A U M

He who knows others is clever, but he who knows himself is enlightened. He who overcomes others is strong, but he who overcomes himself is mightier still.

—Lao Tze.

# THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXVII October, 1939 No. 12

## THE SPIRIT IN MAN

THERE is a vast difference between seeing intellectually the desirability of a course of action, and the actual pursuit of that course, without regret and without reluctance. It requires *Will,* we say, to "go through," and of all intangibles which lie before a man who has reached a cross-roads in life, the Will is the most difficult to understand, or so it seems.

How is it that now and again one sees clearly what is right to do, and at other times merely a passing thought to the "right" is actually painful? There are moments when this or that sacrifice will appear in the rosy light of noble achievement. Then, during the long hours—perhaps years—it takes to carry through the undertaking, come interludes of doubt, of questioning whether this, or anything, is "worth while." One can sustain these periods of mental suffering, and go on grimly in the hope that some day they will pass away. But that is not the only way to meet the oscillations of human nature. There is also the method of impersonality, which means to "get outside of" the condition or state in which oscillations exist. This is the value of philosophy. Philosophy is the guide to states of consciousness. Only the Perceiver, who is not any of its states, can follow the direction of philosophy.

Philosophy teaches that Man is Spirit, and Will is the force of Spirit in action. This means that Man in action is himself *Will.* The power of the will displays itself in spiritual beings the more they are freed from matter. This means that matter is the element of resistance to will, and in different states of matter the power of the will varies according to the density of the medium. If, then, one finds that his will does not always act with the same intensity and continuity, he needs to examine the level at which he has invoked this *spiritual* power. For will is septenary in its manifestations. A man can not indulge material thoughts by the hour, and

then, suddenly, dissolve the energies thus generated by a spasmodic appeal to his better nature. Parabrahm is supreme, and not supreme; supreme as cause, not supreme as effect, explains H.P.B. The whole universe is the result of Will as ever-lasting ideation. But in manifestation, Time imposes its delays on the operations of the will. Cycles exist because matter resists the force of spirit, and the patterns of relation which result from the action of spirit on matter bring into existence the manifested universe and all the "things" of objective perception.

Things which are born in time take time to die. Habits which result from the free play of desire take time to be overcome. A man can bind himself to the wheel of change, suffering and enjoying with its every turn. But he can also rise to a plane which, relative to his lower nature, *is not in manifestation at all.* Here he sees and knows, here he makes the high determinations which we recognize as the vows and pledges of discipleship. No matter what a man has done, or how weak he feels himself to be, so long as he is man there is that place within where he can stand, where he can see what is right and what is wrong. To have done wrong is not to be a miserable "sinner." There is no human being who has not made a "mistake," who has not found it necessary to destroy and build again some one of his creations. We have only to take the position that whatever is, is the result of will, and that the recalcitrant tendencies which seem so hard to overcome are themselves testimony to the creative power by which they were established. This power will as easily re-form tendencies in other directions. There are three elements in all existence—the creator, the power to create, and his creations. Man is the creator, the field of experience is made up of his past creations, and his will is the power to create.

Consider the scale of being, stretching from the infinitely small to the infinitely great. Will is the cause of all these existences. We are somewhere on that scale as beings, but we are universal as will. Who could think of the vast panorama of life, from atom to star, all marching in the universal procession toward a higher life, and believe that he is particularly ignoble for his sins, or specially favored by his virtues? There is no "heavy weight of hours" for him who grows as the flower grows, no vanity or pride of ideas in him who strives for the whole. There is only the work of life lying along the unending path, in which past, present and future are but the temporal reflection of the spirit in man and its creations.

# ANCIENT LANDMARKS

## The Greek Drama

THE Golden Age of Greece lasted from the seventh to the fourth century B. C. During those three hundred years the Greeks laid the foundation stone of Western civilization, planted the seeds from which European science, philosophy and art sprang, and furnished models of education and government which have never been equalled, much less surpassed. These ideas did not originate in the minds of the men who presented them to the world. They were taken from the Mysteries, which in their turn were derived from the archaic Wisdom-Religion. The Mysteries were *universities* in the true sense of the word, teaching universal principles, demonstrating the fundamental unity of all life, showing the common source of all sciences, religions, philosophies and arts, proving the universal brotherhood of man.

The greatest philosophers of the Golden Age of Greece were Initiates of the Mysteries, and their doctrines were all echoes of the Mystery teachings. First came the three Initiates, Thales, Anaximander and Heracleitus, whose philosophical systems embodied some of the Mystery teachings concerning cosmogony. Then came Pythagoras and Plato, also Initiates, who demonstrated the practical value of universal principles when applied to the problems of education and good government.

In the Mysteries, universal principles were taught by means of dramatic representations. The Greek drama, therefore, is also the child of the Mysteries, and the first great dramatist, Aeschylus, was an Initiate.

One of the principal dramas enacted in the Eleusinian Mysteries was the story of Bacchus, or Dionysus. The legend relates that Bacchus, gazing into a mirror, became captivated by the reflection of his image. While thus engrossed he was seized by the Titans, who tore his body into fourteen pieces. Apollo, seeing this tragedy, collected the fragments and joined them together, restoring Bacchus to life.

The myth of Bacchus did not originate in Greece. It is as old as the world, having counterparts in the myths of the Egyptian Osiris, of the Phrygian Atys, the Syrian Tammuz and the Christian Christ. All of these "sun-gods" were murdered, descended into Hades and rose from the dead at the time of the vernal equinox, or "Easter." The story of Bacchus shows how the reincarnating Ego beholds his

image reflected in the waves of space, whispers, "this is I," and thereby becomes entangled in the web of delusion. The incarnating soul becomes the "scape-goat" of atonement for all the sins committed by its many personalities.

The Greek tragedy sprang from the myth of Bacchus. The word "tragedy" is derived from the Greek *tragos,* or "goat," which refers to the "scape-goat" that every Ego becomes as soon as it assumes a body. The first Greek tragedies were always presented during the spring festival in honor of Bacchus, or Dionysus. At first they were merely recitations given by one man, in which the virtues of Dionysus, the spiritual Ego, were extolled. Later a second actor was added, who was called the "hypocrite." Between the dialogues a chorus entered, chanting a lamentation for the condition into which the soul had fallen, or a eulogy on the divine Ego itself.

At that period of Greek history, when there were no public buildings save a few temples and law courts (these frequently being identical) no one would have dreamed of erecting a special building for the production of plays. The setting of the first Greek theater was laid before a convenient hillside, where the people gathered. At the foot of the hill was a flat circle, known as the "orchestra," where the acting and singing took place. Behind the orchestra was a booth, or *skene,* where the actors changed their masks. In the course of time wooden seats were installed on the hillside, then stone and marble seats which, in the theater in Athens, accommodated some seventeen thousand people. The crowd assembled at sunrise for the first play. The mornings were given over to tragedies, the afternoons to comedies, in which dignitaries of the day were caricatured.

In 525 B. C., just fifteen years before the Eleusinian Mysteries began to degenerate, Aeschylus, the first great dramatist, was born in the city of Eleusis. He was of royal birth, tracing his ancestry back to the last King of Athens, and his father was connected in some capacity with the Mystery School. After his own initiation Aeschylus had a symbolical dream in which Bacchus appeared, inspiring him to write tragedies. Recognizing the voice of "Bacchus" as the voice of his own inner self, he took up his work and composed seventy dramas before he died.

Aeschylus' best known work is *Prometheus Bound.* The myth immortalized in this poem is, as Bunsen says, "older than the Hellenes themselves." It is the most ancient of all allegories, the grandest of all myths, being concerned with what is probably the

most important event which has ever taken place upon this planet—that which Theosophy describes as the "lighting up of *Manas*."

In order to understand the real meaning of this poem, we must first go back to the beginning of this globe, when there was no earth as we know it now, but only the image of the earth reflected in the æther of space, and the images of such man-forms as had been developed upon the Moon chain. Seven times this misty, fiery earth turned and whirled, growing more dense with each gyration. Again seven times it rotated, its matter becoming gaseous, the man-forms denser shadows. Another sevenfold gyration produced astral matter and the astral forms of men. These forms were huge, without mind, sex, or speech. Trying to describe them, Aeschylus says,

> Seeing, they saw in vain;
> Hearing, they heard not; but like shapes in dreams
> Through the long time all things at random mixed.

For long ages the building of these forms went on, until at last they were as perfect as they had been on the former chain of globes. Then, in the second race, some of the wiser gods who had watched their building settled within the forms in order to guide and help them. Other gods, less wise, spurned the forms, declaring them unfit for habitation. But finally the Law forced these lesser gods to enter the forms and continue their journey of evolution. Thus, by *incarnation,* the Egos lighted up the latent spark of mind, and so man became a thinking being.

The story of Prometheus, who gave the fire of mind to man, is the tale of humanity itself. The Greeks declared that Prometheus came of a *divine* race. Compared with the body he occupies, Prometheus, the reincarnating Ego, is a *God.* By arousing the thinking faculty in those hitherto mindless forms, Prometheus also aroused the memory of the knowledge they had possessed on the moon-chain, thus giving them the "boon" of which the Chorus sings.

While saving him from mental darkness, Prometheus brought to man all the tortures which accompany self-consciousness: the knowledge of his responsibility to the whole of nature; the painful results of all wrong choices made in the past, since free-will and the power of choice go hand in hand with self-consciousness; all of the sorrows and sufferings—physical, mental and moral—to which thinking man is heir. Prometheus accepted these tortures as inevitable under the Law, knowing that the soul can develop only through its own experience, willing to pay the price for every experience gained.

When Zeus (who in this case represents the lower hosts that built

the forms) saw that Prometheus had made man a god through his gift of mind, he chained the Titan to a rock on Mount Caucasus, helpless victim of the vulture of unsatisfied desire, of regret, and despair, coupled with the "dream-like feebleness which fetters the blind race of mortals." In the midst of his suffering Heracles came to him and told him that "the soul of man can never be enslaved save by its own infirmities, nor freed save by its own strength and own resolve and constant vision and supreme endeavor." But Prometheus, "he who sees before the event," knew that men would never arrive at that condition before the end of the Dark Age. He prophesied that a mighty race would arise, "the kingly race born in Argos," in which a great Avatar would appear. But this Argos is not the Argos of Greece. The Argos of Aeschylus is the mystery name of that region which extends from Kailas mountain nearly to the Schamo desert. It was there that *physical* humanity was born. It is there that the *Kalki Avatar* will appear some 427,000 years hence.

In tracing the wanderings of Io, the "cow-horned maid," Aeschylus shows how Egypt owes its civilization to India. Io was told to go to a land near the river Ethiops, where she would find a dark and swarthy race. She was instructed to take some of these people to the "three-cornered land" and found a colony. The river Ethiops of which Aeschylus speaks is the Indus, sometimes called the *Nila* because of its dark blue color. The dark and swarthy people were the Eastern Ethiopians, who went from India to settle in Egypt. The three-cornered land is the Egyptian delta. The river Nile in Egypt received its name from the "blue river" in India, near which the Eastern Ethiopians dwelt.

How did Aeschylus know the history of these early races? He must have learned it in the Mysteries, where the true history of these early races formed part of the instructions. Both Cicero and Clement of Alexandria declare that this history was taught in the Sabasian Mysteries. These writers are also the only ones who attribute the condemnation of Aeschylus by the Athenians to its real cause. Aeschylus was a pledged Initiate, and in his *Prometheus* he refers to those dark crypts of initiation where a man became "as one newly born." Aeschylus spoke *cautiously* of these things. Aristophanes spoke more boldly in his immortal satire on Heracles' descent into Hades. (*The Frogs.*) Aeschylus was charged with sacrilege and condemned to be stoned to death, because the Athenians believed that he had profaned the Mysteries by exposing some of

their teachings on the public stage. He is said to have been saved from an angry mob by the appeal of his brother, a hero of Salamis.

