

सत्यान्नास्ति परो धर्मः ।



*There is no Religion Higher than Truth*

# THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

BOMBAY, 17th May 1936.

VOL. VI. No. 7.

## DESIRE OF COMFORT

*"Men are not made into steel by comfort."*—W. Q. JUDGE.

It is the way of mankind to seek comfort in failures through moral weakness. This is natural, perhaps, but gives no permanent satisfaction. Theosophical discipline recognizes that *real* comfort comes only with clear perception and understanding of the mistake made. Therefore when we are feeling miserable after a blunder it is best not to seek personal comfort from friend or co-student or even an experienced elder; go to the impersonal philosophy and allow it to shed its light on our mood and our mistake. People are as prone to give as to seek personal comfort. A soothing conversation is like an anæsthetic and puts the soul to sleep. A person feels satisfied when in response to his repentant confession he is told "Well you have learnt and you will not do it again"; and then the awakening conscience goes back into the sleep of solace. The result is that in a short while the mistake is made again. Better far to follow the example of Job who refused to be comforted by pious platitudes when he was seeking for explanation and illumination.

A quiet passing through any unpleasant experience which comes to us as an effect produces a dual good: we pay the debt and close the account; we learn from it and so unfold a new capacity or virtue, or strengthen old ones. We often talk of paying our Karmic debts, overlooking the method by which they are discharged. What is the method? Passing through the experience in calmness, with mind atten-

tive to observe and learn. The debt is not paid when we are thrown off our balance by Karmic processes; we often add to the sum-total of our debt by newly made Karmas. Thus Karma grows—out of one effect several new causes spring. Attend in quietude to the effect and soon we perceive the root-cause; we learn the lesson of the experience; the necessity of learning that particular lesson has ceased. This brings real comfort and what is more we transform our heart of iron and our mind of lead into steel.

Honoré de Balzac speaks of "a heart that was steeled but not of steel." A man of steel has a heart that is neither hard nor soft but a heart in which perception has unfolded. That perception is of the universal which is hidden by the *maya* of the personal. That heart is able to distinguish between cries of pain which are real and cries of wounded pride, of hurt egotism, of unfulfilled desires—in short of the personal self. The cry of real pain is the cry of the Soul, which longs to be free from the tyranny of the personal self. Many a student mistakes the cry of his personal self for the cry of the soul. The true soul-cry has never gone unanswered, for the all-hearing ears of the Lords of Compassion are ever open to that cry. They can, and do give comfort to the aspirant who has deserved comfort by crushing the personality. The comfort They give is the power to comfort in their turn others who cry from that agony that belongs to the Soul.



# A PAMPHLET OF INSTRUCTIONS

## A CHART AND A GUIDE

During the month of April a most valuable pamphlet was published (No. 33 in the U. L. T. Series) which contains a very important Mahatma Letter. In this is to be found an outline of the aims of the Theosophical Movement inaugurated in 1875 by H. P. B., the accredited Messenger of the Mahatmas. In addition to that Letter two short

appendices are included in the pamphlet—extracts from an article by H. P. B. The student will be better equipped to appreciate the pamphlet if he carefully reads the whole of this article. For some comments on it see *The Aryan Path* for November 1930—Vol. I. pp. 750–752. We reprint it below from *Lucifer*, Vol. II, pp. 421–433, for August 1888.

## THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY: ITS MISSION AND ITS FUTURE

[AS EXPLAINED BY M. EMILE BURNOUF, THE FRENCH ORIENTALIST.]

“It is another’s fault if he be ungrateful; but it is mine if I do not give. To find one thankful man I will oblige many who are not.”—SENECA.

“ . . . . . The veil is rent  
Which blinded me! I am as all these men  
Who cry upon their gods and are not heard,  
Or are not heeded—yet there must be aid!  
For them and me and all there must be help!  
Perchance the gods have need of help themselves,  
Being so feeble that when sad lips cry  
They cannot save! I would not let one cry  
Whom I could save! . . . . .”

### THE LIGHT OF ASIA.

It has seldom been the good fortune of the Theosophical Society to meet with such courteous and even sympathetic treatment as it has received at the hands of M. Emile Burnouf, the well-known Sanskritist, in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (July 15, 1888)—“*Le Bouddhisme en Occident.*”

Such an article proves that the Society has at last taken its rightful place in the thought-life of the XIXth century. It marks the dawn of a new era in its history, and, as such, deserves the most careful consideration of all those who are devoting their energies to its work. M. Burnouf’s position in the world of Eastern scholarship entitles his opinions to respect; while his name, that of one of the first and most justly honoured of Sanskrit scholars (the late M. Eugène Burnouf), renders it more than probable that a man bearing such a name will make no hasty statements and draw no premature conclusions, but that his deductions will be founded on careful and accurate study.

His article is devoted to a triple subject: the origins of three religions or associations, whose fundamental doctrines M. Burnouf regards as identical, whose aim is the same, and which are derived

from a common source. These are Buddhism, Christianity and—the Theosophical Society.

As he writes page 341:—

“This source, which is oriental, was hitherto contested; to-day it has been fully brought to light by scientific research, notably by the English scientists and the publication of original texts. Amongst these sagacious scrutinizers it is sufficient to name Sayce, Pool, Beal, Rhys-David, Spencer-Hardy, Bunsen. . . . It is a long time, indeed, since they were struck with resemblances, let us say, rather, identical elements offered by the Christian religions and that of Buddha . . . . During the last century these analogies were explained by a pretended Nestorian influence; but since then the Oriental chronology has been established, and it was shown that Buddha was anterior by several centuries to Nestorius, and even to Jesus Christ . . . . The problem remained an open one down to the recent day when the paths followed by Buddhism were recognised, and the stages traced on its way to finally reach Jerusalem . . . . And now we see born under our eyes a new association, created for the propagation in the world of the Buddhistic dogmas. It is of this triple subject that we shall treat.”

It is on this, to a degree erroneous, conception of the aims and object of the Theosophical Society that M. Burnouf’s article, and the remarks and opinions that ensue therefrom, are based. He strikes a false note from the beginning, and proceeds on this line. The T. S. was not created to propagate any dogma of any exoteric, ritualistic church, whether Buddhist, Brahmanical, or Christian. This idea is a widespread and general mistake; and that of the eminent Sanskritist is due to a self-evident source which misled him. M. Burnouf has read in the *Lotus*, the journal of the Theosophical Society of Paris, a polemical correspondence between one of the Editors of *Lucifer* and the Abbé Roca. The latter persisting—very unwisely—in connecting theosophy with Papism and the Roman Catholic Church—which, of all the dogmatic world religions, is the one his correspondent loathes the most—the philosophy and ethics of Gautama Buddha,



not his later church, whether northern or southern, were therein prominently brought forward. The said Editor is undeniably a Buddhist—*i.e.*, a follower of the esoteric school of the great "Light of Asia," and so is the President of the Theosophical Society, Colonel H. S. Olcott. But this does not pin the theosophical body as a whole to ecclesiastical Buddhism. The Society was founded to become the Brotherhood of Humanity—a centre, philosophical and religious, common to all—not as a propaganda for Buddhism merely. Its first steps were directed toward the same great aim that M. Burnouf ascribes to Buddha Sakyamuni, who "opened his church to all men, without distinction of origin, caste, nation, colour or sex," (*Vide* Art. I in the *Rules* of the T. S.), adding, "My law is a law of Grace for all." In the same way the Theosophical Society is open to all, without distinction of "origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex," and what is more—of creed. . . .

