

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

KATHERINE TINGLEY, EDITOR

VOL. XXXIV, NO. 5

MAY 1928


“We grow towards knowledge that in the great economy of Nature a soul born here comes as a guest out of far realms in eternity: a guest of whose past we know nothing but that it has lived through the ages: and abides here for a while, and goes. Whither? — When we brood on that which is immortal in ourselves the answer comes back to us out of the Living Silence, and we know that life is eternal, and death but a stepping forth into larger fields of life.”— *Katherine Tingley in The Wine of Life*

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

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

(Stenographic report of the ninth of a series of Lectures on the above subject. These were delivered at the request of Katherine Tingley the Theosophical Leader and Teacher, in the Temple of Peace, International Theosophical Headquarters, Point Loma, California, at the regular Sunday afternoon services. Others will be printed in THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH in due course. The following Lecture was delivered August 21, 1927, and broadcast, by remote control, through station KFSD San Diego—680-440.9)

RIENDS: The arguments which we have been using during the course of our studies of the last eight Sundays have been directed to a certain end, that is, the end of proving that the human stock in its evolutionary development takes its origin in a far antiquity; and, when all evidence is taken and considered as a whole, we see that the human stock is actually the most primitive of all the various great phyla, or stocks of living entities, that have evolved during the course of past ages on the surface of the earth.

We have brought together a number of arguments and biologic data of various kinds, forming a cumulative mass of testimony and of evidence in general, all converging to that common point of proof. A single fact in itself may have only such weight as the hearer chooses to give to it as a point in argument; but if collateral facts, evidence of various kinds, are brought forward in substantiation of the principal facts in argument, the weight of testimony finally grows overwhelming, and to logical and reasoning minds must be accepted at least as a reasonable explanation of the thesis which it was undertaken to establish.

Now we cannot be expected to go over those same grounds of

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

argument, nor to bring before you the same evidential facts again today; that would take too much time; but those who are interested in this exceedingly important subject and who have not heard our former lectures, can read them when they are published in our magazine, *THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH*, beginning with the publication of the first lecture in the issue of the month of September next.

You know, of course, that the theory of evolution, as first outlined by Charles Darwin, was by no means the only theory of progressive development as regards the animate entities of the earth that had been thought of before his time; but as Mr. Darwin gave to the facts of Nature, as they were understood in his time, a more or less coherent fabric or structure of argument, building up a logical outline, as far as he could understand it, of the facts of Nature, his theory, or rather his method, attained almost immediate acceptance.

Darwinism, as his method has been commonly called, became the favorite scientific evolutionary theory of the time; nowadays it is more or less moribund, dying. There are still a number of 'die-hards,' 'won't-give-ins,' who cling to the old Darwinian ideas; yet they belong, for all that, rather to what is called the neo-Darwinian scheme, which is Darwinism more or less modified by other facts, other natural facts, which have been discovered and investigated to some degree since Darwin published his first book, *The Origin of Species*, in 1859.

But, as said on last Sunday, we Theosophists do not say that all that Darwin taught, is wrong, or that all that the neo-Darwinians teach, is erroneous. That position would be absurd, because great men have adopted and elaborated those theories of progressive development of the human stock and of the stocks below man, and they have accumulated a large number of natural facts, which in larger or smaller degree furnish some support for those theories. We do not deny an actual fact nor any number of actual facts.

As we have pointed out before, the scientists, when they limit themselves to the elucidation and classification of the facts of Nature, are our best friends, and we very gratefully acknowledge the help that their researches have given to us, in more fully collecting and understanding the intricate problems involved. But it is a vastly different matter when these same men undertake to raise upon those natural facts, or to draw from those natural facts, various theories or speculations or hypotheses, call them as you will, and to pass these off upon a naturally trusting reading public as established facts of Nature. We reserve our right, as free-thinking men and women, to accept or to reject any such

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

hypothesis or theory exactly in the degree that we find such theory or hypothesis to be true or untrue.

Furthermore, evolution is a very old idea, as we have already pointed out many times. There were numbers of great men in former ages who taught it under one form or another. I repeat: Charles Darwin gave to the idea of progressive development a certain methodical form, and it is that form, that method stated as a hypothesis, which is what has been called 'Darwinism.'

Now the main idea in Darwinism was, and in neo-Darwinism is, that all beings evolve from the less to the more perfect. We Theosophists teach the same thing. The Darwinists said that there is a ladder of life, found in the scale of different animate stocks from man downwards to the protozoa, or vice versa; and that it was along this ladder of life in serial course that the human stock evolved, eventuating finally in modern man.

If you examine the various groups of creatures comprising man and the animals below him, there is an evident grade or scale or stair from the least progressed, running up through the more progressed, to the most developed or man — in other words, as just said, from the protozoa up to humanity. The Darwinists say that it is along this stair upwards that the human stock has climbed from an early one-celled entity or protozoon, to the multi-cellular entity that man's physical body now is.

But biologists soon found that this so-called stair or ladder of life was a discontinuous one. Between the various great groups there were vast hiatuses without known connecting links; and researchers hunted long and vainly for 'missing links' connecting these great groups, and found them not. They found them neither in any living entities, nor in those forming the formerly animate record of the geological strata; and those 'missing links' have not yet been found.

Further, they saw, as their knowledge of Nature grew greater, that each of these great groups below man, composed of the backboneless animals or Invertebrata, and of the Vertebrata or backboneed animals such as the fishes and the amphibians and the reptiles and the birds and the mammals,— they found that these great groups did not graduate into each other; these gaps, therefore, made the biologic series of living entities discontinuous instead of continuous, as Darwin's method required. Consequently, the Darwinians, fervent and enthusiastic propagandists of the teachings of their master, sought vainly all over the earth's surface for these missing links, and found them not, as I have just said, nor have they ever yet been found and doubtless never will be found.

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

Brilliant palaeontological and biological work has been done along that line of research, and a vast number of natural facts have been accumulated; but the 'missing links' are as missing as they ever were.

Now, obviously, any stock supposed to have been evolving through these various groups, could not have made such jumps from one great group to another great group. One of Darwin's great maxims was "Natura non facit saltum," that is to say, 'Nature makes no leaps' in its progress forward — which, by the way, is exactly what we Theosophists also asseverate. Evolution is a steady progression forwards, he said, from the less to the more perfect, from the simpler to the more complex. Well, we say so too; and there is here no ground for dispute between our two otherwise extremely diverse views as to the nature and course of evolution.

As time passed in those older days, knowledge of Nature grew still wider; new light began to be thrown upon the geological record, composed of those old but now fossilized animals that formerly lived on the surface of the earth; new fields were opened up for investigation, and were eagerly and anxiously harrowed for facts in support of the popular scientific-transformist theory.

In the endeavors of the researchers properly to interpret the facts before them, to interpret the geological records, they found that instead of the highest of a lower group passing into the lowest of the next higher group by small gradations, the exact reverse of that was found to be the truth; it was found, in other words, that in each case it was the lowest in the lower group and the lowest in the next higher group which most resembled each other in possessing a larger and more generalized similarity to basal mammalian simplicity. It was so with all the groups, particularly so in the case of the vertebrates or animals with backbones, that is to say the fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals.

This discontinuity of series of living forms or formerly living forms on the alleged Ladder of Life, and this totally unexpected revelation of the evolutionary record, were severe blows to orthodox Darwinists; nor have they ever been able to bridge those gaps in the alleged ascending series of living beings.

I have pointed out in former lectures that the reason for this discontinuity of series of living beings is readily accounted for by the fact, fully explained by Theosophy, that while it is true that all animate entities now living or formerly living in geologic times, derived from a general and common point of departure; yet each of such great groups has wandered far afield in the evolutionary line of its own development.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Hence, the farther we go back towards the origin of any such great group, the nearer we approach to the general and common point of departure, and the nearer those earliest progenitors of each such great group will resemble each other in basal mammalian simplicity; while, on the other hand, the farther we recede from that general and common point of departure, in other words the nearer we approach our present age, the more widely separate must the representatives of these various great stocks be from each other, on account of the differing natures and the inherent forces evolving through them.

That early and general and common point of departure, as I have already stated, is the most primitive, the most ancient, and the earliest, stock of all on the present discontinuous so-called Ladder of Life — the human stock. Be it remembered, however, that in the present great evolutionary period on earth, or what we Theosophists call the 'Globe-Round,' it is the mammals only that trace their origin from the primitive human line; the other Vertebrata, that is to say, the birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fishes, as well as the great groups of the Invertebrata, likewise were derived from the human stock, but in the previous Globe-Round — comprising a vastly long cycle of evolutionary development, which was ended aeons upon aeons ago; and in itself, that is to say, in the former Globe-Round, or great Tidal Wave of Life, required scores of millions of years for its completion.

Evolution as taught by Theosophy, calls for a time of vastly long duration; indeed, many hundreds of millions of years. The exact figures we refrain from giving here, because it is neither necessary nor useful; but at some future time we hope to be able to give an outline of Theosophical teachings concerning evolution, which will cover many of the necessary points, and will deal both with questions of time-periods and derivations of stocks.

Darwinism today, as I have said, is dying, moribund. There are still a few die-hards who teach it, of course with newer data and wider knowledge of Nature than Darwin's immediate successors had, but their work is a severe one. We believe them to be sincere for so valiantly upholding a doctrine outworn and nearly dead, and for that reason only they have our sympathy. They doubtless are honest men; yet while we may sympathize with the belief of a man who is transparently honest and sincere, this does not mean that we extend the least grain of sympathy to their views, which we believe to be both mistaken and false, and our belief, as has already been amply demonstrated, is founded upon the facts and operations of Nature itself, not upon any man-made theory nor upon any theory which we ourselves have painfully elucubrated.

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

But let me recall to your minds, friends, a comedy recently enacted in this our own country. I refer to the evolution-trial in Dayton, Tennessee, where old orthodox religious beliefs were seen and heard on the one side, and Darwinistic beliefs were seen and heard on the other side. Each side accused the other side of being wrong; and the world laughed; and we Theosophists laughed heartily also; albeit our laughter was good-humored, good-natured, and without a tinge of malice. But perhaps it was a good thing that this comedy took place. It taught people to think a little more about these subjects, and to read the books on evolution. We do not accept these books on evolution as expressing the facts of Nature altogether; but that, in a sense, is beside the mark.

In view of the fact that a great effort has been made, and is still being made, in some of the States, not merely to permit, but to compel, I believe, the teaching of the old Darwinian theories, or of the neo-Darwinian, in the schools of our country, it was perhaps a good thing that men began to look into these matters with more interest than they formerly had for them. It is no unimportant subject for inquiry, if we remember that it is our children and our young folk whose destiny it might have been to receive as established truths of Nature what is, after all, but a theory more or less outworn.

Now we Theosophists are evolutionists through and through, in the sense that we have before set forth, that is to say, of the unwrapping, the unfolding, of that which is latent within the evolving entity; but most emphatically we are not Darwinists; we are most emphatically not Darwinian transformists, nor are we neo-Darwinists; also we are not Lamarckians; we are not 'transformists' as that word is understood today; but absolutely are we evolutionists.

But here let me enter a most important caveat, a warning of real importance. When I say that we are evolutionists, this does not mean that Theosophy teaches evolution or the growth in progressive development of an evolving entity in the sense that that entity grows or learns through mental or physical accretions: that is to say, that evolution consists merely in adding experience to experience; or detail to detail, if the physical body be concerned; in the sense that a laborer will add brick to brick in order to form a pile of bricks, or in the sense that a brick house is constructed by adding brick to brick, until the entire edifice is completed. That idea we completely reject, because it is not what our studies show to us to be the facts of Nature.

Growth — neither physical growth nor mental growth nor spiritual growth — is not a continuously enlarged pile, either of experiences, or of variation following upon variation in physical structure; that idea is

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

essentially and purely mechanical, and offers more problems for solution than the so-called 'riddle of life' which it might attempt to explain.

Evolution with us, on the contrary, is, as said before, the un-wrapping, the unfolding, the flowing forth, of that which is sleeping or latent as seed or as faculty in the entity itself, and this works on all the three lines of evolution: spiritual, intermediate or mental-psychical, and physical. Evolution, in other words, is the drive or urge or effort of the inner entity to express itself in vehicles growing gradually and continuously and steadily fitter and fitter for it.

Professor Bateson, a well-known British scientist, has expressed the idea, somewhat crudely, we think, but nevertheless graphically, by calling it the 'unpacking of an original complex.' Turn to a flower or to the seed of a tree. The flower unfolds from its bud and finally attains its bloom, charming both by its beauty and perfume; we see here the un-wrapping of what was latent in the seed, later in the bud, later in the bloom.

Thus again with the seed of a tree, an acorn for instance: the acorn contains in itself all the potentialities of the oak which it will finally produce; all the potentialities, I say, from the root-system to the trunk; and of the system of its branches and leaves; and of the numerous fruits, other acorns, which it is its destiny finally to produce, and which in their turn will produce other oaks. This is the main idea back of the Theosophical teachings of evolution, and as it is based on Nature, and on Nature alone, it must represent, as an operation of Nature, a fundamental truth.

The Darwinists have never been able adequately to prove the thesis of Charles Darwin, considered as a method, because they could not prove an end-on, or continuous, or serial, developmental growth from any one of the lower great groups into the next higher great group; or, more generally speaking, from the lowest life up to man. There is along *that scale*, as I have already several times emphatically pointed out, no end-on evolution, and none knows this better than modern biologists themselves.

But we Theosophists teach that evolution, if it exists at all, and we know that it does, must be an end-on, continuous, or uninterrupted serial evolution. An evolution of form which consists mainly of jumps from great group to great group is no evolution at all, and presents anew the very riddle which the Darwinian theory was expected to explain.

However, we have one doctrine in common with the Darwinians, that is, the slow progressive perfection, through immensely long periods of time, of entities from the less perfect to the more perfect. But our

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

method, that is the method we are taught, and the method which we teach, is nevertheless an entirely different method from the method of the Darwinians. Instead of there being one Ladder of Life, leading up to man who is the crown of that Ladder as it were, there are many such ladders of life, each such ladder of life being composed of one of the great groups of animate entities. Instead of there being one procession of living entities pursuing an uninterrupted course from the protozoa or one-celled animals up to man, which course is alleged to be the very path which the human stock has followed, there are various ladders of life along each of which a procession of its own kind climbs.

Please try to understand this idea, because it expresses some of our main points of divergence from the Darwinian theories. It is fundamentally important to understand this, friends, if you wish to have any conception of the Theosophical idea of evolutionary growth, development, progress.