Sophocles, the second great dramatist of ancient Greece, was about thirty years younger than Aeschylus. Being exceptionally talented in music, he was chosen to lead the chorus in the victory of Salamis when he was only sixteen years old. At the age of twenty-eight, he competed with Aeschylus in a dramatic contest, winning the prize which, for a full generation, had gone to the older poet. Aeschylus belonged to the stern generation of Marathon, Sophocles to the sunny age of Pericles. Both reflect the underlying spirit of their generation in their writings. Aeschylus stresses the unrelenting *justice* of Karma; Sophocles, its *mercy*. Aeschylus depicts the struggles of the soul in harsh and rugged lines. Sophocles paints them in softer and more delicate colors. Although Sophocles is not known as an Initiate, in *Electra* he calls the Eleusinian School the "edifice of the gods." In his *Oedipus,* he attempts to solve the riddle of the Sphynx. He tells how the Sphynx, half animal and half human, sat on a rock accosting every traveller with a riddle, which only Oedipus was able to answer. Oedipus, therefore, must be the symbol of the perfected man who has solved all the riddles of life, and is therefore freed from the necessity of reincarnation.

Euripides, the last of the great trio of tragic poets, appeared a generation later than Sophocles. He also wrote of Bacchus, of Jason, of Hercules and his labors, of the Trojan War and its heroes. Once again the age-old theme of the *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* appeared in the Attic tongue, reminding the Greeks of the trials of life which must be met and conquered before man may, in truth, be called *Man.*

During the life-time of these three tragic poets the theater of Greece advanced steadily. Sophocles brought a background into the play, and was the first to introduce scenery, in the modern sense of the word. Euripides moved the chorus from the stage to the background, making the actors the chief center of interest. He was a great friend of Socrates, who never missed a performance of any of his plays. He was also one of the most versatile of the Greeks, being a famous athlete, a painter, a rhetorician, and a pupil of both Anaxagoras and Protagoras.

The popularity of the Greek drama was due to the fact that all educated Greeks of that period were thoroughly familiar with their classical writers. When the Pan-Athenean festivals were celebrated every fourth year, the people listened to the passages from the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* with full understanding, for most of them had

studied these works when they were children and could repeat long passages by heart. Where in our day could we find an audience of 17,000 people who would eagerly listen to, say, a twelve-hour performance of Shakespeare, and who would know the lines by heart? We are greatly impressed when we listen to an orchestra of a hundred men, regarding the symphonies they play as one of the fruits of our modern civilization. Yet, a musical festival took place in Athens in 250 B. C., in which *five* hundred musicians played a magnificent symphony in five movements!

The "musical" education of the Greeks is stressed by all writers. It must be remembered, however, that the word "music" had a much wider application at that time than it now has. The Greek word *mousike* at first referred to the arts of the nine Muses. Gradually its meaning was extended to include everything connected with the training of the mind, just as the word *gymnastike* included everything pertaining to the training of the body. To speak of a Greek as having a good "musical education" is equivalent to saying that he was trained in *all* the liberal arts, including mathematics.

The Greek ideal of education was based upon the idea of universality, of the integration of all branches of learning. That is an ideal which our modern educators could well emulate. Hendrik van Loon, in his recent volume *The Arts,* makes an observation which finds an echo in the heart of every Theosophist who is interested in the subject of education. "There is one thing we can do," he says, "and there the Greeks can be our masters and teachers, as they have been our masters and our teachers in so many other things. They can show us the way back to a consciousness of that universality that underlies all human achievements. They can make us once more realize that nothing in this world exists quite in and by and for itself, but that everything pertaining to the human spirit is correlated and interrelated with everything else. And by so doing they can once more give us a feeling for something that is in truth the beginning and end of all wisdom."

---

## OLDEST PHILOSOHICAL NOTION

The matter-moving Nous, the animating Soul, immanent in every atom, manifested in man, latent in the stone, has different degrees of power; and this pantheistic idea of a general Spirit-Soul pervading all Nature is the oldest of all the philosophical notions.

—*The Secret Doctrine.*

# THE MYSTERY OF EVIL

For over sixteen centuries the new masks, forced on the faces of the old gods, have screened them from public curiosity, but they have finally proved a misfit. Yet the metaphorical FALL, and as metaphorical atonement and crucifixion, led Western Humanity through roads knee-deep in blood. Worse than all, they led it to believe in the dogma of the evil spirit distinct from the spirit of all good, whereas the former lives in all matter and pre-eminently in man. Finally it created the God-slandering dogma of Hell and eternal perdition; it spread a thick film between the higher intuitions of man and divine verities; and, most pernicious result of all, it made people ignorant of the fact that there were no fiends, no dark demons in the Universe before man's own appearance on this, and probably on other earths. Henceforth the people were led to accept, as the problematical consolation for this world's sorrows, the thought of original sin.—*The Secret Doctrine.*

WHILE few today fear the malign influence of fiends and demons, and the original sin is a conception belonging to the history of Christian dogma, we have not thrown off so easily the "thick film" which has come between the searching gaze of man's aspiring spirit and the divine verities he must one day discover. Aided by the sledge-hammer blows of materialism and scientific fact, the iconoclastic work of H.P.B. has been thoroughly accomplished, and the day of blind belief—in traditional religious dogma, at least—is at an end. One has but to turn the pages of *The Secret Doctrine* to see how extensively are treated the subjects of the devil, or "Satan," and the "Fall." Again and again H.P.B. returns to the theme: There is no devil, no hell, no eternal damnation. Satan, Lucifer, Prometheus are one; the reincarnating egos were the "fallen" ones, and it was no fall in the theological sense, but a great sacrifice. With each blow at the soul-degrading dogma of the churches, she sought to establish in the minds of her readers the essential noblity and divine origin of man.

The cycle, however, turns slowly, and modern thought, eschewing the fables of Christianity, has chosen to ignore as well the profound truths which theologians had garbled and distorted beyond recognition. The materialistic answer to the mysteries of human life, which simply says, There are no mysteries, no answer is needed, can hardly suffice for long. Human nature demands *some* explanation for the sufferings which life entails. Today, for a large body

of enthusiasts, the "Capitalist class" is an adequate substitution for the mediaeval Satan and his minions. Unless men find the truth their imaginations are bound to work over the tragedies of human life, fabricating this or that fabulous account of why things are as they are. Already the West is full of "teachers" and *soi disant* messiahs who are promising deliverance for all who believe. But that these new doctrines will be no improvement over the now discarded Christian beliefs is evident from the fact that in almost every case, the source of human woes, and of salvation, is placed outside of man himself.

What, actually, is the cause of human suffering? Some paragraphs from *The Secret Doctrine* will answer:

It is quite natural that the pessimistically inclined profane, once convinced of Nature's numerous shortcomings and failures, and especially of her autophagous propensities, should imagine this to be the best evidence that there is no deity *in abscondito* within Nature, nor anything divine in her. Nor is it less natural that the materialist and the physicist should imagine that everything is due to blind force and chance, and to the survival of the *strongest,* even more often than of the *fittest.* But the Occultists, who regard physical nature as a bundle of most varied illusions on the plane of deceptive perceptions; who recognise in every pain and suffering but the necessary pangs of incessant procreation: a series of stages toward an ever-growing perfectibility, which is visible in the silent influence of never-erring Karma, or *abstract* nature—the Occultists, we say, view the great Mother otherwise. Woe to those who live without suffering. Stagnation and death is the future of all that vegetates without a change. And how can there be any change for the better without proportionate suffering during the preceding stage? Is it not those only who have learnt the deceptive value of earthly hopes and the illusive allurements of external nature who are destined to solve the great problems of life, pain, and death? (II, 475.)

In its final revelation, the old myth of Prometheus—his *proto*— and *anti*-types being found in every ancient theogony—stands in each of them at the very origin of physical evil, because at the threshold of human physical life. KRONOS is "Time," whose first law is that the order of the successive and harmonious phases in the process of evolution during cyclic development should be strictly preserved—under the severe penalty of abnormal growth with all its ensuing results. It was not in the programme of natural development that man—higher animal though he may be—should become at once

—intellectually, spiritually, and physically—the demi-god he is on earth, while his physical frame remains weaker and more helpless and ephemeral than that of almost any huge mammal. The contrast is too grotesque and violent; the tabernacle much too unworthy of its indwelling god. The gift of Prometheus thus became a CURSE—though *foreknown* and *foreseen* by the HOST personified in that personage, as his name well shows. It is in this that rests, at one and the same time, its sin and its redemption. For the Host that incarnated in a portion of humanity, though led to it by Karma or *Nemesis*, preferred free-will to passive slavery, intellectual self-conscious pain and even torture—"while myriad time shall flow"—to inane, imbecile, instinctual beatitude. Knowing such an incarnation was premature and not in the programme of nature, the heavenly host, "Prometheus," still sacrified itself to benefit thereby, at least, one portion of mankind. But while saving man from mental darkness, they inflicted upon him the tortures of the self-consciousness of his responsibility—the result of his free will—besides every ill to which mortal man and flesh are heir to. This torture Prometheus accepted for himself, since the Host became henceforward blended with the tabernacle prepared for them, which was still unachieved at that period of formation.

Spiritual evolution being incapable of keeping pace with the physical, once its homogeneity was broken by the admixture, the gift thus became the chief cause, if not the sole origin of *Evil*. The philosophical view of Indian metaphysics places the Root of Evil in the differentiation of the Homogeneous into the Heterogeneous, of the unit into plurality. (II, 420-421 fn.) *There is no Devil, no Evil, outside mankind to produce a Devil.* Evil is a necessity in, and one of the supporters of the manifested universe. It is a necessity for progress and evolution, as night is necessary for the production of Day, and Death for that of Life—*that man may live forever.* (II, 389.)

The "Fallen Angels," so-called, are *Humanity itself.* The Demon of Pride, Lust, Rebellion, and Hatred, has never had *any being before* the appearance of physical conscious man. It is man who has begotten, nurtured, and allowed the fiend to develop in his heart; he, again, who has contaminated the indwelling god in himself, by linking the pure spirit with the impure demon of matter. And, if the Kabalistic saying, *"Demon est Deus inversus"* finds its metaphysical and theoretical corroboration in dual manifested nature, its practical application is found in Mankind alone. (II, 274.)

In the *"Great Book of the Mysteries,"* we are told that: "Seven Lords created Seven men; three Lords (Dhyan Chohans or Pitris) were holy and good, four less heavenly and full of passion. . . . The *chhayas* (phantoms) of the Fathers were as they."

This accounts for the differences in human nature, which is divided into seven gradations of good and evil. There were seven tabernacles ready to be inhabited by Monads under seven different Karmic conditions. The Commentaries explain on this basis the easy spread of evil, as soon as the human Forms had become real men. (II, 212.)

In human nature, evil denotes only the polarity of matter and Spirit, a struggle for life between the two manifested Principles in Space and Time, which principles are one *per se,* inasmuch as they are rooted in the Absolute. In Kosmos, the equilibrium must be preserved. The operations of the two contraries produce harmony, like the centripetal and centrifugal forces, which are necessary to each other—mutually inter-dependent—"in order that both should live." If one is arrested, the action of the other will become immediately self-destructive. (I, 416.)

