



MEMORY IN THE DYING

The human brain is simply the canal between two planes — the psycho-spiritual and the material — through which every abstract and metaphysical idea filters from the Manasic down to the lower human consciousness. The ideas about the infinite and the absolute are not, nor can they be, within *our* brain capacities. They can be faithfully mirrored only by our Spiritual consciousness, thence to be more or less faintly projected onto the tables of our perceptions on this plane. Thus while the records of even important events are often obliterated from our memory, not the most trifling action of our lives can disappear from the “Soul’s” memory, because it is no MEMORY for it, but an ever present reality on the plane which lies outside our conceptions of space and time.

[*Lucifer*, Vol. V, No. 26, October, 1889, pp. 125-129]

We find in a very old letter from a MASTER, written years ago to a member of the Theosophical Society, the following suggestive lines on the mental state of a dying man:¹

¹ [H.P.B. refers here to a letter of Master K.H. received by A. P. Sinnett about October 1882, when he was at Simla, India. It is a very long communication, and contains answers to queries sent in by Sinnett. These queries and the Master’s replies can be found in *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett*, pp. 144-178. Sinnett had asked:

“(16) You say:—‘Remember we create ourselves, our Devachan, and our Avitchi and mostly during the latter days and even moments of our sentient lives.’

“(17) But do the thoughts on which the mind may be engaged at the last moment *necessarily* hinge on to the predominant character of its past life? Otherwise it would seem as if the character of a person’s Devachan or Avitchi might be capriciously and unjustly determined by the change which brought some special thought uppermost at last?”

To this, the Master replied:

“(16) It is a widely spread belief among all the Hindus that a person’s future pre-natal state and birth are moulded by the last desire he may have at the time of death. But this last desire, they say, necessarily hinges on to the shape which the person may have given to his desires, passions, etc., during his past life. It is for this very reason, viz.—that our last desire may not be unfavourable to our future progress—that we have to watch our actions and control our passions and desires throughout our whole earthly career.

“(17) It *cannot* be otherwise. The experience of dying men— by drowning and other accidents— brought back to life, has corroborated our doctrine

“At the last moment, the whole life is reflected in our memory and emerges from all the forgotten nooks and corners picture after picture, one event after the other. The dying brain dislodges memory with a strong supreme impulse, and memory restores faithfully every impression entrusted to it during the period of the brain’s activity. That impression and thought which was the strongest naturally becomes the most vivid and survives so to say all the rest which now vanish and disappear for ever, to reappear but in Devachan. No man dies insane or unconscious—as some physiologists assert. Even a *madman*, or one in a fit of *delirium*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Memory in the Dying	1
The Hidden H.P.B. — I	5
Correspondence	14
Tuesday Evenings with Mr. Judge	19
A Hindu Chela’s Diary	24
Glimpses of Eternity	30
An Astrological Anecdote	30

in almost every case. Such thoughts are *involuntary* and we have no more control over them than we would over the eye’s retina to prevent it perceiving that colour which affects it most.”

Immediately following the above sentence, there occurs the passage quoted by H.P.B.— *Compiler*.{*C.W.*, xi, 446-47fn}

tremens will have his instant of perfect lucidity at the moment of death, though unable to say so to those present. The man may often appear dead. Yet from the last pulsation, from and between the last throbbing of his heart and the moment when the last spark of animal heat leaves the body—the *brain thinks* and the *Ego* lives over in those few brief seconds—his whole life again. Speak in whispers, ye, who assist at a death-bed and find yourselves in the solemn presence of Death. Especially have you to keep quiet just after Death has laid her clammy hand upon the body. Speak in whispers, I say, lest you disturb the quiet ripple of thought, and hinder the busy work of the Past casting on its reflection upon the veil of the Future . . .”

The above statement has been more than once strenuously opposed by materialists; Biology and (Scientific) Psychology, it was urged, were both against the idea, and while the latter had no well-demonstrated data to go upon in such a *hypothesis*, the former dismissed the idea as an empty “superstition.” Meanwhile, even biology is bound to progress, and this is what we learn of its latest achievements. Dr. Ferré has communicated quite recently to the Biological Society of Paris a very curious note on the mental state of the dying, which marvellously corroborates the above lines. For, it is to the special phenomenon of life-reminiscences, and that sudden re-emerging on the blank walls of memory, from all its long neglected and forgotten “nooks and corners,” of “picture after picture” that Dr. Ferré draws the special attention of biologists.

We need notice but two among the numerous instances given by this Scientist in his *Rapport*, to show how scientifically correct are the teachings we receive from our Eastern Masters.

The first instance is that of a moribund consumptive whose disease was developed in consequence of a spinal affection.

Already consciousness had left the man, when, recalled to life by two successive injections of a gramme of ether, the patient slightly lifted his head and began talking rapidly in Flemish, a language no one around him, nor yet himself, understood. Offered a pencil and a piece of white cardboard, he wrote with great rapidity several lines in that language—very correctly, as was ascertained later on—fell back, and died. When translated—the writing was found to refer to a very prosaic affair. He had suddenly recollected, he wrote, that he owed a certain man a sum of fifteen francs since 1868—hence more than twenty years—and desired it to be paid.

But why write his last wish in Flemish? The defunct was a native of Antwerp, but had left his country in childhood, without ever knowing the language, and having passed all his life in Paris, could speak and write only in French. Evidently his returning consciousness, that last flash of memory that displayed before him, as in a retrospective panorama, all his life, even to the trifling fact of his having borrowed twenty years back a few francs from a friend, did not emanate from his *physical* brain alone, but rather from his spiritual memory, that of the *Higher Ego* (Manas or the re-incarnating individuality). The fact of his speaking and writing Flemish, a language that he had heard at a time of life when he could not yet speak himself, is an additional proof. *The EGO* is *almost omniscient in its immortal nature*. For indeed matter is nothing more than “the last degree and as the shadow of existence,” as Ravaisson, member of the French Institute, tells us.

But to our second case.

Another patient, dying of pulmonary consumption and likewise re-animated by an injection of ether, turned his head towards his wife and rapidly said to her: “You cannot find that pin now; all the floor has been renewed since then.” This was in reference

to the loss of a scarf pin eighteen years before, a fact so trifling that it had almost been forgotten, but which had not failed to be revived in the last thought of the dying man, who having expressed what he saw in words, suddenly stopped and breathed his last. Thus any one of the thousand little daily events, and accidents of a long life would seem capable of being recalled to the flickering consciousness, at the supreme moment of dissolution. A long life, perhaps, lived over again in the space of one short second!

A third case may be noticed, which corroborates still more strongly that assertion of Occultism which traces all such remembrances to the thought-power of the *individual*, instead of to that of the personal (lower) Ego. A young girl, who had been a sleepwalker up to her twenty-second year, performed during her hours of somnambulant sleep the most varied functions of domestic life, of which she had no remembrance upon awakening.

Among other psychic impulses that manifested themselves only during her sleep, was a secretive tendency quite alien to her waking state. During the latter she was open and frank to a degree, and very careless of her personal property; but in the somnambulant state she would take articles belonging to herself or within her reach and hide them away with ingenious cunning. This habit being known to her friends and relatives, and two nurses, having been in attendance to watch her actions during her right rambles for years, nothing disappeared but what could be easily restored to its usual place. But on one sultry night, the nurse falling asleep, the young girl got up and went to her father's study. The latter, a notary of fame, had been working till a late hour that night. It was during a momentary absence from his room that the somnambulant entered, and deliberately possessed herself of a will left open upon the desk, as also of a sum of several thousand pounds in bonds and notes. These she proceeded to hide in

the hollow of two dummy pillars set up in the library to match the solid ones, and stealing from the room before her father's return, she regained her chamber and bed without awakening the nurse who was still asleep in the armchair.

The result was, that, as the nurse stoutly denied that her young mistress had left the room, suspicion was diverted from the real culprit and the money could not be recovered. The loss of the will involved a lawsuit which almost beggared her father and entirely ruined his reputation, and the family were reduced to great straits. About nine years later the young girl who, during the previous seven years had not been somnambulant, fell into consumption of which she ultimately died. Upon her death-bed, the veil which had hung before her physical memory was raised; her divine insight awakened; the pictures of her life came streaming back before her inner eye; and among others she saw the scene of her somnambulant robbery. Suddenly arousing herself from the lethargy in which she had lain for several hours, her face showed signs of some terrible emotion working within, and she cried out "Ah! what have I done? . . . It was I who took the will and the money . . . Go search the dummy pillars in the library, I have . . ." She never finished her sentence for her very emotion killed her. But the search was made and the will and money found within the oaken pillars as she had said. What makes the case more strange is, that these pillars were so high, that even by standing upon a chair and with plenty of time at her disposal instead of only a few moments, the somnambulant could not have reached up and dropped the objects into the hollow columns. It is to be noted, however, that ecstasies and convulsionists (*Vide the Convulsionnaires de St. Médard et de Morzîne*) seem to possess an abnormal facility for climbing blank walls and leaping even to the tops of trees.

Taking the facts as stated, would they not induce one to believe that the

somnambulant personage possesses an intelligence and memory of its own apart from the physical memory of the waking lower Self; and that it is the former which remembers *in articulo mortis*, the body and physical senses in the latter case ceasing to function, and the intelligence gradually making its final escape through the avenue of psychic, and last of all of spiritual consciousness? And why not? Even materialistic science begins now to concede to psychology more than one fact that would have vainly begged of it recognition twenty years ago. "The real existence," Ravaisson tells us, "the life of which every other life is but an imperfect outline, a faint sketch, is that of the Soul." That which the public in general calls "soul," we speak of as the "reincarnating Ego." "To be, is to live, and to live is to will and think," says the French Scientist.¹ But, if indeed the physical brain is of only a limited area, the field for the containment of rapid flashes of unlimited and infinite thought, neither will nor thought can be said to be generated *within* it, even according to materialistic Science, the impassable chasm between matter and mind having been confessed both by Tyndall and many others. The fact is that the human brain is simply the canal between two planes — the psycho-spiritual and the material — through which every abstract and metaphysical idea filters from the Manasic down to the lower human consciousness. Therefore, the ideas about the infinite and the absolute are not, nor can they be, within *our* brain capacities. They can be faithfully mirrored only by our Spiritual consciousness, thence to be more or less faintly projected onto the tables of our perceptions on this plane. Thus while the records of even important events are often obliterated from our memory, not the most trifling action of our lives can disappear from the "Soul's" memory, because it is no MEMORY for it, but an ever present reality

¹ Rapport sur la Philosophie en France au XIXme Siècle.

on the plane which lies outside our conceptions of space and time. "Man is the measure of all things," said Aristotle; and surely he did not mean by man, the form of flesh, bones and muscles!

Of all the deep thinkers Edgard Quinet, the author of *La Création*,² expressed this idea the best. Speaking of man, full of feelings and thoughts of which he has either no consciousness at all, or which he feels only as dim and hazy impressions, he shows that man realizes quite a small portion only of his moral being. "The thoughts we think, but are unable to define and formulate, once repelled, seek refuge in the very root of our being." . . . When chased by the persistent efforts of our will "they retreat before it, still further, still deeper into—who knows what—fibres, but wherein they remain to reign and impress us unbidden and unknown to ourselves . . ."

