

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

KATHERINE TINGLEY, EDITOR

VOL. XXXIV, NO. 1

JANUARY 1928

“A MAN paints a spluttering candle, a greasy cloth, a moldy cheese, a pewter can: ‘how real!’ they cry. If he paint the spirituality of dawn, the light of the summer sea, the flame of arctic nights, of tropic woods, they are called unreal, though they exist no less than the candle and the cloth, the cheese and the can. . . . The realists . . . can only see the moldy cheese; they cannot see the sunrise-glory. All that is heroic, all that is sublime, impersonal, or glorious, is derided as unreal. It is a dreary creed. It will make a dreary world. Is not my Venetian glass, with its iridescent hues of opal, as real every whit as your pot of pewter? Yet the time is coming when every one, morally and mentally at least, will be allowed no other than a pewter pot to drink out of, under pain of being ‘writ down an ass,’—or worse. It is a dreary prospect.”—OUIDA in *Moths*

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

G. V. PURUCKER, M. A., D. LITT.

(Stenographic report of the fifth of a series of Lectures on the above subject. These were delivered at the request of Katherine Tingley the Theosophical Leader and Teacher, in the Temple of Peace, International Theosophical Headquarters, Point Loma, California, at the regular Sunday afternoon services. Others will be printed in THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH in due course. The following Lecture was delivered on July 24, and was broadcast, by remote control, through station K F S D — 440.9 - 680)

RIENDS: You who are assembled in this our Temple of Peace this afternoon, and the many hundreds, or even perhaps thousands, who are listening in at a distance in the seclusion and privacy of their own homes as this our study is being broadcast over the fields of the ether this afternoon:

Man is a mystery; a mystery to the inquiring and investigating mind of the researcher into Nature and into the children of Nature as such, which man is, but more so indeed is man a mystery to himself; and because this mystery exists, due to lack of proper research and of insufficient research into his sevenfold constitution, therefore have we the various and the varying ways of looking at man himself, and of his looking at the Cosmos, the universe of which he is, on this earth, the most intelligent offspring.

Yet there is a solution of this mystery — a solution which is not new, which is as old as, yea older than, the enduring hills, and which again in this our age has been given forth through the medium of the Theosophical philosophy. We have pointed out before that there is no possible contradiction or conflict between a fact of Nature and the Theosophical principles of thought. Theosophy is at once science, philosophy, and religion. It is indeed the original mother of all these; for these three are really but one thing; that is to say, the three branches of thought by which the mind of man attempts to explain, and often does successfully explain, the riddles of the universe and of his own nature.

Anything, then, as we have said before, and we repeat it again this afternoon, which is inherently antagonistic to the free, instinctual operations of man's inner constitution, must be wrong somewhere, either in the presentation of the facts or in their formulation, as a so-called science, or a so-called philosophy, or a so-called religion, because Truth is one; there cannot be two or more Truths. Consequently it is our duty to find a presentation of these facts of Nature, if we can do so, which to the mind of man will be wholly concordant, not merely as concerns those natural facts as they exist in the Cosmos, but wholly con-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

sistent with his own psycho-mental operations as expressed in all branches of his consciousness and thought and feeling.

Man, child of the universe, nursling of destiny, stands, so far as his conception of his place in the Cosmos is concerned, between two vast spheres, two immense universes: it of cosmical magnitude, and it of the infinitesimal worlds; in other words, between the Cosmos and the atom of physical matter. He stands thus because he so sees himself, but only because he so sees himself. I mean that it is on account of his having attained his present stage in his long evolutionary journey that he so conceives of himself as holding this intermediate point, and of occupying it, and from these two universes drawing the life-springs of the understanding which dignify him as man.

But our majestic, age-old philosophy-science-religion teaches us that there are beings so much greater and higher than man is, and beings so much smaller and less than he, that in reality, in each and every such case of comparison, he himself in turn stands, with his world and his cosmos, his universe, as himself the one or the other of these extremes to such greater or smaller entities.

You see, it is a question of relativity. In order to understand it more clearly we must cleanse our minds from the old ideas instilled into them by false education, both religious and scientific, yea and philosophic; also must we understand that man's is not the only mind which can conceive universal things, and that his status in the universal Cosmos is not the only one of supreme importance, as he foolishly but perhaps naturally imagines it to be.

Universal life is infinite in its manifestation in endless forms. Manifested beings are incomputable in number, so great is it; and who dare say that man, noble thinker as he is truly, is yet the only one in the boundless fields of space who can think clearly and imagine rightly and intuit truth? Such egoistic notions of our uniqueness in the scheme of life is really a form of insanity; but the mere fact that we can understand this egoism and struggle against it, and abandon it, shows that we ourselves are not insane.

The old question, Are other worlds inhabited? to the Theosophist seems like the drivelings of an idiot or the infantile imaginings of the undeveloped mentality of a child.

To us Theosophists every operation of the Cosmos, of the infinitesimal cosmos or of the universal Cosmos in the grand sense, arises out of the functioning of innumerable hosts of other conscious or semi-conscious, or unconscious entities, for as we have so often said, the universe is infilled with living beings, its offspring, having consciousness,

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

having faculties of perception, having vehicles appropriate to express these faculties and these consciousnesses, each in its place, and according to its place, and functioning according to its genus and its kind.

You see the scope of thought that these age-old Theosophical teachings open up before our inner vision. What is there in fact that can be forcefully urged against these thoughts? Nothing. Your intuition tells you that they are true; otherwise we must believe that in all the vast infinitudes of illimitable space, that otherwise in the courses of endless eternities, in illimitable Duration, we only, on this speck of dirt, our Earth, in our own solar system, our own cosmical atom, are the only beings that ever have been conscious and that ever have had conscious thoughts, or that ever will be conscious or that ever will think. Is it not then right to call such an excessive estimate of our own self-supposed importance, the imaginings of a lunatic? Think it over, and I am sure that you will agree.

Therefore, since both in the very small and in the very great, these consciousnesses exist and fill all space, we are their children, their evolving offspring; and, moreover, in so far as the small universe is concerned, the microcosm, that is to say, with certain reaches, and within certain frontiers, we as individuals are likewise parents of offspring occupying to us the same relative position that we occupy to those greater consciousnesses of which we speak.

Biologists today compute that in the body of man there are some twenty-six thousand billion living cells, more or less — living things, physiological engines — out of which his body is built; and these cells in their turn are composed of chemical molecules, that is of still smaller particles or corpuscles of matter; and these molecules in their turn again are composed of still smaller entities called atoms; and these atoms in their turn are composed of things still smaller, today called protons and electrons; and latterly we have received word that the electron itself, supposed to be the ultimate particle of matter, is itself divisible and composed of entities still more minute! Is this the end, the finish, the jumping-off place? Are there particles or corpuscles still smaller than these? Who can say? If we are to judge by the past, we are driven to suppose that the end is not reached.

Where dare one say that consciousness ends or begins? Where can it begin or end? Is it of such a nature that we can or must suppose that it has a beginning, or reaches an end? If so, what is there beyond it, or above it, or below it? The idea seems to me to be fantastic.

If consciousness of any kind, man's or any other, have a true limit in itself, then the power of our understanding would not be what it

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

is even in our present relatively undeveloped stage of evolution. We could have no intellectual or spiritual reaches into these wider fields of thought; but we would reach frontiers of consciousness, and we would indeed know them as limits, jumping-off places. Indeed and in fact we then could even not conceive of a beyond, because our consciousness would end there.

We sense something of limitations along these lines in our ordinary brain-functioning, because our brain is in itself a limited portion of physical matter; but every thinking individual, if he examine himself carefully and study his own experiences from childhood to adulthood, from the boy or the girl to the man or the woman, must realize that there resides in man something which is boundless, something which he has never fathomed, something which tells him always, "Come up higher. Go up farther. Reach farther and farther still into the beyond. Cast all that has a limit aside, for in such case it does not belong to your Higher Self."

This consciousness, we say, is the working of the spiritual self of man in him, the operation in his psychological nature of what we call the spiritual monad, the ultimate for him in this our hierarchy of nature only, for that spiritual monad is the center of his being, and in itself knows no limits, no boundaries, no frontiers, for it is pure consciousness.

Evolution — the drive to betterment, the urge to superiority! If we choose to look at it as the old materialists did, then it means superiority over our fellow-men for our own advantage; but if we choose to look at it as it is, according to the facts of nature, as we learn them, and according to the instincts of our own being, it then means *self*-superiority in the sense of rising on the ladder of life ever higher, with expanding vision, with expanding faculties, with expanding sympathies, growing greater — not merely in the physical apparatuses of thinking, not merely in the vehicle, but growing greater from the spiritual core of our being; in other words, opening up for that spiritual essence within us wider doors for it to pass its rays through, down into our personal minds, enlightening us and leading us upwards and onwards, ever higher, illimitably through the various cosmical periods and fields of evolution, which the monad follows along the courses of destiny.

These periods of evolutionary activity we call Manvantaras, in our Theosophical philosophy, Manvantara being a Sanskrit term which, translated, means those periods of activity or manifestation during which the Cosmos is functioning, and not 'asleep.' In the periods of rest or of 'sleep' it reposes; and we call those periods Pralayas, another Sanskrit word meaning dissolution. But when such a period of cosmic rest is com-

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

pleted, the universe is impelled or impulsed again to awaken to a new period of activity.

We may thus see in the operations of the universe, the functioning of the same universal facts of activity and repose that we see around us here on our own Earth, the microcosm of the macrocosm, the Little World everywhere a true copy of the Cosmos, the Great World, for Nature's fundamental laws are one and uniform everywhere throughout it, and these affect every portion, particle, corpuscle, or entity, of the innumerable hosts which compose it.

There is but one fundamental operation of Nature, and that operation, paradoxically, is Itself. This fundamental 'operation' is a generalized expression for its manifold activities, for its various operations. These operations, guided by Nature's own interior impulses, these impulses penetrating and operating everywhere, do therefore guide the vast corpus of being from within outwards, and in consequence, necessarily guide and furnish the driving power for every one of its, Nature's, offspring, whether these offspring be gods, men, beasts, plants, or the supposedly insensate mineral and the worlds below it.

Now, this being so, every operation of that general, fundamental functioning of the Cosmos — call it the fundamental Law of Life if you like,— controls every particular corpuscle and particle of all the offsprings of that Cosmos; even as happens in the case of man, coming down to the small, for if his body be diseased in one part, or healthy throughout on the other hand, that disease or that health is likewise felt everywhere in his physiological organism; the same impulses working in his body convey their messages to every one of the quadrillions of cells composing that body; and similarly in the Cosmos, the indwelling spirit — not necessarily what is popularly called God, but the indwelling spirit of it,— impels and impulses every part of it, and those impulses affect each corpuscle of the Cosmos in similar manner, and hence they all act alike as regards basic fundamental or general causes.

And due to the developing seed of individuality inherent in each monad, and working each in its own way — because each one of these innumerable hosts of spiritual corpuscles of the infinite Cosmos has its own individuality — each such monad nevertheless at the same time, from the beginning to the end, while all the time working out its own individual courses of action, yet ineluctably follows the same general fundamental law operative everywhere.

This is an example of the ancient method of reasoning by analogy, and we may point out that it is based strictly on logic and the facts of nature as our consciousness interprets them.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

When we speak of the evolution of man, we say that as one of the spiritual-psychical-physical corpuscles of the general Cosmos — as the microcosm of the macrocosm, the little-world offspring of the Great World — he merely follows the same operations of nature that the Cosmos is impelled, impelled, compelled, to follow: development, growth from within outwards, throwing outwards into manifestation as organic activity, as expression in organs, so far as his physical body is concerned, the functions within, the impulses within, the drive, the urge to expression, to manifestation, which is within.