The introductory paragraphs of this article show how truly the author has grasped, with this exception, within the compass of a few lines, the idea that all religions have a common basis and spring from a single root. After devoting a few pages to Buddhism, the religion and the association of men founded by the Prince of Kapilavastu; to Manicheism, miscalled a "heresy," in its relation to both Buddhism and Christianity, he winds up his article with—the Theosophical Society. He leads up to the latter by tracing (a) the life of Buddha, too well known to an English speaking public through Sir Edwin Arnold's magnificent poem to need recapitulation; (b) by showing in a few brief words that Nirvana is *not annihilation*;<sup>\*</sup> and (c) that the Greeks, Romans and even the Brahmans regarded the *priest* as the intermediary between men and God, an idea which involves the conception of a *personal God*, distributing his favours according to his own good pleasure—a sovereign of the universe, in short.

The few lines about Nirvana must find place here before the last proposition is discussed. Says the author:

"It is not my task here to discuss the nature of Nirvâna. I will only say that the idea of annihilation is absolutely foreign to India, that the Buddha's object was to deliver humanity from the miseries of earth life and its successive reincarnations; that, finally, he passed his long existence in battling against Mâra and his angels, whom he himself called Death and the army of death. The word *Nirvâna* means, it is true,

\* The fact that Nirvana does *not* mean *annihilation* was repeatedly asserted in *Isis Unveiled*, where its author discussed its etymological meaning as given by Max Müller and others and showed that the "blowing out of a lamp" does not even imply the idea that Nirvana is the "extinction of consciousness." (See Vol. i. p. 290, and Vol. ii. pp. 117, 286, 320, 566, etc.)

extinction, for instance, that of a lamp blown out; but it means also the absence of wind. I think, therefore, that Nirvâna is nothing else but that *requies aeterna*, that *lux perpetua* which Christians also desire for their dead."

With regard to the conception of the priestly office the author shows it entirely absent from Buddhism. Buddha is no God, but a *man* who has reached the supreme degree of wisdom and virtue. "Therefore Buddhist metaphysics conceives the absolute Principle of all things which other religions call God, in a totally different manner and does not make of it a being separate from the universe."

The writer then points out that equality of all men among themselves is one of the fundamental conceptions of Buddhism.

He adds moreover and demonstrates that it was from Buddhism that the Jews derived their doctrine of a *Messiah*.

The Essenes, the Therapeuts and the Gnostics are identified as a result of this fusion of Indian and Semitic thought, and it is shown that, on comparing the lives of Jesus and Buddha, both biographies fall into two parts: the ideal legend and the real facts. Of these the legendary part is identical in both; as indeed must be the case from the theosophical standpoint, since both are based on the Initiatory cycle. Finally this "legendary" part is contrasted with the corresponding features in other religions, notably with the Vedic story of Visvakarman.\* According to his view, it was only at the council of Nicea that Christianity broke officially with the ecclesiastical Buddhism, though he regards the Nicene Creed as simply the development of the formula: "the Buddha, the Law, the Church" (Buddha, Dharma, Sangha).

The Manicheans were originally *Samans* or *Sramanas*, Buddhist ascetics whose presence at Rome in the third century is recorded by St. Hypopolitus. M. Burnouf explains their dualism as referring to the double nature of man—good and evil—the evil principle being the *Mâra* of Buddhist legend. He shows that the Manicheans derived their doctrines more immediately from Buddhism than did Christianity and consequently a life and death struggle arose between the two, when the Christian Church became a body which claimed to be the sole and exclusive possessor of Truth. This idea is in direct contradiction to the most fundamental conceptions of Buddhism and therefore its professors could not but be bitterly opposed to the

\* This identity between the *Logoi* of various religions and in particular the identity between the legends of Buddha and Jesus Christ, was again proven years ago in "Isis Unveiled," and the legend of Visvakarman more recently in the *Lotus* and other Theosophical publications. The whole story is analysed at length in the "Secret Doctrine," in some chapters which were written more than two years ago.



Manicheans. It was thus the Jewish spirit of exclusiveness which armed against the Manicheans the secular arm of the Christian states.

Having thus traced the evolution of Buddhist thought from India to Palestine and Europe, M. Burnouf points out that the Albigenses on the one hand, and the Pauline school (whose influence is traceable in Protestantism) on the other, are the two latest survivals of this influence. He then continues :

"Analysis shows us in contemporary society two essential elements: the idea of a *personal God* among believers and, among the philosophers, the almost complete disappearance of charity. The Jewish element has regained the upper hand, and the Buddhistic element in Christianity has been obscured."

"Thus one of the most interesting, if not the most unexpected, phenomena of our day is the attempt which is now being made to revive and create in the world a new society, resting on the same foundations as Buddhism. Although only in its beginnings, its growth is so rapid that our readers will be glad to have their attention called to this subject. This society is still in some measure in the condition of a mission, and its spread is accomplished noiselessly and without violence. It has not even a definitive name; its members grouping themselves under eastern names, placed as titles to their publications: *Isis, Lotus, Sphinx, Lucifer*. The name common to all which predominates among them for the moment is that of *Theosophical Society*."

After giving a very accurate account of the formation and history of the Society—even to the number of its working branches in India, namely, 135—he then continues :—

"The society is very young, nevertheless it has already its history. . . . It has neither money nor patrons; it acts solely with its own eventual resources. It contains no worldly element. It flatters no private or public interest. It has set itself a moral idea of great elevation, it combats vice and egoism. It tends towards the unification of religions, which it considers as identical in their philosophical origin; but it recognises the supremacy of truth only. . . ."

"With these principles, and in the time in which we live, the society could hardly impose on itself more trying conditions of existence. Still it has grown with astonishing rapidity. . . ."

Having summarised the history of the development of the T. S. and the growth of its organisation, the writer asks: "What is the spirit which animates it?" To this he replies by quoting the three objects of the Society, remarking in reference to the second and third of these (the study of literatures, religions and sciences of the Aryan nations and the investigation of latent psychic faculties, etc.), that, although these might seem to give the Society a sort of academic colouring, remote from the affairs of actual life, yet in reality this is not the case; and he quotes the following passage from the close of the Editorial in *Lucifer*—for November 1887 :—

"He who does not practise altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker

or a poorer than himself; he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother Theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defence as he would undertake his own—is no Theosophist."—(*Lucifer* No. 3.)

"This declaration," continues M. Burnouf, "is not Christian because it takes no account of belief, because it does not proselytise for any communion, and because, in fact, the Christians have usually made use of calumny against their adversaries, for example, the Manicheans, Protestants and Jews.\* It is even less Mussulman or Brahminical. It is purely Buddhistic: the practical publications of the Society are either translations of Buddhist books, or original works inspired by the teaching of Buddha. Therefore the Society has a Buddhist character."

"Against this it protests a little, fearing to take on an exclusive and sectarian character. It is mistaken: the true and original Buddhism is not a sect, it is hardly a religion. It is rather a moral and intellectual reform, which excludes no belief, but adopts none. This is what is done by the Theosophical Society."

We have given our reasons for protesting. We are pinned to no faith.