Having to trace the origin of the idea to the very beginnings of the human mind, it is but just, meanwhile, to give his due even to the proverbial devil. Antiquity knew of no isolated, thoroughly and absolutely bad "god of evil." Pagan thought represented good and evil as twin brothers, born from the same mother—Nature; so soon as that thought ceased to be Archaic, Wisdom too became Philosophy. In the beginning the symbols of good and evil were mere abstractions, Light and Darkness; then their types became chosen among the most natural and ever-recurrent periodical Cosmic phenomena—the Day and the Night, or the Sun and Moon. Then the Hosts of the Solar and Lunar deities were made to represent them, and the Dragon of Darkness was contrasted with the Dragon of Light (See *Stanzas* V., VII. of Book I.) The Host of Satan is a Son of God, no less than the Host of the B'ni Alhim, these children of God coming to "present themselves before the Lord," their father (see *Job ii.*). "The Sons of God" become the "Fallen Angels" only after perceiving that the daughters of men *were fair,* (*Genesis vi.*) In the Indian philosophy, the *Suras* are among the earliest and the brightest gods, and become *Asuras* only when dethroned by Brahmanical fancy. Satan never assumed an anthropomorphic, individualized shape, until the creation by man, of a "one *living* personal god," had been accomplished; and then merely as a matter of prime necessity. A screen was needed; a

scape-goat to explain the cruelty, blunders, and but too-evident injustice, perpetrated by him for whom absolute perfection, mercy, and goodness were claimed. This was the first Karmic effect of abandoning a philosophical and logical Pantheism, to build, as a prop for lazy man, "a merciful father in Heaven," whose daily and hourly actions as *Natura naturans,* the "comely mother but stone cold," belie the assumption. (I, 412.)

* * * *

In these few pages are briefly sketched the true genesis of evil in human life and the history of the idea to its present status of a dying theological deception. But while beliefs may pass, the reality remains, the fertile source of morbid speculation and of blind denial. Only philosophy can prevent another era of ignorance and dogmatism in which priests assume the responsibility of the thinking that each man should do for himself. Only philosophy can meet the despair-born negation of the materialists: 'Objectors to the doctrine of Karma should recall the fact that it is absolutely out of the question to attempt to reply to the Pessimists on other data." (*S. D.* II, 304fn.) Finally, the realization that every man is a divine Monad—the very stuff of Deity itself,—which has voluntarily exiled itself from the bliss of spiritual existence, to descend, for incarnating purposes, to a lower plane and thus transform the animal of clay *into an immortal god*,—to feel this ennobling truth thrilling through the being of man on earth, will give the strength, the *will,* that must arouse the race to its cyclic mission and great inheritance.

---

## Meaning of Pantheism

Pantheism manifests itself in the vast expanse of the starry heavens, in the breathing of the seas and oceans and the quiver of life of the smallest blade of grass. This does not mean that every bush, tree or stone is God or *a* God; but only that every speck of the manifested material of Kosmos belongs to and is the substance of "God," however low it may have fallen in its cyclic gyration through the Eternities of the ever becoming; and also that every such speck individually, and Kosmos collectively, is an aspect and a reminder of that universal *One Soul*—which philosophy refuses to call God, thus limiting the eternal and ever-present root and essence.

—*The Secret Doctrine.*

# THE QUEST FOR SELF-KNOWLEDGE

WE live in a time which permits one of its most "distinguished" representatives to exclaim, "What but bias could have led to the opinion that self-consciousness is typical of mind?" and to proceed with the assertion: "I am confident that the nature of mental action is discoverable neither by an analysis of mental contents nor by self-intuition; that it is necessary, in short, to abandon the method of self-knowledge altogether, and substitute that of general observation."[1] This writer believes, with William James, "that our entire feeling of spiritual activity, or what commonly passes by that name, is really a feeling of bodily activities whose exact nature is by most men overlooked." Now to the student who is at all familiar with the Aphorisms of Patanjali, it is quite evident that introspection of this kind could not possibly overcome even the merely preliminary obstacles to a knowledge of the Spirit. In Book I, Aphorism 30, Patanjali says,

> The obstacles in the way of him who desires to attain concentration are Sickness, Languor, Doubt, Carelessness, Laziness, Addiction to objects of sense, Erroneous Perception, Failure to attain any stage of abstraction, and Instability in any state when attained.

Obviously, introspection which could discover only the sensations of the internal operation of bodily organs cannot be regarded as a "stage of abstraction," nor even as an attempt to reach such a stage. It is only a curious peering about, a sort of "listening" to the working of the nervous system. But suppose this should be pointed out to a modern philosopher or psychologist, with the further admonitions of Patanjali respecting the way to overcome the obstacles to concentration:

> 32. For the prevention of these, one truth should be dwelt upon. Any accepted truth which one approves, is here meant.
> 33. Through the practice of Benevolence, Tenderness, Complacency, and Disregard for objects of happiness, grief, virtue, and vice, the mind becomes purified.
>
> The chief occasions for distraction of the mind are Covetousness and Aversion, and what the aphorism means is, not that virtue and vice should be viewed with indifference by the student, but that he should not fix his mind with pleasure upon happiness or virtue, nor with aversion upon grief or vice, in

[1] Ralph Barton Perry, *Present Philosophical Tendencies* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1929), pp. 282, 283, 284.

> others, but should regard all with an equal mind; and the practice of Benevolence, Tenderness, and Complacency brings about cheerfulness of the mind, which tends to strength and steadiness.

The very thought of such conditions being necessary to the attainment of knowledge of the mind or soul would probably seem ridiculous to our learned professors. Which is, however, entirely their affair, although a sad one. But it becomes the affair of all of us when men posing as teachers announce that the extent of *their* introspective insight marks the limits of all possible learning in this way. Fortunately, modern philosophy exerts but a negligible influence in the modern world—it is doubtful whether it affects even the lives of the modern philosophers. Nevertheless the attitude toward mind and the problem of self illustrated in the above quotations has a negative influence in that it pretentiously conceals a piteous ignorance of man's psychic and spiritual life. A people that can honor and esteem as notable those whose expressions on this subject are, to paraphrase Max Müller, mere "lispings of infant psychology," and "materialistic twaddle," is indeed in tragic need of light on the subject of soul. It is not so much the immediate expression of the view that our own minds can not become a source of self-knowledge, that reveals our weakness, but the general state of mind which makes this theory possible and acceptable to others.

Into such a world of thought H. P. Blavatsky brought the philosophy which says, in a sentence, that "by paralyzing his lower personality, and arriving thereby at the full knowledge of the *non-separateness* of his higher SELF from the One absolute SELF, man can, even during his terrestrial life, become as "One of Us." (*S. D.* I, 276.) Because of its bold denial of the cherished notions of materialism, and because of the many misconceptions of its teachings spread abroad by pseudo-theosophists, Theosophy is almost entirely exiled from the world of modern thought—the orthodox world of intellectual "respectability." Theosophy will be vindicated only by theosophists who make their lives consonant with the principle stated by H. P. B.

Theosophists have in their philosophy the means to achieve this goal, but what of the obstacles? Theosophists, in common with other members of western civilization, have habits of mind similar to those which led William James to his conclusion. The difference lies in the fact that theosophists do not accept as the ultimate realities of mind and character the things that a casual inspection of ourselves reveals. Theosophists regard selfishness as a quality to be eliminated from their lives; most psychologists think selfishness is a

basic and necessary instinct, which may, perhaps, be modified in its more overt expressions, but which can hardly be suppressed without producing a psychosis—or something. Because self-knowledge is elusive, difficult to grasp, theosophists redouble their efforts to reach in, in, to the very root of their being. For the same reason psychologists denominate "self-knowledge" a delusive phrase, instead of an elusive reality.

More than two thousand years ago, Aristotle decided that the problem of ethics and the problem of knowledge are unrelated fields of study. Plato, his Master, had taught that knowledge and virtue are inseparable, but Aristotle did not agree, proceeding to "correct" his Master's doctrine. To this day the followers of Aristotle—the "inductive scientists"—have been describing the *status quo,* either disregarding altogether the question of what *ought* to be, or hoping that, somehow, the ideal will reveal itself as the logical implication of what *is.* "Facts," they say, "when justly arranged, interpret themselves."

This, of course, implies that we are able to look at facts with complete impartiality—impartiality in this case meaning that the observer is absolutely devoid of any notion as to the significance of the facts. Time enough, it is thought, to talk of meaning after we know the facts. This theory seems to work well enough when applied to physics. At least, sufficient practical knowledge in this field has been gained to enable engineers to draft nature's forces in the service of man's physical needs to a most marvelous extent. But what happens when the facts of psychology are treated in this manner? A passage from William James' *Psychology* will illustrate the nature of the problem:

> Not that I would not, if I could, be both handsome and fat and well dressed, and a great athlete, and make a million a year, be a wit, a *bon-vivant,* and a lady-killer, as well as a philosopher, a philanthropist, statesman, warrior, and African explorer, as well as a "tone-poet" and a saint. But the thing is simply impossible. The millionaire's work would run counter to the saint's; the *bon-vivant* and the philanthropist would trip each other up; the philosopher and the lady-killer could not well keep house in the same tenement of clay.[2]

Here Prof. James enumerates a few of the leading *motifs* in human nature as presently constituted. He sees, as most intelligent men see, that he cannot—nor, for that matter, any other man—be

[2] *Op. Cit.* I, 311 (quoted by Boyd H. Bode, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads,* New York, 1938).

philosopher, saint, industrialist and man-about-town all at once: the thing is simply impossible. But if he could, *he would*. Rather than suppose that this eminent psychologist actually meant that *he* would give in to all these desires if he could; that, in the words of Wilde, he longed—

> To drift with every passion till my soul
> Is a stringed lute on which all winds can play,

let us assume instead that in his graceful and modest manner Prof. James chose to play the part of everyman, and, like everything else he did, to play it with great literary effect. He recites our common feelings, holding up before our eyes a brief but comprehensive catalogue of the motions of lower *Manas*. We feel he *understands* us, this both great and entertaining man. The analogues of all his illustrations we easily find in ourselves. His urbane appeal, *Do* be sensible, is somehow flattering. Perhaps he has helped a few here and there to be "sensible," but that is all. There is no better reason for selecting but one of these motives than that of its incompatibility with others—a simple utilitarian principle, the doctrine of enlightened selfishness.

Many of the psychological tests used by the personnel departments of large corporations are based on the same passive acceptance of the attributes of human nature. The applicant for work must undergo an interrogation as to his likes and dislikes and various other of his human foibles. To the psychologist, the "score" of the candidate classifies him in one or another of several empirically derived "types," which determines the kind of work he may be given, or the foreman he may work under, according to their respective temperaments. Results of "great efficiency" are reported by users of these tests.

But what about their effect on the *men*? To a statistical father confessor each of these human beings renders up an inventory of his traits. Reticence is condemned; one who refuses to take the tests is labeled by Science as devious; he is "hiding" something. Imagine the feelings of a sincere theosophist who is trying to maintain a spirit of impersonality in all his human relationships when confronted by a list of attributes which are entirely personal—good, bad or indifferent—and requested to identify all those which are his own! He is asked to affirm as intrinsic parts of his character many of the qualities he is trying to get rid of—an insult to the soul.

These are the sort of "facts" dealt with by modern psychology, the facts on which social science should be based, we are told. If there is a pig in man, feed him a little; not too much, of course, but

feed him. So also with other of our animal-like attributes. Anyone who suggests that the lower nature should be controlled, disciplined, and finally eliminated as a basis of action, is no better than a religious fanatic, a social menace who would turn mankind into a race of complex-ridden Calvinists. The currents of selfishness, anger and lust which flow through men are part of our biological heritage; they may, even should, be modified, but never destroyed. They are *natural*: is not the first lesson of anthropology that man is an animal? Have not the "facts" made this plain?