That, expressed in few words, is the ancient teaching of evolution. It is also the Theosophical teaching of evolution; but it is not the scientific teaching of evolution.

We Theosophists consider the scientific researchers in all fields as our best friends when they elucidate, when they bring to light and classify and catalog and put on record, the facts of nature. But it is another thing when adventurous-minded researchers into nature's mysteries evolve from their own inner fora, from their own minds, this, or that, or some other particular hypothesis, or theory, or speculation, or scientific fad, or idea, and say: "This is a fact or law of nature!"

The only natural fact about so speculating is that it so occurred. In such case it is but speculation, or a hypothesis, or a theory, or a fad; but it is most certainly not a fact or law of nature, in the sense of expressing one or more of the fundamental operations of the Cosmos, of which man is an expression.

Evolution is one of the oldest doctrines that man has ever evolved from his spiritual-mental nature; because evolution properly described is merely a formulated expression of the operations of the Cosmos. Things advance; things progress; things develop from within themselves, evolving, unwrapping, unrolling, throwing out that which is wrapped up, involved. But that is not the evolution of modern science either in its view of man or in its view of the Cosmos.

What then is the so-called evolutionism, so popular today and mis-called 'evolution'? It is really 'transformism'—an adopted French word; and the French very properly, very logically, and very rightly, so call it; because it is transformism. Now then, what is the difference between this and evolution? We define it once more today, because it is very important that the distinction between the two should be kept clear in our minds.

Transformism is the scientific doctrine or hypothesis that, following various supposed 'laws of nature' operating in individuals, one thing is transformed into another thing. To put it briefly and somewhat gro-

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

tesquely, but graphically, it is the doctrine that stones will become trees through transforming themselves into trees; and that trees will become beasts by transforming themselves through change into beasts; and that beasts will become men by transforming themselves through change into men. Now, the biological scientists do not say that; they do not put it in that fashion; of course not; it is too palpably grotesque. But it illustrates the sheer meaning of the word 'transformism.'

Charles Darwin, for instance, who had such great vogue in scientific circles up to some twenty-five or thirty years ago, thought that man evolved from the beast-kingdom by various natural biological factors operating in that kingdom and as expressed in the individual beast or animate entity as the case may be, or perhaps more primitively in the vegetable kingdom. He specified as operative causes more particularly what he called 'Natural Selection,' resulting in the survival of the fittest to survive in their particular environment and in the special circumstances which they had to meet.

His ideas were generally based on the speculations — some of them exceedingly fine — of the Frenchman, Lamarck, who taught what has since been called the theory of acquired or favorable characteristics; that is to say, that an animate entity, by acting upon nature and from the reaction of surrounding natural entities and laws upon it, acquired certain favorable characteristics, which were inherited and passed on to the offspring; and as these characteristics were always for the betterment of the individual acquiring them, therefore there was a gradual advance and progress of that particular racial strain.

But the ideas of Lamarck have since been rejected very largely. There are still a number of die-hards, won't-give-in's, who state that Lamarck taught a great deal of truth; and similarly is it with the theories of Darwin, although transformism likewise is no longer fashionable. Let me illustrate this idea of acquired or favorable characteristics by a bit of old doggerel that I once humorously committed to memory:

"A deer had a neck that was longer by half,
Than the rest of his family's (try not to laugh),
And by stretching and stretching became a giraffe,
Which nobody can deny!"

But the Theosophist does deny it; finds it incomprehensible how any deer, by stretching its neck, even if it be somewhat longer than in the average, in browsing upon the overhanging branches of trees, should be able to pass on an elongated neck to its offspring; and if we inquire into the nature of elongate-necked deer, we shall most certainly find that their offspring are perfectly normal (barring monstrosities)!

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

And a similar inquiry into the possibility of hereditary transmission of acquired characteristics by any individual, would probably show that they are not transmitted.

Individuals of course are affected by environment and circumstance, by their action upon nature and by the reaction of nature upon them; and through long periods of geologic time it is probably true to say that the body of the acting individual, or succession of individuals, would slowly acquire specific modifications; but this would invariably be along the lines of functional tendencies or capacities inherent in the germ-plasm, and most certainly would hardly be classified under the general and rather vague expression 'the inheritance of acquired or favorable characteristics.'

Hence the theory of the transmission by heredity of acquired favorable characteristics is no longer either popular or wisely accepted; although, as I said, there are yet a few die-hards, who still hold to it, as an explanation of the origination of species.

It is not to be supposed, for the common experience of mankind runs contrary to it, that a living body of vegetable, of beast, or of man, can pass on to its offspring modifications which itself has acquired or has suffered during its lifetime, such as membral change, or skill, or muscular development on the one hand, and accidents such as the loss of a limb on the other hand. This is obvious, and no one teaches it or speculates upon it.

But if this living being, or rather all the representatives of any particular phylum, live and die through long generations in some particular environment, do they or do they not acquire characteristics or modifications which become so much a part of their physical being that these modifications are transmitted by heredity? That is precisely the question so warmly disputed.

The general tendency of biological transformist thinkers is to say that this is the very process by which racial strains advance or progress or evolve; but the Theosophist, in common with a large number of eminent biological evolutionists, whose number increases with every year, says No; because the idea, *as stated*, involves the action or working out of an indwelling drive or urge to higher things, which the Theosophist does teach, indeed, but which the theory itself, as a transformist theory or hypothesis, does not contain or does not admit, as the case may be.

Evolution is a fact. The only question is whether the fortuitous action, through periods of time, of the individuals of a race upon Nature, and Nature's fortuitous reactions upon those individuals, suffice ade-

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

quately to explain the process. The idea is steadily growing more and more unfashionable, because the problems of the supposed origination and growth of self-consciousness, and of psychical and intellectual development, are inexplicable by it.

As a matter of fact the real question at issue is this: Is there or is there not behind the evolving racial strain, as expressed in its individuals, a vital urge or drive to betterment, working from within outwards? If so, it is true evolution, and that is what the Theosophist accepts. If the materialistic transformist denies this fact, he has the tremendous *onus probandi* before him, the almost insurmountable difficulty, of explaining whence and why and how these marvelous faculties arise and increase in power and expression with the passage of time. No transformist has yet succeeded in meeting the issue.

The Darwinist is fond of talking of the so-called struggle for life, but we claim that this so-called 'struggle for life' has been greatly overdrawn. It has now become quite popular to believe, on proved facts (and these facts are very opportune), that there is just as much mutual assistance and helpfulness in the animate portion of the Cosmos as there is of combat and struggle; in fact, more.

It is somewhat like the old theory of the proper way of conducting commercial activities. There was a time when the commercial man thought the proper way to succeed in business was by gaining advantage over his competitors — advantages of all kinds, honest or dishonest, it mattered very little indeed; but the better theory, the more modern theory, is that commercial operations are truly successful, when they are co-operative; that it is far wiser and better for men to help each other, to save each other from financial disaster even, than it is to drive one's competitor to the wall. The reason lies in the organic nature of all human activities in which no one can possibly stand alone. There could, in fact, be no such thing as commercial activities unless men worked together, buying and selling to and from each other; and the operation of the same principle of mutual activities and co-operating interests is to be found everywhere.

Now these reflexions amount to a recognition of the forces, behind the veil, working in human nature; and because man is a child of that Nature, and has in him everything that Nature has in herself, in germ or in development, these forces therefore copy or imbody in the small the same operations, the same forces, the same activities, that work in and through the Cosmos.

But returning to the doctrines of transformism, as expressed by the hypotheses of 'natural selection,' the 'struggle for life,' and the

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

‘survival of the fittest to survive’: do we deny these as factors in evolution? Put merely in this way, without any collateral implications of theory or hypothesis, the simple answer is, No, nobody denies a fact, or that, for instance, of three men, the fittest is certainly the most likely to survive in a given set of adverse circumstances or indeed of favorable circumstances.

There is nothing new whatsoever about that idea. It is as old as the ages. The common sense of mankind has recognised that the strong man is stronger than the weaker, and that the man fit for a certain career will be more likely to succeed in that career than the man who is fit for another career.

In each case it is the survival of the fittest to survive in a particular set of circumstances; but the survival of the fittest is not necessarily the survival of the best, as for instance as between man and fish: the fitter to survive in water is the fish; but the fish is by no means superior to the man. The fitter to survive and live a useful career on the surface of the earth, is man. A fish in such circumstances is totally unfit.

We repeat: the fittest is by no means the best, *i. e.*, the most evolved or superior. We did not need Charles Darwin to teach us a fact so well known.

And we likewise know that — simply put, without any theoretical or hypothetical implications of doctrine — Nature itself (using Nature in a generalizing sense, not as an entity, but as an expression of the operations of the manifold beings with which the Cosmos is filled), that Nature certainly does ‘select’ or ‘favor’ certain entities because they are fittest for their environment.

Nobody denies an obvious fact — the Theosophist much less than anybody else. His whole philosophy-science-religion is based on Nature; not alone on the material physical nature which we know with our physical senses, but on that Greater Nature, of which the physical nature is actually but the vehicle, the expression, of indwelling forces. By Nature we mean the entire framework and course of the Cosmos, from the spiritual down to the physical; from the ultra-spiritual down to the ultra-physical — limitless in each direction.

But why do certain things survive and certain fail or fall or ‘go to the wall’? Why — using the word Nature in the sense that we have just specified — why does Nature ‘make selections’? Why does Nature seem to favor, to put it more specifically and more accurately, certain races, certain racial strains, certain entities, certain individuals, allowing them to survive, while others fail or fall?

The answer is as simple as can be. We have simply to look at

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

Nature to find it out. Why involve ourselves in imaginary hypotheses, when we have the great Cosmos all around us, and within us, to draw upon for truth?¶¶ Certain entities or things survive, because they are growing, they are full of vital forces, of an inner urge, which pushes them steadily ahead; ¶ other entities or things fail or fall or 'go to the wall,' because their time to pass away has come, to make place on the stage of life for others to succeed them.

On the surface of the earth even today, we have certain races of men whom we call savages or barbarians. The modern Darwinian or so-called transformist idea is that these savage or barbarous groups are young races, young humans, men in the making. But a close and rigid investigation shows that the truth is the opposite; they are old; worn-out, passing away. They are unfit to survive in present-day conditions and circumstances.

Everything in turn has its chance, lives its life and finally passes off the scene. There is, however, one notable racial exception to the above-cited barbarous groups, which we have no time to pause over today.

Is this a helter-skelter universe, in which entities and things are driven by chance hither and thither, in which no law, no consequences operate, in which the good, and the bad, and the indifferent, are so just merely by chance, and not as the result of cause and effect? Who believes such nonsense? Therefore everything in its turn occupies its place from an anterior operating cause and as a present effect, or exists in a static effectual relation with other things, which temporarily are stronger, more concordant with circumstances and surroundings, and which are therefore fitter to survive than it.

But no sane man believes that in a universe, governed by law or rather laws, by limitless order, or rather orders, filled with limitless consciousness or rather innumerable consciousnesses, or rather incomputable multitudes of consciousnesses, there can be anything that is radically — that is, goes to the root of things — unjust, wrong, out of order, outside of the universal laws. I mean those words actually, literally so.

Our time is drawing to a close for this afternoon, but, friends, our subject is so vast that merely to open the question of evolution requires such an amount of preliminary explanation that our half-hour flies by before we seem to have entered more than the first gateway leading to our real subject, which for the next Sunday or two, or perhaps three, will be Evolution as taught by Theosophy, and as contrasted with the transformism of modern scientific thinkers. Many of these modern scientific thinkers deny the idea prevalent in the world and derived from

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

the writings of Darwinian propagandists, that Charles Darwin ever taught in his *Origin of Species*, or *The Descent of Man*, or in any of his other writings, that man descended from the simian stem, that is, that man is a descendant of ape- or monkey-progenitors.