In stating that the T. S. is "Buddhist," M. Burnouf is quite right, however, from one point of view. It has a Buddhist colouring simply because that religion, or rather philosophy, approaches more nearly to the TRUTH (the secret wisdom) than does any other exoteric form of belief. Hence the close connexion between the two. But on the other hand the T. S. is perfectly right in protesting against being mistaken for a merely Buddhist propaganda, for the reasons given by us at the beginning of the present article, and by our critic himself. For although in complete agreement with him as to the *true* nature and character of primitive Buddhism, yet the Buddhism of to-day is none the less a rather dogmatic religion, split into many and heterogenous sects. We follow the Buddha alone. Therefore, once it becomes necessary to go behind the actually existing form, and who will deny this necessity in respect to Buddhism?—once this is done, is it not infinitely better to go back to the pure and unadulterated source of Buddhism itself, rather than halt at an intermediate stage? Such a half and half reform was tried when Protestantism broke away from the elder Church, and are the results satisfactory?

Such then is the simple and very natural reason why the T. S. does not raise the standard of exoteric Buddhism and proclaim itself a follower of the *Church* of the Lord Buddha. It desires too

\* And—the author forgets to add—"the Theosophists." No society has ever been more ferociously calumniated and persecuted by the *odium theologium* since the Christian Churches are reduced to use their tongues as their sole weapon—than the Theosophical Association and its Founders.—[ED. *Lucifer*.]



sincerely to remain within that *unadulterated* "light" to allow itself to be absorbed by its distorted shadow. This is well understood by M. Burnouf, since he expresses as much in the following passage :—

"From the doctrinal point of creed, Buddhism has no mysteries; Buddha preached in parables; but a parable is a developed simile, and has nothing symbolical in it. The Theosophists have seen very clearly that, in religions, there have always been two teachings; the one very simple in appearance and full of images or fables which are put forward as realities; this is the public teaching, called exoteric. The other, esoteric or inner, reserved for the more educated and discreet adepts, the initiates of the second degree. There is, finally, a sort of science, which may formerly have been cultivated in the secrecy of the sanctuaries, a science called *hermetism*, which gives the final explanation of the symbols. When this science is applied to various religions, we see that their symbolisms, though in appearance different, yet rest upon the same stock of ideas, and are traceable to one single manner of interpreting nature.

"The characteristic feature of Buddhism is precisely the absence of this hermetism, the exiguity of its symbolism, and the fact that it presents to men, in their ordinary language, the truth without a veil. This it is which the Theosophical Society is repeating. . . ."

And no better model could the Society follow: but this is not all. It is true that no *mysteries* or esotericism exists in the two chief Buddhist Churches, the Southern and the Northern. Buddhists may well be content with the dead letter of Siddârtha Buddha's teachings, as fortunately no higher or nobler ones in their effects upon the ethics of the masses exist, to this day. But herein lies the great mistake of all the Orientalists. There is an esoteric doctrine, a soul-ennobling philosophy, behind the outward body of ecclesiastical Buddhism. The latter, pure, chaste and immaculate as the virgin snow on the ice-capped crests of the Himalayan ranges, is, however, as cold and desolate as they with regard to the *post-mortem* condition of man. This secret system was taught to the *Arhats* alone, generally in the Saptaparna (Mahavansa's *Sattapani*) cave, known to Ta-hian as the *Chetu* cave near the Mount Baibhâr (in Pali *Webhâra*), in Rajagriha, the ancient capital of Maghada, by the Lord Buddha himself, between the hours of *Dhyana* (or mystic contemplation). It is from this cave—called in the days of Sakyamuni, Saraswati or "Bamboo-cave"—that the *Arhats* initiated into the Secret Wisdom carried away their learning and knowledge beyond the Himalayan range, wherein the Secret Doctrine is taught to this day. Had not the South Indian invaders of Ceylon "heaped into piles as high as the top of the cocoanut trees" the *ollas* of the Buddhists, and burnt them, as the Christian conquerors burnt all the secret records of the Gnostics and the Initiates, Orientalists would have the proof of it, and there would have been no need of asserting now this well-known fact.

Having fallen into the common error, M. Burnouf continues :

"Many will say: It is a chimerical enterprise; it has no more a future before it than has the New Jerusalem of the Rue Thouin, and no more *raison d'être* than the Salvation Army. This may be so; it is to be observed, however, that these two groups of people are *Biblical Societies*, retaining all the paraphernalia of the expiring religions. The Theosophical Society is the direct opposite; it does away with figures, it neglects or relegates them to the background, putting in the foreground Science, as we understand it to-day, and the moral reformation, of which our old world stands in such need. What, then, are to-day the social elements which may be for or against it? I shall state them in all frankness."

In brief, M. Burnouf sees in the public *indifference* the first obstacle in the Society's way. "Indifference born from weariness; weariness of the inability of religions to improve social life, and of the ceaseless spectacle of rites and ceremonies which the priest never explains." Men demand to-day "scientific formulæ stating laws of nature, whether physical or moral. . . ." And this indifference the Society must encounter; "its name, also, adding to its difficulties: for the word *Theosophy* has no meaning for the people, and, at best, a very vague one for the learned." "It seems to imply a personal god," M. Burnouf thinks, adding: "Whoever says personal god, says creation and miracle," and he concludes that "the Society would do better to become frankly Buddhist or to cease to exist."

With this advice of our friendly critic it is rather difficult to agree. He has evidently grasped the lofty ideal of primitive Buddhism, and rightly sees that this ideal is identical with that of the T. S. But he has not yet learned the lesson of its history, nor perceived that to graft a young and healthy shoot on to a branch which has lost—less than any other, yet much of—its inner vitality, could not but be fatal to the new growth. The very essence of the position taken up by the T. S. is that it asserts and maintains the truth common to all religions; the truth which is true and undefiled by the concretions of ages of human passions and needs. But though Theosophy means Divine Wisdom, it implies nothing resembling belief in a personal god. It is *not* "the wisdom of God," but *divine* wisdom. The Theosophists of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonic school believed in "gods" and "demons" and in one *impersonal* ABSOLUTE DEITY. To continue :—

"Our contemporary habits of life," says M. Burnouf, "are not severe; they tend year by year to grow more gentle, but also more boneless. The moral stamina of the men of to-day is very feeble; the ideas of good and evil are not, perhaps, obscured, but the *will* to act rightly lacks energy. What men seek above all is pleasure and that somnolent state of existence called comfort. Try to preach the sacrifice of one's possessions and of oneself to men who have entered on this path of selfishness! You will not convert many. Do we not see the doctrine of the 'struggle for life' applied to every function of human life? This



formula has become for our contemporaries a sort of revelation, whose pontiffs they blindly follow and glorify. One may say to them, but in vain, that one must share one's last morsel of bread with the hungry; they will smile and reply by the formula: 'the struggle for life.' They will go further: they will say that in advancing a contrary theory, you are yourself struggling for your existence and are not disinterested. How can one escape from this sophism, of which all men are full to-day? . . . ."

"This doctrine is certainly the worst adversary of Theosophy, for it is the most perfect formula of egoism. It seems to be based on scientific observation, and it sums up the moral tendencies of our day . . . . Those who accept it and invoke justice are in contradiction with themselves; those who practise it and who put God on their side are blasphemers. But those who disregard it and preach charity are considered wanting in intelligence, their kindness of heart leading them into folly. If the T. S. succeeds in refuting this pretended law of the 'struggle for life' and in extirpating it from men's minds, it will have done in our day a miracle greater than those of Sakyamouni and of Jesus."

