

www.forgottenbooks.com

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

A THEOSOPHIST'S POINT OF VIEW

BY

JAMES ALBERT CLARK,
President Theosophical Society, Washington, D. C.

PRESS OF THE PATHFINDER.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

COPYRIGHTED 1901
BY M. A. B. CLARK.

198
C593t
1901

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THREE PLANKS IN THE PLATFORM—THREE POSTULATES IN THE PHILOSOPHY.

Theosophical Society founded at New York 1875—First plank, Nucleus of Universal Brotherhood; second, Study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences; third, Investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and psychic powers latent in man—All societies keep same platform—Differentiation caused by contending opinions as to government and administration—Such teachings unjustly charged as a wanton disturbance of faith—The proclamation issued by the "Theosophical Society in America" at Boston, April, 1895—The motto: "There is no Religion higher than Truth"—A member of the Society not necessarily a Theosophist *per se*. The Three Postulates in the Philosophy—Emerson quoted as teaching in conformity thereto—Evolution in the East older than Lamarck and Darwin—The Book of Dyzan—The Perfectibility of Man the chief aim—Reincarnation a necessity to "mount and meliorate"—The Law of Karma (cause and effect) compels rebirth—Man is a soul—Dr. Lyman Abbott quoted—Prof. Max Muller's Gifford Lectures—His definition of Theosophy—Vapid mysticism from the East has crept in to the detriment of Theosophy—Pages 1 to 11.

CHAPTER II.

IS THERE ATHEISM OR AGNOSTICISM IN THE FIRST POSTULATE OF THEOSOPHY?

Misconceptions of the work of Theosophy—Bigoted views—The religious value of "The Unknowable"—Prof. Max Muller quoted—The idea of God—Prof. John Fiske's idea—Prof. Huxley on atheism—Prof. Ladd of Yale University on the "Cognitive faculty"—Herbert Spencer's symbols of "mind and matter"—The scientific method—"I and my Father are one" not fully interpreted—"I am That; that too art thou"—Dr. Paul Carus on the "Idea of God"—Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of Asia"—Isis unveiled has a deeper meaning than the bigoted sectarian can fathom—Sir Matthew Arnold—The "God within" is the "Light that lighteth every

man"—Prof. Ladd's "Philosophy of Knowledge"—The "Great Breath"—The Vedic Rishis—The only God man can know is the divinity within—Paul at Athens—The "Unknown God" of the Athenians—Let all of Paul be quoted, not proof-texts —He studied for the ministry at the "desert school"—Why do not preachers explain that curriculum?—The Sufis, a school of Arabian esotericists, can teach Andover and Princeton something concerning Paul—Paul not correctly interpreted—He studied the basic principles of the esoteric lore, the same in all the old wisdom religions—The science of Psychology will bring clearer light on Paul's teachings.

Pages 12 to 21.

CHAPTER III.

INDIVIDUALITY AND PERSONALITY.

Proper study of Mankind is Man—New Psychology throwing light on the subject—Definition of Personality by Prof. Max Muller—Tracing to the original concepts and roots —Ego always on guard—The Perceiving Inner Self is the Higher Self,—the divinity within—Man, from Manas, a Sanscrit word, "to think"—The Thinker the Individuality— It persists—The seven-fold division of Man in Eastern teaching—Four lower the Quaternary; three upper the Triad— Emerson quoted—The school in which St. Paul studied— The Oversoul—Prof. Brinton's "Religions of Primitive Peoples"—The Christos of the Greeks same as Mahatma of the Sanscrit—Atma, the Higher Self—Marcus Aurelius—The Hindu Upanishads—Prof. Ladd of Yale on the "Knower"— The Chairs of Psychology—Lyman Abbott on Destiny—Goethe on the "stubborn power of permanence in whatever has once possessed reality, or individuality"—Faraday on a "particle of oxygen"—Atma-Vidya (soul knowledge).

Pages 21 to 34.

CHAPTER IV.

SOUL AND SPIRIT—THE DISTINCTION.

Vague definition in dictionaries—Theosophical explanations clearer—"Soul a vehicle of Consciousness"—Prof. Clerk Maxwell on the "go" of a thing—Prof. Denton on the "Soul of Things"—Hermes Trismegistus of Egypt—Pope on Soul— Emerson's Oversoul—Anaxagoras 500 B. C.—Heraclitus before him—Pythagoras 586 B. C.—The soul of a man is the

"go" of a man—Atoms have souls, all have souls—The "go" implies a "goer" and a direction to go—Voltaire's attempt to define—Spinoza and Leibnitz—Matthew Arnold—Charles Johnston, M. R. A. S. of the Bengal Civil Service, Retired, Prize Sanscrit Scholar of India—Quotation from his "The Memory of Past Births"—Man formed from combined attributes—A scientist's agnosticism as to attributes—How did man obtain these attributes—The teaching of the sages—Major Powell on "Motility and awareness"—Prince Guatama's teaching on the continuous "I am I"—Lord Kelvin's hypothesis on life coming to this planet on a meteoric stone—Prof. Newton in Smithsonian Report—Lord Kelvin's computation as to age of this earth—Nature's Finer Forces elaborated in the Science of the Tattvas in Sanscrit—Hierarchies of Beings, all under law as we are—Prof. Huxley on the analogy in favor of superior beings—Darwin's reasoning—Elisha Gray's illustration of the sensitive plate in photography—Same reasoning by Theosophists during all ages—The sponge as a metaphor—Atma (spirit) the seventh principle—Paul's division,—body, soul, spirit — Whittier quoted—The bridge between man and divinity never broken.

Pages 34 to 51.

CHAPTER V.

REINCARNATION.

Is Reincarnation paralleled in nature?—Second Postulate of the philosophy sustains it—Whittier in accord—Astronomy confirms appearance and disappearance — The spectra as proof—Prof. Huxley on the right to claim support from the great argument of analogy—Clerk Maxwell—Prof. Max Muller—Sir William Crookes—Camille Flammarion—Shopenhauer — Upanishads — Lessing — Hegel—Leibnitz—Herder—Fichte—Goethe—Parallel in the solar system and individuated globes—The air we breathe, breathed over again—J. B. Dumas quoted—Geology in support—Botanical Gazette, May 1895—Spore fruits retain individuality although soaked six years in alcohol—Wheat in pyramids of Egypt—Conservation of energy—Flux and Re-flux—The Sage of Koheleth—Emerson also in line—Henry Drummond quoting Huxley unconsciously confirms Theosophic teaching—Prof. E. B. Wilson, of Columbia College, New York, on "The Cell in Inheritance and Heredity"—Prof. H. W. Conn of the

Chair of Biology in Wesleyan University in "The Story of the Living Machine"—The "Tattvas" of the Sanscrit—The anathema against pre-existence of souls at Constantinople A. D. 553—The social nature of Christendom at that time—Gregory Nazianzen's comments on Church Councils—Dr. Momerie on same—The translation of the papal edict—Dr. L. Mosheim—Plato taught the doctrine—Herod quoted—Gibbon followed the trail of this thought—Orlando J. Smith in his work, "Short Views of Great Questions"—Drummond's failure to convince—A Methodist preacher on total depravity—Babes born are "devils in bud"—The Theosophist answers: They are gods in embryo—Transmigration and Metempsychosis definitions confusing—Sir Wm. Jones

Pages 52 to 87.

CHAPTER VI.

KARMA.

The law of cause and effect — Always present in the thought of Man under various aphorisms—Prof. Jevons on finer matter—Dr. Young—Prof. DuBois—The Great Breath—Kismet in Arabian thought—Karma in Aryan thought—Calvinism on Predestination—The Buddhistic Parable of the Lost Son, compared to the Prodigal Son—The masculine and feminine the human organism—Charles Johnston on Karma—The Parsees.

Pages 88 to 105.

CHAPTER VII.

THE GENESIS OF MAN.

The Garden of Eden in all archaeological literature—Means the Golden Age in each—Researches around Nippur—Sven Hedin's second trip—Bishop Usher's chronology—The Kali Yuga Cycle of the Hindus—Extract from "*Biblia*," an archaeological periodical—The still open question whether mankind sprang from one stock—The new theory is the oldest—Man came in streams of monadic essence as do all things pertaining to color, form and sound—Pythagoras's teachings—Chladni's demonstrations of forms in nature by wave action—Law that operates anywhere operates everywhere—The sponge cited as illustration—Inorganic matter did not start from Asiatic soil—The Protozoa originated evenly over the globe—Likewise the Mollusks and Articulates—Fishes, reptiles, birds and mammalians must have

obeyed some uniform law—Man no exception to law—The deluge—Prof. Brinton on Anthropology — Quotation from arcane teachings—Sensations of Tone by Helmholtz — His "Klangfarbe"—Lockyer and Tesla on Messages from Mars—Dr. Alexander Wilder on "generation"—The Psychological bearing—The Scientific bearing of the question.
Pages 106 to 117.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PSYCHIC POWERS LATENT IN MAN.

The Eastern Teaching very old—Quotation from Flammarion—The A. U. M. — Formation, Transformation, Reformation—Prof. Brinton on the Psychic origin of all religions—A universal postulate—Spiritualism, Christian Science—Mental Science and Faith Cures—Society for Psychical Research—Extracts from—St. Augustine and apparitions—St. Thomas Aquinas—Peter Huber (1810) on study of ants—The "astral" not a projection of bodies but a projection of consciousness—Huxley's "Man's Place in Nature"—From Krishna Science to Mormon Science—No pecuniary charge for services in Theosophy—Medical treatment needed—"Little Lives" of the Sanscrit same as microbes—The Environmental Stimuli of Science—Prof. Brinton on potent stimuli—The "unplumbed abyss of the sub-conscious mind"—No limit to the knowing of the Self that knows.
Pages 118 to 139.

CHAPTER IX.

TRANSCENDENTALISM, MYSTICISM, OCCULTISM, ESOTERICISM, AND OTHER TECHNICAL TERMS.

Whirligig of Time and Cycle mean same—John Quincy Adams on Emerson—Goethe's "Westoestlicher Divan"—Leibnitz on innate ideas—Transcendental Biology—Kant's Transcendentalism—Theodore Parker on Emerson—Bronson Alcott and his Plato—Emerson and the Bhavagad Gita — Charles Malloy as Biographer of Emerson — Poem "Brahma" in *Atlantic Monthly* 1857—Preceded Darwin's works—Mysticism—John Stuart Mill quoted—Prof. Goldwin Smith on Mysticism—Balfour's "Foundations of Belief—The "Riddle of Existence" by Goldwin Smith—The soul in the universe—Other quotations from the "Riddle of Existence—Camille Flammarion in "The Unknown"—Trance

states by monks of various orders—Recejac's "Basis of the Mystic Knowledge"—Occultism—Prof. Jastrow, University of Wisconsin—*Popular Science Monthly* of Sept. 1900—Prof. Jastrow's criticism—Theosophy complimented as well as criticised—Spiritualism scored—The supersensuous admitted in Theosophy—Oriental Wisdom Religions noted—The Law of Karma—We are in this world—Not to run away from it—Dr. Lyman Abbott quoted—His "Theology of an Evolutionist"—Temptation needed in the struggle—Revival of Ancient Mysteries—Gen. Albert Pike—His "Morals and Dogma"—Gerald Massey's work—Champollion's first publication—Prof. Max Muller—"What India Can Teach Us"—
Pages 140 to 166.

CHAPTER X.

A THEOSOPHIST'S ATTITUDE TO CHRISTIANITY.

Bitter attacks from orthodox pulpits—Theosophists not iconoclasts—Upholders of true Christianity—Dr. Momerie quoted—Ecclesiastics"rarely hesitate to lie"—Early lying in the church—Rev. Heber Newton of New York—Theosophist welcomes teachings of leading Christian thinkers—Charles Kingsley—Lyman Abbott—N. D. Hillis—Phillips Brooks—J. Minot Savage—Heber Newton—Robert Collyer—William Ellery Channing—James Martineau—Cardinal Gibbons on the Good Samaritan—Nothing new in Christian Scriptures—Truth older than Christianity—The Real always was Real—Bunsen quoted—The Way the Truth and the Life on Egyptian Granite—Zoroastrian lore—The Upanishads—The Book of the Dead—Sunday School Lessons—Dazing the minds of children—Prof. Huxley quoted—His letter to the "Three Bishops"—"The Warfare of Science" by Andrew D. White—A Presbyterian preacher's sermon—Divinity's first manifestation in the flesh—A Washington preacher's attack on Buddha's teachings—Sir Edwin Arnold in refutation—Prof. Max Muller, Rhys Davids—Spence Hardy—Dr. Paul Carus's Gospel of Buddha—Harvard University's translations of Sanscrit—The Theosophist consults authorities on Buddha—Lowell's poem on great teachers—The rock-cut edicts of Asoka—Buddha not a sanctified juggler—The Nazarene not a showman—Prof. Huxley quoted on Miracles—Lyman Abbott on the miraculous—Prof. William Kingdon Clifford—The Parliament of Religions under Asoka—Christianity borrowed from Buddhistic records—

Dr. J. D. Buck's "Mystic Masonry"—Krishna's "immaculate conception;" all sun-gods thus conceived—"Sons of God" in the days of the Alexandrian University—The Theosophist not a believer—He doubts to investigate—He investigates to believe—Honest doubt beginning of true piety—No dogmas as now existing in the teachings of Tertullian—The scientific doubter purified religion—"Christ the first true gentleman"—The shock to orthodoxy—A Baptist preacher in Atlanta—He says "Theosophy is an invention of the devil"—James Lane Allen's "Reign of Law"—A Methodist preacher—Wants all books burned that do not agree with the Bible—Cremation—Frances E. Willard quoted—Lyman Abbott on resurrection of the physical body—It rises in the grass and flowers—The Ten Commandments—Borrowed from the Chaldeans—They borrowed from older civilizations—The Trinity, older than Christianity—Osiris, Isis and Horus in Egypt—Creator, Preserver, Destroyer as Brahma, Vishnu, Siva in India—Church edifices not religion, but instruments to promote religion—Theosophists prefer teachers to preachers—No corner stone ever laid by a Founder of a Faith—They were out among the people—Prof. Hyde of Dartmouth College quoted—The business of the scholar is the pursuit of truth.

