




THE  
**THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT**  
A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO



THE ARYAN PATH  
THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY  
THE STUDY OF  
OCCULT SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY  
AND  
ARYAN LITERATURE

---

---

Vol. IX No. 10

---

---

---

---

August 17, 1939

---

---

The truths and mysteries of occultism constitute, indeed, a body of the highest spiritual importance, at once profound and practical for the world at large. Yet, it is not as a mere addition to the tangled mass of theory or speculation in the world of science that they are being given to you, but for their practical bearing on the interests of mankind.

—MASTER K. H.

## PUBLISHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT

**THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT :** Established November, 1930. Published monthly by Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay, India.

This Magazine is an Independent Journal, unconnected with any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS :** No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, each beginning with the November issue. All subscriptions should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price, 50 cents, 2s., Re. 1, per annum, post free.

**COMMUNICATIONS :** Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten, on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should in all cases be retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

**CORRESPONDENCE :** Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the Magazine. Questions on Theosophical philosophy and history will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the Magazine.

**BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS :** Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine, when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts direct to **THEOSOPHY COMPANY (INDIA), LTD.**, which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. Those objects are :

- (a) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour ;
- (b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study ; and
- (c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

सत्यान्नास्ति परो धर्मः ।



*There is no Religion Higher than Truth*

BOMBAY, 17th August, 1939

VOL. IX. No. 10.

### CONTENTS

Are you One? ... ..	145
Religious Education ... ..	146
Unselfishness of Purpose—Universal Charity—Pity for all Animate Beings ... ..	147
Questions Answered ... ..	149
The Road to Rebirth ... ..	151
Krishna Jayanti ... ..	152
Hypnotism ... ..	154
Sin against Life ... ..	155
Have Animals Souls?—By <i>H. P. Blavatsky</i> ... ..	157

*Vaccination 156*

# THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

BOMBAY, 17th August 1939.

VOL. IX. No. 10.

## ARE YOU ONE ?

“The earnest *working* members are few.”—H. P. B.

If you are not an earnest *working* member already, are you trying to become one ?

W. Q. Judge once wrote that “no Branch should depend on one person, for, if so, it will slump, sure ; nor, on two or three either.” And again—“Times change, men go here and there, and places need to be filled by those who can do the best sort of work and who are full of the fire of devotion and who have the right basis and a sure and solid one for themselves.”

The earnest working member pays attention to his own soul progress only as a means, and does not make it an end in itself. He who thinks of his own spiritual unfoldment may be in earnest, but he is not a working member in the real sense of that term. A working member works and thinks of the work all the time. The service of human souls is his objective and he is not agitated if his progress is nil. But a man intent on serving human souls is bound to unfold his own : unconscious of the process he grows as the flower grows. On the other hand, if a working member toils and moils, neglecting adequate and proper soul-nourishment for himself, he may be labouring very hard but he is weak in his earnestness. A wise doctor who prescribes tonic and nourishment to others makes time to eat adequate and proper food himself.

There are many who are earnest about the work of the U. L. T. but who are somewhat vague about its nature, about the basic principles underlying its programme and policy. The very first principle which we need to grasp is this : We are building up a large and united body of people for the promulgation of Theosophy as recorded in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge. This promulgation requires a careful study of those writings ; and full understanding of them demands application through assimilation, to some extent at least. Unity—Study—Work, as a Triad, will make any associate of the U. L. T. an earnest

*working* member. Such an associate, taking what share he can in the work, will help it on, and he should try to do so by every means in his power. H. P. B. wrote that “No one is asked to give more than he can afford, whether in devotion, time, work or money”, but she added that “No fellow has a right to remain idle.”

There are five methods mentioned by H. P. B. which the earnest working associate of the U. L. T. should employ in order to serve the Cause founded upon our noble Declaration. They are:—

(1) To comprehend the Theosophical doctrines, so that he may teach others, especially the young.

(2) To explain to others what Theosophy is and what it is not, removing misconceptions and spreading an interest in the subject.

(3) To assist in circulating our literature, by buying books when he has the means, by lending and giving them and by inducing his friends to do so.

(4) To defend Theosophy from the unjust aspersions cast upon it, by every legitimate means in his power.

(5) Most important of all—to make his own life an example to others.

The failure of the Parent Theosophical Society was due to personal ambitions which obscured whatever Theosophical knowledge was acquired by some of those on whom it fell to carry on the work after the passing of H. P. B. Personalities pushing themselves to the fore, all unconsciously elbowed out those who could have served the Cause with the power of their own Inner Egos.

Robert Crosbie, the Founder of the U. L. T. having gained considerable experience in the workings of the Theosophical Movement, devised a way which is safe for the student to take and which ensures the good of the Cause, so much more vital than the good of individual associates.

The impersonal basis of the U. L. T. is well-known to all associates; but certain phases thereof are not clearly understood. For example, all earnest working members should find out the implications of the following statement by Robert Crosbie:—

It is difficult to help individuals as such, especially where all the strength is needed for a general effort. It is quite easy to be drawn into this helping of individuals by our sympathies, and sometimes we do things that are not helpful at all, although perhaps a pleasure to both giver and receiver.

Therefore the earnest working member has to learn more and more to confine his work for the promulgation of Theosophy to the U. L. T. platform. He should endeavour to avoid giving aid and help in a personal way. Instead of talking to an individual here or corresponding with another there he should use the impersonal platform and the impersonal periodical to spread broadcast the teachings of Theosophy. Every grade of intelligence can receive help from the platform and through the periodical, as well as through the impersonal correspondence the Lodge carries on. This foundational idea is also given by Mr. Crosbie:—

It should be our policy to state at each meeting what our purposes are—namely to disseminate the fundamental principles of Theosophy and to answer questions on the subject-matter provided. . . . There will be difficulty in getting many to see the importance of this continual reiteration, but it is essential to all true progress.

Thus the U. L. T. should sow seeds in the hearts of men, which will in time flower, and under more propitious circumstances lead to a healthy reform, conducive of more happiness for the masses than they have hitherto enjoyed.

So, Brother Associate of the U. L. T.—

Are you an earnest *working* member?

If not—

Are you trying to become one?

## RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

An article in *The Times of India, Educational Supplement*, (June 14, 1939) written by "A Special Correspondent" more than once quotes Madame Blavatsky's views on the important subject of Education, (*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 35.*)

The writer is rightly apprehensive of religion being "a divisive factor" and "a prolific source of group conflict and communal hatred". "Whenever religious differences", says he, "happen to coincide however slightly with lines of political or racial cleavage, the opposition developed becomes

hopelessly implacable and often fearfully destructive." The natural conclusion from such a proposition would be that religious instruction in schools is bound to stir up racial and religious animosities. On the other hand, the contributor points out that

each step in the elimination of religious education from the curriculum has meant increased risks for our society. As a result . . . our ideals have sunk low; our character has become weak and our will feeble.

Obviously, he does not mean the sectarian religion which not only creates a cleavage between man and man, between community and community, but also thwarts the spirit of inquiry in boys and girls. There can be no two opinions but that instruction in any particular creed should have no place in the curricula of schools or colleges, for certainly such instruction imparts not wisdom, but the very reverse of it. The correspondent undoubtedly had in mind the unsectarian, let us say "Theosophical", education which unfortunately has so far never been tried in India. To teach Hindu youths Hinduism and Parsi ones the Zoroastrian creed and so on is to sow the seeds of enmity leading to fanaticism. Not to do so openly but in an indirect, subtle way, as missionaries of all church denominations do, (they are here to proselyte the "heathen") will produce the same result. Students of genuine Theosophy, therefore, must appreciate the Wardha Scheme the aim of which is to build and shape the character of pupils and "to train the will to choose aright". What is urgently needed is a scheme of education which meets the plan drawn by Madame Blavatsky:

Children should above all be taught self-reliance, love for all men, altruism, mutual charity, and more than anything else, to think and reason for themselves. We would reduce the purely mechanical work of the memory to an absolute minimum, and devote the time to the development and training of the inner senses, faculties and latent capacities. We would endeavour to deal with each child as a unit, and to educate it so as to produce the most harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, in order that its special aptitudes should find their full natural development. We should aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish*. And we believe that much if not all of this could be obtained by *proper and truly theosophical* education.

But, the all-important question then arises—a question which the writer does not touch in his article: Where are the men and women to undertake the sacred task of imparting such unsectarian and truly religious education in schools and colleges? Is not this one sore need of the hour sufficient to spur to action students of Theosophy and to inspire them to pursue more vigorously than ever their three-fold task of "study, application and promulgation"?

## UNSELFISHNESS OF PURPOSE—UNIVERSAL CHARITY—PITY FOR ALL ANIMATE BEINGS

Perhaps you will better appreciate our meaning when told that in our view the highest aspirations for the welfare of humanity become tainted with selfishness if, in the mind of the philanthropist there lurks the shadow of desire for self benefit or a tendency to do injustice, even when these exist unconsciously to himself.—MAHATMA K. H.