And this miracle the Theosophical Society will perform. It will do this, not by disproving the relative existence of the law in question, but by assigning to it its due place in the harmonious order of the universe; by unveiling its true meaning and nature and by showing that this *pseudo* law is a "pretended" law indeed, as far as the human family is concerned, and a fiction of the most dangerous kind. "Self-preservation," on these lines, is indeed and in truth a sure, if a slow, suicide, for it is a policy of mutual homicide, because men by descending to its practical application among themselves, merge more and more by a retrograde reinvolution into the animal kingdom. This is what the "struggle for life" is in reality, even on the purely materialistic lines of political economy. Once that this axiomatic truth is proved to all men; the same instinct of self-preservation only directed into its true channel will make them turn to *altruism*—as their surest policy of salvation.

It is just because the real founders of the Society have ever recognised the wisdom of truth embodied in one of the concluding paragraphs of M. Burnouf's excellent article, that they have provided against that terrible emergency in their fundamental teachings. The "struggle for existence" applies only to the physical, never to the moral plane of being. Therefore when the author warns us in these awfully truthful words:

"Universal charity will appear out of date; the rich will keep their wealth and will go on accumulating more; the poor will become impoverished in proportion, until the day when, propelled by hunger, they will demand bread, not of theosophy but of revolution. Theosophy shall be swept away by the hurricane. . . ."

The Theosophical Society replies: "It surely will, were we to follow out his well-meaning advice, yet one which is concerned but with the lower

*plane.*" It is not the policy of self-preservation, not the welfare of one or another personality in its finite and physical form that will or can ever secure the desired object and screen the Society from the effects of the social "hurricane" to come; but only the weakening of the feeling of separateness in the units which compose its chief element. And such a weakening can only be achieved by a process of *inner enlightenment*. It is not violence that can ever insure bread and comfort for all; nor is the kingdom of peace and love, of mutual help and charity and "food for all," to be conquered by a cold, reasoning diplomatic policy. It is only by the close brotherly union of men's inner SELVES, of soul-solidarity, of the growth and development of that feeling which makes one suffer when one thinks of the suffering of others, that the reign of Justice and equality for all can ever be inaugurated. This is the first of the three fundamental objects for which the Theosophical Society was established, and called the "Universal Brotherhood of Man," without distinction of *race, colour or creed*.

When men will begin to realise that it is precisely that ferocious personal selfishness, the chief motor in the "struggle for life," that lies at the very bottom and is the one sole cause of human starvation; that it is that other—national egoism and vanity which stirs up the States and rich individuals to bury enormous capitals in the unproductive erection of gorgeous churches and temples and the support of a swarm of social drones called Cardinals and Bishops, the true parasites on the bodies of their subordinates and their flocks—that they will try to remedy this universal evil by a healthy change of policy. And this salutary revolution can be *peacefully* accomplished only by the Theosophical Society and its teachings.

This is little understood by M. Burnouf, it seems, since while striking the true key-note of the situation elsewhere he ends by saying:

"The Society will find allies, if it knows how to take its place in the civilised world to-day. Since it will have against it all the positive cults, with the exception perhaps of a few dissenters and bold priests, the only other course open to it is to place itself in accord with the men of science. If its dogma of charity is a complementary doctrine which it furnishes to science, the society will be obliged to establish it on scientific data, under pain of remaining in the regions of sentimentality. The oft-repeated formula of the struggle for life is true, but not universal; it is true for the plants; it is less true for the animals in proportion as we climb the steps of the ladder, for the law of sacrifice is seen to appear and grow in importance; in man, these two laws counter-balance one another, and the law of sacrifice, which is that of charity, tends to assume the upper hand, through the empire of the reason. It is reason which, in our societies, is the source of right, of justice, and of charity; through it we escape the inevitableness of the struggle for life, moral slavery, egoism and barbarism, in one word, that we escape from what Sakyamouni poetically called the power and the army of *Māra*."



And yet our critic does not seem satisfied with this state of things but advises us by adding as follows:—

“If the Theosophical Society,” he says, “enters into this order of ideas and knows how to make them its fulcrum, it will quit the limbus of inchoate thought and will find its place in the modern world; remaining none the less faithful to its Indian origin and to its principles. It may find allies; for if men are weary of the symbolical cults, unintelligible to their own teachers, yet men of heart (and they are many) are weary also and terrified at the egoism and the corruption, which tend to engulf our civilisation and to replace it by a learned barbarism. Pure Buddhism possesses all the breadth that can be claimed from a doctrine at once religious and scientific. Its tolerance is the cause why it can excite the jealousy of none. At bottom, it is but the proclamation of the supremacy of reason and of its empire over the animal instincts, of which it is the regulator and the restrainer. Finally it has itself summed up its character in two words which admirably formulate the law of humanity, science and virtue.”

And this formula the society has expanded by adopting that still more admirable axiom: “*There is no religion higher than truth.*”

At this juncture we shall take leave of our learned, and perhaps, too kind critic, to address a few words to Theosophists in general.

Has our Society, as a whole, deserved the flattering words and notice bestowed upon it by M. Burnouf? How many of its individual members, how many of its branches, have carried out the precepts contained in the noble words of a Master of Wisdom, as quoted by our author from No. 3 of *Lucifer*? “He who does not practise” this and the other “*is no Theosophist,*” says the quotation. Nevertheless, those who have never shared even their superfluous—let alone their last morsel—with the poor; those who continue to make a difference in their hearts between a coloured and a white brother; as all those to whom malicious remarks against their neighbours, uncharitable gossip and even slander under the slightest provocation, are like heavenly dew on their parched lips—call and regard themselves as *Theosophists!*

It is certainly not the fault of the minority of *true* Theosophists, who do try to follow *the path* and who make desperate efforts to reach it, if the majority of their fellow members do not. It is not to them therefore that this is addressed, but to those who, in their fierce love of Self and their vanity, instead of trying to carry out the original programme to the best of their ability, sow broadcast among the members the seeds of dissension; to those whose personal vanity, discontentment and love of power, often ending in ostentation, give the lie to the original programme and to the Society’s motto.

Indeed, these original aims of the FIRST SECTION of the Theosophical Society under whose advice and

guidance the second and third merged into one were first founded, can never be too often recalled to the minds of our members.\* The Spirit of these aims is clearly embodied in a letter from one of the Masters quoted in the “Occult World,” on pages 71 and 73. Those Theosophists then,—who in the course of time and events would, or have, departed from those original aims, and instead of complying with them have suggested new policies of administration from the depths of their inner consciousness, *are not true to their pledges.*

“But we have always worked on the lines originally traced to us”—some of them proudly assert.

“You have not” comes the reply from those who know more of the true Founders of the T. S. *behind the scenes* than they do—or ever will if they go on working in this mood of Self-illusion and self-sufficiency.

What are the lines traced by the “Masters”? Listen to the authentic words written by one of them in 1880 to the author of the “Occult World”:

... “To our minds these motives sincere and worthy of every serious consideration *from the worldly stand point*, appear *selfish*. . . . They are selfish, because you must be aware that the chief object of the Theosophical Society is *not so much to gratify individual aspirations as to serve our fellow men*. . . . and 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 a desire *for self-benefit, or a tendency to do injustice even there where these exist unconsciously to himself*. Yet, you have ever discussed, but to put down, the idea of a Universal Brotherhood, questioned its usefulness, and advised to remodel the Theosophical Society on the principle of a college for the special study of occultism. . . .” (“Occult World,” p. 72.)