Yes; they become as imperceptible and as unreachable as the vibrations of sound and color when these surpass the normal range. Unseen and eluding grasp, they yet work, and thus lay the foundations of our future actions and thoughts, and obtain mastery over us, though we may never think of them and are often ignorant of their very being and presence. Nowhere does Quinet, the great student of Nature, seem more right in his observations than when speaking of the mysteries with which we are all surrounded: "The mysteries of neither earth nor heaven but those present in the marrow of our bones, in our brain cells, our nerves and fibres. No need," he adds, "in order to search for the unknown, to lose ourselves in the realm of the stars, when here, near us and *in us*, rests the unreachable . . . As our world is mostly formed of imperceptible beings which are the real constructors of its continents, so likewise is man."

² [Vol. II, pp. 377-78. — {C.W. xi, 452}]

Verily so; since man is a bundle of obscure, and to himself unconscious perceptions, of indefinite feelings and misunderstood emotions, of ever-forgotten memories and knowledge that becomes on the surface of his plane—*ignorance*. Yet while physical memory in a healthy living man is often obscured, one fact crowding out another weaker one, at the moment of the great change that man calls death—that which we call “memory” seems to return to us in all its vigour and freshness.

May this not be due as just said, simply to the fact that, for a few seconds at least, our two memories (or rather the two states, the highest and the lowest state, of consciousness) blend together, thus forming one, and that the dying finds himself on a plane wherein there is neither past nor future, but all is one present? Memory, as we all know, is strongest with regard to its early associations, then when the future man is only a child, and more of a soul than of a body; and if memory is a part of our Soul, then, as Thackeray has somewhere said, it must be of necessity eternal. Scientists deny this; we, Theosophists, affirm that it is so. They have for what they hold but negative proofs; we have, to support us, innumerable facts of the kind just instanced, in the three cases described by us. The links of the chain of cause and effect with relation to mind are, and must ever remain a *terra incognita* to the materialist. For if they have already acquired a deep conviction that as Pope says—

“Lulled in the countless chambers of the brain
Our thoughts are link’d by many a *hidden*
chain . . .”

— and that they are still unable to discover these chains, how can they hope to unravel the mysteries of the higher, Spiritual, Mind!

“H.P.B.”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. V, No. 26, October, 1889, pp. 125-129]

The Hidden H.P.B.

I

POWER BELONGS TO HIM WHO KNOWS

This is a very old axiom. Knowledge — the first step to which is the power of comprehending the truth, of discerning the real from the false — is for those only who, having freed themselves from every prejudice and conquered their human conceit and selfishness, are ready to accept every and any truth, once it is demonstrated to them. Of such there are very few. The majority judge of a work according to the respective prejudices of its critics, who are guided in their turn by the popularity or unpopularity of the author, rather than by its own faults or merits.

The absurd misconceptions, in so-called cultured circles of society, of the ancient Wisdom-Religion (Bodhism) after the admirably clear and scientifically-presented explanations in *Esoteric Buddhism*, are a good proof in point. They might have served as a caution even to those Theosophists who, hardened in an almost life-long struggle in the service of their Cause, are neither timid with their pen, nor in the least appalled by dogmatic assumption and scientific authority. Yet, do what Theosophical writers may, neither Materialism nor doctrinal pietism will ever give their Philosophy a fair hearing. Their doctrines will be systematically rejected, and their theories denied a place even in the ranks of those scientific ephemera, the ever-shifting “working hypotheses” of our day. To the advocate of the “animalistic” theory, our cosmogenetical and anthropogenetical teachings are “fairy tales” at best. For to those who would shirk any moral responsibility, it seems certainly more convenient to accept descent from a common simian ancestor and see a brother in a dumb, tailless baboon, than to

acknowledge the fatherhood of Pit is, the “Sons of God,” and to have to recognize as a brother a starveling from the slums.

“Hold back!” shout in their turn the pietists. “You will never make of respectable church-going Christians Esoteric Buddhists!”

Nor are we, in truth, in any way anxious to attempt the metamorphosis. But this cannot, nor shall it, prevent Theosophists from saying what they have to say, especially to those who, in opposing to our doctrine Modern Science, do so not for her own fair sake, but only to ensure the success of their private hobbies and personal glorification. If we cannot prove many of our points, no more can they; yet we may show how, instead of giving historical and scientific facts — for the edification of those who, knowing less than they, look to Scientists to do their thinking and form their opinions — the efforts of most of our scholars seem solely directed to killing ancient facts, or distorting them into props to support their own special views. This will be done in no spirit of malice or even criticism, as the writer readily admits that most of those she finds fault with stand immeasurably higher in learning than herself. But great scholarship does not preclude bias and prejudice, nor is it a safeguard against self-conceit, but rather the reverse. Moreover, it is but in the legitimate defense of our own statements, *i.e.*, the vindication of Ancient Wisdom and its great truths, that we mean to take our “great authorities” to task.

Indeed, unless the precaution of answering beforehand certain objections to the fundamental propositions in the present work be adopted — objections which are certain to be made on the authority of this, that, or another scholar concerning the Esoteric character of all the archaic and ancient works on Philosophy — our statements will be once more contradicted and even discredited. One of the main

points in this Volume¹ is to indicate in the works of the old Aryan, Greek, and other Philosophers of note, as well as in all the world-scriptures, the presence of a strong Esoteric allegory and symbolism. Another of the objects is to prove that the key of interpretation, as furnished by the Eastern Hindu-Buddhistic canon of Occultism — fitting as well the Christian Gospels as it does archaic Egyptian, Greek, Chaldaean, Persian, and even Hebrew-Mosaic Books — must have been one common to all the nations, however divergent may have been their respective methods and exoteric “blinds.” These claims are vehemently denied by some of the foremost scholars of our day. In his Edinburgh Lectures, Prof. Max Müller discarded this fundamental statement of the Theosophists by pointing to the Hindu Śāstras and Pandits, who know nothing of such Esotericism.² The learned Sanskrit scholar stated in so many words that there was no hidden meaning, no Esoteric element or “blinds,” either in the *Purāṣas* or the *Upanishads*. Considering that the word “Upanishad” means, when translated, the “Secret Doctrine,” the assertion is, to say the least, extraordinary. Sir M. Monier-Williams again holds the same view with regard to Buddhism. To hear him is to regard Gautama, the Buddha, as an enemy of every pretence to Esoteric teachings. He himself never taught them! All such “pretences” to Occult learning and “magic powers” are due to the later Arhats, the subsequent followers of the “Light of Asia”! Prof. B. Jowett, again, as

¹ [If these are actually H.P.B.’s own words, and not those of the Editor, she had in mind an additional volume of *The Secret Doctrine* which she speaks of in Volumes I and II. — *Compiler, C.W. xiv, 3*]

² The majority of the Pandits know nothing of the Esoteric Philosophy now, because they have lost the key to it; yet not one of these, if honest, would deny that the Upanishads, and especially the Purānas, are allegorical and symbolical; nor that there still remain in India a few great scholars who could, if they would, give them the key to such interpretations. Nor do they reject the actual existence of Mahātmas — initiated Yogis and Adepts — even in this age of Kali-Yuga.

contemptuously passes the sponge over the “absurd” interpretations of Plato’s *Timaeus* and the Mosaic Books by the Neo-Platonists. There is not a breath of the Oriental (Gnostic) spirit of Mysticism in Plato’s *Dialogues*, the Regius Professor of Greek tells us, nor any approach to Science, either. Finally, to cap the climax, Prof. Sayce, the Assyriologist, although he does not deny the actual presence, in the Assyrian tablets and cuneiform literature, of a hidden meaning—

Many of the sacred texts were so written as to be intelligible only to the initiated . . .¹

yet insists that the “keys and glosses” thereof are now in the hands of the Assyriologists. The modern scholars, he affirms, have in their possession clues to the interpretation of the Esoteric Records.

Which even the initiated priests [of Chaldaea] did not possess.

Thus, in the scholarly appreciation of our modern Orientalists and Professors, Science was in its infancy in the days of the Egyptian and Chaldaean Astronomers. PāṢini, the greatest Grammarian in the world, was unacquainted with the art of writing. So was the Lord Buddha, and everyone else in India until 300 B.C. The grossest ignorance reigned in the days of the Indian -ishis, and even in those of Thales, Pythagoras, and Plato. Theosophists must indeed be superstitious ignoramuses to speak as they do, in the face of such learned evidence to the contrary!

Truly it looks as if, since the world’s creation, there has been but one age of real knowledge on earth — the present age. In the misty twilight, in the grey dawn of history, stand the pale shadows of the old Sages of world renown. They were hopelessly groping for the correct meaning of their own Mysteries, the spirit whereof

has departed without revealing itself to the Hierophants, and has remained latent in space until the advent of the initiates of Modern Science and Research. The noontide brightness of knowledge has only now arrived at the “Know-All,” who, basking in the dazzling sun of induction, busies himself with his Penelopeian task of “working hypotheses,” and loudly asserts his rights to universal knowledge. Can anyone wonder, then, that according to present views the learning of the ancient Philosopher, and even sometimes that of his direct successors in the past centuries, has ever been useless to the world and valueless to himself? For, as explained repeatedly in so many words, while the -ishis and the Sages of old have walked far over the arid fields of myth and superstition, the mediaeval Scholar, and even the average eighteenth century Scientist, have always been more or less cramped by their “supernatural” religion and beliefs. True, it is generally conceded that some ancient and also mediaeval Scholars, such as Pythagoras, Plato, Paracelsus and Roger Bacon, followed by a host of glorious names, had indeed left not a few landmarks over precious mines of Philosophy and unexplored lodes of Physical Science. But then the actual excavation of these, the smelting of the gold and silver, and the cutting of the precious jewels they contain, are all due to the patient labors of the modern man of Science. And is it not to the unparalleled genius of the latter that the ignorant and hitherto deluded world owes a correct knowledge of the real nature of the Kosmos, of the true origin of the universe and man, as revealed in the automatic and mechanical theories of the Physicists, in accordance with strictly scientific Philosophy? Before our cultured era, Science was but a name, Philosophy a delusion and a snare. According to the modest claims of contemporary authority on genuine Science and Philosophy, the Tree of Knowledge has only now sprung from the dead weeds of superstition, as a beautiful

¹ [See the Hibbert Lectures for 1887, pp. 14-17, or B.C.W. Vol. XIII, p.91 & fn.]

butterfly emerges from an ugly grub. We have, therefore, nothing for which to thank our forefathers. The Ancients have at best prepared and fertilized the soil; it is the Moderns who have planted the seeds of knowledge and reared the lovely plants called blank negation and sterile agnosticism.

Such, however, is not the view taken by Theosophists. They repeat what was stated twenty years ago. It is not sufficient to speak of the “untenable conceptions of an uncultured past” (Tyndall); of the “*parler enfantin*” of the Vaidic poets (Max Müller); of the “absurdities” of the Neo-Platonists (Jowett); and of the ignorance of the Chaldaeo-Assyrian initiated Priests with regard to their own symbols, when compared with the knowledge thereon of the British Orientalist (Sayce). Such assumptions have to be proven by something more solid than the mere word of these scholars. For no amount of boastful arrogance can hide the intellectual quarries out of which the representations of so many modern Philosophers and Scholars have been carved. How many of the most distinguished European Scientists have derived honour and credit for the mere dressing-up of the ideas of these old Philosophers, whom they are ever ready to disparage, is left to an impartial posterity to say. Thus it does seem not altogether untrue, as stated in *Isis Unveiled* [II, 103], to say of certain Orientalists and Scholars of dead languages, that they will allow their boundless conceit and self-opinionatedness to run away with their logic and reasoning powers, rather than concede to the ancient Philosophers the knowledge of anything the modern do not know.