So long as the smallest personal or selfish desire—even for Spiritual attainment for our own sake—remains, so long is the desired end put off. Hence the above term “demands of the flesh” really covers also demands that are not of the flesh and its proper rendering would be “desires of the personal nature including those of the individual soul.”—W. Q. JUDGE.

The third of the qualifications to be acquired by one who has resolved to tread the Path of Chelaship is given by H. P. B. as “Unselfishness of purpose; universal charity; pity for all animate beings.”

We must begin by pointing to the inner links which bind these three qualifications. They form a triangle. Without unselfishness of purpose there cannot be universal charity and if charity is not universal, we cannot have pity for all. If a thoroughgoing unselfishness is not established in all our thinking our charity is bound to be less than the universal. A mathematical ratio maintains itself between our unselfishness and our charity. In reality a selfish man, in proportion to his selfishness is bound to be uncharitable and miserly. The acts of charity of a selfish person are in reality bargains—not executed for the good of others but for the benefits to be derived by himself. Next, if unselfishness of purpose leads to charity, the latter begets acts of pity for all who breathe. Men and women restrict themselves in pity and charity because the purpose of living is not seen. That purpose is expressed in and by Nature—unity and harmony. Pity for others, charity for the sake of others are most natural manifestations of the Spirit. Human beings have to make efforts to be pitiful and charitable, because they have forgotten that born of Nature, the latter is their most faithful friend and ally. “Were no man to hurt his brother, Karma-Nemesis would have neither cause to work for, nor weapons to act through”, writes H. P. B. We hurt others out of fear or hatred assuming that those others are distinct and separate from us; the good law adjusts the disharmony caused by selfishness by endowing us with necessary pain, procreator of unselfishness and then selflessness. Through a very long round of births and deaths men slowly learn that the purpose of life is unselfishness—Altruism. The ordinary people are passive channels of the Law of Karma; those who aspire to become Chelas have to learn to be active directors of the Law, in the sense that they should ever be on the watch to eschew disharmony, to turn the forces of evil to good. Masters are

knowers of Karma and are therefore Karma itself. In Them are embodied in completeness—unselfishness of purpose, universal charity and pity for all animate beings.

Now let us turn to a consideration of these three separately.

### I: UNSELFISHNESS OF PURPOSE

Let then the motive for action be in the action itself and not in the event. Do not be incited to actions by the hope of their reward nor let thy life be spent in inaction. Firmly persisting in Yoga perform thy duty, O Dhananjaya, and laying aside all desire for any benefit to thyself from action make the event equal to thee whether it be success or failure. Equal-mindedness is called Yoga.—*Bhagavad-Gita*.

Unselfish actions abound but unselfish purpose is rare. Unselfishness of purpose is the most difficult task for the student-server aspiring to Chelaship. Forgetfulness of the personal self is the indispensable requisite in the training of those who are to become Adepts of the Good Law. The Path to the Great Masters begins with the desire to learn that we may teach, and ends in the Great Renunciation of the Self for the sake of others, of suffering fellowmen. Only those who live to benefit mankind and seek no reward—not even their own progress—come under the notice of the Great Renunciators.

Selfishness is the prolific parent of all human weakness. It is the giant weed mentioned in *Light on the Path*. When attacked on one front it seeks another outlet and masquerades under guises difficult to recognise, nay is often mistaken for unselfishness. The would-be Chela is warned of this at the very entrance to the Path.

Ambition is the first curse; the great tempter of the man who is rising above his fellows. It is the simplest form of looking for reward...these vices of the ordinary man pass through a subtle transformation and reappear with changed aspect in the heart of the disciple... The pure artist who works for the love of his work is sometimes more firmly planted on the right road than the occultist, who fancies he has removed his interest from self, but who has in reality only enlarged the limits of experience and desire, and transferred his

interest to the things which concern his larger span of life.

That is why self-examination should be directed primarily to our motives, the hidden spring of all actions. To evaluate them, we need above all, to be honest with ourselves.

Doubly difficult is the task for the student who lives in an age which has made of selfishness an ethical characteristic. Selfishness is the soul of competition, and commercial transactions are not confined to the business world. In other spheres—family life, friendship, even religion—there is nothing else than bargaining rooted in the hope of a reward. The motives which incite to action correspond to our triple Nature (1) Desire for money (2) Desire for fame (3) Desire for power.

Unselfishness of *purpose* is a feature almost universally absent in our civilization. Our world does not totally lack good actions, few though they be. Charitable institutions exist by the dozen, organizations for human welfare are many and varied, self-sacrificing men and women are found in all countries. Theosophy is the friend of all these. But though unselfish actions are discernible a selfless motive is very rare. The subtle desire for personal happiness and for self-satisfaction usually replaces the blatant forms of selfishness. But even treaders of the Path of Liberation work for their own salvation. The Spiritual discipline on the path of Chelaship demands that we renounce even the desire for personal happiness.

Happiness, or rather contentment may indeed follow the performance of duty, but is not and must not be the motive for it.

How to develop this necessary qualification? The sustained resolve to fit ourselves by every means to be the better able to help and to teach others will build it. The best place to unfold unselfishness of purpose is the Lodge—the aspirant's Spiritual Home. Its policy of devotion and of impersonality protects the student from self-interest and gives him an excellent opportunity for disinterested service. This makes it easier for him to preserve the necessary unselfish attitude in all things. Only he who serves the Cause of Theosophy unselfishly soon learns to forget himself in his daily living.

The field of duty is the Chela's training ground—the right performance of duty his only means of advancement. It is *only* on Dharmakshetra that we can transcend personal consciousness, not by change of occupation but by change of attitude. Only such actions as are wrong and unnecessary are to be abandoned.

The *Gita* teaches the art of developing an unselfish motive. When the real actor, the mind, is attached to the fruits of works it is bound by action.

The clue to the eradication of selfishness lies in renouncing all personal interest in the results of action. *Notes on the Bhagavad Gita* indicates how this is done.

Self-interest is always a matter of thinking; we can have no attachment for anything that we do not think about, nor can we have any dislike for a thing we do not think about; so if we find confronting us things right to be done, we should do them, regardless of whether they promise success or failure to ourselves.

A devoted and unselfish Chela should be able to answer truthfully the following queries in the affirmative. Does he desire to help humanity even though his efforts be unknown, condemned or ridiculed? When the Cause is served through another channel is his satisfaction the same as the satisfaction he feels when the worker is himself?

Can we be a grain of incense which the Masters can use in their task of purifying the world? Can we be a small flower which They can use to beautify the world? Are we content to be servants of Their servants. If we can burn up like incense and not feel that we are *non est*, if we are prepared to be thrown away like a dead flower and not feel that we are useless, if we are content to serve Their servants and not feel that progress is not achieved, ah! then the death of egotism is near at hand. (THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, December 1932)

Unselfishness is an expression of the Law of Brotherhood. Selfishness violates that fundamental Law. As the limbs are to the body so are all units of the human family—nay, all forms of manifestation—parts of One Indivisible Divine Life. Such recognition alone can lead to:

## II: UNIVERSAL CHARITY

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.—Sr. PAUL.

Charity is described as Love Immortal. That love which seeks return, or which is dependent on the existence of another personality or which produces undesirable moods of jealousy and the like is mortal. Such love is finite, changing and blind. Personal affection has only one good use, it is an excellent stepping stone to the higher immortal love. Shakespeare's sonnet indicates how personal love can be transmuted.

Love is not love  
Which alters when it alteration finds,  
Or bends with the remover to remove:  
O, no! it is an ever-fixed mark  
That looks on tempests and is never shaken;  
It is the star to every wandering bark,  
Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.—  
Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,  
But bears it out even to the edge of doom.

But what has personal affection to do with charity? Charity of mind or speech devoid of heart feeling is not charity. Throwing a pice in disgust to a clamouring beggar to get rid of him is not charity. When in the giving of helpful thoughts, in the uttering of kind words, in the offering of monetary or other gifts the heart-action is absent, only the semblance of charity is present. It is the feeling of love that builds charity.

We are, however, called upon to practise *Universal* charity. This means not merely to be charitable to all, or even to be charitable in and by all our constituents, but something very different. We have to learn to be charitable to all in thought, word and deed, but how are we to achieve such a stupendous task? By acquiring the knowledge of the art of acting from the point of view of what is best for the universe. When in doing anything we stop to consider the justice aspect—justice to the whole, we acquire the art of universal charity. Our thoughts and words, our feelings and actions affect the furthestmost bounds of the solar system, but they affect most vitally and most powerfully members of the human kingdom to which we belong. So to begin with, our charity—mental, moral, physical—must take into account the good of humanity as a whole. In rendering personal charity and in taking personal interest in the welfare of those who suffer we must not overlook the rest of mankind. A person is helped the best when the aid given is from a universal and not from a personal point of view.

