

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

KATHERINE TINGLEY, EDITOR

VOL. VI

FEBRUARY, 1914

NO. 2

We describe Karma as that Law of readjustment which ever tends to restore disturbed equilibrium in the physical, and broken harmony in the moral world. We say that Karma does not act in this or that particular way always, but that it always *does* act so as to restore Harmony and preserve the balance of equilibrium, in virtue of which the Universe exists. — *H. P. Blavatsky*

THE STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN DEAD:

by H. T. Edge, M. A.



A DISCUSSION of the subject of "Life After Death" has caused a correspondent to send to a newspaper two quotations from Gladstone, which are here reproduced. They are stated to be from pages 253 and 254 of his *Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler*.

The Christian dead are in a progressive state; and the appointed office of the interval between death and resurrection is reasonably believed to be the corroboration of every good and holy habit, and the effacement of all remains of human infirmity and vice.

[The stains of sins] will have to be effaced by a process of discipline, happy indeed in its result, but of which we have no right to assert . . . that the redeeming and consummating process will be accomplished without an admixture of salutary and accepted pain.

Christian eschatology is doubtless ably and copiously treated in doctrinal works and even in some encyclopaedias, but it can hardly be said to constitute matter of common knowledge or interest. Indeed, the subject is very generally eschewed or treated but vaguely and allusively. One curious result of this state of affairs is that Theosophists find people criticising Theosophical teachings on grounds which would also condemn their own religious teachings, did they know what these latter are. One should be sure of one's own ground before criticising.

What more interesting and important religious topic can there be than that which concerns the state of the soul after corporeal death? Yet how greatly is this topic ignored! Theosophists have often pointed out the inadequacy of current doctrines to give an explanation suitable to our sense of fitness or to answer questions that must be answered; yet they have been criticised for offering an explanation similar to the one dimly outlined in the above quotation from a great Christian writer.

There are many sincere and earnest Christians who have challenged Theosophy, and who are of course above the tactics (adopted by some people) of mere misrepresentation and calumny. Yet it behooves them to find some answer to Theosophy, and they realize that they must dig deeper into the mines of their own religion for the wherewithal to find this answer.

Should they not, therefore, be prepared to give a satisfactory doctrine relating to the after-life of the soul? This is what the writer of the passages has endeavored to do; and if Christians were better read in their own divinity, they would find that many other divines have made the same attempt.

The writer must have realized that man, as he leaves the earth, is not fit to enter heaven; nor could the writer's reason accommodate itself to the notion of a *sudden* and wholesale purification. Hence he infers a gradual process. Moreover he sees that this process must be one of arduous and even painful discipline. Evidently, in his view, the Divine law does not act in contravention of natural logic. He uses the word "redeeming" in a way which shows that he does not accept the idea of a sudden redemption, such as we hear of in less intelligent, if equally devout, circles.

Yet, having gone thus far on the road of logic, where or why should we stop? We are led to ask to what extent this idea of gradual purification through discipline accommodates itself to other parts of theological doctrine. It seems like sewing a Theosophical patch on to a theological garment, and is likely to result in the stronger material "taking from the old" and thereby making the rent worse than before. According to Theosophy, there is no place like this old earth for discipline of the soul; and, once having assumed that there is a process of purification, it is but a step farther to assume that this process is carried on upon the earth. If not, where is it carried on?

The conception of heaven has of course changed greatly in recent

years, and it would be pertinent to ask those who criticise Theosophy from the Christian standpoint to define their idea of heaven. Theosophists hold that there is a great lack of symmetry in the doctrine which regards a single earth-life of seventy years (or seventy days) as the prelude to an eternity of life in another realm. Another point to be remembered is that a true system of eschatology should also concern itself with the state of the soul (if any) before birth; for though eschatology means the discussion of future states, that discussion cannot well be separated from the subject of previous states.

Theosophists hold that there is far more in Christianity than has yet been gotten out of it; and, so far from attacking Christians, they merely ask them to study more deeply their religion. What has Christianity to teach about the nature of the soul, its origin, its destiny? Theosophy, in offering its answers to these questions, does not desire to uproot any true doctrine, but merely to help and to explain.

Some churches include a state of purgation in their theology, but the idea is not fully worked out and is too hard-and-fast.

We are too apt to overlook the fact that the soul must exist while we are on earth; for surely the soul is not created when we die. Hence the doctrine that the soul is immortal includes the doctrine that the soul exists now. But by its close contact with the animal nature, a complex *mind* arises — the mind with which we are familiar in our daily life. It is this mind that is the battleground of contending forces, the stage of the drama of human life. In it, purification is continually going on.

The idea of heaven has been doctrinally confounded with the idea of unending existence, and this has led many people to give up the idea altogether. But if heaven is a state of consciousness, it must be subject to laws of change and duration; and though it may last long, it cannot be unending. The very attempt to imagine an unending condition appals us.

In the Theosophic view, a man's life on earth is but one of a series; and heaven is the state of rest and bliss in which the Soul exists during the intervals between lives on earth. Though the duration of this state of bliss is finite, it is many times greater than the duration of a life on earth, and undoubtedly surpasses our most venturesome attempts to imagine the duration of an eternal heaven. Thus rested, the Soul returns to earth to renew its unfinished work. This is a very ancient doctrine, and those who would criticise it should be ready

to vindicate any alternative doctrine which they may wish to maintain. An appeal may be made to authority and revelation; yet we see that theologians are taking considerable liberties with these criterions; and in truth they are right in supposing that man's intelligence was given him to be used. Is not the universe itself the revelation of the Divine, and should we not try to understand this revelation?

It should be possible to deduce from man's nature his origin and his destiny, but a little help from those who have pondered the subject before is always welcome; and Theosophy, the garnered wisdom of ages, can help us to interpret life.

The quotations above given speak of the *Christian* dead, and at once we think of the non-Christian dead, and ask upon what grounds (if any) there can be another law for these latter. This raises the question of Religion and religions. Religions are many, but Religion is one. Christian advocates speak of Theosophy in its relation to Christianity; but what of the relation of Theosophy to the many other religions? If Christianity is to be considered as being on one side, while Theosophy is on the other, where do the other religions come in? Christians realize more nowadays that their religion cannot supplant other religions unless it can prove itself superior; for we no longer propagate religion by the sword. Theosophy would abolish this rivalry between religions by reminding them of their common origin and common root. They are all of them attempts to interpret life; but though the theories may differ, the facts of nature must be the same everywhere. If religion is a question of revelation, that revelation must come to man through his own inner faculties; the only alternative is that it should come through his outer faculties.

Yet we cannot accept as a guide the erring judgments of our wavering opinion. Modern science, by limiting its sphere, leaves aside the questions to which people want an answer. Theories will not suffice; still less mere dogmas, or doubts and negations. We must fall back on the ancient teaching that wisdom proceeds from the purified heart, and our watchwords must be Duty and Charity.

We are neither in the hands of an arbitrary ruler nor a ruthless machine, but under wise and unerring laws, whose nature we may glimpse from their manifestation in our own best nature. We need have no fears as to the fate of our Soul after death, so long as we reverence it in life. Nor need we wait until after death for the "purification by discipline" of which the writer speaks. We can begin it

now; and begin it in ourselves, instead of waiting for some power to begin it for us. The discipline will be plentifully provided by our circumstances, so all we have to do is to adjust ourselves to them. In this way the grosser parts of our character are removed and the finer and stronger qualities shine out. Life is a continuous process, and we can live in eternity while yet in the body. The circumstances of life are calculated with a view to inducing man to exercise his Spiritual Will; but he is prone to the attitude of expectancy, as though he wished a divine power to do for him that which he should do for himself.

MANY RELIGIONS, ONE RELIGION: by Magister Artium



HERE are 2767 religions in the world, according to a statistician. Is any one of these religions right and the remaining 2766 wrong? And, if so, which? Or are they all wrong — or all right? The only sensible answer seems to be that they all have more or less of truth in them, mingled with less or more of error. A dry fact like this is apt to strike the mind forcibly and to make us realize that we do most of our thinking in a very narrow circle and on an insufficient basis of fact. Is there any more reason for setting one religion over another than there is for setting one language over another? There are about the same number of languages in the world, some old, some newer, some largely used, others slightly used, some better than the average, others worse. If it is not the same with the religions, why is it not?

Clearly we cannot reasonably judge religions differently from languages, races, or customs. But, though there are many tongues, many races, many customs, there is but one humanity. Applying this analogy, ought we not to arrive at the conclusion that the oneness of humanity underlies and overrules the multiplicity of religions, just as it does the multiplicity of tongues and races?

Mankind is essentially one, amid countless differences in detail. The more man lives in the essential part of his nature, the more he realizes the unity; and the more he lives in externals, the greater do the differences appear. Some would have it that the only point of oneness among all the races of mankind is the possession of a physical

body and its attendant instincts. If this be so, then the only basis of union among races would be an animalistic basis, such as might be supposed to subsist between refugees cast on a desert isle.

But mankind is *spiritually* one, and this is the key to the solution of the religious difficulty. Many religions, but only one Religion.

A very large number of the extant languages have been traced by philologists to their source in a common language, and correspondingly the races have been traced back to a common race, called Aryan, and believed to have lived in the highlands of Central Asia. Now what about the religions? Again, what about the races not included in the above scheme, those of Africa and America, and Polynesia? To find a common origin we must go further back.

History has given us a picture of the division of races, the dispersal of mankind, the confusion of tongues; events pictured in many an ancient legend and folk-story. Perhaps we are now approaching a cycle of reunion, when the scattered fragments shall grow together once more. Science has wonderfully woven the world together — physically; and a closer union is necessitated. People forced to dwell together have to adjust and harmonize themselves. Hence religious barriers break down and other barriers too.

The wise, the saintly, the enlightened, in every land and every creed, have always been above and beyond formal religion; their knowledge and purity has sprung from an inner fount. But the full manifestation of Divinity requires, not an individual, but a harmonious society of individuals to work through. Hence, when the proper conditions arise, we may look for the manifestation of Light and Wisdom. And these conditions are that mankind should be united. Such people as do now dwell in interior harmony, aspiring after the good, do doubtless constitute an invisible church, of which they are the unconscious members. This is an idea that has occurred to some Christian theologians. Such an inner fellowship must surely exist. But it cannot be revealed to our minds until our minds are fitted to receive the revelation. Thus, it is necessary for the aspirant to Wisdom to “regain the child-state he has lost.”

The Tree is a well-known mystic symbol and represents branches springing from a single stem. Humanity is a tree, and this tree is divided into races and sub-races and smaller and smaller offshoots until we get down to the hairs on the leaves, which for present purposes may be taken to represent individuals. Applying this symbol

practically, we may infer that individuals are bound together in families, the families into larger divisions and so on; and that a common sap runs through all. But this is more than a mere analogy. Humanity is actually thus connected by a common vitality. Brotherhood is achieved by a recognition of this fact. Men do not need to force a fictitious brotherhood, but to recognize a real and actually existing brotherhood.

There is an antipathy between certain races, which prevails as long as their members accentuate the external differences; but becomes less and less in proportion as they accentuate their spiritual unity. In fact, the law is the same for races as for individuals; and the same principles must be applied in overcoming the antagonism. We ought to know how to adapt ourselves to persons of different temperament from our own; and the same should be true of races. But the subject at present is religious, and here again the same rule should prevail. That rule is — how to harmonize contraries. This result is successfully achieved in music and other arts and crafts, and indeed there could be no harmony if all were unison. “Many minds, one heart” is a well-known adage which applies here.

But it is necessary for each one to dig deeper into his own religion, so that he may reach the place where differences disappear in the stronger light of common conviction. Do we all believe in the essential Divinity of man? If so, this forms one common ground. Do we all believe that unselfishness is the true law of human life, and that selfishness breeds destruction? If so, here is another bond between religions. And many other such links — tenets of the one universal Religion — might be enumerated.

But religion may be made a tribal affair, or a racial or a local affair. Thereby it becomes limited and variance sets in between divers of these limited cults. The true practical solution lies in reconciling the many with the One, and in tolerating external differences while recognizing the internal oneness, just as is done in so many other affairs of life.

One conception of religion is that it is a species of tribal magic, or a means of uniting all its adherents into a great force which acts protectively and which (in some cases) overpowers the religions of other people. There is a certain amount of this idea in our notions of Christianity, but perhaps in this case “Christendom” is the better word. In this sense the religion is bound up with ideas and habits

in general, and works hand in glove with commerce and national ambition.

Some scholars analyse religion, delve into the history of cults, and speak as though this tribal religion were the only kind of religion there is. But the truth, in this case as in so many others, lies in the axiom that there is one Truth but many beliefs, one Sun but many lesser lights. It is Religion that must bind together men of diverse religions, as also of divers tongues and nationalities. And the unity of Religion is based on the Spiritual unity of mankind. If there is anything in our own particular religion that is of a universal character, it will survive and stand the test; but anything less will have to give way and take a lower place.

THE FUTURE, NOT THE PAST

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

NEW TIMES demand new measures and new men;
 The world advances, and in time outgrows
 The laws that in our father's days were best,
 And doubtless after us some purer scheme
 Will be shaped out by wiser men than we —
 Made wiser by the steady growth of truth.
 The time is ripe, and rotten-ripe, for change.
 Then let it come. I have no dread of what
 Is called for by the instinct of mankind,
 Nor think I that God's world would fall apart
 Because we tear a parchment more or less.
 Truth is eternal, but her effluence
 With endless change, is fitted to the hour;
 Her mirror is turned forward, to reflect
 The promise of the future, not the past.

ARTISTIC ANACHRONISMS: by R. W. Machell

ARTISTS of fame and skill have frequently, one might say almost universally, adopted the practice of introducing portraits of persons of note of their own period into pictures representing scenes from the lives of the patriarchs or incidents of Bible history; many have introduced their own portraits into such groups or into historical scenes of more modern times. Sculptors have not hesitated to display the persons of some celebrity of their day in Roman toga, or in some even less suitable robe, such as might have served more appropriately to disclose the anatomical elegance of a classic divinity than to veil the physical peculiarities of the politician, who in this disguise was called upon to face the rigors of a northern climate and the curiosity of the public gaze, perched on the perilous altitude of a marble pedestal in a public square. And these anachronisms were accepted as being in the best possible taste. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* I do not propose to question or criticise the taste of the day. Each age has its fashions, and they change too quickly for any but the very young to take them seriously. But one may study them as ephemeral expressions of permanent tendencies of the human mind; and as such one may find them deeply interesting. The instability of their forms of manifestation should not astonish us, any more than does the evanescence of the charms of a wild flower, or the elusive subtlety of a beautiful smile on a child's face.