Pages 167 to 192.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SCIENTIFIC ASPECT OF THEOSOPHY.

Theosophy admits all laws discovered—Asserts existence of others—Ernest Haeckel on knowledge of the "Psyche"—Law of Substance—Conservation of Matter—Conservation of Energy—Conservation of Consciousness follows—"The Riddle of the Universe" by Haeckel—"Guesses at the Riddle of Existence" by Prof Goldwin Smith—The law of effort—Unity of affinity in the whole of nature—Prof. Lester F. Ward—Achievement his talismanic word—Effort a word to denote more—The Positivism of our day—The race not immortal—Faraday and Goethe quoted—The dead to rise again must be born again—Jowett's Plato—Prof. Max Muller on reincarnation—The French school of philosophers—Materialists and Idealists—The Theosophist an Idealist—Prof. Du Bois of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College—The creative power of mind—Spinoza—Tyndalls' address at Belfast 1874—Promise and potency of

every form of life in matter—Monism—Herbert Spencer—Professor Brinton—Romanes—Helmholtz — Paulsen—Dolbear—Ancient and Modern Physics—Thomas E. Willson late librarian New York *World* — Theosophical Forum—Quotations from—The Sanscrit—India—Vedas—Evolution—Erroneous views held as to the "double" of man—The Missionary Bleek among the Bushmen—Minds disordered by religious excitement—Devachanic Planes—Intuition as direct knowledge—Prof. C. Lloyd Morgan of Bristol, Eng., on "Psychology and the Ego"—Theosophical Societies should devote renewed effort to the systematic study of Psychology—Churches will not instruct—Prof. Ladd of Yale—Theosophists do not "read science" into their system—They have it from the ancients—The Revival of Alchemy Occult Societies in France—Wendell Phillips on "Lost Arts"—Liebnitz—The Smithsonian Institution.
Pages 193 to 214.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTROVERTED QUESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.

"Disciples of Blavatsky" a wrong heading in a newspaper—Madame Blavatsky not the founder of Theosophy—It was well known to the Christian Fathers—Comments on Blavatsky—The Countess Wachmeister her companion during period of trial—Her pupils judges of her deportment—Theosophists disciples of nobody—The New York *Journal* on Immortality and Theosophists—An answer to same—As far back as human records go—A Sunday-school publication on the oldest books—An answer to same—The Egyptian Book of the Dead—The Four Vedas—The Zend-Avesta—Chinese Cyclopaedia—Ancient Nippur—Prof. Max Muller on oldest writings—On oldest thought—Theosophists of India on same lines—Gladstone on same search—The origin of Bible by Nehemiah—Colored by the priest Ezra—"Oracles of Truth" in India Sruta—Prof. Brinton quoted—Hymns in Public Schools—Theosophists opposed to thrones and kings as ideals for children—Un-American sentiment.
Pages 215 to 232.

PREFACE.

This book was not written for Theosophists. The aim of the author is to reach the "man on the street" who has heard just enough of Theosophy to wish to know more, and who is, perhaps, overcharged with the misconceptions persistently flung by belligerents.

During the past six years the writer has voluntarily rendered service as Lecturer in Washington, Baltimore and elsewhere, and for three years as President of a Theosophical Society at the National Capital has answered questions prompted from many points of view. These questions form the basis for the reasoning in the following pages. There seems to be a uniformity of experience, judging from the interrogators, for nearly all state—"Theosophy as you teach it is not as we read it in the books." The explanation of the variation is attempted from the author's point of view, and his alone. The Theosophical Society is not bound by it, nor need any Theosophist agree to any statement made, unless, as Emerson taught, it "belongs to him."

The key to the whole effort may be discovered in the rebuke given by Prof. Max Muller: "Theosophy has been so greatly misapprehended that it was high time to restore it to its proper function." In this attempt to exalt the system of thought the irenical method is counseled, whereby it is sought to promote unity by magnifying the essentials and minimizing the non-essentials.

These essentials, which have been adopted by all conflicting camps, are, The Perfectibility of Man; Reincarnation as the process which constantly yields an opportunity

for further perfectibility, and Karma, the law of cause and effect, compelling rebirth to attain perfectibility.

Theosophical writers are not quoted to sustain views presented, excepting Charles Johnston, M. R. A. S. of the Bengal Civil Service, Retired, and the Prize Sanscrit Scholar of India, and Dr. J. D. Buck, of Cincinnati, author of Mystic Masonry and other works.

Disinterested witnesses from the philosophical, scientific and religious domains of thought are liberally quoted. This is in accord with fundamental Theosophic teaching—"look for similarities, not differences."

The adoption of a new Constitution by the "Theosophical Society in America" at Indianapolis, April 30, 1901, after Chapter I had gone to press renders it necessary to add that, hereafter, all in sympathy with any of the principles of the society as outlined by three planks in the platform, may be admitted to membership. Also, incorporated in the organic law is the acknowledgment of the laity as paramount in sovereignty. An Executive Committee of seven, elected annually, will hereafter administer the affairs of the Society. This bars future factional disputes on the part of so-called "leaders." It also establishes a criterion for the individual: "Take Truth for authority, not authority for truth."

J. A. C.

Washington, D. C., May, 1901.

CHAPTER I.

THREE PLANKS IN THE PLATFORM—THREE POSTULATES IN THE PHILOSOPHY.

There are three planks in the platform of the Theosophical Society, founded at New York in 1875,

1st. The formation of a nucleus of universal brotherhood without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color.

2d. The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences.

3d. The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychic powers latent in man.

Several organized societies now exist, all the outgrowth of the one movement, and all keeping intact the same platform. The differentiation was caused mainly by contending opinions as to government and administration. Nevertheless whether from the "Headquarters in India," or its "American Section," or from the "Theosophical Society in America" or any other center of affairs in Theosophical activities, the three planks in the platform serve to distinguish the school of thought in its outer expression from the traditionalism and dogmatisms under which the members were nurtured. If anything can be discovered in these stated objects of the Theosophical Societies which could warrant the unjust charge that the dissemination of such teaching is a wanton disturbance of faith, a further reassurance is offered in the proclamation adopted at the Convention of the "Theosophical Society in America" held at Boston, April, 1895:

> **"To all men and women of whatever caste, creed, race**

or religious belief, who aim at the fostering of peace, gentleness and unselfish regard one for another, and the acquisition of such knowledge of men and nature as shall tend to the elevation and advancement of the human race, it sends most friendly greeting and freely proffers its services.

"It joins hands with all religions and religious bodies whose efforts are directed to the purification of men's thoughts and the bettering of their ways, and it avows its harmony therewith.

"To all scientific societies and individual searchers after wisdom on whatever plane and by whatever righteous means pursued, it is and will be grateful for such discovery and unfoldment of the Truth as shall serve to announce and confirm *a scientific basis for ethics*.

And lastly, it invites to its membership those who, seeking a higher life hereafter, would learn to know the *Path* they tread in this."

As a further evidence of the oneness in soul-movement, Theosophical branches the world over retain the original motto in spirit and letter:

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

The organization, moreover, is wholly unsectarian, with no creed, dogma, or personal authority to enforce or impose; neither is it to be held responsible for the opinions of its members, who are expected to accord to the beliefs of others that tolerance which they demand for their own; and it will be fair to the reader of the following pages to announce that no member of a Theosophical Society is bound by views expressed herein. The point of view as set forth by the author is that which tallies with the truth as he discerns it; it is not claimed that it is truth absolute. No better test of sincerity and fairness is known in the Theosophical estimate than one's willingness to submit his own views to a just comparison with others. This is his standing in court. On this he rests his case.

Much of the confusion found in the publications of the day concerning Theosophy arises from the failure to discriminate between the three planks in the platform, and

the Three Postulates of the philosophy. This is how it comes to pass that a member of the Theosophical Society need not be a Theosophist; need not adopt the system of thought which has distinctly marked itself as Theosophy. To enter the society is to give adherence to but one obligation —that of a conscientious belief in human brotherhood. The Society does not pretend to be able to establish at once a universal brotherhood among men, but only strives to create the nucleus of such a body. Hence it is that in the membership of the Society, in its exoteric expression, are found adherents of all sects and denominations of all religions in the world. It is simply because underlying all faiths, is an inherent sympathy and compassion for the human race.

A Theosophist *per se* is distinguished from a member of the Society, as outlined above, by his adoption of a philosophy which contains the germs (as the adherents believe) of all the religions, philosophies and sciences known to man as far back as human records go, and consistent with the higher and growing thought of our epoch. This philosophy is expressed in the Secret Doctrine by Three Postulates:

1st. An Omnipresent, Eternal, Boundless, and Immutable Principle, on which all speculation is impracticable, since it transcends the power of human conception, and could only be dwarfed by any human expression or similitude. (This fundamental idea must be grasped and followed through varied forms of expression, under many names, and no other proposition can be entertained that is inconsistent with it. (*Secret Doctrine, p.* 14 *Proem.*)

2d. The eternity of the Universe *in toto* as a boundless plane, periodically the playground of numberless universes incessantly manifesting and disappearing, called the "manifesting stars" and the "sparks of eternity." The appearance and disapeparance of worlds is like a regular tidal ebb and flow, of flux and reflux. Herein is postulated the

law of cycles, alike applicable to atoms or suns, to individual man, or to solar systems. (*Secret Doctrine*, *p.* 14 *Proem*).

3d. The fundamental identity of all souls with the Universal Oversoul, the latter being an aspect of the Uncaused Cause, and the obligatory pilgrimage of every soul through the cycle of incarnation from the lowest plane of consciousness to the highest. (*Secret Doctrine*, *p.* 14 *Proem*).

As Emerson expressed it, in conformity with the Third Postulate:

"And, striving to be man, the worm
Mounts through all the spires of form."

And this again supplements the old saying in the arcane records of the East, as found in the Stanzas of the Book of Dyzan, an esoteric work formerly allowed only to the eyes of the initiated:

"Every entity in the universe, is, was, or prepares to become a man."

This esoteric teaching corresponding to the tenets of the ancient religions, sciences and philosophies proves that the doctrine of Evolution is older by thousands of years than Lamarck and Darwin. The ancient seers left it of record in this old esoteric book:

"The spark hangs from the flame by the finest thread of Fohat (energy). It stops in the first world of Maya (Change and Illusion), and is a metal and a stone; it passes into the second, and behold a plant; the plant whirls through seven changes and becomes an animal. From the COMBINED ATTRIBUTES of these, Manu (man) the thinker is formed."

Emerson, a profound student in the ancient lore of Nature's finer forces, discovered for our modern thought, years before Darwin's "Origin of the Species" appeared, the law which expresses the supreme effort to evolve conscious life out of so-called inert material. The following

extract attests his belief which is that of the scientific and philosophical Theosophist:

The fossil strata show us that Nature began with rudimental forms, and rose to the more complex as fast as the earth was fit for their dwelling-place; and that the lower perish as the higher appear. Very few of our race can be said to be yet finished men. We still carry sticking to us some remains of the preceding inferior quadruped organization. . . . The age of the quadruped is to go out,—the age of the brain and of the heart is to come in. And if one shall read the future of the race hinted in the organic effort of Nature to mount and meliorate, and the corresponding impulse to the Better in the human being, we shall dare affirm that there is nothing he will not overcome and convert, until at last culture shall absorb the chaos and gehenna. He will convert the Furies into Muses and the hells into benefit.—*Culture.*

Thus, everything in Theosophic thought points toward man. The very basic principle underlying the three planks in the platform, and the three postulates of the philosophy involves Man—the Perfectibility of Man. How? By due course of evolution. Can one life afford the opportunity to "mount and meliorate? The Theosophist reasons consistently, as he believes, that it will require many lives in succession before perfection is attained. These repeated incarnations are compelled by the law of Karma, which means action and reaction, cause and effect. The law of Karma is the broadest generalization known in the thought of the school.