Each of these various stocks, each one climbing its own ladder of life, and forming a procession along that ladder, reaching from the highest to the lowest, has *de facto*, by the very nature of the evolutionary progress which it has followed, reached wide evolutionary developments, developments widely divergent, I say, from the primitive source or stock whence it sprang. Result: When the Darwinians tried to prove, as they did try to prove, that the highest of any one such great group leads into the lowest of the next succeeding group by imperceptible gradations, they failed completely, because they did not know the new facts which have since come to light, so largely destructive of the Darwinian alleged method of evolutionary ascent, but completely supporting and bulwarking the Theosophical teaching, which we have been enunciating for the past fifty years more or less.

I repeat: It is the basal elements of each of these great groups which most resemble each other in features and characters of primitive simplicity; and in their developmental characters and features as they appear to us today, these obviously are the widest developed, the most divergently developed, from the primitive points of departure, that is from the origin, the basis, of each one of those great stocks.

Naturally, being the nearest to the common point of departure, all those primitive stocks of necessity must have more closely resembled each other than do the more highly evolved and more widely divergent descendants of those primitive stocks, as those descendants appear today.

Theosophy teaches that it is man -- that is the human stock, not man as he now exists, but man as he existed in far bygone geologic periods --- who in those distant ages, threw off these various stocks in a

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

manner fascinatingly interesting that I hope later to set forth more in detail.

But let me here enter an important caveat, let me here utter an important warning, lest my words be mistaken. We do not say that in the *present* great Tidal Wave of Life on this earth — or what we call a Globe-Round — all these originations of the lower stocks took place. We say that the *mammals only*, in this *present* great Tidal-Wave of Life, or in this present Globe-Round, came from man; but in the former great Tidal-Wave of Life, in the former Globe-Round, the various great groups below the mammals came from man in exactly the same way — or nearly so — that the mammalia in this Globe-Round did, those other great groups being the Birds, the Reptiles, the Amphibians, and the Fishes, so far as the Vertebrates are concerned, and the far-distant progenitors likewise of the invertebrate great groups.

It would lead us vastly too far afield to go into that phase of our study today; but remember this: It is our thesis that man is the oldest stock, the most primitive stock in his origin, the first one that evolved on this earth, in this Globe-Round, *so far as the mammals are concerned*, and all the mammals were derived, are derivatives, from primitive man. Please take this statement for the present as a postulate in our study; it will well repay your further examination. In order partly to prove this fact, however, we should have to go into a study of cytology, that is a study of the cell, and that field is beyond the scope of our study for this afternoon.

To return for the moment to the position of the Darwinians or neo-Darwinians of today. In a recent number of *The Scientific American* of September, 1927, on page 232, there is an extremely interesting article called 'Dawn-Man or Ape' by Professor William King Gregory, Professor of Vertebrate Palaeontology in Columbia University. He is apparently of the neo-Darwinian persuasion, and I think I may call him a Darwinian 'die-hard.' I mean no disrespect by this term, for I believe that Dr. Gregory is an honest and sincere man; but to me such appears to be his position.

I have before pointed out the leaping enthusiasm of the earlier proponents of the evolutionary method of Charles Darwin, because they very frequently indeed abandoned the road of science, left that Holy Temple which Science is to the Theosophist, and in their vaulting enthusiasm they sometimes taught things not based on Nature, but which they said 'must have been the case' at some past time, because their theory demanded it! We submit that the attitude of mind and the work so done were neither scientific nor fair to the reading public of those days, who took such statements at their face-value as established facts

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

of Nature, because reputable men enunciated them as facts for acceptance.

In this article, Professor Gregory says, in discussing the question of the evolution of man from the apes, as alleged by the Darwinian theory:

“In other words, even if we did not have the chimpanzee we should have to infer its existence as a sort of half-way station in the long road of ascent from the primitive Eocene primates. Darwin’s theory that man is a derivative from the anthropoid ape-stock, although not from any existing type of ape, accounts for hundreds of such peculiar resemblances between man and the ape. And what other scientific hypothesis can do this?”

With all due respect to Dr. Gregory, I am compelled to point out that we have here precisely the same spirit of vaulting enthusiasm, of what is to me exuberant imagination, that was manifest and that wrought such curious work in a biological sense in the cases of Thomas Henry Huxley in England and Ernst Heinrich Haeckel in Germany — inventors, these two, of imaginary steps in their evolutionary ladder of life; for does not Gregory say in the same spirit, “Even if we did not have the chimpanzee we should have to infer its existence” — in other words, we should have to invent one? Fortunately, the chimpanzee exists; but the idea of substitutive invention is there. Enthusiasm for biological invention is there.

As regards the ‘hundreds’ of such peculiar resemblances between man and the ape, such resemblances most unquestionably exist, though ‘hundreds’ seem to be a large number.

But this is another example of the Darwinian method, friends; just as Huxley and Haeckel followed it: they emphasized and over-emphasized the manifold points of resemblance between man and his younger brothers, the apes — or rather his degenerate half-children, the apes and the monkeys; but they omitted to point out at their full value the host of dissimilarities, the wide divergences, that exist in even greater number between the human stock and the anthropoid and simian stocks. They recognise them in some cases, but denigrate their value, underestimate their importance, or slur them over as things which are so obvious that they need scarcely to be mentioned with more than a passing allusion to their existence; and I must point out that this method of suggestion of the unimportance of important features or characters differing as between the two stocks, has a direct psychological influence upon the readers who see them. As I have said before, the latter take such statements at their face-value, without further examination, as established facts of Nature; which most emphatically they are not.

‘What other scientific hypothesis’ besides Darwinism can explain these resemblances? Why, friends, there is a much older hypothesis than Darwinism to account for these resemblances, and which likewise

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

fully accounts for the very important divergences and the dissimilarities. It was known to the ancients and was generally adopted by them. It was known before Darwin wrote his first book in 1859; and it is this: the anthropoid and monkey-stocks, the anthropoids in particular, sprang from man as their half-parent, in a far-gone period of geological time — not as degenerate men, however, but in another manner which you may find outlined in our books. Hence the resemblances which they naturally show and must show, to their distant forefathers on one side; hence the dissimilarities even more striking, which they show with equal force.

This theory in differing forms is the one which was adopted and forcefully upheld by a number of very eminent zoologists before and after Darwin. I may mention the Frenchman De Quatrefages, several equally eminent German biologists, and latterly Wood-Jones of London University, Klaatsch of Heidelberg University, and Osborn of Columbia University.

This, therefore, is obviously another scientific hypothesis, which, we say, happens to be the true and actual statement of the facts of Nature; and it explains not merely the resemblances but likewise the dissimilarities. This truly philosophical statement of the relationship and resemblance between man and the anthropoid and simian stocks, we Theosophists have been teaching for fifty years or less.

But the statement of the monkey-ancestry of man, the ape-ancestry of man, is not now accepted by most modern biologists. But curiously enough it remains alive. People are averse to changing their minds in relation to what they think are proved facts. It is a pitiful thing to state, friends, but it is a true thing, that men and women usually do not like to think. They like to have their thinking done for them, as has often been remarked. Is it not true? Old and worn-out ideas, ideas which are actually behind the knowledge, scientific and other, of the day, still remain in our minds; the old theory still remains.

Despite the newer and vastly wider light thrown on the problem of evolution by modern research, there are found even today men who want to teach an outworn scientific method or theory or hypothesis in our public schools, as being a résumé of the facts of Nature, as far as man's evolutionary past is concerned. It sounds incredible, but such is the case.

Let me turn to one of the three great men whom I have just mentioned, Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, Professor of Zoology in the same university where Professor Gregory occupies the chair of Vertebrate Palaeontology. Dr. Osborn, writing in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, volume XX, page 591, speaks forcibly as follows:

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

“The net result of observation is not favorable [as regards causes of evolution] to the essentially Darwinian view that the adaptive arises out of the fortuitous by selection, but is rather favorable to the hypothesis of the existence of some quite unknown intrinsic law of life which we are at present totally unable to comprehend or even conceive. We have shown that the direct observation of the origin of new characters in palaeontology brings them within that domain of natural law and order to which the evolution of the physical universe conforms. The nature of this law, which, upon the whole, appears to be purposive or teleological in its operations, is altogether a mystery which may or may not be illumined by future research. In other words, the origin, or first appearance of new characters, which is the essence of evolution, is an orderly process so far as the vertebrate and invertebrate palaeontologist observes it.”

What a change from the scientific views of fifty years ago! A Theosophist might have written this truly remarkable paragraph; and I would like to point out the emphasis laid upon the purposive or teleological principle implicated in this unquestionable truth. ‘Teleological’ means that which tends to a well-defined end or object.

I wish to make another quotation, friends, before I continue our own theme, and I take this quotation from *The Scientific Monthly* of July, 1926, pages 12 and 13, as written by Professor G. T. W. Patrick of the University of Iowa, who says:

“Another feature of twentieth-century evolution is the lesser emphasis put upon the notion of nature as a battlefield — as a scene of sanguinary and ruthless struggle in which the fittest survives. This was one of the unhappy ideas associated with the name of Darwin, even until recently made the excuse and vindication of every evil thing in human society. It is unfortunate that a part of this precious twentieth century has got to be spent in ‘unthinking our convenient Darwinism.’ Professor Patten, writing as a biologist, says that the altruism and co-operation which we are coming to recognise as the absolutely indispensable condition of further social evolution, are basal and primary factors in the grand strategy of evolution in Nature itself.

“In fact, there seem to be indications that the whole evolutionary nomenclature of the nineteenth century was unfortunate. Perhaps we need a new set of terms all around to describe that great world-movement which for seventy-five years has gone by the name of *evolution*. Many biologists are beginning to question the pre-supposition of the nineteenth century that the concepts of the mechanical sciences have any special prerogative in the interpretation of life and mind and society. Professor Haldane has gone so far as to reverse the order, and suggests that ‘the idea of life is nearer to reality than the idea of matter and energy,’ and J. Arthur Thomson believes that the formulae of physics and chemistry are no longer adequate for the description of behavior or of development or of evolution. It is generally felt that Herbert Spencer ‘put something over’ on the scientific world when he exalted a certain trio of concepts, namely, matter, motion, and force, whose redistribution was to explain the whole world.

“Biologists of the present time are largely engaged in patient and persistent investigation in the field of genetics, wisely refraining from speculation as to the causes and meaning of evolution. But it is difficult to refrain from all speculation, and when biologists do enter the field of philosophy and speak of theories of evolution, it is interesting to notice the new terms which they are using. We hear much of creative evolution, not always in the strict Bergsonian sense. We hear of ‘emergent evolution.’ We hear evolution described as ‘a struggle for freedom,’ or as a process in ‘self-expression.’ We hear of the material fabric of nature as being ‘alert’ rather than ‘inert.’ We hear of ‘the grand strategy of evolution.’ We even hear of evolution as a process of achievement, in which life and mind and moral conduct and social organization and science and art are values which have been won.”

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

What a change from the ideas of a half century ago! And we have been teaching these ideas for fifty years past, and our teachings are now evidently bearing fruit, and we are glad.

Now, friends, it is time for me to come to an end this afternoon; but before doing so, I want to point out to you a few conclusions which we must inevitably draw from the great mass of natural facts which we have been collecting, forming, as I have said before, a cumulative mass of testimony, of evidence in general, and all of which converges towards a common point.

We have adduced some twenty important anatomical instances, in proof of the fact that man is the most primitive mammal on the globe today, and always has so been (and we might as readily have brought forward a host of others), as is also proved by the facts in the geological record which we have brought forwards setting forth the fascinating story of the so-called ladder of life, and by the so-called laws of biology as they are enunciated by our greatest biological, that is, zoological and botanical, researchers and thinkers.

Further, we have pointed out that each of the stocks below man — we now take specifically the anthropoid and simian stocks — has wandered far more widely from that original primitive basal simplicity than man has; that man retains more of the basal mammalian features or characters in his body, that is, in his muscles, and in his skeleton, than any other animal now living on earth does; and that the apes and monkeys have wandered far afield in that respect, far more so than man has wandered from the primitive mammalian stock, which was early man himself, as we have already explained.

In other words, the monkeys and apes that we specifically take for our purpose in illustration of our point, are more widely and divergently 'evolved' along their own line than man is along his; although as a matter of fact, their progressive evolution has now very largely ceased, because the door into the human kingdom, towards which all these great stocks below man have ever tended, was closed some eight or nine million years ago, more or less, whilst man is steadily progressing and will progress as long as this planet bears its groups of living entities. The reason for this is a Theosophical one, based on the facts of Nature, but which I have no time to go into today.

I might add, however, that when I say that the lower groups have almost ceased to follow the path of progressive evolution tending towards man as a goal, I, first, do not mean a transformation of body of beast into man; nor, on the other hand, do I mean that they are standing perfectly still in an evolutionary sense; but only that their rising along the

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

Ladder of Life has ceased until the next great Globe-Round or great Tidal-Wave of Life, in the sense that I have before hinted at.

Man's destiny is to draw steadily and progressively, and as time passes ever more rapidly, away from the lower kingdoms; the destiny of these latter is to die out as time passes, to reappear in proper place and at proper time in the next great Tidal-Wave or Globe-Round.

Next: If man sprang from the apes, how is it, please, that he has lost the specific characters or features which mark the anthropoid and simian stocks, and has wandered back in so many respects to an identical basal mammalian simplicity of structure which he must have possessed before, thus violating one of the best known of the biological laws, called the Law of Irreversibility, which sets forth that in evolution no entity, losing an organ or a character or a feature, takes that identical organ up again, or regains it; but that if the recurrent conditions of environment are ever similar to what they were before, he then gains new organs suited to these recurrent conditions in the new circumstances in which he finds himself. Louis Dollo has done some remarkable work in proof and in demonstration of this Law of Irreversibility, which is today accepted by all representative biologists.

Extraordinary fact, if the Darwinian or neo-Darwinian theory is true; inexplicable by the very laws which the Darwinian zoologists themselves have discovered and enunciated. Really, friends, it seems to me that they are 'hoisted,' as the saying goes, 'by their own petards.'

Furthermore, the Darwinians and the neo-Darwinians still say that man belongs to the same sub-phylum or stock that the apes and monkeys do. If so, how is it that if he cannot have been derived from the apes and the monkeys, by the Darwinians' own laws, as we have shown, how is it then, I say, that he cannot have been, as the Darwinians say, the ancestor of the apes and the monkeys, even as we have set it forth?

The point is this: If he belongs to their sub-phylum, which the Darwinians say (but which we do not say), that is to the sub-phylum of the anthropoid apes and monkeys, and if he cannot have been derived from the apes and the monkeys, as is now very generally accepted by biologists, and yet is the most primitive in origin of all the mammals on earth, what is the logical, the inevitable, deduction that we must make, the inescapable conclusion, ineluctable in the force of its logic, which we must draw? It is this: that belonging to their sub-phylum or their stock, as they say, and not being their descendant, he must be their ascendant, their progenitor. That is precisely what we say, although we explain the facts in a very different and more convincing way.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

The Theosophist, a thorough-going evolutionist, looks upon the evolution or the perfection of the physical body of man with deep and profound interest, it is true; but with an immensely greater interest, with a far more profound and wide-reaching searching of his heart, does he study the evolution of the inner evolving monad which expresses itself through its physical vehicle, the body, and which on that account furnishes the drive, the urge, the impulse, ever upwards and forwards, causing that body to change its form slowly as the ages roll by into the Ocean of the Past, becoming with every new era, with every new aeon, a more fit vehicle to express the indwelling intellectual and spiritual forces and potencies of that monad. Please think over this.