As part of this work treats of the Initiates and the secret knowledge imparted during the Mysteries, the statements of those who, in spite of the fact that Plato was an Initiate, maintain that no hidden Mysticism is to be discovered in his works, have to be first examined. Too many of the present

scholars, Greek and Sanskrit, are but too apt to forego facts in favour of their own preconceived theories based on personal prejudice. They conveniently forget, at every opportunity, not only the numerous changes in language, but also that the allegorical style in the writings of old Philosophers and the secretiveness of the Mystics had their *raison d'être*; that both the pre-Christian and the post-Christian classical writers – the great majority at all events – were under the sacred obligation never to divulge the solemn secrets communicated to them in the sanctuaries; and that this alone is sufficient to sadly mislead their translators and profane critics. But these critics will admit nothing of the kind, as will presently be seen.

For over twenty-two centuries everyone who has read Plato has been aware that, like most of the other Greek Philosophers of note, he had been initiated; that therefore, being tied down by the Sodalian Oath, he could speak of certain things only in veiled allegories. His reverence for the Mysteries is unbounded; he openly confesses that he writes “enigmatically,” and we see him take the greatest precautions to conceal the true meaning of his words. Every time the subject touches the greater secrets of Oriental Wisdom — the cosmogony of the universe, or the ideal pre-existing world — Plato shrouds his Philosophy in the profoundest darkness. His *Timaeus* is so confused that no one but an Initiate can understand the hidden meaning. As already said in *Isis Unveiled*:

The speculations of Plato in the *Banquet*, on the creation [or rather the evolution] of primordial men, and the essay on Cosmogony in the *Timaeus*, must be taken allegorically, if we accept them at all. It is this hidden Pythagorean meaning in *Timaeus*, *Cratylus*, and *Parmenides*, and a few other trilogies and dialogues, that the Neo-Platonists ventured to expound, as far as the theurgical vow of secrecy would allow them. The Pythagorean doctrine that *God is the Universal Mind diffused through all things*, and the dogma of the soul's immortality, are the leading features in these apparently incongruous

teachings. His piety and the great veneration Plato felt for the MYSTERIES, are sufficient warrant that he would not allow his indiscretion to get the better of that deep sense of responsibility which is felt by every adept. "Constantly perfecting himself in perfect MYSTERIES, a man in them alone becomes truly perfect," says he in the *Phaedrus* [249 C.]

He took no pains to conceal his displeasure that the Mysteries had become less secret than formerly. Instead of profaning them by putting them within the reach of the multitude, he would have guarded them with jealous care against all but the most earnest and worthy of his disciples.¹ While mentioning the gods, on every page, his monotheism is unquestionable, for the whole thread of his discourse indicates that by the term *gods* he means a class of beings far lower in the scale than deities, and but one grade higher than men. Even Josephus perceived and acknowledged this fact, despite the natural prejudice of his race. In his famous onslaught upon Apion, this historian says:² "Those, however, among the Greeks who philosophized *in accordance with truth*, were not ignorant of anything, . . . nor did they fail to perceive the chilling superficialities of the mythical allegories, on which account they justly despised them. . . . By which thing Plato, being moved, says it is not necessary to admit any one of the other poets into 'the Commonwealth,' and *he dismisses Homer* blandly, after having crowned him and pouring unguent upon him, in order that indeed he should not destroy, by *his myths*, the *orthodox belief respecting one God*."³

And this is the "God" of every Philosopher, God infinite and impersonal. All this and much more, which there is no room here to quote, leads one to the undeniable certitude that,

(a) as all the Sciences and Philosophies were in the hands of the temple Hierophants, Plato, as initiated by them, must have known them; and

¹ This assertion is clearly corroborated by Plato himself, who says: "You say that, in my former discourse, I have not sufficiently explained to you the nature of the First. I purposely spoke enigmatically, that in case the tablet should have happened with any accident, either by sea or land, a person without some previous knowledge of the subject, might not be able to understand its contents." (Epistles, II, 312 E; cf. Cory, *Ancient Fragments*, p. 304)

² *Contra Apionem*, II, § 37.

³ *Isis Unveiled*, I, 287-88.

(b) that logical inference alone is amply sufficient to justify anyone in regarding Plato's writings as allegories and "dark sayings," veiling truths which he had no right to divulge.

This established, how comes it that one of the best Greek scholars in England, Prof. Jowett, the modern translator of Plato's works, seeks to demonstrate that none of the *Dialogues* — including even the *Timaeus* — have any element of Oriental Mysticism about them? Those who can discern the true spirit of Plato's Philosophy will hardly be convinced by the arguments which the Master of Balliol College lays before his readers. "Obscure and repulsive" to him, the *Timaeus* may certainly be; but it is as certain that this obscurity does not arise, as the Professor tells his public, "in the infancy of physical science," but rather in its days of secrecy; not "out of the confusion of theological, mathematical, and physiological notions," or "out of the desire to conceive the whole of nature without any adequate knowledge of the parts."⁴ For Mathematics and Geometry were the backbone of Occult cosmogony, hence of "Theology," and the physiological notions of the ancient Sages are being daily verified by Science in our age; at least, to those who know how to read and understand ancient Esoteric works. The "knowledge of the parts" avails us little, if this knowledge only leads us the more to ignorance of the Whole, or the "nature and reason of the Universal," as Plato called Deity, and causes us to blunder most egregiously because of our boasted inductive methods. Plato may have been "incapable of induction or generalization in the modern sense;"⁵ he may have been ignorant also, of the circulation of the blood, which, we are told, "was absolutely unknown to him,"⁶ but then, there is naught

⁴ The *Dialogues* of Plato, translated by B. Jowett, Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Oxford, Vol. III, p. 523.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 561.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 591.

to disprove that he knew what blood *is* – and this is more than any Physiologist or Biologist can claim nowadays.

Though a wider and far more generous margin for knowledge is allowed the “physical philosopher” by Prof. Jowett than by nearly any other modern commentator and critic, nevertheless, his criticism so considerably outweighs his laudation, that it may be as well to quote his own words, to show clearly his bias. Thus he says:

To bring sense under the control of reason; to find some way through the labyrinth or chaos of appearances, either the highway of mathematics, or more devious paths suggested by the analogy of man with the world, and of the world with man; to see that all things have a cause and are tending towards an end – this is the spirit of the ancient physical philosopher.¹ But we neither appreciate the conditions of knowledge to which he was subjected, nor have the ideas which fastened upon his imagination the same hold upon us. For he is hovering between matter and mind; he is under the dominion of abstractions; his impressions are taken almost at random from the outside of nature; he sees the light, but not the objects which are revealed by the light; and he brings into juxtaposition things which to us appear wide as the poles asunder, because he finds nothing between them.

The last proposition but one must evidently be distasteful to the modern “physical philosopher,” who sees the “objects” before him, but fails to see the light of the Universal Mind, which reveals them, *i.e.*, who proceeds in a diametrically opposite way. Therefore the learned Professor comes to the conclusion that the ancient Philosopher, whom he now judges from Plato’s *Timaeus*, must have acted in a decidedly unphilosophical and even irrational way. For:

¹ This definition places (unwittingly, of course), the ancient “physical philosopher” many cubits higher than his modern “physical” confrère, since the ultima Thule of the latter is to lead mankind to believe that neither universe nor man have any cause at all – not an intelligent one at all events – and that they have sprung into existence owing to blind chance and a senseless whirling of atoms. Which of the two hypotheses is the more rational and logical is left to the impartial reader to decide. [Op.cit., Vol. III, p. 523]

He passes abruptly from persons to ideas and numbers, and *from ideas and numbers to persons*;² he confuses subject and object, *first* and *final* causes, and is dreaming of geometrical figures³ lost in a flux of sense. And an effort of mind is required on our part *in order to understand this double language*, or to apprehend *the twilight character of this knowledge*, and the genius of ancient philosophers, which under such conditions [?] seems by a divine power in many instances to have anticipated the truth⁴

Whether “such conditions” imply those of ignorance and mental stolidity in “the genius of ancient philosophers” or something else, we do not know. But what we do know is that the meaning of the sentences we have italicized is perfectly clear. Whether the Regius Professor of Greek believes or disbelieves in a hidden sense of geometrical figures and of the Esoteric “jargon,” he nevertheless admits the presence of a “double language” in the writings of these Philosophers. Thence he admits a hidden meaning, which must have had an interpretation. Why, then, does he

² Italics are mine. Every tyro in Eastern Philosophy, every Kabbalist, will see the reason for such an association of persons with ideas, numbers, and geometrical figures. For number, says Philolaus, “is the dominant and self-produced bond of the eternal continuance of things.” [See his Fragments On the Universe; in Diels: The Pre-Socratic Philosophers.] Alone the modern Scholar remains blind to the grand truth.

³ Here again the ancient Philosopher seems to be ahead of the modern. For he only “confuses . . . first and final causes” (which confusion is denied by those who know the spirit of ancient scholarship), whereas his modern successor is confessedly and absolutely ignorant of both. Mr. Tyndall shows Science “powerless” to solve a single one of the final problems of Nature and “disciplined [read, modern materialistic] imagination retiring in bewilderment from the contemplation of the problems” of the world of matter. He even doubts whether the men of present Science possess “the intellectual elements which would enable them to grapple with the ultimate structural energies of Nature.” But for Plato and his disciples, the lower types were but the concrete images of the higher abstract ones; the immortal Soul has an arithmetical, as the body has a geometrical, beginning. This beginning, as the reflection of the great universal Archæus (Anima Mundi), is self-moving, and from the centre diffuses itself over the whole body of the Macrocosm.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 523-24.

flatly contradict his own statement on the very next page? And why should he deny to the *Timaeus* — that pre-eminently Pythagorean (mystic) Dialogue — any Occult meaning and take such pains to convince his readers that

The influence which the *Timaeus* has exercised upon posterity is partly due to a misunderstanding.

The following quotation from his Introduction is in direct contradiction with the paragraph which precedes it, as above quoted:

In the supposed depths of this dialogue the Neo-Platonists found hidden meanings and connections with the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, and out of them they elicited doctrines quite at variance with the spirit of Plato. Believing that he was inspired by the Holy Ghost, or had received his wisdom from Moses,¹ they seemed to find in his writings the Christian Trinity, the Word, the Church . . . and the Neo-Platonists had a method of interpretation which could elicit any meaning out of any words. They were really incapable of distinguishing between the opinions of one philosopher and another, or between the serious thoughts of Plato and his passing fancies.² . . . [But] there is no danger of the modern commentators on the *Timaeus* falling into the absurdities of the Neo-Platonists.

¹ Nowhere are the Neo-Platonists guilty of such an absurdity. The learned Professor of Greek must have been thinking of two spurious works attributed by Eusebius and St. Jerome to Ammonius Saccas, who wrote nothing; or must have confused the Neo-Platonists with Philo Judaeus. But then Philo lived over 130 years before the birth of the founder of Neo-Platonism. He belonged to the School of Aristobulus the Jew, who lived under Ptolemy Philometor (150 years B.C.), and is credited with having inaugurated the movement which tended to prove that Plato and even the Peripatetic Philosophy were derived from the "revealed" Mosaic Books. Valckenaer tries to show that the author of the Commentaries on the Books of Moses, was not Aristobulus, the sycophant of Ptolemy [Cf. *Diatribes de Aristobulo, Judaeo, etc.*, ed. by J. Juzacio, Lugd. Bat., 1806]. But whatever he was, he was not a Neo-Platonist, but lived before, or during the days of Philo Judaeus, since the latter seems to know his works and follow his methods.