What then is the permanent idea underlying the anachronisms of artistic expression? It is sometimes said that Rembrandt painted Jesus Christ's disciples as Dutch Jews, because he had no imagination, and could only paint what he saw before him. The same has been said recently of Raffaele by a critic, who declares that Raffaele had no imagination and consequently no sense of humor; but I have not heard any serious critic give the same explanation of similar anachronisms in the works of Veronese, or of Rubens. They are supposed to have simply adopted the fashions of the day. But why the fashion?

May it not be that there is in the human mind an instinct, a kind of racial memory, that is stronger than the education of the day and that defies even the dogmas of religion? May it not be that men feel the continuity of human experience as a great unalterable reality? May they not feel that the people who were high in power in one age were so by virtue of characteristics that in all ages will bring their

possessors to positions of prominence in their own age? And surely it requires no reasoning to see that a man's external appearance is very largely fashioned, or at least modified, by his character. So that it is not unreasonable to suppose that a portrait of a great soldier of one age may express more of the essential characteristics of a great soldier of another age than could be found in a most carefully costumed model hired for the occasion. The anachronism of costume is a small matter when compared with the expression of essential qualities of character, such as no model can render, and no costumier can suggest.

Beyond this I am inclined to go, and to suggest that there is also in humanity an ineradicable conviction of the continuity of experience in the individual, more or less unconscious at present, no doubt, but rapidly reawakening into activity. This might not make itself felt in the mind of an artist as a definite theory of reincarnation, but it might very well induce him to think that he could get nearer to the dramatic realization of vital essentials by studying, and by using, the prominent men and women of his own day, than by trying to create types out of his own fancy, or by merely copying characters stereotyped by previous painters.

As to the introduction of the artist's own personality or that of some member of his family or circle of acquaintance, that will always occur; because no man can be expected to feel that his own personality would be out of place in any company of distinguished persons. The same applies to those artists who have painted madonnas with the features of the woman they loved, without regard to the moral fitness of things, and without any conscious disrespect to the original.

Leonardo himself, in a poetical letter to his patron, describes his long search for figures to serve as models for his Jesus and Judas, in the famous *Last Supper*; and while saying that he could not hope to find a fitting type for the former among the men of his day, and having searched the scum of the city, the jails, and the haunts of vice, in vain, to find one base enough to represent the man who sold his master for gold, he finally suggests painting the head of the prior himself, if the Duke does not think it inappropriate. Leonardo was a profound thinker, a man familiar with the philosophy of the Greeks and Neoplatonists; and one may well suppose that he knew the doctrine of reincarnation and was actually looking for the men of his own day who were (potentially) the men who had played those parts in the

eternal drama of the soul presented in the Christ story, and familiar, as a mystery drama, to every Neoplatonist.

I think that as Reincarnation wins its way again into public recognition, a greater tolerance towards the peculiarities of former ages will assert itself. We shall perhaps be less severe in our criticism of our predecessors, if we feel that they were ourselves; and that we today are executing our little "song and dance" on the stage of the twentieth century for our own amused contemplation in the history that will be written of this age, when we return to birth with our old tendencies and peculiarities, to play our part in the drama of a later age; and to continue our evolution in the great school of life that does not cease with the departure of each generation, but endures eternally.

THE FLOWER OF THE MOUNTAINS

By **Kenneth Morris**

Welsh Air — *Lili Lon*.

I

BUTTERCUPS and bee-loved clover,
 Harebells, daffodils and heather —
 There's a Flower no lark sings over,
 Quite outshines you all together:
 Who shall breathe her dear name?
 Who shall sound her deep fame?
 She that kindles up the uplands
 With her blooms of dream and flame.

Cuckoo-flower by Tybie's Fountain,
 Meadowsweet beside the river,
 There's a Flower upon the Mountain
 Makes the lone blue midnight quiver.
 In the violet glow and gloom
 Where the twilight mountains loom,
 There the heavens behold enraptured
 The white glamor of her bloom.

Rose of all the roses blowing,
 Pansy — purplest, darkest, deepest —
 Not such loveliness art knowing,
 Not such heart-deep sweetness keepst!
 For her scent was snow and fire
 For the starry bardic choir,
 Glyndwr's and Llewelyn's glory,
 Arthur's sword, and Ceiriog's lyre.

II

Maidens in the hay-rich meadow,
 Morfydd, Olwen, Nest, Elonwy —
 Eyes of starlight, sunlight, shadow —
 Glad the sky that looketh on ye —
 What are ye, though so fair,
 Crowned with brown clouds of hair,
 Throats endowed with blackbird sweetness,
 Pride of mien and queenly air —

What are ye, that hearts should hunger
 For your rippings forth of laughter?
 There's a Maid that's fairer, younger,
 Whoso sees shall follow after
 Till the stars fade away,
 And the pearl-rimmed turquoise, Day,
 And Night's gemmed and somber dragon
 Topple headlong in decay.

There's a Maid amidst the Mountains,
 Ageless through the hoary ages,
 And her star-eyes were the fountains
 Of the lore of druid sages;
 And her speech was snow and fire
 For the starry bardic choir,
 Glyndwr's and Llewelyn's glory,
 Arthur's sword, and Ceiriog's lyre.

*International Theosophical Headquarters,
 Point Loma, California.*

THE ESOTERIC PHILOSOPHY OF UNSELFISHNESS: by C. Woodhead



IN *The Crest Jewel of Wisdom*, written by the great teacher Śankarâchârya about a century after the death of Gautama the Buddha, occurs the following passage:

Self-assertion is to be known as the cause of this false attribution of selfhood, as doer and enjoyer.

When sensuous things have affinity with it, it is happy; when the contrary, unhappy. So happiness and unhappiness are properties of this, and not of the Self which is perpetual bliss.

Sensuous things are dear for the sake of the self, and not for their own sake; and therefore the Self itself is dearest of all.

Hence the Self itself is perpetual bliss; not its, are happiness and unhappiness;

as in dreamless life, where are no sensuous things, the Self that is bliss — is enjoyed, so in waking life, it is enjoyed through the word, through intuition, teaching and deduction.

In these words of the great teacher Śankarâchârya, one seems to see outlined the whole philosophy of altruism. So great is the world-glamour, the illusion in which we live, that it is with difficulty we can trace the beginnings of that Reality which is the Eternal. And yet we know that this is the real Occultism towards the realization of which we are all striving more or less consciously. It is the path pursued by every human soul, whether under the Law or by individual volition, or both.

Again and again we find reiterated in all the sacred texts the statement that there is no real separateness amongst existing beings; that all is one; that behind every appearance is a reality which is independent of all else, includes all else, and is eternally the same.

This is that which is spoken of in the sacred books of the East as utterly indescribable, yet the very essence of Being, Consciousness, Bliss, the Higher Self.

In the passage quoted Śankarâchârya shows how these qualities of the Supreme Self produce illusion in the reflected selfhood of the human lower self. A man falsely imagines himself to be a separate *being* with a separate *consciousness* of his own and a *happiness* which depends upon his own separated selfhood. The sensuous things which are of the body are pleasing to this reflected and incomplete selfhood. They produce a pleasure which is a reflection of the harmony of the Higher Self.

Do we not know how temporary and unsatisfying are these experiences of the lower self? They disappear and give place to pain and disappointment. The events of life teach us that the lower self is of no account. Then, if we are wise, we learn our lesson. Says Śankara :

Self-assertion is to be known as the cause of this false attribution of selfhood as doer and enjoyer.

When sensuous things have affinity with it, it is happy; when the contrary, unhappy. So happiness and unhappiness are properties of this, and not of the Self which is perpetual bliss.

Then he goes on to say :

Sensuous things are dear for the sake of the self and not for their own sake, and therefore the Self itself is dearest of all.

If we ponder over this statement of the great sage, it seems to imply that every sort of happiness is due to the feeling of self-consciousness, and so, that the false self-consciousness of reflected self-assertion is the cause of all the misery and unhappiness in the world, from its unstable and illusive character, and from the contrasts of temporary pleasure and pain which we suffer when we allow our self-consciousness to limit itself to the four walls of our personality.

And when Śankara says that "the Self itself is dearest of all," he implies that the highest peace, contentment, and happiness, are to be found in fixing our gaze upon that which is forever outside our ken, but towards which we are ever advancing, on the path to perfection. And he thus concludes:

Hence the Self itself is perpetual bliss — not its, are happiness and unhappiness; as in dreamless life where are no sensuous things, the Self that is bliss is enjoyed, so in waking life it is enjoyed through the word, through intuition, teaching and deduction.

Sooner or later, therefore, we must realize and be entirely convinced that there is actually no separateness in the world, except, as H. P. Blavatsky said, "*in motive.*"

The false self-assertion which is the cause of so much misery and sorrow, choking up the avenues of wisdom and darkening the Sun which gives life and light — this false self-assertion also leads us to misinterpret and misuse the Law which would otherwise reveal the Truth. For as said by H. P. Blavatsky,

In the active laws of Karma — absolute Equity — based on the Universal Harmony, there is neither foresight nor desire. It is our own actions, thoughts, and deeds which *guide that law* instead of being guided by it.

If then we would find true harmony and peace within ourselves we must follow the Law of Harmony, which is the expression in action of the Universal Self. If on the other hand by self-assertion we make a law unto ourselves, we must take the consequences — for "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," that harmony may be restored.

But [says Śankara] he who goes onward through the word of the good Teacher, who is friendly to all beings, and himself well controlled, he gains the fruit and the reward, and his reward is the Real.

If the love of freedom is yours, then put sensuous things far away from you like poison. But love as the food of the gods, serenity, pity, pardon, rectitude, peacefulness, and self-control, love them and honor them for ever.

SAINT-GERMAIN AT THE FRENCH COURT:

by P. A. M.

Souvenirs sur Marie Antoinette (d'Adhémar).

Vol. I, p. 293.



EXPERIENCED a real regret at being forced to give up my acquaintance with Madame de Forcalquier, when, after the letter which I have copied, she passed entirely over to the side of Madame du Barri. One morning, chance caused us to meet on a stairway of the château at Versailles. We could not look at one another without laughing, and then we embraced by stealth.

"How is it you are traveling on such a wrong road?" I said to her.

"It is the fault of my star. You know that the Comte de Saint-Germain predicted to me that I should make my fortune through a favorite. The Pompadour is dead and has not justified the horoscope. It is then for the Comtesse that this task is reserved. I must hurry, else I shall grow old; our dauphin does not look like one who is a great admirer of women."

Since the name of the Comte Saint-Germain has again come under my pen, I should like to speak a little of him. He appeared (that's the word) at the French Court long before I did. That was in 1743; the rumor spread abroad that a stranger, prodigiously wealthy, at least if one judged by the magnificence of his gems, had just arrived at Versailles. Whence had he sprung? No one has ever been able to learn. His aristocratic, intelligent, and sagacious look struck one from the first moment. He had a well-formed and graceful figure, delicate hands, a small foot, an elegant leg which well filled a well-stretched silk stocking. The tight breeches indicated a rare perfection of form; his smile disclosed the most beautiful teeth in the world, a pretty dimple ornamented his chin; his hair was black, his eyes soft and penetrating. Oh! What eyes! . . . I have never seen their like anywhere. He appeared to be forty to forty-five years old. He was still to be met in the private apartments, where he had free entrée, at the beginning of the year 1786. He did not see Madame du Barri, but he was present at the catastrophe of the Duchesse de Châteauroux.

When this lady died, the King, who had only known the Comte de Saint-Germain a year, had nevertheless already so much confidence in him that he asked him for an antidote for the expiring Duchesse. The Comte refused.

"*It is too late,*" he said.

I took him to task one day on account of this reply, claiming that it is always time to try and arrest the effect of a poison.

"If I had cured the Duchesse," he said to me, "I should have been responsible for all the violent deaths which might have followed. Every family would have summoned me to work a miracle, and it would have been unfortunate for me if I had ever failed in the enterprise. Such are men: pretty selfish."

"You are a bit selfish too."

"It is precisely because I resemble them."

The old eternal Comtesse de Georgy, whom certainly death has forgotten on earth, said in my presence to Comte Saint-Germain:

"Fifty years ago I was ambassadress at Venice, and I recall having seen you

there with the same visage ; a little more mature, perhaps, because you have grown younger since then."

"At all times I have esteemed myself happy in paying my court to the ladies."

"You called yourself at that time the Marquis Balletti."

"And Madame la Comtesse de Georgy has a memory as fresh now as it was fifty years ago."

"I owe this advantage to an elixir which you gave me at our first interview. You are really an extraordinary man."

"Had the Marquis Balletti a bad reputation?"

"On the contrary, he was a man of very good company."

"Well, if no one complains of him, I willingly adopt him for my grandfather."

I know that later on his replies to the Comtesse de Georgy have been denatured ; I report them as I heard them come from his mouth.

The Count de Saint-Germain was very strange in everything. M. le Marquis de Valbelle going to see him one day, found him engaged in blowing the bellows ; he asked my husband to entrust him with a crown of six livres ; the latter took one from his purse, gave it to M. de Saint-Germain, who put it on a chemical mattress and covered it with a black substance, then he put the whole into a furnace. M. de Valbelle saw the coin change color, become red, and at the end of some minutes the adept withdrew it from the furnace, let it cool, and returned it to the Marquis. It was no longer silver, but of the purest gold : the transmutation was complete. I preserved this coin until 1786, when it was stolen from my desk with several other foreign or old French coins. I regretted above all, with the loss of the crown of Saint-Germain, that of a rose-noble which my first husband's mother had received from King James II, who brought a box full of them to France. This sort of money perfectly resembled gold, but it was in reality only a chemical composition made by a celebrated adept of the time.

M. de Saint-Germain never gave any one anything to eat and never received any one at his house. To see him, it was necessary to obtain a rendezvous for a fixed day. But he went to see people of quality who desired his visits. He had two valets de chambre ; one served him *five hundred years*, and the other, a regular Parisian, was well acquainted with the court and the city. Moreover, his household consisted of four lackeys, in a livery of the color of Spanish tobacco, collar and sleeves of blue with ribbons of gold. He took a hired carriage for five hundred francs a month. Often changing his coats and vests, he had a rich and numerous collection of them ; but nothing approached the magnificence of his ornamental buttons, his watches, his rings, his chain, diamonds, and precious stones. He had these to the value of a considerable amount, and he changed them almost every week.