These spiritual forces or potencies seeking an outlet, seeking to express themselves, work through the infinitesimal particles of man's inner constitution, the 'life-atoms' we call them, which exist on many planes, on at least four below the intellectual part of that monad.

In the physical body these life-atoms are inshrined within the cells of that body, working through the atoms of which those cells are composed. Thus is it that the evolutionary drive finds its outlet; it comes from within, expresses itself through the intermediate nature of man, then finds an expression through the physical vehicle, in order that the thinking entity may see this world of matter even as we do see it, and draw such lessons from companionship with it — as a master, if you please, not as a slave,— which it may and can draw.

There is the secret of the doctrine of evolution as Theosophy gives it to the world, through the teachings of H. P. Blavatsky, the reviver in our time of the age-old system of thought which today passes under the name of Theosophy and sometimes called by us the Ancient Wisdom.



“TSE-LU asked: Shall I do all I am taught? The Master said: Whilst thy father and elder brothers live, How canst thou do all thou art taught? Jan-Yu asked: Shall I do all I am taught? The Master said: Do all thou art taught. Kung-hsi Hua said: Tse-lu asked: Shall I do all I am taught, and you spoke, Sir, of father and elder brothers. Jan-Yu asked: Shall I do all I am taught; and you answered: Do all thou art taught. I am puzzled, and make bold to ask you, Sir. The Master said: Jan-Yu is bashful, so I egged him on. Tse-lu has the pluck of two, so I held him back.”

— *From the Chinese Classics*

A LIVING UNIVERSE

H. T. EDGE, M. A.

TOWARD the end of last century the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy flourished. The quantity of energy in the universe is constant: energy can neither be created nor destroyed: when it disappears in one form, it reappears in another. But not all forms of energy are equally available to produce work: though none of the energy is lost, some of it nevertheless assumes forms when it is not available to produce work: it 'runs down.' The available energy in any phenomenon is always somewhat diminished; never increased: the non-available energy in the universe is therefore always increasing: the 'Entropy' (available energy) of the universe is tending to zero.

Thus the inevitable prospect was that there would come a day when the energy would all be run down into evenly distributed heat or some such unavailable form, and a dead-level would be reached. The machine would have run down like a clock. Those responsible for this theory did not seem to have been much concerned with the obvious inference that the universe must at some time have been wound up; nor with the equally evident conclusion that, if it had been once wound up, it might equally well be wound up again.

Nowadays we meet with theories more agreeable to our common sense. It is now questioned whether the universe does really tend to run down at all; and in this case of course it would not need to be wound up. The analogy between the circling of electrons round a central nucleus in an atom, and the motions of the heavenly bodies round their primaries, suggests that the latter, like the former, may be perpetual. The vast wastes of empty space are now more than suspected of being packed full of exuberant life. Those atomic lumps of dirt, into which matter was formerly resolved, are now known to be anything but inert clods, and to contain so much vis viva that anything resolved into atoms runs up rather than down. Thus science bears out the dictates of reason, that it is absurd to suppose a beginning or an end; which we have to admit as a fact, though we cannot solve the mystery of time as long as we exercise ratiocinative thought.

More and more is gaining ground the conviction that life abounds everywhere; and one reads articles in which the teeming life of the soil is expatiated upon. The topic is not new, but is growing more upon the

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

general mind. The microbic life of the soil prepares the minerals for use by the plant-roots; without this aid the plants could not feed themselves.

Decay was once thought to be a kind of casual tumbling-down process, much like the popular idea of gravitation. But it is now known that decay is the work of microbes. Without them, nothing *can* decay. All this was stated by H. P. Blavatsky forty years ago in *The Secret Doctrine*, where she says that living organisms are everywhere and at the bottom of all natural operations. What an advance upon the old ideas of inert matter actuated by incomprehensible forces!

Many times had careful reasoners (including even eminent men of science themselves) pointed out that neither the matter nor the force could, when considered apart, have any conceivable meaning, and that therefore the scientific philosophy was wrong. And now the method of observation and experiment has confirmed the reasonable view. Matter and force, energy and mass — whatever vague names we may use — are attributes of life, and life itself is the attribute of a being that lives.

So the universe is a congeries of living beings, of countless grades and kinds, ensouled with consciousness and purposeful actions, also of many grades and kinds. Some day perhaps we shall find that not even chemical actions in a test-tube can work without some living agent.

As we pointed out in this magazine, Vol. II, No. 2, February 1912, it has been proved that many well-known chemical reactions will not work if the materials are 'perfectly pure.' It is the presence of minute traces of impurity that enables them to work. Oxygen and hydrogen, it was stated, would not unite, if both were perfectly clean and *dry*: that is, water cannot be produced unless it is there first!

Oh those blessed 'impurities'! They are truly the animating spirit of nature, without which nothing would work. Perhaps we are too fond of removing these impurities from our food and our medicinal herbs, thus throwing the vital principles down the sink and consuming the mere husk.

In a brief account of a fire at some works, which we read in a newspaper, it is casually stated in a few lines at the end of the account that a certain dog which was accustomed to sleep in them had that night refused to go in and when urged to go in had howled dismally. Quite scientific nowadays! The dog simply looked into the future and glimpsed what was coming. It is proverbially stated that coming events cast their shadow before them: the dog must have seen the shadow.

Too many facts support prevision to allow of any doubt as to its actuality. Modern scientific theories have played such havoc with our custo-

A LIVING UNIVERSE

mary notions of time that we can no longer afford to be surprised at anything.

Professor E. C. C. Baly of the University of Liverpool described at the Royal Institution how it is possible to imitate in the laboratory the processes by which nature changes carbonic acid into sugar and starch in plants. The energy of the sunlight is not enough unaided to perform this operation; but it is increased by an action of the leaf-surface in a way similar to that of certain actions known as catalytic. The lecturer concluded, according to report:

"I myself believe that we find in this the key that unlocks the door of vital chemistry, and that the chemistry of all life is one of high energy, our laboratory-experience being confined to the chemistry of low energy. From this viewpoint I see a wondrous vista unfold itself wherein new understanding, new hopes, and new possibilities reveal themselves. Health and vitality must essentially depend on the high energy level being maintained, any lowering of that level leading to poor health and weak vitality. . . .

"A vision comes to us of a new chemistry with limits far-flung beyond those which constrain our knowledge of today — a chemistry which will embrace and co-ordinate not only the properties of matter upon this earth, not only the wondrous mechanism of the life of man in health and in disease, but in addition the stupendous marvels of the birth and growth of the worlds outside our own."

In view of this we must quote again what was written by H. P. Blavatsky, our first Theosophical teacher, forty years ago:

"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. With every day, the identity between the animal and physical man, between the plant and man, and even between the reptile and its nest, the rock, and man — is more and more clearly shown. The physical and chemical constituents of all being found to be identical, chemical science may well say that there is no difference between the matter which composes the ox and that which forms man. But the Occult doctrine is far more explicit. It says:— Not only the chemical compounds are the same, but 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 the tree which shelters him from the sun. Each particle — whether you call it organic or inorganic — *is a life*."


— *The Secret Doctrine*, I, 261

Every day scientific minds become more convinced that everything must be regarded as alive and conscious in some degree. The notion of dead matter is disappearing. That notion implies some God or Force to actuate the dead matter. We cannot see how a force which is not material can move matter which is dead, or how a mind which is quite abstract can actuate a body which is quite lifeless. There is no possible link between the two.

All this should serve to teach us the importance of our own mind and thoughts and how necessary it is for us to learn to become master of them. By doing so we can remove the obstructions from our vision and thus be able to see more clearly into the mysteries of the universe.

AN ALEXANDRIAN THEOSOPHIST'S DILEMMA

P. A. MALPAS

T Alexandria, somewhere towards the end of the second century of the common era, Ammonius Saccas founded the Theosophic Neo-Platonist School of the Philaletheians, or 'lovers of truth.' His saintliness was so well known that he was called 'Theodidaktos,' the 'God-taught.' Born a Christian, he did not fail to esteem all that was spiritual in the Christianity of the day, but soon ceased connexion with formal and official Christianity. He was far too spiritual a man to find any pleasure in officialism.

One of his pupils, Origen, became very famous indeed as a Father of the Christian Church. His learning was profound and his activity unceasing. Very little indeed is known of the personal history of this great man. Early in the fourth century, Eusebius devotes some pages to him in his ecclesiastical history, but Socrates, another historian, writing somewhat later in the time, tells us that Eusebius was bent more upon eulogizing the Emperor Constantine than upon the accurate recording of facts, and Eusebius must not be taken too seriously (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.*, I, 1). Comparing his life of Constantine with his later writings, we see some strange bits of history in the making, so to say, and Socrates evidently is right. Therefore we know more of the works of Origen than of himself. And he wrote most voluminously.

But a few remarkable points stand out from the mass, and as they have a distinct interest and bearing on some present-day problems, one or two may be noticed here.

It is stated by H. P. Blavatsky that Origen was an initiate of the Mysteries. That being so, he knew far more than he cared to say, or dared to say. And yet rightly or wrongly, he subsequently joined the Christian Church and devoted himself with energy to its support. The act would appear to be inexplicable on any other grounds than those suggested, namely, that he did so in order to try and preserve within that outer church some of the old mystic truths which he saw were likely to be lost if not so concealed.

This learned man found himself in a peculiar position. He was forced to maintain complete silence upon many truths which he knew well. Others he disguised. On the other hand, he had dedicated himself to a propagation of 'facts,' which he knew to be only allegories of the earlier mystic rituals with which he was acquainted. He says so him-

AN ALEXANDRIAN THEOSOPHIST'S DILEMMA

self, and in a rare hint or two shows clearly that he knew the mystic meaning of what to the crowd was mere 'history.'

The semi-esoteric doctrine of Reincarnation was quite familiar to him, and he perhaps taught it among other things in a guarded way. But he has been criticized as a man of 'unsound doctrine' by those who prefer not to agree with him, on account of several misunderstood teachings.

It is he who calls attention to the curious way in which the word 'Jesus' was dropped before the name 'Barabbas,' as it originally stood in *Matthew*. Renan mentions it but does not name Origen. See Origen, III Col. 1772 in Migne: *Comment. in Matth.* To those unacquainted with the Theosophical symbolism, which was the original gospel-symbolism, this name seemed most incongruous, and gradually it was dropped. But in Origen's time, 'Jesus Barabbas' was the common reading, and the plain 'Barabbas' was still fighting its way into acceptance. In the very oldest gospels it stands 'Jesus Barabbas,' and the allegory is not very difficult to follow. 'Jesus the Son of the Father' as opposed to 'Jesus (*the Son of the Father* also) who is called the Christ,' with the condition that one must die if the other is to live, is a very ingenious and graphic symbolism easily to be deciphered by any student who has thoroughly grasped the doctrine of the 'Seven Principles of Man' as given in *The Key to Theosophy*.

Origen, very cautiously, gives other hints which would be not a little surprising if read into other allegories and correctly interpreted.

The curious position in which he found himself is given in his Preface to the *Commentary on John*. He says that they taught the gospel literally, preaching Jesus Christ, and him crucified, to the carnal (that is, the ordinary public church-goer). But to persons farther advanced and burning with love for the divine celestial wisdom, they 'communicated the Logos.' In other words, what the public are taught as 'history,' to the deeper student becomes allegory, and in this way the real secrets of the soul remain inviolate from the *profane*, that is, those 'outside the temple' of real spiritual secrets.

In another passage, Origen says that the evangelists did not give the true interpretation of many of the 'parables,' which had been taught privately. But if they had done so, he says, quoting the final verse of John's Gospel, "the whole world could hardly hold the books that might be written on the matter." Then he says that in case any should accuse him of publishing and explaining mystic secrets or even showing that he had fathomed their meaning correctly, he answers that he cannot claim to have penetrated their depths. (*Comment. in Matth.*, tom. xiv, Col. 1211

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

of Migne.) And although if, to a point, he has gained a rough understanding of some things, either by the will and grace of God, or "by our own exertions after much study and research," then he will say that he dare not commit them to writing; but certain things will be explained to a certain point both for the sake of those who read and for his own sake.

"These things are said about the hidden occult sense of the parable in our own defense. . . ."

Then he gives *one* explanation of the parable of the talents.

The caution of an initiate into the Mysteries is remarkably shown. Although he is giving a somewhat colorless interpretation, he yet makes it quite plain that he is not infringing the *private* information as to the deeper key to the meaning of the allegory.

Now, seventeen centuries later, in *Isis Unveiled* and other books, enough has been published to afford us a glimpse of many of these 'parables' in their true meaning as allegories, and we can see the extent of his caution. But it must have puzzled not a few of his readers in the year, say, 240 A. D. Yet much remains to be elucidated.

Apart from the plain statement that there were two doctrines in the gospels, one for the ordinary church-members, and another for the spiritually progressed few, there are many points of interest which research in the light of *The Key to Theosophy* and *The Secret Doctrine* reveal to the student. As intellectual exercises, however, they are not of much value to the world. But as confirmations of the Theosophical Doctrines upon which real human progress is to be based, they have their necessary and valuable place.

It has been regretted that Origen ever lent his great knowledge of an unsectarian kind to support of a cult or church. But it is hard for us to judge whether his apparent surmise that such was the only way of saving a few of the old truths in their purity was justifiable or not. The times were grown very material and the outlook for the preservation of the old spiritual truths looked very dark. Origen was not the first mystic to make an extreme choice in the hope of helping humanity. If he did wrong, he has been punished for it by subsequent misrepresentation.



"ARE you faultless? No, but you can strive towards faultlessness. Not your act but your motive is weighed in the scales of Divine Justice."

— *Katherine Tingley*

LOMALAND

To Katherine Tingley, its Foundress

GRACE KNOCHE

HERE is the mood of Eden, for the slow
Sweet tendrils of devotion cling and twine
Around each day's endeavor, and Love's vine
In pure libation reddens to leap and flow.

Magical mood of Eden! Sun and sea
Meet in a jubilant mingling with the warm
And crescent love of Comrades; even the storm
Dies in transcendence through Love's alchemy.

Mystical mood of Eden! Tremulous
As trees at dawn, petal of opening flower,
As voice of birds, vibrant and emulous
As the overtones of inner, wakening power,
While down the future echoes clear and fine
Love's symphony of service: "Svasti! Thine!"

*International Theosophical Headquarters,
Point Loma, California*

UNKNOWN HEROES

MAGISTER ARTIUM

"That things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life and rest in unvisited tombs."