What happens to all these facts when they are viewed in the light of Theosophy? Not one of them is denied, insofar as they are true, but all assume a right relation through reference to the great ideal of human perfection. Theosophy tells *why* we have the conflicting desires Prof. James enumerates; Theosophy offers no immoral reasons for moral conduct, as does religion, but gives philosophical and ethical reasons for the control of the desire-nature. Because the arguments for morality used by religion are degrading to reason, science decided to eliminate morality altogether. True, morality crept back into scientific thought camouflaged by such words as "social" and "anti-social," but the logic of modern sociology is entirely that of an orderly regulation of selfishness for the sake of self. Fortunately, scientists, like other men, are souls in evolution, so that their practical action in service to the community is frequently inconsistent with the materialism of scientific theory. The most curious anomaly of our age lies in the impassioned appeals of those who are trying to arouse the masses to unselfish action by preaching a social philosophy which is rooted in animalism. It doesn't make sense, and the masses know it, so they pay no attention. A Hitler is far more interesting to them—more "practical," one might say. For generations western peoples have been told that they are creatures of environment, that they really can't help it. Well, then, maybe this miracle-man can! They've tried everything else, or so they think.

It requires but little reflection to realize how literally "impractical" scientific materialism becomes when applied to the problems of psychology and sociology. Materialism asserts that there are no "first principles"—the denial of intelligent purpose to the process of universal evolution can have no other meaning. But all rational thought is purposive; hence, there can be no intelligible relationship established between non-purposive "laws" of nature and purposive man. Even the attempt of the materialist to prove that nature is ultimately meaningless is itself an expression of purpose; he pur-

poses to "prove" something. In this he illustrates the *fact* of Mr. Judge's statement in *The Ocean of Theosophy:* "All is soul and spirit ever evolving under the rule of law which is *inherent* in the whole." Our very formulations of ignorance themselves bear witness to the inherent law of life.

However psychologists may deny the existence of soul and spirit, they are constrained by the nature of their own being to deal with their fellow men *as if* these latter were in fact independent mental and moral agents. The practical educator in the kindergarten, the elementary and high schools, does not practice his calling "by the book," but through the knowledge gained in living contact with other minds. He may talk learnedly of "conditioning," of "drives," using these and other scholastic terms evolved by modern psychology in exposition of theory, but insofar as he *teaches* he deals with souls and minds, call them what he will. No doubt there are conditioned reflexes and "basic instincts" to be considered as problems of educational method. The theosophist recognizes in the phenomena represented by these terms the phases of psychic action discussed by Mr. Judge in the seventh chapter of the *Ocean,* and by H. P. B. in "Psychic and Noetic Action." But the choosing, thinking, being—the *subject* working through these conditions and states—is somehow taken for granted by the modern theorist; that is, in practice he deals with an essential being that has been utterly ignored in theory. All that is of value in modern education may be attributed to the work of educators who follow a common-sense, rule-of- thumb policy in practice, for between the theories of orthodox psychology and the actual process of *unfolding* that we speak of generally as "learning," there is an impassable abyss.

Because materialism-dominated psychology denies the soul in man, educators who presume to speak of soul are branded as medieval in their thinking. So they restrict their mention of soul to poetic flights of rhetoric in baccalaureate addresses and on other occasions similarly charged with sentiment. The soul is not a subject of scientific inquiry, but only a useful metaphor to be employed when we relax from the rigid austerities of scientific method. Soul, for the scientist, has joined the other "unmentionables" of the Victorian Age; it is under a strict scientific taboo and may be referred to only vaguely and darkly with such terms as "character" and "personality" and other imponderables of the modern vocabulary.

A direct and courageous inquiry into the nature of being, the human being in particular, would raise up all the witch-hunting propensities of the scientific fraternity. The deadly accusation of

"metaphysics" would be heard; a thousand scientific Davids would arise to save modern thought from a renascent Goliath of theology. To speak seriously of the soul is not permitted. Good taste demands a respectful silence on matters which materialism has not yet explained.

Only a few modern thinkers have reached the point where they have been able to recognize the ridiculousness of this position. But that there are any such thinkers at all is a most hopeful sign. In appreciation of one of the most eminent of modern philosophers, and in contrast to that other pole of thought represented by contemporary psychology, we reproduce a passage from the work of F. H. Bradley, *Appearance and Reality:*

> Metaphysics takes its stand on this . . . desire to think about and comprehend reality. And it merely asserts that, if the attempt is to be made, it should be done as thoroughly as our nature permits. There is no claim on its part to supersede other functions of the human mind; but it protests that, if we are to think, we should sometimes try to think properly. And the opponent of metaphysics, it appears to me, is driven to a dilemma. He must either condemn all reflection on the essence of things, — and, if so, he breaks, or, rather, tries to break, with part of the highest side of human nature, — or else he allows us to think, but not to think strictly. He permits, that is to say, the exercise of thought so long as it is entangled with other functions of our being; but as soon as it attempts a pure development of its own, guided by the principles of its own distinctive working, he prohibits it forthwith. And this appears to be a paradox, since it seems equivalent to saying, You may satisfy your instinctive longing to reflect, so long as you do it in a way which is unsatisfactory. If your character is such that in you thought is satisfied by what does not and cannot, pretend to be thought proper, that is quite legitimate. But if you are constituted otherwise, and if in you a more strict thinking is a want of your nature, that is by all means to be crushed out. And, speaking for myself, I must regard this as at once dogmatic and absurd (pp. 4-5).

It is in this spirit that the theosophist undertakes his study of life, within and without himself. He has in the philosophy the principles of inquiry—the means by which the abstract metaphysical concepts of the teaching may be translated into the direct perception of soul-knowledge. It is a long process, and not an easy one, but those who have undertaken it, with all that the Path implies, ultimately find it to be the only thing in life that is worth while.

# THE TEACHING OF PHILOSOPHY

THERE are numerous "philosophies"—collections of ideas formed according to the differing views of life held by individuals. There is also *philosophy,* true to its meaning as love of real wisdom. Those who have found this inclusive knowledge have ever desired to make it available for others—not to call attention to their own learning, but because they know that the highest life is a life of teaching, of helping. Some of the great teachers have brought simple doctrines of right living—practical codes of conduct to follow. Other teachers have taught the same doctrine, but in a different way, meeting the questioning minds of the actively intellectual.

Many students of philosophy, both past and present, refusing the orientation offered by wise helpers of the race, have nevertheless been forced by the very intensity of their mental life to formulate patterns of ideas. Such independent investigations of the mysteries in man and nature have been sometimes helpful, but more often misleading. "Philosophic systems" have been accumulated in almost endless series, but like all speculations, partially true, they lack the principles of universal synthesis and now lie in the intellectual dustheaps of the past. The greatest philosophers, the theosophists of every age, possessing the integrated wisdom of ages, have attempted to relate the limited conceptions of men with a larger perspective. They have realized that confused minds must be met on familiar grounds, and led to see gradually the ordering principles of universal philosophy. Yet some twenty-five centuries have been marked by continued disregard on the part of Western peoples for those great teachers and the basic principles presented for the moral and intellectual benefit of the race. So tangled are men in the webs of modern speculation that an appeal of true philosophy in the devitalized language of intellect only adds to the confusion, appearing little better than myriads of now discarded conceptions. Those sated with "learning" can be awakened only by a language addressed to the higher realm of their nature—the language of soul, the heart doctrine.

Ever since there have been great teachers, both the heart doctrine and the eye doctrine have been contained in their messages. One aspect may predominate, but both are ever present. Development of intellect can never suffice in itself, though it is a potent force when used for the amelioration of suffering and directed from the

highest plane of perception, the perception of right motive. And while the heart doctrine alone may suffice for the intellectually unawakened, these must some day undertake their *Manasic* evolution, the seeds of which are in the heart doctrine itself.

The heart doctrine pervades the Theosophy of H. P. Blavatsky as presented in *Isis Unveiled, The Secret Doctrine* and all her other writings, despite the disciplined intellectuality of these works. H. P. B.'s immediate purpose was to "break the molds of men's minds," yet on every page of her books there is also the heart doctrine for those who can see and appreciate it. Students whom she loved and trusted knew also, in a way impossible to the casually interested public, the devotion to the cause of universal brotherhood which she inspired in others and exemplified in herself. Was Theosophy, re-presented by H. P. B., intended to appeal only to the "elect" of the modern world—the scholars and writers of her time and the future? She strove to awaken the mind of *all* humanity, to bring to simple people a rational basis for high ideals and their application in daily life. No one can study her life and writings without realizing that her aim was to give sustenance to *every* mind and heart. Active and creative minds were starved, not for new intellectual formulas, but for the heart doctrine. Many who brought over from former lives the essence of the heart doctrine needed an awakening of mental energy to turn the force of right motive into its highest usefulness.

Let it not be thought that only the intellectual can appreciate the logic and philosophy of H. P. B.'s teachings. Her metaphysics will stimulate to mental growth many minds hitherto unawakened. And what of the "intellectuals"? Do they need more intellect, or the heart doctrine to balance their one-sided development? A chief objective of H. P. B.'s labors was to turn powerful intellects to new channels by the fire of the heart doctrine, as expressed in the first object of the original Theosophical Society, and by mention of exalted beings—the hidden Teachers of humanity.

No Theosophist need suppose that Theosophy as brought by H. P. B. should be diluted to suit the mental peculiarities of some inquirer. Must the existence of Masters—Beings who are the very source of Theosophy as a body of knowledge—be denied expression because some might think it "superstition"? Rather let it be realized that if Masters are a fact in nature, the worthy have known of them before. Fitting words of Them may vivify that memory and stir a recognition of old.

Strictly "logical" presentation of theosophical philosophy to the typical scholar may invite him to treat the ageless wisdom as he habitually regards the countless theories of Western speculation. The scholar needs rather the philosopher's stone of *heart,* by which he can distinguish between philosophies and the *one philosophy* of timeless duration. Speak not to the over-learned exclusively in terms of complicated metaphysics. Speak to them of the needs of humanity, of practical brotherhood—the heart doctrine. Otherwise minds in a ferment of opposing intellectual positions may pass Theosophy by as merely another set of speculations. The practical altruism and service of Theosophy will perhaps command their respect, and even support, leading them finally to examination of the philosophy itself. Debate with an educator on the "metaphysical necessity" of reincarnation? Rather let him see the moral and mental benefits gained by those who accept such an explanation of human life. Speak *alone* of devotion and universal brotherhood to simple folk who have a natural love of humanity and a spontaneous devotion to great Teachers? Rather point to the need of themselves becoming teachers, which, in turn, requires effective use and development of the mind. The creative energy focused by right use of the mind will cause the fire of Self to burn more brightly, will wake minds and hearts from comparative lethargy, and provide workers possessed of an intense will *to do,* coupled with discrimination and knowledge of practical means and methods.

---

## The Pioneers

Always there are those who will test Theosophy out in their own lives, and learn what it is, and will carry on the work to the last end. They in their good time must come to be the leaders and pioneers of humanity, which must learn, even though the learning takes centuries of suffering. If the light of pure Theosophy is kept burning clear, it will be the saving light of the whole world. That must be. But the question is, who will be the light-bearers? —R. C.

# YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

WHAT *are the inherent ideas impacted into our natures by higher beings? If ideas really rule our lives, what is the difference between this process and creation or salvation by a personal God?*

(*a*) The important word here is "inherent," which is derived from the Latin verb *inhaero,* to stick or cling in, and is defined as meaning "permanently united, as an element of original quality." Our inherent ideas are original qualities or elements of our nature. They are Truth, which means that Theosophy is *inherent* in us. These fundamental ideas may be found expressed in limited ways in many of our everyday conceptions of life. Courage, the admonitions of conscience, reverence for life, patience, whatever discrimination we have—these are some of the ways inherent ideas manifest in our present age. The fundamentals are part of the imperishable center of man's nature; they "were implanted in the human mind at the very beginning of its evolutionary career on this planet by those brothers and sages who learned their lessons and were perfected in former ages." (*The Ocean of Theosophy,* p. 87.) We should note the word *human* and remember that it does not indicate the higher mind. As a man knocks at the door of a house and calls forth one living there, so They called the inherent ideas from higher mind to the lower and thus implanted them there. The Elder Brothers are therefore to be recognized as Teachers, not as creators.