I bring this point of argument before you at the present time, because in view of a certain so-called 'evolution'-trial, it will be interesting to all. These scientific theorists deny, I say, that their Darwinian theories ever taught that man came from the anthropoid or man-like monkeys, called the apes. They will tell you, and have often told you, that Charles Darwin, the inventor of their particular form of transformism, never taught such a thing. Yet how many times have I not seen this statement explicitly made, and I have invariably challenged it, because it is false, it is untrue.

Darwinism teaches emphatically the phylogenetic descent of man from an older form of the anthropoid ape, from a man-like monkey; and preceding that, from a still less evolved mammalian family, which is supposed to have been some as-yet-unknown small insectivorous mammal living in the tree-tops — probably because it was safer to live there than on the ground.

Now, if that were a fact, friends, nobody, certainly no Theosophist, would ever do anything but accept it as a fact of nature. But we know that it is not a fact, for it has never been proved, although otherwise brilliant minds have worked for nearly three quarters of a century in trying to prove it.

But are we or are we not, as Theosophists, evolutionists? We answer this question by saying what we have often said before: We are evolutionists through and through, but most emphatically we are not transformists. We do not believe that man descended from a monkey, that is to say, from the anthropoid apes.

I will read to you in a moment a few passages from *The Descent of Man* by Charles Darwin, in chapter six of that work, wherein, in five different places, he expressly states that in his opinion the origin of man is to be found in an anthropoid ape living in a remote geological period. I take all these quotations from his book, *The Descent of Man*, and I ask you to remember them as forming some of the foundation on which we shall erect superstructures of fact in our later studies.

In chapter six, he says:

"Now man unquestionably belongs in his dentition, in the structure of his nostrils, and some other respects, to the Catarrhine or Old World division [of monkeys]. . . . There can, consequently, hardly be a doubt that man is an off-shoot from the Old World simian stem."

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

(Simian means belonging to or appertaining to the apes.) Again, from the same chapter:

“If the anthropomorphous apes be admitted to form a natural sub-group, then as man agrees with them not only in all those characters which he possesses in common with the whole Catarrhine group, but in other peculiar characters, such as the absence of a tail and callosities, and in general appearance, we may infer that some ancient member of the anthropomorphous sub-group gave birth to man.”

Again, from the same chapter:

“But we must not fall into the error of supposing that the early progenitor of the whole Simian stock, including man, was identical with, or even closely resembled, any existing ape or monkey.”

Obviously not, since these are contemporaneous.

“We are far from knowing how long ago it was when man first diverged from the Catarrhine stock; but it may have occurred at an epoch as remote as the Eocene period.”

And finally, please listen to this gem:

“The Simiadae [that is to say, the anthropoid apes, the man-like apes,] then branched off into two great stems, the New World and Old World monkeys; and from the latter at a remote period, Man, the wonder and glory of the universe, proceeded.”

In closing, let me say that the Theosophist shows to you and proves to you, by an appeal to the facts of nature, as far as we know them, and by all reasonable inference derived from the canons of logic and of intuition, and following the instinctive working of intuition and of all those inner faculties of the human constitution which all sane men possess, that instead of being derived from any beast on this earth in past time, man is the oldest in origin of the animate entities; further, that in his origin he is a child of the gods, as the ancients would have said, that is, of fully self-conscious and progressed beings; and further that, on the other hand, as the farthest advanced and oldest in origin of the animate entities on the earth, if anything ever came from anything, the logical deduction is that all the rest of the animate entities came from him, who is the oldest of all the biological stocks on earth.



“Let your cry be for free souls rather even than for free men. Moral liberty is the one vitally important liberty, the one liberty which is indispensable; the other liberty is good and salutary only so far as it favors this. Subordination is in itself a better thing than independence. The one implies order and arrangement; the other implies only self-sufficiency with isolation. The one means harmony, the other a single tone; the one is the whole, the other but the part.

“Liberty! liberty! in all things let us have *justice*, and then we shall have enough liberty.”— Joseph Joubert: Quoted by Matthew Arnold in his *Critical Essay: Joubert; or a French Coleridge*

MĀNASIC CONSCIOUSNESS

H. T. EDGE, M. A.

IT is incumbent upon students of Theosophy to try and pass on any benefits they may have received from the Theosophical teachings; for to receive without giving is universally admitted to be the conduct of a knave. Moreover, such conduct should rather be described as a futile attempt, for is not giving the true condition of receiving? Certainly, he who tries to receive without giving will not do more than accumulate a useless hoard; while he who bestows with an open hand, thereby opens a channel for more reception. And this is particularly true of wisdom -- of the knowledge that really counts.

The Theosophical teachings are rightly said to be practical: instead of offering mere theories, they furnish reasonable and convincing explanations of what we find to be true: they interpret life as we find it: they show the reasons for things that happen: they explain why things are as they are.

The teachings as to the sevenfold constitution of man may be specially mentioned in this connexion. They give clues to many facts which it puzzles psychologists of all kinds to explain or interpret satisfactorily.

Psychology, in interpreting the reactions between mind and body, so often tends to the conclusion that mind and body react on one another in a perpetual circle, so that man seems to have no power of determining his own conduct or fortune. The result is pessimistic systems, which may serve to discourage, though they can hardly convince. It need scarcely be said that, in the light of such pessimistic systems, the entire existence of man as a thinker becomes futile and absurd; and that a man who devises such a system is using his intelligence for the purpose of denying the existence of that very intelligence. In short, the *facts* of experience are only clouded, not explained.

In a work called *Psychic and Noetic Action*, H. P. Blavatsky shows that what is loosely called the 'mind' in man is composed of two factors, to which she gives the ancient Greek names — *nous* and *psyche*, with their corresponding adjectives, noetic and psychic. The latter of these two is that mind, or that part of our mind, which is closely associated with the body and its senses and functions. But the former, the *nous*, characteristic of 'man, and so markedly distinguishing him from other creatures, constitutes the independent and superior part of our mentality.

MÂNASIC CONSCIOUSNESS

The *nous* does not act *directly* on the body, says H. P. Blavatsky; but it acts on the *psyche*, and this in turn acts on the body.

This simple explanation, so agreeable to the facts of our experience, at once clears up a host of difficulties, and enables us to admit all that is true in the findings of ordinary psychology, without thereby in any way impairing the freedom of man and his power to transcend conditions imposed by his physical life. In other words, the teaching as to the higher and lower mind in man finds here a rational explanation. This teaching is seen to be a necessary inference from the facts of our experience. In the book above referred to, the author shows how the teaching is borne out by the very structure of the human organism.

Most illuminating is the passage where she compares the human organism to a musical instrument with two sets of strings, one of fine silver wire and the other of coarse gut. It is the coarser strings that thrill to the breath of passion, while the finer chords can only resound to the breath of zephyrs proceeding from the higher nature of man.

Man is actually *two*, and yet mysteriously *one*. There is a higher psychology, supplementing the lower psychology to which so many investigations have been restricted. Hence those who know of this higher psychology have naught to fear from the assertions of those who have overlooked it. Let us have the courage of our knowledge; and surely here is where knowledge and intelligence step in to our aid.

Reverting to the Seven Principles of Man, we learn that the human soul is regarded as threefold — a mystic Trinity. These three may be designated the Spiritual Soul, the human soul, and the animal soul; the second being placed between the other two. This makes of man a Two-in-One. That middle principle was not evolved by the line of biological evolution; it was from another source. It is its entry into the organism that causes that organism to develop its superior brain and special organs and functions. Biological evolution could produce but a perfected animal; to produce man, there is need of the entry of *Manas*, the human self-conscious soul. This *Manas* forms the link between the animal and the Divine.

Manas, in ordinary man of today, partakes largely of the lower nature; but it is able consciously to promote its own evolution, and its task is to wean itself from the attractions of the lower nature and to wed itself ever more closely with the Spiritual Soul, until the goal of liberation and enlightenment is attained.

These teachings are as old as the world; we can find them among the wise sayings of all ages. They form the essential basis of religions,

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

however much these may have been overgrown by superstition and sectarian dogma. They are in fact tenets of the Wisdom-Religion, which is the common foundation and common parent of religions. Their effect is to vindicate the character of man in his own eyes, to restore to him his faith in his own Divinity. So greatly has man developed the lower aspects of his nature — his physical senses, his psychic and emotional nature, and one side of his intellect — that he stands in danger of forgetting that he has a spiritual nature — that he *is* essentially a spiritual being; and it is well that he should be reminded of this and be shown how the facts, when fully explained, confirm the thesis.

It will be of advantage now to refer more particularly to *Psychic and Noetic Action*. The date of writing it is 1890, a time when a certain school of scientific speculation, to which have been variously given the names of materialistic, animalistic, or mechanistic, was far more self-confident and dictatorial than it is at present.

The author begins by protesting against the claims of this school as against the findings of Theosophy. It is urged, she says, that the teachings which she is promulgating shall henceforth never be allowed to contradict 'scientific philosophy'! Some medieval casuists suppressed truth, if, as they said, it clashed with 'divine revelation.' But she refuses to pander to *physical* science.

"If the so-called *exact* sciences limited their activity only to the physical realm of nature . . . then the Occultists would be the first to seek help in modern sciences. . . . But once that overstepping material Nature the physiologists of the modern 'animalistic' school pretend to meddle with, and deliver *ex cathedra dicta* on, the higher functions and phenomena of the mind, saying that a careful analysis brings them to a firm conviction that no more than the animal is man a *free agent*, far less a responsible one — then the Occultist has a far greater right than the average modern 'Idealist' to protest."

This is of course no attack on science as such. People who know nothing of science may indulge in such, but no one who has had a scientific training will make any such indiscriminate attack. What is impugned is the dogmatic attitude of certain schools. And we know how that dogmatic attitude is based but on opinions of the hour, which change quickly as new generations of scientific men come along.

In fact, H. P. Blavatsky proceeds to quote, in support of her own views, those of a prominent scientific man of her day, the late George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. He says that there can be no corresponding physical substratum for the marvelous activities of *self-consciousness*. On which H. P. Blavatsky comments that psycho-physiologists who try to define Consciousness on their lines are sure to fail, because —

"Self-consciousness belongs alone to man and proceeds from the SELF, the higher

MÂNASIC CONSCIOUSNESS

Manas. Only, whereas the psychic element (or *Kâma-Manas*) is common to both the animal and the human being . . . no physiologist . . . will ever be able to solve the mystery of the human mind, in its highest spiritual manifestation, or in its dual aspect of the *psychic* and the *noetic* (or the *mânasic*), or even to comprehend the intricacies of the former on the purely material plane — unless he knows something of, and is prepared to admit the presence of this dual element.”

This alludes to the tenet we mentioned above, that the human Soul (Manas) stands midway between the Spiritual nature (Buddhi) and the passionate or instinctive nature (Kâma), making, by its union with one or the other, Buddhi-Manas and Kâma-Manas, the Higher and the lower Manas in man. The school of psycho-physiologists referred to concern themselves alone with the relations between Kâma-Manas and the body, not even understanding these properly, as she says, and knowing naught of the nature and functions of the Higher Manas. But Professor Ladd came to the conclusion that this could in no possible way be construed as a function of physiological action, or even correlated therewith.

The author goes on to denote the Higher and lower Manas, or the noetic and psychic elements, by the names *Individuality* and *personality*. These words are used interchangeably by many writers, but it must be observed that H. P. Blavatsky, and her pupils following her, have distinguished them by these special meanings.

Some pages farther on, Professor Ladd is again quoted, to the effect that —

“The phenomena of human consciousness must be regarded as activities of some other form of Real Being than the moving molecules of the brain. . . . This Real Being, thus manifested immediately to itself in the phenomena of consciousness, and indirectly to others through the bodily changes, is the Mind. . . . The subject of all the states of consciousness is a real unit-being, called Mind; which is of non-material nature, and acts and develops according to laws of its own, but is specially correlated with certain material molecules and masses forming the substance of the Brain.”