But another letter was written, also in 1880, which is not only a direct reproof to the Theosophists who neglect the main idea of Brotherhood, but also an anticipated answer to M. Emile Burnouf’s chief argument. Here are a few extracts from it. It was addressed again to those who sought to make away with the “sentimental title,” and make of the Society but an arena for “cup-growing and astral bell-ringing”:

[Here follow extracts from the Letter which will be found in the U. L. T. Pamphlet—No. 33.]

And this TRUTH is not Buddhism, but esoteric BUDHISM. “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. . . .”

\* *Vide* Rules in the 1st vol. of the “Theosophist,” pp. 179 and 180.



## SELF-DECEPTION

A very common failing in the life of the student of Theosophy is self-deception. It is a difficult fault to eradicate, since by its very nature the student finds difficulty in perceiving it, even when he looks for it, and if he does not look for it, he remains ignorant of it as it does not parade itself. The cause of this fault lies, of course, in the personality. No student but would admit that his personality gives him trouble. It has to be curbed and disciplined, with more or less success, according to the earnestness of the student. But every one finds plenty of work to do on it. Certain phases of the personality, however, are not readily recognised as such, and the student often believes himself free of these.

To take a very common instance—the belief in a personal god. Every student of the Three Fundamental Propositions of Theosophy, as given in *The Secret Doctrine*, is perfectly aware that Theosophy does not admit of a personal god, and every student would say that the personal-god notion militated against all ideas of right and justice. Further, they would openly express their disbelief in such a notion. But do they disbelieve in it? Have they ever examined themselves on the point, or have they just taken their rejection of the idea for granted, as a fact.

Trouble may come—the student may be in great distress mentally, emotionally or physically. Does the idea of a personal god then make no appeal to him? Is he strong enough in his conviction of perfect Justice, that universal Law of Karma, to refrain from appealing for help to something or some one outside of himself? Is he strong enough to stand on his own feet and to be sure that whatever comes, comes well? These questions each must answer for himself, and in answering them dispassionately, a man may find that some idea of outer dependence, some longing for some personal privileges, still obtains. He may intellectually agree that no external power can aid, that one has to work out one's own salvation, but does he apply this intellectual conviction, and if he does, is it sufficiently strong to stand the strain?

Mr. Judge writes of an occultist who, when he met with great misfortune, denied the justice of Karma. The personality had conquered once again through an unconscious belief in the personal-god idea.

The idea of a personal god is so deeply ingrained in the personalities of millions of people that it cannot be got rid of without deep searching into one's innermost being, and ultimately by the

realisation that "I, myself, am God." Until we have utterly transmuted the personality and purged it of all impurity, some lingering traces of this belief in a personal god—a belief we genuinely think we have cast away—will still cling and finally have to be eradicated.

Another Theosophical teaching is that man *is* a soul, not that man has a soul. Again, the Theosophical student admits this in theory, but too often the life belies the belief. If we go to the Third Fundamental Proposition we find that the Eternal Pilgrim—who, for each man is himself—is a spark of the Universal Over-Soul, which itself is an aspect of the Unknown Root. Most of us can do no more than accept this as an hypothesis, and *it must remain as such while our personality is uppermost. If we really knew it as a fact, we could not act as we do.* In too many cases of conflict between the personality and the soul, the personality wins hands down. The instrument controls its controller, paradoxical as it may sound. This is bound to happen at times, maybe, but the Theosophical student should always try to keep alert to defeat the personality. He does not, alas, and then is apt to grumble at his lack of progress!

The demon of lust has to be conquered and the mind has to be restrained by practice and absence of desire before we can say with the conviction that is born of realization, "We are Souls."

The Law of Karma sometimes strains us up to breaking point as has already been pointed out. By self-examination nearly every one can discover that he still wants some reward for his action, some personal appreciation. We may think we do not, but too often we do. We also have a habit of deceiving ourselves into thinking we want something for some one else, whereas it is really for ourselves we desire it. And so while really acting personally, we cheat ourselves into thinking we are acting altruistically.

Many of us talk of an Impersonal God, Souls, Karma, Universal Brotherhood, as if they were our familiar friends, part and parcel of our being, so to say. Whereas if we had really incorporated these great principles to any extent in our being, we should be well on the way to Perfection. It is once again the old, old story—Theory *versus* Practice.

So it would be always well to keep in remembrance the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Otherwise we are guilty of self-deception, fancying ourselves to be something that we are not.



## YUGE-YUGE: CYCLE BY CYCLE

At the end of the last century, Louis Claude de Saint Martin (the unknown philosopher) wrote the following lines, which sound like a prediction of what is now on the way towards fulfilment :—

Perhaps the time is not distant, when Europeans will look eagerly at things which they now treat with distrust or contempt. Their scientific edifice is not so firmly established, that it will not have some revolutions to undergo. They are now beginning to recognise in organic bodies what they call *elective* attraction—an expression which will carry them a long way, notwithstanding the pains they take not to call the truth by its right name.

The literary wealth of Asia will come to their aid. When they see the treasures which Indian literature begins to open ; when they have studied the Mahabharata—a collection of sixteen epic poems, containing one hundred thousand stanzas on the mythology, religion, morals and history of the Indians, etc., they will be struck with the similarity between the opinions of the East and those of the West on the most important subjects.

In this way some will seek correspondences of languages in alphabets, inscriptions and other monuments ; others may discover the grounds of all the fabulous theogonies of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, and others again will find remarkable coincidences with the dogmas published within the last centuries in Europe by different spiritualists, who will never be suspected of deriving their ideas from India.

But while waiting to know more of this theosophic wealth of India, from which I expect more light myself, I must admonish my fellow-men that it is not in these books more than in any others, to take them beyond speculative philosophy. The radical development of our intimate essence alone can lead us into active spirituality.

One of the fundamental teachings of Theosophy is on the subject of cycles. The Law of Periodicity operates in all processes in Nature. The teaching imparted by Krishna to Arjuna that whenever there is a decline of virtue and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world He incarnates from age to age to restore the lost art of spiritual endeavour is one phase of this Law. H. P. B. speaks

of the cyclic effort made by the Lodge of Masters for the helping of humanity. We reprint an article by W. Q. Judge which deals with the subject ; it was first published in *The Path*, Vol. VII, p. 133, for August 1892, and it was signed "William Brehon"—one of the pen-names used by Mr. Judge. It is entitled —

## PLAIN THEOSOPHICAL TRACES

In the *Key to Theosophy* the author says that at the last quarter of each century there is always a distinct movement partaking of the nature of the present Theosophical one, and this opinion is held by many Theosophists. Can these efforts be traced? Did any people call themselves by the name "Theosophist" one hundred years ago? Is it necessary that all such movements should have been called in the past "Theosophical"? And if the claim that such movements are started by the Adepts be true, is the present Society the only body with which those beings work?