HIS quotation from the end of George Eliot's *Middlemarch* is given by Arthur Ponsonby, M. P., at the head of some 'Casual Observations' in the *Manchester Guardian* for January 21, and we quote some of his remarks as follows:

"I have always thought that most of the 'best' people in the world have died unknown and unrecognised. Really faithful service and true heroism must be inseparably connected with self-effacement and the absence of any desire to receive credit for achievement. . . . Soldiers say that for every man who receives a V. C.* there are a dozen who deserve it. But their deeds were unseen, and the entire absence of any desire for public recognition formed perhaps the major part of their heroism."

*Victoria Cross, bestowed for heroism.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

And he describes how we too often desecrate the deed and the hero by dragging them into notoriety; how a young woman, who was heroic during the recent London floods, was pestered by photographers and interviewers and subjected to the risk of having her simple courage tarnished by a love of approbation and notoriety; and how Carnegie, good simple man, trying all ways to rid himself of his money, took up heroes. "Like a child he thought he could reward heroism with a medal." His wealth could teach him no way of ferreting out the right people to receive his benefits. The real heroes escaped him.

We often hear it said that virtue is its own reward. A corollary to this is surely the following: that which seeks any other reward is not virtue. The proverb is often said cynically, as though to disparage the pursuit of virtue, since it brings no reward. But its real sense is to console the disappointed, by reminding them that the real reward of merit lies in the sense of achievement, in the knowledge that one has fulfilled the law.

Animals follow their instincts, without reasoning on points of right or wrong, or of gain and loss. Their satisfaction is in the fulfilment of those instincts, in the expression of their nature. Is there not in man a higher nature, which desires its own expression, and whose fulfilment yields satisfaction? To one who values such satisfaction, recognition, praise, renown, must either flatter a weakness or else be irksome.

What a false picture of human life must history give, if the best people live and die unrecognised and unknown!

What a fine test for our motives this principle affords! Desire of approbation, fear of disapproval — these constitute one of the 'pairs of opposites' enumerated as obstacles to the attainment of peace of mind. The disciple must seek to be the same, of equal mind, under praise and blame. A very little reflexion will show us to what extent our actions and our moods are governed by this form of fear — fear of what will be thought or said about us.

The quotation from George Eliot shows how the humblest can influence the world for good; and how it is not necessary to go about making a noise in order to achieve this good. And surely those who believe in the reality of spiritual powers should be ready to agree with this. We also see that those who live unfaithfully are a drag, living on the self-sacrifice of the faithful liver. Devout people have ever sought to "live aright in the sight of God, who seeth in secret." If we do not believe in the personal Deity, we can at least emulate the best side of this aspiration.

Wherever people are living together in any association, there must

UNKNOWN HEROES

be regulations made in the interests of order and the common welfare. Such regulations will of course often conflict with the personal desires of individuals; and one who has the wrong spirit will be on the lookout for a chance to evade them. But he who has the right spirit will follow them scrupulously, recognising their value and necessity. It may be absolutely safe for me to smoke in a workroom, because I am so very careful. Yet, if I were the manager and had to pay the insurance, I would make a rule that *nobody* should smoke. How could I make exceptions? Therefore, looking at things from this point of view, I will refrain, although in my personal case it seems so needless.

The man who understands what rules are made for, is interested in observing them, and can be trusted to infringe them only when there is real necessity to do so. He will infringe them reluctantly. But the one who has not the sense to understand what a rule is for will be on the lookout for a chance to infringe it. He will be ready to excuse himself and regard himself as a special case. Here then we have a practical test of the sincerity of our beliefs.

But it is incumbent upon us, writing in a Theosophical magazine, not merely to moralize, as might be done elsewhere, but to show how Theosophy illuminates the point. Theosophy stands forth as a champion of immaterial forces and of the unseen potencies that lie within and beyond the outer nature of man and the outer layers of Nature.

Theosophists claim to believe in the power of right thought and right feeling. It stands to reason that what they consider the best conduct will be of a kind not recognisable by ordinary observation. This is the true meaning of that saying that —

“That power which the disciple shall covet is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men.”

He must desire those possessions only which belong to the pure soul, which therefore belong to all pure souls equally, and so cannot be the private possession of any one. The gifts of the Spirit, in fact. His reward is the sense of having done things aright — the reward which a workman feels in having done a good job.

Theosophy distinguishes clearly between the higher and lower side of man's nature, and sets before us the prospect and duty of cultivating the higher and escaping from the influence of the lower. So here is one way in which we can do it —if we are in earnest about the matter.

But Theosophy teaches that thoughts are far more potent than acts in their influence. The roots of action lie in the thought-world, and to the contents of this world we contribute by our thoughts. No man

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

can sin alone, says H. P. Blavatsky in a well-known quotation; and the corollary is that no man can do a good action alone. What we call solitude may be teeming; external contacts with other people are confessedly very imperfect: however close people may be together, they remain mysteries to each other. Real contacts must be on a higher plane. He who acts faithfully, unseen and without recognition by the outer world, has initiated himself into another world.

That utterly false picture of human life, which records only the deeds done in public, and omits the overwhelming majority of deeds — those that are done without recognition! There must surely be record somewhere that is true to the facts, a recording angel's ledger. And we know that Karma will weigh each one of us 'utter true,' ignoring altogether the judgment of the world.

HOME-GROWN THEOSOPHY

PERCY LEONARD

“This commandment is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us. . . . Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? But the word is very nigh thee in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.”

— *Deuteronomy*, xxx, 11-14

MANY of those who were attracted by the teachings of H. P. Blavatsky in the early days seem to have imagined that Theosophy was a choice and delicate exotic whose native home was in the East, and that it could exist in the inclement West only under hothouse conditions protected in an atmosphere of mystery and seclusion. It was indeed supposed to be so subtil and abstruse that it was adapted only to the understanding of the cultured few, and must be discussed in a highly technical jargon of Sanskrit derivation.

It is easy for us now to see how the mistake arose, because although the simple teaching of Universal Brotherhood was vigorously stressed from the very beginning, a very definite effort was made to influence the intellectual leaders of the masses, and to this end prominence was given to the philosophical basis upon which the ethical structure was reared. Metaphysical ideas almost wholly foreign to the western mind needed a new vocabulary, and this very naturally was derived from the oriental sources in which these ideas were found. But as in all enterprises of a like nature, a 'saturation-point' was finally arrived at, when

HOME-GROWN THEOSOPHY

as much of Theosophy as could be absorbed at this cycle had been assimilated, and it was considered that the public at large would receive their dues as the ideas percolated down by the ordinary channels to the lower intellectual levels.

It was at this juncture that William Q. Judge established his claim upon our undying gratitude by recognising the situation and by bringing Theosophy into the open light of day, divesting it of its garments of mystery and presenting it as an everyday practical philosophy capable of being applied to the affairs of daily life.

It is related that on one occasion Mr. Judge entered a room in Headquarters where a member was writing an article on Practical Occultism. The ink-pot was so placed that every time the writer wanted to dip his pen he had to reach clear across the table. "The very man I wanted to see," exclaimed the writer. "Can you give me some pointers on the subject of Practical Occultism?" With a quiet smile Mr. Judge pushed the inkpot within easy reach and remarked: "That's Practical Occultism!"

Theosophy teaches the art of doing the right thing, at the right time, and at the right place, and in the right way. It teaches the commonest kind of common sense. It helps one to plan out one's housework to the best advantage, and to speak the word of encouragement exactly when it is needed. It prompts us to give good advice, and, more important still, it teaches us to suppress the word of good advice when its offer would be inappropriate. It has light to shed upon the most obscure problems of life and destiny, and an intimate and timely urge for the right action in the smallest crisis in our daily life.

Many a student of Theosophy dates his interest in the subject to the visit of a Theosophical lecturer to the town in which he lived; but as he grows older he begins to realize that as a matter of fact a Theosophical lecturer has been trying to get him to listen from the first moment at which his budding mind began to open to the light. I mean of course the Teacher who is always at hand and has his dwelling in the heart of all. The teaching does not come in fervid bursts of oratory, nor as closely reasoned argument presented in the diction of the lecture-hall, nor as the sharp command of the drill-sergeant; but rather in the hush of silence as a still small voice. Sometimes it comes as an impulse to do something that rises from we know not where, and yet those who recognise its authority would go through fire and through water to do its bidding against the opposition of the world in league against them.

It does not limit its advice to what we consider the great crises

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

of our lives, the parting of the ways when our future destiny appears to hang upon the snap decision of a moment. It stands ready in the most trifling emergency and it has been said by a deep student of life that we never meet with an accident so small as the cutting of a finger without an effort on the part of our inward monitor to warn us.


Of course the reason why we blunder on through life with nothing more reliable for our guidance than the crude and inefficient judgments of the brain-mind, is because our minds are fixed on anything rather than the proper business of our lives. We fall and stumble, we do the wrong thing, we speak the wrong word, and yet all the while an experienced counselor stands ready to assist; but so long as we lend our ears to the roaring voice of the great illusion of material life, we are deaf to all else.

If we were more in earnest we should of course listen, but the question arises: Are we sufficiently in earnest? Or do we not prefer to entertain ourselves with the never-ending pictures flashing on the screen of our minds and the bewitching appeals of passion and desire of which our mental atmosphere is full? A certain degree of courage is needed to make the attempt to enter this new field of consciousness in which the still small voice is able to make itself heard. New ventures in an environment to which we are unaccustomed, entail a readjustment and a measure of suffering until we have accommodated ourselves to the new conditions. A child growing up into manhood finds it easy to 'put away childish things' because with his newly acquired interests the old ones lose their power of appeal; but in the spiritual coming-of-age there is often a dreary barren interval in which, after the old interests have been set aside, the new interests are still but faintly realized.

Most of us have yet to realize that there is a right way and a wrong way of doing everything, and yet Theosophy has its word of advice on every detail that arises in the course of our everyday life. The whole question as to whether our incarnation is to be a failure or not, lies in our use of the opportunities which arise moment by moment throughout the day, and it is precisely on these very questions that an answer that is practically infallible may be ours for the asking. May we not put to ourselves this question: Shall we continue to muddle through life deciding our conduct by the cloudy and uncertain judgments of the brain, or shall we cultivate an attitude of calm expectancy, an inner silence, in which we may hear the whispered counsel of the Divine Companion, that so our lives may shine with a splendid consistency lighting the secret path along which we all must travel to the Upper Day?

THE UNTIMELY BIRTH OF KNOWLEDGE

SIR KENNETH D. MACKENZIE, BT.

UDYARD KIPLING in his latest book strikes a profound note in his story, *The Eye of Allah*. It may not awaken complete response to the author's thoughts in the minds of all, for beneath the tale lies a suggestion of a truth far deeper than the casual reader would notice. "It would seem the choice lies between two sins," said the Abbot of St. Illod's: "To deny the world a Light which is under our hand, or to enlighten the world before her time."

Is it better to keep to ourselves what we have learned or discovered and know to be true, or to disclose our knowledge to a world which is still unfit to receive the information, and at the best would disbelieve if not punish us for our disclosures? That is what he meant, and in those days such knowledge was indeed a dangerous possession if contrary to the orthodox views held by those who claimed the sole right to possess any knowledge whatever. . . .

The study of Nature in its various branches had to be carried out ostensibly for other objects which would not clash with orthodox views and beliefs; discoveries made and knowledge gained were 'camouflaged' by symbols and cryptic formulae which were decipherable only by the initiated, methods of concealment very necessary if research were to be made free from interference. . . .

Such were the 'Dark Ages,' and dark indeed they must have seemed to those who yearned to enlighten the world with discoveries that they had made, or with knowledge gained in the realms of Nature. . . . But Truth would not be stifled, and the minds of men were gradually opened to wonders of which they had never dreamed, dispelling the clouds of ignorance and superstition which for centuries had enveloped them.

Though knowledge gradually increased, thus improving the material condition of mankind by the freedom of thought to which it gave rise with liberty to employ it, some restraint seems to many people to have been needed. Material progress so outstripped what we call 'spiritual,' that until recent years the latter seems to have been forgotten, for it did not keep pace with material advancement, and so retain the former within limits suitable to the state of man's evolution. It was like putting a dangerous weapon in the hands of a child ignorant of how to use it, or so mischievous as to do so improperly if given the chance.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

The nineteenth century was above all a century of increased knowledge which with the first flush of acquisition was believed to be 'the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth,' a result of 'kicking over the traces' of dogma and creeds previously believed to be indisputable. We can look back now with a smile in the light of our further knowledge upon statements then made by the highest authorities; but that we can do so should warn us that any beliefs now held may also have to be modified by further discoveries and consequent knowledge gained.

The trend of the acquired knowledge of last century was towards material benefits, for the great advance made in everything which would make life easier, more pleasant and enjoyable, and specially facilitate communication, was after all of a purely material and far less spiritual character than might have been the case. . . .

Unfortunately, however, many of the discoveries and inventions of service to man made during the past century have been turned into methods of destruction and perverted from their original intention to purposes of evil. Knowledge gained being unchecked in regard to its dissemination as had previously been the case, became common property, and some who could use it turned their attention to how it might best be applied for offensive purposes of war under the plea that they were also defensive. The Great War was a culmination of such endeavors, and forces of Nature of every available kind were brought into service for destructive purposes with results that we all know. Nor is man yet satisfied with what he has done; he must search continually for further means and methods of dealing out death and destruction under the guise of defense until, unless checked somehow, humanity will destroy itself, and the whole of civilization as we know it must perish.

Science is ever on the search for greater knowledge and explores, so far as it can, all mysteries of Nature: and not content with having in some branches nearly reached the limit of material or physical research, is now striving to learn secrets which Nature has hidden and made 'occult' for a very good reason. Science does so because it cannot prove, and consequently denies, that anything which exists is other than material or can be of an entirely different nature than 'matter,' though what 'matter' really is it cannot say except that it consists of atoms constructed of electrons and protons of electricity. This statement it can 'prove' only mathematically, for they are all utterly invisible to our human eyes.

Wireless enables children to play with one of Nature's secrets

THE UNTIMELY BIRTH OF KNOWLEDGE

of which scientists at present know but little of the whole, and can do so harmlessly because what is known is but the fringe of what lies beyond, and thus they are within safe limits. Were much further knowledge granted or obtainable easily, what would happen can be foreseen by those who glimpse beyond the material plane and thus know that it will be withheld from mankind until humanity has reached a stage of evolution when it could safely be entrusted with it.

It seems to be once more the old story of 'the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil'; the desire for knowledge for which man is unripe, and it is evidently the Divine Will that he obtains it at his own peril if he does, or may not do so, and we should be thankful that such is the case.

Even so, the knowledge now possessed is working towards a culmination which must bring about chaos if allowed to continue. We are too apt to think that 'progress' is the sure result of knowledge. True progress can be advancement only when knowledge is applied for the benefit of mankind as a whole, otherwise it becomes a means for retrogression and detriment.