This disposes of the view (continues H. P. Blavatsky) that the known laws of psycho-physiology refute the notion of a free will in man. However much the lower nature may follow the laws of motion and of conservation of energy, the Higher Manas is independent and retains its power of choice.

Part II of the book proceeds to point out the special and distinguishing functions of psychic and noetic action. We cannot follow the explanation in full, but must be content mainly to refer to it and also to another article by H. P. Blavatsky in her magazine *Lucifer* for September 1890, entitled ‘The Dual Aspect of Wisdom.’ Here she refers to the Third Epistle of James, in the Bible, where he distinguished between the Wisdom that is from above, and the wisdom that is earthly, sensual, devilish. The following quotation is important:

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

“The ‘Higher Ego’ cannot act directly on the body, as its consciousness belongs to quite another plane and planes of ideation: but the ‘lower’ *Self* does. . . . The ‘Higher Ego,’ as part of the essence of the UNIVERSAL MIND, is unconditionally omniscient on its own plane, and only potentially so in our terrestrial sphere, as it has to act solely through its *alter ego* — the Personal Self.”

We conclude these extracts by the following grand asseveration:

“Verily that body, so desecrated by Materialism and man himself, is the temple of the Holy Grail, the *Abytem* of the grandest, nay, of all the mysteries of nature in our solar universe.”

This shows the importance of taking proper care of the body, not by way of coddling it or letting it rule us, but by way of clean living. It is possible to overdo the idea of the body being a dirty clod, and the soul or spirit a sort of intangible gas. The temple may be very unclean and ill-kept; but it can be swept and garnished.

Everyone agrees that individual character is humanity’s greatest asset, and that no laws and rules can avail to organize a successful society unless the units composing it are staunch and true. Nay, we may go farther and say that a society composed of such units would need no hard and fast regulations.

But upon what does character depend? Upon the estimation in which man holds himself, upon his self-respect. So long as he has not confidence in himself, he will drift weakly in the current of desires and habits and social conventions, and will seek help and salvation from external sources, real or imaginary. But once let him realize that he is essentially a being endowed with free will and an unlimited power of self-evolution, and he will begin to exercise that divine prerogative, and to become a responsible agent of progress instead of a piece of driftwood.

But bear in mind that self-respect is not vanity, nor is it personal ambition; it is incompatible with these. Vanity and ambition swell the lower man, and might be described as fevers; the really strong man is neither vain nor ambitious. It is not his personal ego, but the real Self behind the veil, that he calls into action.

Certain confused doctrines promoted in the name of evolution have over-emphasized the animal part of human nature; but it is not likely that they will have a lasting effect upon mankind. Men are too much aware of the other side of their nature; and it is much more likely that the doctrines of science will be constrained to fall into line with man’s convictions derived from his daily experience and meditations on life. And here is where the Theosophical teachings respecting the higher nature of man and its relation to the lower nature and to the body are so important.

SILENCE

M. G. GOWSELL

A TERROR, say you, that no sound is heard:
That all seems blank, and savors of the tomb,
The shroud, the pall, the grim funereal plume.
Turn on the jazz, you say: the ribald word,
Yes, worse, were better far than this — absurd!
To be companioned thus? Nay, such a doom
Were of the damned; one cannot dream to whom
The grave itself were not to be preferred.

Such is the well-nigh universal cry.
Distraction, crowned and horsed, and sword-in-hand,
Goes forth for conquest, with increased demand,
That you shall purchase this, though you may die:
That YOU, the you who thinks, shall bend the knee,
A slave to every phase of its decree.

*International Theosophical Headquarters,
Point Loma, California*

THE ESSENTIAL DIVINITY OF MAN

H. A. FUSSELL

“Theosophy considers humanity as an emanation from divinity on its return path thereto.”—H. P. BLAVATSKY: *The Key to Theosophy*, p. 23



ACCORDING to Theosophy, man in his essential nature is divine. “But *is* man divine?” some one may object. “If he is, how is it that there are so many evil-disposed people in the world, and so much crime?” The objection will be answered in the course of this article.

But first: Who and what am I? Do the needs and impulses of my physical body originate in what all are agreed to call ‘the self’? Or the passions, desires, ambitions, and the acts which life in society and in the world call forth? Not necessarily, only in so far as I identify myself with them, live in and for them, and so make them expressions of the

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

self I create by constantly yielding to them. For we are "self-created beings, the creatures of Karma."

As a matter of fact, the real source of the majority of our acts is custom and habit; they are not consciously willed at all. They certainly are not the offspring of the 'spiritual will,' seldom even the result of reflexion; and our thoughts come to us often from we know not where. "The true Self," as an ancient Hindû teaching puts it, "is not the body and not the stream of thoughts, but verily the Lord of both, unborn and beyond death."

Even a cursory examination will convince us that very many of our thoughts, feelings, desires, and impulses come from external sources. We dwell upon them and let them determine our conduct, considering them our own because they are consonant with our temperament and character. That is why they come to us. If they found no answering echo in our hearts we should not have them. And all the time the 'real I' is quiescent, being given no chance to manifest, owing to the confused and chaotic condition of our minds.

In the course of a single day how many different 'selves' do we not exhibit! So contradictory and even violently opposed is their nature, that if we are in the habit of reviewing the thoughts and acts of the day, before retiring for the night, we are loth to admit their identity with our real self, or what we consider to be such.

The contemplation of this multiple and much divided personality of ours can be very distressing. That is why some people dread to be alone. What leisure their business or their profession allows them they devote to 'company,' or to a round of amusements, and so make self-knowledge impossible.

Sooner or later, however, some catastrophic experience, a profound emotional disturbance, a long convalescence, or, it may be, so seemingly insignificant a thing as a child's look, or the changed tone in the voice of a friend, awakens the feeling of unworthiness; the veil is rent and the man sees himself for what he is.

For the first time, perhaps, he faces himself. What a strange paradox his life has been! What inner disharmony! What a waste of energy in the pursuit of things of no value, and what wilful neglect of the things that really matter! He now realizes with all its appalling consequences that his mind is the battle-ground of opposing forces, each striving to gain complete control of him. And how he has vacillated between them! But where shall he find the power for the self-adjustment, of which he now feels the need?

If he continues to look within and only goes deep enough, he will

THE ESSENTIAL DIVINITY OF MAN

find that self-analysis, painful and mortifying as it is,— for the conscience is at work,— leads straight to the only source of strength in the battle of life that a man has, namely, his own Higher Nature, which is Divine and will give him the power he now seeks so earnestly, and enable him to become what he knows he ought to be and can be.

No longer held back by the memory of past faults and failures, he will go forward on the path of self-directed evolution, which is the prerogative of the awakened soul which knows the laws that govern life and make spiritual progress possible. To quote the words of Katherine Tingley, “he will seize hold on himself, assert and realize his potentially all-dominating soul-existence.” And in the endeavor to live up to his highest possibilities he will hear the deep glad accents of Eternity encouraging him to continue. Conscious of his true dignity as a *divine-human* being he will learn to control all the elements of his composite nature, and to use them as instruments of the Spiritual Will. Even while in the body he will have glimpses of that other world in which the highest part of him lives and which, like it, is imperishable and eternal.

The different elements of our nature enable us to get into touch with the different planes of being. By means of my body, the physical senses, and the brain-mind, I gain knowledge of the material world, adapt myself to it and act upon it. My mind — the higher mental faculties — introduces me into the thought-world, which in its turn leads up to the world of spirit, the things of which must be spiritually discerned, for they transcend even the highest intellectual faculties and are fully open to intuition alone. Though the physical body is the last of the seven principles which compose man's nature, it is necessary to preserve it in well-being, for so long as we are in earth-life, it is the basis and, so to say, the ‘container’ of all the others. Morbid forms of asceticism are dangerous. The old adage, *Mens sana in corpore sano*, expresses a profound truth. Bodily and mental fitness are closely allied; and Âtmâ-Buddhi, the highest principle in us, can only act, on this plane, through Manas, the mind.

There is interaction between all the principles and planes. Metaphysically speaking, they are aspects or exteriorizations of the One Self. And my rank in the scale of being depends upon with which one of them I choose to identify myself, for man becomes what he loves and desires and thinks about.

Manas is the link between Spirit and matter. Standing midway between man's divine nature and his terrestrial nature, it is the balance-principle on which his destiny depends. The animal passions and desires tend to drag Manas downward, but if man — the *thinker* — strives

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

to carry out the behests of Spirit, Manas is united to Spirit and the man attains immortality and blessedness. It is because Manas is, as has just been stated, 'the balance-principle,' that Katherine Tingley says:

"There is but one true and legitimate battle-field: the Mind of Man, where the duality of our nature keeps us constantly at war, the only rightful war there is — the war of the God in us against the lower self."— *The Gods Await*, p. 50

And Angelus Silenus, a German mystic of the seventeenth century, very truly says:

"Das grösste Wunder Ding ist doch der Mensch allein:
Er kann, nachdem er's macht, GOTT oder Teufel sein."

("The greatest wonder-thing is surely man alone; he can, according as he will, be GOD or devil.")

We have all met men who find their pleasure in the satisfaction of their bodily appetites, for whom spiritual things seem non-existent; and men of brilliant mind but soulless, who are entirely ignorant of the real meaning of life; and once or twice in our lives we may have known men and women who are saints, in the true meaning of the word, who live not for self but for others, and whose whole delight is in the spirit.

But how did man get his mind and become a self-conscious thinking being, with the capacities and attributes of a God in him? Modern science can give no satisfactory answer. Theosophy, which rejects all purely materialistic explanations of the universe, tells us that man was endowed with mind (Manas) by the Mânasaputras: advanced beings who developed all their principles long ages before this universe of ours was in existence. The 'divine spark' or Monad was in man from the beginning, as it is in every atom of the universe, or he could not have evolved at all, for from it comes the desire and the power to progress. In the kingdoms below man evolution is instinctive, they have no choice in the matter. But man must rise through self-exertion: he can, within limits, either further or thwart the divine purpose in evolution.

The descent of the Mânasaputras — the so-called 'fall of the Angels' in the Bible — simply means that these pure spirits 'loved' man so dearly, as is said in *The Secret Doctrine*, that they incarnated of their own free will and in accordance with Karmic law, in the 'mindless' human forms that had been made ready to receive them, in order to enable man to complete his evolution and to fulfil his destiny. It is the most important event, that we know of, in his long history.

With what tremendous powers for good and evil was man then endowed, for he became thereby an individual self-conscious entity, capable of 'self-directed evolution.' Hitherto his evolution had been

THE ESSENTIAL DIVINITY OF MAN

determined for him; but from now on he must choose his path, *become* the conscious God that he is potentially, or lose all chance of spiritual progress in this Manvantara.

Henceforth, we have to do with man — the thinker. In the course of the free development, on which he is entering, he will find himself in possession of new and varied faculties for self-expression, and for action in the world and on his fellow-men: powers which, if used for selfish ends, will be his and their undoing, but which, if used rightly, will carry him and them to ever greater heights of perfection and glory.

Many, many lives will be necessary before our natures are sufficiently perfected to permit of union with the God within, for there are

“no privileges or special gifts in man, save those won by his own Ego throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations. . . . In all men is the creative force necessary for their further and independent evolution.”

And spiritual development, once begun in real earnest, will carry the man who is true to his Higher Self, past all difficulties and failures.

According to Theosophy, the universe evolves at the same time and along with man. Not only does man acquire new faculties as he progresses, but new elements in nature — a different fauna and flora even — appear with the cyclic changes which usher in the different ‘Rounds’ and ‘Races.’ These faculties and elements are only ‘new’ in the sense that the time has come for their manifestation, for they are latent in both man and nature.