² Only Clemens Alexandrinus, a Christian Neo-Platonist and a very fantastic writer.

No danger whatever, of course, for the simple reason that the modern commentators have never had the key to Occult interpretations. And before another word is said in defence of Plato and the Neo-Platonists, the learned master of Balliol College ought to be respectfully asked: What does, or can he know of the Esoteric canon of interpretation? By the term "canon" is here meant that key which was communicated orally from "mouth to ear" by the Master to the disciple, or by the Hierophant to the candidate for initiation; this from time immemorial throughout a long series of ages, during which the inner — not public — Mysteries were the most sacred institution of every land. Without such a key no correct interpretation of either the *Dialogues* of Plato or of any Scripture, from the *Vedas* to Homer, from the *Zend-Avesta* to the Mosaic Books, is possible. How then can the Rev. Dr. Jowett know that the interpretations made by the Neo-Platonists of the various sacred books of the nations were "absurdities"? Where, again, has he found an opportunity of studying these "interpretations"? History shows that all such works were destroyed by the Christian Church Fathers and their fanatical catechumens, wherever they were found. To say that such men as Ammonius, a genius and a saint, whose learning and holy life earned for him the title of *Theodidaktos* ("god-taught"), such men as Plotinus, Porphyry, and Proclus, were "incapable of distinguishing between the opinions of one philosopher and another, or between the serious thoughts of Plato and his fancies," is to assume an untenable position for a Scholar. It amounts to saying that,

- (a) scores of the most famous Philosophers, the greatest Scholars and Sages of Greece and of the Roman Empire were dull fools, and
- (b) that all the other commentators, lovers of Greek Philosophy, some of them the acutest intellects of the age — who do not agree with Dr. Jowett — are also

fools and no better than those whom they admire. The patronising tone of the last above-quoted passage is modulated with the most *Naive* conceit, remarkable even in our age of self-glorification and mutual-admiration cliques. We have to compare the Professor's views with those of some other scholars.

Says Prof. Alexander Wilder of New York, one of the best Platonists of the day, speaking of Ammonius, the founder of the Neo-Platonic School:

His deep spiritual intuition, his extensive learning, his familiarity with the Christian Fathers, Pantaenus, Clement and Athenagoras, and with the most erudite philosophers of the time, all fitted him for the labour which he performed so thoroughly.¹ He was successful in drawing to his views the greatest scholars and public men of the Roman Empire, who had little taste for wasting time in dialectic pursuits or superstitious observances. The results of his ministration are perceptible at the present day in every country of the Christian world; every prominent system of doctrine now bearing the marks of his plastic hand. Every ancient philosophy has had its votaries among the moderns; and even Judaism . . . has taken upon itself changes which were suggested by the "God-taught" Alexandrian . . . He was a man of rare learning and endowments, of blameless life and amiable disposition. His almost superhuman ken and many excellencies won for him the title of *theodidaktos*, or God-taught; but he followed the modest example of Pythagoras, and only assumed the title of *philaltheian*, or, lover of truth.²

It would be happy for truth and fact were our modern scholars to follow as modestly in the steps of their great predecessors. But not they — Philaltheians!

Moreover, we know that:

Like Orpheus, Pythagoras, Confucius, Socrates, and Jesus himself,³ Ammonius committed

¹ The labour of reconciling the different systems of religion.

² New Platonism and Alchemy, by Alex. Wilder, M.D., pp. 7, 4. [See 1975 reprint of the 1869 ed. by Wizards Bookshelf.]

³ It is well-known that, though born of Christian parents, Ammonius had renounced the tenets of

nothing to writing.⁴ Instead, he . . . communicated his most important doctrines to persons duly instructed and disciplined, imposing on them the obligations of secrecy; as was done before him by Zoroaster and Pythagoras, and in the Mysteries. Except a few treatises of his disciples, we have only the declarations of his adversaries from which to ascertain what he actually taught.⁵

It is from the biased statements of such "adversaries," probably, that the learned Oxford translator of Plato's *Dialogues* came to the conclusion that:

That which was truly great and truly characteristic of him [Plato], his effort to realise and connect abstractions, *was not understood* by them [the Neo-Platonists] at all [?].

He states, contemptuously enough for the ancient methods of intellectual analysis, that:

the Church — Eusebius and Jerome notwithstanding. Porphyry, the disciple of Plotinus, who had lived with Ammonius for eleven years together, and who had no interest in stating an untruth, positively declares that he had renounced Christianity entirely. On the other hand, we know that Ammonius believed in the bright Gods, Protectors, and that the Neo-Platonic Philosophy was as "pagan" as it was mystical. But Eusebius, the most unscrupulous forger and falsifier of old texts, and St. Jerome, an out-and-out fanatic, who had both an interest in denying the fact, contradict Porphyry. We prefer to believe the latter, who has left to posterity an unblemished name and a great reputation for honesty.

⁴ Two works are falsely attributed to Ammonius. One, now lost, called *De Consensu Moysis et Jesu*, is mentioned by the same "trustworthy" Eusebius, the Bishop of Caesaraea, and the friend of the Christian Emperor Constantine, who died, however, a heathen. All that is known of this pseudo-work is that Jerome bestows great praise upon it (*Vir. Illust.*, cap IV, and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, xix). The other spurious production is called the *Diatessaron* (or the "Harmony of the Gospels"). This is partially extant. But then, again, it exists only in the Latin version of Victor, Bishop of Capua (sixth century), who attributed it himself to Tatian, and as wrongly, probably, as later scholars attributed the *Diatessaron* to Ammonius. Therefore no great reliance can be placed upon it, nor on its "esoteric" interpretation of the Gospels. Is it this work, we wonder, which led Prof. Jowett to regard the Neo-Platonic interpretations as "absurdities"?

⁵ Wilder, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

In the present day . . . an ancient philosopher is to be interpreted from himself, and by the contemporary history of thought.¹

This is like saying that the ancient Greek canon of proportion (if ever found), and the Athena Promachos of Phidias, have to be interpreted in the present day from the contemporary history of architecture and sculpture, from the Albert Hall and Memorial Monument, and the hideous Madonnas in crinolines sprinkled over the fair face of Italy. Prof. Jowett remarks that “mysticism is not criticism.” No; but neither is criticism always fair and sound judgment.

La critique est aisée, mais l'art est difficile.

And such “art” our critic of the Neo-Platonists — his Greek scholarship notwithstanding — lacks from *a* to *z*. Nor has he, very evidently, the key to the true spirit of the Mysticism of Pythagoras and Plato, since he denies even in the *Timaeus* an element of Oriental Mysticism, and seeks to show Greek Philosophy reacting upon the East, forgetting that the truth is the exact reverse; that it is “the deeper and more pervading spirit of Orientalism” that had — through Pythagoras and his own initiation into the Mysteries — penetrated into the very depths of Plato’s soul.

But Dr. Jowett does not see this. Nor is he prepared to admit that anything good or rational — in accordance with the “contemporary history of thought” — could ever come out of that Nazareth of the Pagan Mysteries; nor even that there is anything to interpret of a hidden nature in the *Timaeus* or any other *Dialogue*. For him,

The so-called mysticism of Plato is purely Greek, arising out of his imperfect knowledge² and

¹ Jowett, *op. cit.*, III, p. 524.

² “Imperfect knowledge” of what? That Plato was ignorant of many of the modern “working hypotheses” — as ignorant as our immediate posterity is sure to be of the said hypotheses when

high aspirations, and is the growth of an age in which philosophy is not wholly separated from poetry and mythology.³

Among several other equally erroneous propositions, it is especially the assumptions (*a*) that Plato was entirely free from any element of Eastern Philosophy in his writings, and (*b*) that every modern scholar, without being a Mystic and a Kabalist himself, can pretend to judge of ancient Esotericism—which we mean to combat. To do this we have to produce more authoritative statements than our own would be, and bring the evidence of other scholars as great as Dr. Jowett, if not greater, specialists in their subjects, moreover, to bear on and destroy the arguments of the Oxford Regius Professor of Greek.

That Plato was undeniably an ardent admirer and follower of Pythagoras no one will deny. And it is equally undeniable, as Matter has it, that Plato had inherited on the one hand his doctrines, and on the other had drawn his wisdom, from the same sources as the Samian Philosopher.⁴ And the doctrines of Pythagoras are Oriental to the backbone, and even Brahmanical; for this great Philosopher ever pointed to the far East as the source whence he derived his information and his Philosophy, and Colebrooke shows that Plato makes the same profession in his *Epistles*, and says that he has taken his teachings “from ancient and sacred doctrines.”⁵ Furthermore, the ideas of both Pythagoras and Plato coincide too well with the systems of India and with Zoroastrianism to admit any doubt of their

they in their turn, after exploding, join the “great majority” — is perhaps a blessing in disguise.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 524-25.

⁴ *Histoire Critique du Gnosticisme*, by J. Matter, Professor of the Royal Academy of Strasbourg. “It is in Pythagoras and Plato that we find, in Greece, the first elements of [Oriental] Gnosticism,” he says. (Vol I, ch. iii, p. 53; Strasbourg ed. 1843-44.)

⁵ *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, London, 1827, Vol. I, pp. 578-79.

origin by anyone who has some acquaintance with these systems. Again:

Pantaenus, Athenagoras and Clement were thoroughly instructed in the Platonic philosophy, and *comprehended* its essential unity with the Oriental systems.¹

The history of Pantaenus and his contemporaries may give the key to the Platonic, and at the same time Oriental, elements that predominate so strikingly in the Gospels over the Jewish Scriptures.



CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Karl:

You may be sure I was mighty glad to have your letter of the 26th with its news in regard to your own well-being, but sorry to learn that the Oceanside people are having both outer and inner difficulties.

I have always felt that Max Heindel as a sincere and earnest student. However he may have been mistaken in some respects, under Karma, at least he was a worker along those lines which to him seemed major duties. And again, I have felt a respect for the devotion of Mrs. Heindel, who has "carried on" despite all obstacles and limitations.

As I study and endeavor to apply the great teachings of Theosophy it is more and more brought home to me that difficult as it is to burst the bonds of one's embodied Skandhas, otherwise called the personality, it is a thousandfold greater task to try to rise above the Skandhas of the race. The whole western world is almost overpoweringly affected by those collective Skandhas that we call religion, science and philosophy. The moment any man endeavors, after his

first awakening, to follow and hold fast to the "small old Path," he begins to face on another plane the Skandhas of the class of reincarnating Egos to which he belongs. It is here that all too many sincere Souls are led into side paths. The Skandhas really represent the "unfinished business," so to say, that is, the uncompleted actions and unlearned lessons of the past. With so many Theosophists the remnants of the personal god idea, and one or another form of "healing" practices, carry them off on the reverse arc. H.P.B., Mr. Judge and Mr. Crosbie, well recognized these dangers, and so had every charity and sympathy for their fellow men in whom the psychic nature was misunderstood and, therefore, misdirected.

I do not quite understand how anything at U.L.T. should cause, or promote, internal dissensions amongst the Oceanside Rosicrucians. Certainly they have both the right and the duty to follow Truth as they may perceive it. Our only desire is to serve, whenever and wherever possible, all those interested in any way in the Three Objects of the Theosophical Movement. I wish that more of the earnest ones there could come in contact with *The Friendly Philosopher*. You have a copy, haven't you? Anyway, you should be able to be of good and ameliorating influence because of your own nature and understanding.