Taking up the last question first, we may turn to H.P.B. for authority. She often said that while the T. S. movement of to-day was distinctly under the care of the Adepts, it was not the only one through which effect was sought to be made on the race-thought and ethics, but that in many different ways efforts were constantly put forward. But still, she insisted, the T.S. wears the badge, so to say, of the Eastern and Ancient Schools, and therefore has on it the distinctive mark—or what the Sanskrit calls *lakshana*—of the old and united Lodge of Adepts. Inquiring further of reason and tradition,

we find that it would be against both to suppose that one single organization should be the sole channel for the efforts of the Brotherhood. For if that Brotherhood has the knowledge and power and objects attributed to it, then it must use every agency which is in touch with humanity. Nor is it necessary to assume that the distinct efforts made in each century, as contradistinguished from the general current of influence in all directions, should be called Theosophical. The Rosicrucians are often supposed not to have existed at all as a body, but deep students have come to the conclusion that they had an organization. They were Christian in their phraseology and very deep mystics ; and while they spoke of Holy Ghost, Sophia, and the like, they taught Theosophy. They were obliged by the temper of the time to suit themselves to the exigencies of the moment, for it would have been extreme folly to destroy the hope of making any effect by rushing out in opposition then. It is different now, when the air and the thought are free and men are not burned by a corrupt church for their opinions. In one sense the T.S. is the child of the Rosicrucian Society of the past. H.P.B. often said this, and inquiry into their



ideas confirms the declaration. The Rosicrucians were Christian in the beginning and descendants afterwards of Christians. Even to-day it is hinted that in one of the great cities of this new Republic there is a great charity begun and carried on with money which has been given by descendants of the Rosicrucians under inward impulse directed by certain of the Adepts who were members of that body. For blood does count for something in this, that until an Adept has passed up into the seventh degree he is often moved in accordance with old streams of heredity. Or to put it another way, it is often easier for an Adept to influence one who is in his direct physical line than one who by consanguinity as well as psychic heredity is out of the family.

Looking into Germany of 200 years ago, we at once see Jacob Bœhme. He was an ignorant shoemaker, but illuminated from within, and was the friend and teacher of many great and learned men. His writings stirred up the Church; they have influence to-day. His life has many indications in it of help from the Masters of Wisdom. A wide-spread effect from his writings can be traced through Germany and over to France even after his death. He called himself a Christian, but he was also named "Theosopher," which is precisely Theosophist, for it was only after his day that people began to use "ist" instead of "er". Long after his death the influence lasted. In the sixties many hundreds of his books were deliberately sent all over the world. They were given free to libraries all over the United States and prepared the way for the work of the Theosophical Society in an appreciable measure, though not wholly.

One hundred years ago there was such a movement in France, one of the agents of which was Louis Claude, Count St. Martin, whose correspondence was called "Theosophical correspondence". He refers to Bœhme, and also to unseen but powerful help which saved him from dangers during the Revolution. His books, *L'Homme de Désir* and others, were widely read, and there are hints of a Society which, however, was compelled to keep itself secret. At the same date almost may be noted the great American Revolution influenced by Thomas Paine, who, though reviled now by ignorant theologians, was publicly thanked by Washington and the first Congress. This republic is a Theosophical effort, for it gives freedom, and fortunately does not declare for any particular religion in the clauses of its Constitution. Hints have been thrown out that the Adepts had some hand in the revolt of the Colonies in 1775. In replying to Mr. Sinnett some years ago, it was written by his Teacher that the Brotherhood dealt with all important human movements, but no one could arraign the body at

the bar and demand proofs.

Bro. Buck wrote in 1889: "I have a volume entitled *Theosophical Transactions of the Philadelphia Society*, London, 1697, and another dated 1855, entitled *Introduction to Theosophy or the Science of the Mystery of Christ*, and in 1856 *Theosophical Miscellanies* was issued."

About 1500 years ago Ammonius Saccas made a similar effort which was attended with good results. He had almost the same platform as the T. S., and taught that the aim of Jesus was to show people the truth in all religions and to restore the ancient philosophy to its rightful seat. It is not at all against the theory we are dealing with that the various efforts were not dubbed with the same name. Those who work for the good of humanity, whether they be Adepts or not, do not care for a mere name; it is the substantive effort they seek, and not a vindication in the eyes of men of being first or original or anything else.

But we have only considered the Western World. All these centuries since A.D.I., and long before that, Theosophical efforts were put forth in Asia, for we must not forget that our theories, as well as those of Ammonius Saccas, are Eastern in their origin. However much nations may at first ignore the heathen and barbarian, they at last come to discover that it is frequently to the heathen the Christian owes his religion and philosophy. So while Europe was enjoying the delights of rude and savage life, the Easterns were elaborating, refining, and perfecting the philosophy to which we owe so much. We who believe in the Adepts as Brothers of Humanity must suppose that ignorance did not prevail in the Brotherhood as to the effect sure to be one day produced in Europe whenever her attention could be diverted from money-making and won to the great Eastern stores of philosophy. This effect came about through England, Germany, and France. Frenchmen first drew attention to the *Upanishads*, Germans went in for Sanscrit, and England conquered India, so that her metaphysical mines could be examined in peace. We have seen the result of all this more and more every year. There is less ignorant, narrow prejudice against the "heathen," the masses are beginning to know that the poor Hindu is not to be despised in the field of thought, and a broader, better feeling has gradually developed. This is much better than the glorification of any Brotherhood, and the Lodge is always aiming at such results, for selfish pride, arrogance, and the love of personal dominion have no place therein. Nor should they in our present Theosophical Society.

WILLIAM BREHON.



## THE HOUSEHOLD STAGE

The supreme importance of the Home as a maker of Men, and of the institution of Marriage as a creator of the Adept Occultist, is pointed out in the philosophy of Theosophy. The dignity and prosperity of the home greatly depends on purity in marital relationship, on proper heart-adjustment between husband and wife, and on the unity of perception and of action undertaken by both. The ideal of the Grihastha is high and sacred, and some of its esoteric aspects are well brought out in the reprint of Mr. Judge's old article in *U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 34* on "Living the Higher Life," which has just been published. Some useful thoughts on the same topic are to be found in the following article reprinted from *The Path*, Vol. V., p. 82, for June 1890, by Harij—the pen-name of the late Dr. J. D. Buck. It is entitled—

## BROTHERHOOD AND SEX

It will not be denied by any fairminded and intelligent person that the brotherhood of man includes also the sisterhood of woman. The same altruistic conception is applicable to both sexes. Advancement along this line means undoubtedly the real progress of the whole human race. It is not possible, however, that the two sexes should advance along parallel lines and that those lines, while tending in the same direction, should never touch each other, should never coalesce. It is not generally conceived that this one principle of brotherhood under the inspiration of altruism is also the key to the truest and highest relation of the sexes. The contrast is usually drawn between separation of the sexes, or celibacy, and the present association of the sexes, viz. animality; and all that is known of either of these conditions is far from satisfactory. No one imagines that in either condition the highest development for either individual is attained. The ideal perfection of either man or woman is not looked for either in any known monastic or social aggregation of individuals. Hence the question, Is marriage a failure?, has become a popular one for discussion. Most of the discussions upon the subject begin by ignoring the actual condition of things, show great ignorance of the real principles involved, and end either in confusion or despair of any real improvement. That selfishness is the real root of the trouble here complained of, and that the association of man and woman when really inspired by altruism is a very different thing indeed, lying as it does at the very foundation of every happy home, is not generally admitted because such relations are seldom seen.

Great as is man's selfishness in his lust for power and greed of gain, it never reaches its limits except in his relations to woman. Here the selfishness of man is supreme. Everywhere else the selfishness of man manifests method and shows design. He formulates an object, and works towards its accomplishment. But in his sexual life man is an unreasoning animal dominated by blind passion, and woman or wife is often his victim as is the helpless animal in the claws of a tiger. His reason is sophistry, and his apparent kindness often only a snare.

The problem is by no means solved when, aware of all this, man deliberately turns his back upon woman and seeks in a life of celibacy relief from temptation.

The elements of an ideal life are not to be found except in the natural and existent. In our present condition man has need of woman, and woman has need of man. Each has something to give, to receive, and to learn from the other. The proof of this proposition is the fact that they find themselves thus associated, and that of the entire number of children born nature sees to it that there shall be no great disparity in numbers on either side.