Contrary to current theories of evolution, which really begin in the middle of the evolutionary process, the self-imposed limitations of modern science preventing it from taking into account what precedes, Theosophy teaches that in every Manvantara, or period of manifestation, that which first awakens into being, after the Pralayaic period of rest or non-manifestation, during which all things return to their primordial essence in Parabrahman — ‘Absolute Being and Non-Being,’ — is *spirit*, which cycles downward, becoming more and more materialized — for want of a better term — with every successive ‘globe of the earth-chain,’ until the lowest point is reached on this our earth, which is the last in the descending series, and on which matter and spirit balance one another. Spirit is then immaterialized, so to say, that is, *latent* in every particle of matter, both in man and in the universe. From now on the ascent of spirit begins, everything in manifested nature striving to mount upwards under the urge of spirit; and the indwelling spirit carries with it those lower elements which it has succeeded in spiritualizing, on its return journey to its divine source.

Needless to say, neither the process of immaterialization nor that

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

of dematerialization can be described in a magazine article, for they comprise the whole history of the manifested universe. The double process requires an almost incalculable period of time, but which is but a moment in eternity. And when it is accomplished, after a due period of rest, it will begin again, but higher, nobler, more perfect than before, for Spirit is eternal and there is no end to its manifestations. The earnest student, who is desirous of knowing more of this magnificent conception of evolution, is referred to H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, where as much of the Ancient Wisdom is given out as is possible at the present time.

As interrelated parts of such a vast scheme it is evident that neither man nor any object in the universe, from suns to atoms, can be known and understood apart from the rest. The meaning and significance of life must be sought in the relations of beings and things to one another and to the whole.

As finite beings our field of consciousness is limited, and for convenience of analysis we are compelled to confine our attention to the definite objects under consideration. Nevertheless, our mental horizon is continually widening — more particularly at the present time, owing to the remarkable discoveries in archaeology and science — and we naturally form some conception, however inadequate, of the Universal Order we dimly surmise, as well as of the purpose and end of evolution. All men are philosophers and metaphysicians by nature, even the scientists who pour scorn upon the professional philosopher and metaphysician.

There is inherent in man, whose actions are all directed towards ends, an irrepressible tendency to ask 'Why?' and 'Wherefore?'— questions to which the purely descriptive method adopted by modern science, can give no answer. The answer, however, can be found in Theosophy, which alone of all the systems of thought in the world today, satisfies both the longings of the heart and the demands of the intellect.

We are told in *The Secret Doctrine* that everything in the universe, from latent Gods to atoms, prepares to become man, on this or some other earth. It is said there that

“the desire for a sentient life . . . is a reflexion of the Divine Thought propelled into objective existence, into a law that the Universe should exist. . . . To attain full self-consciousness Spirit must pass through every cycle of being culminating in its highest point on earth in man.”

Some modern scientists and, of course, all materialists, reject entirely what they call “the absurd proposition that the world exists in order that man may have a field for moral action.” It would indeed be the height of absurdity and of presumption were man the ephemeral

THE ESSENTIAL DIVINITY OF MAN

creature they deem him to be — a fleeting shadow, foam upon the wave, appearing but to disappear.

Profound thinkers, however, like Kant and Fichte, consider it perfectly reasonable that the world was made for the perfecting of man, and the idea can be traced as far back as the Hindû sage Patañjali, who taught that “the universe exists for the Self’s experience and emancipation.” But this is only possible through Reincarnation, for man, obviously, does not become either free or perfect in one earth-life.

Throughout the whole series of incarnations the *real* man — the Reincarnating Ego — retains his identity as the conscious subject of this succession of ever-varying experiences, which are necessary for his spiritual growth. The different personalities he assumes, and which are his own creation, the product of his Karma, have, of course, no memory of the ‘rôles’ in which the Ego has appeared, — for, like actors, we play many parts. The *real* man is not, therefore, the creature of flesh and blood, of passion and desire and brain-intellect, which we contact within the limits of space and time. The real ‘I’ will not be fully revealed, either to itself or others, until that state of complete self-consciousness is attained, which is the result of our many human existences. Until then we shall continue to be mysteries to ourselves as well as to others.

“Matter is the vehicle for the manifestation of soul on this plane of existence, and soul is the vehicle on a higher plane for the manifestation of spirit,” is a doctrine which was taught by Plotinus as well as by H. P. Blavatsky. But then the teachings of Plotinus are an echo of the ancient Wisdom-Religion which H. P. Blavatsky came to reveal.

Seeing then that the world in which we live provides a field for moral action, for intellectual and spiritual growth, we may now consider how man can obtain the “Wisdom and Knowledge which alone can dispel the Fruits of Illusion and Ignorance,” and so become consciously divine.

The first requisite is that he must be altruistic and act impersonally and unselfishly. Self-realization is indeed the law of his being, but he must learn to realize himself without interfering with the self-realization of others, in whom this law is equally operative. He can do this only in so far as he is actuated by impersonal universal love for humanity. As all beings and things are irresistibly impelled to seek perfection, he must help them to rise.

It is a trite remark that “one man is no man.” Man can develop his faculties and powers only in association and co-operation with his fellows. And Theosophy teaches us that their full development will not be completed until humanity knows and feels itself an indissoluble whole, and that Universal Brotherhood is but the prelude to a manifestation

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

of the Divine-Human, so glorious, so unprecedented, that mankind, in its present divided condition, cannot even conceive of it.

It is the aim and purpose of Theosophy to emphasize the great truth of Universal Brotherhood, and to show that it is perfectly feasible to begin the practice of it *now*. Moreover, there is great danger of the liberty of thought and action which we now enjoy, degenerating into extravagance and license, unless some great sustaining ideal takes possession of men's hearts. Self-discipline and joy in service are what is needed.

He who strives to live according to the dictates of the God within him "reflects the Self-Existent Lord like a clear mirror" and becomes a source of strength to others. In such clear shining they discover their own greatness and make effort at self-purification, in order that they, too, may radiate Light and Blessedness. And they find that helping others to discern the God in them is far more efficacious than any attempt at outer reform.

In essence and origin we are all divine. The enigmatical intermingling of good and evil in human lives, the differences in capacity and endowment, all come from the *use* that we have made of our inheritance. That is the answer to the objection raised at the beginning of this article: "If man is divine, why is there so much evil and crime in the world?"

We have all belied our godlike nature in some life or lives, and, as in each successive incarnation there must be either deterioration or improvement, some have forgotten their divine origin to such an extent that they have become obsessed by inclinations to evil.

The habitual criminal lives in ignorance of his higher nature, imagines that he is living out his life, and does not know that he has mistaken his lower nature for his real self. So far as his present wrongdoing is concerned, he may have acted under the pressure of circumstances over which he seemingly had no control, or a bad heredity may have been the immediate cause.

We must beware of judging by appearances. The impulse to sin does not originate in our deepest nature, but in the lower animal and passionate nature. The real 'I' comprises far more than what is apparent. We are all greater than we know. And in the case we are considering, the true Self may yet reassert itself, if we will only give it opportunity. As Katherine Tingley says: "There is always another chance; always the possibility of amelioration"; for no man can place himself outside of Divine Care and Compassion.

"How can any earnest thinker deny the essential Divinity of Man? In every one's experience there is enough to convince him that out beyond all we see and hear is a living

SIMPLICITY AND SILENCE

pulsating power urging men on to higher purposes, nobler service,— driving us in quest of a knowledge that would justify life and make its meanings clear. This is the Ray of the Infinite in us. It proceeds from the Supreme Central Source of all; it broods over humanity and enfolds it. It is the Teacher, the Knower, the Helper, the Consolation. . . .

“The Real Man is a spiritual being; and the thinking mind must be guided by that which when manifested makes one whole. The lowest human being on earth today has still within him a ray of the Eternal Love, of God that is All-beauty.”

— KATHERINE TINGLEY: *The Wine of Life*, pp. 60-61

SIMPLICITY AND SILENCE

H. TRAVERS, M. A.



HERE was once an apron.

But it had so many straps and buckles and pockets and other patent fixings on it that it was all fixings and no apron.

So I tied a piece of burlap round my waist and went on with my work.

Which is a parable.

How often do we find that elaborations, intended to make matters more efficient, merely complicate and hinder! In certain operations in physical science the most elaborate precautions are taken to avoid or to compensate for errors. In the hands of an expert these precautions are invaluable; but to the inexpert they are a source of additional error; and he will probably get more accurate results by rough and ready means. Pages of instances might be given, drawn from many kinds of work, mechanical, chemical, household economy, and what not.

There are certain philosophies of life based on the idea of simplicity or simplification; especially the Tao philosophy of China. The teachings of Jesus, as given in the Christian gospels, have the same idea; but these teachings do not occupy a prominent position in the later Christianity, for they were added to and transformed, and annexed by the Roman imperium. But surely the Jesus of the Gospels was trying to inculcate simplification of life. The *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* breathes the spirit of simplification from cover to cover.

Perhaps it may be considered a valid criticism to say that simplification is an old man's philosophy, the gospel of an ancient civilization. Youth, it may be argued, whether of man or nation, is rather for expansion, elaboration, adventure. Be it so: my hoary reader, it is you I address; and, young fellow, may you live long enough to find solace in the virtues of simplification.

We must never forget the universal principle of 'pairs of opposites,' or, in emphasizing one side, forget the existence of the other. Accumula-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

tion and elimination; piling up and discarding; these are contrary processes, everywhere at work, and their interaction makes life and motion. From the simplicity of infancy, the personality is gradually built up and elaborated; but age tends to discard and to return to simplicity. In another life the same dual process goes on. At last so complex, elaborate, and burdensome a personality has been collected and built up, that a strong flow towards simplification sets in. Hence those dark sayings of the Wise: "Give up thy life, if thou wouldst live"; "He who loses his life for my sake shall find it."

The notion of acquisition is deeply ingrained in our ideas. It is hard to get rid of. Yet there comes a time when we realize in a flash that we have to eliminate rather than to pile up. The wealthiest man is he who carries his property about with him, in the shape of an ability to be comfortable in any circumstances; not he who is miserable unless he is surrounded with a complication of appliances. Socrates is a notable example of this kind of riches.

The conditions of modern life are said to be growing more and more complicated; yet we can discern in them a trend towards simplicity; not however so much by trying to return to former conditions, as by going forward to a new simplicity. Circles return to the point they started from. In any case it is character rather than circumstances that counts; and our ideal should be to maintain a simple heart amid external complexities.

The vow of poverty is but feebly expressed by depriving oneself of worldly goods. In a fuller sense it should mean the stripping away of that crowd of desires and fancies which so encumbers us. Distraction prevents us from steering straight towards the goal of wisdom and self-mastery. To achieve this goal, simplification is necessary. "Be humble if thou wouldst attain to wisdom. Be humbler still when thou hast attained it." Blessed are the "poor in spirit."

The word 'Silence' is intimately connected with simplicity; we see this when we think how greatly we could simplify our dealings by merely keeping our lips closed on ninety per cent. of the occasions when we are prone to open them. If you are going to do something — yes, if you are a fool, by all means go and tell somebody what you are going to do; then he is sure to butt in and mix things up for you.

Silence simplifies life; eliminates very much of the needless and troublesome. The goal of attainment is often spoken of as a great and welcome silence. Both simplicity and silence pertain to that Oneness which we attribute to the Divine, and towards which we always yearn.

FREE WILL OR FATALISM

GERTRUDE VAN PELT, M. D.