My best wishes to you,

Yours sincerely,
John Garrigues.[12-30-41]

Dear Brother Stangle:

Away from the city during the first half of September and over crowded with duties incident to my absence and to the re-opening of the full seasonal activities, I have been literally forced to let your letter of Sept. 15th lay unanswered until I should have freedom of time and thought to give you such help as possible.

¹ *New Platonism and Alchemy*, p. 4.

The problem you are facing is one that is common to every student-Theosophist, as to all other thoughtful men seeking clear perception of duty. Before taking up the main subject matter of your letter, perhaps it would be well to correct the idea that "H.P.B. went to war." There is no statement on this subject by H.P.B. herself that would warrant this statement. Its source is in Col. Olcott's *Old Diary Leaves*. Col. Olcott himself has placed on record his admission of the unreliability of his own memory, and certainly the study of his theosophical career, as recounted by himself, shows very many errors in his statement of facts. It is true, according to HPB's own statement, that she was present in Garibaldi's army at the battle of Mentana.¹ My own opinion is that

¹ The factors surrounding this event are many, even though HPB is very oblique in her comments: [November 3, 1867. Mentana is a small town in Italy, some 21 kilometers North of Rome. It was the site of a battle between the volunteers of Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-82) and the troops of the Pope and France. Garibaldi had some 6,000 ill equipped men with two canons taken from the enemy. The Papists had 3,000 under General Kanzler. The French had 3,000 under General Failly, with excellent artillery. Garibaldi was wounded and taken prisoner during the retreat. He lost some 600 men. In 1877 a monument was erected on the battlefield in memory of the Garibaldian dead.

H. P. B. told Col. Olcott of having been present as a volunteer at the battle of Mentana. In proof of this, she showed him where her left arm had been broken in two places by a sabre-stroke, and made him feel in her right shoulder a musket-bullet still imbedded in the muscle, and another one in her leg. She also showed him a scar just below the heart where she had been stabbed with a stiletto (*Old Diary Leaves*, I, 9). Col. Olcott speaks elsewhere (*O. D. L.*, I, 264,) of H. P. B.'s having received five wounds and being "picked out of a ditch for dead."

As to H. P. B.'s own statements in some of her letters, they are rather elusive and sketchy, obviously showing the desire to avoid any definite information on this subject, as pertaining to events regarding which she had good reasons to preserve secrecy. In a letter written to Sinnett in 1886 (*The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett*, p. 144), she says: "The Garibaldies (the sons) are alone to know the whole truth; and a few more Garibaldians with them. What I did, you know partially; you do not know all. My relatives *do*, my sister does not, and therefore and very luckily Solovioff does not."

....

she was there, as in so many other places prior to the commencement of her public mission, for occult purposes of her own. It is perfectly well known that Mazzini and Garibaldi were two ardent patriots who devoted their lives to the setting free of Italy from priestly domination. There is much in the lives of both these men which would indicate that they belonged to the order of what is sometimes called "patriot souls," such, for example, as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and the late Theodore Roosevelt. I have myself no doubt that both Mazzini and Garibaldi were helped, whether consciously or unconsciously to themselves, "from the other side," and that HPB's mission in Italy at that time was to give such help as possible from this side, as well as, perhaps, to be "an observer on the scene."

Turning now to the main subject matter of your letter, I have had an interesting experience, which goes to show that even our very difficulties and delays in trying to resolve our doubts have their truly occult side. Thus, forced as I was to delay replying to your letter, it turned out that another student here, perplexed as you are,² had the happy thought to "search the scriptures" for himself. What he found seemed to him so valuable that he got up a mimeograph pamphlet, and I am sure that its contents will be of great value to you, so am enclosing you a copy herewith. Under separate cover I am also sending you a copy of a pamphlet which contains articles, pro and con, on this subject from noted and sincere Christian men, some of whom take one view of their duty, and others who see exactly the opposite. These articles were originally published in *The Christian*

In a letter written to Monsieur C. Bilière, in 1883, H. P. B. states that her Guru "has already twice patched me up. The first time was at the battle of Mentana in 1867." (quoted by Mary K. Neff, in *How Theosophy Came to Australia*, etc., p. 25.) [*C.W.vi*, p. 279-80]

² The "perplexity" revolved around the problem of whether or not to be a "conscientious objector" to WWII. — Ed., A.T.

Century, a non-denominational publication, which is perhaps the most influential of all the religious periodicals. These articles were all originally published well prior to the entrance of the United States into the world war. I think you will find much in them that will be of help to you.

If you will read page 39 in *The Friendly Philosopher*, beginning with the paragraph "In your letter you have asked my opinion in regard to a specific matter of action,"¹ ... you will, I hope, get the same light from it that I did myself, for this particular letter of Mr. Crosbie was in fact written to me at a time when I found myself in a similar situation to your own present state of mind. I naturally turned to Mr. Crosbie in the hope that he would give me a "yes or no," a "do this, or do that" answer. You can see for yourself the wisdom with which he put me squarely back

¹ Which continues, "On general principles one might answer such a question, but in particular cases, where all the elements that enter in can only be considered fully by the person involved, that person alone is competent to reply, or determine.

In considering a question bearing on the ethics of any case we have first to be sure that we have no prejudices or preconceptions that can interfere with correct conclusions; in other words, "to be free from hard and fast conclusions as to men, things and methods." If we are thus free, we will not be liable to be swayed by the general classifications of good and evil, so common in the world, and the great error of the churches. The way is then open for the real point at issue, which to me is *not* what is done, but *why* was it done — the motive. Now who can answer this but the one who acts? If the act appears to him as a duty, and a proper one, he alone has paramount power, and there should be none to question a right to perform duty as it is seen and understood. It might very well be that another's acts would be improper for us, because of our different attitude; it might also be that our acts, seemingly proper to us, would to that other seem improper. From these considerations it would see fair to deduce that the only correct sanction, and the one we should seek, would come from within. ...

General principles may be stated, and each individual left to apply them as he sees fit. In no other way can progress be made. We have finally, in any case, to determine whether we are swayed by inclination rather than plain duty, in order that we may not deceive ourselves. Whatever, then, is decided in all honesty with ourselves, is our duty, and no man is our judge."

on my own feet — a direct application of the Third Fundamental. He used often to say to me that earnest men have no difficulty in the direct perception of principles, their trouble lies in their attempts to *apply* their fundamental principles, and this is, of course, because each one of us is "between two fires," "between the upper and the nether millstone" *in ourselves*. This is but the return of Atlantean Karma. You will find the nature of this struggle very clearly put on page 272 of the Second Volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, middle paragraph.² Now as then the earnest man comes to the point where there is "a struggle for life between the spiritual and the psychic, the psychic and the physical." Even the most devoted students, as you know by your own experience, as well as by observation, try to "pacify" both sides of their nature. The world is full of that kind of "pacifist," — men who believe in the Golden Rule, but when the hour of battle comes, do the opposite. Practically speaking, it is certainty that every decent-minded man is opposed to war on principle, but when the hour of trial comes we know too well what most of them do in practice.

² Which reads: "What was the religion of the Third and Fourth Races? In the common acceptance of the term, neither the Lemurians, nor yet their progeny, the Lemuro-Atlanteans, had any, as they knew no dogma, nor had they to believe on faith. No sooner had the mental eye of man been opened to understanding, than the Third Race felt itself one with the ever-present as the ever to be unknown and invisible ALL, the One Universal Deity. Endowed with divine powers, and feeling in himself his inner God, each felt he was a Man-God in his nature, though an animal in his physical Self. The struggle between the two began from the very day they tasted of the fruit of the Tree of Wisdom; a struggle for life between the spiritual and the psychic, the psychic and the physical. Those who conquered the lower principles by obtaining mastery over the body, joined the "Sons of Light." Those who fell victims to their lower natures, became the slaves of Matter. From "Sons of Light and Wisdom" they ended by becoming the "Sons of Darkness." They had fallen in the battle of mortal life with Life immortal, and all those so fallen became the seed of the future generations of Atlanteans."

There are two statements in the books that should be helpful to you: One is as to what constitutes "lawful war." You will find it in the Eighteenth Chapter of the *Gita*, and it reads as follows: "He whose nature is free from egotism and whose power of discrimination is not blinded does not slay though he killeth all these people, and is not bound by the bonds of action." The other is at the beginning of the Third Fragment of the *Voice* where the disciple comes to the Teacher, as I went to Mr. Crosbie, and as each of us goes to someone whom he trusts. There the first paragraph shows the student asking for "orders." But the Teacher answers: "Prepare thyself, for thou wilt have to travel on alone (make up your own mind). The Teacher can but point the way. The Path is one for all, the means to reach the goal must vary with the Pilgrims." This last quotation must necessarily have reference to the fact that morally and intellectually as well as physically, there is an enormous range amongst men — from the degraded outcasts of our civilization, from the untutored savage, up to the noblest, most refined, examples. From this it must follow, as was pointed out in the Laws of Manu thousands of years ago, that we cannot judge the conduct of one man from the basis of conduct followed by another. "The means to reach the goal," therefore, must necessarily "vary with the pilgrim."

Here in the Lodge at Los Angeles there are sincere and devoted students who have entered the army, and others, equally sincere and devoted, who have taken their stand as conscientious objectors. It is therefore well, above all things, to bear in mind that the spiritual equation, the moral equation, does not reside in what is done. There is no morality in any action. The moral and spiritual responsibility is in the actor, not in the action. Certainly Theosophy shows that there are as many different ways of learning as there are different classes of minds. The whole history of the race shows that the great

majority of men are still in that stage where they will learn life's lessons only in the hard way.

We know, finally, that the real object of every true Theosophist is Universal Brotherhood, and the real practical occultism of every earnest student is to "fit himself to be the better able to help and teach others" the path of Universal Brotherhood. If you think it out on that basis, and can bring yourself to the view that you are serving the cause of Universal Brotherhood by going to war, what is there for you to do but to act on that basis and take the consequences? If, on the other hand, you see as Buddha saw, that "hatred does not cease by hatred; hatred ceases only loving," or, as Jesus put it in the negative sense — "Those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword," then, as a simple honest man you will take your stand on that basis, act accordingly — and take the consequences. In either case it is plain that there is no room for compromise. To me the whole burden of *The Bhagavad-Gita* is Krishna's advice to Arjuna, to "rise above the pairs of opposites." What does that mean? To me it means, quit trying to compromise between the spiritual and the psychic, the psychic and the physical.

If you find anything of real help in the enclosure I am sending you, as spoken of above, or in the contents of this letter, you are quite at liberty to make the best use of them that your judgment may determine, but there would seem to be no need to use my name in the matter. The moment that I, you, or anyone else, adopt a given application at the suggestion of someone else, it becomes our decision and our responsibility, not his. The true Theosophist, following the example set by HPB, Mr. Judge and Mr. Crosbie, does not pose as an authority or guide for anyone but himself, but is always glad "to give our receive advice and instruction" in the form of suggestion for the consideration of any enquiring fellow-student.

My best wishes go to you,
 Yours sincerely,
 John Garrigues
 [10-09-42]

Dear Friends:

The writings of a young Canadian Muslim woman, Irshad Manji, has come across my desk. The book she wrote is entitled *Trouble With Islam, A Wake Up Call for Honesty and Change*. I am in the process of forming a letter for her. She is very brave. Havel in his speech in Oslo in 1990, gives us the source and seeds of the kind of hatred that fundamentalism of all stripes embraces.