The trouble is that we have been taught to train our minds to admit the truth of nothing which cannot be physically proved; to rely only on our five senses and [brain-mind] intelligence. Consequently anything which lies beyond such demonstration is inadmissible as truth, or at the best will be accepted only as 'possible theory' however demonstrable it may be as fact through other but 'unscientific' methods.

Theosophy offers explanations of much which is so far unprovable by any means acceptable to modern science in spite of the fact that discoveries since made were foretold and explained long ago by Theosophists.*

Thus it is that everything in Nature has come to be regarded solely in a 'practical' light, and the hidden meaning of many physical facts carries no weight with scientists. Attempts are being made to bring into the service of man, forces which science inferentially thinks exist, and even in some cases believes do exist, but those who know what the result would be were such efforts to be successful, also know that their untimely birth will not be permitted for the sake of the human race itself.

The marvels of the atom are glimpsed at by science, and some experimenters are hoping to solve the problem of how to 'harness' its inconceivable energy. Were it certain that if solved such knowledge would be applied only to the service of man and not disservice, it might be permitted, but assuredly it will not be unless it is ordained that man

*Notably by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

must learn another lesson before he realizes that there is something else than physical matter in this world. He has not really learned that yet.

Science may smile at such statements, but some students of it acknowledge that such is the case, and foresee to what results such premature knowledge would lead. Human nature being what it is, we may not feel flattered by such views of our mental condition; children do not care to be told that they are 'not old enough' to understand all they desire to know, and do not relish that excuse for leaving their curiosity ungratified; but the simile is applicable, and the same answer has to be given.

Since no outward restraint is placed on the acquisition of knowledge or its employment, what is there which can and could do so for the safety of humanity unless it be something beyond earthly influence: something altogether more far-seeing and wise!

It is true that no government would permit anything to be done to harm its *own* people, but indirectly that would be the very plea a scientist would urge for the employment of some force of Nature that he had discovered which could be applied to destructive purposes. He would argue that it should be adopted for defensive purposes in self-defense and used as a threat of retaliation to be held over an enemy. But the knowledge once gained could never be effectively guarded, and in time would become the property of all nations as has always happened.

The result of the birth of such knowledge would therefore be premature so far as human control of it would prevent evil from resulting, and the position would remain the same as it now is.


A well-known preacher said not long ago when expressing his conviction that modern science had ousted Christianity from its position as a guide through life: "The future is either with Christ or chaos, and unless some rein be placed upon man's proclivity for destruction and mischief, he will certainly end by destroying civilization, and himself with it." That opinion is shared by more than one of our great scientists who know the potency of forces that might be let loose were it known how to do so, nor are grave warnings wanting that some great trouble is imminent should man persist in perverting to evil purposes forces of Nature of which he has become partially cognisant.

The spirit of self-interest and material gain must give place to more altruistic ideals, and man must learn, as he inevitably will some day, that his Brotherhood with all living creatures is a fact and not a fancy.

WHAT OUR SOCIETY NEEDS MOST

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

[Reprint from *The Path*, September, 1892]

 HE first object of our Society is the formation of a nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood. This is a practical object and at the same time a fact in nature. It has been long regarded by the greater number of men as an Utopian ideal, one that might be held up, talked about, desired, but impossible of attainment. And it was no wonder that people so regarded it, because the ordinary religious view of God, nature, and man, placed everything on a selfish basis, offered personal distinction in heaven to the saints who might die in the odor of sanctity, and thus made impossible the realization of this beautiful dream.

But when the Theosophical philosophy shows that there is a unity among beings not only in their better natures but also on the physical plane, our first object becomes most practical. For if all men are brothers in fact, that is, joined one to another by a tie which no one can break, then the formation of the nucleus for the future brotherhood is something that has to do with all the affairs of man, affects civilizations, and leads to the physical as well as moral betterment of each member of the great family.

This first object means philanthropy. Each Theosophist should therefore strive so to understand Theosophical philosophy as to be able to expound it in a practical and easily understood manner, so that he may be a wider philanthropist by ministering to the needs of the inner man. This inner man is a thinking being who feeds upon a right or wrong philosophy. If he is given that one which is wrong, then, becoming warped and diseased, he leads his instrument, the outer man, into bewilderment and sorrow.

Now as Theosophical theories were and are still quite strange, fascinating, and peculiar when contrasted with the usual doctrines of men and things, very many members have occupied themselves with much metaphysical speculation or with diving into the occult and the wonderful, forgetting that the higher philanthropy calls for a spreading among men of a right basis for ethics, for thought, for action. So we often find Theosophists among themselves debating complicated doctrines that have no present application to practical life, and at the same

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

time other members and some inquirers breathing a sigh of relief when anyone directs the inquiries into such a channel as shall cause all the doctrines to be extended to daily life and there applied.

What we most need is such a Theosophical education as will give us the ability to expound Theosophy in a way to be understood by the ordinary person. This practical, clear exposition is entirely possible. That it is of the highest importance there can be no doubt whatever. It relates to and affects ethics, every-day life, every thought, and consequently every act. . . . With [the proponents of a certain orthodox religious system] the appeal is to fear; with us it is to reason and experience. So we have a natural advantage which ought not to be overlooked.

High scholarship and a knowledge of metaphysics are good things to have, but the mass of the people are neither scholars nor metaphysicians. If our doctrines are of any such use as to command the efforts of sages in helping on to their promulgation, then it must be that those sages — our Masters — desire the doctrines to be placed before as many of the mass as we can reach. This our Theosophical scholars and metaphysicians can do by a little effort. It is indeed a little difficult, because slightly disagreeable, for a member who is naturally metaphysical to come down to the ordinary level of human minds in general, but it can be done. And when one does do this, the reward is great from the evident relief and satisfaction of the inquirer.

It is pre-eminently our duty to be thus practical in exposition as often as possible. Intellectual study only of our Theosophy will not speedily better the world. It must, of course, have effect through immortal ideas once more set in motion, but while we are waiting for those ideas to bear fruit among men a revolution may break out and sweep us away. We should do as the Buddha taught his disciples, preach, practise, promulgate and illustrate our doctrines. He spoke to the meanest of men with effect, although having a deeper doctrine for greater and more learned minds. Let us, then, acquire the art of practical exposition of ethics based on our theories and enforced by the fact of Universal Brotherhood.



“WHEN the heart is attuned to the sorrow and the needs of the world, the mind becomes illumined, and wisdom enters in. Those who possess the wisdom that is born of compassion, may truly be called ‘inspired.’”

— *Katherine Tingley*



THEOSOPHY AND KARMAN

QUESTION: What do you Theosophists mean by Karman? Is it Fate?

ANSWER: No, it is not Fate, nor has any Theosophist ever so called it; and this misconception of its meaning has been particularly rejected by the three Theosophical Leaders, H. P. Blavatsky, William Q. Judge, and Katherine Tingley. Karman is the Theosophical doctrine formulating a law or an operation of Nature, so working that every cause is inevitably followed by its consequence or effect, which immediately in its turn becomes a new cause, or rather *is* a new cause producing another effect, which in its turn again becomes a producing cause, and so forth.

Fate is supposed to be a divine decree or a predetermined sentence by some Divinity, of which human beings, and other entities and things according to this fantastic theory, are helpless subjects. This the

Theosophical philosophy repudiates.

Karman, on the other hand, is what the producing agency himself or itself sets in motion. I act, and my action has a consequence, for my own weal or woe. I violate, as the saying goes, one of Nature's laws, and must suffer the consequence, thereby learning valuable lessons of various kinds; but it is I myself or some other causative agency which sets Nature's laws in operation, and it is neither a God nor gods who set Karman on us.

You immediately see the justice of this, and the position of dignity which mankind possesses in Nature, for he is at once shown by this, our noble Theosophical doctrine, to be his own savior as well as his own injurer.

This, in very brief form, is a statement of the doctrine of Karman, one of the oldest religio-philosophic teachings in the world, and one of the noblest because one of the most inspiring. — G. DE P.

REINCARNATION AND TRANSMIGRATION

QUESTION: You Theosophists, I understand, teach Reincarnation. Is this the same as Transmigration or what

is often called Metempsychosis?

ANSWER: It is not, as Transmigration and Metempsychosis are commonly misunderstood to be by

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Occidental folk, who misinterpret with regard to the general doctrine of Reimbodiment the Oriental and Greek teachings passing under those two names: Metempsychosis and Transmigration.

Reincarnation is the doctrine that the human ego-soul reimbodies itself in another garment of human flesh, after its period of postmortem repose; but our Theosophical teaching of Reincarnation likewise is emphatic in stating that the human ego-soul never, under any circumstances, enters a beast-body. "Once a man, always a man," is the ancient saying. How could it do so? No beast can furnish a vehicle fit or appropriate to express the human spiritual and intellectual powers;

and Nature makes no such grotesque mistakes as the common misconception implies.

Such a misconception runs violently contrary to the doctrine of Karman, to the effect that every act done by a producing agency is followed by its natural consequence very rigidly and consistently.

It is impossible in a short answer like this to set forth the difference which exists between Transmigration and Metempsychosis; and it is only possible to say here that they refer to two aspects of the adventures of the life-atoms. Full information can be gained by the earnest student from a perusal and study of our Theosophical works.

— G. DE P.

THEOSOPHY "AS IT SEEMS TO ME"

[The following is a letter written by a Theosophist to a man who is a Christian of a very broad and liberal type, who has given his views of Theosophy "as it seems to me." In the feeling that it will also be of general interest, it is reproduced here.]

MY DEAR —, I have read with great interest your letter explaining your religious views and giving your opinion of Theosophy "as it seems to you." I should like to say first that it has given me a deep and genuine pleasure to find I have a brother who has preserved so well the feeling of true religion, when so many are flippant and thoughtless about such matters.

What you say about your aspirations and views fully justifies me in claiming you as a brother Theosophist; for this is quite in ac-

cord with the definitions given of a Theosophist by the Founder, H. P. Blavatsky. She declares that the word applies to anyone who believes in brotherhood and who molds his conduct in accordance therewith, and who has the spirit of religion in him, and is broad and tolerant to the views of others.

Our platform, as can be seen from the declared Objects, is extremely eclectic, and proclaims the brotherhood of humanity without distinctions of race, creed, color, etc. Its policy is to interfere with no man's religion, while striving to

THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

harmonize the adherents of various religions on the basis of the truths and ideals common to all. Such is a Theosophist in the broad sense.

But there are others who have elected to make a closer study of the body of teachings which have been introduced under the name of Theosophy, and who perhaps have had sufficient confidence in their Teachers to ask the position of pupils for further instruction.

But it is perhaps needless to point out that Theosophy as I understand it is a very different matter from Theosophy as (you say) you understand it. While of course I must assume that you have given what you honestly believe to be a fair presentation of Theosophy, I am bound to say that I can only describe it as a heterogeneous mass of misinformation. Consequently your criticism of Theosophy amounts to no more than the familiar method of demolishing a bogey.

The things which you combat are the same things which we ourselves have to combat, in our endeavors to relieve Theosophy from its encumbrance of travesties and misrepresentations. The case would be exactly paralleled if I should attack your Christianity in the manner of the secularist park-orators, or on the strength of such perversions as those of --- or ---- or ---.

It is necessary to bear in mind that any religion or philosophy, proclaimed in the world, will be surrounded by an outgrowth of

misrepresentations and crude expositions. This is true of Theosophy.

At various times in the earlier history of our Movement, people have found themselves unable to adhere to the original principles and ethics, and have split off into coteries which continue to propagate, under the name of Theosophy, views which are obviously inconsistent with the original principles as recorded in the writings of the Founders. Some of these views are trash and some are positively harmful; and, while I may admit that it is not easy for an inquirer to avoid being misled by them, I nevertheless cannot assume any responsibility for such perversions.

So your criticism of Theosophy can only be described as irrelevant, since it merely impugns what we do not hold, and leaves our real beliefs untouched. Your criticisms consist mainly of misstatements of fact (unintentional of course), and are sometimes mutually contradictory.

I propose therefore to try and give you a better idea of Theosophy -- to present briefly Theosophy as I understand it. Your knowledge of my character and abilities should alone suffice to suggest the *inference* that Theosophy, as I understand it, cannot be what you have represented it to be.

In the first place it is necessary that I should defend the reputation of the Founder and my teacher, H. P. Blavatsky. The truth of

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Theosophy does not rest on her authority as a kind of pope or priest, and she herself was foremost to state this fact and to disclaim such authority. But it is the duty of a Theosophist to defend his teachers against misrepresentation; and further, as such misrepresentation forms part of your argument against Theosophy, by refuting it I shall (in your estimation) be defending Theosophy.

I maintain then in the first place that a perusal of H. P. Blavatsky's works by a candid and competent reader must result in a conviction of the sterling worth of her character and of her great mental attainments. Have you ever studied *The Key to Theosophy*, for instance? Have you studied *The Secret Doctrine*?

We have had, and have, people of consummate ability who have studied these works profoundly, people who can in no sense be described as credulous or in any way inferior, yet who have become convinced of the reality of the vast system of teachings which she expounds and of the absolute sincerity and unselfish devotion of her character.

As for myself, besides having pursued these studies for forty years, I knew H. P. Blavatsky personally and with all the intimacy of a pupil with a teacher. What I learnt during that relationship I cannot expect to make known to you. But it means everything to me; and it is my duty to declare

that my belief, trust, and confidence in my Teacher, as the greatest person I have ever known, both in character and knowledge, remain unshakable.

As to your remark that, "according to what some people say," the pretensions of Blavatsky and Judge have been exposed, it is surely sufficient to point out that, if that is to be accepted as a criterion, we shall have to condemn every single one of the great teachers of religion, philosophy, or science, since the beginning of history; not excepting Socrates, Joan of Arc, Galileo, and -- Jesus.

Of course H. P. Blavatsky has been defamed; of course Judge has been defamed. But what does this prove, more than that they encountered bitter hostility from those who considered it their interest to destroy her and her work?

There is no going away from the fact that H. P. Blavatsky has given to me, and to so many others, gifts of priceless value; and the worth of these gifts remains the same whatever their source. And we prefer to judge of the source from the nature of the gifts, rather than to estimate the value of the gifts by theories as to their source.

You surely cannot be seriously asking me to reject beliefs which I have found to be true, and principles which I have found to be estimable, on the simple ground that some people have defamed the character of the teacher who introduced these things to me? You

THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

of course do not reason so; but, if you do not, then wherein lies the force of your argument?

"Theosophy, as I understand it, is a mixture of Buddhism, mysticism," etc. — Let us see what Theosophy is as its Founder understood it. She states that Theosophy has for its object —

"to rescue from degradation the archaic truths which are the basis of all religions."

"If the root of mankind is one, there must also be one truth which finds expression in all the various religions."

"Are any of the church's dogmas worth the tenets of Christ's Sermon on the Mount?"