(*b*) It has been observed by all unprejudiced men that many people know and act upon certain principles such as justice, honesty, charity, which are accepted as principles of living, not merely as pleasant ideals. All races show some faith in ideals of this nature and children often reveal an instinct for right human relations, co-operation, gratitude, respect for elders. Why is this? The history of humanity shows that, under the guidance of Elder Brothers, each period of evolution begins with a long review of what has taken place in previous periods. During that review, the Wise Ones, those who have learned the lessons of the previous periods, strengthen the good, the fundamental, the true ideas. Mr. Judge has referred to that time as the period when the Elder Brothers burned these ideas into our natures, impacting or imprinting them on the human mind. This is not creation, but *intensification* of already existing ideas. There can be no confusion if we remember that universal ideas like Brotherhood and Justice are part of all minds and were brought over from previous periods of evolution. All knowledge

is in the higher man; education merely wakes it up, brings it through to this plane. All evolution is education. There is no creation, no salvation by higher beings, because the knowledge is our own, the use of it our own, the responsibility none but ours. The role of the divine beings is not that of "God" or "Creator," but that of Teacher and Friend to a humanity entering a new field of work. Mankind has never been without these Friends.

(*c*) An understanding of true education will give the answer to this question. It is the process of drawing out the ideas inherent in the nature of the pupil by a teacher who knows what to draw out and how to do it. A school teacher shows children how to add and subtract and thus awakens in them the inherent power to use arithmetical processes. False education fills the mind with mental lumber —ideas which do not awaken because they are not axioms and offer no stimulus to the creative faculties.

What the true teacher does in his sphere is analogous to what the Masters do at the beginning of a period of evolution. It is said that They impacted the ideas into man's nature. The word impact is derived from the Latin *impingere,* meaning "to strike against," to set the vibrations going as in a bell, to wake up. When we strike fire from a stone we do not think that we set fire to the stone by our action. We simply make it possible for the fire in the stone to manifest. In the early stages of this globe, humanity went to school to adept-teachers who understood true philosophy. These teachers did not, as the questioner seems to think, fill us with new ideas, pack something into us, and thus become dictators. They set the old vibrations going again. One of the Masters wrote: "The mission of a planetary Spirit is but to strike the Keynote of Truth. . . . The vibrations of the Primitive Truth are what your philosophers name 'innate ideas'."

*Is not much of Theosophy based on the Kabala and the Hindu Teachings?*

(*a*) No, Theosophy is not a mosaic of this or that religion or philosophy. The Secret Doctrine antedates them all, for it was "the universally diffused religion of the ancient and prehistoric world." (*The Secret Doctrine* I, xxxiv.)

What proof have we that Theosophy is not compiled from religions and philosophies such as the Hindu teachings and the Kabala? There is a test that any student can make. Any and all partial teachings can be understood only if studied in the light of Theosophical principles.

There is, of course, a connection between any religion or philoso-

phy worthy of the name and Theosophy, because all religions have sprung from the same source. H. P. B. says that records of the Secret Doctrine exist today in the secret crypts of libraries belonging to the Occult Fraternity. This may be proved by examining the great religious teachings from the basis of Theosophy. Casting aside the overlay of superstition and priestly interpretations, we find that the Fundamental Teachings of Theosophy exist as the foundation and framework of them all.

In another way, it may be seen that Theosophy is not a composite of eclectic doctrine because it is not a message directed to any particular people, as with the many religions. Today the lines of communication among the peoples of the world have made possible the universal *world* message of Theosophy. It was not delivered by word of mouth as with particular religions, but recorded in English, the most widely used language the world over.

(*b*) No, Theosophy is not based on this or that teaching. Theosophy comes from its Knowers who have presented Their Wisdom in every cycle and to every race. The Initiates of every country have preserved with care the secret or esoteric aspect of the Wisdom Religion and given out only what could be assimilated by the various races according to their advancement and culture. Mr. Judge says in *The Ocean of Theosophy* (p. 23): "Those Elder Brothers . . . have caused its (Theosophy's) repromulgation and pointed to its *confirmation* in ancient books." There is a vast difference between referring to ancient books for confirmation, and using them as *sources*. Reference to ancient books does not indicate that they are the basis of Theosophy. If all the scriptures in the world had been destroyed centuries ago, the source of Theosophy would have remained unaffected, because that source is not merely in physical records of stone and parchment, although such records exist. Theosophy is the unforgettable possession of Perfected Men. They are the Knowers of it just as an author is the knower of what he is going to put into his book before he writes it down. They, from time to time, have made records of Theosophy. All use of ancient books is for our sake, for evidence is required by the doubting minds of the Dark Age, corroboration is required by people who have forgotten the very existence of their Elder Brothers, let alone the fact that They are the Knowers of a complete body of knowledge. H.P.B. says:

> We have concerned ourselves with the ancient records of the nations, with the doctrine of chronological and psychic cycles, of which these ancient records are the tangible proof. . . .

> It is only by bringing before the reader an abundance of proofs all tending to show that in every age, under every condition of civilization and knowledge, the educated classes of every nation made themselves the more or less faithful echoes of one identical system and its fundamental traditions—that he can be made to see that so many streams of the same water must have had a common source from which they started. What was this source? If coming events are said to cast their shadows before, past events can not fail to leave their impress behind them. It is, then, by these shadows of the hoary Past, and their fantastic silhouettes on the external screen of every religion and philosophy, that we can, by checking them as we go along, and comparing them, trace out finally the body that produced them. (*The Secret Doctrine* II, 794.)

*What is the basis for teaching that the "Golden Age" will return? Is it inevitable? Are all "golden ages" the same in character?*

(*a*) The basis in Theosophy that the Golden Age will return is given in *Isis Unveiled* (I, 293), where it is stated that when humanity received its coats of skin there began an uninterrupted series of yugas. In *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 198), it is shown that the seven races will go through the four yugas. These cycles are given in tabular form on page 125 of *The Ocean of Theosophy,* and pages 68-70 of Volume II of *The Secret Doctrine.*

Will all the Golden Ages be the same in character? Only Life itself is always the same. As men gain more knowledge, their outlook changes. As the Golden Age is typified by purity and innocence, these qualities must vary with the grasp of the Eternal Truths. Nor would it seem that all the races go through these Yugas at the same time, because there are always, by analogy, some egos going through childhood, some youth, some maturity (which has been likened to Kali-Yuga), and some in the decline.

(*b*) The Golden Age is the name that has been given to periods of high illumination and purity in the history of mankind. "It was the 'Golden Age' in those days of old, the age when 'the gods walked the earth, and mixed freely with the mortals'." (*S.D.* II, 273.) It is really an exalted age of Innocence in the life of a Race, before the old evil tendencies re-assert themselves. The Golden Age and the childhood of an individual are analogous in the sense that both are periods of opportunity because each offers a time free from the weight of *skandhas* from the past. But in the childhood of an individual today we do not find that he feels himself one with the god within, or that a child can be "a priest unto him-

self," as it is said man was during the Golden Age. Nor is a child's spiritual ego in operation as it was in man until nearly the end of the Fourth Race. (*S.D.* II, 306.) Theosophy paints the glorious picture of infant humanity, guided from the beginning by the Great Teachers and Knowers, living in brotherly love from knowledge of man's god-like nature. These powerful leaders of mankind hold back the mass of evil tendencies for a time, that the race may have a better start. Each manvantara, each period of race history, and each individual life begins with this golden opportunity.

There have been many Golden Ages and they need not have faded to Iron Ages of such blackness as the present period. We have lived in the golden age many times and the turn of the cycle will inevitably bring another after our present Kali-yuga. But it is not inevitable that we shall be there. We must now set up the causes and *work* to earn a part of that golden opportunity. The egos of every age determine how luminous the succeeding age will be, just as in each life a man determines by his choices how bright will be his future life and lives. So golden ages vary in characteristics according to the Karma of race and nation. Anyone can establish his own golden cycle in the midst of general darkness by leading a life of altruism and service. The seed for the golden age of the future is being sown right here in the land of America, now in preparation for the coming Sixth race, and the more glorious Seventh race to follow. H.P.B. writes:

> Occult philosophy teaches us that even now, under our very eyes, the new Race and Races are preparing to be formed, and that it is in America that the transformation will take place, and has already silently commenced. . . . Thus the Americans have become in only three centuries a "primary race," *pro tem.*, before becoming a race apart, and strongly separated from all other now existing races. . . .
>
> This process of preparation for the Sixth great Race must last throughout the whole sixth and seventh sub-races . . . the present Race is on its ascending arc; and the Sixth will be gradually growing out of its bonds of matter, and even of flesh. . . .
>
> The Cycles of Matter will be succeeded by Cycles of Spirituality and a fully developed mind. On the law of parallel history and races, the majority of the future mankind will be composed of glorious Adepts. Humanity is the child of cyclic Destiny, and not one of its Units can escape its unconscious mission, or get rid of the burden of its co-operative work with nature. (*The Secret Doctrine* II, 444-6.)

# HOW DO WE FAIL?

THE question of failure is a very earnest one among Theosophists. To fail is to fall short of some standard of perfection, some goal which, like everything else in manifestation, is measurable by degree. Just as right is sometimes measured by its opposition to wrong, so a specific failure is but a limitation of success. It is necessary for any Theosophist trying to lead the higher life to regard his so-called "failures" as steps to success; otherwise he may be caught in the slough of despair. To know that we have fallen short implies an appreciation of the ideal that we have not reached.

We all realize that the sadness of H. P. Blavatsky over the failure of the Theosophical Society to be an instrument of true brotherhood was no mere negative despondency. She never ceased to point out where policies and actions had failed of the ideal, nor to emphasize by her every word and deed the real nature of that ideal.

Constant self-study and self-questioning are the habit of those who intend not to fail humanity in the task of lighting the fires of brotherhood. But in the numerous failures which are bound to occur because we are only *on the way* to perfection, there will always be at least one positive success, that of knowing wherein we have failed. Without this knowledge we are helpless and hopeless, for others as for ourselves. The method by which we aid others to sink their differences and forget their antipathies is by "disseminating the Fundamental Principles" and by demonstrating them in our actions.

Our work is to unite mankind, and any action which departs from this aim, creating differences or distinctions, emphasizing a personal superiority here, obvious unfitness there, is certainly failure. There must be *common sense* in an effort to establish harmony among the members of *any* group. Does the hostess to a gathering of friends retire to the precincts of some private room to discuss the shortcomings of some with other of her guests? If so, she has ceased to be a hostess. Are Mr. A's good qualities seen when we are thinking of the hidden whispers about his faults? Brotherhood has disappeared when, all too often, we damn with faint praise. Smiling, we say that so-and-so is "not so bad," but . . . , and a shrug of the shoulder says the rest. We are none of us free from faults, but surely the greatest of all faults—and one we can easily avoid in this work of ours—is the casual derogation of others. Instead of dis-

cussing the *value* of the speaker's talk, or what was good, we say in an off-hand manner that he missed a good point, he was long-winded, that his vocabulary is too simple, or not simple enough, and so forth.

Where criticisms are needed—and they are often desperately needed—there is only one place where they can possibly do good, and even there sometimes fail. Meanwhile, to others, only speech of good-will. If a man has faults, he usually has good qualities, too. For theosophists whom we know to be engaged in a glorious work of unselfishness, how can we do otherwise than create for each and every one of them a circle of appreciation, of warmth and united harmony?

This does not mean that our conversation must be limited to mutual admiration and hypocritical congratulation. That would still be *personal.* To be impersonal is not to be uncritical; to be brotherly is not to be sentimental. The *Manasic* life is in the mind; it deals with ideas and their true relation, not with the personal idiosyncracies of men and women. These should be beneath our notice, except as their analogues are noted and corrected in ourselves.