The inability of the Mind to connect to the Heart within drives people to gain their identity from the form, dress and ritual.

The evolutionary step that all Humans need to take is that of Realizing the SELF.

Havel put it interestingly as: —

"Responsibility to something higher than my family, my country, my firm, my success. Responsibility to the order of Being, where all our actions are indelibly recorded and where, and only where, they will be properly judged."

"The specific experience I'm talking about has given me one great certainty: Consciousness precedes Being, and not the other way around, as Marxists claim. For this reason, the salvation of this human world lies no where else than in the human heart, in the human power to reflect, in human modesty, and responsibility."

Havel also indicates that if the Americans are going to be able to help the Muslim world, they must also evolve to this level of being truly Universal.

In his speech in LA Calif. in 1991, he spoke: —

"None of us knows how the quiver of a shrub in California affects the mental state of a coal miner in North Bohemia, or how his mental state affects the quivering of the shrub. I believe that we have little chance of averting an environmental catastrophe unless we recognize that we are not the masters of being, but only a part of Being, and it makes little difference that we are the only part of Being known so far that is not only conscious of its own being but is even conscious of the fact that it will one day come to an end. We must recognize from this that we are related to more than the present moment and the present place, that we are related to the world as a whole and to eternity. We must recognize that, by failing to reflect universal, supra-individual and supra-temporal interests, we do a disservice to our specific, local and immediate interests. Only people with a sense of responsibility for the world and to the world are truly responsible to and for themselves."

What he indicates there is our Duty, to become more aware and think with care. Is not our duty to elevate the Buddhi/Manas? It is interesting to think of all the cults that arise when others try to do that duty for another and as the Teachings of Theosophy indicate, the duty of another is dangerous. So then, if we cannot do that duty for another how then do we help others? Is this the purpose of our time in Kali Yuga?

Laura
 London, Ontario, Canada

Tuesday Evenings with Mr Judge

[These discussions were held at meetings of the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York in 1886.]

G. — I would like to ask how many degrees there are in the Theosophical Society, and if there are any others, who, if any one, can confer them, or how can they be obtained?

The President [WQJ] — I can state authoritatively that there are three degrees. The first or lowest is that in which every member is upon entering; the next is that of probationary and accepted Chelas, or disciples; and the last is that of Adepts and Mahatmas; each of these in turn has its natural divisions. The first is conferred by membership and diplomas. The second cannot be conferred by any person, officer or otherwise, in the Society's exoteric work, nor can the third. Those two are to be taken, so to say, by merit, and only that particular Adept in whose ray you are knows who is his chela.

G. — Cannot Col. Olcott or Mme. Blavatsky, or the heads of the movement here, confer the second degree?

The President — Most positively not. Persons have asked that before of Olcott and Blavatsky, and the reply has been a positive refusal and denial of power to do it.

G. — I have heard that a member of another Branch was offered the second degree by some one, either an officer or some other person.

The President — Such a proposal was highly improper. All of those who are in the second degree, when they have knowledge of it, conceal such fact; and, as I said, no official has any right in the matter. A degree so conferred would be, in fact, empty nonsense. As Light on the Path hints, those

who reach the second degree will know it themselves, within themselves. Many work unceasingly for years not knowing from any written evidence that they are chelas.

The work of the Society is of two kinds:

- (a) Exoteric work in the world, to spread a knowledge of truth, and help all to make investigation to that end. In this work both chelas and non-chelas are engaged. It is the first degree; and anyone can take it, by asking for it and by being a person of good character. It takes in the work of all the branches of every kind, because what some, choose to call "secret work" is the property of each man who pursues it.
- (b) The esoteric or secret work of the Society. This is done by adepts and their own chelas. Without exception this is profoundly secret, even extending to complete concealment by both adepts and chelas of what they have done. The reason is that it is all work upon the interior or soul part of the people, and chelas never say that they are chelas or that they are doing any secret work. If, for instance a chela is directed to implant in another's mind, a certain great idea, he tries to do so, but he tells no one, not even other chelas whom he may know to be such; nor do they ask him. Each proceeds on his own line of work, trying to carry out the directions he may have received. Each chela entered this so-called 2d degree because he attained to that moral and mental state. So it could not be conferred by any diploma, nor by any officer of any class whatever. There are of course some chelas who are higher in mental and moral and spiritual development than other chelas. This would constitute another division among those of the 2d degree. But it is a natural division; and no amount of sentiment, or of declaration of desire,

will accomplish this. The person must grow into that state, whether the growth be slow or rapid. The same differences exist among those of the highest section. Some are greater adepts than others, just as Moses appeared to be greater than the magicians of Pharaoh.

As to progress in this matter, it must follow that those progress the most who succeed in purifying their lives, their thoughts, and their motives, and who work the most unceasingly and unselfishly for others in the great cause.

It is hard to keep off the motive of working for the purpose of acquiring the reward, but it is easy to try, and to try to do so is absolutely necessary.

G. W. S. — A friend asked me if some chelas do not confess to others who are supposed to be higher, something like the Catholic church.

+ **[WQJ]** — Decidedly not. Such a thing is extremely ridiculous. As a preceding reply said, each one has to work on his own lines and his only superior is his Guru, and even to his Guru he does not confess. It is not necessary, but must be useless. For if our ideas of the inevitableness of Karma are correct, then no amount of confessions could wipe out the Karma of our acts. Consequently such confessions would be absurd.

Confidences then are never revealed.

Question from Chicago. — "I am troubled by the idea that perhaps I am wasting time in my studies by pursuing them in the wrong direction. I do not want to fritter away the time and find after some years that all has been in the wrong direction."

R. H. — I do not see why any effort can be called wasted. All study stores up energy and there can be no waste whatever. Even study in what seems the wrong direction gives that much experience.

Col. — The only wasted time, it appears to me, would be in pursuing such powers as that of projecting the double, seeing astral forms, and so on. That does not, it would appear, develop spirituality, it is only a physio-psychical training.

+ — The question could be answered better if we knew just what line of study the questioner has been and is now pursuing.

(The subject of Karma was taken up, and discussion was had upon the influences which persons striving toward adeptship, had to contend with.)

A. D. — related the instance of a lady who said she would like to know several adepts, because "it would be so nice to have them do errands for her, recover small articles mislaid, bring coffee in Oriental cups, etc., with the aid of elementals." He thought this illustrated the false attitude in which many persons stood toward the subject, not even trying to understand the smallest of its great truths.

E. D. H. — What effect has Karma on our present struggle to better our lower nature? Is old Karma lost or mislaid, or does it enter into the matter, or are we to be governed henceforth only by that Karma which we are now making? Can old Karma be avoided?

The remark of Jesus is applicable here, where he desired his disciples "to be delivered from temptation." He did not desire that temptation should not come to them, but that they should be delivered from it, that is from its effects or power. Karma is not always all worked off in any one incarnation. We are now under the effects of old Karma, which we ourselves, in a past life, or in the past of this life, stored up. At the same time that we are now working Karma off, we are making new, which will rebound upon us now or in a succeeding incarnation. Our duty then to ourselves and the race, is to now make as much good Karma as we can, not devoting ourselves to,

or being worried about past Karma; that is inevitable. It must come, so whatever it may be, good or bad, we now should accumulate good Karma even if we find in a few years, some terrible disaster upon us, the result of crime or error in a former life. It is certain that the life to come after this one, will not have disasters if we do right now. The most powerful of Buddha's disciples, Moggallana, was suddenly assassinated in his later years by robbers, and Buddha did not interfere. His explanation was, that in a previous incarnation Moggallana had committed a similar act which had not up to that time been compensated for.

Col. — I am led to believe Karma ought to be sub-divided, as: that of the body, the mind, the desires, and so on. The man himself must be the result in the ever present of all the good and evil of him in the past.

I think it can be changed and affected,

- (a) unknowingly, as, by climate, by family, by nationality, race, through ignorance, and by the age;
- (b) understandingly, by one's perceptions and judgment conjoined with will, when his mind is opened to a knowledge of Karma, for then he works with that in view. Immaturity of mind and want of clear perception of right may in this direction obstruct progress. So, until the dross is burned away, leaving only the spirit, he will have to fight many tough battles, which, however, will leave him better armed for each succeeding conflict.

+ — In Light on the Path that is distinctly stated, and especially as to the constant fights or storms that will occur; and the silences coming among those fights and storms, are the chances for preparation.

B. X — A thought occurs here worthy to keep. This constant struggle, up and down, surely goes on. It is easy to aspire when we feel jubilant in spirit, but not easy when we

are in the depth of despondency. In the first case it is natural, for the jubilant feeling is caused by the present aspiration. If we only aspire then, the progress will be slow. But if we force ourselves to contemplation of the Supreme Soul when we are in despondency, then in the succeeding period of joy which will come, the bound upward is to a point beyond where we were before, and so the next downward rush will not be so low as the last, whereas if we leave it to itself we may for a long period never rise above, or rather never pass certain limits of this oscillation. So it is more valuable for us to aspire and to reach toward the Supreme Soul, when we are in despondency, than when we find ourselves in a highly elevated condition. We must refer to this again in another light.

Col. — Theosophists should take offence at no man, and have no pet theories of right for others. By helping a questioner he can build good Karma for himself. In all men is more or less of good. Nor should we despotically drive another into well doing. We should plant seeds of good. Lopping off, perforce, a branch of evil does no radical good, for the cause may still remain. So a correct view of Karma leads to a struggle with oneself in which all others are helped and affected, as we are so linked with others that any change in us must affect them.

+ — The three great kinds of Karma should be well understood. That is, of our family, of our race or nation, and of the present age. It is very certain that if any of our duties are left unfulfilled, whether at death or upon renouncing the world, they will rebound on us at some time. These kinds of Karma are exhibited in the defects and good qualities of (a) the family, (b) the nation, and (c) the whole humanity. The first we may know and cure, (b) is obscure for us, (c) almost unknown. But all are powerful. So the rash person who rushes madly for Adepts and chelaship, unwittingly may put his head in the lion's mouth. The defects due to family Karma are strong enough to overwhelm him

at the first trial, and how powerful, nay, dreadful, are the defects of his nation, all to him a blank. Here nature is cruel perhaps — no, only just — although inexorable. We first then must try to know our family defects, and by doing good Karma bring up to the front the reserved force of our past high deeds and aspirations, so that when we shall have got to a point of trial the good qualities are in sufficient strength to help us. This is what we may call "Karmic stamina." It is what Jesus meant when he said, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven."

E. B. H. — I think every mental or physical fault allowed to hold its ground, insidiously leaves at every recurrence a sediment in the soul. This drags us back to earth, because of the desire which accompanied it. It would seem then that what people call fate is truly fate, but we made it and we alone can unmake it.

B. X. — That is true, and that is the whole struggle. This "fate" is Samsara, or the great wheel of rebirths, from which each alone must deliver himself.

G. — Perhaps the stress so often laid by Theosophy upon our not being anxious about the effect of our actions is really intended to prevent us occupying ourselves too much with what comes into the cognizance of our fully developed powers, lest we should not give those which are in embryo a chance to assert themselves — that, in fact, there is a different and more important effect of our actions than that generally seen, this effect being the one on which our attention should be fixed.

The danger in that case is that one may be continually thinking about what kind of Karma he is generating, which, it seems to me, would be unhealthy and abnormal and only refined selfishness — like thinking all the time of his own salvation from hellfire.