"Theosophy is the shoreless ocean of universal truth, love, and wisdom."

"Theosophy reconciles all religions, sects, and nations under a common system of ethics."

"Theosophy is Religion itself — religion in the true and only correct sense."

"No Theosophist has ever spoken against the teachings of Christ."

I could continue such quotations indefinitely. They show that you have not sufficiently studied Theosophy as defined by its promulgator, and that the whole basis of the system is ethical in the deepest and broadest sense.

We have continually to defend Theosophy against the false charge that, because it interprets and throws light on all religions and philosophies, therefore it is nothing but a hotch-potch, or at best a synthesis, of these.

I take next your point that Theosophy "claims what is in effect a special revelation." In *The Key to Theosophy*, which H. P. Blavatsky wrote to explain what Theosophy

(in her view) is, and what it is not, I find the following:

"INQUIRER: Are we to regard Theosophy as in any way a revelation?"

"THEOSOPHIST: In no way whatever — nor even in the sense of a new and direct disclosure from some higher supernatural or at least superhuman beings; but only in the sense of an unveiling of old, very old, truths to minds hitherto ignorant of them."

In the preface to *The Secret Doctrine*, I find the following:

"These truths are in no sense put forward as a revelation; nor does the author claim the position of a revealer of mystic lore now made public for the first time in the world's history. . . . This work is a partial statement of what she herself has been taught by more advanced students."

Nothing can be clearer than that she intended her teachings to be, as she has so often declared, an offering to the critical intelligence and candid examination of her readers. She asks that they be studied and estimated on their merits. She expressly demurs against any attempt to buttress them by an appeal to authority or by a claim to special revelation.

It is in this sense that I myself have accepted these teachings; and, as we have no use for unintelligent and bigoted persons, we do not want anybody else to accept the teachings on any other basis.

"Locates its adepts in inaccessible places." — At the risk of seeming rather severe, I feel both bound and justified in saying that this remark smacks of the cheap sneers we used to find in the facetious leaderettes of the daily press.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

It is at all events an innuendo; for what is the force of the remark if it does not imply that Theosophists believe the adepts to be non-existent, and that they therefore locate them in inaccessible places because they are afraid of being found out?

As to Reincarnation. This is not an article of faith, for no articles of faith are required of members. Pseudo-Theosophists have much disparaged it by their absurdities. Rightly put, it seems to many able minds by far the most reasonable view of the after-life that is extant. *Reincarnation: a Study of Forgotten Truth*, by E. D. Walker, contains a very large collection of testimony from the great minds of all ages to their conviction of the truth of this view.

Personally I may describe myself as convinced, as are many others; though I hold that it is impossible for an ordinary incarnate mind to get more than the vaguest notion of matters that pertain to conditions when the mind is discarnate and everything is so entirely different from all earthly experience.

There is one place where you describe Theosophists as credulous and deficient in critical acumen, and then say immediately afterwards that Theosophy appeals only to the intellectual. This inconsistency appears to have been inspired by your wish to make the point that Theosophy has no appeal for the unintellectual and for

the public in general. This, however, is again contrary to fact -- if we are to accept the statements of the Founder.

I have no space to quote, but may say generally that, as the appeal of Theosophy is primarily ethical, it appeals to all classes and grades; and I may quote W. Q. Judge to the effect that:

"Unfathomable in its deepest parts, it gives the greatest minds their fullest scope, yet, shallow enough at its shores, it will not overwhelm the understanding of a child."

Theosophy does not "rely for its support on a hypothetical past," or any other kind of past. It shows man how to arouse his own spiritual intuitions, which is done by living to the best of his ability in accordance with the divine law. By so doing, he purifies his vision and thus discovers for himself the real support of his faith. As to the past, Theosophy interprets it and vindicates the ancient ancestry of man.

I see you mention some of our teachings as being contrary to the idea of evolution and progress; but this again shows how scanty is your acquaintance with our teachings. For evolution is not merely recognised but forms the entire sub-structure of the system expounded in *The Secret Doctrine*.

Theosophists are par excellence believers in evolution. Only, evolution as they understand it is on a vastly grander scale than as it is imagined by contemporary science. Science has so far given attention

THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

only to the history of man's physical envelop; and even as to that, their views are admittedly tentative, provisional, and constantly changing.

It would be as just to say that evolution is contravened by the fact that the giant saurians of the Jurassic period have disappeared, leaving only insignificant remnants. Even modern biologists are giving up the idea of a unilinear evolution and approximating to the Theosophical idea of cyclic and spiral evolution.

This brings me to another of your objections, which is again contrary to fact. You say that, if Theosophy is true, the discoveries of science ought to bear it out; but that, so far as you can see, this is not the case. You should try to see a little farther; for it is one of our strongest points that the recent discoveries and admissions of science *have* followed and vindicated the teachings of Theosophy and the statements of H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*.

I cannot here go into details, but some of us have compiled lists of such cases, and it is my almost daily task to call attention, in my articles, to some one or other remarkable instance of the way in which science is being converted from the ideas which it used to hold to the ideas put forth by Theosophy forty years ago. This has been the case both in physics and biology. The doctrine of evolution is perhaps the most notable

instance of all that could be cited.

In general it is obvious that thinkers in every department are rapidly giving up the old mechanical materialistic ideas and coming round to a conviction that mind and not matter is the great reality.

As to the real purpose and principles of Theosophy, I can only refer those anxious to know to the books. But I will give a few more quotations.

"We would have all to realize that spiritual powers exist in every man."

"The doctrines of Theosophy call forth every hitherto dormant power for good in us."

"The duty of a Theosophist to himself is to control and conquer, through the Higher, the Lower Self."

"The duty of the Theosophical Society is to keep alive in every man his spiritual intuition."

"The duty of the Theosophical Society is to oppose and counteract bigotry in every form: religious, scientific, or social."

"The duty of a Theosophist: to fear no one and naught save the tribunal of his own conscience."

"Where does a Theosophist look for power to subdue his passions and selfishness? To his Higher Self, the God in him."

"Our endeavor has been to uncover the ruin-encumbered universal foundation of religion."

"Theosophy is the quintessence of duty."

"Theosophy considers humanity as an emanation from divinity, on its return path thereto."

"Theosophy reveals the origin of the world's faiths and sciences."

These quotations from the Founder may help to show Theosophy as it seemed to her and as it seems to me.

Well, I hope I have not been too emphatic; but it is legitimate

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

polemics, and I felt a challenge to defend my faith and especially my teachers. Your statement of your religious convictions shows how broad and tolerant you are; and in connexion with what you say about faith, I quote the following from W. Q. Judge, which may be acceptable, even though some people may say that "his pretensions have been exposed."

"The power to know does not come from book-study nor from mere philosophy, but mostly from the actual practice of altruism in deed, word, and thought; for that practice purifies the covers of the soul and permits

that light to shine down into the brain-mind."

The mysteries of the Kingdom are revealed to those who can follow the doctrine. *μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται.**

You say that religion is concerned primarily with the feelings and only secondarily with the reason. Which reminds me of one of our teachings that there is a wisdom of the Heart which is superior to the wisdom of the head. For us, the path of knowledge consists in finding this Secret Wisdom.

Yours as ever,

H. E.

* Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

PSYCHOANALYSIS, HIGHER AND LOWER

H. TRAVERS, M. A.

MODERN psychology — the meaning of the word is changed: it is no longer a theory of the mind, but a practical study of the same. It seems to boil down to this — that our conduct is mainly based on motives which are called instinctual; reason does not govern our conduct — *that* steps in after the event, to explain or justify the conduct. The instinctual motives well up from a hidden fount somewhere inside of us — called the subconscious. As soon as they reach the conscious mind, we start trying to explain them to ourselves: we *do* the thing: why do we do it? A reason has to be found, plausible, acceptable; and we accordingly find it. But along comes Mr. Freud or some such unpleasant person and turns on his microscope and probe and shows us the little worm in the backyard of our mind, so to say, which really started the business.

These instincts are of a primitive kind, and there is a particular one of them which has been much overdone, as we know. Investigation of dreams, hypnotism, are among the methods used in dissecting the mind.

A good deal of this is just plain common sense put into learned

PSYCHOANALYSIS, HIGHER AND LOWER

language — all very well, because that is quite a good way of recalling people's attention to things they had forgotten. Tantrums and contrariness reappear under newly invented names, thereby claiming a new share of attention. But let us try to see what it all amounts to as a practical proposition.

Man is an animal — man is an animal and nothing else — man is an animal plus something else and better — man has an animal nature and a higher nature — man is a spiritual being attached to an animal mechanism. Well, if a man is using a machine — I don't care who he may be — Shakespeare, Jesus Christ, anybody — there are likely to be cogwheels and grease and such matters concerned in the process. So, if Mr. Freud investigates and digs out a mass of such contraptions, what does it amount to? If a doctor dissects me, alive or dead, he is likely to find a lot of queer unpleasant primitive things — but what does that amount to?

Has anyone dissected and probed the higher nature of man, in search of what can be found there? Why does a mother take off her cloak and freeze to death that her babe may be warm, or why does anybody rush instinctively to the aid of someone in danger? No suppressed egoism or instinct of self-preservation or desire to propagate the species here, surely. If some of these latter instincts are found in the animals, then shall we say that they are therefore base and ignoble after all, or may we say that even the animals have divine inspirations?

But, apart from any motives found in the animals, man has all that which makes him man, as distinct from even the highest animals. And among other things he has the power to dissect his own mental anatomy, as witness Freud himself. Even should man, having discovered his degraded motives, decide to let go and abandon himself to them, even that is an act of free will and decision, and he certainly is a good deal more than an animal — he is at least a devil, and that is something!

But enough of this; we could go on with this sort of thing indefinitely, but prefer to leave it to the man who writes the scientifico-facetious editorials in the papers. I think we all see the point: it is this: Is all this psycho-analysis going to encourage us in our weaknesses, or is it going to help us to be better men and women?

"Know then thyself, presume not God to scan:
The proper study of mankind is man."

We can but know ourself, if we would know anything. For we are shut up in ourself, surrounded by ourself. Our senses are the gateways to knowledge of anything that may be outside — our senses, whether they be outer senses or *inwits*. What we have to learn is to distin-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

guish self from non-self. This study is progressive, we advance by stages. What at one time seemed to be self, becomes later on an object of contemplation. We take up a new stand, outside of our old self, from where we can look down upon it as an object external to ourself. How far may this process be carried? Is it possible that some day I may find myself outside the whole thing that now seems to be Me, looking at it as a curious spectator, interested but not involved in its thinkings and feelings and doings?

If modern psychology reveals the existence in me of sundry propensities which are inconvenient or humiliating, the thing to do is to get the upper hand of them. Some say these things are natural and inevitable and should be given rein. Why not let the weeds grow in our garden? Will it not do harm to try and suppress them? Will they not, in that case, grow into dreadful shapes?

Common sense shows that it will not do to let things grow like that. Yet the trouble is that there is a modicum of truth in what is said about suppressed instincts turning into morbid forms. But the whole business needs studying carefully and treating judiciously; it must not be dashed at in a hurry and without discrimination.

Parents, in their pride, will bring up children in the fixed idea that they are good, without however doing anything to eradicate the natural evil that is in them. The result is a double life for the child. Some children thus learn to lie and dissemble unconsciously and without sense of guilt. Here is the root of suppressed instincts and the morbid forms they may take.

Hence we need a kind of parent that will be willing to *see* the evil in the child, and not try to blink it; that will be courageous enough and wise enough to correct it, so that it will not grow into morbid forms. And then the dilemma of what to do with such instincts will not arise at all, because they will no longer be there. And the right thing to do with such morbid propensities, if they have been suffered to grow, is to arouse the higher nature of the child, which is the only power able to deal with such forces.

In short: shall we say, when we have discovered wild propensities in our nature, I am a brute, therefore I will behave like a brute? Or shall we say: I am a man, therefore I will behave like a man and tame these things? And above all let us psychoanalyse the higher nature and show the divine urges and intuitions in man, and teach the children to open a path for these influences to become active in their lives, so that the lower forces may be subdued easily and naturally.

REASONING BY ANALOGY

ROSE WINKLER, M. D.

THERE is something fascinating in fixing a line of thought tautly (in this sense) to the first division of animal life, and by drawing it securely through pioneer-specimens of the second, third, and more divisions, to gather a view which, taken at the beginning, extends its scope until all Nature in miniature can be satisfactorily scanned. I therefore shall continue with a few analogies, as fundamental facts which may help to furnish links in the chain of ever-becoming.

The sponge-skeleton shows a large number of pores in the outer surface, and for this reason the name Porifera (Latin, 'pore-bearing') is given to this group of animals. The slime-sponge is no longer a one-celled animal, but is made up of many cells. It is classed as the pioneer of the second division of living animals because in it a new plan of structure has begun.

It reproduces by laying eggs, and may also increase by dividing and budding. These latter processes have not yet completely disappeared --- being the processes common to the microscopic animals belonging to the first division.

The process of overlapping will be recognised in all divisions of life. Mother Nature does not break off functions suddenly.

In the egg-laying sponge, the yolk begins to divide into two cells, or separate masses of slime (protoplasm), and these again divide into four, and these four into eight, and so on, till the egg is a globe of small round cells, the beginning of the young sponge; and each cell has its own special work to do. How very like a hen's egg, in which the greater masses of cells undergo further development and growth!

The sponge-egg likewise contains albuminous substance, the yolk or fat of egg; and a nucleus, abounding in the same chemical substances that are found in the egg we eat.

Then a change takes place in the cells around the outside of the rest, and each one of them puts forth a cilium (eyelash) so as to form a fringe round the whole body. With the fringe of cilia surrounding it, the young sponge is ready to make its way into the world, bursts through the skin of the bag, and waving its lashes with the joy of freedom, swims out, an oval-shaped body, into the sea.

No sooner has it settled down and fastened itself to a rock on the

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

floor of its sea-home, than it begins to draw in all the whip-like hairs outside its body in order to *drive in*, through the *small* holes, the fresh seawater full of oxygen, living plants, and animals, thus bringing food to each cell; while the bad water is driven *out* through the *large* holes, carrying away with it all that is hurtful and useless. How like the functions of the lungs and bronchi!

Although these functions are carried on through rudimentary organs, are they not analogous to the processes of digestion and excretion, as well as of inspiration, expiration, and oxidization in one? The sponge-animal has learned to form in one body two kinds of cells with different duties, which by their mutual labor carry on in one being the work of life.

The smooth slime-cells take in the food, while the whip-cells forage for this same food and sweep away the refuse. At the same time, smooth cells are employed in constructing the skeleton which supports the whole body, building with the secretions made out of itself and aided by that secreted out of its food and water that go to make up the fine silky fibers of the toilet sponge, or those of lime and flint, so very beautiful in workmanship and design.