If we are to follow the plain logic of Dame Nature, no man or woman has the right to live alone until the lesson is learned, and then living alone will be very different indeed from living for self.

When the animal instincts are simply suppressed, or stamped out, or, as is generally the case, burned out, man is in a very different condition from that in which these same gross elements are refined, elevated, purified, and preserved.

When the ancient writings declare that "In heaven the human being is neither married nor given in marriage, but is *as the angels*," and when mystics like Jacob Böhme represent the highest estate as sexless, these writers are seldom understood because the interpretation proceeds from the purely animal plane, while these writers speak from a different plane entirely.

The average condition of the man of the world in any sexual relation is satiety for individual woman with the animal passion still unsatisfied, though perhaps restrained by law, by fear, or by religion.

In all true marriage, in any relation deserving the name of love, the condition is exactly the reverse; the animal is conquered and the true woman is enthroned. This is the explanation of repeated



marriages, of polygamy, and of concubinage ; and in each of these cases human law generally ignores even nature, except the lowest animal life, to say nothing of the higher law and the divine life.

A great deal has been written and preached about "*Soul Mates*" and spiritual affinities. Most of such discussion is not only vulgar trash, but a great part of it arises from satiety on the animal plane, and is really an attempt to justify a change that shall by novelty renew the waning animal life. Stripped of all disguise, many such pleas are neither more nor less than lust masquerading in the holy name of love. What have pure animals incapable of one altruistic impulse to do with "*soul mates*" and spiritual affinities? One capable of spiritual affinity may find it as Christ did, by lifting the Magdalen out of the slum of sin and despair into the light of a love that is pure beneficence and crowned with beauty and blessing. Those who prate most of soul-affinities often mean, when stripped of all disguise, to drag down a pure soul to their own animal plane.

The love of a true woman will redeem any man from the dominion of lust, who really desires to conquer himself. The love of a true man will elevate and glorify any woman who really feels her womanhood and aspires toward its highest realization. No marriage can be a failure where these opportunities are sought, and few marriages are so bad that they cannot thus be turned to account in the real life of the soul. Equal love, equal intelligence, equal wealth and social position fade into insignificance in the presence of equal opportunity.

If, instead of longing for conditions that do not exist and that are not likely to exist, people would take the conditions in which they find themselves and make the most and the best of these, they would often be surprised to find at last that these very conditions are the best that could have occurred to them. They would find that in working through these conditions every obstacle had been a help, and every inharmony a gymnastic of the soul. These are but the lessons of Karma ; and true courage and true progress consist alike in subduing the environment, never in running away from it. The embryo adept who sits idly longing for other worlds wherein to display his power will find himself a fossil to be laughed to scorn and trodden under foot at last by any plebeian who passes that way. The plebeian is an adept who finds in his surroundings opportunities, and who finds in his daily life an inspiration to better living and greater usefulness.

HARIJ.

## SAYINGS OF ROBERT CROSBIE

Everything in Nature is septenate, then words and ideas are septenate.

Adulation fosters ambition, if the least thought of self remains.

We give the evil thing power by thinking about it, a power that it would not otherwise have.

Things of evil are creations of our own mental state.

Kicking against the pricks hurts only the one who kicks ; moreover, the pricks seem to enjoy it, for, being kicked, they keep coming back.

Knowledge bridges over many things that would otherwise mean nothing but trouble.

We all have powers and knowledge that the brain does not function in. Our work is to co-ordinate, so that the higher knowledge may be made manifest in the flesh.

Having dropped some seed, the character of the soil may be determined. The duty of the sower is to sow ; the seed will test the soil.

When people place their attention in the direction of food, form or ceremonies, they are almost certain to end in ritualism and the loss of the real issue.

The nature of soul as unmodifiable must be grasped.

Automatic habit has to be gradually changed and *control* substituted.

There are two kinds of knowledge—knowledge of any and all conditions, and knowledge of the Self.

Doubt and desire seem to go together ; for wanting a thing implies the doubt of getting it, and intensity of doubt is expressed in fear.

Credit each other with the best of motives and let it go at that ; any other way leads to confusion and misunderstanding, hence to separative thought and action.

Calmness can be attained by seeing the necessity for it, and by endeavour which is constant.

Theosophy can be tested out by present knowledge and proves itself with every test.

We reject every authority except that of our expanding spiritual perceptions.



## IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

The mission of India as custodian of the world's spiritual treasures is recalled by a speech made by Dr. S. N. Das Gupta at the recent Indian Cultural Conference under the auspices of the Indian Research Institute at Calcutta. *The Times of India* (17th April) quotes him as saying :—

The time has now come when in the interests of our cultural self-consciousness and national regeneration, and in the interests of humanity at large, which is waiting for our active contribution as the oldest member of human civilisation, we have to take stock of our past and arrive at a consciousness of our historical personality. The lamp of our life is flickering in the wind, but, dimly or brightly, it has been burning all the while. It only needs the oil of our sympathy and love that it may shine forth and send its rays of illumination and the messages of its historic past, integrated into a practical realisation of the present, to all the countries of the world.

The writings of H. P. B. abound in references to the unique position of India "whose holy men and sages have left to the world the greatest and most sublime philosophies that ever emanated from the minds of men." (*The Secret Doctrine*, I, 423)

We affirm that, if Egypt furnished Greece with her civilization, and the latter bequeathed hers to Rome, Egypt herself had, in those unknown ages when Menes reigned, received her laws, her social institutions, her arts and her sciences, from pre-Vedic India; and that therefore, it is in that old initiatrix of the priests—adepts of all the other countries—we must seek for the key to the great mysteries of humanity . . . In those ancient times countries which are now known to us by other names were all called India. There was an Upper, a Lower, and a Western India, the latter of which is now Persia-Iran. The countries now named Thibet, Mongolia, and Great Tartary, were also considered by the ancient writers as India. (*Isis Unveiled*, I, 589)

And in *The Ocean of Theosophy* Mr. Judge declared that "Of all the old races the Aryan Indian alone yet remains as the preserver of the old doctrines." (pp. 85-6) "There the people are fitted by temperament and climate to be the preservers of the philosophical, ethical and psychological jewels that would have been forever lost to us had they been left to the ravages of such Goths and Vandals as western nations were in the early days of their struggle for education and civilization. (p. 9)

An editorial in *The Indian Social Reformer* (18th April) states exactly the Theosophical position in regard to social reform :—

Economic inequalities are, in the ultimate analysis, due to inappreciation of ethical values in a community; and moral reform is the only sure method of social reform. The mistake of many Socialists and Communists is to assign to the ethical and spiritual a lower position than to the economic and material aspects of society, in their schemes of social reform. Christian Socialism avoids this mistake but its basis is not wide enough to make it acceptable to all communities. A nation which is guided by religious and moral principles in all its affairs may not be the richest or the most powerful nation on earth, but it will not lack in the essentials of true happiness.

