

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

“There is no Religion higher than Truth”

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

VOL. 52, No. 11

17th September 1982

EDUCATION: THE KEY

[Reprinted from THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, February 1944.—Eds.]

To SAY that education is the key to all our problems is stating a great fact, but it is not solving the problems. Between perception of a truth and full utilization of it stretches a long, long path. Students of Theosophy know this. They study the seven Golden Keys in *The Voice of the Silence*, perceiving their beauty, truth and usefulness, but they know that this perception has not brought them to Perfection — that is still a far goal! The Keys must be used in order that the user may unlock the gates on the Path. We must study, understand and embody those Keys: “Thou canst not travel on the Path before thou hast become that Path itself.” So, since we can see that education is a key to our world problems, let us try to come to a better and fuller understanding of all that that implies with the help of the light that Theosophy throws on the subject, and by making a few practical applications.

Only a few very general principles can be outlined here; a bird's-eye view of the chief problems given; and a few indications of how wrong education has contributed to produce, and right education could change, the terrible conditions that prevail. As parents, teachers and citizens we share the responsibility for the wrong education that has produced such horrors; and, more important, for what we can do to alleviate them.

On every sea and on every continent men are pitted against one another — slaughtering one another! This fact we must face. But worse, they have been *educated to do so!* Have you ever visited a children's toy store and seen the array of toy guns, cannons,

pistols, soldiers, tanks, bomber-planes, battleships; games based on war and slaughter; books glorifying war and slaughter? Have you ever bought any of these, or bows and arrows, slingshots and pop-guns, as toys for your little boys? Have you ever allowed them to play with such toys? Parents, if you have, you have started their education as killers; planted in their minds a disrespect for the sacredness of life; begun to familiarize them with the idea of slaughter.

Go further — have you looked into the textbooks used for educating your children? Again, war and conquest glorified; wholesale thefts and murders justified; butchers made into heroes; might made out to be right. Teachers, are you surprised that the adult can do what you have taught the boy and girl to admire and thrill to?

Go still further — some governments demand military training for all boys; some parents even in other countries send their boys to military schools — army and navy preparatory schools. Theosophy teaches us how potent early impressions are; every educator admits it. So, it is no great mystery what makes it possible for men to slaughter one another — they are educated for it.

But there are other factors also involved, relating more to *why* they are doing it. Let us classify in four broad departments the influences that contribute most to divide man from man, and place against these the four Principles which could serve as counterbalancing forces, binding all men into one Universal Brotherhood.

The first separative force is sectarian religion. Subtly, from babyhood, children are made to feel that *their* religion is superior; its god or gods better than all others; its rules and rituals and prayers, if not the only true ones, at least the most potent and necessary. Parents cause these impressions to form in their children's minds and continue this positive harm by sending them to sectarian schools. The harm done by exclusive, sectarian and communal schools is incalculable. The wars and atrocities that have taken place in the name of religion are the most bloody and frightful that history records, and schools conducted by or for any particular religion are the nurseries for such disasters in the future. Parents should not support or patronize, and teachers should refuse to teach in such schools. One sectarian religion is as bad as another.

The antidote to sectarianism? The teaching of *Universal Unity and Causation*. Our children should be shown that Truth is One, Causation is One, that there is One Divine Life, One Divine Law;

and that there is no religion higher than TRUTH. A proper comparative study of religions and philosophies, without prejudice, would break the shackles of sectarian claims and priestly imposture. Such study should be undertaken by Theosophical students so that they will be fitted to help and teach others, parents and educators.

The next potent separative force is race and colour prejudice. With the horrors before us that the Nazis have perpetrated on the Jews, we need not point to history for corroboration. The front-rank thinkers of many races have been warning the nations that the spectre of race and colour prejudice is threatening in many forms. How shall we overcome this danger? Not a few educators have observed that race and colour prejudices do not seem to be natural characteristics. Very young children never display them; they seem to be an artificial growth, *educated into children*. Let us stop at once educating our children in race and colour prejudices, preferences and hates! Have you ever said before your child, "Oh, he is a foreigner!" or, "They are not like us — they are black!" (or white, or brown, or yellow, as the case may be)? Have you ever said, "What can you expect? He is an American!" (or of any other nation not your own)? Such remarks — with their implications of superiority and inferiority based on race and colour instead of on inherent character — are the seeds of future persecutions of the innocent, like those that wring our hearts today.

The antidote to race and colour prejudice? The teaching of *Human Solidarity*. We must teach our children that everyone is a Soul belonging to the Human Family, living and learning on one earth — Humanity's School. Teach that moral worth, not birth in a particular race, is the test of a man; that racial type and colour are but the clothing of the Soul, and that clothes do not make the man.

Another factor that divides our human family is social standing based on birth or money. Many degrees of class and caste distinction exist in all countries. Those with more power exploit those with less; the bitter struggle from below upward and the bitter pressure from above downward are both hideous to behold. Householders, have you treated your servants with scorn and injustice, or allowed your children to do so? Have you thought or implied that their labour is less honourable than your own? Parents, have you sent your children to schools where those of wealthy and aristocratic families have their vanity and conceit pandered to till they

feel justified in looking down on and exploiting the less privileged? Teachers, do you favour the sons and daughters of the rich and influential regardless of individual merit? Do you foster competition in both study and sport, instead of right emulation? Do you reward the clever and hold up the dull to ridicule? If you do any of these things, need you feel surprised that we are in the grip of bitter struggles on a larger scale between Capital and Labour, Autocracy and Democracy, rich and poor?

The antidotes to all invidious distinctions, of caste and class, of wealth and natural endowments? The twin doctrines of the *Law of Karma* and *Reincarnation*. Only when we look upon each human being, young or old, as a Soul on this earth to learn from every circumstance and condition; only when we grasp the significance of the fact that each Soul must pass from race to race, religion to religion, caste to caste, in a long chain of many lives on earth in order to develop and unfold; only when we see that this process of learning and unfolding is under a just and immutable Law of cause and effect; then only can we eradicate all these prejudices from our hearts and minds, and so help others to do likewise.

Who will make a beginning in educating for a better future if not students of Theosophy?

WHEN Professor Einstein was asked at a dinner party, "How are we ever going to get a better world?" his reported reply was: "You have to have better people."

This simple and obvious fact, that you cannot have a world better than the units that compose it, has been understood by every world-teacher of whom we have record. Their philosophic or religious systems were all designed to meet that need. They came to "save" mankind from its animalistic and violent condition by helping it to evolve both by their precept and practice to a better and finer type of manhood.

—ESME WYNNE-TYSON

THE LOVE OF SERVICE : THE SERVICE OF LOVE

Self-doomed to live through future Kalpas, unthanked and unperceived by men; wedged as a stone with countless other stones which form the "Guardian Wall," such is thy future if the seventh Gate thou passest. Built by the hands of many Masters of Compassion, raised by their tortures, by their blood cemented, it shields mankind, since man is man, protecting it from further and far greater misery and sorrow.

—*The Voice of the Silence*

THE NATURAL OUTFLOW of love, even the most material, can find its expression only in the service of the object of love. The love of a mother for her child, of the miser for his hoard, of the patriot for his country, of the chela for his Guru, and of the aspiring Soul for the Divine, are but a few examples of the wide and varied types of the love-service relationship. Wherever love is found to be the motive power that impels a person to service, there the latter loses its all too familiar aspects of drudgery and becomes a dominant expression of the centre round which his life revolves.

As with love, so with service. Between selfish and selfless service lies the wide chasm of personality. Wherever there is selfishness, whether it be in love or service, there the eternal is dwarfed to the mutable, the Universal to the selective and the restricted. True service seeks for no returns, is invariably modest and rejoices most in its acts, big or small, of self-sacrifice and self-denial. Just as love immortal transmutes itself into a compassion that includes in its sweep every single unit of manifested life, so too does selfless service alchemize itself into a total sacrificial action generated not for the love of someone or some ideal, but for a love that embraces the whole of the human race and all things else in the universe. Love that is so sublimated can express itself in no other way save in the fulfilment of an all-encompassing brotherhood, and the true expression of such brotherhood finds its efflorescence in the care, the protection, the rescue and the salvation of any and all men as men. In this outpouring of sacrificial yet loving service there can exist no distinction of caste or colour, creed or sex, nor yet of the good, the not so good and the evil. This all-inclusive oneness in the eyes of him of the exalted service is forcibly brought out in the *Bhagavad-*

Gita. In Chapter VI of that scripture, Krishna says:

And whosoever, believing in spiritual unity, worships me who am in all things, dwelleth with me in whatsoever condition he may be. He, O Arjuna, who by the similitude found in himself seeth but one essence in all things, whether they be evil or good, is considered to be the most excellent devotee.

This similitude between oneself and all creation is not to be found by a reliance either on the physical or the astral aspects of man and nature. It is to be found and recognized and embraced in the spiritual essence that pervades all things and from which neither the man of most evil ways nor the most devastating and catastrophic aspects of nature are exempt.