### III: PITY FOR ALL.

When a universal point of view of charity is taken there suddenly burst upon our attention the cases of those who are unjust to Nature, destroyers of her forms on the upward way. If only the justice aspect of Karma is taken into account hardness of our own hearts would result. Therefore, to emphasise the mercy aspect of Karma, we are given the third of this triad of qualities—Pity for all animate beings.

Let thy Soul lend its ear to every cry of pain like as the lotus bears 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.

Spilling of blood and destroying of highly organised animal forms have occult effects, and some of the most ghastly aspects of the Black Art are connected with these. Animal sacrifice is only one remove from sacrifice of human bodies. Vivisectors are called unconscious black magicians by H. P. B.

In the lower kingdoms also man's ignorance of their psychic constitution and the way those forms of life grow make him destructive.

## QUESTIONS ANSWERED

"Let us compare all things, and, putting aside emotionalism as unworthy of the logician and the experimentalist, hold fast only to that which passes the ordeal of ultimate analysis."—H.P.B.

चित्रं वटतरोर्मूले वृद्धाः शिष्या गुरुर्युवा ।

गुरोस्तु मौनं व्याख्यानं शिष्यास्तु चिन्तनसंशयाः ॥

"Ah! the wonder of the Banyan Tree. There sits the Guru Deva, a youth, and the disciples are elders; the teaching is silence, and still the disciples' doubts are dispelled."

Q. In Mr. Judge's well known article on "Living the Higher Life" (U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 34) we are advised to encourage in ourselves the wish to incarnate again and again in the same family. In the *Gita* we are told that one who strives for perfection in devotion will eventually be born in a pure and fortunate family or even in a family of spiritually enlightened persons. How can we combine these two futures and desire and work for the attainment of both?

Ans. This question suggests the study of a point brought out in another of Mr. Judge's articles—the one entitled "Thoughts on Karma" (See THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT for November 1937). Here it is stated that there are three factors which determine where and into what family the Ego shall take incarnation. These three are deserts, similarity and responsibility. A family draws us, then, because it will afford us the circumstances of life we deserve, be they good or bad; because we have certain characteristics in common with its other members; or because we are partly responsible for its being what it is or for its circumstances. Any incarnation of a given Ego is determined by a combination of all these three factors. This fact brings home a lesson of particularly great importance to students of Theosophy. Such students often have to stand alone as far as their immediate family is concerned, getting no sympathy at home in the matter of their interest in our philosophy and our cause. As a result they begin to feel that they do not really belong to the family where karma has brought them; they feel superior, when not antagonistic, to these other souls who are not interested in spiritual things, and often the tendency is to conclude that blood

is after all not thicker than water and that their real affinities are outside the family circle. Now while Theosophy encourages the formation of spiritual friendships based solely on community of interests, it also points, as in the article cited by the questioner, to an important relationship subsisting between the members of one family group. What is that bond? The three karmic factors, deserts, similarity and responsibility, give us the key to the answer. If, as so many students imagine, there is little similarity between ourselves and our near relatives, then the cause for the intimate connection should be sought in one of the other two elements that draw us together. In responsibility probably, for deserts may be suffered or enjoyed in any one of a number of family groupings, but responsibility must be worked out with the particular individuals towards whom it was incurred. Hence we may conclude that wishing to be born in the same family means wishing to finish a job and work out a responsibility.

As for combining this desire with a longing to be born in "a pure and fortunate family"—we are probably more likely to gain this reward from lives of doing our duty than as a result of efforts to attain it. There is another hint in connection with this point to be found in "Living the Higher Life". Mr. Judge says: "Blessed is he who in each incarnation, *then and there*, gets rid of the defects of the family into which he is ushered. . . . then strives to be born in the same family again and again, until he himself becomes Buddha and assists his family to become a family fit for a Buddha to be born into."

\* \* \*

Q. Mr. Crosbie says: "Business is bad at best". Does this mean that business is a kind of outcast in the family of human activities?

A. The function of working up raw material and serving as a link between the producer and the consumer (which covers "business") is surely a necessary one in any but the most primitive form of human society. Hence it cannot be an outcast in the family of human activities; for all necessary actions can be spiritually performed. What Mr. Crosbie probably means is that as things are at present the complex we call the business world is a vortex of selfishness and the man who tries to lead the life of a businessman and apply Theosophical ethics thereto has a hard time. So at best business is bad. But this does not mean that it cannot be made better, and just because it is essential to society business will have to be spiritualized. As in all reforms the starting point is on the plane

of motives and of the spiritual interpretation of the function of the business man. Things being as they are, the road to noticeable improvement in this field is a long one. But the Theosophical student knows that no harvest of physical effects can be expected unless seeds are sown and tended on the invisible plane of thought and feeling. So if his karma has placed him in the industrial or commercial world, he may take heart and work steadily for the regeneration of that particular aspect of human activity, convinced, as a writer quoted in the June 1939 issue of *The Aryan Path* says, that what we are "apt to look upon as beauty-destroying, mind-enslaving instruments of the Devil" are "fundamentally and in essence spiritual". The art is to work this idea out clearly in the mind and then put the new interpretation into action. In this work great aid will be derived from an examination of the rules and ideas which the Hindu Vaishya of old was given to observe. Production of wealth in an honest manner—without robbing or destroying Nature—and its proper distribution for the benefit of culture and the maintenance of propriety in the social order were Vaishya-dharma.

The public attitude in regard to alcohol consumption is changing in Great Britain. *The Manchester Guardian* for 25th May quoted Lord Lothian, the new British Ambassador to the U.S.A., who presided at a recent London luncheon of the National Commercial Temperance League, as recommending official limitation of alcohol consumption in the British army, navy and air force. His suggestion was inspired by the regulations imposed not long ago on the German air force and navy.

At the same luncheon, Dr. Ronald Cove-Smith demolished the ridiculous claims put forward in beer advertisements:—

One might as well say "Saltpetre for preserving, sulphur for purifying the blood, and charcoal for digestion—so gunpowder is best."

Desirable as the avoidance of alcohol is for all from the standpoint of physical health, it is imperative for the earnest student who has resolved to overcome his lower nature and to fit himself for soul service. H. P. B. writes:—

Alcohol in all its forms has a direct, marked, and very deleterious influence on man's psychic condition. Wine and spirit drinking is only less destructive to the development of the inner powers, than the habitual use of hashish, opium, and similar drugs.

And again:—

It is well known what an evil influence the evaporations of blood and alcohol have on the spiritual side of human nature, blowing the animal passions into a raging fire.



## THE ROAD TO REBIRTH

Theosophy, as far as it has been restated for our century, while firmly maintaining the fact of reincarnation as an indispensable factor in soul evolution, is yet almost silent as to the actual process of the descent of the Ego from the invisible to the visible, from an unembodied state to incarnation in a physical body. But there are one or two hints thrown out by Mr. Judge that we recognize as seed thoughts, recalling that

it was never the intention of the Occultists really to conceal what they have been writing from the earnest determined students, but rather to lock up their information for safety's sake in a secure safe box, the key to which is—intuition. The degree of diligence and zeal with which the hidden meaning is sought by the student is generally the test—how far he is entitled to the possession of the so buried treasure.

Most students of Theosophy are familiar with the passage in *The Ocean of Theosophy* (Indian Edition p. 73) where Mr. Judge writes :—

As we know that no human body is formed without the union of the sexes, and that the germs of such production are locked up in the sexes and must come from food which is taken into the body, it is obvious that foods have something to do with the reincarnating of the Ego. Now if the road to reincarnation leads through certain food and none other, it may be possible that if the Ego gets entangled in food which will not lead to the germ of physical reproduction, a punishment is indicated where Manu says that such and such practices will lead to transmigration, which is then a "hindrance".

Less well known but no less significant is his inquiry in notes for his projected but never written occult novel, "Shall the question of reincarnation through cloud and rain and seed and thus from the seed of the man, be gone into?" This query is preceded by a pregnant paragraph, from which we quote :—

He consents inwardly to assume life there and soon a heavy storm arises, the rain beats, he feels himself carried to the earth and in deep darkness. A resounding noise about him. It is the noise of the growing plants. This is a rice field with some sesamum in it. The moisture descends and causes the expanding; sees around, all is motion and life. Enclosed in the sphere of some rice he bemoans his fate. He is born in a Brahmin's house. (THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, March 1939, p. 68)

It was more than thirty years after Mr. Judge pointed to the fact that certain foods contain the germ of physical reproduction and that others do not that modern science overtook ancient theory. In 1925 two scientists in the University of California, Doctors Scott and Bishop, discovered that any organism living upon food lacking in Vitamin X, later

christened "Fat Soluble E", was absolutely sterile. But just what are vitamins, those hypothetical constituents of food, present in some foods, absent from others, modern science does not know. They are not chemical bodies which have been isolated and examined under the microscope, but are known only by the observed effects of the presence or absence of these almost unknown quantities on the physical organism ingesting this or that food. Whether they ever will be isolated or demonstrated physically, or whether they are—as was suggested in the "On the Lookout" section of *Theosophy* (Los Angeles) for June 1923—"astral substances especially connected with the various forms of pranic currents" remains to be established.