So, the Perfectibility of Man, brought about through Reincarnation, which is compelled by Karma, gives the scope of Eastern philosophy and science a claim for a disinterested hearing. But the reader may ask—"Where does Religion obtain a status by such a formula?" The answer is, again—in the Perfectibility of Man! Religion, as defined by the teachings of the sages, is—"devotion to the

highest goodness known to man." This devotion brings perfectibility. "What will you do with man's soul?" the inquirer insists. The answer is always ready in the teachings of the seers—"Man has no soul; that would make the possessor and the possession a duality; man is a soul—that makes him a unity, an individuality. It is the soul that has a body, a covering; not the body possessing a soul as a property of matter. Imagine a student of the wisdom of the ages accepting the soul as a manufacture out of nothing at birth, a mere function or property of matter, instead of a growth by development!

This point of view may startle the reader who still clings to the incredible traditions and discredited apologetics of a faith nurtured in the darkest centuries of the Christian era, but it seems by the law of evolution, and the conception of a rational order in the universe that one must change one's point of view at every milestone reached on the upward ascent. As Lyman Abbott in behalf of the liberal Christians who hear him gladly, expresses it:

"Both within and without the church we are passing through a great transition of belief. It is not merely a change in the phrasing of creeds; there is a radical change in the substantial point of view. This change in point of view does not involve any overthrow of Christian faith. Rightly understood, it involves a widening, and should involve a deepening, of religious faith."

While the liberal thinker is acting upon the suggestion of Dr. Abbott, it might occur as seemly to quote one of the ablest scholars of the world in our day, who has just "passed over," to use the terminology of Theosophy,—Prof. Max Muller, who, in commenting on Origen, one of the Christian Fathers, anathematized because of his theosophic teachings, says, in his Gifford lectures.

"What I wish to make quite clear to you is, that there is in Christianity more theosophy than in any other religion, if we use that word in its right meaning, as comprehending whatever of wisdom

has been vouchsafed to man touching things divine. . . . Nor shall we ever appreciate at its full value the theosophic wealth of the Christian religion, quite apart from its other excellences, till we have weighed it against the other religions of the world."

And, finally, as the best definition yet available for the teacher of theosophy, that given by Max Muller is quoted, not only because of his great ability to pronounce judgment by contrast and comparison, but mainly for the reason that he was not a member of the Theosophical Society and not at all friendly to some of the so-called leaders of the cult:

"I ought, perhaps, to explain why, to the title originally chosen for this my final course of Gifford Lectures, I have added that of Theosophy. It seems to me that this venerable name so well known among early Christian thinkers as expressing the highest knowledge of God within the reach of the human mind has been so greatly misapprehended that it was high time to restore it to its proper function. It should be known once for all that one may call one's self a theosophist without being suspected of believing in spirit rappings, table turnings, or any other black arts."

If the name is entitled to the adjective "venerable" by such a careful philologist, it becomes the searcher for truth to attempt an exploration into the archaeology of Theosophy. If the name was "so well known among early Christian thinkers," it behooves the scholarship of the day to ascertain how they got it. If Theosophy in their minds did "express the highest knowledge of God within the reach of the human mind" it stands for duty that this "highest knowledge" be recovered. If Theosophists themselves, have "so greatly misapprehended" this ancient system of thought as to justify the rebuke given, it remains a duty doubly impressive that it be "restored to its proper function."

The author, from his point of view, after several years of diligent study, is free to state that Theosophy has received more injury by misrepresentation and wrong inter-

pretation from some of its own membership than was possible for the antagonistic schools to inflict. Vapid mysticism from certain sects in the East has crept in, and so-called Occult Arts (ceremonial magic) has been copied and these added to the vagaries of certain trance mediums of the female sex, have wrought havoc in the ranks. Like the warring creeds and dogmas of Christianity, the non-essentials have taken precedence in certain schools labeled Theosophy.

Yet with all the mishaps which have overtaken special camps of study, the essentials have not been wrecked by the inordinate personal ambition of leadership. Despite the breaking of the movement into sectarian channels, these essentials—"Perfectibility of Man," "Karma," "Reincarnation" and the hope of a Universal Brotherhood, all remain in the teachings of each of the factions. The text books of each are interchangeable, and the periodicals of all are read with interest. This is clearly an advance, and an improvement on the narrowness of the Orthodox denominations. Church members as a rule have not been detected in the act of swapping their denominational organs. An illustration of this bigotry is here cited. A Baptist congregation in a large city, a few years ago appropriated a sum of money for the purchase of a library. The pastor was named as chairman of a committee of three to select the books, and with him were afterward associated two residents familiar with the current literature of the day, one being an editor. Competing publishing houses forwarded assorted consignments granting privilege of return of such as were not chosen. The culling began under the immediate supervision of the preacher, a young man fresh from his theological studies. His order was peremptory that no book should be allowed a place on the shelves which contained in any manner a reference or allusion to any form of baptism other than immersion. When appealed to by the editor that the ruling would shut out many exemplary vol-

umes, the answer was emphatic: "Dangerous doctrine shall be allowed no shelf room here!"

Such an incident would be impossible in a Theosophical organization for the reason that the second plank in the platform insists upon a study of all religions, all rites, all ceremonies. And in studying the archaeology of baptism, the Theosophist finds that immersion was a religious rite in the Ancient Mysteries, 6000 B. C., and accompanied with more elaborate ceremony than now practiced by the Baptists as a sect. This pagan rite which had a wholesome meaning of old, now serves to keep the warring christened clubs of Christendom in their respective water-tight compartments, and more impressively strange is it to the archaeological searcher for truth, to find that on this point, the Christian Fathers, and founders of opinions by apologetics, in the early centuries of our era, were in nowise seriously affected by the question. In the instance cited, however, it served to keep the well-meaning members of that Baptist congregation from reading the excellent literature of the kindred evangelical churches, due to the action of one man, who was preacher rather than teacher.

A further study by the comparative method, in the spirit of the second plank as referred to, convinces the Theosophical student that there is good in all religions; that no one faith has a monopoly of the truth; that he who knows but one religion, and that his own, knows none; that the Bible, which is proclaimed from pulpits as the one only book, is among teachers of men many books; that the real Bible of the world will "never be completed until the last great man is dead," as Emerson expresses it; that revelation was not shut off with St. John; that man was created divine, not depraved; that man saves himself by his own individual effort without mediation of priest or preacher (though their services as guides and teachers are not to be ignored); that science is not profane, but as sacred as any knowledge attainable by man for his perfection;

that the only God man can know with positive knowledge is the Divinity within him; that man makes his own heaven; makes his own hell; that "there is no limit to the knowing of the Self that knows" as the Sanscrit has it; that all great teachers have endeavored to lead man to this "knowing" whether on scientific, philosophical or religious lines; and that duty calls as of old by the stern command—"Man Know Thyself."

All this, in the mind of the oracle of any christened club will be branded "dangerous doctrine" and heresy, but the minds of intelligent men are devoutly and reverently accepting such teachings, under the impetus given by the Theosophical Societies, aided heroically by liberal Christian teachers, and men of light and leading in other climes, under other faiths, from other points of view.

Yet another instance by way of contrast and comparison. The *Sunday School Times*, three years ago devoted some space to a contribution evidently from the pen of a preacher as indicated by the technical theological terms used, the aim of which was to combat the tendency of thought on Theosophical lines. The opening paragraph reads:

"Self-knowledge is the poorest kind of ignorance. A man who studies himself thinks that he knows himself."

Is it any wonder that thinking, serious, sincere and refined people leave orthodox churches and seek instruction elsewhere? The Theosophical Society gains recruits by such arrant nonsense. But the concluding clause is fully as irrational:

"Look outward, not inward, is a thousand times better as a guide of conduct than the old pagan maxim, 'Know thyself.' "

Shades of Solon! chief of the seven sages of Greece, whose Solomonic motto was, Know thyself! (Proverbs xiv., 8.) All the inspiring literature of the ages touching the inner light is here blown outward and the still small

voice is hushed. It is just such fanatical and bigoted zealotry which has invested the fair ethics of a once pure Christianity as rendered in the earlier Greek interpretations with a theological garment of as many colors as Joseph's coat, and in the last analysis has resolved sanctified hatred into an unnecessary war of words rather than into an actual contest of principles. The Theosophist seeks by candid and critical study to recall to the consciousness of the age as frequently as available the enduring injunction —"Man, Know Thyself."

CHAPTER II.

IS THERE ATHEISM OR AGNOSTICISM IN THE FIRST POSTULATE OF THEOSOPHY?

Of misconception of the work of the Theosophical Movement there will be no end so long as certain narrow minds entertain the bigoted views set forth by those who show in their very assertions an unfortunate lack of acquaintance with the essentials of the body of teachings, labeled Theosophy.

The first prevailing erroneous idea is that Theosophy is but another milder phase of atheism or agnosticism, because it sets some religious value on the "Unknowable" as defined in the first postulate of the philosophy, wherein, expressing the idea of the First Cause, it is stated, as a "Principle, on which all speculation is impracticable, since it transcends the power of human conception and could only be dwarfed by any human expression or similitude." If the charge filed is well-founded, a plea can be entered in defense that the Theosophist has, at least, been consistent in conforming to the definition rendered by Prof. Max Muller, —"Expressing the highest knowledge of God to which the human mind can reach." This very definition implies that by effort man may reach higher than the now highest, in time, and at our present stage of evolution it is found by research that the Theosophist is in quite good company, for the scholarship of the world in all ages has agreed that the First Cause is infinite and eternal, and that the finite can neither apprehend nor comprehend the Infinite.

But the Theosophist can sustain and maintain an "idea" of God; though to describe the content of this idea would lead to almost infinite variation, for it is found in all history that according to their ideal of God such has been the character of the people, and the same is true of each individual. Prof. John Fiske's idea at one time when under the suffocating effects of dogmatic teaching was that of a judge on the bench, with a scribe just in rear who was jotting down every act, good or bad committed by every person on earth. But his view under self-development has changed, for he sees in the "dramatic tendency of the universe a multiform manifestation of the infinite power." Nevertheless, although Fiske has completely renounced an anthropomorphic God, he seems to retain a conception of psychical attributes for his Divinity. The Theoeophist will not quarrel with Prof. Fiske if the psychical attributes will be allowed to remain as manifestations on the psychic plane, and there only; in so far as these attributes thus psychically displayed are good, they must be divine, but they are secondary rather than first in cause, according to the Sages.

Prof. Huxley may not be accepted by the average reader as a profoundly religious man in the ordinary sense, but by the author of these pages he is regarded as an exponent of the highest thought of his day, and Theosophy must stand for the highest thought in each realm, whether scientific, philosophic or religious, and all must agree if Theosophy is to be moored to safe anchorage. Dr. Huxley wrote on the Unknowable:

"Of all the senseless babble I have ever had occasion to read, the demonstrations of those philosophers who undertake to tell us all about the nature of God would be the worst, if they were not surpassed by the still greater absurdities of the philosophers who try to prove that there is no God." And again, "A dogmatic atheist is a nuisance."

Nevertheless Dr. Huxley claimed to be an agnostic because, he added for qualification, this positive asertion:

"Agnosticism is of the essence of science whether an-

cient or modern. It means that man shall not say that he knows or believes that which he has no scientific ground for professing to know or believe."

* * * * * * *

"And the knowledge which goes 'beyond knowledge' is something which my cognitive faculties do not enable me to apprehend."

The diligent student of Theosophy who endeavors to keep pace with the highest thought of the day, especially in the domain of Psychology, will observe that the great scientist has measured his words. His belief rests on his "cognitive faculties." This is the limit of inspiration in the evolution of mind following the formula of the process outlined by Prof. Ladd, who occupies the chair of Psychology in Yale University. "The cognitive faculty—the acquisitive or perceptive power—is the first and fundamental power of intellect. It includes (1)sense perception (2) consciousness and (3) intuition proper."

Hunt's Poetry of Science is allowed on the shelves of cultured people in the Christian faith, and it states:

"Of the phenomena of causes as far as they are revealed by Science in its search, it will be shown that beneath the beautiful vesture of the external world there exists, like its quickening soul, a pervading power, assuming the most varied aspects, giving the whole its life and loveliness, and linking every portion of this material mass in a common bond with some great universal principle beyond our knowledge."

The greatest synthetic philosopher of our age—Herbert Spencer, concludes that "our only course is to recognize our symbols ('mind' and 'matter') as symbols only of some form of power absolutely and forever unknown to us." The Theosophist is not prepared to accept such pessimistic words as "absolutely and forever," for his cognition leads him to believe that when the Perfectibility of Man is reached, after long stretches of time ahead, he will arrive at a state of omniscience. However, Spencer aligns with the ancient postulate when he states that we are "ever in the

presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed" and that it is this same Power which "in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness." This, for scientific reasoning is drawing remarkably close to the touch of Theosophic thought as handed down by the sages, which makes that power within ourselves as divine as its source.