He claimed to possess the secret of melting several diamonds into one ; he cleared those which were defective without sensibly diminishing their weight. He repaired one which belonged to Louis XV, and increased its value by a thousand crowns. I do not know what will become of this precious collection at his death. It is thought that he died in 1784 at Sleswic, while with the Elector of Hesse Cassel ; however, M. le Comte de Chalons, on returning from his embassy at Venice, in 1788, told me that he had spoken to the Comte de Saint-Germain in

the Square of St. Mark, the day before his departure from Venice, to go as Ambassador to Portugal. I saw him another time.

One evening, M. de Saint-Germain was telling a story in which, as usual, he had played the principal part, but not remembering well all the details, he turned towards his valet de chambre :

“ Am I not right, Roger ? ” he asked the latter.

“ Monsieur le Comte forgets that I have only been five hundred years with him, so I could not have been present at that adventure ; it must have been my predecessor.”

From that moment M. Roger was never called anything else but “ the five hundred years.”

Conversation never languished where the Count de Saint-Germain was present ; he enlivened it by a wealth of historical details ; tales of ghosts, pictures of manners, varied and choice descriptions. Naturally reserved, he only seemed at ease in good company. He sat at table without unfolding his napkin, because he never ate in public. But it was precisely on these occasions that he amused people by his extraordinary stories.

The Comte de Saint-Germain had a manner of his own of telling a story which filled his most insignificant tales with terror ; but we have talked enough of this extraordinary personage. Let us return to Versailles, to the preparations for the marriage of M. le Comte d'Artois.

Vol. I, p. 333. Death of Louis XV.

The moment was approaching when a new existence was about to commence for my well-beloved princess (Marie Antoinette). On New Year's Day 1774, she found in her bedroom, on the porcelain night-table, a rich casket of Burgos, all ornamented with gold ; the key and the lock were also of this metal. Although I was present with Madame de Noailles, madame la dauphine took upon herself to open the casket. Scarcely had she touched the key when a tune inside played the air of the new opera *Iphigenia in Aulis*, composed by Gluck : “ Let us sing, let us celebrate our Queen.” (*Chantons, célébrons notre reine.*) Then the lid rose automatically, opened by another ingenious spring, and showed a little royal crown, a scepter, a hand of justice, and a cloak, all in miniature, but of rare perfection. These insignia were of pure gold, enriched with diamonds and precious stones. The mantle, of beautiful velvet, was distinguished by magnificent embroidery. From whom did this present come ? No one dared to ask. The Dauphine closed the box again, and put it in a corner, then turned to us.

“ This present is very inconvenient,” she said. “ So, ladies, I beg you not to mention the matter again.”

Finding myself alone the next day with the Dauphine, I could not help saying to her :

“ Madame, do you not see a presage in yesterday's present ? ”

“ Say, rather, an impudent trick ! Why send me a scepter and a hand of justice ? These things are only suitable for M. the dauphin. That comes from the Countess.”

“ For my part, I should attribute it to that mysterious person. . . ”

“I had not thought of it,” replied the princess, with heightened color. “I wish it were so, for then at least, my suspicions would only fall upon one who wishes me well. Besides, the King is in wonderfully good health, and will live twenty years yet. That would be a happy stroke of fortune. The Dauphin does not know men sufficiently well, and needs to study them more, and really I should be upset if his reign were to commence so soon. Louis XV, in the interests of the kingdom and of his family, ought to call the Dauphin into his councils; instead of that, they keep him apart, and when he mounts the throne, he will be like a stranger in his own palace.”

I wondered at the justice of these words. A revolution in the cabinet has just taken place. . . .

Towards the middle of March 1774, the Empress Maria Theresa wrote to Madame d'Adhémar mentioning that there was a rumor in Vienna, “which I do not believe, that the King of France is ill, so much so that it is not expected that he will prolong his days to the end of May: my ambassador is silent on this subject, as well as my daughter. There are often rumors which confirm this axiom: *The voice of the people is that of God!* . . .”

“This letter,” says Madame d'Adhémar, “which came to me in the ordinary way, puzzled me a great deal; I was astonished to find them attributing sickness to the King when he was in perfect health, and my surprise was boundless when we saw that monarch die suddenly. . . .”

Madame d'Adhémar's turn for service with the Dauphine, Marie Antoinette, came just after she had heard of a new frivolity on the part of the King, more suitable for a young man than for an old grandfather.

Vol. I, p. 353

The Dauphin entered almost at the same time; he looked upset.

“What is the matter?” Marie Antoinette asked him.

“Nothing!” he replied in a tone that proved the contrary to be the case.

I judged it discreet to approach the window, but the prince held me by my hand.

“Stay,” he said; “you have loved my grandmother, my mother; you are devoted to my wife and you cannot be in the way; besides what I have to tell is foolishness, a mere superstition . . . but for all that it deserves attention. I was writing in my study; in front of my bureau, there is, as you know, a large portrait of the King. Suddenly I heard a noise. I raised my head and I saw the picture fall with its face on the floor, whilst the massive frame remained hanging on the wall. I went to examine the position of things; the space between

the frame and the masonry is too narrow to have permitted the stretcher to slip without being held by the wainscotting.

“And were you alone?” asked the Dauphine.

“Quite alone. I called my attendants, who are as much surprised as myself.”

“It is an evil omen!” I said, recalling the letter from the Empress.

Neither of them replied. The Dauphin soon left the room. Then the princess said to me:

“You remember the present of the casket on New Year’s Day? I thought it came from an enemy’s hand; but today I am convinced that it comes from my unknown prophet. . . . Suppose the King is going to die! . . . That picture falling seems to me to be an evil augury; there are things that happen in great houses that are difficult to explain. For example, you have heard of the Fairy Mélusine of the Lusignan family, of the White Lady of the Electors of Brandenburg, and at Vienna they assert that when the Emperor of the House of Austria is going to die, the Count Gerard of Alsace is seen walking in the imperial château, spurred and carrying a whip in his hand. My mother has told me that this phantom appeared when she lost my father, and that this gave her a sort of pleasure, because she was convinced by it that the House of Lorraine had really a common origin with that of Rudolph of Hapsburg. Do you know if the Bourbons also have their genius?”

I did not know, and consequently could not tell the Princess anything on the point. We chatted a long time about the mysterious warnings; then I determined to confess to her what the Empress had written to me from Vienna, that the King would not live out the month of May.

“What day is it today?” asked the Dauphine.

“The 30th of April, Madame,” replied Madame d’Adhémar.

“So tomorrow is the beginning of May! I wish it were over. . . . My God, I do not know what to expect! . . .”

The next day, which was Saturday, the physicians Lamartinière and Bordeu were called suddenly to Trianon where the King had celebrated one of his little suppers the previous evening. It was soon known that he was dangerously sick. Only Lamartinière, with his usual candid honesty, dared tell the truth. It was smallpox with complications, and the King passed away on the tenth of the fatal month of May. His grandson Louis XVI reigned in his stead, and his young wife, Marie Antoinette, Archduchess of Austria and Dauphine of France, entered upon her troubled career as his Queen. She was little more than a girl, with much to learn.

Speaking of the Créqui family and Madame de Créqui:

Vol. II, p. 29

Nor do I agree with Madame de Créqui as to the Count de Saint-Germain; she makes of him an imbecile charlatan, and he seemed to me clever and witty

(*rusé et spirituel*). What diversity of judgments on the same personage, and yet we have both seen him! In truth, I have been more intimately connected with him. He has left me a curious manuscript which perhaps I shall publish some day, if circumstances do not oppose the project.

Vol. II, p. 94.

Louis XV did not like spending gold, while he was prodigal of his famous notes payable in cash; I recollect that the thaumaturge Saint-Germain came to me one day shaking with laughter.

“Can you guess how I have been spending part of the morning, Madame?” he said to me. “I will give you a thousand guesses. . . . I had the honor to discuss with a Jew, or rather with the King of France, as to the price of a diamond ring which I want to get rid of. His Majesty wants this jewel, but is afraid of paying too much, and so ordered Lebel to buy it for him. Lebel found nothing better than to send me a Child of Israel. I know all these gentlemen, and we argued and bargained like a couple of magpies. Finally I sold my diamond for six thousand francs more than the King would have paid if he had been there himself. And I’ll tell him so the first time he permits me to pay my respects!”

Ibid., p. 190.

Comte de Saint-Germain also told me when speaking of the favorite:

“If they do not canonize her, it will be because the sovereigns of France want to save a hundred thousand crowns!”

It is well known that this is the ordinary price that is given for proclaiming the worship of a new saint.

Vol. II, p. 263.

The day after the consecration of the King, at the moment of going to church, I found the Queen very much upset.

“I have received a note from my mysterious correspondent,” she told me. “It is scarcely in harmony with the splendors of this solemnity, for, if I am to believe it, we are surrounded with dangers. This paper tells me to distrust the relatives of the King and to fear my own. It is terrible to come and disturb the tranquillity of a Queen when she expects happiness.”

I reassured her, saying that this correspondence was a reprehensible mystification, and that in her place I should refuse to read any letter that had no signature.

“You do not know what a desire people in our position have to know things,” said the Queen. “We are burning to penetrate into this unknown world from which those who surround us are the first to separate us. Oh! Madame d’Adhémar, the more I advance in life, the more I persuade myself that the throne hides many deceptions!”

I was going to reply, when the Duc de Choiseul, who had an audience with Marie Antoinette, entered.

Vol. III, p. 286.

Madame d’Angivilliers used to see, in the early times, the Comte de Saint-Germain, the thaumaturge; he never left her house, and there he led the conversation. She claimed that he always remained in correspondence with her; I

believe that in this assertion there is the vanity of friendship. At the approach of the Revolution, I saw her less often, by reason of her intimacy with M. Chanderlos de Laclos, author of the *Liaisons Dangereuses*. He was one of the enemies of the Queen, and one of the trumpeters paid by the Palais-Royal. . . . He is one of those who did the most harm to the Royal family.

Vol. IV, p. 1.

The future darkened; we were close upon the terrible catastrophe which was about to overthrow France; the abyss was under our feet, and we turned our heads aside; struck by a fatal blindness, we passed from one fête to another. It was a sort of madness which impelled us gaily towards our ruin. . . . Alas! how could we avert the tempest when we did not see it coming!

However, from time to time, uneasy or observing minds tried to drag us out of this fatal security. I have already said that the Comte de Saint-Germain had tried to open the eyes of their Majesties by giving them a glimpse of the approaching peril; but M. de Maurepas did not wish the safety of the kingdom to come from another, got rid of the thaumaturge, and he appeared no more.

There remained still the mysterious giver of the warnings, he who had written to the Queen when she was yet only the dauphine; his voice was also disregarded. It is true that he always employed strange forms, that he did not let himself be known. Was he wrong? I do not think so, for would he have obtained the confidence that was denied to the Count de Saint-Germain, and which I and so many others denied to the celebrated Cazotte, when he showed to us the death that was ready to strike the greater number of those who were present at that supper which I never recall without a feeling of terror?

Vol. IV, p. 107.

At the commencement of 1789 the Queen was discussing the hostility of the Etats-Généraux and certain individuals, with the Duchesse de Polignac and the Comtesse d'Adhémar, when the Comte d'Artois entered.

He was pensive, downcast; he spoke but little. His sister-in-law was disturbed by this taciturnity. He hesitated; then at last he spoke.

"Since there is no one here," he said, "except the Duchesse and our *good Comtesse* (this was what they called me), I can tell you what has just happened to me. As I was coming up the stairs, a gentleman dressed in black, with a benevolent face, gave me a packet. I took it, thinking it was a request. Then, examining it, I saw my address. The seal was soon broken. 'Take it, Countess,'" continued His Royal Highness, addressing me. "Read this strange communication to Her Majesty."

He gave it to me, and, raising my voice, I read the following sentences.

"Monseigneur:

"The time of your ruin approaches. You have not desired to conquer the esteem of the Parisians; you will learn at your cost what their hatred can do! . . . Yet a few months, and woe betide you! Woe to your friends! Woe to all those who have disdained freemasonry, who have persecuted Cagliostro and tortured the brethren! An expiatory altar will rise in the very place where the Templars perished, and the victims that will be sacrificed to them in reprisal will

be the descendants of the King who caused them to perish, and the successors of the prelates who condemned them!

“Tremble, Monseigneur! I warn you of your peril, your death is prepared! Save yourself! If not, you will die as the King will die, like Monsieur and . . .”

I stopped and looked at His Royal Highness with a glance of reproach. By a similar glance he showed me that he recognized his imprudence.

However, the Queen, quite upset, said:

“I bet that my name comes after that of Monsieur!”

My silence was equivalent to an avowal, and the Duchesse uttered a cry of horror as she said:

“Monsieur, have you given orders for the arrest of that giver of the warning? It is necessary to communicate this letter to the King, to the ministers, to the lieutenant of police, to the attorney-general . . .”

“I sent after my man, but he had disappeared,” replied the Comte d’Artois. “As for the threats contained in the epistle, there isn’t a day in which I do not receive similar ones.”

“And I also,” continued the Queen. “If I were to show you the infamous things they address to me hourly, you would tremble in quite another manner. I advise my brother, instead of making a noise about it, to be silent and let things take their course. We shall meet numberless obstacles. They will torture us through the États-Généraux. . . . You are silent, good Countess?”

“I am reflecting, Madame, on what is happening. I wager that the black gentleman is an honest man. He can aid the friends of Monsieur; we must find him.”

“I will attend to it,” continued M. le Comte d’Artois, who forgot all about it the next day. “But why recall the Templars? What have I in common with them? And that Cagliostro, I have never harmed him in anything. All those things are compliments of our cousin the merchant.”

By this qualification, the Prince meant the Duc d’Orléans. At this time one could see clearly into his purposes. His connexion with the Parliament, his spending money on the rabble, his acceptance of the grand-mastership of the free-masons, the people who surrounded him, those meetings at Passy and Mousseaux, the pamphlets he paid for, loudly accused him. They would have done well to degrade him, to punish him; they did not do so and it was a mistake. When he threw off the mask, there was no time to treat him according to his deserts. The power had passed not to him, but to his accomplices who besides, later on, undertook his punishment themselves.