In this work of intelligent tolerance, we must learn to forgive, not merely to *tolerate.* Suppose some one person is obviously a source of dissension—irritable, perhaps, or bitter. Let us remember that he who is of pleasant speech and personable mien may contribute little more. He may find it easy to be pleasant with no responsibility in paying the rent, no heartache over broken promises, no knowledge of the weakness of his brothers, nor deep consciousness of his own defects. We are all of us persons; our armor is none too strong, and each must have his time of trial. There are bound to be numerous moments when our vanity is pricked, when we are misjudged, unappreciated or maligned. We flare up and "give as good as we get," as the saying runs. We act as person to person, instead of as soul to soul. After it is over, we study ourselves and see our failure—as *persons.* Then we try not to put some other in that position which caused our unbrotherly feeling. It is easy to show the smiling side of our nature to the relative stranger. It is only when our fortunes are definitely thrown in with others that common property, common jobs, common work may become a "bone of contention."

"The duty of another is full of danger." Who are we to assume that this one has "failed"? — or worse, that he who failed, as we

think, in the past, will fail again? If he "failed" in our company, how great was our share in his failure?

Of course, we are not speaking of moral failures—failure of *motive*—but of the "shortcomings" all human beings exhibit, and which we discuss too easily and too often with manifest pleasure. Because we do not see eye-to-eye, nor ourselves experience another's problems, we may condemn one who actually is sacrificing time, money, and effort in the service of humanity. This is the worst kind of distinction, being based on personal like and dislike rather than on recognition of the inevitable differences of color, social caste, indoctrinated creed, or professional affiliation. We nobly overlook these differences in one who is attractive to us, who *agrees* with us. Such "brotherhood" is only self-deception—the worst form of slavery. We bind to this slavery all of those who are close to us in heart, who look to us for spiritual example, when we form ostracizing cliques. Our judgments should be of the principles of the philosophy of Theosophy; if we fall down, or another falls down, judgments are to be made of ideas and acts, never of persons. If the principles are obscure and need to be interpreted and applied by someone else, they are not freedom-giving Theosophy, but just another set of dogmas.

Let us seek every opportunity to be united with our fellows by appreciating their good qualities. We need not be *blind* to faults, of others or our own, for it is dwelling on faults, instead of trying to eliminate them, that works havoc. Pretense is futile. We are all one family, and it is because we are so close and love each other so much that the actions of each are so quickly noticed. Let Theosophy be deliberately attacked by someone who is malicious, or uninformed, and we present a solid unity of thought and explanation. What is the meaning of this, that our greatest unity comes with an external danger? The danger from inner dissension is just as great. To re-affirm constantly our trust and affection, our mutual aim, is the way to prevent and cancel that kind of failure which broke the heart of our great Teacher—failure in true Brotherhood.

# "YOUR CITY"

THIS is a remarkable book by Dr. E. L. Thorndike, one of America's leading scientists.* The announcement on the jacket states, "The conclusions which Dr. Thorndike draws are so challenging that they are bound to provoke lively discussion." For once, a publisher has been guilty of understatement, for the work contains revelations that should cause not only discussion, but also have a dynamic influence on practical social science. Dr. Thorndike says in his Preface:

> This book is the result of three years' study of the recorded facts concerning 310 American cities. Its conclusions are outcomes of the treatment of nearly a million items by modern quantitative methods. It is written for all intelligent citizens.
>
> The conclusions about the quality of life in these cities, the causes of the differences between one city and another, and the ways and means of making all our cities better places for good people to live in are often startling and opposed to popular doctrines; but they follow inevitably from the facts.

What are some of these "startling facts"? Dr. Thorndike interprets his mass of statistical data in terms of several basic yardsticks. The important indices are: "General Goodness of Life" (G); "Personal Qualities" (P); "Income" (I); and "Wealth" (W).

First emerges the fact that there are considerable variations among cities. Some cities provide a better life for their citizens than others. The G index (General Goodness) varies from 62 in Pasadena (California) to 17 in some cities of the old South. Dr. Thorndike's grading system is ingenious. The "100" mark is assigned to a hypothetical (but possible) city which would have all the best traits of the existing cities. Similarly, the "0" mark represents the fortunately non-existent city which would have for its G grade a composite of the lowest scores in all the 37 items used for calculating the G index.

The next question is, What accounts for these variations? In other words, "What makes a 'good' city good?" The answer to this query constitutes the bulk of the book. Here is part of Dr. Thorndike's answer:

> Cities are made better than others in this country primarily and chiefly by getting able and good people as residents—people who, for example, are intelligent, read books, do not contract syphilis, or commit murder, or allow others to do so, own their

* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1939.

> own homes, have telephones, and support doctors, nurses, dentists and teachers rather than lawyers and domestic servants. The second important cause of welfare is income. Good people, rich or poor, earning much or earning little, are a good thing for a city, but the more they have and earn the better. They and their incomes account for at least three-fourths, and probably more, of the differences of American cities in the goodness of life for good people.
>
> In the cities of heaven it may be different. They may differ in glory by creeds, or by faith and hope. In some Utopia it may be different. Its cities may become good by fancy schemes of education, government, production, distribution and consumption of wealth, or what not. In the minds of theorists it may be different. In Russia or Italy it may be different, though I am confident that it is the same. But in these American cities it is the fact. The good ones are good first and chiefly by having good people, secondarily by having high incomes (p. 67).
>
> The goodness of life in a city is explainable only in part (about one fourth) by wealth and income. If by a miracle we could turn every house, shop, office and factory in a city into one worth twice as much, and double the wages and other income of every inhabitant of the city, the improvement in G the next year, or the year thereafter or a decade thereafter, would probably be very disappointing. The goodness of life in a city has deeper roots than its present wealth and income (p. 62).

Some significant facts are pointed out by Dr. Thorndike. For instance, the size of a city has no particular relation to its "goodness." Other facts which have little bearing on the goodness of a city are its rapidity of recent growth, the presence of factories, a large wholesale trade, and women in professions. A high percentage of residents listed in *Who's Who* does not add to goodness. On the other hand, a large percentage of dentists, designers, artists, engineers, musicians, architects, trained nurses and teachers is good for a city. It is bad for a city to have a large percentage of domestic servants, but not so bad as a large percentage of clergymen! Illiterates, however, are less desirable than clergymen.

The bearing of church membership on the life of the community is most interesting and evidently surprises Dr. Thorndike himself. Church membership seems to vary inversely with the scores for G (General Goodness Index) and P (Personal Qualities Index). The importance of these correlations brings the following comment from Dr. Thorndike:

> Few even of those who thought that they were fully aware of the great decline in influence of the churches compared with

other human organizations would have believed this possible. It was admitted that certain highly intellectual groups and certain workers in factories and at skilled trades were lukewarm or antagonistic toward the church, but it was supposed that great numbers of good people upheld the church at least to the extent of membership, and that persons outside it were on the whole less idealistic and less devoted to traditional virtues than those inside.

This may still be true within a city, but as between cities, it was false by 1926 (p. 97).

The communities with the largest percentage of church members are below average in good reading, home ownership and continuance in school, and have more than their share of illiterates and child labor.

To offset these damaging affiliations, we find that church membership is antagonistic to homicide, deaths from venereal diseases, and illegitimate births. . . . Church membership is thus still affiliated with typical features of traditional morality, if not with the broader aspects of welfare.

On the whole, unless the better communities under-report their church membership or the worse communities over-report theirs, we must suspect that the churches are clubs of estimable people and maintainers of traditional rites and ceremonies rather than powerful forces for human betterment.

Why should noble men and women give their time and money to make the church great and strong if communities where it is strong are no better than those where it is weak? What are the churches doing with their prestige and power if they are neither helping the health and education and recreation of a community nor improving the personal qualities of its residents? These questions are not asked here by enemies of the church, or by impractical reformers within its circle, or by arm-chair theorizers about its nature and function, but by a set of impersonal facts showing what the church is doing and failing to do in American cities (pp. 99-100).

Dr. Thorndike makes some suggestions as to possible ways of improving a city, but the thoroughness and honesty of his book are evident from the fact that he offers no pseudo-scientific panaceas. On the subject of government reform, he has this to say:

So far as the meagre evidence goes, it appears that good government is a real but secondary factor, that a good population will either have a good government or get along fairly well with a bad one, and that it is not wise to expect much from changes in governmental machinery or from waves of reform which do

> not express the fundamental wants and habits of the citizens (p. 105).
>
> Cities which produce, cities which sell, cities which do investment and insurance work, cities which are refuges for those who have earned rest—all can provide a good life, though in somewhat different ways. Not, save in small measure, by any fancy schemes of government and administration so far invented. A city should be alert and open minded to learn what experts in municipal administration have discovered. It will then get as good government as it deserves; nothing more than this should be expected (p. 157).

From the cumulative mass of facts one conclusion gradually and inevitably emerges, a conclusion almost Confucian in its common sense and simplicity. Good cities are good because they have good people living in them. For instance, in connection with the problem of crime it is stated, "Cities become good more by positive actions of good men and women than by the repression and extermination of evils."

In the last chapter, "Improve Your City," an interesting footnote appears: "In this and in later statements of this chapter I no longer restrict myself to conclusions which follow inevitably from the measurements, but use also my personal judgment, and perhaps my prejudices." Some of what follows is sound advice, but certain elements in Dr. Thorndike's recommendations do not show much sequence from the facts so painstakingly and brilliantly marshalled in the preceding chapters. For instance, after having established the detrimental effect of churches on a city, he lists a number of suggestions for strengthening the churches. Like most scientists, Dr. Thorndike has little appreciation of the character of true Religion. There is also some loose talk about "the germ cells producing the next generation." However, taken as a whole, this is a good book and is well worth at least one reading.

The factual part of *Your City* confirms the basic principles of social reform given by Theosophy. Students will find the problems enumerated by Dr. Thorndike illuminated by statements in Section XII of *The Key to Theosophy*. H. P. B. Dedicated the *Key* "to all her pupils that they may learn and teach in their turn." The task of Theosophists is to sow the germs of truth in the hearts of men. These germs are alone capable of producing a reform in human nature, which must precede all general movements for human betterment, unless we would pour new wine into old bottles. And when we find other people hard to reform, each one can turn to a fully

equipped laboratory where he can work to reform the stubborn human nature in himself. This is a task to which it is well to bring enthusiasm bred from conviction, "for truth accomplishes no victories without it."

---

## GAMUT OF PRINCIPLES

In the normal or natural state, the sensations are transmitted from the lowest physical to the highest spiritual body, *i. e.*, from the first to the 6th principle (the 7th being no organized or conditioned body, but an infinite hence unconditioned principle or state), the faculties of each body having to awaken the faculties of the next higher one to transmit the message in succession, until they reach the last, when, having received the impression, the latter (the spiritual soul) sends it back in an inverse order to the body. Hence, the faculties of some of the "bodies" (we use this word for want of a better term) being less developed, they fail to transmit correctly to the highest principle, and thus also fail to produce the right impression upon the physical senses, as a telegram may have started, from the place of its destination, faultless and have been bungled up and misinterpreted by the telegraph operator at some intermediate station. This is why some people, otherwise endowed with great intellectual powers and perceptive faculties, are often utterly unable to appreciate—say, the beauties of nature, or some particular moral quality; as, however perfect their physical intellect, — unless the original, material or rough physical impression conveyed has passed in a circuit through the sieve of every "principle"—(from 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, up to 7, and down again from 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, to No. 1)—and that every "sieve" is in good order, — the spiritual perception will always be imperfect. The Yogi who, by a constant training and incessant watchfulness, keeps his septenary instrument in good tune and whose spirit has obtained a perfect control over all, can, at will, and by paralyzing the functions of the 4 intermediate principles, communicate from body to spirit and *vice versâ*—direct.

—H. P. B.