Scientific method in the department of philology is attracting attention to the demand for a more correct translation of the expression—"I and my Father are one." In the oriental consciousness the religious teacher of whatever sect or tongue, whether Narada of India, Appolonius of Tyana, or Jesus of Nazareth, would have sought to convey the idea that "I and my Parent-Source are one"; or "I and my eternal source are one', or "I and my Infinite Source are one," or "I and my Higher Self are one." Parent-Source includes the Motherhood of God as well as the Fatherhood; the eternal feminine as well as the eternal masculine; but it only includes. The highest thought of that day was not masculine, nor feminine; "I am That; that too art Thou" was then clearly understood in the esoteric teachings which had existed from time immemorial, and this teaching was woven into the thread and thrum of the texture of that ancient system of thought defined by Max Muller as the "venerable name so well known among early Christian thinkers"—Theosophy.

Theosophy denies the anthropomorphic god of the dogmatists, the personal god of the theologians, but this does not suffice to rank Theosophists as atheists or agnostics. Epicurus centuries before Christ said:

"That man is not an atheist who denies the gods of the multitude but much rather, he who subscribes to the opinions of the multitude concerning the gods."

Dr. Paul Carus in his excellent treatise on "The Idea of God" says:

"If we could make of the innumerable God-ideas in the

minds of men a composite photograph, such as Galton made of certain classes of faces, we should find in all of them one feature most prominently present: God is to everybody who believes in a God the ultimate authority in conformity to which he regulates his conduct."

The same author in another paragraph when summing up his own conception adds:

"This view of God is more than an idea. It is an ideal. An ideal is an idea that is an aim for our aspiration. An ideal is a living idea, i. e., an idea which can constantly be more and more realized and always admits of still greater perfection."

The Theosophist's point of view must be similar, for he is forever aiming toward the Perfect Man and the continuance of the effort "always admits of still greater perfection." Therefore, whether this "Unknowable" be qualified in terms, as the Eternal, the Absolute, the Self-Existent, the Most High, the Only Pure, the Higher Self, or any equivalent of the divine working in the universe, the Theosophist will fall in line with the expounder of any such system, and this Theosophic method has sufficed for men of the highest mind and the most pious imagination, such as Giordano Bruno, Spinoza, Kant, Goethe, Shelley, Wordsworth, Carlyle, Emerson, Channing, Martineau, and the liberal Christian teachers of the higher planes of thought, as well as of the six systems of Philosophy in India. The seers of all nations gave out such concepts. And the opening words of the sermon of Buddha on his return to his father's palace made doubly immortal in verse by Sir Edwin Arnold in his "Light of Asia," gives emphasis to this basic principle in Theosophic teaching:

"O Amiteya! measure not with words
The immeasurable; nor sink the string of thought
Into the fathomless. Who asks doth err,
Who answers, errs. Say nought!

Shall any gazer see with mortal eyes,
Or any searcher know by mortal mind,

Veil after veil will lift—but there must be
Veil upon veil behind."

The search for truth by the Theosophist is rewarded constantly by the lifting of the veil, and the true meaning of Isis Unveiled is deeper than the bigoted sectarian can fathom. And at every step gained in lifting veil after veil, there is recognized as defined by Matthew Arnold "the power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." "The Supreme Reality which is concealed behind the changing course of phenomena" will serve equally as well as a symbol, for after all, it will depend on the mental angle, or point of view under which the disciple of any great teacher contemplates Nature, or the manifestations of the Universe.

If man with his capacities and aspirations proceeds from the Great All as a source, man must include the germ of all possible development. This is the Divinity within so tenaciously adhered to by the Theosophist. This aspiration of the germ need not at all conflict with the Unknowable as the foundation of a system of pious reverence even if it is reduced to the cold expression of the scientific thinker in the formula and symbol of x to the nth power. But will the less-favored mortal who does not and cannot follow the subtleties of advanced thought derive any comfort from such abstruse conclusions? The Theosophist alleges that he can, for the reason that man carries within him an ideal of perfection which enables him to construct independently within his own soul the true religion, which is the negation of all materialistic or dogmatic faiths, and is itself nothing less than the liberty or purity of the mind and soul. In short, it is the God within, that Light which "lighteth every man which cometh into the world." But it is also as strenuously enjoined by the teaching of the inner consciousness that every soul must work out its own salvation. The pivotal doctrine of Theos-

ophic teaching admits no privileges, no special gifts in man save those won by his own Ego, his own self, through persistent effort through a long line of reincarnations; the long pilgrimage toward that which is now the Unknowable, for we see now in part only, but then face to face.

Prof. Ladd in "The Philosophy of Knowledge" sounds an assuring note to the less cultured mortal who might otherwise dread the arduous struggle in the pursuit of the higher life which is an essential in Theosophy.

"The plain man's consciousness, in his simple work-day transactions with things and observations of himself cannot set itself up as the measure of all the truths of science and philosophy. But it has in it the everlasting truth of the Ego's self-active life; and it enables its possessor to make his own the ancient mystic saying of India—"That too art thou." The feeling of the unity in difference of the self and also its oneness with the world are present as the abiding truth of all such knowledge. The germs of insight into the inner nature of things lie waiting recognition and development in every human mind; every man is a metaphysician and a philosopher; he who can say *homo sum* is forced to confess both an interest in this inner nature and an undeveloped potency of insight. Nor is the insight something far away from him—'over seas' or 'up aloft.' It is rather, if he will hear it, a word near him, and ready to be put in his own mouth."

This is clearly the teaching of the sages of old which the Theosophist sanctions, and establishes that religion is to each individual according to the inward light with which he is endowed.

And this endowment is an emanation, a ray, from the Great All, an activity of the Great Breath which forever moves through the dense infinitudes of a universe, or countless universes for ought we know, for we cannot measure with our thought the Unknowable. It is simply sufficient for the Theosophist to have and to hold the essential truth that was taught by the Vedic Rishis, the Achi-u of Egypt, the Wise Men of the East under whatever appellation; in the Vedanta, by Kapila, by Buddha, by Plato, by Jesus, by

Emerson, by all sages and seers and men of light and learning everywhere—the Manifestation of the First cause in us. Again, it is proclaimed from this point of view that the only God man can know is the Divinity within.

Again, it will be asked what signification is to be granted to the incident narrated in Scripture where Paul declares to the men of Athens, not the Unknown God to which their altars and monuments attested. The Theosophist's answer is that the highest thought of our age has devoted reverent study to the original text, and it proves that our popularly accepted translation needs scholarly revision and more accurate interpretation. Indeed, able papers from the most profound critics are easily available, and over all must be taken into account the psychic state of consciousness in which Paul functioned after his defective external sight was exchanged for a clearer insight, revealed to him by a process that need not in this scientific age be set down as supernatural or miraculous. Such sudden changes have appeared in all ages; the Eastern psychologists are familiar with episodes in their own literature where revelation as with a lightning-flash at midnight causes the subject to see the world and all things therein in an entirely new aspect.

Paul, who declared that he could be all things to all men was simply doing that which all great teachers have done, not giving new truths, (for truth is old and always was truth,) but to call men back—back to the reality from which they had wandered, as sheep gone astray. The men of Athens on Mars Hill easily must have understood him as he told them that which they already knew; that their Unknown God had made the world and all things therein; who dwelt not in temples made with hands; who needed nothing, seeing he was the giver of life, breath, and all things; who had made of one blood all nations of men. Paul further declared that they should seek him if haply they might *feel after him and find him*, though he was constantly at

hand, and the one in whom they lived and moved and had their being.

Notwithstanding the clearness of Paul's teaching when properly interpreted, which any Theosophist will sanction, he shows no very emphatic condemnation of the so-called agnosticism of the assembled Athenians, for he adds that God has "winked at" or overlooked it. The understanding of the Theosophist is reenforced by the scientific method of reasoning on the facts. When a sensational evangelist preaches in Washington, we fail to find any rush of the scientists of the capital, the professors of the schools, or the plodding students in the lore of the day to hear him; neither do we believe, as Theosophists, that the cream of Athenian culture was present at the street preaching of the eloquent advocate of his freshly found faith. The Unknown God of the culture of Athens is described in the highest thought of that day in much the same terminology as is now used by our ablest exponents in progressive culture.

When Paul is quoted to the Theosophist let all of Paul be quoted and filed with the pleadings in the case; not proof-texts culled, or isolated incidents, nor special pleading. The Theosophist seeks to answer the general issue on the merits of the case. Paul had studied at the feet of Gamaliel; had retired to the desert to prepare for his ministry. Why do not preachers attempt to unearth the curriculum of that "desert" school? The Theosophist has investigated on archaeological lines and has found to his satisfaction that Paul was graduated as a teacher in esoteric lore. The Sufis, a school of educated Arabian esotericists (and many are professors in Mohammedan colleges to this day), can teach the graduates of Princeton or Andover a few things in Paul's history well worth considering. Therefore, when the theologian quotes Paul, let it be understood by the Theosophist, at least, that all of Paul is meant, his fallibility and proneness to err, (being human,) as well as his enlightened insight. In the light of psychology, he is an in-

teresting study. Whether he believed the world was to come to an end during the life of men then listening to him, and that the Nazarene was to descend in glory to rule, he certainly preached it. But it is hardly possible that the translation is correct wherein, by his answer to doubters he involves the false analogy of the seed, which germinates, i. e., continues to a new life, when the translation makes Paul declare that it dies. On this point alone, the value of Theosophic study surpasses that of the metal-riveted theologian. The Theosophist declares that Paul is not rightly interpreted. Graduating from his course of study in the desert he went forth with views of the Cosmos and processes in nature which clearly indicate a thorough knowledge of the Secret Doctrine taught in said esoteric school. He knew, as he must have known as a student of such teaching, that even the formless void held the atoms of coming planets and moons and the essences from which their inhabitants were to be compounded. These seeds of humanity were awaiting their time to sprout and spring up and grow into the beauty of the image of their Infinite Source, now seen through a glass darkly. And he was taught by the Masters of Wisdom that forms and types persist through all vicissitudes, for these things come and go and come again by the force which proceeds from the Infinite, Unknown energy. "With the outgoing Breath, forms appear; with the indrawing Breath, forms disappear," was an axiom of the school in which Paul studied, had been the teaching of all the Wisdom Religions of antiquity and is to-day accepted by Theosophists as well as by scientists, although they express it in their own terminology. In the clearer light which is breaking from the beacon posts of the higher criticism, Paul will be more intelligently understood, but with the greater illumination which the science of Psychology is diffusing, Paul's personality can be separated from his individuality, and the gist of his teaching apprehended by a more scientific survey.

CHAPTER III.

INDIVIDUALITY AND PERSONALITY.

If the proper study of mankind is man, (and Theosophists lay great stress upon such study,) it ought to be made plain at the outset why the first general classification —that of Individuality and Personality—is so strenuously insisted upon. The materialistic scientists have been giving the past generation their conclusions touching the external form of man, how that form may be comfortably fed, housed and lodged, but knowledge of the real man is ignored, his needs neglected, and a few of the so-called "great lights of science" deny that he exists.

Happily, a new Psychology is overthrowing the hasty enunciations of the past forty years, and former students of the Vogt and Buchner schools are entertaining conceptions more in accord with the Chairs of Psychology in our leading institutions of learning, and not a little satisfaction is felt by the students of the Wisdom Religions of Antiquity in the fact, that the more searching the investigation by observation and experiment, supplemented, of course, by induction, and deduction as well, the more clear seems the approach to the psychology of the ancients, who were the greatest nature students the world has produced.

What is the personality? Let us begin with the origin of the word and trace its development. If, as Professor Max Muller asserts, every word is a palace of thought, a better understanding can be gained by an examination of the apartment which contains both original roots and subsequent accretions, whether fungus, or normal growth. The

same eminent philologist states that there are but eight hundred material or predicative roots for all the words we find in our cumbersome dictionaries, and that these are derived from but one hundred and twenty concepts all told, which "are the rivers that feed the whole ocean of thought and speech." Can we trace the conception of either the personality or the individuality to original concepts? If we fail, we shall not surely be at a loss for the equivalent of both in the conception of man, for man, as a concept must be included with the others, of which the same great authority on the Science of Language and the Science of Thought, states:

"That there is no thought that passes through our mind, or that has passed through the minds of the greatest poets and prophets of old, that cannot directly or indirectly be derived from one of these fundamental concepts."

Then, to answer the question—What is the personality of man? it is sufficient to say with competent authority to sustain the statement, that the personality of man is his mask. Seek the definition. Webster gives person, as derived from persona, a mask (used by actors), from personare, to sound through. The word is compounded of per,(by or through,) and sonare,(to sound). So a person is a mask by or through which some force or energy is sounding. This something, which is striving to manifest itself out in the open, or to express itself, is the individual. This is how it comes to pass that descending to us from archaic thought, the line of demarcation, or distinction, has been kept pronounced in all philosophical thought.

"Individual" is defined by the Standard Dictionary, as

"not capable of being divided without losing identity; existing continuously as an entity; single. Philos. The logical doctrine that individual things are the only real existences. The doctrine that only the individual ego with its changes and states exist."

Here we have the basis for an explanation. The individual, or ego, which is the "I am I" of Theosophy, cannot

be divided and it is that which is acting back of the mask, using the body as per, by or through, and sonare; to sound.