Steeped in its craze for materiality, the world is wont to evaluate service by bringing it under the scrutiny of the senses, the emotions and the cold deductive reasoning of the lower mind. It thus formulates norms for behaviour which do not and cannot rise above the ephemeral and perishable side of existence. Not knowing of the higher mind, it denies its existence. Rejecting the possibility of invoking the divine afflatus, it brushes it all off as the fabrication of hallucinated minds. Thus it comes about that, among those who wield temporal power, the noble concept of service is not talked about and much less extolled. Thus, where loving, sacrificial action should reign supreme, there is planted the idea of a barter — so much service given must yield as much compensatory return or else the service turns into an extravagance and a waste. The canker of selfishness has so proliferated in life that if the person, the group or the nation finds that the return it gets from its service is to its way of thinking inadequate, it immediately seeks to lower its standard of service to compensate for the inadequate return. How this wrong concept plays havoc with men's souls may be seen in labour-management distrust and in international manoeuvres to steal a march over other more needy nations. Service in such degenerate forms cannot yield anything but a poisonous crop. It promotes not good-will but strife; it forces nations to change alignments and even enter into partnership with forces of wickedness and evil; it makes of a man a hard, calculating and crafty person who weighs the gain to himself and adjusts his behaviour accordingly.

In the ultimate reckoning, it will be found that in true service you have to make your own interests subservient to the interests of

another. True service can never question the validity and relevance of its duty, but discharge these regardless of any consequence to itself. With the tone of service pitched that high, can an average man aspire to such service? Yes, if he continues in his efforts to establish a rapport with the immortal part of himself where alone true Love abides in its ideal and unadulterated form. However, he has to reach up to this eminence from the pool of mire in which he stands. He has to start from such lowly levels and try to copy in active earth-life the effulgence and the dignity which accompany true service—a service that the highest self delights to render. Such a discipline becomes in reality an exercise in the arousing to activity of the master faculty of imagination. This exercise resembles the building of a bridge from this side of earth-life—a bridge thrown across the turbid and turbulent waters of insatiable desires for a safe transit to the only secure haven of refuge where the highest Self awaits the return of the questing soul.

There come times in each man's life when he finds that instead of getting the help which he expects, he faces unjust criticism from those brother disciples to whom he turns for encouragement and guidance. Personal injustice, even thinly hidden jealousy, he will have to expect and learn to take in his stride. 'These pinpricks are valuable opportunities that test and strengthen his adherence to love and charity. Does he react violently to such acts of injustice that others are wont to pile on him? Does he feel dejected? Does he think that his own barking will silence the pack of barking dogs that snap at his heels? Then does he lose his hold on love, and losing it he seeks in his torment to return to the law of the jungle and that cruder retaliatory concept of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Conversely, he has to be on guard lest too soon he considers himself as one apart from the mass and in his new-found arrogance looks upon another's act of service as inadequate and paltry. Such harsh judgements are indications of the paucity and superfluity of his own concept of charity-based service. Where the aspirant comes across the efforts of a brother weaker than himself and finds these efforts feeble and not effective of much good, it would be far, far better and nobler if he himself picks up that "paltry" act of service from the point where his weaker brother abandoned it and makes it bear fruit a hundredfold the while he sedulously practises self-effacement. By so doing, he serves the cause

of that brotherhood that discovers the same divine essence in all things and everywhere. Chances of such high service come to all and are either seized or ignored in proportion as the ideal of loving service has been deeply imbibed or is being traded at its lip-value.

That service is truly poor which neither instructs, nor blesses, nor elevates. Where love does not overbrood the act, where the hydra-headed desires are allowed free rein, where competition and rivalry and animosity course through the nerves of the person, there are sown seeds that bring forth an evil brood. The world suffers from such service.

There are many who think that joining a cause and serving it will in time effect the great transmutation in their lives. They but delude themselves. Many such have fallen by the wayside when they discovered that they were only marking time and that their service remained barren of results both to themselves and to others. The initial enthusiasm wore off in time and then their service became a chore and a drudgery — a bitter medicine that had lost its healing essence. Where did they fail? If they would submit their plight to a deeper analysis they would invariably find that they felt resentful when their love remained unrequited or was even spurned. They would also find that they had abandoned the discipline of submitting their actions for scrutiny by the higher tribunal of their Soul and had thus forfeited its instruction and guidance. They failed because they did not rekindle their burnt-out torches at the immortal flame. Seeing this and realizing their errors, they can always pick themselves up and renew their onward march towards the eternal. There are still others, and not a few either, who flaunt their service before them like a banner. They seek all opportunities to show how loyal they have been to their ideal and how they have multiplied their deeds of service. At the slightest provocation they open the flood-gates of their woes — how they meekly suffer “in silence” the blows of a cruel fate that rewards with torture and ill-fame their service of others. Theirs is a sorry lot, for though they started right, they fell from their high estate and began looking for adulation and sympathy from those who were not competent to judge their intrinsic merit or the lack of it.

There can be no real service, or love, or sacrifice, unless the individual establishes an unbreakable link with the highest in himself, and from that position of a benign strength seeks to work his wonders

in the world of men. It is only when he realizes to some extent the greatness of his service that he begins to glimpse the validity of the truth contained in the injunction given in *The Voice of the Silence*:

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

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

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

These tears, O thou of heart most merciful, these are the streams that irrigate the fields of charity immortal. . . .

THE HITHERTO very esoteric doctrine of the *Nirmanakayas* was lately brought forward and explained in the treatise called *The Voice of the Silence*. These *Nirmanakayas* are the *Bodhisattvas* or late Adepts, who having reached Nirvana and liberation from rebirth, renounce it voluntarily in order to remain invisibly amidst the world to help poor ignorant Humanity within the lines permitted by Karma. These are the *real* SPIRITS of the disembodied men, and we recognize no others. The rest are either *Devachanees* to whose plane the spirit of the living medium must ascend, and who therefore, can never descend to our plane, or *spooks* of the first water. But then no *Nirmanakaya* will influence any man for the benefit of the latter for his own weal, or to save him from anything save death, and that only if the man's life is useful. By the fruit we recognize the tree. Units are as the leaves of that tree for them; and they look forward to benefit and save *the trunk*, not to concern themselves with its every leaf, whether good, bad, or indifferent. Even living Adepts have no such right.

—*Lucifer*, November 1889

WHAT IS MATTER AND WHAT IS FORCE ?

I

[In *The Theosophist* for September 1882, H.P.B. published a criticism by "A Theosophist" upon some statements made by Col. H. S. Olcott in a lecture delivered by the latter at Madras. The critic, taking exception to the remark that "Electricity cannot, except under prepared conditions, be seen, yet it is *matter*," contended that it is not matter at all, but a force. To this was appended a longish reply, which H.P.B. has stated elsewhere was written by one of the Adepts. In this and in our next issue we reprint the major portion of this reply.—EDS.]

"As a question of science"—which, as such, has to be strictly kept within the boundaries of modern materialistic science—all "discussion on this subject," however "desirable," would prove, on the whole, unprofitable. Firstly, because science confines herself only to the physical aspects of the conservation of energy or correlation of forces; and, secondly, because, notwithstanding her own frank admissions of helpless ignorance of the ultimate causes of things, judging by the tone of our critic's article, I doubt whether he would be willing to admit the utter unaptness of some of the scientific terms as approved by the Dwija, the "twice-born" of the Royal Society, and obediently accepted by their easily persuaded admirers. In our age of freedom of thought and cheap paradox, party spirit reigns supreme, and science has become more intolerant, if possible, than even theology. The only position, therefore, that could be safely assumed by a student of esoteric philosophy against (evidently) a champion of the *exact* science, in a discussion upon the appropriateness of certain modern scientific terms, would be to fight the latter with his own weapons, yet without stirring an inch from one's own ground. And this is just what I now propose to do....

To show the better the right we have to assume an attitude of opposition against certain arbitrary assumptions of modern science, and to hold our own views, I must be permitted to make a short digression and to remind our critic of a few unanswerable points. The bare fact that modern science has been pleased to divide and subdivide the atmosphere into a whole host of elements, and to call them so for her own convenience, is no authoritative reason why the Occultists should accept that terminology. Science has

never yet succeeded in decomposing a single one of the many simple bodies, miscalled "elementary substances," for which failure, probably, the latter have been named by her "elementary." And whether she may yet, or never may, succeed in that direction in time, and thus recognize her error, in the meanwhile we, Occultists, permit ourselves to maintain that the alleged "primordial" atoms would be better specified under any other name but that one. With all the respect due to the men of science, the terms "element" and "elementary" applied to the ultimate atoms and molecules of matter of which they know nothing, do not seem in the least justifiable. It is as though the Royal Society agreed to call every star a "Kosmos," because each star is supposed to be a world like our own planet, and then would begin taunting the ancients with ignorance since they knew but of one *Kōsmos*—the boundless infinite universe! So far, however, science admits herself that the words "elements" and "elementary," unless applied to primordial principles, or self-existing essences out of which the universe was evolved, are unfortunate terms; and remarks thereupon that "experimental science deals only with legitimate deductions from the facts of observation, and *has nothing to do with any kind of essences except those which it can see, smell, or taste.*" Professor J. P. Cooke tells us that "Science leaves all others to the metaphysicians" (*New Chemistry*, 1877).