# ON THE LOOKOUT

## "Climates of Opinion"

W. E. H. Lecky wrote in the last century:

> A change of speculative opinions does not imply an increase of the data upon which those opinions rest, but a change of the habits of thought and mind which they reflect. Definite arguments are the symptoms and pretexts, but seldom the causes of the change. Their chief merit is to accelerate the inevitable crisis. They derive their force and efficacy from their conformity with the mental habits of those to whom they are addressed. Reasoning which in one age would make no impression whatever, in the next age is received with enthusiastic applause. It is one thing to understand its nature, but quite another to appreciate its force.
>
> And this standard of belief, this tone and habit of thought, which is the supreme arbiter of the opinions of successive periods, is created, not by the influences arising out of any one department of intellect, but by the combination of all the intellectual and even social tendencies of the age. (*Rationalism in Europe* I, 6-7.)

## Evidence of Transition

Reference to this sort of an analysis of historical development is helpful in understanding the tendencies of contemporary scientific literature. The present generation is witnessing a definite change in the modern "tone and habit of thought." The direction of the change Theosophists may easily anticipate by turning to the various statements in the teaching respecting the impending psychic development of western peoples. In science, the significance seen by investigators in new facts is a sensitive indicator of this transition. For example, Prof. Francis B. Sumner of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography writes at length in the September *Scientific Monthly* on the remarkable ability of Pacific salmon to return years later to lay eggs in the stream where they had themselves been spawned. Equally wonderful is the pilgrimage of European and American species of fresh-water eels. Both species are spawned in the same region of the western Atlantic, yet the young of each kind find their way to streams on opposite sides of the Atlantic, according to the habitat of the parents. Then, years later, they return to spawn in the Atlantic at a point often several thousands of miles from their river homes. The offspring, as Prof. Sumner says, "with no parental coaching, except what is conveyed through

the genes," repeat the cycle, reaching in time their own proper sides of the Atlantic and ascend the rivers. It should be added that the eggs of the two species are laid in contiguous or overlapping areas and that the larvae of both mingle freely together.

## A "PSYCHIC" EXPLANATION

Examining the various theories to explain this "home-stream" instinct, Prof. Sumner ends by admitting that "we lack any satisfactory clue" as to how the fish are guided to their habitat. His only suggestion is "the existence of some sort of organic memories or 'engrams'," recorded in the nervous systems of the fishes, since the return journey is so largely dependent upon the individual's early history. But of greatest interest are the biologist's hints at some "psychic" factor, cautiously indicated in two pages of discussion of psychic research. When a serious scientist of this eminence will print such ideas in the staid and orthodox—almost reactionary—*Scientific Monthly,* the event is a rather large straw in the wind. William James, Prof. Sumner notes, "unhesitatingly expressed his belief that the 'medium' (or her 'control') might be 'acquainted with facts about the circumstances, and the living and dead relatives and acquaintances, of numberless sitters whom the medium never met before, and of whom she has never heard the names'." To this he fairly adds:

> One may, of course, cite James as a striking instance of how a brilliant and learned man may allow himself to be woefully deluded, and this may, indeed, prove to be a just appraisal of his case. However, I should insist that no one is entitled to offer such an opinion unless he has at least taken the trouble to examine the evidence on which James based his beliefs.

Of the experiments conducted by Dr. Rhine at Duke University and by other investigators, Prof. Sumner has this to say:

> On the whole, these experiments have every appearance of being conducted honestly and with a serious endeavor to exclude the numerous opportunities for self-deception. Statistically speaking, they would seem to have a vastly higher evidential value than we ordinarily demand in an experimental research in biology.

## A "NON-PHYSICAL" SENSE

In conclusion, he makes plain that his intention is to "insist upon the possibility that in both man and some other animals, impressions from the environment may not all be mediated through

recognized organs of special sense which are sensitive to recognized modes of chemical or physical stimulation." His final remark is one to which psychologists in particular should hearken: "I believe that it is our present duty to settle some of these highly controversial matters by experiment, instead of dogmatically denying them or complacently ignoring them."

If the signs are read aright, it will not be long before such reasoning in favor of hidden psychic powers will meet, as Lecky says, "with enthusiastic applause," and the old materialistic denials be greeted with the ridicule they richly deserve. Gradually, acceptance of psychic powers will come to be taken for granted, and eventually the time will come when, in the words of another great English historian, "even the dullest intellect will wonder how they could have been denied."

## Macrocosm and Microcosm

Dr. Edwin Hubble of Mount Wilson Observatory, California, has discovered striking similarities between the evolutionary growth of universes and the development of the cell (New York *Herald-Tribune,* May 8). Following is the press account of his conclusions, the result of a survey of the cosmos which included 3,000 photographs of every type of universe or nebula:

> Dr. Hubble's report upsets most of the present theories of the evolution of the nebulae. According to present beliefs, a small central nucleus of stars begins to rotate and throws out streams of stars which become the far-flung arms of the spiral nebulae. The spiral pinwheel arms are not flung out of the nebulae but develop within it, Dr. Hubble believes. The pictures show that the nebulae extend far beyond what formerly were considered their borders. As a result, streams of stars which appear to have been thrown out of the nucleus of the nebulae are shown to have developed well within their confines. The nebulae begin as spherical masses of stars having no sign of structure within except an increasing density of stars from the indefinite outer limits toward the center. The next step is the appearance of a well developed nucleus or center, in which vast numbers of stars, or suns, are concentrated. Next comes the development of a ring of stars around the nucleus but well within the nebulae. A bar then appears across the nucleus and joins the ring. The ring breaks at the point of contact with the bar, or spindle. One end of each ring segment remains in contact with one end of the spindle, and the other end extends outward. These two become the two main spiral arms of the nebulae.

> This process bears a striking resemblance to the development of a cell. In this, the nucleus of dense matter is made up largely of chromosomes packed in a general spherical shape. As the cell grows, some processes in the surrounding protoplasmic jelly develop a structure which attaches to the chromosomes and forces them into an approximately straight line. The line of chromosomes is pulled into two parallel halves, and each half goes to a new position in the cell, which then divides into two.

## ANALOGY THE GUIDING LAW

This amazing discovery bids fair to put modern astronomy in the way of becoming a legitimate branch of occult science. "Analogy," wrote H. P. B., "is the guiding law in Nature, the only true Ariadne's thread that can lead us, through the inextricable paths of her domain, toward her final and primal mysteries." (*S. D.* II, 153.) Study of the formation of worlds and solar systems as a process analogous to the development of an organism from a fertilized egg will lead science to some startling conclusions, not the least of which will be that the ancients had good scientific reasons for symbolizing the universe as an egg and speaking of limitless space as a universal womb. It might be said that Dr. Hubble has made of the mystery of the development of a complex organism from a simple, undifferentiated germ cell, and the mystery of the origin of specific celestial motion, leading to the development of the heavenly bodies, *one fundamental problem.* In both cases, the missing factor is *Intelligence.* The awakening of the Universe is described in Stanza III of Cosmogenesis:

> "DARKNESS" RADIATES LIGHT, AND LIGHT DROPS ONE SOLITARY RAY INTO THE WATERS, INTO THE MOTHER DEEP. THE RAY SHOOTS THROUGH THE VIRGIN-EGG; THE RAY CAUSES THE ETERNAL EGG TO THRILL, AND DROP THE NON-ETERNAL (*periodical*) GERM, WHICH CONDENSES INTO THE WORLD EGG.

## "DIVINE THOUGHT"

The symbolism of this passage is explained by H. P. B.:

> The solitary ray dropping into the mother deep may be taken as meaning Divine Thought or Intelligence, impregnating chaos. This, however, occurs on the plane of metaphysical abstraction, or rather the plane whereon that which we call a metaphysical abstraction is a reality. The Virgin-egg being in one sense abstract Egg-ness, or the power of becoming developed through fecundation, is eternal and forever the same. And just as the fecundation of an egg takes place before it is dropped; so the

> non-eternal periodical germ which becomes later in symbolism the mundane egg, contains in itself, when it emerges from the said symbol, "the promise and potency" of all the Universe. (*S. D.* I, 64-5.)

For a discussion of the development of the individual cell, read *S. D.* I, 218-19, 222-4, and II, 116-17, 731-2. The spiritual intelligences which move the "spiral pinwheel arms" of the nebulae are called in archaic philosophy the "Heavenly Snails." These whirling arms have for ages been represented by the Swastica, "the 'HAMMER OF CREATION,' with its four arms bent at right angles," which "refers to the continual *motion* and revolution of the invisible Kosmos of Forces." (*S. D.* II, 99.) Dr. Hubble says that a "small central nucleus of stars begins to rotate. . . . " But *why*? — what causes this rotation? This problem, insoluble to modern physical astronomy (See "Science and the Secret Doctrine," THEOSOPHY XXVI, 349), finds adequate explanation only in *occult* astronomy, which "does not deny the certainty of the mechanical origin of the universe; it only claims the absolute necessity of mechanicians of some sort. . . . " (I, 594.)

## COSMIC DIFFERENTIATION

The particular motions which bring to birth the inhabitants of space come about through the ceaseless motion of the Great Breath, which in manifestation assumes particular patterns, molding primordial matter according to the ideas of the Universal Mind. This is the work of Fohat, who "causes the ideal prototypes to expand from within without—viz., to cross gradually, on a descending scale, all the planes from the noumenon to the lowest phenomenon, to bloom finally on the last into full objectivity—the acme of illusion, or the grossest matter." (*S. D.* I, 63. ) How does this occur, from the physical viewpoint?

> "Motion is eternal in the unmanifested, and periodical in the manifest," says an Occult teaching. It is "when heat caused by the descent of FLAME into promordial matter causes its particles to move, which motion becomes Whirlwind." A drop of liquid assumes a spheroidal form owing to its atoms moving around themselves in their ultimate, unresolvable, and noumenal essence; unresolvable for physical science at any rate. (I, 97-8 fn.)

## THE KANTIAN THEORY

This change of motion is "from eternal vibration in the unmanifested, to Vortical Motion in the phenomenal or manifested World." (I, 118 fn.) This discussion may be concluded with

H. P. B.'s reference to the intuitive speculations of Kant on the subject. The great German philosopher was unable to think that "the matter which fills today the heavenly spaces" could have provided the primitive impulse imparted to the planets. He postulated a universally pervading primordial substance, very much like the *Akasa* of the occultists. H. P. B. summarizes his theory:

> It must be that which filled space—was space—originally, whose motion in differentiated matter was the origin of the actual movements of the sidereal bodies; and which, "*in condensing itself in those very bodies,* thus abandoned the space that is found void today." In other words, it is that same matter of which are now composed the planets, comets, and the Sun himself, which, having in the origin formed itself into those bodies, has preserved its inherent quality of motion; which quality, now centered in their nuclei, directs all motion. A very slight alteration of words is needed, and a few additions, to make of this our Esoteric Doctrine.
>
> The latter teaches us that it is this original, primordial *prima materia,* divine and intelligent, the direct emanation of the Universal Mind—the *Daivaprakriti* (the divine light emanating from the *Logos*—which "Light" we call *Fohat*)—which formed the nuclei of all the "self-moving" orbs in Kosmos. It is the informing, ever-present moving-power and life-principle, the vital soul of the suns, moons, planets, and even of our Earth. The former latent: the last one active—the invisible Ruler and guide of the gross body attached to, and connected with, its Soul, which is the spiritual emanation, after all, of these respective planetary Spirits. (I, 602.)