As H. P. B. says in *The Key to Theosophy* :—

To seek to achieve political reforms before we have effected a reform in *human nature, is like putting new wine into old bottles*. Make men feel and recognise in their innermost hearts what is their real, true duty to all men, and every old abuse of power, every iniquitous law in the national policy, based on human, social or political selfishness, will disappear of itself. Foolish is the gardener who seeks to weed his flower-bed of poisonous plants by cutting them off from the surface of the soil, instead of tearing them out by the roots. No lasting political reform can be ever achieved with the same selfish men at the head of affairs as of old. (p. 194) If the action of one reacts on the lives of all, and this is the true scientific idea, then it is only by all men becoming brothers and all women sisters, and by all practising in their daily lives true brotherhood and true sisterhood, that the real human solidarity, which lies at the root of the elevation of the race, can ever be attained. (p. 197)

"Is Genius a Disease?" is the question asked by Mr. Campbell Nairne in his review in *John O' London's Weekly* of Mr. Havelock Ellis's *From Rousseau to Proust*. Rousseau's mental and physical invalidism, Hugo's delusion of greatness, Verlaine's occasional mania for drink, Proust's nervous asthma, all are brought forward in the attempt to link genius with a pathological condition. It is but natural, as H. P. B. has pointed out, that knowing nothing of *true* genius, the world should call genius that which is the outcome of culture and of purely intellectual acuteness, which "is always apt to lead to the extremes of weal or woe him, through which this artificial light of the terrestrial mind manifests."

As a consequence, we continually hear and read a good deal of that which to the Occultist seems quite paradoxical. "Genius requires cultivation," says one; "Genius is vain and self-sufficient," declares another; while a third will go on defining the *divine*



*light* but to dwarf it on the Procrustean bed of his own intellectual narrow-mindedness. He will talk of the great eccentricity of genius, and allying it as a general rule with an "inflammable constitution," will even show it "a prey to every passion but seldom delicacy of taste!" (Lord Kaimes.) It is useless to argue with such, or tell them that original, and great genius puts out the most dazzling rays of human intellectuality, as the sun quenches the flame-light of a fire in an open field; that it is never eccentric; though always *sui generis*; and that no man endowed with true genius can ever give way to his physical animal passions. In the view of an humble Occultist, only such a grand altruistic character as that of Buddha or Jesus, and of their few close imitators, can be regarded, in our historical cycle, as fully developed GENIUS."

A perusal of the whole of H. P. B.'s article on "Genius," reprinted in *U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 13*, from which the above quotations are taken, will well repay the student.

Our April issue (p. 93) pointed out that the Harijans' conversion to Christianity does not remove their social disabilities as "Untouchables." We quoted an instance of Roman Catholic Untouchables. A memorandum has been presented to the Governor of Madras, in which a reference to castes among Protestant Indian Christians is made. We quote from *The Hindu*, 25th March:—

It was pointed out in the memorandum that though for statistical and political purposes, the Depressed Class Christians were described to belong to the Indian Christian community, they continued to labour under the same difficulties as Depressed Classes who were not converts. In Protestant churches also, the caste system was to be found. In one and the same village one caste had an exclusive church for itself, while the Depressed Class Christians had a different one.

Five cases of post-vaccinal encephalitis, much more deadly than smallpox, are recorded in the Annual Report for 1934 of the Chief Medical Officer of the British Ministry of Health. Four of the five victims died, their deaths being directly attributable to vaccination, we learn from *The Abolitionist* (March 2, 1936). And yet the Minister of Health, Sir Kingsley Wood, could say in answer to a question in the House of Commons on the 16th December 1935 that he was advised that it was "not yet

possible" to guarantee absolute absence of risk that encephalitis would follow the use of vaccine lymph, *although the risk was very small* (Italics ours)!

If further comment on the futility of animal experimentation and like practices were needed, it could be found in the same number of *The Abolitionist*. It quotes a statement in *The Medical World* of 24th January by Dr. G. Rome Hall. Commenting on certain cancer experiments chronicled in the Tenth Report of the Imperial Research Fund, Dr. Hall remarked:—

At one time it was noted that English mice infected with transplanted cancer, themselves previously inoculated, could be protected up to 90 per cent. cases. But if Danish mice were used under exactly the same conditions only 10 per cent. survived; no difference could be found in the two breeds of mice.

*The Abolitionist* pertinently asks:—

If the experimenters cannot reason from one breed of mice to another, how can they ever hope that the results of their experiments will apply to man?

In an article on "Mental Hygiene and International Relations" (*The Contemporary Review*, April 1936), Lord Allen of Hurtwood expresses some very Theosophical ideas about the intimate relation of the individual moral outlook to the question of war or peace.

The last obstacle which now stands between man and peace lies not in the poverty of the earth's soil, but in our minds and dispositions...Not one of these nations in recent years has been confronted by any difficulty which need have baffled them, like plagues and famines, causing them to fight for life. The means for discussing and remedying our grievances have been available. Modern nations have in fact been driven forward to policies, both unnecessary and evil, by nothing more nor less than bad mental health on the part of all concerned.

Qualities that make for poise and good will develop, he points out, in so far as the individual is less and less the victim of inner strife.

Primarily the good qualities are of course internal harmony, courage that is not destructive, and the capacity for dispassionate observation. But these alone may prove insufficient...Is there not one quality which almost by itself would go a long way to solving most of our problems, domestic, national and international...I suspect we may hope for a more universal capacity for elementary kindness and gentle treatment of our neighbours.

The attention of students is invited to the pertinent article on "The Greatest of All Wars" which appeared in *THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT* for July, 1932.



## THE U. L. T. 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 given to Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local lodges. There are no dues of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with.

Correspondence should be addressed to:—

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS  
51, Esplanade Road,  
BOMBAY

## 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

Anna 1, 2d., or 5 cents, per copy.

Postage extra.

*Texts for Theosophical Meetings*

Anna 1, 2d., or 5 cents, per copy.



PUBLISHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT :  
Established November, 1930. Published monthly  
by Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51, Es-  
planade 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 neces-  
sary remittance. Price, 50 cents, 2s., Re. 1, per  
annum, post free.

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

CORRESPONDENCE : Letters from subscri-  
bers 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 suf-  
ficient 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 Brother-  
hood of Humanity, without distinction of  
race, creed, sex, caste, or colour ;
- (b) The study of ancient and modern religions,  
philosophies and sciences, and the demon-  
stration of the importance of such study ;  
and
- (c) The investigation of the unexplained laws  
of nature and the psychical powers latent  
in man.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

May, 1936.

VOL. VI. No. 7.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Desire of Comfort ... ..	97
A Pamphlet of Instructions :	
A Chart and A Guide ... ..	98
The Theosophical Society :	
Its Mission and Its Future ... ..	98
Self-Deception ... ..	104
Yuge-Yuge—Cycle by Cycle :	
Plain Theosophical Traces ... ..	105
The Household Stage :	
Brotherhood and Sex ... ..	107
Sayings of Robert Crosbie ... ..	108
In the Light of Theosophy ... ..	109

India—51, Esplanade Road, Fort, Bombay.

England—17, Great Cumberland Place, London, W.I.

U. S. A.—119, West 57th Street, New York.

OUR INDIAN PUBLICATIONS

By H. P. Blavatsky

The Key to Theosophy	Re. 1-8 or 3s. or \$1.00
Raja Yoga or Occultism	Re. 1 or 2s. 6d. or .75
The Voice of the Silence	As. 8 or 1s. 6d. or .50
Five Messages to Theosophists	As. 4 or 6d. or .25

By W. Q. Judge

The Ocean of Theosophy	Re. 1 or 2s. 6d. or .75
Letters That Have Helped Me	Re. 1 or 2s. 6d. or .75
Echoes from the Orient	As. 4 or 6d. or .25

Postage Extra. All of the above are authentic and exact  
reprints of the original editions.

THEOSOPHY COMPANY (INDIA), LTD.  
51, Esplanade Road, BOMBAY, INDIA.