This stern *pronunciamento*, which shows the men of science refusing to take anything *on faith*, is immediately followed by a very curious admission made by the same author. "Our theory, I grant, may all be wrong," he adds, "and there may be no such things as molecules (!) . . . The new chemistry assumes, *as its fundamental postulate, that the magnitudes we call molecules are realities; but this is only a postulate.*" We are thus made to suspect that the exact science of chemistry needs to take as well as *transcendental* metaphysics something on blind faith. Grant her the postulate—and her deductions make of her an *exact* science; deny it—and the "exact science" falls to pieces! Thus, in this respect, physical science does not stand higher than psychological science, and the Occultists need fear but very little of the thunderbolts of their most *exact* rivals. Both are, to say the least, on a par. The chemist, though carrying his subdivision of molecules further than the physicist, can no more than he experiment on individual molecules.

One may even remind both that none of them has ever seen *an individual* molecule. Nevertheless, and while priding themselves upon taking nothing on faith, they admit that they cannot often follow the subdivision of molecules with the eye, but “can discern it with the intellect.” What more, then, do they do than the Occultists, the alchemists, the adepts? While they discern with the “intellect,” the adept, as he maintains, can as easily discern the subdivisibility *ad infinitum* of that which his rival of the *exact* methods pleases to call an “*elementary* body,” and he follows it — with the *spiritual* in addition to his *physical* intellect....

But we must pass to the more important question now and see how far science is justified in regarding electricity as a force, and Colonel Olcott — with all the other Eastern Occultists — in maintaining that it is “*still matter.*” Before we open the discussion, I must be allowed to remark that since “a Theosophist” wants to be *scientifically* accurate, he ought to remember that science does not call electricity a *force*, but only one of the many manifestations of the same; a mode of action or motion. Her list of the various kinds of energy which occur in nature is long, and many are the names she uses to distinguish them. With all that, one of her most eminent adepts, Professor Balfour Stewart — one of the authorities he quotes against our President — warns his readers (see *The Forces and Energies of Nature*) that their enumeration has nothing *absolute* or *complete* about it, “representing, as it does, not so much the present state of our knowledge as *of our want of knowledge, or rather profound ignorance of the ultimate constitution of matter.*” So great is that ignorance, indeed, that treating upon heat, a mode of motion far less mysterious and better understood than electricity, that scientist confesses that “if heat be not a species of motion, it must necessarily be a species of matter,” and adds that the men of science “have *preferred* to consider heat as a species of motion to the alternative of supposing the creation of a *peculiar kind of matter.*”

And if so, what is there to warrant us that science will not yet find out her mistake some day, and recognize and call electricity, in agreement with the Occultists — “a species of a peculiar kind of matter”?

Thus, before the too dogmatic admirers of modern science take the Occultists to task for viewing electricity under one of its aspects — and for maintaining that its basic principle is — MATTER,

they ought at first to demonstrate that science errs when she herself, through the mouthpiece of her recognized high-priests, confesses her ignorance as to what is properly Force and what is Matter. For instance, the same Professor of Natural Philosophy, Mr. Balfour Stewart, LL.D., F.R.S., in his lectures on "The Conservation of Energy," tells us as follows:

We know nothing, or next to nothing, of the ultimate structure and properties of matter, whether organic or inorganic, and . . . it is, in truth, only a convenient classification and nothing more.

Furthermore, one and all, the men of science admit that, though they possess a definite knowledge of the general laws, yet they "have no knowledge of individuals in the domains of physical science." For example, they *suspect* "a large number of our diseases to be caused by organic germs," but they have to avow that their "ignorance about these germs is most complete." And in the chapter "What is Energy?" the same great naturalist staggers the too confiding profane by the following admission:

If our knowledge of the nature and habits of organized molecules be so small, our knowledge of the ultimate molecules of inorganic matter is, if possible, still smaller. . . . It thus appears that we know little or nothing about the shape or size of molecules, or about the forces which actuate them . . . the very largest masses of the universe sharing with the very smallest this property of being beyond the scrutiny of the human senses.

Of *physical* "human senses" he must mean, since he knows little, if anything, of any other senses. But let us take note of some further admissions; this time by Professor Le Conte in his lecture on the *Correlation of Vital with Chemical and Physical Forces*:

. . . Since the distinction between force and energy is very imperfectly, or not at all, defined in the higher forms of force, and especially in the domain of life . . . our language cannot be more precise until our ideas in this department are far clearer than now.

Even as regards the familiar liquid — water — science is at a loss to decide whether the oxygen and hydrogen exist, as such, in water, or whether they are produced by some unknown and unconceived transformation of its substances. "It is a question," says Mr. J. P. Cooke, Professor of Chemistry, "about which we may

speculate, but in regard to which we have no knowledge. Between the qualities of water and the qualities of these gases there is not the most distant resemblance." All they know is that water can be decomposed by an electrical current; but why it is so decomposed, and then again recombined, or what is the nature of that they call electricity, etc., they do not know. Hydrogen, moreover, was till very lately one of the very few substances which was known only in its aeriform condition. It is the lightest form of matter known.¹ For nearly sixty years, ever since the days when Davy liquefied chlorine, and Thilorier carbonic acid under a pressure of fifty atmospheres — five gases had always resisted manipulation — hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, carbonic oxide, and finally bioxide of nitrogen. Theoretically they might be reduced, but no means could be found by which they could be dealt with practically, although Berthelot had subjected them to a pressure of 800 atmospheres. There, however, where Faraday and Dumas, Regnault and Berthelot had failed, M. Cailletet, a comparatively unknown student of science, but a few years ago achieved a complete success. On the 16th of December, 1878, he liquefied oxygen in the laboratory of the "Ecole Normale," and on the 30th of the same month he succeeded in reducing even the refractory hydrogen. Mr. Raoul Pictet, of Geneva, went still further. Oxygen and hydrogen were not only liquefied, but *solidified*, as the experiment — by illuminating with electric light the jet as it passed from the tubes containing the two gases, and finding therein incontestable signs of polarization which implies the suspension of solid particles in the gas — proved it.²

There is not an atom in nature but contains latent or potential electricity which manifests under known conditions. Science knows that matter generates what it calls force, the latter manifesting itself under various forms of energy — such as heat, light, electricity, magnetism, gravitation, etc. — yet that same science has hitherto been unable, as we find from her own admissions, as given above, to determine with any certainty where matter ends and force (or spirit, as some call it) begins. Science, while rejecting metaphysics and relegating it through her mouthpiece, Professor Tyndall, to

¹ A cubic yard of air at the temperature of 77 deg. Fahr. weighs about two pounds, while a cubic yard of hydrogen weighs only 2½ ounces.

² Article of Mr. Henry de Parville, one of the best of the French popularizers of science — *Journal des Débats*.

the domain of poetry and fiction, unbridles as often as any metaphysician her wild fancy, and allows mere hypotheses to run races on the field of unproved speculation. All this she does, as in the case of the molecular theory, with no better authority for it than the paradoxical necessity for the philosophy of every science to arbitrarily select and assume imaginary fundamental principles; the only proof offered in the way of demonstrating the actual existence of the latter being a certain harmony of these principles with observed facts. Thus, when men of science imagine themselves subdividing a grain of sand to the ultimate molecule they call oxide of silicon, they have no *real* but only an *imaginary* and purely hypothetical right to suppose that, if they went on dividing it further (which, of course, they cannot) the molecule, separating itself into its chemical constituents of silicon and oxygen, would finally yield that which *has* to be regarded as two *elementary bodies* — since the authorities so regard them! Neither an atom of silicon, nor an atom of oxygen, is capable of any further subdivision into something else — they say. But the only good reason we can find for such a strange belief is, because they have tried the experiment and — failed.

How can they tell that a new discovery, some new invention of still finer and more perfect apparatuses and instruments may not show their error some day? How do they know that those very bodies now called “elementary atoms” are not in their turn compound bodies or molecules, which, when analysed with still greater minuteness, may show containing in themselves the *real*, primordial, elementary globules, the *gross* encasement of the still finer atom-spark — the spark of LIFE, the source of Electricity — MATTER still! Truly has Henry Kunrath, the greatest of the alchemists and Rosicrucians of the Middle Ages, shown spirit in man — as in every atom — as a bright flame enclosed within a more or less transparent globule, which he calls *soul*. And since the men of science confessedly know nothing of (a) the origin of either matter or force; (b) nor of electricity or life; and (c) their knowledge of the ultimate molecules of inorganic matter amounts to a cipher; why, I ask, should any student of Occultism, whose great masters *may* know, perchance, of essences which the professors of modern materialistic school can neither “see, smell, nor taste,” why should he be expected to take their definitions as to what *is* MATTER and what FORCE as the last word of unerring, infallible science?