Meantime a most interesting and suggestive article bearing on this mysterious subject is contributed to *The Aryan Path* for August 1939 by Shri Nolini Kanta Gupta, to which the attention of the student is particularly invited. The Upanishadic "Science of the Five Fires" is directly concerned with the passage of the soul into earth existence. The stages in the process, which is conceived as a sacrificial cycle, are : (1) Soma, symbolising in one sense the very soul and substance of life, (2) Rain, which is offered to the Earth who brings forth (3) Food. Food in turn is offered to the Father, who elaborates (4) Semen, the generative fluid. Then, with the contribution of the Father and later with that of the Mother, the cycle of sacrifice culminates in (5) the Child.

Shri Gupta emphasises that the esoteric sense of this description goes beyond the outer symbols. The region of Soma, for example, is the "own Home of Bliss and Immortality", where the soul rests between lives on earth. The rain represents the journeying down of the soul from that home of bliss, when the hour strikes. The Upanishadic Rishi viewed the sacrificial cycle of reproduction as "a cosmic cycle, as a limb of the Universal Brahman".

The sexual function, for example, is easily equated to the double movement of ascent and descent that is secreted in nature, or to the combined action of Purusha and Prakriti in the cosmic play, or again to the hidden fount of Delight that holds and moves the universe. In this view there is nothing merely secular and profane, but all is woven into the cosmic spiritual whole; and man is taught to consider and to mould all his movements—of soul and mind and body—in the light and rhythm of that integral Reality... Even movements relating to food and to sex, should be dedicated to the Cosmic Being—Viswa Purusha—and that alone received which comes from Him.

## KRISHNA JAYANTI

H. P. 49 ff

Before the next number of THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT is published Hindus will have celebrated the Natal Day of Krishna, the Great Incarnation of Wisdom. Students of Theosophy venerate the Teacher and His priceless Teaching embodied in the *Gita*. All of them owe a debt of gratitude to W. Q. Judge for showing the way of study of the Song Celestial. His rendition of the *Gita*, as also the Notes he wrote are among our valued possessions. Below we print one of his articles which first appeared in *The Path* for September 1895 (Vol. X. p. 178) under the Caption:

## NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA

We assume, quite justifiably, I think, that the *Bhagavad-Gita* sets forth Aryan philosophy. The Aryan is white and noble in contradistinction to the black and ignoble. This book then, if Aryan, must give us a noble system of philosophy and ethics, useful not only for speculative minds but also in daily life. Whoever was the author, he, or they, compressed into a short conversation—that is, short for Indians—the essence of religion and philosophy.

The singular manner in which this conversation or lecturing or teaching came about should be first noted. It is after the very beginning of a battle, for the arrows had already begun to fly from side to side. A rain of arrows would first be thrown in before the hand-to-hand encounter began. Arjuna and Krishna are in Arjuna's great chariot. And there, between the two armies, Arjuna asks for advice and receives it through eighteen chapters. All of this has significance.

Arjuna is man or the soul struggling to the light, and while Krishna was one of the Avatars or manifestations of God among men, he is also the Higher Self. Arjuna as man in this world of sense and matter is of necessity either always in a battle or about to begin one, and is also ever in need of advice. This he can get only in a valuable way from his Higher Self. So the singular manner of placing the conversation where it is, and of beginning it as it begins, is the only way it ought to be done.

Arjuna is the man in the life his Karma has produced, and he must fight out the battle he himself invited. Arjuna's object was to regain a kingdom, and so each one of us may know that our fight is for a kingdom gainable only by individual effort and not by anyone's favour.

From the remarks by Arjuna to Krishna we can perceive that the kingdom he—like ourselves—wishes to regain is the one he had in some former age upon this planet or upon some far more ancient one. He has too much insight, too much evident soul-power and wisdom to be an Ego who only for the first, or second, or third time had visited this earth. We likewise are not new. We have been here so

many times that we ought to be beginning to learn. And we have not only been here, but beyond doubt those of us who are inwardly and outwardly engaged in the Theosophical Movement for the good of others, have been in a similar movement before this life.

This being so, and there being yet many more lives to come, what is the reason we should in any way be downcast? The first chapter of the Book is really not only the survey of the armies, but also the despondency of the principal person—Arjuna. He grows downcast after looking over all the regiments and seeing that he had, on both sides, friends, teachers, relatives, as well as enemies. He falters because want of knowledge prevents him from seeing that the conflict and many apparent deaths are inevitable. And Krishna then proceeds to give him the true philosophy of man and the universe so that he can either fight or refrain from fighting, whichever he sees at any time the best.

Krishna leads him gradually. He plays upon his pride by telling him that if he backs out all men will say he is the most ignoble of all cowards; then he plays upon his Hindu religious teaching, telling him that a warrior must obey the rules of his caste, and fight. He does not plunge at once into high metaphysical speculation or show him occult wonders. And herein it seems to me is a good lesson for all working Theosophists. Too many of us when trying to spread forth the Theosophical teaching drag the poor Arjunas we have caught right into obscure realms where Theosophists themselves know nothing at all but terminology. Krishna's wise, practical and simple method should be followed, and much better results will be obtained. Our object is to spread Theosophical philosophy as widely and quickly as possible. This cannot be done if we indulge in words and phrases far removed from daily life. What good does it do to talk about the Absolute, Parabrahm and Alaya, and to say *manas* when we mean mind, and *kama* when desire and passion are the English equivalents? It only puzzles the new enquirer, who feels that he has to learn a new language before he will be able to do anything with Theosophy. It is a good deal easier

to show that the new terms can be learned afterwards.

The first chapter having introduced the practical question of life, the second is equally practical, for it directs attention at the outset to the larger and eternal life of which each incarnation is a day or a moment. For Krishna says:

"I myself never was not, nor thou, nor all the princes of the earth; nor shall we ever hereafter cease to be. As the Lord of this mortal frame experienceth therein infancy, youth and old age, so in future incarnations will it meet the same. One who is confirmed in this belief is not disturbed by anything that may come to pass."

Thus, continued *practical* existence as opposed to continued theoretical and so-called heavenly existence, and as opposed to materialistic annihilation, is declared at once. This is true immortality. The Christian Bible has no word in the original, teaching immortality such as this; and the preaching of the priests does not lean to an unselfish view of continued existence. And it is very certain that if one is fully confirmed in the knowledge of eternal life through reincarnation he is quite unlikely to be disturbed by things that disturb other people. So at the very outset the teachings of Krishna open up a tremendous vista of life, and confer a calmness most necessary for us in the fight.

The generality of men have many and widely branching objects for mental devotion. It is a devotion to sense, or to self, or to wrong belief or to improper practice. But the follower of the *Bhagavad-Gita* gradually comes to see that the true devotion is that which has but one object through all changes of scene, of thought, or of companionship. That object is the Self which is all in all. The Self, as object, is immovable, whereas the objects taken up by the unwise are movable and transitory.

Equal mindedness and skill in the right performance of duty are the true rules—this is yoga. This right performance of duty means the mental state, for the mere performance of an act has no moral quality in it, since even a machine may be made to perform acts usually done by men. The moral quality resides in the person inside and in his presence or absence. If a human body, asleep or devoid of a soul, raised its hand and took the life of another, that would not be a crime. And oppositely the performance of a good act is no virtue unless the person within is in the right attitude of mind. Many an apparently good act is done from selfish, hypocritical, crafty or other wrong motives. These are only outwardly good. So we must attain to a proper state of mind, or mental devotion, in order to know how to skilfully perform our actions without doing so for the sake of the result; doing them because they ought to be done, because they

are our duties.

Krishna warns Arjuna also against inactivity from a false view of the philosophy. This warning necessary then is so still. On hearing this teaching for the first time many say that it teaches inaction, sitting still, silence. And in India great numbers taking that view, retired from life and its duties, going into the caves and jungles away from men.

Krishna says:—

"Firmly persisting in yoga perform thy duty."

To endeavour to follow these rules empirically, without understanding the philosophy and without making the fundamental doctrines a part of oneself, will lead to nothing but disgust and failure. Hence the philosophy must be understood. It is the philosophy of Oneness or Unity. The Supreme Self is one and includes all apparent others. We delude ourselves with the idea that we are separate. We must admit that we and every other person are the Self. From this we will begin to see that we may cease to be the actor although outwardly doing every act that is right. We can cease to be the actor when we know we can withdraw ourselves from the act. Attachment to the act arises from a self-interest in the result that is to follow. It is possible for us to do these things without that self-interest, and if we are trying to follow the rule of doing our actions because they ought to be done we will at last do only that which is right to be done.