I have omitted to state that this conversation took place at the Duchess’s apartments. The Comte de Vaudreuil, M. d’Adhémar, although out of humor, the Bailly de Crussol, M. de Mailly, arrived one after the other; we changed the subject, and Monseigneur went to the Opera. He did not ask me again for the letter, which I hid in my bosom at the entry of M. de Vaudreuil; I forgot to give it him back, and since then it has remained in my possession. It will serve as a proof to accuse the enemies of the Royal Family.

(To be continued)

THE CREATIVE QUALITY: by Lydia Ross, M. D.



THE creative quality is the vital life principle. It marks the positive pole of manifested worlds, bringing order out of chaos and light and form out of empty darkness. The opposing, negative quality, interacting with it everywhere is destruction, which makes for disorder, dissolution, and the dissipation of created things back into nothingness.

With this dual play of positive and negative forces, of creation and destruction, manifested life appears and operates at the pivotal point of balanced action. The forces engaged are essentially cosmic, making and unmaking worlds, and repeating the rhythmic process down to the last atom of matter, and the last creation of mind and of aspiration.

Destruction acts with an instinct that steadily *grows stronger and more conscious*, as the expressions of life gradually advance up the scale. It aims to weaken, tear down, mutilate, kill and disintegrate the created forms. Creation as progressively develops in conscious power and works to focus, harmonize, correlate, vitalize, and unify the elements of the physical, mental, and moral worlds. To the immortal actor in the cosmic drama, time and space and mind and matter are but stage properties, and "the play's the thing."

With this comprehensive scope, the creative quality has the simplicity of fundamental things. It stands for a common multiple, in which many seemingly unrelated things have a part. It provides the scientific basis for correlating misplaced and misdirected energy upon right lines; and it gives the terms in which the solution of many problems may be read upon higher levels.

Unfortunately the essential unity of different phases of the creative quality is not generally recognized. Like other forms of force, this energy is impersonal, though colored by the material, mental, and moral mediums through which, in turn, it operates.

It is the higher use of this force that crystallizes ideals into tangible forms and noble living. It is the constructive faculty that makes sounds into words and groups them into human speech with vital meaning. It quickens the facts of natural laws into forms of art, science, and industry. In its physical rôle it constantly renews the body-tissues and, after death and disintegration, it utilizes the debris in upbuilding new forms. Last, if not least, it perpetuates the species.

The higher use of the creative power most nearly relates the human creature to the creator; while perversions of it more nearly puts

him on a par with demons. Through the senses of a new body in each life the soul contacts the material for making its new world — no two ever quite alike. Whether the man beget many good and useful deeds or head a long line of evil and imperfect actions, his virtues and vices, successes and failures, are created into actualities that revolve around his center of consciousness. To the degree that he is actively human, he is a creator. Inertia or indifference more closely relate him to subhuman kingdoms of matter.

In the beginning, the infant's world is without form and void. An idiot, in failing to work out the common wonder of creating a growing world of his own, is abnormal in proportion to his failure. Possessed of organs of sense, he lacks innate power to incorporate impressions into his own sphere and to make their meaning his own. A Helen Keller, however, shows the constructive principle working through mind and heart and will to make her world of more than average size and interest.

Creation and destruction make the day and night of matter, all forms of which are changing, from "the everlasting hills" down to the tiny cell. Man literally lives in the midst of a moving current of the material traversing his body. When the waste processes are the stronger he is drawn toward the minus pole of negation, weakness, pain, disease, death, nothingness. The impelling, creative force, working in and through matter, magnetizes everything with its plus quality. The destructive quality demagnetizes things, and thus, minus attraction, they negatively drift toward nothingness.

Health is the natural product of dual action at the balanced point of creative nutrition and destructive waste. Even with increased waste, as in lung tuberculosis, death does not win while nutrition equals the breaking down. On the other hand, excessive nutrition shows hyper-creation of tissue. The over-nourished man becomes more of a human animal; his abnormal growth by no means makes him more of a man. Manhood is not a mere matter of physique. Nor does it expend surplus upbuilding energy at the level of the appetite, but functions as a conscious creator on distinctly human lines.

An unbalanced excess of cells in any organ results in abnormal local growth often cancerous. Nature insists upon balanced action, and is intolerant of even excessive creative activity that results from retarded force at any point. Cancer begins with a useless piling up of good cells that do no work, but deprive other tissues of rightful

room and nutrition. Cells do not increase in number and actively function at the same time. The self-consumed energy of multiplying cells adds nothing to the constitutional welfare. An enlarging focus of growth in stomach or liver does not add to the digestive power, but creates a tumor. Useless growths often become self-limited by degenerative processes. With no progressive purpose, the inverted current of energy swirls for a time in abnormal local action and then settles below the point of health. As the body becomes laden with the toxins of the disintegrating growth, the destructive ebb-tide carries it back to the starting-point, for re-formation.

This question of function, work, purpose, touches the basis of all natural growth. The organic cell not only must reproduce itself occasionally, but it must continue to *create something that is an advance upon itself*. This is the law of life, the real "survival of the fittest." It is this continuous evolutionary current that makes "the stone become a plant, the plant an animal, the animal a man, and the man a god." The connecting thread of purpose, linking everything from the atom up to man in a regulated series of unfoldments, is a growing consciousness. The man becomes a god by becoming aware that he *is* a god, enveiled in matter. The impelling reality within all things makes them channels for the universal stream, which cannot be resisted or retarded with safety.

The material elements of food and air not only are changed into nutrition, but into heat and force for use of the body and brain. This power, balanced by the negation of effort in muscles and nerves, produces skill. Skill is an advance upon mere strength, as manual dexterity excels the use of sharper and stronger animal claws. Here the material force in food is conserved in mental use.

Mental life naturally manifests in the balanced play of positive knowledge and belief, and opposing, negative ignorance and doubt. An accurate differential diagnosis pivots between the weight of evidence showing what the case is, and the evidence of what it is not. An over-fed mind, like the over-fed body, is stuffed with information not functionally active in practical use. A bore is painfully well-informed on some things; and many minds are restlessly over-active for want of legitimate purpose. On the other hand, the negative or stunted intellect gravitates to the minus side of mental growth and action.

The growing mind does something more than repeat, parrot-like,

its stock of ideas. Its function is to digest ideas into knowledge of truth. Conviction is the worked-out product of belief and doubt. It contains the elements of positive proof which affirms and negative doubt that denies. Out of digested ideas comes the finer force of judgment, discrimination — something born with the complex heritage of many ideas and experiences. By gradually becoming the conscious heir of his great past, man's knowledge and belief are changed into a larger sense of being. Through his imagination the creative quality gives him a sympathetic understanding. This insight is the evolutionary essence of all the previous functional play of consciousness that, step by step, leads up to it from crude matter.

Functional action of the moral nature, far from being something apart from or unrelated to lesser phases of existence, is the natural extension of them. It is the more complete, full-grown expression of the real man, whose potential nature can find full play only in ideality that builds for perfection. Creative ideality and destructive selfishness unite the divine in man to the force and feeling of his physical nature to make him something more than man. "A little lower than the angels," he has powers they could gain only through incarnation.

The primal, common purpose of all functional action is the production of a more potent current and the liberation of more consciousness. Life, in self-conscious man, has the cumulative impetus of his many incarnations. He is moved by the vital, evolutionary currents that well up from the very foundations of his nature.

The ovum gives up its cell individuality to be reborn in countless cells of a new creature. According to the balanced perfection of the parent-cells is the new body perfect. And according to the unity and ideality of the parental conditions is the harmonious, ideal character invoked for the new body. The true parents give up time, thought, energy, and comforts, for the child who stands for their united selves in a new combination of possibilities. Their love and self-sacrifice develop the finer phases of their nature. And their common interest in a new tie makes for a more lasting and satisfying unity on the higher levels of conscious life.

If, on the other hand, their mutual expression of creative quality does not rise above even ideal physical and mental consciousness and function, the *main current* of their evolutionary energy is retarded there. If their greatest consciousness is a matter of sensation, at best

it is but a symbolic foreshadowing of the enlarged sense of being, in which each soul knows its primal unity with all life, but no less feels its individual completeness and isolated perfection.

However distant such a goal may seem, it is the task which challenges every soul as, life after life, old ties are renewed and old experiences are rehearsed. Those couples who seem unable to live together or apart are re-echoing the unity and discord of previous lives together. The basic tie that draws men and women together is not merely the glamor of passion and physical complement. Beyond all that, it tells of a divine unity antedating all incarnations, as it foretells the enlightened existence of dual humanity, when, transcending all previous creative expression, the higher inheritance is consciously and unitedly claimed.

Animal appetites allied with mind are refined into greater subtlety, increased in range and complexity, and, if uncontrolled, acquire the balance of power. Conversely, the natural unobstructed trend of human evolution conserves physical creative force on to lines of mental and moral upbuilding. The individual or the civilization whose progress does not extend beyond material and intellectual expression, is doomed to degeneration. It is a going backward to inform the animal nature with the powers of mind, instead of raising the splendid material force to distinctly human levels of action. The horse, who could not be mastered if he knew his own strength, yields to mental, not physical mastery. But the human animal nature, from ages of experience, allied with mind, *does know its strength*. With the unsuspected, plausible power of keen and conscious instinct, it enlists the mind in gratifying its desires.

A pampered pelvic appetite, like over-feeding, shows abnormal want of balance which makes for weakness, disease, and moral malignancy. As the most pronounced physical consciousness, it too often stands for the largest realization of the sense of selfhood, because the current of creative quality is retarded at material levels. The result of this evolutionary delay is not only failure to create the finer forms of action and more perfect types of character and being, but the cumulative impetus overflows the ordinary bounds and barriers. With the negative failure to advance morally, comes the positively increased impulsion and wider sweep of immorality. When the innate desire to extend the consciousness to greater heights is denied expression, the acting desires, upon reaching the ordinary limits of sensation,

revert to perversions for novelty. The reaction of degeneration is a moral symptom of abnormal civilization, not of savagery.

Thought and feeling directed to a part attract nutrition to it. As the reinforced local center of action gains nutrition, its consciousness increases, thus completing the vicious circle of physical and psychic stimuli. The resulting passive congestion and chronic crave, however sluggish and morbidly dull, consumes nutritive and conscious power which belong elsewhere. "Behind (individual) will stands desire," choosing the part and directing the play of the responsive creative force. With equal energy it assumes the costume and portrays the characteristic rôle of the appetites of head or of heart.

As the retarded life currents swirl and eddy at material levels, the surging, deflected force rises beyond ordinary barriers in degenerative and destructive overflow. It is noteworthy that in this strenuous age of sagacious materialism, the continued increase in cancer is most marked in pelvic and digestive organs. This physical fact comports with the prevailing standard of purpose, which, with conscious ingenuity and eager unrest, seeks to satisfy desire for a fuller life below the lines of moral growth. The objection that malignant and degenerative diseases also afflict those of fine feeling and upright lives does not weaken the general conclusion. The very organic unity that makes our civilization what it is, renders its most sensitive and highly-organized units unconsciously susceptible to the psychic miasms of its atmosphere; social as well as individual karma must be reckoned with.

Nature gives the animals the impetus of instinct to carry them forward in the evolutionary stream. Self-conscious man, free to choose, moves by his own will. He may go forward in the natural channel; or turn aside into useless whirlpools; or aimlessly drift to the ports of negation. But choose he will, and move he must.

The logical necessity of providing an onward outlet for surging mental energy to be used in moral creations has not been recognized. Earnest thinkers everywhere know that indulgence, selfishness, sensuality and their diseases are at the degenerating point which, in great civilizations of the past, marked the beginning of the end. An uneasy sense of failure and danger prompts the changes going on in all established institutions — religious, social, educational — though these are but outward forms of inner feeling, the visible effects of unseen causes. The change must be made in the human heart, "for out of it are the issues of life." No economic scheme can right the ultimate

wrongs of individuals who fail to do themselves justice. Oppressor and oppressed are victims of a common ignorance of their own natures. Nor can education or legislation establish higher ideals of morality than are fostered by the sanctity of home relations.

The impersonal nature of the universal creative quality is obscured by its age-old physical worship and degradation which has deeply marred it with hereditary vulgarity. Even science so liberally classifies matters as "secondary sexual" as to imply that the reproductive function is the primary fact and purpose of existence. With degrees of refinement, this conclusion goes unchallenged, tacitly accepted or frankly indorsed by the unscientific masses.

The lives of the moral outcasts put into italics the prevailing social code; they but emphasize the errors in the routine declaration of principles. The redlight district shows a frank danger signal. Its recruits had homes once, as their successors have now. What of the lack of light in these homes regarding the child's dual nature? The prevalence and demoralizing and devitalizing influence of childish vices is not fully recognized or reckoned with even by physicians or moralists, by parents or educators. Because of the present tidal-wave of evolutionary energy that is surging through every human channel, the younger generation is impelled more powerfully — for better or worse. It is an exceptional time for moral advance or for shipwreck.

The old injunction, "Know Thyself," made the riddle of the sphinx mean that man himself held the solution to all the riddles of creation.

OBJECTIONS TO KARMA AND REINCARNATION:

by Magister Artium



IN the columns of a daily paper appeared a brief article on Karma and Reincarnation, from the pen of an able writer in the domain of literary criticism and current comment. He objects to both these doctrines but the ground of his objections is shallow. To some extent they are based merely upon current misrepresentations of the doctrines; but in the main they are due simply to his not having thought over the matter in question. This is apparent, because his objections are those which come first into the mind of any one, upon hearing of Karma and Reincarnation; but it is scarcely necessary to say that they have also

occurred to the minds of those who have studied and written about the subject, and that they are therefore fully met. In short, we have here simply a chatty "daily column" on the topic.

The first objection turns on the familiar point that the action of Karma — that is, reaping the consequences of one's past actions — is both useless and unjust unless we preserve a memory of our past lives. It is unfair and also futile, say these critics, for a man to suffer for deeds which he does not remember having committed, and which are (to all intents and purposes) the deeds of another individual. But, borrowing a phrase from the objector himself, we may ask him, "Is it so?" If today I am suffering from indigestion, does it make any difference to the laws of nature whether I know what caused it, or whether I do not know? I may even eat poison and die from the results, but the results are the same whether I ate the poison knowingly or unknowingly. Of what avail will it be for me to criticise this law of nature from the ethical standpoint or the aesthetic standpoint or the scientific standpoint or any other point of view? It is a fact, and we must accept it and adjust our philosophy to it.