“Men of science,” our critic tells us, “employ in turn as agents of exploration, light, heat, magnetism, electricity and sound”; and at the same time he enunciates the now heretical proposition, “that these several manifestations of force are *imponderable*.” I respectfully suggest that when he speaks of *imponderable* agents he sins against the decrees of his great masters. Let him study the books published upon the newly reorganized chemistry based upon what is known as “Avogadro’s Law”; and then he will learn that the term *imponderable* agents is now regarded as a scientific absurdity. The latest conclusions at which modern chemistry has arrived, it seems, have brought it to reject the word *imponderable*, and to make away with those textbooks of *pre-modern* science, which refer the phenomena of heat and electricity to *attenuated forms of matter*. Nothing, they hold, can be added to, or subtracted from, bodies without altering their weight. This was said and written in 1876, by one of the greatest chemists in America. With all that, have they become any the wiser for it? Have they been able to replace by a more scientific theory the old and tabooed “phlogiston theory” of the science of Stahl, Priestley, Scheele and others? — or, because they have proved, to their own satisfaction, that it is highly unscientific to refer the phenomena of heat and electricity to attenuated forms of matter have they succeeded at the same time in proving what are really Force, Matter, Energy, Fire, Electricity — LIFE? The *Phlogiston* of Stahl — a theory of combustion taught by Aristotle and the Greek philosophers — as elaborated by Scheele, the poor Swedish apothecary, a secret student of Occultism, who, as Professor Cooke says of him, “added more knowledge to the stock of chemical science in a single year than did Lavoisier in his lifetime,” was not a mere fanciful speculation, though Lavoisier was permitted to taboo and upset it. But, indeed, were the high priests of modern science to attach more weight to the essence of things than to mere generalizations, then, perhaps, would they be in a better position to tell the world more of the “ultimate structure of matter” than they are now.

Lavoisier, as it is well known, did not add any new fact of prime importance by upsetting the phlogiston theory, but only added “a grand generalization.” But the Occultists prefer to hold to the fundamental theories of ancient sciences. No more than the authors of the *old* theory do they attach to phlogiston — which has its specific name as one of the attributes of *Akasa* — the idea of weight which the

uninitiated generally associate with all matter. And though to us it is a *principle*, a well-defined essence, whereas to Stahl and others it was an *undefined* essence — yet, no more than we, did they view it as *matter* in the sense it has for the present men of science. As one of their modern professors puts it: “Translate the *phlogiston* by *energy*, and in Stahl’s work on Chemistry and Physics, of 1731, put *energy* where he wrote *phlogiston*, and you have . . . our great modern doctrine of conservation of energy.” Verily so; it is the “great modern doctrine,” only — *plus* something else, let me add. Hardly a year after these words had been pronounced, the discovery by Professor Crookes of *radiant matter* — of which, further on — has nigh upset again all their previous theories.

(To be concluded)

ONE of the occult doctrines which has been most often laughed at by the incredulous scientasters of the Press and popular platforms, is the assertion that electricity is an entity, having a substantial existence. How often have the wise critics poured scorn on the heads of Theosophists for believing such wild nonsense, in the face of infallible modern science, which had long ago proved (save the mark!) that electricity, and light and heat, was a form of energy!

But in this respect, as in so many others, the Nemesis of Truth has overtaken our slanderers. In the latest, most thoroughly orthodox textbook on Electricity, by Professor Oliver Lodge, in the *Nature Series*, that “scientific authority” declares in the name of the most advanced science that electricity is *not* energy — whatever it may be — and upholds the doctrine that electricity is *ETHER*, or if not ether itself, then certainly a “form of its manifestation.” The Whirligig of time brings strange revenges, and the one now cited is but the forerunner of many another case in which “orthodox” and “infallible” science will quietly appropriate occult teachings without one word of acknowledgment, teaching as facts the very doctrines which for years it has scorned as “unscientific charlatanry.” *Ex uno disce omnes.*

—H. P. BLAVATSKY (*Lucifer*, July 1890)

SUFFERING

IN THE LIGHT OF REINCARNATION AND KARMA

WHAT do we mean by suffering? What has Theosophy to say on suffering? Some people think only of escaping it. Yet it is said: "Woe to those who live without suffering" — there is no possibility of growth without it.

Suffering affects us on several planes of being. Physical suffering, whether from disease, starvation, torture from human violence, or hurt from the force of the elements — heat, cold, wind, etc. — this is perhaps the most obvious and spectacular form of suffering. But also to be considered is inner suffering, involving emotions, passions, desires, frustrations, linked around self-egotism. Psychological suffering has deeper roots in the nature than physical. The pangs of unrequited love or lust, hurt feelings, or vanity, the agony of loneliness, fierce remorse, deadly jealousy — we all suffer these to some extent and they do not heal so readily by themselves and are likely to recur. The higher level of mental suffering is connected with problems of conscience, conflicting duties, questions of injustice and the sense of desolation when truth evades us and doubts assail.

Yet at all three levels, men seek out and cherish difficulties that bring what most people would consider as suffering. Mountaineers, yachtsmen and others challenge the elements and endure hardships with a sense of satisfaction. Mortification of the flesh is sought by Eastern and Western ascetics. Suffering becomes their comfort. On the emotional level, apart from the folk who are "never happy unless they are miserable," there are others who cherish their sensibility and sensitivity, however excessive, because it makes them "different" when they look, so to say, at themselves in the mirror.

Yet there is a higher, nobler aspect to suffering, and mental suffering has the possibility of opening the gate to the higher. In the conflict of duties, the agonies of conscience in the dark, doubting night of the soul, the despondency experienced by Arjuna on the battlefield — with these, if the mind turned upward to the higher nature, with reliance and pressure on that, then the answer and the help that is needed do come. The dark night precludes the dawn of spiritual advancement, of an awakening to the true, immortal and divine nature. And, even when we tread the spiritual path, there will

still be suffering — since it is essential to growth. There is suffering taken on deliberately by the personality under the inspiration of the Soul-Ego, for the purpose of developing Soul qualities that only difficulties can bring out — strength, patience, perseverance, will, compassion for others, adaptability and resourcefulness — these active, immortal attributes are carried forward from life to life.

There is also the case of accepting pain and trouble, even persecution and enmity, if these are concomitant with the good that is sought. The mother accepts the pains of childbirth and the responsibilities that often seem a limitation, for the sake of the family. The reformer knowingly faces martyrdom for the sake of an ideal, and in pity for those who are crying out in their need. There is, of course, also a false side to this — the fanatic who actually seeks out martyrdom, since its intensity of sensation enhances his or her sense of egotism.

How can we begin to make deliberate use of suffering? We can recognize sometimes that pain is a warning of some wrong course of action by ourselves, but where suffering, whether physical, emotional or mental, seems to be caused by outside factors, people tend to think of it as chance, the “cussedness” of things, or as springing from other people’s actions, injustice, cruelty, or whatever it may be. The religiously inclined may speak of the incomprehensible will of God, but most people today would blame their circumstances, their family heredity or upbringing, their employers, or the Government for whatever handicaps they suffer. It is all the fault of those who are so cruel and uncaring towards them!

Now this is the attitude to pain and suffering that needs to be changed. The saying, “Ye suffer from yourselves,” is not cruel and harsh, since it means it is in our power to change. Reliance on the two interlocking laws of reincarnation and karma gives the power to do so, since it means the recognition that the real man assumes different personalities, but at the same time the balance of action-reaction carries over through the stream of lives. Whatever we think, feel or do, we shall finish by being at the receiving end — an aspect of the universal law of cycles, that of sowing and reaping.

So suffering affords the best way of evaluating our actions. It is also a restoration of balance — dynamic, because always changing with fresh activity on all three planes. If we go through the experience without making use of it, perhaps resentfully, then we

may call it punishment. If we have gained something constructive from the Soul point of view, then it is precious. Good and bad karma do not depend on circumstances. Illness, poverty and disability are bad karma if nothing of value to the Soul is learned from them. If any of them help the person to awaken Soul qualities, then they are "pleasing to Ishwara," *i.e.*, good karma.

To come back to the difficult point of "Ye suffer from yourselves," it is true that men and women are cruel and unjust, or neglectful of their fellow-beings, thereby creating painful karmic effects for their own future. And others have the right and duty to circumvent the cruelty and injustice if they can do so without falling into the same trap themselves. It is only too easy to execute one man for murdering another, but, karmically, it is wrong. Vendettas, too, are a vicious circle. But one must also ask why the victims were at that particular place at that particular time, with their particular circumstances, so that they became the victims. Not chance, but a concatenation of past actions—remembering also that we never act alone, but always in conjunction with others. Why are the egos coming to rebirth born in a particular family and not in another? Is it because of past ties or connections? Why are some handicapped and some seemingly favoured? It is past actions working out, though those now favoured may still have many black pages in their life's long record, mistakes and wickednesses still to be worked out and balanced. It is not what comes to us, as seeming good or seeming evil, that counts in reality, it is what we learn from it.

Through good and evil the soul comes to a knowledge of itself, and then begins the task of learning to work for the whole of life. The culmination of that still means sacrifice. Buddhas may raise themselves above the sorrows of life and its limitations, may merge themselves in Nirvana, absolute sorrowless bliss, yet this is, paradoxically, a loss. Greater than these are the Buddhas of Compassion. For, though they have reached Nirvana and live in its timeless, boundless Light, paradoxically they still work in the shadow with the sorrowful children of men, pointing out the way to salvation from the illusions of matter, and giving whatever aid karma permits. Though this Path of Compassion is called the Path of Woe, it is no longer sorrow for themselves that is felt, but a boundless pity for all those still caught up in selfishness and ignorance, not yet

awake to the call of the Spirit, and thus prisoners of their self-created suffering. This, too, is the constant inspiration and task of the eternal Theosophical Movement.