Col. — After all, but a small part of each man's total Karma is the effect of his own action; there are, besides the Karma of his own making, the Karma of the family to which he belongs, his national Karma, the Karma which results from the condition, moral, intellectual or social of the civilization in which his nature is developed, and so forth, to all of which he is subjected. Before mankind can hope to escape from the bonds of matter all these different Karmas must run down and cease to have action.

E. D. H. — Can Karma come to a head?

+ — Undoubtedly, it is coming to a head all the time in life, blossoming out in the shape of thoughts, words and actions, which are themselves the seeds of future Karmic bloom and fruit. These are the lesser wheels within that greater wheel of Karma, each turn of which brings us back to the world of matter once more.

B. X. — The meaning of what is said in Bhagavad-Gita about acting without being bound in the action, is, that we should learn to do any action because we believe it to be right, having no thought for what the consequences may be. But if we regard the consequences, then we are really acting not because we are sure of our standard of action, but with a view to some result. This inevitably binds us in the bonds of action, and results in a Karma that will bring us surely back to that kind of life. We are not to be indifferent, because that is worse yet.

We should act with the above high motive, using at same time the same amount of energy as those do who are entirely bound up in results, as the author of Light on the Path tells us.

As yet, we must be content with putting the state of not caring for Karma and not making Karma, as an ideal to be aspired to, for we cannot even begin the struggle without making Karma. Therefore, as a step toward a higher plane, we must try to make

good Karma, and in this endeavor we should not fail to try to comprehend, through study, what we are, how we should act, what Karma really is, and how best it can be reduced, avoided, or worked off.

After all, the attitude of mind we are in when any act is performed, is more important than anything else. This is easily understood when we consider how often men do a certain thing with good intention which we cannot condemn, although others, better informed, know it to be unwise.

Number II

May, 1886.

Question from Brooklyn — I have heard that telegrams or letters signed "K. H." have been received by certain theosophists directing things to be done or lines of study to be pursued. Can they be considered genuine and from the adept named, and if so why are they not more general?

W. Q. Judge — stated his firm conviction to be, that such telegrams or messages were not genuine, and that he knew from statements made in India to him, that the Adepts do not send messages around in such a manner, and that, even with their accepted disciples, they are very chary of messages. He also said that a disciple of the adepts, whom he met in India, assured him that those Beings must not be held so cheap as they have been made by some, and the disciple (an accepted chela) declared that he would sooner cut off his hand than send a pretended message, referring also at the time, to the well-known rule in occultism that any occultist, student or adept, who directly by pretended messages or phenomena, or indirectly by mysterious assumptions or small deception, pretends to have *siddhis* (powers), or otherwise attempts to convey the idea that he has

made progress in the secrets of occultism, thereby at once forfeits his progress and throws himself far back.

Col. — It seems to me also, that every one must be careful not to accuse any student of having made such an attempt at deception, because often we may feel that such attempt has been made, when in fact, the feeling is due to our own ignorance and inability to understand, or to his desire to avoid possible misconception.

A. D. — related the instance of a lady who said she would like to know several adepts, because "it would be so nice to have them do errands for her, recover small articles mislaid, bring coffee in Oriental cups, etc., with the aid of elementals." He thought this illustrated the false attitude in which many persons stood toward the subject, not even trying to understand the smallest of its great truths.

E. D. H. — What effect has Karma on our present struggle to better our lower nature? Is old Karma lost or mislaid, or does it enter into the matter, or are we to be governed henceforth only by that Karma which we are now making? Can old Karma be avoided?

The remark of Jesus is applicable here, where he desired his disciples "to be delivered from temptation." He did not desire that temptation should not come to them, but that they should be delivered from it, that is from its effects or power. Karma is not always all worked off in any one incarnation. We are now under the effects of old Karma, which we ourselves, in a past life, or in the past of this life, stored up. At the same time that we are now working Karma off, we are making new, which will rebound upon us now or in a succeeding incarnation. Our duty then to ourselves and the race, is to now make as much good Karma as we can, not devoting ourselves to, or being worried about past Karma; that is inevitable. It must come, so whatever it may

be, good or bad, we now should accumulate good Karma even if we find in a few years, some terrible disaster upon us, the result of crime or error in a former life. It is certain that the life to come after this one, will not have disasters if we do right now. The most powerful of Buddha's disciples, Moggallina, was suddenly assassinated in his later years by robbers, and Buddha did not interfere. His explanation was, that in a previous incarnation Moggallana had committed a similar act which had not up to that time been compensated for.

Col. — I am led to believe Karma ought to be sub-divided, as: that of the body, the mind, the desires, and so on. The man himself must be the result in the ever present of all the good and evil of him in the past.

I think it can be changed and affected, (a) unknowingly, as, by climate, by family, by nationality, race, through ignorance, and by the age; (b) understandingly, by one's perceptions and judgment conjoined with will, when his mind is opened to a knowledge of Karma, for then he works with that in view. Immaturity of mind and want of clear perception of right may in this direction obstruct progress. So, until the dross is burned away, leaving only the spirit, he will have to fight many tough battles, which, however, will leave him better armed for each succeeding conflict.

+ — In Light on the Path that is distinctly stated.



A HINDU CHELA'S DIARY¹

IN the month of December he arrived at Benares, on what he hoped would be his last pilgrimage. As much as I am able to decipher of this curious manuscript, written in a mixture Tamil — the South Indian language — with Mahratta, which, as you know, is entirely dissimilar, shows that he had made many pilgrimages to India's sacred places, whether by mere impulse or actual direction, I know not. If he had been only any ordinary religiously disposed Hindu we might be able to come to some judgment hereupon, for the pilgrimages might have been made in order to gain merit, but as he must long ago have risen above the flowery chains of even the Vedas, we cannot really tell for what reason these journeys were made. Although, as you know, I have long had possession of these papers, the time had not until now seemed ripe to give them out. He had, when I received them, already long passed away from these busy scenes to those far busier, and now I give you liberty to print the fragmentary tale without description of his person. These people are, you know, not disposed to have accurate descriptions of themselves floating about. They being real disciples, never like to say that they are, a manner quite contrary to that of those famed professors of occult science who opportunely or inopportunely declare their supposed chelaship from the house top.

* * * "Twice before have I seen these silent temples standing by the rolling flood of sacred Ganges.

¹ The original MS. of this Diary as far as it goes is in our possession. The few introductory lines are by the friend who communicated the matter to us. — WQJ

They have not changed, but in me what changes have occurred! And yet that cannot be, for the I changes not, but only the veil wrapped about, is either torn away or more closely and thickly folded round to the disguising of the reality. *

* *

It is now seven months since I began to use the privilege of listening to Kunala. Each time before, that I came to see him, implacable fate drove me back. It was Karma, the just law, which compels when we would not, that prevented me. Had I faltered then and returned to the life then even so far in the past, my fate in this incarnation would have been sealed — and he would have said nothing. Why? Happy was I that I knew the silence would have not indicated in him any loss of interest in my welfare, but only that the same Karma prevented interference. Very soon after first seeing him I felt that he was not what he appeared exteriorly to be. Then the feeling grew into a belief within a short time so strong that four or five times I thought of throwing myself at his feet and begging him to reveal himself to me. But I thought that was useless, as I knew that I was quite impure and could not be trusted with that secret. If I remained silent I thought that he would confide to me whenever he found me worthy of it. I thought he must be some great Hindu Adept who had assumed that illusionary form. But there this difficulty arose, for I knew that he received letters from various relatives in different parts, and this would compel him to practice the illusion all over the globe, for some of those relatives were in other countries, where he had been too. Various explanations suggested themselves to me. * * *

I was right in my original conception of Kunala that he is some great Indian Adept. Of this subject I

constantly talked with him since _____ although I fear I am not, and perhaps shall not be in this life worthy of their company. My inclination has always been in this direction. I always thought of retiring from this world and giving myself up to devotion. To Kunala I often expressed this intention, so that I might study this philosophy, which alone can make man happy in this world. But then he usually asked me what I would do *there* alone? He said that instead of gaining my object I might perhaps become insane by being left alone in the jungles with no one to guide me; that I was foolish enough to think that by going into the jungles I could fall in with an adept; and that if I really wanted to gain my object I should have to work in the reform in and through which I had met so many good men and himself also, and when the Higher Ones, whom I dare not mention by any other names, were satisfied with me they themselves would call me away from the busy world and teach me in private. And when I foolishly asked him many times to give me the names and addresses of some of those Higher Ones he — said once to me: 'One of our Brothers has told me that as you are so much after me I lead better tell you once for all that I have no right to give you any information about them, but if you go on asking Hindus you meet what they know about the matter you might hear of them, and one of those Higher Ones may perhaps throw himself in your way without your knowing him, and will tell you what you should do.' These were orders, and I knew I must wait, and still I knew that through Kunala only would I have my object fulfilled. *

* *

"I then asked one or two of my own countrymen, and one of them said he had seen two or three such men, but

that they were not quite what he thought to be 'Raj Yogs.' He also said he had heard of a man who had appeared several times in Benares, but that nobody knew where he lived. My disappointment grew more bitter, but I never lost the firm confidence that Adepts do live in India and can still be found among us. No doubt too there are a few in other countries, else why had Kunala been to them. *

* *

In consequence of a letter from Vishnurama, who said that a certain X¹* lived in Benares, and that Swamiji K knew him. However, for certain reasons I could not address Swamiji K directly, and when I asked him if he knew X he replied: "If there be such a man here at all he is not known." Thus evasively on many occasions he answered me, and I saw that all my expectations in going to Benares were only airy castles. I thought I had gained only the consolation that I was doing a part of my duty. So I wrote again to Nilakant: "As directed by you I have neither let him know what I know of him nor what my own intentions are. He seems to think that in this I am working to make money, and as yet I have kept him in the dark as regards myself, and am myself groping in the dark. Expecting enlightenment from you, etc."

The other day Nilakant came suddenly here and I met Sw. K. and him together, when to my surprise K at once mentioned X, saying he knew him well and that he often came to see him, and then he offered to take us there. But just as we were going, there arrived at the place an English officer who had done Kunala a service in some past time. He had in some way heard of X and was permitted to come. Such are the complications of Karma. It was absolutely

necessary that he should go too, although no doubt his European education would never permit him to more than half accept the doctrine of Karma, so interwoven backward and forwards in our lives, both those now, that past and that to come. At the interview with X, I could gain nothing, and so we came away. The next day came X to see us. He never speaks of himself, but as 'this body.' He told me that he had first been in the body of a Fakir, who, upon having his hand disabled by a shot he received while he passed the fortress of Bhurtapore, had to change his body and choose another, the one he was now in. A child of about seven years of age was dying at that time, and so, before the complete physical death, this Fakir had entered the body and afterwards used it as his own. He is, therefore, doubly not what he seems to be. As a Fakir he had studied Yoga science for 65 years, but that study having been arrested at the time he was disabled, leaving him unequal to the task he had to perform, he had to choose this other one. In his present body he is 53 years, and consequently the inner X is 118 years old. * * * In the night I heard him talking with Kunala, and found that each had the same Guru, who himself is a very great Adept, whose age is 300 years, although in appearance he seems to be only 40.² He will in a few centuries enter the body of a *Kshatriya*,³ and do some great deeds for India, but the time shall not yet come."