To take another illustration. Suppose I inflict injury upon a person and thereby sow the seeds of vengeance in him. Will it make any difference to his feelings and his probable actions if I should happen meanwhile to *forget* that I have injured him?

Or what about the scientific laws of heredity? Do they take any account of the ignorance of the child, or of his inability to control his parentage (for he is unable, according to the same scientific ideas)? It is thus seen that the writer's objections to Karma apply with equal force to many other things which he entirely admits; and consequently they are not objections to Karma, but a caviling against the order of nature in general. He says, "Did I choose freely to have the burden of choice imposed upon me? If I did not so choose, then Karma is unfair." We ask in return, "Did you choose your parentage? Or how many of your circumstances *did* you choose?" On this reasoning, the whole of life is at once unjust and absurd; and no more is needed to expose the quaintness of such arguments against Karma and Reincarnation.

The other objection made by the writer turns on the usual logical obfuscation about "freewill" and "necessity." And here again we must remind him that this problem underlies the whole domain of thought and is not peculiar to Karma and Reincarnation. Hence

to condemn these doctrines on the ground that they do not instantly solve for us in a popular manner the eternal problem of man's free-will, is absurd, because it means that we must on the same ground condemn every religion and philosophy known to man. This objection is consequently as quaint as the other — as must indeed have struck all intelligent readers of the criticism.

We ask, then: "Has any one a *serious* objection to bring against Karma and Reincarnation, or must we be forever disposing of such arguments as the above, or else disowning various misrepresentations of those teachings?"

When a critic says: "Your doctrine of Karma is unfair and futile, because it says that I am suffering for deeds which I do not remember having committed," he is quarreling with the *facts* of life. For the *fact* is that he actually is suffering many things whose cause he cannot trace. We may therefore leave him to run atilt at the facts of life to his heart's content, and perhaps his importunities may induce Providence or Fate, or whatever he believes in, to change its mind and its methods; but we must protest against saddling Karma or any other philosophical and scientific doctrine with the blame. We would not dream of doing so futile a thing as asking him what is *his* explanation of this iniquitous contrast between the Eternal Laws and man's muddled wits; for we do not expect a man to reveal his esoteric secrets in a newspaper.

Those who have carefully studied and seriously considered the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation, find they afford a far better explanation of the *facts* of life than any other doctrines. Of the kind of arguments used by those who have not seriously considered the question, yet who presume to educate the public on it, we have many specimens. No doctrine can easily explain everything to a man, so long as his comprehension remains limited, as it is at present. So it is absurd to reject Karma on this ground; especially as, if we do so reject it, every other doctrine goes into the waste-basket along with it. It is not difficult to get beyond the limits of many current theories of life, but the doctrine of Karma will be found to accommodate itself to any expansion of the intellect which we may propose to make.

Theosophy does make the problem of Free-will clearer, removes many difficulties, and sets the inquirer at the beginning of a path to greater knowledge. All intelligence is both bound and free: bound

with respect to certain conditions, free with respect to certain other conditions. A dog can run in any direction, but he cannot fly. His motions on the ground are limited only by his volitions, but his experiments in aviation are limited by the laws of gravitation and the construction of his body. It is possible, however, that his volitions are limited by something else — say, his hereditary instincts; but still they are *relatively* free. It is so with our own make-up. Our sensual desires are bound by narrow limits and would lead us to eat like a pig or sleep like a dormouse. But another part of us is free from their influence and able to set them aside and control them. Here again, we have an instance of relative freedom of the will. Theosophy goes deeper and says that in man there is a Spiritual Will, which is independent of every desire and fancy that goes to make up what we will call our personality. This Spiritual Will is the Will of the Essential Man, and it is not bound by the same conditions as bind the personal ego. No doubt even the Essential Man is obedient to conditions of some sort; for it is inconceivable that any action can take place except in accordance with a law. Yet the Law which directs the age-long life of the Spirit is not that which hems in the short career of an earth-life.

The reincarnating Soul is the liver of the life, and accomplishes its purposes whether the brain-mind is aware of them or not. The Soul does not forget; nor is it essential to its purposes that the brain should remember. On the contrary, it may be more desirable that the brain should *forget*. If we fail to remember the past experiences of the Soul, we need neither wonder at the fact nor deplore it. The path of knowledge is open to all who can tread it; and shall we play the part of the man who cavils at the laws of the Universe because he does not comprehend them all?

With many of us, of course, belief is largely a matter of convenience; and therefore we may be interested in the attempt to disprove an unwelcome doctrine. The satisfied may well be left to their satisfaction; and there will still remain a host of the unsatisfied who may find relief in the teachings of Theosophy — those teachings which solve so many difficulties and to which the objections are so puerile.

A STUDY OF CONTRAST: by Percy Leonard

Peace after war, port after stormy seas
Ease after toil, death after life
Doth greatly please. — *Edmund Spenser*



ACCORDING to Theosophy as promulgated in the last quarter of the nineteenth century by H. P. Blavatsky, as soon as the universe issued forth into manifestation from its obscure and to the mortal mind unfathomable abyss, it split up into two contrasting poles: Spirit and Matter, Good and Evil, Light and Darkness, God and Devil, Life and Death.

In the dogmatic scheme God is represented as planning a universe to be populated by somewhat colorless, insipid individuals, blindly obedient to his decrees. And on this earth he formed a paradise where he intended men should multiply in happy innocence, ignorant of the knowledge of good and evil, and so to continue in a blameless (but haply somewhat bovine) state of irresponsible innocent bliss, until at the age of Methusaleh they died and were ushered into an eternal state of transcendent rapture in the New Jerusalem where they would remain for evermore —

All rapture through and through in God's most holy sight.

Satan, however, a traitor in the angelic camp, interfered, and "brought death into the world and all our woes," thus upsetting the benevolent designs of the Creator.

Surely the Theosophical conception of the fundamental necessity of contrast as being part of the Divine plan is more dignified and worthy than the notion that omnipotence and omniscience could be circumvented, and the original intentions of Divinity be thwarted by the machinations of a meddling demon!

Yet even in the Bible we find that Satan is not so black as he is usually painted. In the Book of Job he is represented as *a Son of God*, and was directly commissioned by the Almighty to try the patience of Job. From the loss of his family and cattle down to his loathsome skin-disease, every disaster that befell him was in strict accordance with the instructions received by Satan the agent of God. In an old Hindû book we are told that "for the sake of the Soul alone the Universe exists," and as the universe is composed of pairs of opposites we must assume that these contrasts are necessary for the education and evolution of man.

"It takes all sorts to make a world," says an old proverb, and when

the novelist wishes to enlist our interest in his story, his little epitome of life, he invariably presents to our view two contrasting poles, the hero and the villain, and on the varying fortunes of these two pairs of opposites, against the background of the lesser characters, the interest of the whole narrative revolves.

For some reason best known to himself, Thackeray described his novel *Vanity Fair* as a novel without a hero, but every reader with any penetration must recognize in the faithful Dobbin the Good Principle in that little cosmos, to offset and serve as contrast to the infamous Becky. Even Thackeray's genius could not succeed in holding the interest of the reading public had he not bowed to the inevitable necessity of making his little universe bi-polar.

Theosophy teaches that the soul of man swings like a pendulum between the world of matter and the world of spirit. A life is lived on earth among the disappointments and the limitations of a bodily existence and this is followed by a time of rest and peace, spent in the heaven-world where all his garnered experience is assimilated, his wounds healed, his ideals realized, his confidence restored, and after which he once again descends, enters a new body, and sets himself to learn his lessons in the hard but necessary school of human life. An indefinite sojourn in Devachan, or the spiritual world, would cloy him with its unrelieved monotony of ease and sweetness. An interminable conflict on the battlefield of material life would blast the soul by its too-long-continued strain. We need the alternating contrasts, the interchange of states, to complete our experience and emphasize the lessons taught by each.

The necessity of contrast has even impressed some theologians when they have treated upon the Saints' Eternal Rest in Heaven. After walking through the golden streets for untold ages and participating in an interminable concert of sacred music, can we wonder that the theologians have seen the need of some opposing contrast to relieve the unrelieved monotony of celestial bliss? The Rev. Richard Baxter has suggested that the saints in glory are permitted to enjoy a contrast by proxy, as it were. They may, he thinks, sometimes steal away to the verge of the Elysian Fields, lean over the battlements, and look into the furnace on the further side of the Great Gulf fixed between. There they may see their former friends who suffer in the quenchless flames, and having let the contrast sink into their minds, they will participate in the concert with an added zest,

a heightened realization of their own blessedness, and strike their harp-strings and raise their voices with redoubled thankfulness and joy. Thus in the dogmatic scheme "All things work together for good to them that love God," and the very tortures of the damned are overruled to subserve and enhance the pleasure of just men made perfect!

We are bound to assume that any compassion the saints may have developed during their earthly existence has been removed from their constitution by some transcendental surgical operation. A mother who could see her first-born quiver in the flames and then participate in a concert with any satisfaction is happily a rarity upon our earth.

Jesus Christ said, "the poor ye have always with you," and indeed it is hard to conceive of life without the two opposing poles of poverty and wealth. Supposing reincarnation to be true, then, I ask you to imagine a man who devotes his whole time to the accumulation of an enormous fortune. Lapped in luxury he grows self-indulgent. Never knowing hunger he is incapable of sympathizing with the distress of the starving. May it not be required for his education that in some future life on earth he will himself be situated so that he will physically experience the poverty which he successfully avoided in his previous earth-life? If a man exerts his utmost will to swing his pendulum to extreme wealth, will it not of necessity oscillate to the other pole as a direct consequence and a necessary result? This would not be a blind mechanical adjustment merely; but a merciful provision in the divine order of things for the experience of the soul and the symmetrical development of his character. Middle lines are best, and the Theosophist believes that by a life of unselfish labor for others he will find that the Law will follow him through his earthly pilgrimage and provide for his moderate necessities without the need of his devoting his thought and effort merely to the absorbing question as to what he shall eat and drink and wherewithal shall he be clothed.

Contrast is the great schoolmaster to teach us the lessons of life. One of the first mistakes humanity made when endowed with the Promethean fire of mind was to suppose that pleasure was the great goal and that our lasting satisfaction lay in an infinite series of agreeable sensations. Therefore we flung ourselves into a mad pursuit of pleasure only to find our course continually checked and thwarted by the operation of the Law of Contrast which enacts that every orgy of the senses must be followed by a reaction of dulled sensation and

an ebbing of the tides of life. Gaiety pushed to its extreme merges into depression, and they who drain the cup of pleasure to the bottom are the ones who taste the bitter dregs of keenest pain. In playing see-saw on a balanced plank it is well known that the higher you rise into the air the lower you dip towards earth, and those who teeter up and down upon the see-saw of sensation, trying to win their happiness by making a permanent home in pleasure, are slowly being taught the hopeless folly of their enterprise. The writer once went on a pleasure excursion with a companion who seized every opportunity to get a laugh. A joke was squeezed to yield its last drop of merriment. Every laugh was so prolonged that it died of sheer exhaustion, and every opportunity to tell a funny story was eagerly seized and made the most of. Later on he learned that his merry companion was subject to fits of melancholy, the natural reaction of extreme and boisterous hilarity.

Here is a suggestion which, though merely a speculation put forward to illustrate the subject and entirely unauthorized, is yet I think to be supported by the teaching of the Law of Contrast.

Religions in all ages have been discredited and injured by the practice of extreme asceticism on the part of some of their adherents. An attempt has been made to crush out the natural, innocent pleasures of moderation by a fierce determined will. Yogins have sequestered themselves in solitudes and supported life on a few grains of rice a day. They have lain on cold stones without coverings, they have swung on hooks which pierced their backs, and deprived themselves of necessary sleep. If in some succeeding earth-life (I speak as a believer in reincarnation) you wanted to find one of these extremists, where should you look for him? I would not inquire at the monasteries or search the lonely cells of desert anchorites, but wherever in the whirl of great cities the mad pursuit of pleasure was most madly followed up, there I should look, and I believe that foremost among the revelers would be found the stern ascetics of a former age, obeying the recurrent swing of the pendulum pushed too far to the opposite extreme in some past life of self-inflicted torture. The votaries of pleasure in one life will by a natural reaction be the inmates of hermit caves in a succeeding life, and thus the poor unfortunates will oscillate between these two extremes until they learn their lesson and keep to the middle of the road.

Were we continually obliged to watch these tragedies of oscilla-

tion and see our brothers perpetually beating their heads against the stone walls that border the middle of the pathway of our life, the spectacle would be sad enough to all who had any feeling of compassion; but as Shakespeare so often introduced fools and clowns into his most harrowing tragedies to relieve the strain upon our minds, so life abounds with comic interludes, and humorous "asides" that mitigate the sadness and render existence supportable in what would otherwise be indeed a vale of tears.

True Theosophy advises that we should turn our gaze inward — that the dawn of the spiritual consciousness be found and its radiance shed upon our daily life. That the song of the soul should be recognized first in the depths of our own being and then be sounded forth to still the noisy discords of the world outside.

Contrast is necessary everywhere. Existence depends upon the balance of opposites. Some people in their enthusiasm for living the Higher Life wish to destroy their passional nature and thus get rid of strife and temptation, which they regard as hostile to their progress.

Our lower nature is indeed antagonistic to the higher, but yet it is useful. Good would not be good without evil as a contrast. It is the animal passions that furnish us with the necessary force for working on this plane when once subdued, and they can only *be* subdued by struggle and temptation with of course the possibility of our defeat.

I believe that we may fairly deduce from the teachings of Theosophy that as a man nears the completion of his education the violence of contrasts in his life will gradually subside. No longer snatching at extremes of pleasure he will avoid the sharp antithesis of pain. His course will become more temperate and equable. The crude vibration of pleasure will appear as much a disturbing and unwelcome factor in his life as the vibrations of pain. No longer fascinated by these two poles of sensation, man prepares to leave the battlefield and schoolroom. He has fought his fight and learned his lesson: why tarry further in the halls of learning? For his own sake there is no need to remain; but can a compassionate onlooker retire if his presence would help the younger scholars and shorten and render easier their painful tasks? The great Teachers have made a deep resolve never to retire until the last learner has done with his lessons and the old schoolroom of contrasted poles has dissolved and melted into its original unity, because "for the sake of the soul alone the universe exists."