How can we explain the fact that each cell will produce none but its one kind, equally perfect and easily classified? How can we account for the origin of the cell, the protoplasm, the nucleus, the chemical substances, permeating all? Are we not compelled to realize that all are overshadowed by innate intelligence, unerring law and order, infinite beauty, and the urge for ceaseless progression towards an ever higher and invisible goal?

Study Theosophy as taught by H. P. Blavatsky if you would learn more about these mysteries of life and mind, and he who seeks, will find.

NEWS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD

OBSERVER



WE have not heard the last of Glozel yet. A new exploration of the district has been begun by M. Salomon Reinach, the eminent French archaeologist, and other explorers, who are not satisfied that the charges of fraud against the Fradin youth have been proved, or, if they are well-founded, that they settle the question of the alleged relics of an alphabet of immense age in the negative. The new explorations are to be made under conditions which

NEWS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD

will exclude all possibility of fraud on the part of the excavators. Fingerprints found on the objects, if any, will be compared with those of the suspected persons. We shall watch with great interest the next developments in this strange romance of archaeology.



Controversy which has raged for decades as to the age of man in America has been particularly lively of late because of the number of new discoveries pointing to the probability that man has lived here for hundreds of thousands — perhaps millions — of years, and did not make his first appearance a few thousand years ago as an immigrant from Asia.

Dr. J. W. Gidley, with a Smithsonian party, working in Florida, has just obtained additional information that man was in America during the Pleistocene or Ice-Age. In conjunction with other discoveries in the West (referred to several times in these columns) it seems impossible any longer to doubt the immense age of Man in America, even if Dr. Fairfield Osborn's estimate of four million years as the age of the fossilized bone tools he lately found in Nebraska be laid aside for further confirmation.

In 1916, human remains were discovered in Florida associated with extinct animal bones known only in the Pleistocene, and others were found later. The argument against the great age of these human bones is that they worked down from the surface or were ordinary burials. Dr. Gidley's careful exploration at Melbourne, Florida, has, he declares, absolutely settled the question by proving that the human bones, pottery, and arrowheads, etc., are contemporary with the extinct Pleistocene animals found in the same bed and could not have been inserted in that lower and very ancient stratum. The upper stratum is a marsh-deposit and anything inserted into the lower bed could have been traced by the disturbance and by darker-colored sand brought from above. An arrowhead was found within a few feet of a Pleistocene mastodon.

Students of Theosophy have never had the least doubt as to the immense antiquity of man in America, and it is satisfactory to watch the steady accumulation of facts in support of this view. It should always be remembered that the presence of man in America in far-distant geological periods does not militate in the least against the possibility — nay probability — of migrations from Asia, the Pacific Islands, Atlantis, etc., at later dates.

In connexion with these migrations, Dr. Hrdlička considers that the European Aurignacian or Cro-Magnon race had several features in common with the prehistoric Indians. We must never forget that the

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Aurignacians, from whom modern European man is probably derived in large measure, have no known ancestry. Where they came from is still a mystery to science, and their immediate predecessors in Europe — the Neanderthal men — are not supposed to be related.

Dr. Alexander Götz of the University of Göttingen, Germany, has recently returned to the California Institute of Technology from Mexico where, among other scientific activities, he has investigated and photographed the temple or monument near San Fernando about thirty miles from Mexico City which is reputed to be the oldest building in America or perhaps elsewhere.

Professor Byron Cummings, of Arizona University, who partly excavated it some years ago, reported that it is a solidly built temple in the form of a truncated cone 387 feet wide at the base and 291 feet in diameter across the highest platform which is 74 feet above the ground. It is completely surrounded by very ancient lava which came from a neighboring volcano, and this lava covers numerous strata of clay-deposits which were brought down by floods, burying the base of the monument to a height of from fifteen to nineteen feet. Competent geologists state that thousands of years must have elapsed during which the clay was laid down, and that the lava covered the clay not less than two thousand years ago.

Dr. Götz is quoted in the *Los Angeles Times* as saying that this monument —

“is undoubtedly the oldest product of human builders yet discovered. Geologists can tell by measuring the corrosion of the lava that the huge mound of hand-picked stones is undoubtedly 9000 years old, or 3000 years older than the Egyptian vestiges of civilization. Fearing that the Spaniards would destroy the monument, the Indians painstakingly covered its sides with earth on which they planted trees and shrubs. When the Spaniards viewed the structure for the first time, they saw what, until recently, was believed to be a strangely-formed hill.

“This discovery reveals that Mexico, and not Egypt, apparently was the cradle of civilization. This is borne out by the fact that the course of civilization in Egypt was retrogressive, while in Mexico it was progressive.”

We do not agree with Dr. Götz that Mexico is the cradle of civilization — so many ‘cradles of civilization’ are offered by different schools of anthropologists — and we might suggest that the course of civilization in Egypt was *cyclic* rather than retrogressive as a whole; but it is extremely interesting to find that science is beginning to realize that America is by no means a ‘New’ World, and that great and hoary civilizations have passed away on this continent thousands of years before the times of the oldest authentically known empires of the Old World. This is precisely what Katherine Tingley, more than thirty years ago, stated publicly would be discovered in no long time, incredible as it seemed then.

THE DIVINITY OF NATURE IN THE ART OF MAURICE BRAUN

REGINALD POLAND, Director of Fine Arts, San Diego



“He has never painted a poor picture,”—such is the statement of a discerning critic in reference to Maurice Braun. Like so many of the really great, he is modest about his art. If you wish to find out about him, you can do so only through the medium of his paintings. All who recently saw that glorious collection of his pictures in the Fine Arts Gallery, will realize how well and pleasingly his interpretations can speak to us.

This painter was born in Naggy Bittse, Hungary. In a beautiful account written by Mrs. Maurice Braun are recorded numerous instances of the fine spirit of her husband, even when he was very young. For example, we hear that when he was but three years of age, he recalls attending a fête in one of the little squares of his native village, where, amid flaming torches, clowns were playing pranks and the sword-swallower was busy with his unappetizing fare. All this meant nothing to the little Maurice, however. He wandered out under the dark blue effulgence of Heaven’s dome in order to commune with the stars, fancying himself one of those stars.

It was said that even at that age he could make a very good drawing of the head of Attila, which was so frequently used as a sort of trademark for things Hungarian—coffee, tobacco, etc. His young friends would surreptitiously ‘borrow’ the butcher’s pencil, so that their wonderful artist-chum could ‘make faces for them.’

At four years of age, with his mother and her four other children, he sailed for the ‘promised land’—America, of course. After arriving here, he entered one of the New York City schools, where, in the things which he liked, he showed remarkable proficiency, although otherwise he was not so successful. He has even said himself that, if he had decided upon running as a vocation, he would probably have made a great name for himself, because he could outstrip all in such races. In his art-classes, again, he carried away all the highest honors.

His life in ‘the big city’ was quite delightful. He loved the parks and the Natural History Museum collections. Nature was his most sought retreat from the worries of this material, hectic, and vain existence in getting a living. Every Sunday, for several years, he would go to the Metropolitan Museum, in order to study and enjoy the Old Masters,

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

especially. He read what he could, and painted on the sly. For his family could not understand why anyone would want to waste time on art which could not be expected to bring returns.

Although at fourteen he was apprenticed to a jeweler, in order to become a highly skilled craftsman, he finally revolted, and, upon receipt of no more than his registration-fee from his father, he entered the National Academy in New York City. Studying with F. C. Jones, William Q. Ward, and George W. Maynard, he succeeded in winning every prize for four years at that school.

He started out with the idea that he would be a portrait-painter. His great abilities in such work may cause us to wonder why he made a change. As we have seen, Nature has always been the source of his inspiration. He loved to draw the distinct personalities among the many kinds of trees.

Because he wished to break away entirely from the danger of following others, and because he realized the surpassing beauty of the Southern California paradise, he 'pulled up stakes' in 1909 and came to San Diego, where he continued to live for twelve years.

In 1921, however, he realized that in order to do still better work here, he could broaden and develop his viewpoint as well as technique by seeing what was going on in the rest of this country. And so he returned to the East, painting en route in Colorado and in New York state. When he reached New York City, he learned that he was already known as 'the painter of the East and of the West.'

HIS QUALITIES

The nationally known writer, Talbot Mundy, had long admired 'Braun landscapes,' even before he had met the artist. In his work he found sure proof of the great thought and study which the artist had given to painting. Successful accomplishment, beyond the shadow of a doubt, was the result of much tireless and painstaking effort. And yet there is no effort visible in his beautiful pictures.

Mr. Mundy has sensed that rare enthusiasm which bestirs the artist to action, not simply now and again at rare moments, but every day. The writer loves his simplicity of child-like faith, belief, and love. There is a happy balance of both the seen and the unseen truths in his sunny scenes. The integrity of the man himself shines through the pigments.

Although he may have chosen Southern California for his field, without knowing exactly why, in part he probably did so because the country is so like his own nature. In the interpretations of this theme is the brightness of high-noon, joyous color, and the warmth of sunshine. Even when he paints the gray East, he is decidedly colorful. You will not

THE DIVINITY OF NATURE IN THE ART OF MAURICE BRAUN

find the stormy, tragic or pessimistic vein in his pictures,— never the striving for theatrical effect, nor dominating drama.

SO BRAUN SAYS

Our leader realizes that his is not the only good way in which to paint; he likes the work of many. Inness will always remain for him not only a master of pictorial art, but a fine thinker and a true poet. Winslow Homer, truly American and a truly realistic interpreter, and John La Farge, the manifold, he admires almost as much. Among our later landscapists, Redfield, Schofield, and Symons have real significance for him. Arthur B. Davies, who suggests the abstract by visible forms, and who is so rhythmic, poetic, and even musical in his dynamic compositions, pleases Braun more than all others in this country.

He knows that this country is bound to achieve the greatest success. Her greatest progress, however, will come later on. With it, Southern California will rise to a place of decided leadership as an American center of art. There is no doubt of this in his mind; the beauty of the country in time must dominate and develop a demand for beauty, in man-made creations.

EXAMPLES

We have suggested that Mr. Braun can paint the most delicate, subtil, and gray, wintry New England scenes, but make of them pearl-like gems over whose soft and elusive surface vibrate all the pastel-shades of the rainbow.

Again, when painting the autumn foliage of Old Lyme, Connecticut, the golden aspens or cottonwoods of Colorado, or the still more somber notes of California's autumn, Maurice Braun shows the strength and stamina of his own character, as well as the monumental power of God-made life which has weathered the storms and heat of summer, and is prepared for the blasts of winter's winds. The rich golden notes of variegated autumn foliage, when painted by his brush, seem fairly to resound and emanate a warmth which is a warmth of geniality.

In the Y. W. C. A. of San Diego is his 'Winter.' A heavy, cold, and wet blanket of snow covers everything. And yet, through it all, the sun is struggling to shine, promising refreshing spring ere long.

In 'Spring at Old Lyme,' this promise is fulfilled. The light green buds are popping out; a silvery shimmer pervades all things in a youthfulness of life.

'Mount Kisco,' with its bouquet of bright primary colors, is the full blossom of bounteous summer. Here the strength of those life-giving months is quite evident. Similarly, in 'Mountain Lake,' owned

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

by Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Elliott, of Point Loma, we have Mr. Braun's persistently good drawing, lovely color, and excellent, but not at all obvious, composition.

Such paintings reveal both inspiration and knowledge. They are not cold, although they are completely realized concepts, but vividly picture the personality of both the particular scene and also of its artist. In them are vitality, poetry, and beauty. From this we can understand that they are friendly pictures, not only happy, but decidedly optimistic. In fact, if we were to typify Braun and his art in one word, that word would be 'optimism.'

As he sees it, "beauty is the language of art, its message, its breath of life. There is divine beauty in Nature."

RECENT DISCOVERIES, ACTIVITIES, AND PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

C. J. RYAN



ANOTHER scientific hypothesis, till lately very popular, seems to be quite dead; this is the dreary suggestion that the sun is rapidly running down to extinction and that cold death will soon overwhelm the earth and the other planets. Eminent scientists now offer us a period of perhaps fifteen trillion years for the sun to maintain its present radiation; this seems quite long enough for the human race to exhaust the possibilities of evolution on the physical plane in this planet!

According to the Ancient Wisdom, the sun cannot wear itself out until it has performed its destined duty. Materialistic science, on the contrary, does not conceive that there is any kind of Plan or Scheme in the appearance of life and consciousness, but holds that sentient life casually appears in the few places which have become chemically and physically capable, in some haphazard way, of supporting it, and that it develops into higher forms by the unconscious play of various 'natural' or 'biological' forces.

This is, of course, the cyclic reaction from the medieval idea of a Deity made, as someone said, "in the image of man," and who created everything with his hands and said it was very good — an idea derived from Oriental allegories taken literally by matter-of-fact Western minds. If we do not let ourselves be carried away by this reaction, but look more deeply into the meaning of the Oriental teachings with the help of

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

the light of Theosophy, we shall see how reasonable is the claim that there is a Plan or orderly process of the evolution of conscious life, and that this plan is co-ordinated and harmonized with the physical evolution of sun and planet.

The soul of humanity has already passed through cycles of experience in which conditions on earth were so different from present ones that ancient philosophers spoke of them as former 'worlds,' long destroyed. Our 'world' will disappear in its turn, its geographical formation and physical conditions making room for 'worlds' of a structure incomprehensible to us now, and with possibilities for higher spiritual advancement yet unimagined.

The recent claim of the most eminent astro-physicists that the sun has enough internal energy of its own — *not derived from the outside* (which is exactly what H. P. Blavatsky gave in her *Secret Doctrine* as the occult teaching) — to last for vast periods of time, is a big step toward the Theosophical position.

In *Five Years of Theosophy*, published about fifty years ago when the idea was held that the sun was cooling and dying, one of H. P. Blavatsky's Eastern Teachers vigorously assailed this pessimistic notion. Here is a quotation from the article:

"Is the Sun merely a cooling mass? Such is the accepted theory of modern science. It is not what the 'Adepts' teach. The former says,— the sun 'derives no important accession of heat from without': the latter answer — 'the sun needs it not.' He is quite as self-dependent as he is self-luminous; and for the maintenance of his heat requires no help, no foreign accession of vital energy; for he is the heart of his system, a heart that will not cease its throbbing until its hour of rest shall come. Were the sun a 'cooling mass,' our great life-giver would have indeed grown dim with age by this time, and found some trouble to keep his watch-fires burning for the future races to accomplish their cycles, and the planetary chains to achieve their rounds. . . .

"The 'Adepts,' who are thus forced to demolish before they can reconstruct, deny most emphatically that the sun's luminosity has already begun to weaken and that his power . . . may be exhausted within a given and conceivable time. . . ."

This is almost precisely what Professor Eddington and astronomers in general are now teaching as the logical outcome of all the recent discoveries on more lines than one. As he says, "the sun contains within itself the energy which is to last it the rest of its life."