IT is astonishing with what infinite pains certain types of brains argue away essential facts in nature, which to a simple mind seem quite obvious; that is, it would be astonishing if it were not so familiar. One illustration is the unbelievable mental myopia which prevents a man from finding a soul in himself or others — more than that, it must be an absolutely blind spot in his mind; for there is nothing nature has written all over her surface more plainly than the presence of soul, and in letters so glowing and dazzling that they seem by their splendor almost to conceal, indeed, anything else. Soul holds together the human frame; shines out of its eyes; withdraws and the whole structure collapses as a brilliant sunset vanishes when the sun sinks to rest.

Similarly, there are those who seek to argue away their own free will, notwithstanding that everyone is conscious that he possesses it. Although people repeat many times daily, 'I will' and 'I will not,' they prefer to consider these expressions mere figures of speech and reduce themselves and others to simple automatons. Nevertheless, these negators deny constantly by their actions their avowed beliefs.

It is true that a keen student of human nature can predict with an *almost* certainty what another will do under given circumstances. For his habits and tendencies are known. Habit has a dynamic force, but who formed the habit? Certainly, their tyranny is such that all should hesitate to place themselves in the grip of those which are not good. If any one doubts his free will, let him undertake to use it in choosing or changing his habits — but in the beginning, before they grow too strong.

If a man is seen sliding down hill with no obstacles in sight, it is safe to assert that he will reach the bottom; but who can predict what will happen when he gets there. He may patch himself up temporarily in preparation for future slides. Or the sudden arrest may jar him into thinking that he has had enough of such experiences. And then comes to the surface a force with which it is difficult to reckon.

How many, how very many, have seemed to reach the limit of debauchery; of vice; of physical deterioration, with nothing apparently before them but extinction, yet who have, on the contrary, pulled themselves together and risen to a point of glorious self-command. It is the old story of "I will arise and go to my Father." What is more inspiring

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

than these examples? - for they reveal the power of soul and of the human will.

It happens now and then that some one curiously misinterprets the Theosophical doctrine of Karma, to imply fatalism, but this only before he has taken time to study it. Being simply the universally accepted law of cause and effect, applied to the individual, it really stands for just the reverse. In one word, it expresses the fact that every man is responsible for his own actions and thoughts; that at every moment of his life he is reaping the results of what he has sown in the past, and simultaneously creating causes which in the future must certainly become effects to be dealt with. Sometimes these can be counteracted when they arrive.

Imagine a huge ball rolling toward a fatalist; one, of course, whether he recognises it or not, that he has sent out in the past and which is now returning home again. Two courses are open. He may sit still and allow the ball to crush him, or he may send out another, strong enough possibly to neutralize the force of the first, or, at least, to deflect its course. Will he be stupid enough to carry out his theories? Probably not. He will help himself to the extent of his power. Will he hold on to his theories? Yet they have been formed in the face of similar experiences he has had to meet in some degree every day of his life. Or suppose his house takes fire, will he let it burn unmolested, or do the natural thing?

These effects, as a rule, more subtil and profound, often involving a lifetime of suffering, are inevitable; as certain as the rising of the sun; as certain as fate, though not fate, they cannot be escaped, but how they are received is the real question. One may meet them courageously, heroically, determined to build out of them noble character; or he may sink, fret, rebel. The choice lies before him. It is useless to argue it away on the theory that he is acting under the compulsion of his tendencies. For these, which are his character, he formed also. They are a part of this karma, and must, sooner or later, be grasped and reformed. The history of the soul is not written in external events, which are only a means to an end, but in interior achievements and conquests.

In the early stages of evolution, human beings, we are taught, are guided by those above them, just as a child is carried by its parents until the period of moral responsibility is reached, when it must walk.

We all learn by our mistakes. They are the stepping-stones by which we mount. The obstacles we meet have been of our own making in the past. They are the means through which, guided by the divine side of our own natures, we grow; develop our moral fiber; climb to

SCIENTIFIC ITEMS

higher regions; breathe a purer air. Weak natures cringe before them. Strong natures hail them, study them, conquer them. Without free will to do all this, life is meaningless, absurd.

Why should vast and unlimited armies of beings march through the eternities past and to come like dumb, driven cattle? And, indeed, they bear on their faces the denial of such a preposterous theory.

Without intelligently directed effort, there is no growth, no gathering of strength. Even the athlete knows this for his muscles. But, as a matter of fact, human beings *do* expand, evolve, even flower at times, as they march forward to their destiny. If not, they decay — but stand still, never — still less, evolve without free will. There is no destiny for a marionette.

The soul of one must be sleeping indeed who can look upon the heroic figures of the past and present, straining with their life's blood to save men from self-destruction, and not see in them an independent divine fire, which by their free will they have seized.

H. P. Blavatsky writes in *The Secret Doctrine*:

“The closer the union between the mortal reflexion MAN and his celestial PROTOTYPE, the less dangerous the external conditions and subsequent reincarnations — which neither Buddhas nor Christs can escape. This is not superstition, least of all is it *Fatalism*. The latter implies a blind course of some still blinder power, and man is a free agent during his stay on earth. He cannot escape his *ruling* Destiny, but he has the choice of two paths that lead him in that direction, and he can reach the goal of misery — if such is decreed to him, either in the snowy white robes of the Martyr, or in the soiled garments of a volunteer in the iniquitous course; for, there are *external and internal conditions* which affect the determination of our will upon our actions, and it is in our power to follow either of the two.”— Vol. I, p. 639

Through the exercise of this power man carves his way to godhood, adjusting the results of his mistakes until he works only through the Higher Law — at peace, at last, with all the elements of his nature.

SCIENTIFIC ITEMS

H. TRAVERS, M. A.

ALCOHOL



ALCOHOLIC liquors have a directly pernicious action on the brain, and especially upon a certain important organ thereof. Doctors become, with every day, if we may judge from their quoted utterances, more and more of the opinion that alcohol, even in small quantities, does nothing but harm. But, even if it could be shown (which however seems not to be the case) that alcohol benefits the *physical* health, we should still condemn its use, on the ground that

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

such alleged benefit is gained at the expense of more essential functions in our constitution. Its action may be described as a poking of the fire, or a bleeding of the cow (instead of milking her); and it need not be denied that such violent means may often be productive of a temporary flood of energy — energy of a certain kind.

A dose of alcohol will liberate a quantity of the stored up virtues of the body; it will unlock the bank of life and draw large checks; and though we may have a large enough balance to last a lifetime, payment has to be made somewhere. It is an acknowledged fact that the debt is handed on to subsequent generations, in the form of debilitated and neurotic constitutions; and what science has discovered with reference to the mechanism of heredity supports the conclusions drawn from experience, that a generation may be skipped, and vitiated germ-cells transmitted by a parent who is herself free from alcoholism.

And, speaking of heredity, Theosophy recognises more than one sort. Not only may I be the parent of a child by the ordinary process of procreation, but I am surely the parent of my own future life. It is simply an item in the doctrine of Karma that an overdraft, if not honored in the present incarnation, becomes chargeable to a future incarnation; so that I have but a doubtful right to blame ancestors for merely providing me with the kind of body which I have incurred for myself by my own past actions.

At best, alcohol feeds the grosser nature at the expense of the finer; and does even that much in a very clumsy and wasteful manner. It is admitted that its seemingly stimulating effect is in reality an inhibitive effect; that is, it deadens certain useful and necessary brakes and checks whose proper function is to prevent waste and to regulate functions. Mentally speaking, this becomes equivalent to a deadening of the conscience, a removal of the sense of shame. Such effects are apparent enough in the case of acute alcoholism; and the same must apply, with necessary changes, to chronic alcoholism — that is, to moderate drinking.

One seems to remember that medieval belief spoke of the existence of a kind of obsessing demons called 'just halvers,' because they were prudent enough to give their victim one half of what they took; just as though a wicked uncle, keeping the child in ignorance of the heritage, should hand him out from time to time a small sum, while appropriating an equal or a larger amount for himself. Alcohol, together with other drugs, must surely be an instance of this wily process; and it is an interesting reflexion that people must often pay through the nose, for their ignorance, by falling victim to tricks of this sort.

SCIENTIFIC ITEMS

MIND AND BODY

DOES a physical ailment cause a mental ailment, or does the mental ailment cause the physical? It is both ways of course, and when regarding the matter from one side we should not forget the other. Mind and body act and react on each other. Wrong thoughts set up a wrong bodily condition, and this in turn reacts on the mind; and so it may go on until the condition grows into a fixed habit — into a character.

Is there then no escape from this wheel? Yes, because mind and body are both servants, servants or instruments of a superior power independent of them both. Thus the remedy for such a condition, if we have decided that it is inconvenient and ought to be changed, is to operate upon mind and body both.

Take a particular case for illustration — depression. That was doubtless set up originally by the mind and indulged until it bred a condition in the body. The result of this is that moods of depression are apt to arise at any time, without apparent cause. Usually however we invent a cause; every circumstance that meets us wears a black aspect, and we delude ourself with the idea that the evil is in the circumstance; whereas it is in us. It is when this condition reaches an extreme limit that we begin to suspect its delusive character.

When a man starts grumbling at every single thing, one after another, you realize that there is something the matter with *him*. And can you do this in your own case? It is not so easy, but not so difficult either; it only requires candor and a little sacrifice of self-love.

If we were a great deal more sensitive and delicately organized than we are, a wrong thought or mood would make us ill at once. This happens to some extent even as things are. But usually there is a more or less prolonged interval between the mental cause and its physical effect. A large class of ailments could be traced back to wrong mental attitude at some time in the past. By that mental attitude we built ourself a certain sort of body; and now we find ourself encumbered with it, after our mental attitude is changed.

The distinction between mind and body is probably not altogether valid, and thus is likely to lead to wrong conclusions. At all events we cannot push this distinction to the extent of regarding mind and body as two entirely separate things. In actual experience we find that an undesirable condition exists within us, and has to be gotten rid of; and it may not help much to try and define too closely whether it is the mind or the body that is afflicted.

A rest, especially a sleep, will remove part of the burden that we

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

are carrying, and thereby enable the will to cope successfully with the remainder of the load. We ought to practise the art of postponing the consideration of difficulties until more favorable opportunities. "I can never settle this question as long as I am in this nervous state; my thoughts keep running around in a circle; let me postpone the matter for a while until my nerves have quieted down."

But the best remedy is to bear in mind that the true nature of man lies in the impersonal, and that, if he can move away from himself, he will find healing for both body and mind.

LOGIC

LOGIC is often sneered at, but there is nothing the matter with logic. There is nothing the matter with the rules of arithmetic when sums fail to come out correct. The stricter a rule is, the more monstrous are the results likely to be when it is broken. And so with logic: the poor results it so often yields are due to the fact that its rules are not followed.

I have never heard two people argue fairly, and do not expect ever to. Not merely do they break the rules of logic through ignorance, but they will stoop to any trick for the purpose of carrying their point. Is it any wonder that such monstrous results are reached? And is it fair to blame logic or human reason for these consequences?

"Men are taller than women: I am a man, and you are a woman: therefore I am taller than you." This is just a sample of the kind of argument that passes muster for logic; only we have put it bald and naked, instead of wrapped up in verbiage.

Any article or book you may read will be found teeming with logical fallacies. We do not propose here to write an elementary text-book on logic, so we refer the reader to such a book if he wants to know what the rules of logic are, and what are the commonest fallacies. All we want to do at present is to defend logic and the reasoning mind against unfair charges that are brought against it by people who simply do not know how to use it. The fact that such bunglers do not succeed merely proves the validity of the laws against which they are trespassing. If the rules of arithmetic were not rigid, it is possible that a wrong calculation might lead to a right answer; but, since a wrong calculation leads to a wrong answer, this is a proof that the rules are rigid.

As a means of discovery, logic has its uses, subject to limitation. It is possible to grope one's way around a room, but much quicker and surer to use the eyes and walk straight to one's goal. It is possible to

A MEDITATION IN LOMALAND

prove that an orange is an orange by showing that it is not anything else; but the process is tedious and full of pitfalls. It is by no process of logic (commonly understood as such, at least) that we recognise each other when we meet. Logic is more in its element when it acts after the event — when, after the discovery is made, it traces out the path by which the discovery was made, or maps out the links between hypothesis and conclusion.