[The article which follows, "On the Screen of Time," in a way supplements the above, and a reflection on their joint message is invited.—EDS.]

MEDICAL SCIENCE today is no longer able to understand or treat many of the current serious diseases of our time, because it sees the human body as something like a machine made of separate parts. There are different specialists dealing with different parts who very often do not take into account how these parts interrelate, how body and mind are interdependent and how this whole organism is embedded in a social system and in a natural environment. All these are very important aspects of illness. And, since the world view underlying current medical science is not appropriate to dealing with this interconnectedness, we can very often not deal with our most serious illnesses.

Now, a very similar phenomenon can be observed, for example, in economics, where economists tend to separate the economy from the social system and the ecosystem in which it is embedded. They therefore use their basic concepts, like profit, productivity, gross national product and so on, in a very narrow way, and they can't understand phenomena like inflation, for instance, which have to be seen in their broader social and ecological context. The world is so densely populated that there is no single problem that can be separated from the larger environment. . . .

I very often call it an ecological perspective -- an awareness which tells you that the world is fundamentally interdependent, that all phenomena depend on one another. We are embedded in a natural environment and we are embedded in a social environment and all these have to be taken into account. So we have to realize that when we destroy our natural environment, or pollute it, or in some other way degrade it, this will ultimately destroy ourselves. This is the awareness we need.

—FRITJOF CAPRA

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME

[Reprinted from *The Path*, August 1895.—Eds.]

IN a recent contribution to an English magazine, a writer on Theosophy makes Pain the very centre of manifested nature. The universe, it is there said, was produced through the self-sacrifice of the Logos, and self-sacrifice is made synonymous with pain. From that first agony all things have since subsisted on physical and mental torture; all growth has been the result of pain. Pain is to be welcomed as an honoured guest. Remains the truth at first repellent, it is said, then austere but attractive, finally peace-giving and inspiring, that each step upward is only won by pain. Pleasure, happiness are not named. A picture is drawn of blood and tears and broken hearts that must make the ordinary reader marvel at this strange philosophy. Such a view stands out in vivid contrast to the old legend which made the universe the result of a great shout of laughter from the gods. They could contain their joy no longer, and in one long peal of merriment the worlds were born. Opposites indeed! Neither view is correct when taken apart, and it is unfortunate that this writer on Theosophy should have insisted upon one of nature's poles to the entire exclusion of the other. The duality which exists throughout this period of manifestation, or Manvantara, is fully explained in the *Bhagavad-Gita*. Heat and cold, light and darkness, pleasure and pain are opposites. One opposite cannot exist apart from the other. Growth does not take place by means of pain alone, any more than through pleasure alone, but is the result of oscillations between the two extremes. Above these two extremes there is a third state which may be called Contentment. In that state both pleasure and pain are accepted equally. Preference is not given to one mode of force any more than to the other. All these phenomena of consciousness can be interpreted in terms of vibration, and just as a bad smell can be transformed into a sweet odour by changing the vibration of the "odoriferous ether," so intense agony can reach a point when it becomes indistinguishable from delight. So with enjoyment: it can become so intense that it loses its character and is called painful. A good instance of this was given the other day by the great Italian tenor Tamagno, who confided the fact to an interviewer that some music gave him such delight that he suffered agonies from it!

So it is impossible to consider pain as central or as something superior to pleasure. The philosopher, according to the *Gita*, regards both with an "equal mind." The worship of one at the expense of the other is unhealthy, besides being unphilosophical.

Once a vision was seen.¹ The seer is known to the writer by letter only, though well known. He was in Paris. Passing up from the Luxembourg Gardens, along narrow streets that seem to be a centre of equal attraction for priests, restaurants and funerals — though hiding perhaps beneath this safe disguise an inner life of different and loftier order — he came out upon the *Quai* directly opposite the site of the Tuileries. Leaning over the parapet, gazing at the muddy waters of the Seine, his thoughts were in no way enticed by the miles of second-hand bookstalls that extend along the south side of the river. Their volumes in every language and on every subject (a battered *Key* among the rest!), rare and curious, cheap and very nasty, no more occupied his mind than the tragedy of the fallen Empire which had played its last stake within two hundred yards of where he stood. Paris, once the temple of Pleasure and still the *rendezvous* of pleasure-seekers, was all in holiday attire. Laughter was in the air — but what are surroundings to a man whose mind is occupied with thoughts that are worth the thinking? Nothing. Truly it is the mind which makes the surroundings, and Archimedes was neither the first nor the last thinker who has remained faithful to a thought during the sacking of his city.

My friend soon found realistically the truth of this oft-repeated adage. He had been pondering over the history of a life, a friend's life; studying it, not unkindly, but in relation to universal principles and with fraternal sympathy. He came down along the record of events until he reached the present. Looking out across the river, gazing without sight at what had once been the palace of a tinsel Caesar, there suddenly appeared to him a gray figure, stooping, meditative. Then it waxed clearer and he saw that the head of the figure was bent over some object held in the hand. It seemed that the whole being — the mind, heart and soul of this silent spectre — were rivetted on this one object. My friend looked more closely to discover what this was: only a worm, a poor, struggling worm transfixed on a pin, writhing in agony. A feeling of disgust

¹ The writer evidently renders an experience of Mr. Judge's — EDS., THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

at the cruelty of it came over him and he turned to reproach the torturer, who had not seen him, who had eyes for nothing but the sufferings of the captive worm, regarding it with interested pity and yet with satisfaction. "Why not take it off—?" my friend began. but as he turned to speak he started back in momentary horror. The figure was that of the person whose life-history he had been pondering, and the worm, as he now saw, bore a similar likeness—the picture of a mind gloating over its own self-inflicted sufferings.

Then all vanished. A company of French infantry passed by him with strident bugling that could be heard for miles. It sounded miles away. The picture still fascinated him. The pity of it! For it was true: this had been the symbol of that life. The Worship of Pain; a sublimated form of selfishness that longed for a martyr's crown, but which would welcome the martyrdom for its own sake, even without the crown. A selfishness that in its grosser form would be but hypocrisy and conceit. A passion for pain which made it seem that to inflict it on others was to confer a benefit rather than a wrong. How could they grow without pain? See how *I* have grown through pain! A disease, my brothers, a disease of the mind. "Think not that breaking bone, that rending flesh and muscle, unites thee to thy "silent Self," And remember that "these vices of the ordinary man pass through a subtle transformation, and reappear with changed aspect in the heart of the disciple." The St. Dominic of yesterday may well continue to try to purify the souls of others and his own, by the pain he thinks it right to inflict, though now perhaps he uses some mental torture. The St. Simeon Stylites of one life may pass from racking his body for "the greater glory of God," to racking his mind, and with the same motive. He may now cry as then, though in different form:

O my sons, my sons . . . mortify
Your flesh, like me, with scourges and with thorns;
Smite, shrink not, spare not . . .

* * * * *

O Jesus, if thou wilt not save my soul,
Who may be saved? Who is it may be saved?
Who may be made a saint, if I fail here,
Show me the man hath suffer'd more than I.

But that is not Theosophy: nor is it Occultism. It is far removed

from either. Once more we see that growth does not depend upon the amount of pain or pleasure that is endured, but upon our attitude of mind towards all that may meet us on life's journey. "It is not *what* is done, but the spirit in which the least thing is done that is counted." Extremes are always dangerous. To follow "the Middle Path" requires a broad mind that can recognize the duality running throughout the whole of nature and that can adapt itself to either mode of force with lightning-like acceptance, meeting the pleasure and the pain, the failure and the success, with unmoved centre. It is not an easy path to travel, but those who try to follow it and who continue trying *shall succeed*.

—JULIUS

THE LIVING STREAM OF THOUGHT

THE GREAT PHILOSOPHERS and teachers are the glory of humanity. No country can claim them as its peculiar property or demand credit for their appearance in its midst. Nor does the message of the world's great thinkers and teachers belong to any given age. The hall-mark of truth, as of art, is its universality. That which is true, like that which is beautiful, possesses a validity that is of place as little as of time.

But there is pride of time, subtler and more widespread than pride of place. It exalts the present era. The latest scientific theory, the book just off the press, the *dernier cri* in art, drama, education, philosophy — that is the best. "The new age speaks; let all the voices of the past be still!" Such pride we could imagine the leaves feeling that flutter for a season on a tree. "See, we have life and motion, all the rest is dead wood merely, that we try to hide." But where were they without the moving sap that courses through the trunk we see, and from the roots deep hidden from the sight? The first step towards their fall is their insulation against the life of the parent tree.

The lesson for our modern age is not to insulate ourselves against the living stream of thought that is our heritage, the message of past eras that, assimilated, still can give us strength. Let the Wise speak, be they of ancient or of modern times, of this land or of that, nor heed the clamorous throng who would deny them hearing!