The now-abandoned theory that the sun is kept going by some ordinary process of combustion was also denied by H. P. Blavatsky's Eastern Teachers some fifty years ago, at a time when no other explanation was offered by physics, and to deny it was to show great hardihood. But they spoke from the standpoint of a deeper knowledge.

In the work quoted above, another significant hint is given, worthy of serious consideration in view of the modern conception that elec-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

tricity or electric particles are the bricks of which sensible matter is built. After quoting Sir John Herschel on the 'rice-grains' (the bright sheets or flakes of unknown material which constitute the visible surface of the sun), where he speaks of them as:

"the immediate sources of the solar light and heat . . . we cannot refuse to regard them as organisms of some peculiar and amazing kind; and though it would be too daring to speak of such organizations as partaking of the nature of life, yet we do know that vital action is competent to develop at once heat, and light, and electricity"—

the writer continues:

"These 'wonderful objects' . . . are simply the reservoirs of solar vital energy, the *vital* electricity that feeds the whole system in which it lives and breathes and has its being. The sun is, we say, the storehouse of our little cosmos, self-generating its vital fluid, and ever receiving as much as it gives out. . . ."

In view of the new scientific discovery that the sun is self-sustaining, theories of great complexity involving highly abstract and metaphysical — we may almost say, occult — conceptions, have been devised which show a near approach to the teachings of Theosophy. Matter and energy are interchangeable; the mysterious atoms, miniature 'solar systems' of electrons and protons, dissolve into equally mysterious energy, to recombine sooner or later into the illusion of 'matter' again. But, according to Theosophy, what is behind this 'pair of opposites,' is neither blind nor dead, but intelligent and vital.

The total eclipse of the Sun, seen in England and northern Europe on June 29, 1927, presented one very unusual feature. The eclipse was viewed by astronomers from Greenwich Observatory in an airplane at an altitude of 11,000 feet, and excellent photographs were obtained. Four or five prominences were seen, one, near the north pole of the Sun, being 50,000 miles in height. These prominences are the so-called 'red flames' extending from the chromosphere or rose-colored ring of light seen round the Sun during total eclipses.

Everyone has heard of these rosy 'flames'; they are easily visible to the naked eye during totality. The astronomers in the airplane, high above the surface of the earth and the denser part of our atmosphere, reported that to their surprise the prominences did not appear red to them but of a 'lustrous silver white.'

Great interest has been aroused by this remarkable observation, and the subject will occupy the attention of astronomers at future total eclipses. It is not the first time, however, that such an observation at a great height has been made, for on July 29, 1898, from the top of Pike's Peak, Colorado (14,147 ft.), Professor Langley observed the absence

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

of red in the solar prominences, "which," he not unnaturally said, "surprised me."

In both these cases observation at a height where the atmosphere of the earth is greatly rarefied showed that the 'flames' no longer displayed the ruddy hue so conspicuous at low levels, and in view of the Theosophical teaching that our atmosphere modifies the radiations coming to the earth's surface far more than the scientists have realized, these observations are extremely interesting to students of the Ancient Wisdom as evidence of the accuracy of its teaching on this question. If the denser part of the earth's atmosphere can so modify the 'lustrous silver white' light from the prominences as to cut out all its constituent rays except the red ones (which are the only ones visible from low levels) how can we trust our spectroscopic analysis of the radiations from the Sun and the other stars!

All the new theories about the constitution of the celestial bodies, and to a large degree, about the structure of the universe, depend upon the belief that the light-radiations from the stars reach us in practically the same condition as when they started — *weakened* and *slightly* modified in a well-known proportion according to the thickness of the earth's atmosphere — but not fundamentally transformed by the subtraction of large portions of the spectrum in such a way as to render it impossible to tell what the original emission actually was. So these eclipse-observations must be disconcerting to some of these theories.

Is it not within the bounds of possibility that to get real knowledge we shall need to follow the methods of research of the Eastern Adepts who have developed their spiritual perceptions in the only way which leads to the heart of the universe? This possibility is not reserved for a favored few but is the heritage of the race: man has powers undreamed-of by Western psychology — within himself. But to develop these high and subtil perceptions, hard intellectual study is not enough; they are the natural outcome of lives of unselfishness and impersonal service to humanity through which the divine, spiritual part becomes awakened in man. The desire for the gratification of intellectual curiosity, however laudable it may seem, will never lead to ultimate truths.

The remarkable difference in the color of the solar prominences when seen from a great height above the surface of the earth is not the only reason for believing that science is approaching the discovery of the 'special laboratory' in the upper atmosphere of which H. P. Blavatsky speaks in *The Secret Doctrine* as well known to esoteric science, but quite unknown to western scientists. Not only will the arguments about the stars derived from the analysis of light by the spectroscope need modification when the action of this transforming 'laboratory' is better under-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

stood, but possibly those relating to more mundane matters. The following is suggestive of unexpected possibilities.

It is well known that the Greeks believed that high above the earth stood the highest heaven, the Empyrean; this means the region of Fire. Did they only mean material fire, as is generally supposed, or was there more in this attribution than appears? Is there a region of warmth many miles above the surface of the earth?

We are well aware from balloon-observations that the temperature falls rapidly as we ascend till it reaches 76 degrees or more below zero Fahrenheit. At about 19 or 20 miles it *rises* ten degrees; beyond that no sounding-balloon can ascend. It has been assumed that very soon far lower temperatures occur descending to the 'absolute cold of outer space.'

But according to recent reports from Russia, Professor Vassily G. Fessenkov, head of the Government Institute of Astro-Physics, and one of the leading authorities on the earth's atmosphere, announces that, mainly owing to the researches of British scientists, the theory that the higher we go the colder it gets has been exploded. On the contrary, he says, at a height of about forty miles there is a hot stratum of atmosphere several miles thick. Professor Fessenkov derives his conclusions from close studies of the higher regions at sunset. As the sun goes down it successively illuminates higher and higher layers of the atmosphere, and by spectroscopic analysis of the reflected light the composition of each layer is determined and the temperature ascertained. He declares that the temperature rises to the extraordinary height of 85 degrees *above zero* Fahrenheit, at about 43 miles above the surface of the earth! He believes that still farther up intense cold begins again.

As there is always ideal weather in this hot region, he suggests that airplanes will ultimately be able to utilize it for long-distance flights, but how the problem of needed air-resistance is to be solved in such a rarefied atmosphere is not clear.

However that may be, we, as students of Theosophy, are specially interested in the surprising declaration by a leading scientist that great heat exists in far-away regions of the air where no western scientist has hitherto suspected anything but intense cold. According to Professor Fessenkov, the summer warmth of the higher region is caused by a physico-chemical process taking place when the ultra-violet rays from the sun strike the oxygen layer about fifty miles up, after passing through the still more distant regions of hydrogen. "The obstruction of the oxygen causes absorption of the ultra-violet rays, heat is given off in the process, and much of the oxygen is turned into ozone." Lower down, conditions are different and there is no liberation of heat.

Whether the argument is sound or not, it is highly interesting to

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

find an accredited representative of modern science in accord with one of the Theosophical teachings, *i. e.*, that there is a layer high up in our atmosphere where physico-chemical transformations take place, and that this layer is warm. The teaching says that we do not get nearly all our heat directly from the sun, but a much larger proportion from the meteoric dust-layers surrounding our earth, and which are said to be 'magnetic.'

Space will not permit further consideration of this question, particularly as the full details of Professor Fessenkov's report are not yet available, but we are inclined to think that it is only the beginning of a new chapter in scientific discovery of a most surprising nature.

Some months ago we referred in these columns to the radio 'ceiling' or reflecting layer high above the earth that scientists from the Carnegie Institute of Terrestrial Magnetism and others have discovered. It was mentioned (August 1927) as being possibly related to the 'magnetic' or 'chemical laboratory' known to the Occult philosophers.

Recently, H. A. Heising, of the Bell Telephone laboratories, told the Institute of Electrical Engineers that the 'electrical ceiling' changes its position from perhaps 160 miles above the earth in daylight to 400 miles at night, rising about six miles a minute and falling twenty a minute. It acts as a reflecting mirror and is thought to be responsible for some of the things that happen in short-wave transmission. It would be highly interesting to learn what connexion it has with Professor Fessenkov's heated layer, if any.

The new researches are certainly proving the Theosophical teaching that the apparently 'serene transparent atmosphere, gradually thinning out by imperceptible degrees to the vacuum of outer space' is by no means so simple as it seems; and as to the vacuum of outer space, new discoveries, including the mysterious Millikan rays, testify to the truth of the old saying that Nature abhors a vacuum. H. P. Blavatsky quotes from an ancient Eastern *Commentary*:

"There is not one finger's breadth (*angul*) of void Space in the whole Boundless (Universe). . . ."

One of the most striking teachings brought by H. P. Blavatsky was that there have been four world-wide cataclysmic changes in terrestrial conditions as well as many minor ones, during the hundreds of millions of years since the earth has been the seat of animal life; each of these reconstructions finally creating what was practically a new world. The last two were associated with the destruction of the Lemurian cycle of humanity, and the Atlantean, respectively. Until lately geology did not look favorably upon any theories of revolutionary changes — *Natura non facit saltum*, was the favorite motto; but we now find that theories of gigantic cataclysms are being seriously considered, and that science

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

is approaching curiously near in these speculations to the knowledge of the East.

One of these theories is well supported by the testimony of the rocks. It has recently been set forth in great detail by Professor A. P. Coleman, of Toronto, in *Ice Ages Recent and Modern*, a fascinating work. There have been four great glacial periods and several minor ones. During the major glaciations the earth underwent the most tremendous devastation over immense areas of its surface, but reconstruction began with the return of warm temperatures.

The most recent glacial period is that of the Pleistocene Age, and we have not yet completely emerged from it. It was formerly believed to be the only Ice Age, but it is now known that these visitations of intense cold are periodic and return at long intervals. Millions of years before the Pleistocene, the last glaciation, the Permo-Carboniferous, the Pre-Cambrian, and the Huronian Ice Ages occurred. These four are the greater glaciations known in the geological record.

An observer on the moon, if he could have watched the earth for several hundred million years would have seen curious rhythmic changes of appearance. According to the record of the rocks as far as we know it, the land would have been clothed with vegetation almost everywhere for ninety-five per cent of the time; no whiteness being seen at the poles because snow and ice were unknown or quite insignificant. Gradually a whiteness would begin to extend from the poles, waxing and waning, but finally extending until it covered an immense area, in some cases almost reaching the equator. Then, after many thousands of years, or perhaps millions, the ice-sheets began to melt under the increasing warmth and to retreat towards the poles. Finally they disappeared altogether and the earth regained its normal green clothing which it kept for millions of years until the gradual approach of the next frigid cycle, and so on.

It is reasonably believed that the enormous volume of water locked up in the form of ice-sheets during the glaciations may have lowered the sea-level six hundred feet and exposed large tracts of formerly submerged land, and Professor Coleman points out that when the present polar caps melt away as the earth returns to its normal warmer temperature, the sea-level will rise more than 50 feet, perhaps 140, and will drown all the wharves and harbor works! He also suggests that the minor refrigeration which heralded the Tertiary Period (the Age of Mammals) was fatal to the gigantic reptiles such as the dinosaurs, whose sudden disappearance is one of the unexplained mysteries of biology, and left the world free for the dominion of the vertebrates with their protecting fur or feathers.

We cannot enter at all fully into this fascinating subject here, but

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

it has been referred to because of its significance in possible relationship to the four great and destructive changes in world-conditions so strongly insisted upon by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*.

No cause for these recurring ice-ages is known, though numerous theories have been offered. Variations in the earth's orbit, changes in the angle of the axis, geographical alterations of the earth's surface, a periodical weakening of the sun's energies, and other possibilities have been tried and found wanting. The student of Theosophy would suggest that periodical changes in the earth's magnetism at such long intervals that modern science has not yet discovered them might perhaps solve the larger part of the problem.

Meteorological research has taken very little account of terrestrial magnetic variations in relation to weather and climate, though a beginning has been made by the establishment of a connexion between sunspots and rainfall in certain places in America and Africa. According to the Occult teachings the glacial conditions are indirectly caused by magnetic changes in the 'chemical laboratory' in the upper air. This does not exclude the possibility that another factor may be some change in the position of the earth's axis.

One definite and unexpected conclusion has been reached by science, arising from the discovery of periodical glaciations separated by far longer intervals of warmth during many hundred million years of the earth's history. This is that the sun cannot have perceptibly changed in its average output of energy during immense periods of time. There is no evidence that the sun is weakening in its forces and rapidly moving towards extinction. From the geological evidence it has kept its fires burning in much the same way for probably several billion years. Astronomy lends aid to the reasonable view that the life-history or evolution of stars such as our sun is a process which takes such a long time as to appear almost infinity to our limited perceptions.

In considering the periodical return of terrestrial refrigeration and its apparent connexion with definite periods of reconstruction, the student of Theosophy is reminded of a fundamental difference between the teaching of the Occult Theosophic philosophers and the superficial opinions of so many modern scientists upon causation. It is expressed by H. P. Blavatsky in the following passage, which is well worth consideration by those who are not satisfied with the modern mechanistic views about the workings of the nature forces:

"It is a fundamental principle of the Occult philosophy, this same homogeneity of matter and immutability of natural laws, which are so much insisted upon by materialism; but that unity rests upon the inseparability of Spirit from matter, and, if the two are once divorced, the whole Kosmos would fall back into chaos and non-being. Therefore, it is absolutely false, and but an additional demonstration of the great conceit of our age, to assert

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

(as men of science do) that all the great geological changes and terrible convulsions have been produced *by ordinary and known physical forces*. For these forces were but the tools and final means for the accomplishment of certain purposes, acting periodically, and apparently mechanically, through an inward impulse mixed up with, but beyond their material nature. There is a purpose in every important act of Nature, whose acts are all cyclic and periodical. But spiritual Forces having been usually confused with the purely physical, the former are denied by, and therefore, have to remain unknown to Science, because left unexamined."

She then quotes Hegel:

"The history of the World begins with its general aim; the realization of the Idea of Spirit — only in an *implicit* form (*an sich*), that is, as Nature; a hidden, most profoundly hidden unconscious instinct, and the whole process of History . . . is directed to rendering this unconscious impulse a conscious one. . . . And this aim is none other than finding itself — coming to itself — and contemplating itself in concrete actuality. . . . *Reason governs the World and has consequently governed its history*. . . . (*The Philosophy of History*, p. 26)

— *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, pp. 640-641

So we learn from the more spiritual science of Theosophy, reflected here and there in the West by a few more intuitive minds, that great changes in terrestrial conditions, such as the glacial periods, are not blind products of mechanical processes, but are integral parts of the grand scheme of evolution, factors to clear away worn out conditions and to provide new and better opportunities for experience as the 'soul of the world' moves onward under the illusory appearance of multitudes of separated material forms.