And, again, all philologists further enlighten us with the broader definition, that the word person came finally to mean the wearer of the mask, so that the actor who was wearing the part for effect, was himself acting a part for effect, hence, the word "part" nearly always accompanies the word person in the vocabularies. And so reasoned Southey:

"How different is the same man from himself as he sustains the person of a magistrate and that of a friend."

And Jeremy Taylor emphasizes this conception:

"No man can long put on a person and act a part."

Back in the original languages where the accretions from inflowing dialects have not compounded and re-compounded in words, the nature student, whether an intuitive American Indian, or a Sanscrit pundit, would seek to convey the impression "my body is cold," not "I am cold," for "I," and the body, the personality, the mask, are conceptions apart. Eastern psychology has held persistently to this distinction. The thinkers of the West are coming to it. though hampered with the fungus growth of theological reasoning which has inflicted upon an unsuspecting following the idea of a personal god, in other words, a big sounding board, a vesture, or mask. They mean, however, a big man, but person is not the man in accurate thought.

The masks, whether of nature in any domain, or pertaining to man, are ever-changing bodies. Each new personality is not better, relatively than a fresh suit of clothes, with specific characteristics of color, form and quality, but the real man, the individuality, the entity that never changes, that has a continuous existence, who wears these clothes, has, according to our reasoning thrown aside many a natural covering in its long pilgrimage through space and time, through a long series of incarnations. Looked at in its physiological aspect, the personality is a shifting gar-

ment never two seconds the same, for we are scientifically told that the blood makes a circuit of the entire body during two minutes, carrying with it Nature's finer forces, thus making and remaking a new personality. The average man takes five and a half pounds of food and drink each day, amounting to one ton of solid and liquid nourishment annually. In seventy years he eats and drinks one thousand times his own weight to maintain and sustain an external mask or personality that the something which is behind it, that which persists continuously may sound through, or manifest. The "I am I" remains; the Ego is always on guard. Nevertheless, no less a theologian than the renowned Francis Wayland in his University Sermons, warped by the dogmatic influences of a system of anthropomorphic inheritance from medieval teaching leaves this for young preachers in this scientific age to assimilate:

"We conceive of the Deity as an actual existence, an infinite being, whom, by the analogy of language we term person."

In other words, in common with too many of the dogmatic men of "the cloth" who have not acquired the scientific method of reasoning, the individuality, that stubborn persistence throughout all nature, is ignored, and "person" the most shifting thing known, composed of ever-changing mobile atoms is used as a type to give an idea of God. On this reasoning the clothes make the man. The overcoat of nature, i. e. its vesture, in its physical manifestation, the great sounding-board can serve as the orthodox idea of a personal God.

Professor Max Muller who has translated the Sacred books of the East, had investigated the inner meaning of all religions by the comparative method, endeavored to educate the thinking world on this point. The following extract attests his insight by the scientific precision gained by more than a half century of diligent study:

"We are told that what distinguishes us from all other

living beings is that we are personal beings. We are persons, responsible persons, and our very being, our life and immortality, are represented as depending on our personality. But if we ask what this personlity means, and why we are called *personae*, the answers are very ambiguous. Does our personality consist in our being English or German, in our being old or young, male or female, wise or foolish? And if not, what remains when all these distinctions vanish? Is there a higher Ego, of which our human ego is but the shadow? From most philosophers we get but uncertain and evasive answers to these questions, and perhaps here, in the darkest passages of psychological and metaphysical inquiry a true knowledge of language may prove our best guide."

It is to the true knowledge of language that the Theosophist will wish to be guided, and those who think for themselves are rapidly arriving at the conclusion which forced itself upon the consciousness of Max Muller who declared that he was a believer in the atman, or soul-in-itself, the monad soul; he believed in a "thinker of thoughts" a "doer of deeds," a Self within the person, and he further declared that he may have been the reincarnation of an ancient Hindu.

This perceiving inner self, as the Theosophists believe, is the carrier of the personality or mask; the counter-part in idea, though the same in essence is the carrier of all, the Higher Self, which is Divinity, or Deity, or God, in that aspect, and therefrom arises the saying of the ancient religion —"I am That; That too art Thou"; and from this well known teaching, the Christian Fathers easily understood, as the better scholarship of the future must, the true interpretation of the expression, "I and my Divine Source are one."

But there is much to learn before a full grasp of the above can be attained. Man in the generic sense is not strictly the same as deity. A divine principle, rather, manifests itself in man. The conscious Ego, which distinguishes man from the animal is the Fifth Principle—Manas, the

vehicle of the divine Monad or "God." This compels us to seek the origin of the word "Man," not homo," or "vir," or any other term incorporated from languages subsequent to the old Sanscrit.

Man is derived from Manas, a Sanscrit word, meaning to think. Therefore, man, in the strictest sense of the term, is the Thinker. This Thinker is the Individuality, that which stubbornly persists. It is the self-conscious part of man; that which distinguishes him from the animal. But, as man has animal in him as well, the thought of the Eastern scholars saw fit for classification, to denote man as a septennary being, giving clear definitions and meanings to each of these seven Principles.

1. The Physical body, which in its chemical and mechanical aspects differs but little from the animal structure, Same nitrogen in the tissues, same calcium in the bones, same iron in the blood. The physiology of modern science covers the realm of investigation on this lower rate of vibration of the human structure.

2. The Etheric, the finer stuff in the interstices of the body; too fine to be detected with the microscope as yet developed, but logically consistent with the stated proposition of science that no two particles of matter can touch. Therefore the spaces between the particles cannot be set down in thought as a vacuum.

3. The Vital, the pervasive force which animates everything that breathes and lives, from the lowest organism to man.

4. The Animal Soul, or, in the terminology of the East, Kama, which means desire. All sentient existence is governed by this principle, and sad it is to relate, that man, who should have evolved above animal desire should still, as a rule, be functioning on the lowest vibrations of this plane. So materialistic has become some departments of scientific thought that one scientist in Washington defined "soul" as "conscious desire strong enough to induce active

effort for its satisfaction." This definition, however, if rightly construed, may serve good purpose on higher planes. for when evolution has carried all men to where many are now adapted, to an aristocracy of mind, a caste of brain activity, and above the greed of avarice in its brutal and animal propensities, then man, functioning on the mind plane, can yet retain the scientist's definition and be a soul of "conscious desire (for better things) strong enough to induce active effort for its satisfaction."

The four Principles above enumerated, constitute the Personality of Man, and they are designated in Theosophical literature as the Quaternary, because of their fourfold aspect. The symbology of the East was ever at one on this thought of the fourfold aspect of man, the four equal sides of a pyramid, all rising at an even slope to an apex.

The three higher principles which complete the septenuate are called the "Triad," the "Trinity," and the Immortal aspects of Man. The lowest of the three makes the fifth in the scale and is called Manas, and Manas means Thought, the Thinker, the Mind, the Knower, and all terms which have a relative bearing to man as a self-conscious being. In the course of evolution as taught by the sages of old, self-consciousness did not appear until this plane had been reached. It is this Ego, which is held responsible for all the sins committed through, and in, every new body or personality, or mask. This fifth Principle is the real individuality, or the divine man. As it sows so shall it reap. It is this Individuality which is the force within, the spectator, the witness, the "doer of deeds" the "thinker of thoughts" which Max Muller believed in, and he was not an enrolled Theosophist. It is this Ego which engraves its character principally upon the corporeal mask. The inner form characterises man also in his face. "As a man thinketh so he is." For the internal being is continually laboring to manifest itself outwardly. Each individuality acts out its quality and impresses it upon the personality, or mask. The

will of the individual creates, for the will in motion is force, and force moulds matter. Thus, Emerson is enabled to say:

"As a man thinketh so is he, and as a man chooseth so is he, and so is his nature. A man is a method, a progressive arrangement; a selecting principle, gathering his like to him wherever he goes. He takes only his own out of the multiplicity that sweeps and circles around him."

In the school in which St. Paul studied it was taught that man's body is the work of the force within, and that Nature as manifested, the vesture of the Almighty, was the expression of the great force, the Great Breath which impelled it forth ,the Great Oversoul, and this deanthropomorphizing conception is reaching to the better thought of our own day, for the late Professor Brinton of the University of Pennsylvania wrote in his "Religions of Primitive Peoples":

"The idea of the World-Soul manifesting itself individually in every form of matter from the star to the clod is as truly the belief of the Sioux Indian or the Fijian cannibal, as it was of Spinoza or Giordano Bruno. I repeat, wherever we find the divine, the spiritual agency, set forth in myth or symbol, creed or rite, we find it characterized by two traits; it is of the nature of the human mind, and it is the source of ultimate power. Who dare measure the height and the depth of this intelligence? It draws its knowledge from sources which elude scientific research."

The Sixth Principle is denominated Buddhi, the spiritual soul. It means in the esoteric teaching of the East the same as the "Christos" of the Greeks, and the Mahatma of the Sanscrit. Other languages have terms corresponding. It is the direct vehicle of pure spirit. It is the plane of enlightenment. The great teachers of the world have been, according to the belief of the Theosophist, fully conscious on this plane.

The highest principle is Atma, the Higher Self, neither your spirit nor mine, but like sunlight, shines on all. It is the universally diffused divine principle, and is as inseparable from its one and absolute super-spirit, the

Great Unknowable, as the sunbeam is inseparable from sunlight.

With these short definitions, as compared to the longer interpretations in many Theosophical books, it is not to be wondered at that Marcus Aurelius could sincerely say:

"Let your soul receive the deity as your blood receives the air; for the influences of the one are no less vital than the other. For there is an ambient, omnipresent spirit which lies as open and pervious to your mind (Manas) as the air you breathe into your lungs."

Professor Max Muller quoted an incident which well illustrates the marked distinction upon which Theosophists dwell:

"There is a Sanscrit verse which an Indian friend of mine, a famous Minister of State sent me when retiring from the world to spend his last years in contemplation of the highest problems: 'I am not this body, not the senses, nor this perishable, fickle mind, not even the understanding. I am not indeed this breath; how should I be this entirely dull matter? I do not desire, no, not a wife, far less houses, sons, friends, lands and wealth. I am the witness only, the perceiving inner-self, the support of the whole world, and blessed."

The profound meditative thought of the Eastern sages forever hugged nature; their similes and metaphors were clothed in language which conveyed directly the full and deep meaning of their utterances. In the attempt to teach those below them in intellectual development, this description of Man is of record in one of the ancient Sanscrit books:

"The body is a chariot, the bodily powers are the horses, and the external world is their field. The mind is the reins, the Soul is the charioteer, and the One Self is the lord of the chariot.

"He who is ignorant, with mind not firmly held, his bodily powers run away with him, like the unruly horses of a charioteer. He is impure and gains not the place of peace.

"But he who is wise holds firm his mind; his bodily powers, like well ruled horses, do not run away with him:

he has wisdom for his charioteer, he is forever pure, and he gains the end of the path, the supreme resting place of the emanating Power."

The Hindu Upanishads teach that "according to a man's deeds and acts thus he becomes; he whose deeds are evil becomes evil; he becomes holy through holy works and evil through evil works."

St. John on the Isle of Patmos, a student of the ancient esoteric lore, breathes the same lesson in the words:

"He that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still."

And a philosopher of more modern date wrote:

"Whate'er thou lovest, Man,
That, too, become thou must,
God, if thou lovest God,
Dust, if thou lovest dust."

Professor Ladd of Yale University has emphasized the idea of the inner perceiver, the Knower, in his Psychology:

"It is an undoubted fact that the mind [soul] has a history in each individual case; and in each case such history is a development. This self-recognizing unity of development which belongs to the mind is a striking proof of the validity of its claim to be considered a real being. As the being which acts and knows itself as acting, which is acted upon and knows itself affected, which is the subject of states, and itself attributes these states to itself, which develops according to a plan and so remembers and comprehends the significance of the past states that it can recognize the fact of its own development—as such a being the mind [soul] is more entitled to consider itself 'real' than to consider real any of the various objects that, immediately or indirectly, appear before it in the course of its history."