Yesterday I went with Kunala to look at the vast and curious temples left here by our forefathers. Some are in ruins, and others only showing the waste of time. What a difference between my appreciation of these buildings now, with Kunala to point out meanings I never saw, and that which I had when I saw

² There is a peculiarity in this, that all accounts of Cagliostro, St. Germain and other Adepts, give the apparent age as forty only. — WQJ

³ The warrior caste of India. — WQJ

¹ I find it impossible to decipher this name.

them upon my first pilgrimage, made so many years go with my father." * * *
* * * * * * * * *

A large portion of the Ms. here, although written in the same characters as the rest, has evidently been altered in some way by the writer, so as to furnish clues meant for himself. It might be deciphered by a little effort, but I must respect his desire to keep those parts of it which are thus changed, inviolate. It seems that some matters are here jotted down relating to secret things, or at least, to things that he desired should not be understood at a glance. So I will write out what small portion of it as might be easily told without breaking any confidences.

It is apparent that he had often been before to the holy city of Benares, and had merely seen it as a place of pilgrimage for the religious. Then, in his sight, those famous temples were only temples. But now he found, under the instruction of Kunala, that every really ancient building in the whole collection had been constructed with the view to putting into imperishable stone, the symbols of a very ancient religion. Kunala, he says, told him, that although the temples were made when no supposition of the ordinary people of those eras leaned toward the idea that nations could ever arise who would be ignorant of the truths then universally known, or that darkness would envelop the intellect of men, there were many Adepts then well known to the rulers and to the people. They were not yet driven by inexorable fate to places remote from civilization, but lived in the temples, and while not holding temporal power, they exercised a moral sway which was far greater than any sovereignty of earth.¹

¹ In the ancient Aztec civilization in Mexico, the Sacerdotal order was very numerous. At the head of the whole establishment were two high priests, elected from the order, solely for their qualifications, as shown by their previous conduct in a subordinate station. They were equal in dignity and inferior only to the sovereign, who

And they knew that the time would come when the heavy influence of the dark age would make men to have long forgotten even that such beings had existed, or that any, doctrines other than the doctrine based on the material rights of *mine* and *thine*, had ever been held. If the teachings were left simply to either paper or papyrus or parchment, they would be easily lost, because of that decay which is natural to vegetable or animal membrane. But stone lasts, in an easy climate, for ages. So these Adepts, some of them here and there being really themselves Maha Rajahs,^{2**} caused the temples to be built in forms, and with such symbolic ornaments, that future races might decipher doctrines from them. In this, great wisdom, he says, is apparent, for to have carved them with sentences in the prevailing language would have defeated the object, since 'languages also change, and as great a muddle would have resulted as in the case of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, unless a key stone had also been prepared; but that itself might be lost, or in its own turn be unintelligible. The ideas underneath symbols do not alter, no matter what might be the language, and symbols are clear immortally, because they are founded in nature itself. In respect to this part of the matter, he writes down that Kunala informed him that the language used then was not Sanscrit, but a far older one now altogether unknown in the world.

From a detached sentence in the Ms., it is shadowed out that Kunala referred to a curious building put up many years ago in another part of India

rarely acted without their advice in weighty matters of private concern. (Sahagun *Hist. de Nueva Espana*, lib. 2; lib. 3 cap. 9 — *Torq. Mon. Ind. lib. 8 cap. 20; lib. 9, cap. 3, 56*; cited by Prescott in *vol. 1, Conq. Mex.* p. 66). — [WQJ]

² King or Ruler.

and now visible, by which he illustrated the difference between an intelligent construction and unintelligent one. This building was the product of the brain of a Chandala,¹ who had been enriched through a curious freak. The Rajah had been told upon some event occurring, by his astrologers, that he must give an immense sum of money to the first person he saw next day, they intending to present themselves, at an early hour. Next day, at an unusually early season, the Rajah arose, looked out of the window, and beheld this Chandala. Calling his astrologers and council together and the poor sweeper into his presence, he presented him with lacs upon lacs of rupees, and with the money the Chandala built a granite building having immense monolithic chains hanging down from its four corners. Its only symbology was, the change of the chains of fate; from poor low caste to high rich low caste. Without the story the building tells us nothing.

But the symbols of the temple, not only those carved on them, but also their conjuncture, need no story nor knowledge of any historical events. Such is the substance of what he writes down as told him by Kunala. He says also that this symbology extends not only to doctrines and cosmology, but also to laws of the human constitution, spiritual and material. The explanation of this portion, is, contained in the altered and cryptic parts of the Ms. He then goes on:

* * * "Yesterday, just after sunset, while Kunala and X were talking, Kunala suddenly seemed to go into an unusual condition, and about ten minutes afterwards a large quantity of

malwa flowers fell upon us from the ceiling.

"I must now go to _____ and do that piece of business which he ordered done. My duty is clear enough, but how am I to know if I shall perform it properly. * * * When I was there and after I had finished my work and was preparing to return here, a wandering fakir met me and asked if he could find from me the proper road to Karli. I directed him, and he then put to me some questions that looked as if he knew what had been my business; he also had a very significant look upon his face, and several of his questions were apparently directed to getting me to tell him a few things Kunala had told me just before leaving Benares with an injunction of secrecy. The questions did not on the face show that, but were in the nature of inquiries regarding such matters, that if I had not been careful, I would have violated the injunction. He then left me saying: 'you do not know me but we may see each other.' * * *

I got back last night and saw only X, to whom I related the incident with the fakir, and he said that, 'it was none other than Kunala himself using that fakir's body who had said those things, and if you were to see that fakir again he would not remember you and would not be able to repeat his questions, as he was for the time being taken possession of for the purpose, by Kunala, who often performs such things.' I then asked him if in that case Kunala had really entered the fakir's body, as I have a strange reluctance toward asking Kunala such questions, and X replied that if I meant to ask if he had really and in fact entered the fakir's person, the answer was no, but that if I meant to ask if Kunala had overcome that fakir's senses, substituting his own, the answer was yes; leaving me to make my own conclusions. * * *

¹ A low caste man, *e.g.*, a sweeper. Such a building can now be seen at Bijapur, India. — WQJ

I was fortunate enough yesterday to be shown the process pursued in either entering an empty body, or in using one which has its own occupant. I found that in both cases it was the same, and the information was also conveyed that a Bhut¹ goes through just the same road in taking command of the body or senses of those unfortunate women of my country who sometimes are possessed by them. And the Bhut also sometimes gets into possession of a part only of the obsessed person's body, such as an arm or a hand, and this they do by influencing that part of the brain that has relation with that arm or hand; in the same way with the tongue and other organs of speech. With any person but Kunala I would not have allowed my own body to be made use of for the experiment. But I felt perfectly safe, that he would not only let me in again, but also that he would not permit any stranger, man, or gandharba,² to come in after him. We went to _____ and he * * *

The feeling was that I had suddenly stepped out into freedom. He was beside me and at first I thought he had but begun. But he directed me to look, and there on the mat I saw my body, apparently unconscious. As I looked * * * the body of myself, opened its eyes and arose. It was then superior to me, for Kunala's informing power moved and directed it. It seemed to even speak to me. Around it, attracted to it by those magnetic influences, wavered and moved astral shapes, that vainly tried to whisper in the ear or to enter by the same road. In vain! They seemed to be pressed away by the air or surroundings of Kunala. Turning to look at him, and expecting to see him in a state of samadhi, he was smiling as if nothing,

¹ An obsessing astral shell. The Hindus consider them to be the reliquae of deceased -persons. — [WQJ]

² Nature spirit or elemental. — WQJ

or at the very most, but a part, of his power had been taken away * * * another instant and I was again myself, the mat felt cool to my touch, the bhuts were gone, and Kunala bade me rise.

He has told me to go to the mountains of _____ where _____ and _____ usually live, and that even if I were not to see anybody the first time, the magnetized air in which they live would do me much good. They do not generally stop in one place, but always shift from one place to another. They, however, all meet together on certain days of the year in a certain place near Bhadrinath, in the northern part of India. He reminded me that as India's sons are becoming more and more wicked, those adepts have gradually been retiring more and more toward the north, to the Himalaya mountains. * * *

Of what a great consequence is it for me to be always with Kunala. And now X tells me this same thing that I have always felt. All along I have felt and do still feel strongly that I have been once his most obedient and humble disciple in a former existence. All my hopes and future plans are therefore, centred in him. My journey therefore to up country has done me one good, that of strengthening my belief which is the chief foundation on which the grand structure is to be built. * * *

As I was walking past the end of Ramalinga's compound holding a small lamp of European make, and while there was no wind, the light there several times fell low. I could not account for it. Both Kunala and X were far away. But in another moment, the light suddenly went out altogether, and as I stopped the voice of revered Kunala, who I supposed was many miles away spoke to me, and I found him standing there. For one hour we talked ; and he gave me good advice, although I had not asked it — thus it is always that when I go fearlessly, forward and ask for nothing I get

help at an actual critical moment — he then blessed me and went away. Nor could I dare to look in what direction. In that conversation, I spoke of the light going down and wanted an explanation, but he said I had nothing to do with it. I then said I wanted to know, as I could explain it in two ways, *viz* : 1st, that he did it himself, or 2d, that some one else did it for him. He replied, that even if it were done by somebody else, *no Yogi will do a thing unless he sees the desire in another Yogi's mind.*¹ The significance of this drove out of my mind all wish to know who did it, whether himself, or an elemental or another person, for it is of more importance for me to know even a part of the laws governing such a thing, than it is to know who puts those laws into operation. Even some blind concatenation of nature might put such natural forces in effect in accordance with the same laws, so that a knowledge that nature did it would be no knowledge of any consequence.²

[TO BE CONTINUED.]



Glimpses of Eternity —

Thus the direction of the will should be towards realizing one's aspirations which are Buddhic when the intellectual fifth principle is nearly merged in Buddhi the sixth. These aspirations may be called glimpses into the eternal! The lower consciousness mirrors aspirations unconsciously to itself and itself aspires and

¹ This sentence is of great importance. The Occidental mind delights much more in effects, personalities and authority, than in seeking for causes, just as many Theosophists have with persistency sought to know when and where Madame Blavatsky did some feat in magic, rather than in looking for causes or laws governing the production of phenomena. In this italicized sentence is the clue to many things, for those who can see. — WQJ

² This was published as a series of articles in Volume I of *The Path*. It will be concluded next month. — Ed., A.T.

is elevated if things are in accord. Such an aspiration would be a tendency towards Theosophy; this instinct, if developed, becomes a conscious aspiration.

H.P.B.

An Astrological Anecdote — —

In astrology the stars do not *cause* our good or bad luck, but simply *indicate* the same. A man must be a psychologist and a philosopher before he can become a perfect astrologer, and understand correctly the great Law of *Universal Sympathy*. Not only astrology but magnetism, theosophy and every occult science, especially that of attraction and repulsion, depend upon this law for their existence. [CWIII, 192]

Says a Professor of Astrology, W. H. Chaney: “Take to the unphilosophical astrologer the horoscope of a boy born with Sagittarius rising, Jupiter in the same, on the ascendant, in exact trine to the Sun and Leo, with other favorable configurations, and instantly he would declare that the boy would become a great man, a Prince, a President — and so would I. But the astrologer might insist that all this good fortune was *caused* by the boy having been born under such fortunate aspects, whereas I should look *beyond* the birth for the *cause*, and should probably discover, that before his conception, his parents had been away from each other for weeks or months, during which both lived a life of perfect chastity; that they were very harmonious, in excellent bodily health, their intellects clear, their minds cheerful, and their moral natures strong.” [Ibid., p. 191]