DOCTRINES, NOT DOGMAS

“WHAT is Dogmatism?” asks Mr. Judge, speaking as Chairman of the European Convention held in London in 1893. And having put the question, he proffers the answer: “To my mind, it is the assertion of a tenet that others must accept.”¹

Dogma is in itself an unpleasing word. The very sound of it, blunt and heavy, seems to end discussion even before the latter has begun. We might say that it lacks resilience, a necessary quality if discussion is to be fruitful. But the dogmatist propounds rather than discusses. He has little original matter to give forth. What he relies upon is “knowing his own mind,” a phrase that can be used to ward off anything new, and therefore unwelcome, that might be put into it.

Mr. Judge may have been thinking of this stultifying condition when he wrote, “Although I have very definite beliefs of my own, still I hesitate to put them in a dogmatic form.”² For Mr. Judge was never a dogmatist. He was something quite different, a transmitter of the Truth — that timeless Truth restated for the age he lived in by his Guru, Madame Blavatsky. She had herself received it from its guardians, the Adepts, though much of it, we know, was already imprinted on Mr. Judge’s own mind, or he would not in childhood have been found in his eighth year “devouring the contents of all the books he could obtain, relating to Mesmerism, Phrenology, Character-reading, Religion, Magic, Rosicrucianism, and deeply absorbed in the Book of Revelation, trying to discover its real meaning.”³

This, however, is to digress.

What more has Mr. Judge to say concerning dogmas?

We do well to arm ourselves with some of his potent words, for however tolerant and peace-loving students of Theosophy may be, we have sometimes to counter the well-meant protests of our friends against “embroiling” ourselves with that Movement. Mr. Judge touches on this very matter when he quotes an Adept as saying, “So long as a shadow of dogmatism lingers in the hearts of the multitudes, the world’s prejudices have to be conquered step by step, not at a rush.”⁴

¹ THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, March 1971, p. 162.

² *Letters* (Am. Ed.), p. 184.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

⁴ *The Heart Doctrine*, p. 16.

Religious dogmatism is an old, old affliction of humanity. Read the history of Christianity and note the bitter quarrels between different sects, the rivalries of bishops, those shepherds of the flock, the many breakaways resulting in the various denominations that exist today. Dogmatism seems inevitable in the sphere of orthodox religion. Most regrettably, it seems to pertain to it, doubtless for the good reason that religion *matters*, so that, naturally, those who take it seriously try to ensure that the tenets they value should be maintained. They ignore the fact, however, that since mentalities differ, the said tenets cannot appeal to, still less convince, *all*.

From the same speech made by Mr. Judge at the European Convention we gather that dogmatism was suspected by some to be present in the Movement itself. "The fear of a dogmatic tendency and of the actual existence among us of dogmatism" are points which Mr. Judge brings fully into the open when defining the difference between enlightened conviction and mere obstinate clinging to some point that makes a personal appeal. "One has," he says, "a perfect right to have a settled conviction, to present it forcibly, to sustain it with every argument, without being any the less a good member of the Society. Are we to be flabby because we are members of an unsectarian body, and are we to refuse to have convictions merely because no one in the Society may compel another to agree with him? Surely not."⁵

He warns anxious Members to avoid harping on the subject. "Let no one be so injudicious as to raise needless alarms and thus attract disaster. We are protected by our constitution-declarations, and it is sufficient for the purpose that now and then our officials promulgate a reassertion of our undogmatic attitude."⁶

Such a moderate tone is always characteristic of Mr. Judge. He may — and does — state plainly that "the Theosophical Society was founded to destroy dogmatism,"⁷ but of that very 'ism which throughout history has been so grievously conducive to persecution and massacre, even of it he can speak temperately, merely stating the fact that "to judge or reject before examination is the province of little minds or prejudiced dogmatists."⁸ Likewise he records, as he is entitled to do, that the Church has promulgated dogmas and condemned doctrines wholly without any authority, and some that

⁵ THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, March 1971. pp. 162-63.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁷ W.Q.J. Series, Pamphlet No. 4, p. 23.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

Jesus held himself, it has put its anathema upon. By turning to the Gospels we can verify this last fact for ourselves.

But — doctrines! The word breathes forth a fresher, purer air. Yes, Theosophy has indeed its doctrines, the first and foremost being the two great doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation. Both are logical, acceptable, showing as they do “justice triumphant in the world, meting out reward or punishment as it is deserved in any state of life.”⁹ Mr. Judge may well say that “the taking up of these ideas is, in effect, a new mental incarnation,”¹⁰ but to enlarge upon them in detail is not the purpose of the present article. Rather, let us note that, basically, “the aims of the members in a Branch should be to eradicate selfishness and to promulgate and illustrate the doctrine of universal brotherhood, basing the explanation upon the actual unity of all beings. This of itself will lead to the explanation of many other doctrines, as it underlies them all, great and small.”¹¹

Speaking at the close of another European Convention, that of 1892, speaking in three capacities, namely, as Chairman, as General Secretary of the American Section of the Theosophical Society, and as co-Founder of the Society itself, along with Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, Mr. Judge again emphasized the fact that the Society was creedless, and that by “looking into the religions and philosophies of the past and present we shall perhaps discover the one truth which must underlie all systems of religion and philosophy. We have come to believe,” he continues, “that all systems of religion, Buddhism, Brahmanism, Confucianism, what you call Christianity, all rest on one basis, all flow from one old school. And if we can cut away the husks, the crusts, about this central truth, we shall at last have arrived at the truth about it.”¹²

Theosophists have long been aware of that truth. But it is still unacknowledged by the so-called “orthodox” of religious bodies in general. Sects and denominations, a manifold throng, persist, and the one great basic universal teaching which is free from such blemishes is too often looked askance at, too seldom looked *into*, though, as Mr. Judge says, it underlies them all.

The claim is just, yet, in presenting it. Mr. Judge offers a word

⁹ W.Q.J. Series, No. 4, p. 8.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹² *Vernal Blooms*, pp. 239-240.

of warning, a word typical of his wise, perceptive mind. "If our effort is to succeed, we must avoid dogmatism in theosophy as much as in anything else, for the moment we dogmatise and insist on our construction of theosophy, that moment we lose sight of Universal Brotherhood and sow the seeds of future trouble."¹³

Universal Brotherhood, though a fact in nature, has, alas, not yet been recognized as such. Wherefore all the more does it lie to us, today's students and workers for Theosophy, to do what lies within our power to make its teaching known. Thus acting, for the good of others, we ourselves shall benefit, even though that be not our primal object, for, says Mr. Judge, "we cannot promulgate the doctrines and the rules of life found in Theosophy and at the same time ourselves not live up to them as far as possible."¹⁴

Here is a final word to us who, today, see organized religion so largely failing in its mission that false values, greed, immorality and brutality, the latter exercised both on humankind and on the animal creation, have spread the world over and call forth but little comment from what is usually classified as "the public generally." In his capacity as President of the Theosophical Society in America, addressing the European Section of the Theosophical Society, and bidding that they "press forward together in the great work of the real Theosophical Movement," Mr. Judge wrote these words which surely speak as aptly to us today: "Together we can devise more and better ways for spreading the light of truth through all the earth. Mutually assisting and encouraging one another we may learn how to put Theosophy into practice so as to be able to teach and enforce it by example before others. We will then each and all be members of that Universal Lodge of Free and Independent Theosophists which embraces every friend of the human race."¹⁵

¹³ W.Q.J. Series, No. 4, p. 23.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 3, p. 23.

¹⁵ *Vernal Blooms*, p. 257.

HOW CAN MAN DEFEAT HIS DESTINY?

THE SEEDS OF DESTINY develop from within without, in the soil of our civilization, country, race, family. The Soul with its seeds is not born into a particular family, country or race by accident or by chance. It is *attracted* to its own circumstances and surroundings. What we call obstacles arising from our circumstances are but the necessary resistances offered by the soil to the seeds of destiny. This teaching that our circumstances, our bodily and other limitations, are our own self-made destiny, has been wrongly applied and large numbers of people, in the name of contentment and resignation, sit down with folded arms and say: "Karma, Kismet, Fate!" Such an attitude is wrong because it overlooks the aspect of present exertion, self-choice and free wil. *Destiny manifests itself in terms of Exertion*. This is an important, central teaching which should never be lost sight of.

In our destiny we have good and bad aspects, strong and weak forces. These aspects and forces precipitate themselves in our lives through our present actions. It is possible to starve out the evil forces of destiny by abstaining from evil actions in the present. It is also possible to bring out the beneficent forces and aspects by the performance of righteous actions. Exertion and destiny are like positive and negative electricity; exertion is positive, destiny is negative. At any given moment, in any particular situation, the descent of fate depends on what we choose to do now, and how we exert ourselves to fulfil that choice. Without present action past destiny cannot show itself. Hour by hour, in act after act, we make a canal for the good waters of destiny to flow into. Similarly, hour by hour, we can build a dam to prevent the dirty waters of destiny from drowning us. This philosophical principle is highly practical and on its understanding and correct application depends the answer to the question — How can a man defeat his destiny?