The materialistic critic asks the Theosophist, "Have not animals souls?" The answer is, that the teachings of the ancient sages fall into line with the conclusions of modern psychology on this point. It is granted that the enunciations from the Chairs of Psychology are received by the best scientific thinkers, and that the study of mind in animals, usually called Comparative Psychology, and the study

of mind in the lower races of mankind called Ethnic Psychology prove that animals have all the kinds of consciousness man has, though not so highly developed. The difference is in degree not in kind, and the ancient teaching goes farther, in declaring that in due course of evolution animals will become men. But here a distinction must be noted. The animal soul, the Personality, differs from the Human or Divine Soul. Only Man, the Thinker, is conscious of the Spiritual Nature. He is the being which is denominated the self. Man is self-conscious in his individuality. The animal is conscious on the plane of collective existence as yet. The nature which man manifests as the outcome of his Animal soul grows out of his passions and desires and tastes and impulses rooted in bodily needs or processes. Animals share this nature in common with us, for they possess bodies, and etheric, or lower psychical matter, vitality, and a nature created by desires and needs. Thus man is conscious of disharmony and discontent. St. Paul struggled with this double nature; the modern thinker is engaged in an attempted solution of the problem and has decided tentatively, at least, that the lower nature is the brute left over in him. The Theosophist offers an explanation by presenting more fully than these pages can afford, the essential difference between Personality and Individuality. To understand the full scope of the teachings relating thereto would involve all that has been written by ancient and modern investigators on the doctrine of Evolution, to explain the growth and development of the Personality, and all that was known, or at least, all that has been recovered of the Esoteric lore to present the doctrine of the origin of man. For the wisdom of the East, not contradicted successfully by the schools of the West, tells us that we cannot understand or even think of anything in nature of which we have not some correspondent within ourselves. If this outline is too severe a stretch into Cosmic law, and it may frighten a few who dread to study too

severely, let them be content at least with a view presented by Rev. Lyman Abbott:

"What am I and what is my destiny? Not what I am now, still less where did I come from: but what are the possibilities within me, and what the light that beckons me on to an illimitable life? What will be evolved out of me when the work of growth is over? That is the real question. If the Christian Church had spent half the time in studying the problem how it could get on, which it has spent in debating the question whether it came from Adam or not, it would have made much further progress than it has. Evolution is the development of any object toward the fulfilment of the end of its being, and by a force residing in the last analysis upon what is the power within me."

The Theosophist asserts that the Individuality is that force within,—the Knower, the Thinker, essentially Divine.

Goethe, in his elaboration of what he calls the "stubborn power of permanence in whatever has once possessed reality, or individuality" is paralleled in a more concrete argument by Faraday, who proclaimed the indestructibility of individual substance:

"A particle of oxygen is ever a particle of oxygen—nothing can in the least wear it. If it enters into combination and disappears as oxygen; if it passes through a thousand combinations, mineral vegetable, animal; if it lie hid for a thousand years and then be evolved, it is oxygen with its first individual qualities."

It is the individuality which in all the domains of nature is constantly seeking to manifest itself in all the varying forms known to science. A study of this perpetual change of form and that of inequality in the forms, is the study of the personalities, the masks of the physical world. As a logical result, the great teachers of old, the most rigid of evolutionists in comprehensive scope and minute detail, embodied in their thought, that assuming the immortality of the individuality, there is no escape from the conclusion that the only way in which an endless existence can be lived in a universe of perpetual change of form, from planets to atoms, is through the successive embodiments of the divine

essence in human and even in higher forms. On this reasoning, in the higher thought of antiquity, which was Theosophy or Atma-Vidya (soul knowledge) or Gupta-Vidya (cave knowledge) or any other label for a group of ideas, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was founded. It becomes of interest, therefore, to attempt an explanation of the idea of soul.

CHAPTER IV.

SOUL AND SPIRIT—THE DISTINCTION.

With a half column of agate type in Webster's dictionary to define Soul, and a column and a half for Spirit, it is not to be wondered at that the "man on the street" is confused. Nor do the theologians aid the seach for truth. The scientists are divided, the more materialistic averring that properties of matter cover all that can be postulated on both soul and spirit, the more rational camp holding tentatively the deductions only, of Psychology, as manifested by Psycho-Physiology—functions of matter again.

The Theosophical books, as a rule, copying the teachings of the Wisdom Religions of old, give some comfort, but the outsider who has heard naught since youth but the explanations of partisan preachers will find but little to aid in the general Theosophical definition: "Soul is a vehicle of consciousness." While this will stand for a serviceable explanation in a class-room where for years earnest pupils have sought to reach the hidden truths of arcane wisdom, it does not satisfy the more practical work-a-day citizen of this intensely active epoch. Soul *is* a vehicle for consciousness as thus defined, but we move to amend, and state that soul is a vehicle for a higher consciousness, for the soul itself is consciousness, and is self conscious of that consciousness. It is because it is self-conscious that it is designated as a human soul, and thus distinguished from souls of a lower plane of consciousness.

But with all the confusion which arises from the abstruse disquisitions which have emanated from theologians,

especially since the days of the Scholastics in the Middle Ages, when they labored long and earnestly to decide how many souls could stand on the point of a needle, there have been clearer minds, with scientific method of thought, and others with bold intuitional reaches, buttressed by facts gleaned from observing the rational and moral order of the universe, who have given us an insight into what may be considered the realities.

Prof. Clerk Maxwell, one of the keenest scientific intellects of the nineteenth century was wont to interrupt the too long and verbose explanation of some intricate problem, as presented by his questioner, with the emphatic query: "What is the go of it?" Given that one cue, and Maxwell would build an hypothesis and then demonstrate it mathematically, and with that cue we venture to make clearer the explanation of soul, in accord with the thought of the East.

The "go" of a thing, is the soul of a thing, for things have souls. Prof. Denton wrote a fat-sized book entitled—"The Soul of Things." An impersonal concept has a soul, for it has a "go" to it, hence "the soul of an enterprise." A mass of souls has a "go," thus "an able general is the soul of his army." A personification of an attribute would in ordinary thought be conceived as the shadow of a shade of a substance, yet it has a "go" to it, for Shakespeare declared, "he is the very soul of bounty." So, "kindness is the soul of politeness"; "patriotism was the soul of the Revolution"; "Truth is the soul of science," because it is the "go" of it.

Of course, these quotations pertain to that aspect of soul which belongs to the animating principle or force of anything; and this idea of soul is not new to the thought of man, for the great Hermes Trismegistus of Egypt, inscribed: "Soul moves every entity. All things are full of soul, and all things are properly moved by that."

This "go" of things is not at all confined to man as a soul and the visible things animate or inanimate around

him. It becomes a fact in the higher realms, and a conception of the unity of man and nature evolves the same conclusion. Pope sought to make this plain by suggesting that this world seems to require the existence of a Power which co-ordinates all the activities of the Cosmos, if it does not actually create the forms in and through which these activities are displayed, and so he regarded the Universe as

"One stupendous whole whose body nature is, and God the Soul."

Emerson's Oversoul is but the reincarnation of the older and buried thought, for even before Anaxagoras and his "Treatise on Nature" 500 B. C., Heraclitus who had preceded with a work on nature, gave the same thought, when he postulated that every individual soul participated in the universal Nous, or Oversoul. Pythagaros, who had studied in Egypt (B. C. 586) said: "There is one Universal Soul, diffused through all things, eternal, invisible, unchangeable in essence like truth, in substance resembling light." In its innermost meaning, in the aspect of activity, or the *actus*, it was the "go" of the world, or the universe, or the individual man, or the animal, the plant, the crystal, the cell, the molecule, even the atom; all have souls.

But when we say the "go" of a thing there must be something to go—a goer. One implies the other, and a further implication arises in direction of the "go." It must be going somewhere, and must have come from somewhere, somehow. Platitudes do not clear the mystery. Voltaire may have satisfied his inner consciousness when he declared:

"There must be something within us which produces our thought; something very subtle; it is a breath; it is fire; it is ether; it is quintessence; it is a slender likeness: it is an intellection; it is a number; it is harmony."

All this pleads strongly for an intensified effort of our imagination to wrench the meaning from his similes. The

matter-of-fact reader would get a clearer conception from the Theosophical definition that "soul is a vehicle of consciousness; elemental when below the plane of self-consciousness; human when it reaches this plane; divine when it passes it." No shock to the doctrine of evolution here, and no strain on the thought of the liberal Christian.

Bruno, the last philosopher of Theosophic trend, who was burned at the stake four hundred years ago, elaborated a chain of reasoning on this point. The goer, the soul of a man, in his thought was a thinking monad. It stands midway between the divine intelligence and the world of external things. As a portion of the Oversoul it is immortal. Through all this reasoning, he was the forerunner of Spinozism. The monad of his conception need not differ from the beginning of a soul on this planet as held by Leibnitz, nor need it conflict with the postulate of Theosophy that every entity in the Universe either is, was, or prepares to become a man. All sentient life on this planet begins with instinct; all will end in Omniscience. This is the inevitable outcome of an evolution set forth in great detail in the Sanscrit literature.

The trend or direction of this go of the soul, while blurringly discerned in the apologetics of past centuries under dogmatic teaching, needs better exposition, more in line with practical thought. Thus, a soul converted, as interpreted by the sages of old is a soul set with a go in a new direction. The soul remains the same, the direction only is changed. Etymologically the word means a turn; con, with, and verto, to turn. What is it that is turned? Clearly the course hitherto taken. Not the soul, the essence itself. The turning in another direction sets a pace for some other destiny, hence, the preacher who, in the advanced thought of the day was turning or converting his own thinking faculties in a direction different from the rut of his professional brethren came close to the old thought:

"We talk of saving souls—we mean saving lives,"

and in the Theosophical thought, that is all the teacher and guide can save. He has no jurisdiction of the soul. That is beyond him, and the Eastern students have found better solutions for these questions than have appeared from our theological institutions. Another preacher in a recent contribution to a religious journal adds:

"Both pulpit and pew will grow in religious fervor when they become more concerned about truth than about souls."

Matthew Arnold caught the inspiration of truth when he said:

"For after all, the object of religion is conversion [in its literal sense], and to change people's behavior."

Now the behavior of a thing is the go of a thing, and the only thing that can be changed. The soul is a birth from afar, a part of the oversoul, and in its essential and fundamental make-up antedates any system of religious thought now on this globe, if the best reasoning of the great minds of all ages is not all astray, all perverted. If, however, the soul was a manufacture out of nothing at birth, the Theosophist loses his standing in court.

Charles Johnston, M. R. A. S. of the Bengal Civil Service, Retired, and the "Prize-Sanscrit Scholar of India," has caught the finer force of interpretation in all his translations, and has fed the Theosophical literature with the delicate shading and strong vigor of coloring here and there, which have entirely escaped the more pedantic philologists. In his "The Memory of Past Births," p. 29, is the following:

"The true inner teaching of the East is so different from this, so much higher than this, that its would-be interpreters have often failed to grasp it altogether, and have fallen into one grotesque mistake after another, as a result of this failure. We must try to gain some firm hold of this great principle, or all our further studies will be in vain. We must first try to understand and constantly keep in mind that the Eastern doctrine teaches that the *soul of every man is already perfect, and perfectly endowed with all its infinite powers*, being one with all other souls in the

highest life; so that no growth is possible for the Infinite; nor any gain thinkable for that which is the limitless all. What we can do is, not to add to the powers of our souls, but to come to some perception, dim and vague at the first, of the tremendous powers our souls already possess. We are not the patrons of the soul; and all its magical powers, to develop this, and call out that, as the humor takes us, and at last to turn the whole into a means of complacent self-glorification. We are rather humble beneficiaries of the divine Life; quite unable to save our souls, which need no saving; yet, by great good fortune not debarred from the possibility that our souls may save us. The soul of each of us, through its own inherent and divine nature, already stands above the ocean of birth and death, above time and space, above pain and sorrow."

Bearing in mind that the word Man is derived from the Sanscrit Manus, to think, Theosophy is warranted in denominating man as "The Thinker." This Thinker is the fifth Principle of the sevenfold being. How came it into maifestation on this planet? By due course of evolution. What are its component parts? How is it constituted? Refer back to the ancient stanza quoted from the Book of Dyzan:

"The spark hangs from the flame by the finest thread of Fohat (Energy, that Infinite Energy from which all things proceed).

"It stops in the first world of Maya (change), and is a metal and a stone." Here, the law of crystallization must be guided by the Great Breath which sent it forth, and the Theosophist recognizes this in the charming manner by which Ruskin taught in the "Ethics of the Dust." Atma, the Seventh principle, Spirit, is pervading it, as it pervades everything, like the sunshine, good and evil alike; like the water which flows through the sponge, and through all marine life.

"It passes into the second, and behold—a plant; the plant (i. e., the directive agency in the plant) whirls through seven changes and becomes an animal."

During all these shifting manifestations a soul is observable to the mind's eye, for there is a "go" to each.

And now comes the point of contact overlooked by modern evolutionists:—

"From the COMBINED ATTRIBUTES of these, Manu (man) the Thinker is formed."

No missing link here, and this not in a carping sense against the laudable endeavor of science to find a missing link in organic structure, in the form developed by growth in the long process of the organic evolution of man as one of the mammalia, the animal soul of Theosophy, the fourth Principle, governed by Desire, for desire is the animating force, the soul of that Principle, the "go" of it.

Man, then, as the Thinker, is formed of *attributes*, and not according to the materialistic-cabalistic formula—CHON—carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen, the fundamental elements which constitute protoplasm. Even such a man, whether viewed as a machine after the studious explanation of Prof. Thurston of Cornell University, or as a chemical compound according to others, or as a product of forces which are termed vital by another school, or as a unit of force, a dynamic center, by the camp of thought which resolves all to Dynamism—even such a man would have a soul, the animal soul,—Kama,—of the Theosophical thought, and this soul would be the "go" of such a man. But the "attrbutes" which make man—the Thinker, are yet wanting and must be accounted for. The animal soul is not paramount in its sovereignty. It may claim its "state rights," but it is subordinate to the federated whole. Every atom in Theosophical thought has a soul of its own, its "go." When these atoms are grouped to form molecules, each molecule has a go, a soul. When these are combined into cells, there is a federation of all below, but tissues are formed which lord it over all, and these again are synthesized into organs, each with a soul or "go" of its own. The animal man federates all below, and the organs are all compacted to make an organism, of which the five senses are the channels or approaches to its environment and to its

inner center. But the attributes of Man, the Thinker, remain unreckoned with. Can this be made plain to the reader as the Theosophist understands it?

