the snake as medicine is beyond description."

If the most violent of poisons has its uses, does it not stand to reason that there is not an ingredient, not an essence in nature but can prove both life-giving and death-dealing? This fact of the dual forces in nature leads to an important principle. There is no good or evil *per se*, no "elixir of life" or "elixir of death," or poison, *per se*, but all this is contained in one and the same universal essence, this or the other effect, or result, depending on the degree of its differentiation and its various correlations. The *light side* of it produces life, health, bliss, divine peace, etc.; the *dark side* brings death, disease, sorrow and strife. *Deus est Demon inversus*.

How were the largest blocks of stone in the pyramids at Gizeh moved and raised into place? For Egyptologists, this is a mystery that has still not been solved satisfactorily. According to recent findings reported in *New Scientist*, the stones are much heavier than they have hitherto been thought to be, the largest of the four blocks to be found at the Third Pyramid weighing not 220 tonnes but 290 tonnes. The problem of how these vast blocks were moved has become even more baffling.

The Secret Doctrine throws some light on the antiquity of the pyramids and on their builders, which gives us a clue:

"The MIGHTY ONES perform their great works, and leave behind them everlasting monuments to commemorate their visit, every time they penetrate within our mayavic veil (atmosphere)," says a Commentary. Thus we are taught that the great Pyramids were built under their direct supervision, "when *Dhruva* (the then Pole-star) was at his lowest culmination, and the *Krittika* (Pleiades) looked over his head (were on the same meridian but

above) to watch the work of the giants." Thus, as the first pyramids were built at the beginning of a Sidereal year, under Dhruva (Alpha Polaris), it must have been over 31,000 years (31,105) ago. (I. 434-35)

The civilization of the Atlanteans was greater even than that of the Egyptians. It is their degenerate descendants, the nation of Plato's Atlantis, which built the first Pyramids in the country, and that certainly before the advent of the "Eastern Æthiopians," as Herodotus calls the Egyptians. This may be well inferred from the statement made by Ammianus Marcellinus, who says of the Pyramids that "there are also subterranean passages and winding retreats, which, it is said, men skilful in the ancient mysteries, by means of which they divined the coming of a flood, constructed in different places lest the memory of all their sacred ceremonies should be lost." These men who "divined the coming of floods" were not Egyptians, who never had any, except the periodical rising of the Nile. Who were they? The last remnants of the Atlanteans, we maintain. (II. 429)

The Atlanteans were giants in physical stature and the lifting of huge blocks of stone might not have posed the same problem for them as it does for us. But considering that the pyramids were built "under the direct supervision" of the "Mighty Ones," is it not possible that the blocks were moved not by sheer physical labour, but by other means? For instance, the levitation of objects can be made possible, by those who have the knowledge to do so, by "a change of polarity and of normal gravity, not yet admissible by science. (Cf. *Isis Unveiled*, I. xxiii-iv, 496-98.)

The chapter on "Egyptian Wisdom" in the first volume of *Isis Unveiled* throws further light on the wonderful architectural skill of these ancients:

No one, from Herodotus and Pliny down to the last wandering engineer who has gazed upon these imperial monuments of long-crumbled dynasties, has been able to tell us how the gigantic masses were transported and set up in place. Bunsen concedes to Egypt an antiquity of 20,000 years. But even in this matter we would be left to conjecture if we depended upon modern authorities. They can neither tell us for what the pyramids were constructed, under what dynasty the first was raised, nor the material of which they are built. All is conjecture with them. . . . One of the *Books of Hermes* describes certain of the pyramids as standing upon the sea-shore, "the waves of which dashed in powerless

fury against its base." This implies that the geographical features of the country have been changed, and may indicate that we must accord to these ancient "granaries," "magico-astrological observatories," and "royal sepulchres," an origin antedating the upheaval of the Sahara and other deserts. This would imply rather more of an antiquity than the poor few thousands of years, so generously accorded to them by Egyptologists. (I. 519-20)

Is it because the white-skinned Aryan races were never born "builders," like the Eastern Æthiopians, or dark-skinned Caucasians, and, therefore, never able to compete with the latter in such colossal structures, that we must jump at the conclusion that these grandiose temples and pyramids could only have been erected under the whip of a merciless despot? Strange logic! It would really seem more prudent to honestly confess at once, that we really know little about these ancient nations and that, except so far as purely hypothetical speculations go, unless we study in the same direction as the ancient priests did, we have as little chance in the future. (I. 525)

A report prepared by Japanese scientists, and just published in English, shows that the long-term consequences of the atom bombs dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima 36 years ago have been much more serious than predicted by earlier studies of the United Nations and other agencies (*The Times of India*, August 18). Medical checkups that are still being conducted on the 370,000 people exposed to radiation prove that "irreversible injury" has been caused to their cells, tissues and organs, often resulting in leukaemia and other diseases. Many have developed cataracts years after the bombings. And children exposed to radiation while still in the womb have grown up to be much smaller in stature than those who escaped it.

But the damage is not merely physical. The bombings have had enormous psychological and social consequences. Victims continue to live under stress, and the "psychological and spiritual shock" they have sustained is incalculable. They are constantly hounded by the fear that they may suddenly develop some incurable ailment as a result of "delayed radiation effects," or that their children might be born deformed. This leads to lack of interest in their work and loss of a sense of purpose. Many of them have become unbalanced and are prone to breakdowns.

Should this not provoke some thinking of value? The atomic bomb-

ings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and their aftermath have stunned the conscience of man; yet the stockpiling of nuclear weapons continues with unabated pace and forces us all back to the question whether the lesson has been learnt and whither we are tending.

Physicians are now prescribing laughter, not only to treat several physical and psychological ailments, but also to *prevent* diseases. *Science Digest*, in its issue for June 1981, states:

The very act of laughing is actually good exercise. In an average laugh, the diaphragm, thorax, abdomen, heart, lungs and possibly even the liver get a brief workout. Laughing can clear foreign matter from the respiratory system and speed up circulation and heart rate. If the laugh is especially vigorous it flexes muscles in the face, arms and legs. Humour also relieves boredom, tension, guilt, depression, headaches and backaches.

A recently developed hypothesis is that laughter stimulates the brain to produce hormones called catecholamines, such as epinephrine, norepinephrine and dopamine. Those hormones may then trigger the release of endorphins, natural opiates that can reduce pain or discomfort from arthritis, for example, or chronic allergy.

Without laughter, people would get sick more often and more severely, according to Dr. William Fry, of the psychiatry department of Stanford University Medical School. "Humour stirs the insides and gets the endocrine system going," he says, "which can be quite beneficial in alleviating disease."

A staunch advocate of the laugh-yourself-to-health approach, *Saturday Review* editor, Norman Cousins, who tried it out on himself, with great success. Inspired by his example, some hospitals and institutions have started to make use of the humour-health connection. In one experiment, a tumour went into remission after a cancer patient was exposed systematically to doses of humour. "Laughter is a good natural tranquilizer," says Dr. Raymond A Moody, author of *Laugh After Laugh: The Healing Powers of Humour*.

Laughter is peculiar to man and is rather an outlook towards life, an attitude of mind—which brings us to the mind-body relationship. The psychological processes involved in laughter and in the sense of humour in general need to be better known and afford a vast scope for research.