Men of science once argued that a boat which was deep in the water would drift down a stream at the same rate as a log which floated shallow; but men of experience said that the log would drift faster. As soon as this was shown by experiment to be true, science set about finding the reason; which was, that the layers of water slide over each other, so that the surface water moves faster than the water lower down. But there was nothing wrong with science; this ought to have been foreseen, only it wasn't. Other instances might be cited to similar effect: it is so hard to foresee everything, to allow for every possibility.

As a boy I had a book on aeronautics wherein it was proved conclusively by an eminent authority that a machine lighter than air could not be steered. He said that the analogy of a ship did not hold good, because the ship is in the water and reacts on the air; whereas the airship is all in the one element. One must suppose that this bigwig had never swum under water.

We have recently read where someone argues against the possibility of telepathy, on the ground that, in a particular case where it would have been most desirable and apparently most easy, it did not in fact occur. An infirm old man collapses in his chair; he tries to call the attention of his wife, sitting with her back to him; but she is stone deaf, and he dies. Hence telepathy is not true! How easy to prove what we want! How easy to beguile our willing auditors with a show of logic!

A MEDITATION IN LOMALAND

E. J. DADD

T is in the plan of Nature that all life should be embosomed in beauty, and if we seek her unselfishly she is generous with her treasure. Her consciousness varies during the day: when the warm glow of morning on the eastern hills is reflected in the west on the rim of the vast Pacific horizon, then the tide of life is

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

rising and pressing gently through the all-pervading peace, and our hearts naturally yearn and aspire. . . .

*Beauty in the blush of the dawning,
Brimmed like a cup of rich wine,
Burst o'er the rim of the morning,
Flow through the hearts that are thine.*

Nature prospers other feelings as the day advances, when there is work to be done, and the song of life pulses merrily in the sea-breeze sweeping up over the hills. . . .

*Out of the deep, unto the deep,
Welling and flowing,
Over the sea, over the land,
Breezes are blowing:
Over the forests and over the flowers,
Into the valleys and ferny bowers,
— Heigh! and away!*

*Out of the deep, unto the deep,
Whirling and winging,
Over the sea, over the land,
Breezes are singing:
Whispering secrets out of the past,
Bearing them onward into the vast,
— Heigh! and away!*

*Out of the deep, unto the deep,
Urging and pouring,
Over the sea, over the land,
Breezes are soaring:
Far o'er the plains and far o'er the hills,
Over the rivers and rocky rills,
— Heigh and away!*

And then at midday, in the forest, beneath the shelter of the thick leafage, there rests a great quietude, a deep contentment. . . .

*Here beneath the quiet trees,
Dim-shadowing, wide-spreading,
Dwells an age-old spirit of peace,
Long-lingering, soft-treading.*

West of the trees, in the canyons that lead to the shore, the growth on the southern slopes is luxuriant after the spring rains. The moist

A MEDITATION IN LOMALAND

mosses clinging to the steep banks are the happy earth itself grown more conscious: they flow down under the bushes, pause on the edge of the pathway, and continue beyond as though they had leapt the intervening space. On the gliding green current is a multitude of flowers, mingled with ferns and grasses. Down in the distance is a V-shaped glimpse of the sea, with its white lines of breaking waves, framed by the steep sides of the canyon.

Let us go down to the shore where the tide has ebbed, and the seaweed lies neatly combed by the sweep of the last wave that surmounted the rocks. It rests in a deep slumber, pervaded by the atmosphere of other-worldness that belongs to the sea. When the next wave of the returning tide foams across, it will bestir itself slightly, and the hissing bubbles will sink through it and out of sight. Then, later on, when the sea has well risen, it will awaken fully and spread its branching beauty in the swaying water.

Surely the sea is a world of mystery, and magically so at sunset, when the tide of the day's life is ebbing. As I look from my window, each tree and shrub, the very earth itself, is radiating a glow of feeling, related in some way to the pageant of the sunset, and a luminous presence comes up out of the sea, forming part of a great Silence. . . .

*As the sea and the sky blend their radiance and die,
In the breath of their passing is born from the twain
The soul of their beauty incarnate again
In a soft-spreading shadow that crosses the shore,
And reaches dim fingers through casement and door.*

Seeking the inner life of Nature, we find our Self.

"Imagination," says Katherine Tingley, "is . . . a power innate in everyone, and that which might help each to find his Soul. It is the handmaiden of the God in man, and our guide into that Kingdom of Heaven within, which is the realm of thought where the Soul speaks to the heart and mind . . . in the silent places of our lives, in the moments when we verge upon greatness, when an overwhelming consciousness comes in upon us of the universality of the Divine Life, and of the divine possibilities latent in man; when the silences of great Nature cry to us tidings of the God in ourselves, and we feel the nearness, the companionship, of That which it would be presumption to define, but in Whose universal presence we must tinge our thoughts and feelings with a certain solemnity, a mystery and grandeur . . . before the Mirror of this Infinite Beauty,—in the Temple of this Majesty—standing in an attitude of larger reverence . . . in silence. . . ."

ELECTRON THEORY ON THE WOBBLE

T. HENRY, M. A.

HE times move so rapidly that it may be thought difficult for us older folk to keep up with them; yet, paradoxically enough, it is possible that more progress in this way may be made by those who stand still than by those who run. Certainly, if a horse is running around in a circle, you are more likely to catch him by staying where you are than by chasing in his rear.

The above is pertinent to some remarks we have seen that the electronic theory of matter is having its foundations examined, and that wise heads are beginning to shake in doubt as to the stability thereof. In a word, the theory begins to look nebulous to some eyes, while others declare they have detected a wobble. This is hard on people who have labored to swallow that theory and thought they had managed to digest most of it; to others it may be a relief.

We may be apt to forget to what an extent this structure of matter has been built in the imagination — that scientific imagination which Tyndall has bequeathed to us. When the atom itself is far and away too small for the keenest instruments to discern, the electron, if there are degrees of invisibility, is more invisible still. It is in fact, an inference; we suspect it by a study of what we see happening. This picture of a central nucleus of positive electricity, surrounded by planetary orbs of negative electricity, was devised to explain certain happenings. But now comes someone who claims to have another theory which will explain things just as well or even better.

When we construct such a theory in our imagination, we almost inevitably import into this new world many familiar attributes of the larger world in which we live — three-dimensional space, volume, mass, inertia, etc., etc., — a policy which is not deemed to be philosophically valid. To explain what lies behind mechanism, we devise more mechanism! We cut up our little particles into still littler particles — and so ad infinitum.

The official method of science is to observe facts, to co-ordinate these by provisional hypotheses, and to use these hypotheses for the discovery of other facts. Yet discovery often runs so fast that hypothesis is left behind. Experimenters find out more than the hypothesis warranted. It is safe to say that more has been found out by experiment than by induction; which leaves the theorist to find explanations after the event.

VALEDICTORY: R. MACHELL

KENNETH MORRIS

I

MACHELL, how oft when we foregathered here,
Our comrade-thoughts out-traveling made their goal
That far and glimmering Gate beyond the pole
Of earthly concepts, which, O Brave and Dear!
You have passed, wondering, through — now that so clear
Your course lies sunward, heartward; and all made whole,
That which knew pain, is not; and you are the Soul,
Sunset's and Dawn's and Truth's and Victory's peer

Throned in the Deathless. For though you wing your way
Through this kind Universe now made your shrine
To the ultimate Fairylands of Wizard Peace,
Or but postpone a little while the day
Of your return, we know that, being divine,
Neither our love for you, nor your work, can cease.

II

Robed in the Sea, and beautiful as Noon,
Your hallowed presence passes toward the West,
All without sign of weariness: no rest
Demanded or desired where, starry-strewn
In gold and lazuli and azure, soon
Shall sphere on sphere of beauty yield to the quest
Of pilgrim feet so joyously addressed
Beyond the Empire of the Sun and Moon.

O Heart that never was but constant here,
And held within only the Worlds of Light,
Take what you will of singing sphere and sphere —
The song, the rainbow glories yours by right!
Then, since Heaven cannot hold Heaven's heroes down,
Find here again in toil your hero's crown!

III

A new companionship has come to be
Under the stars. I have not seen till now

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Night wear Altair and Vega on her brow
With such solicitude, so tenderly;
Nor young Capella flash such jewelry;
Nor Capricorn so whitely a blossom-bough.
What Heart of Beauty floods the dark, to endow
With such sweet consolation, sky and sea?

Ah, when we watched the setting moon of old
Her subtil glory squander there afar,
And the gray sea burn silver through these leaves,
Or even some slow wave wink and sparkle gold:
You were not then so near as now you are,
Being heart and parcel of all this peace! Who grieves?

*International Theosophical Headquarters,
Point Loma, California*

THOSE WHO ONLY HALF-LIVE

LYDIA ROSS, M. D.

(Stenographic Report of Extemporaneous Address delivered at a meeting conducted by the William Quan Judge Theosophical Club, in the Rotunda of the Râja-Yoga Academy, Point Loma, California, Sunday evening, November 13, 1927)

EAR Leader, Mr. Chairman and Comrades: I am very much impressed with the fact that Arjuna's despondency, as outlined in the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*, which has been the topic of discussion this evening, was dependent upon the fact that he was only half-alive — the subject upon which I have been asked to speak. Had he been fully alive to his possibilities, he certainly would not have been despondent. I believe we can all take that home to ourselves: that if we were alive to who we are and what we are and to our own powers, it would be impossible to discourage us.

Evidently it is the lower nature operating in Arjuna that is as willing to defeat him with despondency as with any other weapon; and I am not sure but what we are all defeated, and that we do surrender to that, quite as often as to anything more vigorous, more alive.

In our recent memorial services for dear Dr. Coryn, the Leader spoke as though, if he could send a message back to us, it would be to emphasize the value of life; and as we comrades are allied to our Teachers

THOSE WHO ONLY HALF-LIVE

and our Leaders through our higher natures, so we often have a peculiar link with each other through our weaknesses.

Life is said to be a paradox. Perhaps that was never more peculiarly so than in the present age, when all the critics speak of life as being too strenuous. And yet there is no question that we are not too much alive in any of the departments of life; for we are only half-alive. The specialists all emphasize the perfection of their particular specialty, and teach that the world would be so much better if everyone were quite up to their standard. And yet they teach but one phase of life.

H. P. Blavatsky said that "Theosophy is the science of life and the art of living." And truly outside of Theosophy there is no one specialist who really gives us any clue to the art of life.

If humanity as a whole were alive to their possibilities, to their best possibilities, surely in the world of music and art there would be no ground to question or discuss the matter of jazz and cubistic monstrosities, and all that. If the artists were alive to the perfection of harmony and of art, they would see no reason to discuss the imperfections, which are simply bizarre novelties, as it were.

If we were alive to our possibilities as physical human beings, I believe that we could do much more for our health than we do. I believe that we would depend less upon the pills and the powders, if we were not so closely identified with our pet diseases and our familiar symptoms. If the scientists who are trying to find the new serums and all that, were alive to the possibilities of the human being, they would not expect through vivisection to get the key to nature's harmonious action.

If we were as alive to the human possibilities as nature's creatures are to their possibilities, certainly the world would be quite different from what it is today. One can wander out into the woods, along the sea-shore, anywhere, and see the insects and the creatures of a day that are as alive and alert and as busy and as purposeful with their duties, as they can be. They are living up to all there is in them. And can we say that there is a human being who is doing that? Hardly.