THE TESTIMONY OF MEGALITHIC MONUMENTS:

by H. Travers, M. A.



ARCHAEOLOGY is of unfailing interest to the reading public, and the press is evidently aware of this fact. Man is interested in the subject of his own ancestry, and more and more space is given to articles and illustrations dealing therewith. In a popular scientific periodical we find an abridgment of an address before a learned society on megalithic monuments; it is amply illustrated with photo reproductions and gives an excellent idea of the universal diffusion and magnitude of these silent witnesses of man's mighty past. The pictures embrace the Balearic Isles, Peru, Easter Island, India, China, Honduras, Ireland, Abyssinia, Egypt, England, France, Africa, Siberia, and Java. The article accompanying them gives descriptions of the remains and also some speculations as to their origin and use. With regard to the speculations, the readers will probably feel how inadequate these are; and, remembering that academic opinions are many and conflicting, and that science is unsettled and continually changing, will await the advent of more light on the subject. It would seem that this is a case where preconceived theories have been permitted unduly to color the inferences which might be drawn from the evidence of the facts. True, the scientific method, though inductive in principle, allows in practice a reasonable amount of give-and-take between fact and provisional hypothesis; but sometimes the hypothesis is given undue prominence over the fact, and then we get what amounts to a dogmatic attitude.

For instance, it is assumed, as part of a preconceived opinion, that the quarrymen and sculptors of these monuments were ignorant of the use of metal tools; whereas, in the absence of this preconceived opinion, the use of metal tools might have been *inferred* from the skill with which very hard material has been graven. The ignorance of metals, however, having been assumed in deference to well-known beliefs as to the evolution of races, it becomes necessary to account for the undeniable results in some other way; and here comes in the difficulty which cannot fail to strike the reader. The account at present under consideration adopts the policy of providing explanations so far as the writer's imagination will go, and leaving the rest unexplained. Sometimes, too, the argument seems to be that because things *might have been* so, therefore they *were* so. In the case of the Egyptian obelisks, we are told that some people think they were burned out

of the quarry, and others that they were split out with wooden wedges. After the block was thus detached, however, it was "dressed and carved and removed to its destination." How carved? we may well ask; with fire or with wooden wedges? And why could they not have quarried the block with tools like those wherewith they engraved it? As to the transportation and erection of the monoliths, the writer prefers to say, "We do not know."

Clearly the workmen had capable tools of some sort, whether metal or of some other kind not now known to us; the inference can be evaded only be a hypothesis more wonderful than that which it seeks to obviate. As to the Easter Island statues, we are told in so many words that the architects *did* drag them across the island with ropes made of native hemp, and *did* roll them up inclines, and *did* undermine them till they sank into perpendicularity, and so forth; when we strongly suspect that the writer's knowledge warrants no more than that they *might* so have worked.

The great resemblance between the stones, their arrangements, and their inscribing, suggests that they were all erected by one race; but their widespread prevalence implies that such a race must have been spread over the entire globe. This idea is repugnant to opinions conceived on other grounds, and is therefore rejected. The theory of migration is also rejected on similar grounds; and we are left with the hypothesis that nearly all races pass naturally through a stone-age, wherein they are impelled to erect these gigantic structures and to dedicate them in the same way to the same grandiose religious yearnings. Our present authority, however, departs diametrically from many other theorists, for he abandons the idea that it was the *environment* that thus impelled so many independent races to act in the same way. That favorite principle will not work in this case, it seems; the environment was *not* the same. Hence it could not have been the environment which called forth the megalithic habit in the peoples. It must have been something from within. Man at all times and in all places has been *intuitively* impelled, says our authority. This alone will suffice to show the uncertainty of opinion on such subjects.

Many of the monoliths, as is well known, are of enormous size. A corner-stone at Cuzco is 27 feet by 14 by 12, and enormous blocks are found high up in walls, as at Persepolis, while the perfection of the fitting and jointing is an unceasing marvel. On the evidence of the facts one would infer great knowledge and power on the part of

the artificers, and it is only preconceived ideas that prevent us from doing so. One would likewise infer the prevalence of a single race, rather than resort to the very difficult hypothesis mentioned above. It might be pointed out that at the present time there exists a race and a civilization (the European) which has carried its name and its ideas all over the globe. Why not so in the far past? The answer is, Because preconceived ideas about human evolution bar the way. But after all these ideas are very evanescent in comparison with the ages wherewith we are dealing; and it is possible they may be changed; and then the evidence of facts will be able to speak for itself.

Some races do not have any megalithic stage, thinks the writer; the American aborigines have not been through it, though their predecessors had. Who, then, are those aborigines? Many will be disposed to regard them as the remote descendants of just such ancient races as built the monuments. They constitute a medley of many races; they are the remains of a whole human family, so to say. Differing widely among each other in language, customs, and disposition, they have a certain broad resemblance; though perhaps it would be more accurate to say that they resemble one another in the one point of being different from later races. Does the writer regard them as a "primitive" people — that is, as a people who have never emerged from childhood? Both they and aborigines in general are far more like very *old* races, in their second childhood rather than in their first.

In Africa we are faced with the same problem of a medley of widely differing races, all bearing signs of great antiquity; and putting such facts in conjunction with the evidence of the monuments, we have strong ground for the opinion that the past history of man is on a far larger scale than is at present believed, and that it goes much further back. Civilization, too, would seem to be a periodic phenomenon, sweeping like a wave slowly around the globe, raising now one people, now another, to its crest, and afterwards dropping them into the trough as it passes on. Then the old races continue to live, with simpler habits and fading memories.

The phrase "primitive man" seems a stumbling-block in the way of impartial opinion. It suggests that human evolution lies all in one line, of which the present civilization is the highest point ever reached, and that all preceding races and ages have been but lower steps in this ascent. This theory, a survival of bygone narrow views, becomes

more and more inconsistent with the growth of knowledge. Sooner or later the facts will force us to accept the view that civilizations have existed long ages ago and disappeared with scarcely a trace.

If "primitive man" means living in a primitive state, then the world furnishes us many living examples today; but there is little, if anything, to suggest that such peoples are on the upward line of development.

In attempting to divine the purpose of these monuments, we are prone to adopt the plan of searching among our own ideas for one which will suffice as explanation. Were they fortresses, tombs, or temples? It is at least possible, however, that their original object was one which would scarcely be comprehensible to our present ideas. Again, some allowance must be made for the probability that monuments which have stood for countless centuries would be used for all these purposes at different times as the convenience of different peoples might suggest. Some are evidently connected with astronomy, as though to fix sidereal positions for the marking of epochs and the counting of great cycles; or to focus the light of the sun or some star upon an interior shrine. The Egyptian ones are graven with signs whose meaning is even now but partially disclosed, and there are stones similarly graven in America, whose message has not been disclosed at all. It seems likely that the great human family which promoted the erection of these monuments had a science, a religion, or a religion-science, which was expressed in symbols, and that the symbols were thus indelibly recorded, not merely for memorial purposes, but because the symbol was expected to evoke the cosmic potency for which it stood. In this case the proper erection, decoration, and dedication of such a temple might be a ceremony of the utmost importance to the welfare of the people who did it. What if superstitions are but the survival of ceremonials which once were performed rightly, knowingly, and effectually?

A great field is open to Americans in archaeology, and yet we find them strangely fettered to the ideas of the Old World. Surely here is scope for originality and independence; and there are in America ruins as venerable as any in the Old World.

We must expect a certain reluctance on the part of academic opinion to adopt views which would too suddenly and greatly enlarge the confines of its familiar domain; and we are fully aware that an acceptance of the Theosophical view regarding the antiquity of the

human race would entail a somewhat revolutionary overhauling of comfortably settled ideas. What is more, our ideas in other respects would need enlarging, if consistency were to be preserved. But is not this overhauling already going on everywhere? In what department of thought and life is man not actively engaged in searching out broader ways? The question of man's past is intimately woven with the questions of his present and future.



THE SENSE of Duty cometh first; then cometh Stedfastness; and zealous Work the jewel is, that crowneth all. — *H. P. Blavatsky*

THE GOOD is one thing; the pleasant another; these two, having different objects, claim a man. It is well with him who clings to the good; he who chooses the pleasant, misses his end. — *Kathopanishad*

ONE MOMENT in eternity is of as great consequence as another moment; for eternity changes not, neither is one part better than another part.

— *Zoroaster*

KARMA is never the cause of emancipation; actions are for the purification of the heart, not for the attainment of real substance. The substance can be attained by right discrimination, but not by any amount of Karma.

— *Sankarâchârya*

LIKE a beautiful flower full of color, but without perfume, are the fine but fruitless words of one who does not act conformably thereto.

IF ONE should conquer in battle a thousand times a thousand men; and if another should conquer himself, it is the greater victory.

ONE'S own self conquered is better than all other people. Not an angel or demon, or even a god, can change into defeat the victory of one who hath vanquished himself and lives always under restraint. — *Dhammapada*

SCIENTIFIC JOTTINGS: by the Busy Bee

HOW CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE HAS FOLLOWED H. P. BLAVATSKY



IN these days, when current thought is admitting so many things for which H. P. Blavatsky contended a quarter of a century ago, it is interesting to refer to her writings in confirmation of the fact that she was the pioneer. Positions for which Theosophists in the past have contended, as against the current ideas of yesterday, are now held by the science of today. This state of affairs is in accordance with evolution. It was inevitable both that current opinion should follow, and that it should follow slowly; and it is equally inevitable that it will in the future still further indorse the teachings of Theosophy. For this there are two reasons: first, the body of current thought follows along "lines of force" already laid down by such pioneers as H. P. Blavatsky and those who have studied her teachings; second, the teachings of Theosophy being true, science must inevitably confirm them as it advances towards its splendid destiny.

1. That the work of modern science is excellent, when carried on according to its own prescribed conditions; but that it often transgresses these and becomes dogmatic, unreasonable, and overbearing.

On this subject, H. P. Blavatsky opens her section on science, in Volume I of *The Secret Doctrine*, with these words, which have been often quoted but will always bear repetition:

So long as Science remains what in the words of Professor Huxley it is, viz., "organized common sense"; so far as its inferences are drawn from accurate premises — its generalizations resting on a purely inductive basis — every Theosophist and Occultist welcomes respectfully and with due admiration its contributions to the domain of cosmological law. It is only when its more ardent exponents, overstepping the limits of observed phenomena, in order to penetrate into the arcana of Being, attempt to wrench the formation of Kosmos and its *Living Forces* from Spirit, and attribute all to blind matter, that the Occultists claim the right to dispute and call in question their theories. — p. 477

2. That the function of science is to classify and generalize on phenomena, but it cannot explain the ulterior causes.

Science can, it is true, collect, classify, and generalize upon phenomena; but the occultist, arguing from admitted metaphysical data, declares that the daring explorer, who would probe the inmost secrets of Nature, must transcend the narrow limitations of sense, and transfer his consciousness into the region of noumena and the sphere of primal causes. — *Ibid.*

3. That faculties higher than the physical senses are needed.

To effect this, he must develop faculties which are absolutely dormant — save in a few rare and exceptional cases — in the constitution of the offshoots of our present Fifth Root-race in Europe and America. He can in no other conceivable manner collect the facts on which to base his speculations. — *Ibid*

The subject of these quotations has lately been the theme of authoritative scientific pronouncements, and it is important to observe how closely these pronouncements follow the forecast. H. P. Blavatsky was a sturdy champion of science, and so are Theosophists; let us not forget that. For surely to distinguish between truth and error is to do service to science and to vindicate its loyal votaries against those who merely disparage it by departing from its noble principles.

The function of science, as science is defined by its own adherents, is *necessarily* and by definition limited in the way described by H. P. Blavatsky and admitted by candid and discerning men of science. It studies phenomena, finds out laws of relationship, draws inferences leading to the discovery of other facts, applies its discoveries to invention, etc. But its knowledge of what lies beyond the reach of the physical senses is necessarily inferential. And this method does not lead to certain and invariable conclusions, as we well know. Is the existence of mind known to us by inference or by direct cognition? Evidently the latter; and if we ask whether science would ever have discovered *mind* by inference from physical data alone, we at once see what a confusion of meaning there is. A very large part of the mind is objective to perception, it can be perceived by mental senses and studied. These mental objects, however, are not amenable to physical senses and instruments, and higher wits are needed for their investigation. Realizing this, some men of science have been led into “psychic research” and the like; but in following this track they have not sufficiently revolutionized their methods of research.

4. *Concerning the ether.*

The ether has recently been cited scientifically as an instance of a higher order of matter which eludes the physical senses. It can transmit transverse undulations, we are told, and the frequency of these can be measured. And yet we cannot find any rapport or connexion between ether and matter; we do not brush against it or disturb it in any way as we sweep through it. Thus ether would seem to be undifferentiated physical matter; or matter itself, in the unit condition, with its qualities all latent and undeveloped. It is the parent of matter, as it were. Like the Deity, it sustains the universe and

creates it, yet stands aloof. Besides the ether, there is this radio-active matter, which forms the connecting link between elements, the chemical elements being like eddies or temporary aggregations of this ever-flowing substance. All this and much more is said in *The Secret Doctrine*, the subject "ether" being alluded to in innumerable scattered quotations throughout the work. But there are seven grades of ether, and ether itself is but one grade of seven grades of Ākāśa, the world-stuff. So there is much to discover yet. Ether —

is MATTER on quite another plane of perception and being, and it can neither be analyzed by scientific apparatus, appreciated, nor even conceived by "scientific imagination," unless the possessors thereof study the Occult Sciences.— *Ibid.* p. 487

Evidently, if physical matter requires this parent-substance behind it, so must other objects — non-physical objects — require a substratum. There must be a mental ether as the background of our mind, wherein thoughts work, are born and dissolved, just as physical objects do in *their* ether. And so on, through successive stages, till we come to the primordial world-stuff, the Great Deep, the Waters of Space, the Earth-Mother, etc. The ether of science is the lowest analog of this last.