A scientist whose writings on the functions of matter which appear to us as mind, brain products merely, "gave himself away" when discussing attributes, by declaring that science knows nothing of attributes. As a kindergarten lesson he chose sugar. Science can determine something of its molecular groupings, its atomic weights, its chemical ingredients, but when all is done, it is found that sugar is sweet. Sweetness is an attribute. He admits that Science can give no explanation why this attribute should appear as the real, distinguishing characteristic, that which really makes it sugar and nothing else in our concept. So with lead, in another primary lesson. Science can give no rational explanation as to the attributes of these products of Nature, yet so-called teachers undertake to enlighten the world with their materialistic views on the most complex structure known in the world, Man, the Thinker, and solve the problem by stating that the action of force on matter accounts for it all.

The oldest school of evolutionists, the sages of the East, have had these thoughts in their minds for the past ten thousand years and more. Weighed against the conclusions of some of our so-called savants who were oblivious of the gigantic proscesses transcending the province of the senses, until Darwin's Origin of Species appeared, or Lamarck and Goethe, and Emerson before him had evolved the broad generalizations, they are puerile. These aphorisms, formed by the Eastern students, by uniformity of experience, are easier of apprehension, more logical in deduction, and more satisfying to the aspiring mind.

How did the Thinker get these attributes? If the combined attributes of all below are centered in the highest product—Man, by what course of procedure were they enabled to thus combine? The Sages of the East are very

elaborate in the explanations. There are differences, to be sure, even in the esoteric works which are not given to the public. But it will suffice to say that the Oversoul held all that any unit soul can possibly possess. This unit soul, this monad, this Ego, this Individuated portion of the essence, was the spark which hung from the great reservoir of Energy as allegorically outlined in the stanza from the Book of Dyzan. If the Oversoul had it to give, the unit, a "spark" could have it. It could have it, according to the Eastern Wisdom, when it had reached a capacity for receiving it.

When Maj. Powell teaches us from his scientific point of view that the first organized bit of protoplasm is endowed with "motility and awareness," by which it can move, and yet be aware of how it should move, and this awareness is its knowledge of good and evil, he is trenching close on the enduring wisdom of the ages, but back of all this, the Eastern teacher would place the Infinite Spirit even in every molecule that bit of seemingly unconscious matter, for Spirit pervades all. And the "awareness" would involve even at this early stage in the process, the full play of all the psychical attributes which the tiny starter on the pilgrimage upward on the wheel of necessity was capable of exercising, and no more. There were attributes, however, even in that start, beyond the ken of the microscope or the grasp of too many of our dogmatic evolutionists.

But to have attributes, something must carry them. Where was the carrier, the vehicle which bears them along? Will a conglomeration of principles or attributes, by the mere power of cohesion move along and preserve identity? According to some translations from the old teachings we are asked to believe just that, and that Prince Gautama, the Buddha, taught such a doctrine, that there is no Atman, no Self, no Ego, no continuous "I am I," no persisting individuality, merely a cluster, a grouping of intangible results which at the end of a life makes up a sum total, and this sum

of attributes begins in the next life just where the last sum left off. The books are full of exhaustive treatises on this vexed question, but to the Theosophist who aims to adhere closely to the essentials of the school, what matters it? Whether an Ego, or a bundle of conceptions, the essential fact remains in both of the conflicting schools, that they must reincarnate again to win perfection; that the law of Karma recognized by both schools will compel this pilgrimage; and that when the pilgrimage is ended, the Perfectibility of Man will have been reached. The Six Systems of Indian philosophy are agreed on these three essentials.

Lord Kelvin in his desperate attempt to evade the seeming miracle of life in the organic world coming out of the inorganic material, suggested that possibly a germ of life might have been transmitted from another planet snugly wrapped in the moss covered recesses of a meteoric stone. Given one germ, and all the rest would naturally follow. Weismann's theory of the one germ which has transmitted through cells all that now lives would be abundantly fortified, and the consequent deduction that all life, all cells, have a part of the life of that one spark by cellular transmission. This argument is available for the Theosophist when touching the Third Principle, Life—the Vital principle, but not for the soul. How would the great principle of individualizing be accounted for—the integration forever manifesting, no two alike, nor can they be made alike?

Lord Kelvin's hint is valuable, to say the least, as compared to the theological theory that matter as we sense it on this planet, was created out of nothing. The one germ enclosed in a meteoric stone gives a start in a new direction, but it is amplified in the larger thought of science. See Smithsonian Rep., 1895, p. 198:

"Prof. Newton has attempted to form some estimation of the number of such aerolites, and he comes to the conclusion that our atmosphere receives the enormous total of some 20,000,000 meteorites per 24 hours, each of which is

large enough to produce the phenomena known under the name of the 'shooting star.' However small these fragments may be—and yet in order to become visible because of the heat evolved by friction against the atmosphere, they cannot be so very minute—they certainly bring to our planet a considerable amount of foreign matter, a large proportion of which remains some time suspended before falling."

If they "bring to our planet a considerable amount of foreign matter" is it any strain on the scientific consciousness to think that other things, not labelled "foreign matter" can also be brought, especially when we take it for granted that the Universe is spun of the same stuff as revealed by spectrum analysis? Equally so, when our planet is given all the chance to pick up on its travel of 33 millions of geographical miles, which our solar system traverses annually. How many miles have been traveled during the 60 million years, which is the latest of Lord Kelvin's computations for this earth, and he has changed his estimate three times during the life of the author of these pages?

In the world of mind as in the world of matter, as the Theosophist believes, there can be no life, no soul, no "go" of things where there are no energizing and active influences at work. These energizing and active influences transcend the spectroscope, yet are real, in Nature's Finer Forces, or, as the Sanscrit describes that particular domain and activity in the Cosmos, "The Tattvas," (the science of the Finer Forces). Attributes are accounted for in that science. They may not be the last word in the world's great thought, but they afford more satisfaction to the student than can be derived from a study of materialism. These attributes have one common origin as therein taught, and are so directly related and naturally dependent that they can be reasonably resolved to their one source, and possess equivalents of power in their normal action as real as can be shown in the doctrine on the physical plane—the Correlation of Forces. They came from One, they return to One, is the ancient teaching. The original nebula held the es-

sences, the potentia of all attributes, from which all individuation proceeded. These seeds of true humanity have come and gone, and will come and go again as will stars and suns and solar systems, and universes until the purpose for which they were impelled is accomplished. They were sent forth, each with a soul, and a go to each as that aspect of activity which is forever associated with the soul. What are some of these attributes? The things desirable in the higher aspirations of man. What else so desirable as the attributes of devoutness, which no animal soul can possess in this round or cycle; or wisdom, or magnanimity and peace? or nutritious thoughts and sanative sentiments; religious veneration for great and good men and heroic masters in virtue, and the great Teachers of all ages, all climes; the recognition of the best in all better lives as so much redeeming leaven.

Again, Man the Thinker exercises the prerogatives of his attributes in the search into the earth's history, in the study of Nature's laws, in investigating the system of the Universe, in judging of right and wrong, in himself and in others. Did these attributes evolve by due course of organic evolution? These attributes, which together with many not enumerated, are the credentials which Man, the Thinker, holds to prove his kinship with the Divine in the Universe. The exaltation of Man in the direction, the go, of his higher nature is the proof that Man is not what the materialistic scientists choose to postulate him by a working hypothesis, which in its organic aspect contains great truths, but which is but part of the truth when measured with the teachings of the oldest evolutionists in the world. The present existence of Man is but a link in the chain of eternity which enables him to say, I am, I always was, I always will be. I and my divine source are One. I came from that, I shall return to it.

Theosophical literature embraces many of the allegories of the East regarding the Hierarchies of Beings who

assist in the development of all the Principles—the Seven, of which man is the fulfilment. Many students of the culture take these allegories literally, forgetful of the fact that an allegory is that which says one thing but means another as Max Muller stated it. Allegories are for teaching purposes. Yet, they carry the soul of truth, the go of truth. Whether superior beings are to be termed "Lords of Light," or Dhyans-Choans, or "Sons of Wisdom," or "Sons of Mind" or "Manasa-Putra," or any appellation found in the Esoteric lore of old, they all convey a teaching which warrants a belief in Powers or activities transcending our plane of being. Herbert Spencer gives a hint of this when discussing Law:

"Though we can never learn the ultimate nature of things, we are learning more and more their order of manifestation; and this order or manifestation we call law. There is a law inherent in the primordial substance of all matter which obliges all things to evolve after the same mode or manner. The worlds in the infinite abyss are in all respects similar to the cells in vegetable or animal tissue. Wherefore, by the study of the natural sciences, the truth may be learnt, not only in regard to these but in regard also to the occult sciences for the facts of the first are as a mirror to the facts of the last. And just what the spiritual Ego is to the physical man is God to the manifest universe, its spirit, dwelling in and pervading it; no more no less."

Acting on this chain of reasoning many Theosophists depend not so much on the hierarchies who are supposed to control or guide, but on the law under which they act, for they reason that these superhuman beings are but the children of the dense infinitudes, obedient to the law as are we.

Prof. Huxley is quoted frequently on this line of thought because of the following extract which is taken from his letter on the "Three Bishops":

"For our earth is an insignificant particle of the solar system, while the solar system is hardly worth speaking of in relation to the All; and, for anything that may be proved to the contrary, there may be beings endowed with full

powers over our system, yet practically as insignificant as ourselves in relation to the universe. If any one pleases, therefore, to give unrestrained liberty to his fancy, he may plead analogy in favor of the dream that there may be, somewhere, a finite being, or beings, who can play with the solar system as a child plays with a toy."

Combine the thoughts as expressed by both Spencer and Huxley, and the germ of insight is displayed which gives rise to the idea that immortals such as the masters in the world's history continue to exist; that they have not lost their compassion for the human race, for they are part of it; that they are the great souls, or in the language of the East, the Messiahs, the Christs, the Buddhas, the Mahatmas, for all these mean the same, Maha, great; Atma, soul.

And Darwin left for reverent consideration the following (Life and Letters, vol. 1, p. 282):

"Believing as I do that in the distant future man will be a far more perfect creature than he now is, it is an intolerable thought that he and all other sentient beings are doomed to complete annihilation after such long, continued, slow progress."

Therefore, the Theosophist is justified in looking forward to the goal, the Perfect Man,

"The one far-off, divine event
To which the whole creation moves,"

as Tennyson has so gloriously expressed it.

To define Spirit as distinct from Soul, the teachings of the East are explicit and fascinating because of their simplicity. Spirit is one and indivisible. It is not *mine* nor *thine;* nor can it be so rendered in the thought of the sages. It pervades everything. Each thing in Nature partakes of its share of this all-pervasive force according to its capacity. Elisha Gray gives an apt illustration:

"When a photographer trains his camera upon an object, however intense the light may be, and however clear-cut the picture that is thrown upon the plate in the camera, unless the plate is properly sensitized so that the picture may be impressed upon it, all the other conditions are in vain."

So with the action of Spirit. The Theosophical thought has always taken the sun and its rays as a metaphor. It was used by the Rishis of the Vedic period; by the Achi-u, (the manes or Saints of Egypt); by the philosophers of the Vedanta; by the Sufis (the descendants of the Arifs) the learned Arabian sages, by the Magi, the wise men of the Zoroastrian learning; by the Gnostics and the scholars of the Alexandrian University, and its rival seat of learning, the school of Pergamos; by the German school of mystic thought; by the Cambridge Platonists, and by the modern Theosophists.

As the light grows, power grows with it. The sun was but the emblem of that power. The amoeba can take but little; its capacity is small. Man, the complex product, can take much, his capacity is more. It must be assimilated; it cannot be individuated. The sunshine pouring into my room is not my sunshine; it belongs to all; but it can be assimilated to good purpose, and therefore the allegory is carried to beautiful imagery in the Orient of the Soul as a vehicle of consciousness, the bearer of it; the assimilator, the digester.

The sponge is another metaphor in Theosophical teaching, and for teaching only. The water, representing the all-pervasive spirit, flows through it. The sponge, if gifted with speech cannot say of it, it is mine or thine. It flows for all. But the sponge can do something with that portion which flows through its tiny chambers. It breathes it in and takes even the air which the water contains and all the substances in the sea water which are for its own good. Man can do no more in kind, though greater in degree. This is the keynote to spiritualizing the lower realms of nature.

The Sanscrit word is Atma (spirit), and means, because of its all abounding supply, breath as well, to interpret the Great Breath. It is the Seventh Principle in Man, the highest on the rung of the ladder. "It goeth where it

listeth." Hence Paul's division of man in his threefold aspect, body, soul (psyche) and spirit (pneuma). The usage of an utilitarian age has applied it to pneumatics, because it takes from the all surrounding environment its force. It is the *Christos* of the higher archaic thought, the seventh Principle, if anything. From it comes the ray of "light which lighteth every man which cometh into the world."