All men and women instinctively recognize that they must do righteous deeds — unselfish and kindly and just; and yet they are not able to act thus. Selfishness, egotism, greed overpower us. The sins of omission and commission are numerous as well as varied. We can say that our destiny has two aspects, good and evil, and has three constituents — mind, character and body. Our present exertion must take into consideration these aspects and constituents. We must commit good acts: we must omit evil ones; thus we

make room for the good aspect of destiny to manifest, and prevent the expression of the evil aspect. But both these processes of commission and omission must be deliberate. We must deliberately eschew wrong; equally deliberately must we do right. And these two deliberate actions must be in reference to the three seeds of mind, character and body.

This brings us to the exercise to be done daily, not spasmodically but regularly, ever keeping in view the purpose of defeating evil destiny. Three fetters have to be broken; three ornaments have to be secured. The fetters of mind, character and body are acts to be omitted; the ornaments are acts to be committed. The fetters are for the thieves of Nature, the ornaments for her kings. What are these fetters and ornaments?

The fetter of the mind is its disposition to continue as a prisoner of *Kama* — desires and passions. Our cravings and ambitions imprison our minds, nay more, exploit them. The ambition of the man of business imprisons and exploits his mind; our fears and hopes, our loves and hates, act as heavy chains on our mind, and disable its returning to the freedom of its own estate. The soul must instil into the mind courage to fight and defeat the enemy of passions and desires; for that purpose the mind must be made to recognize its abject slavery to desires and passions. We must present the mind with the shining jewels of divine ideas — noble, liberal and cosmic. Of these shining jewels of high thoughts a crown must be made, for our mind must be the crown of the Soul who is the King. Hence the need for daily study, constant company of high thoughts and liberal ideas, association with holy and learned men.

The fetter of character is the sense of possession inherent in most people. Not only the wicked are greedy and competitive; the good, too, are charged with that feeling of greed. The ornament of character is philanthropy. Fight and defeat your sense of possession by cultivating philanthropy. But it is not the giver of money only who is a philanthropist; often he is not! The real philanthropist begins with thoughtfulness and good will in small affairs. Personal attention to the woes and difficulties of others, personal help rendered, personal advice given — in such seemingly small acts of good will the true philanthropist is born. To write a cheque from our surplus funds is easy enough; to think and feel for our neighbour is very difficult. If mind is the crown of the Soul, philanthropy is

the sceptre. The authority of the King is never in the rod of punishment, but in the wand of philanthropy. Without philanthropy we cannot be just, for then justice is robbed of mercy.

The fetter of the body is in its personal, separative aspect, with which we identify ourselves. People say, "I am a man," "I am a woman," "I am a Hindu," "I am a Christian," and so on. This non-recognition that we are primarily human souls is what makes the fetter of the body, a hard iron chain very difficult to break. That is taking a personal view of the body. How shall we defeat the destiny of the body? By cleansing it of all its personal, separative tendencies; by clothing it in the royal robe of humanism. Our body is first and foremost a *human* body, not an animal *rupa*. To be human we must be humane. To don the robe of humanism, that is the third thing we must do.

And now we have answered the question — How can man defeat his own destiny? By fulfilling it.

Make of your body a fit instrument for the Soul; have philanthropy and good will as the basis of your character; fill your mind with great ideas which have ever moved men and masses of men to righteousness. Thus we defeat the evil destiny and fulfil our *dharma* — to be human, to be man.

Our heritage is royalty. Forgetting that, we have become exiles from our spiritual kingdom; we have become untouchables, eating the carrion of pride, living in the filth of selfishness, greed and fear. But, untouchables as we are, if we take courage we shall see that there are the Royal Fathers of the Race, the Compassionate Sages who encourage us, inspire us, to walk out of our present degradation into the joy of knowledge, of altruism, of brotherhood. So let us all endeavour to defeat our destiny by fulfilling it. Let us never forget that in the midnight darkness of failure there is the herald of the dawn of success. Feel the power of Royalty within your heart and triumph will be yours.

I WILL NOT grieve that men do not know me; I will grieve that I do not know men.

—CONFUCIUS

IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

The stockpile of means of destruction in the world is already so gigantic that peace has become a necessary condition for man's survival. All right-thinking people are agreed that the weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us. But to be in a position to abolish war, say the experts, at least two crucial changes have to be effected: a change in the social and political structures and a change in our way of thinking.

Dr. S. C. Derksen, a writer and lecturer on peace education who works with the Netherlands Unesco Centre, writes on "Education for Survival" in a special issue of *Unesco Features* (No. 48, 1982):

Research has shown that a certain style of thinking and behavioural habits promote war rather than peace. For example, there is human aggressiveness, which is part of all of us, and our inclination to resist any drastic changes. We might also emphasize our inclination to see the facts as we would like them to be rather than as they are. Also the political indifference and ignorance of many people constitute a threat to peace. This leads to the conclusion that another kind of education is called for, aiming at promoting greater psychological and political maturity in the average citizen....

An individual is psychologically mature when he has the ability to recognize the relativity of his own viewpoint and thus is receptive to the norms and values, if not truths, held by other people. Furthermore a psychologically mature person is capable of coping with his own aggression reasonably well and of handling conflicts in non-violent way. Even in a critical situation he will keep a realistic view of the world....

A politically mature person is characterized by a lively concern with political matters and a more than superficial knowledge of them... Many politicians are caught in their traditional war-oriented thinking to such an extent that without countervailing pressure from public opinion a breakthrough cannot be expected. Unfortunately, such critical and well-informed public opinion is still almost non-existent. So we must conclude that greater political maturity is as much needed as greater psychological maturity....

Research has brought out that a kind of education, turning out more flexible human beings, less inclined to think in extremes, is within our reach... At last, there is a growing interest in

such peace education all over the world. . . .

The best educational situation is one in which mutual comprehension and respect are always in the foreground, in which equality and awareness of the uniqueness of the individual are practised, and in which the foreign is considered an enrichment of one's existence rather than a threat. Furthermore, there should be more place in our education for the gentler strengths of man such as pity and humility. Our heroes are still too often those who achieve their goal by means of brutal force, as a study of cinema, television and a considerable part of our history textbooks will show.

Present-day educational programmes are geared too much to how to produce and too little to how to live. The disproportionate attention given to the former issue has contributed to the creation of a terrifying gap between our spiritual and our technical powers. Modern man looks increasingly more like a monkey driving a Rolls Royce. A more adequate education should therefore be especially concerned with the problem as to how people can gain control of technical development again. To realize this goal more attention should be given both to existential problems such as: what is the sense of our life? how can we learn to cope with ourselves and with others, and to socio-political problems.

In particular a lack of existential insights and perspectives are dangerous lacunae. In a recent discussion a student called this lack of orientation the "hole" in our existence. He maintained that this hole is now being filled with liquor, drugs, sex, Cup Football and soon perhaps with racial hatred and worse. . . . The existing subjects at school — history, geography, economics, the sciences, languages — are too little attuned to the demands of the present day to be able to contribute seriously to the kind of peace education required. Traditional educational programmes should therefore be revised soon. . . .

Peace education is not only essential but also — in all likelihood — possible. In any case we shall have to make the most of the chances available. The greatest sin of this time is, after all, to acquiesce to the existing facts.

Until recently, psychologists denied the existence of feelings and minds in animals. Today, however, animal consciousness has become a respectable subject for scientific investigation. The recently

renewed concern about animal suffering and animal rights has among its supporters many scientists themselves. In *Psychology Today* for March 1982, Robert C. Solomon writes of what scientists are finding out about animal consciousness:

A year ago, a large group of distinguished scientists came together under the auspices of the much-respected Dahlem Conferences. . . . In 1981, the purpose of the conference was not only to bring together the current research in one area but also, and more important, to establish the legitimacy of the field itself — in this case, the scientific study of animal minds. The exact title of the conference was “Animal Mind — Human Mind,” and its purpose was to reintroduce the once *verboten* concepts of “experience” and “consciousness” into the study of animal behaviour. . . .

Griffin, the conference director, set the tone for the unusual discussions to follow by noting in his opening remarks “how little we really know about animal minds” — in part, he said, because “scientists have so long ruled out *a priori* the possibility that mental experiences could occur in animals.” And yet, perhaps surprisingly, rather clear agreement on the main point was apparent by the end of the conference: that it makes sense to talk about the minds of animals and to investigate, in a scientific context, precisely what kind of mind this or that animal has. . . .

The current outcry against the use of animals in unnecessary experiments and against the alleged brutality of the conditions under which animals are mass-produced for food presupposes the potential of animals for suffering. Peter Singer’s epochal treatise on *Animal Liberation*, for example, indicated what he called the “concentration-camp methods” of cosmetics manufacturers, who squirt chemicals into the eyes of rabbits until they go blind, and of poultry farmers, who keep chicks cooped up in cages no larger than their bodies. But do we know what constitutes suffering for a chicken? . . .

The most often repeated conclusion of the Dahlem Conference [was] that the traditional question of whether or not a creature is conscious has to be rejected in favour of a broader question about gradations or levels of consciousness. The all-or-nothing question only reinforces the old disputes. Theodore Bullock from San Diego argued. Virtually every animal, he said, has a mind of some degree of complexity. It responds to its environment through sequences of more or less complex behaviour, sometimes

learning, sometimes calculating, sometimes even thinking. But whether we mean by mind simply the ability to experience sensory input or pain, or the ability to learn and adapt, it becomes clear that we are now talking about degrees of development within the realm of minds. . . .