## SCIENCE, NATURE, AND SOCIETY

Dr. Paul B. Sears, professor of botany at Oberlin College and author of *Deserts on the March* and *This Is Our World,* is well known for his knowledge of the problems of soil conservation and his studies of the relation between society and its natural environment. In *Harper's* for July, Dr. Sears writes on "Science and the New Landscape," bringing both technical knowledge and philosophical insight to a consideration of the way Americans have exploited and destroyed much of the natural wealth of their country. Many-sided in its viewpoints and implications, the article cannot be summarized, but is well worth reading entire. A little more than a year ago Dr. Sears wrote that "While science has produced revolutionary changes in our manner of daily living, it has scarcely touched many aspects of our behavior and attitudes of mind which

were developed under far different conditions from those which made science possible." (*Science,* June 3, 1938.) In the *Harper's* article he continues this general thesis, that science must be integrated with the *whole* of modern culture, or society will suffer increasing maladjustments from the failure of people to adapt themselves to the conditions which technical scientific progress has made possible. He says:

> It is necessary for scientists to realize more clearly than they do that science itself is a manifestation of human culture. They have been too much accustomed to think of it as something aloof from, and independent of, the culture which gave it birth. Our histories of science portray the great discoverers as geniuses living in ivory towers, working quite outside the common life of man. Certainly science has encountered and occasioned tremendous conflict with entrenched phases of the culture pattern —quite as though it were something alien and incommensurable with what had preceded it. Yet the scientist, for all of his boasted independence, is, in a sense, as great a slave to convention as any individual within the social pattern. If you disbelieve this, try publishing the reports of a genuine discovery in words or symbols which have not had the social approval of your fellow scientists.

## A Wholesome Sign

Dr. Sears remarks that "This whole question of the cultural origin and conditioning of science has been so well developed by the British school of historians that it is not necessary to go farther with it." Such evidences of a critical awareness toward scientific attitudes are rapidly increasing. In a decade or so probably even the rank and file of scientific workers will have an appreciation of the truth uttered by H. P. B. half a century ago, "that materialistic, physical science is honey-combed with metaphysics; that its most fundamental principles, while inseparably wedded to transcendentalism, are nevertheless, in order to show modern science divorced from such "dreams," tortured and often ignored in the maze of contradictory theories and hypotheses." (*S. D.* I, 485.)

The metaphysics of positivism asserts that Nature is without inherent purpose, that man's life is a biological accident, that ethics is naught but codified tradition. These metaphysical theories are largely responsible for the "tragic and unnecessary conflicts within society and within the individual," which Dr. Sears deplores. They form the background for the general view of life which permitted Henry M. Teller, U. S. Secretary of the Interior fifty years ago, to

say: "I don't believe there is either a moral or any other claim upon me to postpone the use of what nature has given me, so that the next generation or generations yet unborn may have an opportunity to get what I myself ought to get." This is jungle morality, and it explains the irresponsible "rape of nature" which has taken place in America during and since his time.

## SCIENCE "ON THE SPOT"

Today, however, Americans are becoming aroused to the great importance of conserving their natural wealth. Various organizations, Dr. Sears relates in *Harper's,* "are beginning to learn that all of them are concerned with different facets of the one great central problem, — that is, the restoration of the American landscape to a condition of health and constructive activity."

> And so [he writes] the scientist awakens to find really potent delegations at his doorstep, asking guidance and promising effective support. This challenge can be embarrassing. The layman realizes, for example, that education is essential to the conservation movement. One group has appointed a committee on education, of which I am a member. This committee is assured of unlimited and effective political support for its recommendations. There is every inducement to prepare a manifesto and have it widely adopted. Unfortunately, the sober truth is that Conservation is not a subject which can be taught. It is a way of life into which we must grow as a people.
>
> The scientist is on the spot. Accustomed to getting results from him in chemistry, medicine, and industry, the American public now turns to him with an almost pathetic confidence for relief in its present plight. What may it expect? Certainly science faces a far more profound and serious task than the kind of ingenious trouble-shooting to which it has been accustomed. It is one thing to streamline an automobile, improve radio reception, invent a new dye formula, or devise a new structural design. It is a very different thing to aid in reshaping the attitude and way of life of a nation, especially one which has been accustomed from the first, with a few notable exceptions, to despise the earth upon which it depends. The only analogy in applying science on such a nation-wide basis is to be found in the field of public health. We know enough of the painful and fumbling progress in sanitation, hygiene, and prophylaxis to have some notion of what lies ahead in attempting to reshape the landscape.

Dr. Sears has put his finger on the essence of the problem by showing that its solution lies in "reshaping the attitude and way of

life of a nation." When all social reform is seen to be possible only through this means, and when scientists and other leaders in modern life learn enough about human beings to realize that their attitudes and "ways" of life are but the reflex of their *philosophies* of life, then will there be a general return to ethics and metaphysics—a general exodus from the barren shores of materialistic hypothesis and all-denying scepticism. Theosophists need to be ready to do their share in the re-education of a whole race.

## False Clues of Science

Conclusions based on recent experiments with apes and monkeys illustrate the misleading effects of modern materialistic assumptions. (New York *Times,* Aug. 13.) Some years ago Yale scientists showed that gorillas, orangs and chimpanzees can be led to fit sections of bamboo together and pile up boxes to reach otherwise inaccessible food. An article in *Science* for July 2, 1937, describes similar experiments at Yale showing how chimpanzees can be made to cooperate in difficult attempts at food-getting. Following the lead of these investigations, Dr. Carl J. Warden of Columbia has investigated the tool-using abilities of monkeys to see if these lower animals exhibit like intelligence. The monkeys quickly learned to use a rake to haul in food. Then they found they could use a short rake to get hold of a longer one, with which the food was reached. Some of the monkeys eventually learned to use in this way as many as eight rakes placed at different distances from the cage. Dr. Warden's work, reported in the New York *Times,* is hailed by Waldemar Kaempffert as of "great scientific importance," revealing, he thinks, "that the ability to use tools is not limited to man and the anthropoids," but "originated long before even the chimpanzee evolved."

## Telepathic Rapport

When monkeys in their natural habitat show such capacity, then it will be time to consider whether there is any direct evolutionary significance involved. As one sympathetic to the experiments in telepathy carried on at Duke and other universities, Mr. Kaempffert might have suggested the possibility of mental influence by the experimenters on the animals. So far as the monkeys are concerned, their use of tools appears to be a simple case of suggestion: the experimenters provided the tools, set the stage, and then longed

for the animals to get the idea. It would be strange indeed if they failed. Much more remarkable feats have been reported of dogs, and surely dogs are not links in the evolutionary chain from tarsioid to man! A United Press dispatch of Aug. 23, 1937, tells of the exploits of Jim, an English setter belonging to Samuel Van Arsdale of Sedalia, Michigan. Here are some of the things that Jim, who died recently, could do, according to the report:

> He could walk up to a group of men and single out the one wearing a gray hat or a suit of a certain color. From a group of parked automobiles he could select anyone his master told him to choose. He could pick out a license number from a group of cars, select tags of various states or of any color designated.

## A "PSYCHIC" DOG

Two conditions were necessary for Jim to perform: Mr. Van Arsdale had to be present, and he had to be facing the object Jim was to select. The theory that signals were used was ridiculed by the master, who pointed out that no one of the thousands who saw the dog respond had ever detected any such clues, urging also that no dog could pick out an object merely from the glance of a human. Offering no explanation himself, the owner of the dog said, "Jim seemed to know what I was thinking. He would never work for anyone else, not even for Mrs. Van Arsdale. But he would obey commands of other people if I said, 'Jim, do what the man wants you to do'." Jim was not a "trick" dog. His master disclaimed any ability as an animal trainer, saying that Jim "never performed the tricks other dogs commonly performed; he would not learn them. He'd merely sulk when I tried to teach him."

It seems plain that Jim's capacities were simply the result of a close psychic union between dog and man, indicating that "controlled" experiments in the field of comparative psychology are impossible, so far as ordinary scientific technique is concerned. Mind is a *continuous* principle, and minds are continually affecting one another, both consciously and unconsciously; mind *in isolation* does not exist. The only really controlled experiment possible in psychology is the experiment of *self*-control, and that requires a discipline quite different from the methods familiar to the laboratory scientist. Mastering this regimen of discipleship, the scientist would no longer study anthropoids and monkeys in his attempt to follow the injunction of the Delphic oracle, but would seek the knowledge of man in the only place it can be found—in himself.

## "Who Was Socrates?"

An attempt to settle this question once and for all appears as a recent book by A. D. Winspear and T. Silverberg, bearing the above title. The Greek sage was the product of economic circumstances, the authors hold. A sympathetic reviewer for *New Masses* (June 6, 1939) lauds the work as a "ringing challenge to contemporaries to study anew the history of philosophy in the light of the material background of all philosophizing—the conflicts of social groups amidst the development of the forces of production." This "ringing challenge," currently so popular, though it perhaps has not received the exclusive attention demanded by the *New Masses,* has nevertheless tremendously affected the whole modern field of historical interpretation. It proposes a theory which has, as the reviewer suggests, "far reaching consequences for the whole history of philosophy." Dialectical materialism threatens not only to take over the present and future, but also the past.

## Aristocrats "Corrupt" Plato's Teacher

One who has considered the distinctive character of Socrates in the light of Plato's deep reverence for his old friend finds it somewhat amusing that the primary explanation of the sage is sought in his economic background. Thus in the opening paragraph:

> Socrates emerged from a humble background. His parents were members of the rising class of skilled artisans who, in the period just ten years after the Persian Wars, were for the first time beginning to achieve prominence. It was this class, created by the new mercantilism, that in the fifth century was to provide the backbone for the brilliant Athenian democracy.

The book offers a novel explanation for the trial and death of Socrates. The social elevation of Socrates, along with his class, it seems, brought him into contact with the aristocracy, and this led him to become the enemy of his former love, democracy. Making the additional mistake (?) of studying the philosophy of Pythagoras, Socrates suffered a further strengthening of his anti-democratic tendencies. The true democrats of Athens, realizing that Socrates was the "ideological ringleader" of the aristocracy, took measures to protect themselves, and one whom the Delphic Oracle had called the wisest of all Greeks was sent to his untimely death. (Theosophists may note with some surprise that in this interesting story the Pythagoreans are the villains behind the scene!)

## GENIUS MADE EASY

Were all historians to follow carefully the suggested method of character analysis, the great geniuses—the enigmas of history—could be "easily" explained. Was Shakespeare's love for the tragedy, perhaps, due to a poor cabbage crop in the days of his infancy? Fortunately, the most brilliant proponents of economic emphasis in history are the first to sense the impossibility of a complete explanation from such a basis. Charles A. Beard, for instance, states in his introduction to *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States:* "If anywhere I have said or written that 'all history' can be 'explained' in economic terms, I was then suffering from an aberration of the mind."

A continued interest in the words and wisdom of the ancients can be turned either to helpful or detrimental use. That new light is needed upon the contemporary picture of the past is clearly evidenced by present textbooks, compiled from masses of data void of integrating meaning. That the only "new interpretation" currently before the eyes of modern scholars is one looking to economic forces as the determining factors in all history is regrettable. Such emphasis upon a subsidiary cause represents a cycle in the development of the race mind which will wear out too slowly unless there is intelligent correction and constant challenge to this antithesis of Theosophy—dialectical materialism.

## "CUNNINGLY MADE-UP HISTORY"

"Historical writers," wrote H. P. B. in closing the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine,* "are to ancient History that which the white ants are to the buildings in India." In the Introductory she spoke of the dread Karma for "cunningly made-up History, for events purposely perverted, and for great characters slandered by posterity, mangled out of recognition, between the two cars of Jagannâtha—Bigotry and Materialism; one accepting too much, the other denying all." The one is the *alter ego* of the other—Bigotry is the doctrine of the senseless will of a personal God. Materialism, of the force of blind matter. Both lead to calculated lies in science and history, and the death of impartial inquiry and disinterested research. Both gain their strength from the weaknesses of human nature, which always prefers an easy belief in authority to individual effort and judgment. Men will continue to oscillate between anthropomorphism and materialism until the God within is discovered.