The most wonderful advance in the discovery and the use of nature's finer forces is engaging the attention of the world today. And yet men seem to have no idea that all those amazing nature-forces are but symbols of finer and more potent forces in the human being. The reason is that they are looking outside of themselves instead of inside themselves; and while we are always anxious to 'fix the blame,' and we might look back on the old theology and on materialistic science, it is a question whether we Theosophists, who have a better knowledge of life,

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

are really living up to the full value of it, or doing quite as well as our parents did, whose lives often went out far beyond the theology which they had and who really had much more of the spirit of devotion.

There must be times when every one has moments of inspiration, whether through suffering or through some beautiful experience; and the most intense suffering or the most beautiful experience has always left one feeling much more natural, and much more like himself or herself, than at other times. And the question is why are we not always alive to our best selves? Life is cyclic, up and down; but if we really believe in ourselves, if we were really alive to ourselves, I question whether this despondency of Arjuna would defeat us quite so often.

H. P. Blavatsky said at one time that we are eternally self-deceived; and we are probably as much lacking in our knowledge of our lower selves as of our higher selves. If we were willing, if we had the courage, to face our own weaknesses, it would only be because the Higher Self was looking at them! The lower nature will certainly never face itself, never face the truth.

As has been said already this evening, the performance of duty is the talisman and the key; and as duty places each one equidistant from the truth within, the simple duty of the day, whatever it may be, when we are working under a real Leader, gives each one *the* opportunity which belongs to him, to find *the* truth for himself. Although no two blades of grass are alike, and no two human beings are alike, the unfolding of the nature, according to its degree of evolution, will come, if each one puts all that is in himself into the duty of the hour. Illumination may be just as brilliant while washing the dishes or while hoeing the garden as in any highbrow activity.

That we have been taught this and have the unusual opportunity of living it out, obligates us to pass the fact on to those outside who have not our philosophy of life. Day by day, in one way and another, there are little items that come out in the literature and in the news that show that Theosophical thought is permeating the social mind in a most hopeful way.

I would like to say a word for the older people, who think that if they can just sit comfortably for the rest of their days, that is all there is in life for them. I know that some of these old people can make an incarnation in consciousness within a few years; and I know also that some of them can make some karma by missing their opportunities that they will hate to face in the next life.

As for these younger people, these younger members, I do not

NEWS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD

think that any words can make plain the opportunities which they have. It is not so easy with a whole lifetime for a background to make changes. There is neither any particular spot nor any particular moment, when one suddenly makes a turn-over and leaves all his weaknesses behind; but it is step by step that we climb. It is so much easier to make the right habits when one is younger than it ever will be again.

Of course we have been told this in much better language a dozen times, and the Leader has told it all to us; and as one of the holy men in India said at one time: "Do not try to do good, but be good." And so the inspiration of the Leader, her presence, herself, her living truth, is the most convincing thing; and in so far as we can even in degree, just follow that, we shall be doing something to be more alive to ourselves.

NEWS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD

OBSERVER



THE discoveries of alleged writings of prehistoric man at Glozel, near Vichy, France, have been mentioned recently in these columns as being of unusual interest, but the latest report is that the international committee appointed by the International Scientific Congress at Amsterdam a few months ago, which has been studying the subject with great care, has decided against the antiquity of the writings, the 'tomb,' the oven, and some of the bones. These are said to be less than a century old, but some of the other articles found in the collection are probably truly prehistoric.

The report, as briefly summarized in a cable from France, is very puzzling and contains palpable inconsistencies. Before intelligent comment can be made we need to see a more accurate statement. It is hard to see why such an elaborate fake, as claimed in the report, should have been made in the mid-Victorian period, and not discovered till now. The practical joke, if such it can have been, has failed to make any point until all who devised it have been long in their graves.

The chief argument against the antiquity of the carvings is that they are claimed to have been cut with iron tools. It is an axiom among most archaeologists that iron tools were not used by man till comparatively recent times. A few archaeologists are not fully convinced that prehistoric man knew nothing of iron — a metal which perishes by oxidation so quickly,— and, as we pointed out in the April, 1927, number of this magazine on page 357, it is the opinion of Mr. A. H. Verrill of the

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Heyes Foundation, that certain undoubtedly archaic sculptures could only have been cut by iron chisels.

The mystery of the Glazel artifacts has provoked the most furious discussion, reaching even to personal insults and threatened legal action. It looks as if we may safely conclude that the problem is not finally solved and further interesting reports are not unlikely to be presented.



AMONG the great conquerors of past centuries whose graves have been quite lost to sight, Attila the Hun and Genghis Khan are specially prominent. Last October reports were published in the press that their burial-places had been found. Tradition has always said that Attila was buried near the village of Afgalva in Hungary, and recently while digging in that neighborhood, workmen discovered a number of Roman weapons, coins, pottery, and other articles. No details are yet to hand, but it does not seem unlikely that these objects mark the tomb of the 'Scourge of God.'

Regarding Genghis Khan's tomb, an apparently well-founded report of its discovery is credited to Professor Peter Kozloff, a well-known Russian explorer who has been working in Asia for many years and has made many remarkable finds. If the published story is genuine, the discovery is one of the most wonderful of the century; in fact it is so sensational that one hesitates to accept it without further corroboration.

According to the press-report, the tomb has never been really lost, but only kept secret from the outside world in general by lamas who have guarded it for seven hundred years. How Professor Kozloff was able to discover it has not yet been published.

The Great Khan's remains are said to lie in a silver sarcophagus resting on the crowns of seventy-eight conquered rulers, and the wonders of the tomb vie with those of Tutankhamen. The tomb stands in a large hall about forty feet square lying behind a labyrinth of passages cut into a mountainside. Strange ceremonies and weird events are said to take place there. Every seventh hour one of the seven lamas in charge strikes a great jade bell hanging above the sarcophagus; and the lamas told Professor Kozloff that once a year the Khan's spirit returns to earth, blows out the lamps, and, by using a lama's hand, writes the events of the coming year.

Certain privileged Mongols as well as the Khan's descendants pay their respects to his memory, in the tomb, once a year. The career and exploits of Genghis Khan are so amazing that nothing but the indisputable evidence available could persuade anyone to believe them, and hardly anything could be told about the wonders of his tomb more sur-

EVENTS IN THE LIVES OF GREAT MEN

prising than the cold-blooded account of the events of his life. The war-like deeds of Alexander or Napoleon fade almost into insignificance beside the accounts of his conquests. Historians claim that he learned his extraordinary skill in strategy and tactics from the Chinese who, though intrinsically a peace-loving race, were supreme in the art of war. Genghis Khan's hardest fighting took place when he turned his arms against Southern China.

If the report of the discovery of this magnificent tomb prove correct, as seems likely from the standing of Professor Kozloff, it will be still another proof that, as H. P. Blavatsky said, the earth has great surprises for us concealed under its apparently undisturbed surface, or in the possession of those who will not reveal them till the proper time, surprises which will revolutionize many accepted beliefs.



THERE is a well-known tradition in Sweden that from time immemorial the people of that country have belonged to the same race, and have changed very little if at all. This has been hotly disputed, but a strong piece of evidence in its favor has just appeared. Deep in a marsh in Östergötland, near the cloister-ruins of Alvastra, remains of palisades and wooden huts built on piles, have just been found, which are declared by the State antiquarian authorities to be the oldest human habitations in northern Europe. The palisades were evidently used to protect the cattle against hunters or wild beasts. The measurements of the skulls of these, presumably Neolithic, people are identical with those of modern Swedes, and thus the old tradition is confirmed.

EVENTS IN THE LIVES OF GREAT MEN

F. MACALPIN

(A Paper read at the meeting of the William Quan Judge Theosophical Club,
Sunday evening, November 27, 1927)



SOME are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." So says Shakespeare through the mouthpiece of the yellow-stockinged, cross-gartered Malvolio. But wherein lay this pompous cockerel's contemplated greatness? In the fact of being his mistress Lady Olivia's husband, probably to spend the rest of his life as a country squire, and pass into oblivion unknown as great save to his own important self.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

The degree of greatness of a man's life is purely relative, as is everything else. I may consider one great in so far as he affects the thoughts in my life, or how his acts or thoughts stir my imagination; but to you the view is different, the relation of ideas is not the same. I may be very enthusiastic over the beautiful shades of natural coloring in the paintings of a certain artist, while you may be shocked and horrified at his entire lack of form and composition. You may admire the author with a fantastic imagination, while I may enjoy another's bold realism. And thus, the relativity of circumstances occurs all through the scheme of our lives.

What, then, is true greatness? From the foregoing paragraphs it would follow naturally that true greatness consists of a worthy example which all may follow to the greatest possible good of all. It is the noble actions and thoughts of those we know of as great that most deeply affect our lives and evoke our admiration and intensify our aspiration, and it is these acts and thoughts, and not ugly statues and busts of their features, that will remind mankind for years to come of their nobility of character. Why can we not cherish only the spirit of a man's life and efforts, without coming too close to the personal?

A few years ago, while standing in front of a statue of one of our most notable national characters, I was much interested in the remarks passed by several average citizens, one of which was to the effect that the notable in question (or rather his statue), looked like "the gink that sweeps out Riley's store." -- What price glory?

Men who are at present generally considered among the great, may be placed in two classes: leaders of men, and leaders of thought. The former class includes principally military and political characters. The events, as well as the results of the events in the lives of these leaders forms a large part of national and international history. Unfortunately the bad comes down with the good, and whatever virtues may be recorded are fairly evenly balanced in most cases with wholesale murderings, intrigue, and indulgent personality.

However, what was it that brought these great ones to their height and power; why were they leaders of men? It would be hard to generalize a proper reply to this query, because of the relativity of our different opinions of their greatness, but I believe that one of the foremost reasons in the majority of cases has been a fundamental knowledge of human nature, and secondly, a capability for the most advantageous use of the intellect. We should not neglect the intellect because of a mistaken idea that it is a hindrance to the functioning of intuition; rather should we develop it to its highest point and in its loftiest aspects

EVENTS IN THE LIVES OF GREAT MEN

as an aid to intuition, and as a very important factor in the acquirement of true wisdom. It is the abuse of the intellect and not its development that shuts the door on intuition.

The most successful leaders of men have realized the true value of example. They knew that if they were to expect faith and loyalty from their followers, then they themselves must show faith and trust in turn. They knew the true value of those who think for themselves, as also they know the power of co-operative thought, and gathered about them the brightest minds to produce the most effective results. They knew the power of definite decision, and the unnerving effect of doubt, and they could see those qualities in men which would best suit them for their various purposes. Thus they are known to us as great.

In the other class are the leaders of thought, those who have learned through events in their lives various phases of the philosophy of life, and have handed these down to us by word or writing. Here again it would be better if only the impersonal were left for us to learn from. Personality is such an unsatisfactory element to deal with, and shakes the foundations of our beliefs sometimes with its crude inconsistencies.

After knowing of the virtues of some great captain, or admiring the philosophy of a thinker, it is disquieting to the sensibilities, to say the least, suddenly to hear that this captain was an incessant masticator of garlic, or that thinker only shaved half his face in order to return a clever retort to those who asked him why. The heroes of boyhood often in this way come down in estimation point by point as we grow older. Probably neither the captain nor the thinker ever imagined that these events would reach posterity. Unfortunately for these idiosyncracies, however, paid publicity agents are not the only ones who know how to write, nor are loyal followers rendered unobservant by devotion.

So we find that the events in the lives of these great ones that mean the most to all of us are those which portray nobility of character, purity of purpose, strength in decision, and faith in themselves and mankind.

There is a third class of noble ones, who work, unheralded and unsung; be their world large or small they help to keep it cheerful and harmonious; saying nothing of themselves, and very little of anything else. They may number hundreds, or thousands, or millions, but they are truly great. They are doing what they consider their fullest duty, and so form the balance-wheel that steadies the rhythmic progress of humanity.