Animal psychologists once dismissed out of hand the idea that animal minds, animal consciousness, and animal experience might be part of science. Now, that idea has become their basic premise, the starting point for much of their work. The question now is one of degree. The old—and, it is to be hoped, moribund—question about the validity of ascribing consciousness to creatures other than ourselves can be replaced with hundreds of more precise experimental questions about the sensitivity, intelligence, and experience of animals. With this recognition of continuity from species to species can also emerge a renewed appreciation of differences. We need not ask whether animals have intelligence, or language, or emotions, but rather what intelligence, what kind of language, and which emotions. However, the answers to such questions will not come easily. If they come at all, it will be only after far more observation, experimentation, and conceptual clarification than the past few decades of science, or centuries of storytelling, have required of us.

H.P.B. has written at length on this subject in her article "Have Animals Souls?" (reprinted in *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT* for March, April and May 1970 from *The Theosophist* for January, February and March 1886). She examines the views of the Christian Church, scholastic philosophy and natural sciences, and answers the objections to the animal having an intelligent and therefore an independent soul.

The animal, then, is debarred from progress and immortality, because he is an automaton. According to Descartes, he has no intelligence, agreeably to mediaeval scholasticism; nothing but instinct, the latter signifying involuntary impulse, as affirmed by the materialists and denied by the Church.

Both Frederic and George Cuvier have discussed amply, however, on the intelligence and the instinct in animals. . . . A line of demarcation ought to be traced between instinct and intelligence. The construction of beehives by the bees, the raising of dams by the beaver in the middle of the naturalist's dry floor as much as in the river, are all the deeds and effects of instinct for ever unmodifiable and changeless, whereas the acts of intelligence are

to be found in actions evidently thought out by the animal, where not instinct but reason comes into play, such as its education and training calls forth and renders susceptible of perfection and development. Man is endowed with reason, the infant with instinct; and the young animal shows more of both than the child.

Indeed, every one of the disputants knows as well as we do that it is so. If any materialist avoid confessing it, it is through pride. Refusing a soul to both man and beast, he is unwilling to admit that the latter is endowed with intelligence as well as himself, even though in an infinitely lesser degree. In their turn the churchman, the religiously inclined naturalist, the modern metaphysician, shrink from avowing that man and animal are both endowed with soul and faculties, if not equal in development and perfection, at least the same in name and essence. Each of them knows, or ought to know that instinct and intelligence are two faculties completely opposed in their nature, two enemies confronting each other in constant conflict; and that, if they will not admit of two souls or principles, they have to recognize, at any rate, the presence of two potencies in the soul, each having a different seat in the brain, the localization of each of which is well known to them, since they can isolate and temporarily destroy them in turn — according to the organ or part of the organs they happen to be torturing during their terrible vivisections. . . .

Who ever pretended that a cow or a dog could be an ideologist? But the animal may think and know it thinks, the more keenly that it cannot speak, and express its thoughts. How can Buffon or anyone else know? One thing is shown however by the exact observations of naturalists and that is, that the animal is endowed with intelligence; and once this is settled, we have but to repeat Thomas Aquinas' definition of intelligence — the prerogative of man's immortal soul — to see that the same is due to the animal. . . .

Verily when the world feels convinced — and it cannot avoid coming one day to such a conviction — that animals are creatures as eternal as we ourselves, vivisection and other permanent tortures, daily inflicted on the poor brutes, will, after calling forth an outburst of maledictions and threats from society generally, force all Governments to put an end to those barbarous and shameful practices.

The case of Marcos Rodriguez Pantoja, abandoned in a forest region of South West Spain from 1953 to 1965, has something to tell us. The boy was seven years old and could speak before he was turned adrift, and so was later able to talk of his forest days. Gabriel Manila, a psychology lecturer at the University of Palma, got Marcos to speak of his life in the forest, and the transcript of these tape-recordings has now been made the subject of a book — *Marcos: Wild Child of the Sierra Morena*.

After the death of his mother, Marcos had known nothing but ill treatment, and at the age of seven he was sold to a surly old man who made the boy tend his goats. After a short while the man disappeared, leaving Marcos to fend for himself.

In *The Observer* (London) for June 20, Naomi Lewis narrates and comments on his experiences in the forest:

Now in the forest world, the boy discovered a new community, less cruel and irrational than the one he had left: wolf and fox and snake were among its members. There he happily lived for 12 years, and there he would have stayed. But he was perceived, the Civil Guard was alerted, and he was brusquely captured and carried away. His long hair was cut short; his dress of skins replaced by stiff conventional clothes. He was promptly given religious instruction, but no other teaching.

The reality of all this comes out sharply in the transcript, fragmented, rambling, disjointed though it is. Now he relates some bar or army episode; now he tells of the snake that was his guardian and twice saved his life, or of the wolves which he taught to leave his goats alone — and which in turn taught him cleanliness, a notable Marcos trait. (He saw them wash their meat in the stream, and sweep out the floor of their den.) From the wildcat he learnt to bury his own excreta.

He describes his inventions: a water channel, a clay container for cooking. He ponders questions: why are animals less obsessed with sex than men? . . . Until he left the forest, he was himself (like other ferals) sexually undisturbed.

The forest-reared feral, like a man in myth, has had a long and unique education; he brings back knowledge and gifts that can't be learnt in laboratory conditions. So Marcos still feels like an exile. Quick and adaptable, he is ready to conform, but to what? As a hotel worker in tourist Spain, he hardly sees the human at its best. He would like a home, but the women he

meets are either nuns or prostitutes. He dislikes the dirt, disorder, swindling and unreason of the human scene. Ah, Descartes . . . He cannot tolerate cruelty, especially to animals.

“The wild child has something to tell us,” Janila writes, “but we have never yet quite been able to identify what it is.” The something seems clear enough. To put it politely: a reappraisal of human and non-human cultures. Swift, of course, has done this already in *Gulliver*. But you read what you wish to read, and the human knows very well what to skip.

The following is from *The Times of India* for August 7:

A woman walking down a Chicago street burst into flames for no apparent reason, and the police said they had no immediate explanation.

Bomb and arson investigators were called in to determine whether any accelerant was present, but the police said there was no smell of accelerant at the scene.

Reference books list eight incidents of human spontaneous combustion, going back to the 18th century. . . . The first reported incident of spontaneous combustion involved Countess Cornelia die Bandi, 62, Cesena, Italy, in the 18th century. Neighbours noticed yellowish smoke coming from her bedroom and a maid discovered a heap of ashes at her bedside. Her legs reportedly remained untouched by the flames.

In another incident, Euphemia Johnson, 68, of England, died in 1922 when she burst into flames while drinking her afternoon tea. Her remains — calcinated bones — were found lying in her unburned clothes. The furniture in the room was barely singed.

“There is not a thing or a particle in the Universe which does not contain in it latent fire,” says H.P.B. (*Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge*, p. 116). That the vital functions of the human body, as also of animals and plants, involve small currents of electricity has been recognized by physiologists since the development of sensitive recording instruments. In the systems of certain people the accumulation and secretion of electricity reach, under certain conditions, to a very high degree, and there are cases on record of persons being able to do such things as exhaling fire from the mouth, emitting sparks from the body, lighting electric bulbs with their bare hands without touching a switch, approaching their index

finger to a gas-beak from which a stream of gas is issuing, to light it as if a burning match had been applied to it, etc. (See H.P.B.'s article, "Electric and Magnetic Affinities Between Man and Nature," in *She Being Dead Yet Speaketh*.) But in most of these cases the electromagnetically charged persons do not come to harm.

Under the title "A Human Storage Battery," *The Theosophist* for August 1883 (THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, February 1975) gave an instance of exhalation of fire from the mouth of a young man from Michigan, and commented in an Editor's Note:

If, then, we turn to occult science to seek for an explanation, we will find that there are cases on record of individuals who emit from their persons a luminous vapour or aura, under high states of nervous exaltation. Sometimes it appears as a wild radiance, sometimes as a lambent flame, and in others as an electric or rather odic coruscation. . . . But the light in these instances is of an odic character, and though flaming and flickering like fire, has none of its combustive property. Writers upon sorcery and mediumship have frequently recorded anecdotes of the bursting forth of flames from the doors, windows, chimneys or roofs of buildings without apparent cause, and in fact at times when there was no fire in any part of the house, nor any articles stored within, such as cotton, cotton-waste, greased rags, or other substances liable to spontaneous combustion. These mysterious burnings have been sometimes attended with stone-showers or throwings, equally unaccountable. The Spiritualists affirm that the agents in all these cases have been spirits; but unless they be the fire-elementals or Salamanders of the Rosicrucians, they must be queer "Spirits." . . . The fire-proof individual is a medium for these fire elementals, and contains in himself an unusual proportion of Salamandrine properties, the result of an abnormal combination of elemental forces in his foetal development. Normally, a human being contains the elementals of all the four kingdoms in almost equal proportions, any slight preponderance of one or the other determining the so-called "temperament."

An imbalance of these elementals in the constitutions of some persons might be a reason for their coming to harm through spontaneous combustion.