A great deal of the unhappiness of life comes from having a number of interests in results which do not come out as expected. We find people pretending to believe in Providence and to rely on the Almighty but who are continually laying down plans for those powers to follow. They are not followed, and as the poor mortal fixed his mind and heart on the result, unhappiness follows.

But there is a greater unhappiness and misery caused by acting, as is the usual way, for the sake of results. It is this that causes rebirth over and over again unendingly. It is by this that the great humdrum mass of men and women are whirled around the wheel of rebirth for ages, always suffering, because they do not know what is happening to them, and only by an accident altering the poor character of births incessantly repeated.

The mind is the actor, the person who is attached. When it is deluded it is not able to throw off the subtle chains that bind it to reincarnation. Having spent an incarnation in looking after results it is full of earthly impressions and has made the outer skandhas very powerful. So when its stay in Devachan is at its end the old images, impressions and the powerful skandhas drag it back to another life. At the time of bodily death the mind is temporarily almost altered into the image of the dominant thought of life, and so is beside

## HYPNOTISM

itself or insane by comparison with the sage and with what ought to be its proper state. Being so it is impossible for it either to prevent rebirth or to select and take up an incarnation with a definite end and work in the world in view.

The bearing of the teaching upon ethics is in my opinion very important. It gives a vital system as opposed to a mechanical one. We are to do our duty with the thought that we are acting for and as the Supreme Being, because that Being acts only by and through the creatures. If this be our real rule it would in time be impossible for us to do wrong, for constantly thinking thus we grow careful as to what acts we commit and are always clearing up our view of duty as we proceed.

On the other hand a mechanical code of ethics leads to error. It is convenient because any fixed code is more convenient to follow than the application of broad principles in brotherly spirit. Mechanical codes are conventional and for that reason they lead to hypocrisy. They have led people to mistake etiquette for morality. They cause the follower of them to unrighteously judge his neighbour who does not come up to his conventional code which is part of his ethics. It was a mechanical system of ethics that permitted and encouraged the Inquisition, and similar ethics in our later days permit men professing the highest altruism to persecute their brothers in the same way in intention. If the law and liberty of the times were not opposed they would slay and torture too.

But I have only time to touch lightly upon some of the many valuable points found in the first two chapters. If but those two chapters were preserved and the others lost, we would still have enough.

The remaining chapters deal with universal cosmical truths as well as with philosophy and ethics. They all enforce the great doctrine of unity or non-separateness. In going over them we find such references as require us to know and to believe in the Wisdom-Religion. The rise and destruction of races is given, the obscurities and darkness between evolutionary periods, the universal great destructions and the minor ones are there. Through all these the Self sits calmly looking on as the spectator, the witness, the receptacle.

Where Arjuna the Archer is, he who was taught by Krishna, with him is glory, honour, fortune and success. He who knows Arjuna knows himself.

—WILLIAM BREHON

Writing on "Hypnotism in the Dentist's Chair" (*The Evening Standard*, 7th June 1939), Francis Wimbrook reviews the history of hypnotism in modern times (doing less than justice to Mesmer, the "discoverer" of this force subsequently rechristened hypnotism) and extols its value as a substitute for anæsthetics and as a promoter of rapid healing. He might justly have made far less modest claims for hypnotic healing, but the very fact that hypnotic suggestion is so powerful a force and as yet so imperfectly understood, should suggest extreme caution in its use.

Mr. Wimbrook makes the common mistake of confusing hypnotisation by mechanical means, the fixing of the eyes on a bright spot, a metal or a receding white line with mesmerism proper, in which the will of the operator acts on the nervous system of the patient. "Suggestion" is a matter of vibrations produced by the Will. These vibrations are quite distinct—operating, in fact, on quite a different plane—from the molecular vibrations of the object gazed at, which produce the hypnotic state by bringing into unison with themselves, through the medium of the eye, the molecular vibrations of the nervous centres of the subject's brain.

Theosophy, which outlines the rationale of this most important branch of the Occult Science, warns gravely against its dangers. The physician who mesmerises his patient imparts to him some of his own vital fluid, intangible but none the less real, and with it, if the healer be not perfectly pure and healthy, may convey some of his own physical ills as well as mental vices. The evil that one such "healer" can effect is great. Furthermore, while the healthy vital fluid imparted by the physician can and does cure, too much of it will kill.

Defenders of hypnotism who claim that "it is impossible to make any one do a thing he abhors, even when completely hypnotised" leave out of account the progressive weakening of the patient's free will by this subjection of his mental action to the will of another, and also the possibility of "suggestions" planted in the subconscious coming to disastrous fruition long after they are made.

Another factor, surely an undesirable one, is the intimate *rapport* established between hypnotiser and patient, which enables the operator who has once really subjugated the will of the patient to his own, thereafter to impress his thoughts upon the former patient even at a distance and without a word being spoken, and by an irresistible power to force obedience to his mental orders.

## SIN AGAINST LIFE

"When I am annoyed by an ungovernable animal, I am reminded that the brutes would not oppose man if man understood and entered into his true relations with all things. The brutes are unconsciously aware of the general human opposition, which they see focalized in each human being. When I am in harmony with all things, men *cannot* and brutes *will not* oppose me. In underrating instinct, the brute is more true than is the man, to the unwritten Law."—W. Q. Judge.

Not so many years ago fashionable ladies in the West decorated themselves with osprey plumes—forgetting perhaps the old fable of the jackdaw and the peacock's feathers. And tortoiseshell dressing-table appurtenances gladdened the eyes of those rich enough to afford them. To-day the latter "fashion" is nearly dead and the former has been made to die out owing to the agitation against the appalling cruelty involved.

To-day, at some very fashionable restaurants in London the diners choose from a number of living, swimming fish one they fancy and it is forthwith killed and cooked and eaten with relish; while in the poorer districts live eels are bought for food. Huge carcasses (no, why use that term for it has become so familiar that it only calls up the vision of "good to eat", rather use the term corpses which is more correct) are hung up in shop windows with little dishes to catch the still dripping blood, and from these corpses people choose what part they will buy and cook and eat. Or, to take another example, raw meat is advocated to those ill of certain diseases—even though this too has been proved to be of no avail!

Look at the world of "sport". There has been much outcry of late against the obvious unfairness of the laws regarding what is looked upon as "sport" and therefore legitimate, and what is called "cruelty to animals" and punishable by fine or imprisonment. "Sport" seems to be that which is done by people in large numbers and which the on-looker has got accustomed to; "cruelty" seems to be the infliction of pain by one or two persons on some animal. We therefore get the strange case of "hunting", "coursing", "fishing" and "shooting" for sport being looked up to as rightful employment for the rich—good for trade, good for making people brave, etc., and in contrast the flogging or imprisonment of youths for tying a cat to a tree and pelting it with stones. Also, hounds are trained to "worry" foxes and hares, but if a dog "worries" sheep then it must be destroyed. In past years both rich and poor enjoyed cock-fights, and strange as it may seem, a "hanging" was looked upon as a treat, and only of late has France decided that guillotining shall be done in private, while in England crowds still collect at the time that a prisoner is to be hanged, though all they can get out of it is to know that it is happening behind

the walls. Cock-fights though illegal in Britain still take place in secret, it is said, or addicts to this form of cruelty go across the water to places where it is not illegal.

In England, stag-hunting will soon be killed by popular disgust; it will not be long, if it is persisted in, before the onlookers "set upon" the hunters and forcefully stop the hunt if the hunters cannot be "shamed" into giving up such "sport".

"Coursing" is where hares are driven from the surrounding country to a cabbage patch and then as they come out one by one two greyhounds are let loose to chase them. Very soon the hare is caught (only very rarely does one escape) and often each dog will have one piece of the hare in its mouth and a tug-of-war ensues with the hare screaming with pain until a lucky bite takes away its life. This "sport" is watched by hundreds of men and women and is legal!

Hunting of foxes, both old foxes and cubs, is still a "sport", and young followers of the hounds who have their own pet animals at home, enjoy and feel proud in having a piece of the killed fox rubbed on their faces so that they may be "blooded". Strange as it may sound the otherwise gently nurtured young girls love, yes that is the word, *love* this ceremony!

Fishing is such a general "sport" that it comes more as a shock to find how all, young and old, enjoy seeing a fish caught and slowly die, or watch "live" bait struggling in pain and fear until it is caught by a larger fish.

And yet, campaign after campaign has been and is being fought to ensure "humane" killing of animals that are killed for food, and "humane" traps or poison gas to destroy the farmers' pests! Humane hypocrisy!