5. *Atoms are developed, decay, and die; the atomic condition being only a temporary condition of matter.*

"Matter is eternal," says the Esoteric Doctrine. But the matter the Occultists conceive of in its *laya*, or *zero state*, is not the matter of modern science. . . . Therefore, when the adept or alchemist adds that, although matter is eternal, . . . yet atoms *are born at every new manvantara*, or reconstruction of the universe, it is no such contradiction as a materialist who believes in nothing beyond the atom, might think.— *Ibid.* p. 545

MATTER IS ETERNAL, becoming atomic (its aspect) only periodically.— *Ibid.* p. 552

This is interesting in connexion with the recent discoveries in the radio-active series of elements. It is now found that what were believed to be fixed and stable elements are merely temporary stages in the evolution of another substance, which is described as electrons in motion. In the Mendeleeff periodic table, in which the chemical elements are catalogued in accordance with their atomic weights, there are places that are occupied by groups of elements instead of by single elements, and the required atomic weight is a kind of average of these several approximations. Inferentially it is suspected that the other

elements are in reality groups of elements, closely allied and bound together. The atoms, therefore, appear now as planetary systems moving in an ether of radio-active sub-matter. The subject of the evolution of matter is hereby opened up, and this leads us to another point — the evolution of worlds.

It is stated in *The Secret Doctrine* that cometary matter and some of the bodies classed under nebulae, are physical matter in some of its inchoate and preparatory stages, on the way towards further concretion into planetary matter. This again has now been admitted by certain astronomers, to whom the discovery of radio-active matter and electrons has furnished a convenient *locus standi*. It should be mentioned that H. P. Blavatsky also states that the light received from distant stars undergoes modification upon entering the confines of terrestrial space, so that its appearance in the spectroscope affords misleading testimony as to its condition when it started on its journey, and consequently as to the constitution of the elements on those stars. The chemical elements on those stars are not of necessity exactly the same as on earth, nor is matter necessarily in the same stage of evolution. But there is what some scientists have called a “compensating influence” which neutralizes the testimony of the spectroscope by translating it into terrestrial language, so to say.

6. *That living organisms are the active agents in physical phenomena.*

Science, dimly perceiving the truth, may find Bacteria and other infinitesimals in the human body, and see in them but occasional and abnormal visitors to which diseases are attributed. Occultism — which discerns a life in every atom and molecule, whether in a mineral or human body, in air, fire, or water — affirms that our whole body is built of such lives, the smallest bacteria under the microscope being to them in comparative size like an elephant to the tiniest infusoria.

Vol. I, p. 225, note.

The same infinitesimal *invisible lives* compose the atoms of the bodies of the mountain and the daisy, of man and the ant, of the elephant, and of the tree which shelters him from the sun. Each particle — whether you call it organic or inorganic — is a life. — *Ibid.* p. 261

Every day science is affording more evidence of this, by discovering microbes at work behind organic processes. But it has not yet gotten so far as to trace the presence of invisible lives behind the phenomena usually called inorganic. It does, however, admit that these phenomena are the effects of unknown causes, but prefers to designate those causes by provisional names which describe but do not explain

them. Chemical affinity, for instance, is an expression used to denote both the phenomenon itself and its unknown cause; and we are in the position of a man seeing the work in operation but unable to see the operators. Nevertheless,

Chemistry and physiology are the two great magicians of the future, who are destined to open the eyes of mankind to the great physical truths. — *Ibid*

7. *As to invisible globes in the solar system.*

A recent scientific speaker has suggested that there *may* be such, and that they might be every whit as substantial as our own, and yet we never be aware of them. What do we know of the ether, which yet, as they say, is far and away the densest substance known, and which is so omnipresent and important? Some speculators have even gone so far as to suggest that matter is merely so many holes in the ether! On this plan there could be any number of worlds, made of different orders of matter, hurtling about in space, all unaware of each other, never colliding (because they are on different planes) any more than a thought can collide with an automobile. At least, this is what they say, or something like it; and it agrees very well with things that are stated in *The Secret Doctrine*. As to the atomic theory, if matter is composed of very minute particles separated from each other by relatively enormous spaces, there is evidently room for many different kinds of matter to be superimposed upon, or interwoven with, one another; so that a single accidental jerk might knock us right off this world and on to another, without our moving more than a minute fraction of a hair's breadth!

Certain globes are mentioned in *The Secret Doctrine* as being "in coadunition, but not in consubstantiality, with our globe." If physical matter is built on the atomic system, it seems conceivable that bodies so constructed could interpenetrate each other.

8. *That the intellectual faculty is only one of the possible means at our disposal for attaining knowledge.*

This idea, which has been emphasized in scientific circles lately, is of course so much a part of Theosophy that one can scarcely select any particular quotation appropriate thereto. But it needs to be carefully stated, or misconception may arise through the variable meaning of terms. For the purpose in view, the word "intellect," or the phrase "intellectual faculty," has to be restricted so as to denote the ordinary scope of what is *called* the intellect today. This is important. Otherwise it might be said that the scope of the intellect is unlimited; and

so indeed it is, if we use the word in a proper and wider sense. But the meaning of the statement, in either case, is that other faculties exist besides those which modern science employs. H. P. Blavatsky's thesis, in the subject of Occult Science, is based on this. How else, she says, in a quotation made above, can the student gain first-hand knowledge as to ultra-physical nature? Theosophy has always proclaimed the existence of latent faculties in man, but it has been far more important to insist on the primary rules of brotherhood and conduct, which are *indispensable conditions to the more intimate study of nature*. Those who endeavor to reverse the process and to delve into nature's mysteries before they are fit, meet inevitable disaster. They are deluded by their imagination, or they arouse dormant passions, or they upset the balance of their nervous system and brain, or they stray into absurd and futile bypaths, and thus leave the ranks of useful workers.

We have first to fight our own nature and master its weaknesses ere we can stand equipped for explorations in realms of inquiry where the conditions are both hazardous and exacting. And since the nature outside us and the nature inside us are really one and the same, the only way to understand the mysteries of the former is to master those of the latter. This explains why people have failed to master the deeper mysteries of external nature; they have not yet learned to master the mysteries of their own nature. Since they choose to live under the dominance of their physical nature, their senses cannot transcend its limits; surely a very logical and equitable state of affairs. In the same way, a man who is under the dominion of any passion or weakness is thereby crippled and blinded in the work of research; and should he by any means endeavor to force on the development of astral senses, he merely multiplies his delusions. Of this we have abundant proof in the fate of those who have mistaken the way and dabbled in psychism.

Theosophy does not profess to teach people "how to become magnetic and fascinate other people," or how to develop what is euphemistically termed a "strong will," but what is really only a strong desire (and therefore a cruel master); hence it will not be expected that we shall give rules for the attainment of these admirable results. Besides, there is no special reason why we should take such a benevolent interest in the psychic development of people, whether singly or collectively. It might be better to develop the powers ourselves, rather

than give away our secret! But we prefer to follow the real program of Theosophy and develop those powers which will make us of use in the world; hence we are engaged in combating evil wherever we may happen to meet it.

The real meaning of Science is Self-Knowledge, and we understand the external world in proportion as we understand our own nature. Do we not need a Science which will unfold to man the mysteries of his nature and render him a happy and self-controlled being? If so, then we must develop *Spiritual* faculties — the power to perceive intuitively what is right, and freedom of the Will so that we may do what we know to be right. Nor are these faculties out-of-the-way or bizarre; they are merely the faculties which we all possess but which we so often neglect and undervalue.

It would be merely a question of time and trouble to prolong this paper indefinitely by citing more instances of the way in which current thought has followed the track of Theosophy. The function thus fulfilled by Theosophy is in accordance with the way in which knowledge always has been diffused. People may look for some sudden revelation, or try to prove that the greater is evolved from the less, in knowledge, as they say it is in other matters; but enlightenment is always traceable to the work of some dynamic individuality, though this central sun may be attended by a train of lesser lights to reflect and distribute his luminosity.

GIGANTOSAURUS AFRICANUS

Recent discoveries in Africa have resulted in the finding of a nearly complete skeleton of what is by far the largest animal whose remains have yet been found. This saurian, which has been named *Gigantosaurus Africanus*, was found by German savants at Tendaguru in German East Africa. It is not long ago that *Diplodocus Carnegii* was an object of wonder as being the largest nearly complete skeleton found. This was 84 feet long, and 11 feet high at the shoulder; but *Gigantosaurus* is 160 feet long and 22 feet high at the shoulder. His arm bone is 7 feet 1 inch, as long as the whole leg of *Diplodocus*. An imaginary picture of him appears in *The Illustrated London News* (August 30), where he is seen to be an enormous lizard, but with legs as long proportionally as those of a bear, an immense tail trailing behind, and a very long neck carrying an insignificant lizard's head. He lived in Lower Cretaceous times.

There is considerable doubt as to whether an animal of such a

size could stand up or even cohere, supposing physical conditions to be anything like they are now. If he was aquatic, the difficulty, of course, would not be so great; but if he became stranded, he might be crushed under his own weight. There is a similar difficulty with regard to some of the flying reptiles. Perhaps, then, we may surmise that physical conditions were not the same at this remote age; the properties of matter may not have been the same. And after all it is just as reasonable to suppose this as the contrary; especially when we reflect that everything is subject to evolution. Men of science are more favorably inclined to the view that such things as chemical elements are not fixed and constant, but may change and evolve. And so it may be with other qualities of nature. One would hardly expect that a world so different in many respects from the present world would be identical in other respects. The evolution of animals, so far as size is concerned at any rate, has not been continuously progressive. The lizard tribe has greatly degenerated since Cretaceous times.

A RECENT press cable from New York announces the arrival of an eminent anthropologist with some ancient skulls which, he says, "tend to confirm the belief that the anthropoid ape was an offshoot of primitive man." This is not the first time in late years that this view has been mooted in scientific quarters; but it merely confirms the statements made a quarter of a century ago by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine* (published 1888). Hence we have another illustration of the way in which science ends by following the lines of Theosophy. The notion of "primitive man," however, still survives and colors the theories.

H. P. Blavatsky states that certain anthropoid apes are the remote descendants of an early race of mankind, and are a by-product due to a mistake made by that race. Science must eventually come round to this view. But it must also gradually adopt many others of the teachings of Theosophy as regards evolution, such as the very great antiquity of the human race and of civilization; and be prepared to give up its present narrow and inadequate view of the subject. But the views of modern science on evolution are very inchoate and variable; they can scarcely be considered as the last word.

H. P. Blavatsky was a pioneer of thought, and Theosophy is a pioneer movement. The great body of thought must follow slowly. Even those men of science who have ventured with great caution to express some of the views advocated by Theosophy, have aroused criti-

cism among their fellows as being too daring or too visionary. Moreover the teachings of Theosophy with regard to evolution are part and parcel of Theosophy as a whole. Theosophy's nobler account of the origin of man is consistent with its nobler ideal of man's present nature and future destiny. The world will be glad when science gives up the idea that man came from the apes.

A LONG ARTICLE on "Sleep," in a magazine, after much reasoning and the citation of many illustrative cases, ends with the following conclusion: that sleep is not a disease nor a morbid condition due to self-poisoning of the body; but that it is a normal condition, forming (together with the waking state) part and parcel of the life of the individual. Its function is protective and restorative, and designed to prevent the individual from arriving at a state of exhaustion.

It may seem strange to some minds that so long and elaborate a disquisition should have been considered necessary in order to prove this obvious fact. But the explanation is that it was necessary to confute another theory to the opposite effect. Certain theorists, it seems, had declared that sleep was an abnormal state.

Thus we see that all roads lead to truth, if followed far enough, but some are more roundabout than others. We cannot be *too* sure of a thing; the more different kinds of ways we know it, the better; and although we knew before that sleep was nature's sweet restorer, we know it even better now. One way of proving that a thing is so, is to prove that it is not otherwise. Thus, an algebraist might prove that x is equal to y by showing that it is not equal to any of the other letters of the alphabet. And so, since sleep is not an abnormal process, therefore it is a normal process.

Sleep is a state of consciousness; or, rather, several different states of consciousness, for we pass through successive stages between complete wakefulness and the deepest slumber. What is the state of the ego during deep sleep? Presumably, if an insect were to bite us while we were in this state, the critics of Reincarnation and Karma would call it unjust, because we are thereby made to suffer for something which happened in a state of which we preserve no recollection. We spend about a third of our life in a state of consciousness which we do not remember; so why cavil so much over the fact that we do not remember the past experiences of the Soul?

How could we bring to our waking consciousness the experiences

of deep sleep? Perhaps by translating those experiences (if this be possible) into terms of waking consciousness. To remember fully what we experienced in deep sleep would be like being awake and asleep at the same time — which *may* be possible. If, when the veils of sense are drawn aside, and the imagination no longer deludes us with its pictures, knowledge is revealed, how could we bring back that knowledge into the waking state, where the senses and the imagination exercise such despotic sway? Perhaps we may get light and inspiration during deep sleep, and it may act as a power that stands behind our thoughts and deeds during the day; but it would be very likely that our minds would twist the inspiration into strange distorted shapes.

It is pointed out that often a five-minutes' sleep will refresh one greatly. This shows that the repair of bodily tissues is not the only thing that rests us. If we can for a moment *let go* of all thought, travel down to the center of our consciousness, and come up again by a different route, we get a new start. The writer quoted said that sleep is a positive state, not a negative one. And it can be made still more positive, if, when falling asleep, we bear in mind that we are approaching a mystery and need to be master of our will.

FRIENDS IN COUNSEL

WHAT IS OCCULTISM? by H.



THE word "Occultism" needs to be defended against perversion arising from the wrong sense in which it is often used. As it came into prominent use in connexion with Theosophy, it is proper to turn to the writings of H. P. Blavatsky for a definition of what she meant thereby. She has described it as the sacred science of Self-Knowledge, and has inseparably associated it with all that is unselfish and noble. In thus defining it, she has been careful to distinguish Occultism from psychism, magic, and the occult arts; pointing out that the latter do not imply unselfishness and purity of motive, and may therefore be used for evil purposes, or by the ignorant with evil effect; whereas Occultism demands of the student unselfishness and reliability of character.

As the Theosophical Society was founded for the purpose of promoting the true welfare of humanity, not to minister to the needs of a

select coterie, it can be understood that Occultism (as defined by the Founder of the Theosophical Society) is concerned alone with the real interests of humanity and not with any lesser interests.

Occultism is the knowledge of how to use our faculties aright, how to find our place in life, how to realize what we are and what is our true purpose. It is the science of Self-Knowledge, and Self-Knowledge is defined by H. P. Blavatsky to be "of loving deeds the child." And in this she but repeats the eternal message of the great Teachers, who have ever taught that the road to Wisdom lies through Compassion. This maxim is also the essence of Christianity.