What a short cry from all this to the horrors of war! From watching a fly caught in the spider's web or on the despicable fly-paper to the death agonies of a fish, fox, bird, through the horrors of vivisection it is but a step to the torturing of prisoners of war and of concentration camps.

From punishable cruelty to animals, through traditional "sports" to licensed vivisection laboratories! Let those who think any gain to human suffering has been attained by vivisection study the subject; there is not space here to go into it, but

material can be easily found. What is it but the logical outcome of the slow stultifying of the feeling-nature through these accepted cruelties that makes it possible for a man to clamp down on a table a living, breathing, feeling animal and then proceed with his knives (call them lancets if you need to stupefy still more the feeling-nature) to cut that living flesh, to tie one or other living organ in this or that way, to this or that other organ! Or insert the germ of some dreadful disease and watch the stages of that disease and the suffering of the animal. What are our vaccines, serums, etc., but fancy names for the loathsome ingredients of the Witches' Cauldron of *Macbeth*? Lest any should think that this is exaggeration, in 1904 (it is supposed to be better now) speaking at the Victoria University of Manchester, Dr. S. Monckton Copeman said regarding vaccination lymph:—

The most satisfactory material was found to be vesicle pulp, obtained in the *post mortem* room from cases of discrete small-pox that had died during a comparatively early stage of the eruption.

The fight against the forced vaccination of people in Great Britain has won in the past a "conscience clause", which means that no Britisher need be vaccinated or have his children vaccinated, and yet you see on board ship instructions issued that if you wish to land at such and such a place you *must* be vaccinated, or inoculated against such and such disease. And all this, at the very time when the medical profession is beginning *en bloc* to agree to the anti-vaccination ideas of some few of their profession in past years. Even in the Woolwich arsenal and other War Departments it is no longer necessary that persons under twenty-one should be vaccinated, nor is the rule enforced for boys in the Army, thanks to Mr. Hoare-Belisha. Think—in the thirtythree years ending December 1937, 118 children (under five) died of small-pox in England and Wales, but 291 died of vaccination.

Immunisation against diphtheria is, says *The Medical Times* (November 1937):

one of the latest, we might almost say one of the latest crazes. At any rate, we again wish to sound a note of warning against it. We really know far too little about the actual results of immunisation to warrant us meantime in adopting such measures. Unfortunately deaths following immunisation have been reported from time to time. This should make us go very cautiously.

These facts must be made more widely known.

The human body is not a receptacle in which should be placed all manner of disease. Polluting of drinking water is a vile thing; how much more vile is the polluting of the very life-essence of the human being! We collect gas-masks against poison-gas which will affect the lungs but we open up our blood stream willingly to take in poison.

Just as there is no excuse for cruelty in "sports", and no excuse in the cruelty of vivisection, the case is still worse when we come to cruelty for fashion referred to at the beginning of this article. Now-a-days, instead of the dreadful cruelty of trapping wild animals for their skins in the forests of Canada, Russia, etc., a new trade is creeping into prominence, and not only in the West where one expects to see everything noble giving way to the craze for money, but also in India, the land that once gave birth to the Buddha and listened to His noble teaching of *ahimsa*, harmlessness. "Kill not, for pity's sake and lest ye slay the meanest thing upon its upward way." Cannot Indians themselves watch that such things do not contaminate their land further? The newspapers have reported that a mink farm has been started at Kotagiri in the Nilgiris. Will you please visualise not the farm but the slaughter day? Will you please, if you are Western, think in terms of your dog, or cat or hunter. Look into their eyes and think what would happen if a few years hence cat fur or dog hair became popular as a covering; or horse hair and skin, soft and oh! so glossy, became a fashionable settee cover! And if you are Eastern in the land where the Buddha taught love for all creatures, harmlessness and compassion, cannot you refuse to soil His and our land with more blood! The Western hemisphere is crouching in fear of war. Surely the "whole creation groaneth and travaileth" because of man, as the scripture puts it, but need we for the sake of a fine coat use the skin which covers the little mink? Its actual death will be painless—that is if the same laws apply here as in England. What we have to face is the fear of the animals at slaughter time and the soaking of the land with the blood of the animals "which cries aloud for vengeance". Slaughter goes on for food unfortunately and for sacrifice, but for fashion—! Lest any should say that animals do not "know" when the time comes for death, let someone interested obtain a film which shows a fox farm in North America. A lovely life the foxes have, good food, freedom, a large wood to live in, and beautiful they look! Rounding-up day comes,—the film shows it in part. Let any unprejudiced person look at the foxes being rounded up—and then put on their fox fur!

Before it is too late, will some humanitarian Indian take an interest in these subjects and make it a thing of shame to keep a mink farm? It is a disgrace for Indian servants or Indian curers and packers to help in it and also a thing of shame to have anything to do with modern medical methods and Western "sports". Epictetus says there are two kinds of petrification, one is of the sense of shame. And Aldous Huxley writes that the best

way to stop war is to bring in the sense of shame. We must be ashamed of cruelty, ashamed to kill for fashion, ashamed of selfishness.

In our issue of November 1937 we reprinted some comments of H. P. B. from her *Lucifer*, Vol. I. p. 211 for November 1887 on this subject under the heading "Sin Against Life" which caption we use for this article.

H. P. B. however has written at full length on this subject in an article in three instalments, which appeared in *The Theosophist*, Vol. VII for January, February and March 1886. We reprint the first of the series below (the remaining two will appear in our September and October issues) under the caption H. P. B. used—

### HAVE ANIMALS SOULS? IX 112, 119

"Continually soaked with blood, the whole earth is but an immense altar upon which *all that lives has to be immolated* endlessly, incessantly. . . ."—COMTE JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. (*Soirées* I. ii, 35).

Many are the "antiquated religious superstitions" of the East which Western nations often and unwisely deride: but none is so laughed at and practically set at defiance as the great respect of Oriental people for animal life. *Flesh-eaters* cannot sympathize with total abstainers from meat. We Europeans are nations of civilized barbarians with but a few millenniums between ourselves and our cave-dwelling forefathers who sucked the blood and marrow from uncooked bones. Thus, it is only natural that those who hold human life so cheaply in their frequent and often iniquitous wars, should entirely disregard the death-agonies of the brute creation, and daily sacrifice millions of innocent, harmless lives; for we are too epicurean to devour tiger steaks or crocodile cutlets, but must have tender lambs and golden feathered pheasants. All this is only as it should be in our era of Krupp cannons and scientific vivisectioners. Nor is it a matter of great wonder that the hardy European should laugh at the mild Hindu, who shudders at the bare thought of killing a cow, or that he should refuse to sympathize with the Buddhist and Jain, in their respect for the life of every sentient creature—from the elephant to the gnat.

But, if meat-eating has indeed become a vital necessity "the tyrant's plea!"—among Western nations; if hosts of victims in every city, borough and village of the civilized world must needs be daily slaughtered in temples dedicated to the deity, denounced by St. Paul and worshipped by men "whose God is their belly:"—if all this and much more cannot be avoided in our "age of Iron", who can urge the same excuse for sport? Fishing, shooting, and hunting, the most fascinating of all the "amuse-

ments" of civilized life—are certainly the most objectionable from the standpoint of occult philosophy, the most sinful in the eyes of the followers of these religious systems which are the direct outcome of the Esoteric Doctrine—Hinduism and Buddhism. Is it altogether without *any* good reason that the adherents of these two religions, now the oldest in the world, regard the animal world—from the huge quadruped down to the infinitesimally small insect—as their "younger brothers", however ludicrous the idea to a European? This question shall receive due consideration further on.

Nevertheless, exaggerated as the notion may seem, it is certain that few of us are able to picture to ourselves without shuddering the scenes which take place early every morning in the innumerable shambles of the so-called civilized world, or even those daily enacted during the "shooting season". The first sun-beam has not yet awakened slumbering nature, when from all points of the compass myriads of hecatombs are being prepared to salute the rising luminary. Never was heathen Moloch gladdened by such a cry of agony from his victims as the pitiful wail that in all Christian countries rings like a long hymn of suffering throughout nature, all day and every day from morning until evening. In ancient Sparta—than whose stern citizens none were ever less sensitive to the delicate feelings of the human heart—a boy, when convicted of torturing an animal for amusement, was put to death as one whose nature was so thoroughly villainous that he could not be permitted to live. But in civilized Europe—rapidly progressing in all things save Christian virtues—*might* remains into this day the synonym of *right*. The entirely useless, cruel practice of shooting for mere sport countless hosts of birds and animals is nowhere carried on with more fervour than in Protestant England, where the merciful teachings of Christ have hardly made human hearts softer than they were in the days of Nimrod, "the mighty hunter before the Lord". Christian ethics are as conveniently turned into paradoxical syllogisms as those of the "heathen". The writer was told one day by a sportsman that since 'not a sparrow falls on the ground without the will of the Father', he who kills for sport—say, one hundred sparrows—does thereby one hundred times over—his Father's will!

A wretched lot is that of poor brute creatures, hardened as it is into implacable fatality by the hand of man. The *rational* soul of the human being seems born to become the murderer of the *irrational* soul of the animal—in the full sense of the word, since the Christian doctrine teaches *that the soul of the animal dies with its body*. Might not the legend of Cain and Abel have had a dual signi-

fication? Look at that other disgrace of our cultured age—the scientific slaughter-houses called “vivisection rooms”. Enter one of those halls in Paris, and behold Paul Bert, or some other of these men—so justly called “the learned butchers of the Institute”—at his ghastly work. I have but to translate the forcible description of an eye-witness, one who has thoroughly studied the *modus operandi* of those “executioners”, a well known French author :—

“Vivisection”—he says—“is a speciality in which torture, scientifically economised by our butcher-academicians, is applied during whole days, weeks, and even months to the fibres and muscles of one and the same victim. It (torture) makes use of every and any kind of weapon, performs its analysis before a pitiless audience, divides the task every morning between ten apprentices at once, of whom one *works* on the eye, another one on the leg, the third on the brain, a fourth on the marrow; and whose inexperienced hands succeed, nevertheless, towards night after a hard day’s work, in laying bare the whole of the living carcass they had been ordered to *chisel* out, and *that* in the evening, is carefully stored away in the cellar, in order that early next morning it may be worked upon again if only there is a breath of life and sensibility left in the victim! We know, that the trustees of the Grammont law (*loi*) have tried to rebel against this abomination; but Paris showed herself more inexorable than London and Glasgow.”\*

And yet these gentlemen boast of the *grand* object pursued, and of the *grand* secrets discovered by them.

“Horror and lies!”—exclaims the same author. “In the matter of secrets—a few localisations of faculties and cerebral motions excepted—we know but of one secret that belongs to them by rights: it is the secret of torture eternalised, beside which the terrible natural law of *autophagy* (mutual manducation), the horrors of war, the merry massacres of sport, and the sufferings of the animal under the butcher’s knife—are as nothing! Glory to our men of science! They have surpassed every former kind of torture, and remain now and for ever, without any possible contestation, the kings of artificial anguish and despair!”†

The usual plea for butchering, killing, and even for legally torturing animals—as in vivisection—is a verse or two in the Bible, and its ill-digested meaning, disfigured by the so-called scholasticism represented by Thomas Aquinas. Even De Mirville, that ardent defender of the rights of the church, calls such texts—“Biblical tolerances, *forced from God* after the deluge, as so many others, and based upon the decadence of our strength”. However this may be, such texts are amply contradicted by others in the same Bible. The meat-eater, the sportsman and even the vivisector—if there are among the last named those who believe in special creation and

the Bible—generally quote for their justification that verse in Genesis, in which God gives *dual* Adam—“dominion over the fish, fowl, cattle, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth”—(Ch. i., v. 28); hence as the Christian understands it—power of life and death over every animal on the globe. To this the far more philosophical Brahman and Buddhist might answer; “Not so. Evolution starts to mould future humanities within the lowest scales of being. Therefore, by killing an animal, or even an insect, we arrest the progress of an entity towards its final goal in nature—MAN;” and to this the student of occult philosophy may say “Amen”, and add that it not only retards the evolution of that entity, but arrests that of the next succeeding human and more perfect race to come.

Which of the opponents is right, which of them the more logical? The answer depends mainly, of course, on the personal belief of the intermediary chosen to decide the questions. If he believes in special creation—so-called—then in answer to the plain question—“Why should homicide be viewed as a most ghastly sin against God and nature, and the murder of millions of living creatures be regarded as mere sport?”—he will reply :—“Because man is created in God’s own image and looks *upward* to his Creator and to his birth-place—heaven (*os homini sublime dedit*); and that the gaze of the animal is fixed *downward* on its birth-place—the earth”; for God said—“Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind”, (Genesis I, 24). Again, “because man is endowed with an immortal soul, and the dumb brute has no immortality, not even a short survival after death”.

Now to this an unsophisticated reasoner might reply that if the Bible is to be our authority upon this delicate question, there is not the slightest proof in it that man’s birth-place is in heaven any more than that of the last of creeping things—quite the contrary; for we find in Genesis that if God created “man” and blessed “them”, (Ch. I. v. 27-28) so he created “great whales” and “blessed them” (21, 22). Moreover, “the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground” (II.—7): and “dust” is surely earth pulverized? Solomon, the king and preacher, is most decidedly an authority and admitted on all hands to have been the wisest of the Biblical sages; and he gives utterances to a series of truths in Ecclesiastes (Ch. III) which ought to have settled by this time every dispute upon the subject. “The sons of men... might see that they themselves are beasts” (v. 18)... “that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth the beasts....

\* *De la Resurrection et du Miracle*. E. de Mirville.

† *De la Resurrection et du Miracle*. E. de Mirville.



a man has no pre-eminence above a beast",—(v. 19) "all go into one place; all are of the dust and all turn to dust again", (v. 20)... "who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth *upwards*, and the spirit of the beast, that goeth *downward* to the earth?" (v. 21). Indeed, "who knoweth!" At any rate it is neither science nor "school divine".

Were the object of these lines to preach vegetarianism on the authority of Bible or Veda, it would be a very easy task to do so. For, if it is quite true that God gave *dual* Adam—the "male and female" of Chapter I of Genesis—who has little to do with our henpecked ancestor of Chapter II—"dominion over every living thing", yet we nowhere find that the "Lord God" commanded that Adam or the other to devour animal creation or destroy it for sport. Quite the reverse. For pointing to the vegetable kingdom and the "fruit of a tree yielding seed"—God says very plainly: "to you (men) it shall be *for meat*". (I, 29).

So keen was the perception of this truth among the early Christians that during the first centuries they never touched meat. In *Octavio* Tertullian writes to Minutius Felix: "We are not permitted either to witness, or even hear narrated (*noverē*) a homicide, we Christians, *who refuse to taste dishes in which animal blood may have been mixed*."

But the writer does not preach vegetarianism, simply defending "animal rights" and attempting to show the fallacy of disregarding such rights on Biblical authority. Moreover, to argue with those who would reason upon the lines of erroneous interpretations would be quite useless. One who rejects the doctrine of evolution will ever find his way paved with difficulties; hence, he will never admit that it is far more consistent with fact and logic to regard physical man merely as the recognized paragon of animals, and the spiritual Ego that *informs* him as a principle midway between the soul of the animal and the deity. It would be vain to tell him that unless he accepts not only the verses quoted for his justification but the whole Bible in the light of esoteric philosophy, which reconciles the whole mass of contradictions and *seeming* absurdities in it—he will never obtain the key to the truth;—for he will not believe it. Yet the whole Bible teems with charity to men and with mercy and love to animals. The original Hebrew text of Chapter xxiv of Leviticus is full of it. Instead of the verses 17 and 18 as translated in the Bible: "And he that killeth a beast shall make it good, beast for beast" in the original it stands:—"life for life", or rather "soul for soul", *nephesh tachat nephesh*.\* And

\* Compare also the difference between the translation of the same verses in the *Vulgata*, and the texts of *Luther* and *De Wette*.

if the rigour of the law did not go the extent of killing, as in Sparta, a man's "soul" for a beast's "soul"—still, even though he replaced the slaughtered soul by a living one, a heavy additional punishment was inflicted on the culprit.

But this was not all. In Exodus (Ch. xx, 10, and Ch. xxiii, 2 *et seq.*) rest on the Sabbath day extended to cattle and every other animal. "The seventh day is the sabbath... thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy...cattle"; and the Sabbath *year*... "the seventh year thou shalt let it (the land) rest and lie still... that thine ox and thine ass may rest"—which commandment, if it means anything, shows that even the brute creation was not excluded by the ancient Hebrews from a participation in the worship of their deity, and that it was placed upon many occasions on a par with man himself. The whole question rests upon the misconception that "soul", *nephesh*, is entirely distinct from "spirit"—*ruach*. And yet it is clearly stated that "God breathed into the nostrils (of man) *the breath of life* and man became a living soul", *nephesh*, neither more nor less than an animal, for the soul of an animal is also called *nephesh*. It is by development that the *soul* becomes *spirit*, both being the lower and the higher rungs of one and the same ladder whose basis is the UNIVERSAL SOUL or spirit.