It is evident that what are generally called "occult powers" are of the nature of personal aggrandisements, and cannot therefore achieve the grand object. There are many people who are out after the mysterious, and many people ready to cater for them; but this is the way of the world in other matters than Theosophy. Fortunately, there are also in the world serious people — people who count for something — and they also must be ministered to.

When H. P. Blavatsky came with her message to the modern world, she earnestly sought for pupils able and willing to learn what she had to teach. Many were attracted, and they all received in accordance with their capacity. To appeals for knowledge, the Teacher can only reply by offering for acceptance the conditions. If these are accepted, knowledge can be conferred or the applicant set on the way to winning it. If the conditions are rejected, the knowledge cannot be conferred or won. Many were unable to accept the conditions, and went away disappointed; in some cases blaming their Teacher instead of themselves. And what are the conditions? Simply that the aspirant must show himself devoted to the great cause for which the Theosophical Society was founded. It was thus that H. P. Blavatsky bade her pupils register in their hearts a vow to themselves that they would so dedicate their lives. And so those who understand the word "Occultism" in the right sense are serious and earnest people, not mere wonder-seekers.

To give a concrete example of what is meant by Occultism, we might refer to the Râja-Yoga system of education, which was founded by Katherine Tingley for the purpose of carrying out Theosophical principles with regard to education. Here, surely, is where knowledge is needed; for while there is unlimited solicitude to do the right thing in education, we find everywhere an almost total darkness as to how

to set about it. In the Râja-Yoga system, the knowledge of human nature is applied to education, and the children are taught to govern their lower nature by means of their Higher nature, and so grow up healthy, happy, and well-balanced. There is no mystification, but simply plain common-sense. The teachers in this school may truly be said to be studying practical Occultism; because, instead of being engaged in wonder-seeking, they are applying their knowledge to useful work.

The power of thought is one of the familiar phrases of today, used in connexion with what is miscalled "occultism." But in what unworthy associations do we find this expression used? By the power of thought, say most of the professed teachers, we are to obtain — what? Ease, poise, comfort, contentment; physical health, strength, beauty, or even perhaps money and position (for a consideration). This seems a sorry attempt to wrest the powers of the Soul for the service of the personal Ego. It sounds very like ordinary self-love and worship of personal stature; and there is not much of the old gospel of brotherly love about it, nor of the manly qualities of the Knight and true Gentleman.

The power of thought is indeed magical and potent, provided it is not turned to increasing the strength of the personal Ego. Clearly, the strengthening of personal Egos can only result in emulation and strife, not in the common good. Reformers miss their best opportunities through neglecting the power of a pure mind and devoted purpose. They pay too little attention to the effect of their own lives upon the success of their work. Perhaps they are enlisted in the cause of mercy as against cruelty and wish to stop some form of cruelty. But cruelty is overcome by kindness; therefore the reformer must be himself kind — on *every* occasion where it is called for. But he does not realize the importance of this, for he does not study Occultism.

It is a familiar enough saying that the only true satisfaction for man lies in impersonal service. But this sounds unpalatable for some people. The reason is natural, for the personal Ego protests at the idea of deposing him from the throne he has usurped. But, however unpalatable may be the truth, we must all admit it sooner or later, for the eternal laws cannot be changed to suit our ideas. If we fail to accommodate ourselves to the facts of life, the facts will continue to jar upon us. Man is here for the purposes of his Soul, which are not necessarily identical with his passing fancies or even his favorite

desires. The sooner he learns the purposes of his Soul and acquiesces in them, the better; for then, instead of being driven by a relentless fate, he will be following a known purpose. Occultism is the way by which we may win this knowledge of the purposes of the real *I* — which is not the personal *I*.

H. P. Blavatsky has written interestingly on the difference between "Psychic and Noetic Action," showing that it is possible prematurely to arouse certain latent forces in our nature, but that the result is futile or harmful, for the simple reason that we have neglected first to practise ourselves in the art of self-control. Experience of ourselves and of people in general shows that self-control is more needed than anything else, as we cannot yet govern the faculties we already have. It is essential first to call into action the Spiritual Will, and of course this can only be done by setting aside the selfish personal will. In other words, the aspirant must follow the path of impersonal service. In this way he develops his *Spiritual* powers — that is, he develops his real strength. A pure motive and a sincere aspiration towards the path of Wisdom can really awaken in us powers of the serviceable kind. But we must get rid of vanity and desire for personal profit, or the bias in our motive will pull us in the wrong direction. It is said in one book of instructions that "That power which the disciple shall covet is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men." This may sound harsh to some, but to others it will sound cool and refreshing.

WOMAN'S CHARACTER IN THE LIGHT OF REINCARNATION:

by M. T.



WHEN Reincarnation is taken into consideration in the study of woman's character, we can explain what we find in women as no other teaching enables us to do. We find at last the true reasons why women are what they are, why they do what they do, and why one woman, given a certain set of conditions as a life-opportunity, shows herself a heroine who conquers every obstacle and is a benediction to all around her, why another perseveres in the performance of her duty, but scatters no sunshine on the path of life, and why still another in similar conditions sinks from bad to worse until it is difficult to trace in her the semblance of womanhood. Reincarnation helps us to find the causes that account for woman's character as we know it and it furnishes a power-

ful incentive to the building of character on right lines now and to a conscious advance towards the perfection which is the final goal of our destiny. It is thus a teaching which reveals to each woman, her own self, in her relation to the past, the present, and the future, and helps her to begin to work with knowledge of the laws of being and of development, instead of being buffeted by Fate without any certainty that knowledge gained by experience is of any lasting benefit.

Reincarnation implies duality of nature — an enduring part of the human being, and its temporary masks or personalities of earth-life. In the permanent part of the nature, the Soul, are stored the lessons of each life; and when death comes, this lasting Self passes to a state of rest and refreshment until it is time to assume a new form on earth and acquire more experience. When the moment for rebirth comes, the past of the individual, every thought and act of which has linked itself to an unseen form and lies dormant until the time for rebirth, gives shape to the present and a child is born with physical, mental, and moral characteristics, all the direct result of his past deeds and thoughts. As the child grows he begins to create his future, just as certainly as he represents his past.

The superficial way of accounting for character is by attributing it to heredity from parents, to environment and early training. The fact is that many children have the same characteristics as their parents; but according to Theosophy they do not derive these from the parents, but come to be born of parents who have these tendencies similar to their own in a past life. The child is not like the parents because they are of the same family; they are of the same family because in the past they initiated like tendencies, or because they created conditions which they must take the fruits of together. It is the heredity from ourselves in past lives that faces us. Any student of life sees that each individual represents himself — the way different persons act in the same circumstances proves this. Environment and early training can do much, but the seeds of good and evil came with the new-born child and often grow to fruition again in defiance of the soil in which they are planted.

Character is the moral individuality of a person. It represents his or her power to choose “the better rather than the dearer.” It is a token of triumphs in past struggles. It is built up only by meeting temptation with the strength that overcomes, with the wit to slay a foe of your better nature before he slays you. A life of steady, posi-

tive resistance to evil, sends into space vibrations of strength and courage that speed to help to shape character at our next birth. The other course of conduct sends forwards the skulking demons of unconquered vices which often peep out in the faces of even very young children. We all recognize the different degrees of character. There are the steadfast and reliable. They were born that way some of them, and others have grown more like that after some intense experience that necessitated self-conquest if they were to continue to live at all. There are those who are vacillating. They resist one temptation, and succumb to the next unworthy desire. They never keep a steady purpose from one week to the next, hardly from one hour to the next. What will make them do it, until hard knocks awaken the Soul in them, and how will they learn except by repeated efforts life after life? And how will Humanity's great lesson of carrying a conscious high purpose from day to day across night and sleep, from life to life across death to birth again, in unbroken continuity of effort, ever be learned but by means of the long series of probationary in earth-life which the merciful Law affords to Humanity. A few "hints of the proper craft," a growing resolve to rivet the knowledge gained to the metal in us that endures, these we must win from an incarnation and learn to waste no moments in the ages necessary to perfect ourselves.

The building of every woman's character must then be begun where it was left off in a past life. One difficulty is that few women know where they have to begin. They do not know their own natures. Flattery, even affectionate but indiscriminating admiration, and the petty conventionalities and deceptions of life, help to keep them in the dark about themselves. Nor have they any idea of the high possibilities existing in each woman. The study of Theosophy is a revealer of the Self and enables a woman to enter a new path of life. Theosophy is living truth; it awakens the deeper nature, evokes power to see, and to overcome obstacles.

The knowledge of the teaching of Reincarnation especially, soon develops a new sense of responsibility. How many women would act differently if they knew that unless they act right towards every one in the events of life, unless they discharge their full duty to every one concerned, the same set of conditions, the same souls in different bodies, will meet them in another life, will return again and again until the knots of Fate are untied by right action? It is inclination, deep-seated selfish desire and ignorance of the true teachings, that make

women imagine that they can wield circumstances according to their wish and avoid experiences which with the suffering involved, are the means of growth their lives afford them. It is easy to foretell the future of the women who will carry no bricks in the building of character, who will avoid while they can the tests of life. They will meet again the husbands they neglected because mere inclination turned them from what they had undertaken; they will meet again the children they indulged or neglected without considering the easy way they took; they will meet again the men and women towards whom they acted in any way falling short of what they knew to be right, and, unless they learn from failure and call on their own Souls, they will have in the reborn associations not the strength and insight won by right action, but the flabbiness of will and the blind rebellion that fancied injustice engenders.

We can see that to build on a sure basis women must know that life continues as it does, that the opportunity is what it is, to reap on earth what they sow on earth and to learn to sow the right seed. They must know that the object of life is not to cherish any conditions that seem to constitute mere personal happiness, but to learn and to grow. Happiness does come, but we have to learn and to grow until the noble qualities of the Soul can be impressed on all the conditions of life and until these qualities are free in all our fellow creatures. Katherine Tingley has said that we must learn to love to suffer and endure. It is because pain and suffering *are* the birthpangs, or *may* be, of the higher qualities. Neither philosophy nor true religion nor experience teaches us that there is any other method. But this does not mean that sorrow and humiliation and anguish continue after the necessary testing is complete. It does not mean that relief with realization is delayed beyond the time in which a woman with her eyes open can learn her lessons. Some who have endured to the end have lived when the end came, poised for the time between the past and the future, seeing the meaning of it all, reading in a purified space in their own natures the golden letters of a great lesson and calm with a great peace, knowing that some of the knots of destiny were loosed forever.

A study, in noble poetry, of a realization like this is found in Browning's *The Ring and the Book*. Pompilia, the heroine of the poem, reviews her short life of bitter suffering and humiliation, reviews it with courage and tenderness and good cheer, and in the telling of her story makes plain why she can voice with such serene cer-

tainty that no more will she meet him who had caused her anguish. It is a convincing picture of a woman who had accepted without rebellion or hate a trial in a fiery furnace of experience and who knows that the test is over.

In this poem Browning expresses another idea that bears on the growth of character. One, praising Pompilia, says:

This I praise most in thee, where all I praise,
That having been obedient to the end
According to the light allotted, law
Prescribed thy life, still tried, still standing test —
Dutiful to the foolish parents first,
Submissive next to the bad husband — nay
Tolerant of those meaner, miserable
That did his hests, eked out the dole of pain —
Thou patient thus could rise from law to law,
The old to the new, promoted at one cry
O' the trump of God to the new service, not
To longer bear, but henceforth fight, be found
Sublime in new impatience with the foe.

Intuitions of the warrior-service which women have yet to do in the upward course of the race as a whole, and momentary glimpses of the high qualities that await the call that can evoke them, cannot come to those who are determined to continue in the limited ideas of life and of responsibility that exclusion of reincarnation encourages. Woman must see beyond one life and its attainments while concentrating on every moment's duty as never before. Life must be deeper because it has a broader outlook; every moment must have consciousness of eternity in it, and draw the past on to the future, to the realization of the divine qualities that belong to future cycles of growth. All the inarticulate, the unspoken depths in women's nature are still to be woven into positive character. They must be realized in a new courage, a new insight into the power of the divinity inherent in all beings, a new trust in the Self that will bring healing to suffering Humanity. Do you wonder that those who see the heights of attainment to be reached by women in lives to come, as the Theosophical Teachers have seen them, cannot but appeal again and again to women to try to find the sure path towards the perfecting of character; to find the true spirit of devotion that holds them always in the recollection that at any moment they may stand poised in eternity, seeing the threads of life that have come from the past, weaving them into a

fabric unstained by selfishness, unbroken by weakness, whole and fair, a magic robe with which to clothe themselves in all future conquests.

The woman who is thus studying character in the light of Reincarnation will not feel impelled to enter into any new field of activity until she has learned to poise herself between her past and her future. She will have the less to undo later on. She will not be confused by seeing some of her sisters who present a temporarily harmonious association of the characteristics supposed to sum up womanly perfection, but who are so absorbed in the contemplation of this happy combination that they have ceased to grow. A wise man once said, "The great marks of character are teachableness and a capacity for growth." We learn by studying life that sometimes characters described as rounded are really crystallized in very small rounds and that there is not an opening anywhere in the circumference where a fresh inspiration can find entrance.

This leads to another aspect of Theosophical teaching that is indissolubly connected with Reincarnation. This is that in the conquest of the lower nature by the higher, of matter and the desires by Soul, in the building strong of the temple of character, there is always necessary the kindling of the flame of spiritual valor from above. The Soul informs the mind; Those Who Know teach those who would find wisdom; the Great Helpers stand ready to call to those who are at the beginning of the Way. A third Theosophical teaching adds to this that there are times when this call and the power to respond to it, if one will, are stronger than at other times. The bearing of this upon the study of woman's character is that the present is a time pregnant with unprecedented possibilities of attainment; that the teachings which prepare the nature to respond and inspire women to make efforts that will loosen knots that have bound them fast for ages, are ready in Theosophy; that the Teacher who can evoke the Spirit within is with us. The moment is ripe when woman can rise to a new life in which she can assume a command as an awakened Soul in all the battles this life and the lives to come may bring.

For none more than you are the present and the past,

For none more than you is immortality!

Each man to himself, and each woman to herself is the word of the past and present, and the word of immortality;

No one can acquire for another— not one!

No one can grow for another — not one!