This statement will startle those good men and women who, however much they may love their cats and dogs, are yet too much devoted to the teachings of their respective churches ever to admit such a heresy. "The *irrational* soul of a dog or a frog divine and immortal as our own souls are?"—they are sure to exclaim: but so they are. It is not the humble writer of the present article who says so, but no less an authority for every good Christian than that king of the preachers—St. Paul. Our opponents who so indignantly refuse to listen to the arguments of either modern or esoteric science may perhaps lend a more willing ear to what their own saint and apostle has to say on the matter; the true interpretation of whose words, moreover, shall be given neither by a theosophist nor an opponent, but by one who was as good and pious a Christian as any, namely, another saint—John Chrysostom—he who explained and commented upon the Pauline Epistles, and who is held in the highest reverence by the divines of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches. Christians have already found that experimental science is not on their side; they may be still more disagreeably surprised upon finding that no Hindu could plead more earnestly for animal life than did St. Paul in writing to the Romans. Hindus indeed claim mercy to the dumb brute only on account of the doctrine

of transmigration and hence of the sameness of the principle or element that animates both man and brute. St. Paul goes further : he shows the animal *hoping for*, and *living in the expectation of the same "deliverance from the bonds of corruption"* as any good Christian. The precise expressions of that great apostle and philosopher will be quoted later on in the present Essay and their true meaning shown.

The fact that so many interpreters—Fathers of the Church and scholastics,—tried to evade the real meaning of St. Paul is no proof against its inner sense, but rather against the fairness of the theologians whose inconsistency will be shown in this particular. But some people will support their propositions, however erroneous, to the last. Others, recognizing their earlier mistake, will, like Cornelius a Lapide, offer the poor animal *amende honorable*. Speculating upon the part assigned by nature to the brute creation in the great drama of life, he says :

The aim of all creatures is the service of man. Hence, together with him (their master) they are waiting for their renovation"—*cum homine renovationem suam expectant*.\*

"Serving" man, surely cannot mean being tortured, killed, uselessly shot and otherwise misused ; while it is almost needless to explain the word "renovation". Christians understand by it the renovation of bodies after the second coming of Christ ; and limit it to man, to the exclusion of animals. The students of the Secret Doctrine explain it by the successive renovation and perfection of forms on the scale of objective and subjective being, and in a long series of evolutionary transformations from animal to man, and upward....

This will, of course, be again rejected by Christians with indignation. We shall be told that it is not thus that the Bible was explained to them, nor can it ever mean that. It is useless to insist upon it. Many and sad in their results were the erroneous interpretations of that which people are pleased to call the "Word of God". The sentence "cursed be Canaan ; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" (*Gen. ix. 25*),—generated centuries of misery and undeserved woe for the wretched slaves—the negroes. It is the clergy of the United States who were their bitterest enemies in the anti-slavery question, which question they opposed *Bible in hand*. Yet slavery is proved to have been the cause of the natural decay of every country ; and even proud Rome fell because "the majority in the ancient world were slaves", as Geyer justly remarks. But so terribly imbued at

all times were the best, the most intellectual Christians with those many erroneous interpretations of the Bible, that even one of their grandest poets, while defending the right of man to freedom, allots no such portion to the poor animal.

God gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,  
Dominion absolute ; that right we hold  
By his donation ; but man over man  
He made not lord ; such title to himself  
Reserving, human left from human free.

—says Milton.

But, like murder, error "will out", and incongruity must unavoidably occur whenever erroneous conclusions are supported either against or in favour of a prejudged question. The opponents of Eastern *philozoism* thus offer their critics a formidable weapon to upset their ablest arguments by such incongruity between premises and conclusions, facts postulated and deductions made.

It is the purpose of the present Essay to throw a ray of light upon this most serious and interesting subject. Roman Catholic writers in order to support the genuineness of the many miraculous resurrections of animals produced by their saints, have made them the subject of endless debates. The "soul in animals" is, in the opinion of Bossuet, "the most difficult as the most important of all philosophical questions."

Confronted with the doctrine of the Church that animals, though not soulless, have no *permanent* or immortal soul in them, and that the principle which animates them dies with the body, it becomes interesting to learn how the school-men and the Church divines reconcile this statement with that other claim that animals may be and have been frequently and miraculously resurrected.

Though but a feeble attempt—one more elaborate would require volumes—the present Essay, by showing the inconsistency of the scholastic and theological interpretations of the Bible, aims at convincing people of the great criminality of taking—especially in sport and vivisection—animal life. Its object, at any rate, is to show that however absurd the notion that either man or brute can be resurrected after the life-principle has fled from the body for ever, such resurrections—if they were true—would not be more impossible in the case of a dumb brute than in that of a man ; for either both are endowed by nature with what is so loosely called by us "soul", or neither the one nor the other is so endowed.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

(To be continued.)

\* *Commen. Apocal.*, Ch. v. 137.

## U. L. T. PAMPHLET SERIES

1. *Is Theosophy a Religion?* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
2. *What Theosophy Is* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
3. *Universal Applications of Doctrine and The Synthesis of Occult Science* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
4. *Castes in India* . . . . . D. K. MAVALANKAR
5. *Theosophy Generally Stated* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
6. *Karma* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
7. *Ormuzd and Ahriman* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
8. *Reincarnation in Western Religions* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
9. *Reincarnation, Memory, Heredity* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
10. *Reincarnation* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
11. *Dreams* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
12. *Mind-Control* . . . . . { D. K. MAVALANKAR  
W. Q. JUDGE
13. *Mediatorship* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
14. *H. P. Blavatsky* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
15. *On The Secret Doctrine* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
16. *The Secret Doctrine Instructions* . . . . . { W. Q. JUDGE  
and others
17. *Truth in Modern Life* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
18. *Culture of Concentration* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
19. *Hypnotism* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
20. *Kosmic Mind* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
21. *Overcoming Karma* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
22. { *What Are the Theosophists?*  
*Some Words on Daily Life* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY  
A MASTER OF WISDOM
23. *Christmas* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
24. *Cyclic Impression and Return* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
25. *Memory in the Dying* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
26. *The Origin of Evil* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
27. *The Fall of Ideals* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
28. *On the New Year* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
29. *A Master's Letter*
30. *Karma—The Compensator* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
31. "Let Every Man Prove His Own Work" . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
32. { *The Dual Aspect of Wisdom*  
*Who Possess Knowledge?* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
33. *The Great Master's Letter*
34. *Living the Higher Life* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
35. *Theosophy and Education* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
36. *Musings on the True Theosophist's Path* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE

*Texts for Theosophical Meetings*

## BOOKS

### By H. P. BLAVATSKY

*Isis Unveiled*

Centenary Anniversary Edition. A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1877. Two volumes bound in one.

*The Secret Doctrine*

A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1888. Two volumes bound in one.

*The Theosophical Glossary*

A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1892.

*Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge*

*The Key to Theosophy*

*Raja-Yoga or Occultism*

*The Voice of the Silence*

*Five Messages to Theosophists*

### By W. Q. JUDGE

*The Ocean of Theosophy*

*Letters That Have Helped Me*

*Echoes from the Orient*

*The Bhagavad-Gita*

*Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*

*The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali*

*An Epitome of Theosophy*

### By ROBERT CROSBIE

*The Friendly Philosopher*

*Answers to Questions on The Ocean of Theosophy*

### OTHER BOOKS

*Light on the Path*

"No-Man's-Land"

*The Laws of Healing—Physical and Metaphysical*

### MAGAZINES

*Theosophy* (English)—Los Angeles XXVIIth volume

*Théosophie* (French)—Paris XIVth "

*De Theosoof* (Dutch)—Amsterdam Xth "

*The Aryan Path* (English)—Bombay Xth "

*The Theosophical Movement*—Bombay IXth "

Prices may be had on application to the United Lodge of Theosophists.

# The United Lodge of Theosophists

## DECLARATION

THE policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable *Basis for Union* among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "*similarity of aim, purpose and teaching*", and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that *basis*. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

*"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult  
or sect, yet belongs to each and all."*

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge as set forth in its "Declaration", I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate; it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the Form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signature will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished to Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with.

Correspondence should be addressed to

### The United Lodge of Theosophists

51, MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD, BOMBAY, INDIA.

## OTHER LODGES

LOS ANGELES .....	Theosophy Hall, 245 W. 33rd Street
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA .....	Masonic Temple Building
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA .....	Pacific Bldg., 4th and Market Streets
NEW YORK CITY .....	24 East Sixtieth Street
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA .....	Theosophy Hall, 1434 Tenth Street
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA .....	628 Electric Building, 6th and E Streets
PHOENIX, ARIZONA .....	32 North Central Ave.
PHILADELPHIA, PA. ....	Lewis Tower, N. E. Cor. 15th and Locust Sts.
WASHINGTON, D. C. ....	709 Hill Building, 17th and Eye Streets
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA .....	425 Richmond Street
LONDON, ENGLAND .....	17 Great Cumberland Place, London W. I.
PARIS, FRANCE .....	14 rue de l'Abbé de l'Épée 5e
AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND .....	24 Vondelstraat
PAPEETE, TAHITI .....	Rue du Docteur Fernand Cassiau