As Whittier puts it:

"The Word which the reason of Plato discerned,
The Truth at whose symbol the Mithra fire burned;
The Soul of the World which the Stoic but guessed,
Is the Light Universal the Quaker confessed."

This light, the ray from the Absolute is that Power all pervading, "not ourselves that makes for righteousness." It is as immanent in the soul of the Universe, or the soul of the world, or the soul of man as is the power of gravity in the cosmos. In it "we live and move and have our being."

In the philosophical text books the opposite poles of manifesting substance are termed Spirit and Matter. The strict Theosophical school prefers to eliminate the conjunction "and" and to designate it as Spirit-Matter. At their ultimate they are but two aspects from a common source and one as sacred and holy as the other. Spirit reaches to the farthest, remotest atom of matter; matter sublimated, reaches to the farthest rim of spirit force. Matter is as incomprehensible to the mind of man as spirit. In the polarity of things, according to the Eastern school, both are present in everything. Soul stands midway as a vehicle. The development of the individual soul (not in essence but in function) is but a small fragment of the Oversoul. The development has been along fixed lines. No new material has been created. That which we hold was involved in Nature from the beginning. So that, in connection with the growing Theosophical thought that the human soul, with its attributes, comes from Divinity, and returns to the Infinite when its mission is fulfilled, by successive reincarnations,

there is also the deeper thought that it was never torn away from Divinity but by man's own choice. It was a losing of the way, the right "go." The bridge was not broken but rendered invisible for a time by the darkness of passions and desires engendered by the wrong tendencies and habits of the flesh. Hence the old adage in Eastern thought, paraphrased in the Scripture of Christianity, borrowed almost word for word from the old Sanscrit, and born from the meditations of pastoral and shepherd life.

"We all, like sheep, have gone astray."

CHAPTER V.

REINCARNATION.

After more than a quarter of a century's discussion of the doctrine of Reincarnation, brought about mainly through the literature of the Theosopical societies, it no longer appears singular in the world's thought. But inquiries beset the advocate of this old teaching; the busy man of the day asks: "Is Reincarnation paralleled in Nature?" And, again, "if we have lived before on earth, and are to return, upon what principle or law in the Cosmos is the process rooted?"

The Theosophist refers the seeker to the Second Postulate of the philosophy which came from the East:

"The eternity of the Universe, in toto, as a boundless plane, periodically the playground of numberless universes incessantly manifesting and disappearing called the "manifesting stars' and the 'sparks of eternity.' The appearance and disappearance of worlds is like a regular tidal ebb and flow, of flux and reflux. Herein is postulated the law of cycles, alike applicable to atoms or suns, *to individual man* or to solar systems."

Whittier caught the inspiration of this old teaching, and in more than one of his poems the central idea may be discerned. Here is one:

"And India's mystics sang aright,
Of the One Life pervading all,—
One being's tidal rise and fall
In soul and form, in sound and sight,—
Eternal outflow and recall."

If worlds reappear and disappear to reappear again by a re-forming of the original atoms as astronomy teaches,

(for nothing can be lost,) the Theosophist is justified in adhering to the universality of law.

The spectra reveals the threads of nebulous matter and embryo suns, which must succeed older planets, all cumulative proof that there is no special creation; that this applies in the moral as in the material sphere; that the fundamental unity and the subservience of all things and concepts of things, can be resolved to a law, which, if it operates anywhere, operates everywhere. It is the reign of law, the immutability of law.

"Behold, I snow you Truth! Lower than hell
Higher than heaven, outside the utmost stars,
Farther than Brahm doth dwell

Before beginning, and without an end,
As space eternal and as surety sure,
Is fixed a Power divine which moves to good,
Only its *laws* endure."

And on those laws, emanating from that Power (for antecedents of a super-physical kind are required) the Theosophist pledges faith, though always with large insistence on the ethical as rooted in the physical, to account for the logical necessity for man to appear and disappear, and appear again, the evolution onward until perfection is gained, to be accomplished through self-induced, and self-devised methods after having attained to self-consciousness.

Even so strong a reasoner as the late Professor Huxley gave utterance to the following:

"None but very hasty thinkers will reject it on the ground of inherent absurdity. Like the doctrine of evolution itself, that of transmigration has its roots in the world of reality, and it may claim such support as the great argument from analogy is capable of supplying."

With full accord to Professor Clerk Maxwell's declaration that all science is but a disclosure of analogies, it is legitimate for the Theosophist to state that there is more of analogy in nature to sustain the doctrine of Reincarnation than can be found in favor of any other proposition which

seeks to enlighten mankind on the grave problems connected with Man and his destiny.

Professor Max Muller, acknowledged for more than a half century as one of the leading thinkers, said:

"Personally I must confess to one small weakness. I cannot help thinking that the souls toward whom we feel drawn in this life, and that the souls who repel us here, we do not know why, are the souls that earned our disapproval, the souls from which we kept aloof in a former life."

Sir William Crookes, probably unequaled in the scientific world to-day as a discoverer as well as a teacher, believes it as in conformity with the law discerned by him in all departments of nature.

Camille Flammarion, the great astronomer of France, and, more properly speaking, of the world, admits the reasonableness of the doctrine over any other yet proposed as the solution of a profound problem.

The best of German philosophy is suffused with the idea. Schopenhaur, who boldy declared that he gathered his light from the Upanishads of India, was as strenuous an advocate of reincarnation as can be found in modern times.

Lessing, Hegel, Leibnitz, Herder, Fichte, the younger, and a long galaxy of German scholars of the present day are in harmony on the problem.

Many of the strongest points in its favor can be found in the writings of Goethe, wherein he set forth his arguments in favor of what he calls the "stubborn power of permanence in whatever has once possessed reality."

Faraday's opinion quoted before can well be afforded repetition here, to disclose another point of view for he was proclaiming the "indestructibility of individuality:"

"A particle of oxygen is ever a particle of oxygen—nothing can in the least wear it. If it enters into combination and disappears as oxygen; if it pass through a thousand combinations, mineral, vegetable, animal; if it lie hid for a thousand years and then be evolved, it is oxygen with its first *individual* qualities."

In order to make clear to the reader who has not the time to compare the authorities quoted, how the processes of Nature are harmoniously acting together, the great with the small, one item in the make-up of the chain of reasoning should not be lost sight of, viz.: How can anything which belongs to this world get away from it? If we postulate the "eternity of the Universe *in toto* as a boundless plane" we must at the same time postulate its sovereign unity. What's in it must stay there; it belongs to it.

If we posit again, that this eternal Universe as a boundless plane is "periodically the playground of numberless universes incessantly manifesting and disappearing" the old matter is worked over, as a logical sequence, and to the initial impulse,or the first vibratory thrill, or first Great Breath, as you choose, nothing is added, nothing is taken away. Modern science will sustain the Eastern student of Physics is this particular.

If again, from one of these fresh universes thus impelled forth, there is flung off as an individuated portion, a solar system, (and there are many thus far flung in space,) each takes its own; keeps its own; holds its own to its own work.

If, now, a solar system flings off an individuated portion of itself making a world of its own, as is our sphere, it brings its own with it, and holds it until the purpose is fulfilled, or "filled-full," as the old Saxon had it. A given amount of energy came with it; it stays with it; it will go out with it, but while functioning in its sphere of influence all is here. Nothing gets away so far as Science or reason can enlighten us. Only in the domain of a decrepit theology can we find things leaving, and they, the souls of mankind, a small contingent going to heaven, the overwhelming majorities going to hell.

Take the air we breathe. It carries both life and death as one, and only one, of the many agents for that very purpose. It is in a state of flux and reflux as stated in the Sec-

ond Postulate, now supporting life, and now destroying it as a dangerous poison; but it is all here, and will stay, though transmuted many times. In the words of J. B. Dumas:

"The plants owe their existence to air, and animals could not exist without plants. The air that lately gently fanned our faces is the sum total of all life that has been, it is a myriad of lives; it is those who preceded us; it is the dear dead for whom we mourn; it is now a part of ourselves, to-morrow it will proceed on its way, going through incessant metamorphoses, passing from one organism to another without choice or favor, until the time comes when our planet shall die and the substance of all that was life shall return to the cold earth, a gigantic grave that will revolve in silence and desolation through the unfathomable depths of the darkened heavens."

Could any quotation from Science more emphatically demonstrate the soundness of the Second Postulate of Theosophic Philosophy?

Take again the solid foundation of the earth on the surface of which we exist. The new continents are built out of the ruins of older sedimentary deposits, and it is even legitimate to say scientifically that these continents are reconstructed from the ruins of an old planet. At least, the point taken is sustained, that nothing belonging to this earth has been allowed by any law now in our scientific cognizance to escape. Even the new races are fed out of the decomposition of the foregoing. Life evermore feeds death; death in turn feeds life; both stay here as part of the wise economy of the Inscrutable Purpose. The lands now forming in the Lower Tertiary are fed from the washings of the protruding Paleozoic rocks, even the Archaen foundations. All here under transformation, and obeying the law of re-embodiment, which is the parallel of re-incarnation; the former applying to natural domains below man, the latter, as its name indicates—a re-fleshing, a re-coming into a fleshly existence:

"The dust we tread was once alive," and our scientific text-books teach us that almost every par-

ticle, albeit invisible to the naked eye, still retains the organic structure which, at periods of time incalculably remote, was impressed upon it by the powers of Nature as living proof that all is here; none has escaped to Mars or to any other land of parks, commonly called Paradise—and even this word came from an older thought, an older race, the Persians, whom we were wont to call "pagans."

The sea, too, holds its own. Seemingly, it gives in response to the sun's demand a part of itself, but the transmutation is only too apparent in the end, as it is throughout all visible Nature:

"Stars sweep and question not. This is enough
  That life and death and joy and woe abide;
And cause and sequence, and the course of time,
  And Being's ceaseless tide.

Which, ever-changing, runs, linked like a river
  By ripples following ripples, fast, or slow—
The same yet not the same—from far-off fountain
  To where its waters flow

Into the seas. These steaming to the Sun,
  Give the lost wavelets back in cloudy fleece
To trickle down the hills, and glide again;
  Having no pause or peace.

This is enough to know, the phantasms are;
  The Heavens, Earths, Worlds, and changes changing them,
A mighty whirling wheel of strife and stress
  Which none can stay or stem."

Turning now to the lowest activity known to man, that which manifests in what modern science calls inorganic matter. The germs of all are at the outset like each other to the ordinary vision, but in the process of development each germ acquires, according to Eastern teaching, at marked epochs in its time, or "rounds" if the technical terminology of Theosophy is insisted upon, the differential characteristics of the sub-kingdom to which it belongs.

Whether these processes are in charge of higher entities, or hierarchies of beings assigned to such overseeing, let each Theosophist decide for himself. The real point at issue is to prove by this development, that each germ will re-embody, or reincarnate- as the case may be, according to law, which is not violated from the amoeba to man. Force is never lost in the inorganic world and it is never created in the organic world, but it is here on earth, for the earth's sake, and will not get away without law to warrant it. It will re-embody, aye, even as a manifestation of energy, it will reincarnate.

As a typical illustration of the stubborn power of permanence in whatever has once possessed reality, let the following scientific experiment serve to show, how small spores in the vegetable kingdom can hold their own, and re-embody (or reincarnate in their own manner of tissue) after the struggle of six years soaking in alcohol, which in ordinary thinking would have destroyed every vestige of individual force or power in each:

In May, 1895, I recorded the fact (*Botanical Gazette*, 20 : 229) that the spore fruits of *Marsilia quadrifolia* had so completely excluded 95 per cent. alcohol that both microspores and megaspores from them germinated freely, although they had then remained in the alcohol continuously for almost three years. It may be of interest to record further that when, in April, 1898, the last of the material gathered in the summer of 1892 was used up, no diminution in the vitality of the spores was apparent. Vigorous normal prothallia were grown from them in great numbers. The sporocarps had thus kept out alcohol for almost six years.—*Charles R. Barnes, The University of Chicago.*

If these insignificant (relatively speaking) vegetable entities could hold their own for six years, and resist the external assault of the alcohol in which they floated, is it any strain upon the scientific consciousness to make a demand for the reappearance of Man, his reincarnation on earth, when as a dynamic center of force he surpasses in individuality any known entity on the globe?

The claim that grains of wheat found in the Pyramids of Egypt have germinated after 4,000 years of rest may not be accepted as conclusive by all scientists, some alleging that we have no positive proof of such power of re-birth into the vegetable world for a period over two hundred years; but whether for two, or one hundred, or fifty, or ten years, the principle here contended for is the same—the stubborn power of permanence of the wheat; wheat it was, wheat it must be again, according to the second Postulate, for the principle applies to kernels of grain as it does to "atoms or suns, to individual man or to solar systems." We cannot think intelligently without admitting the great law of the Conservation of Energy, and its logical sequence, the Persistence of Force, since the postulate that force can arise out of nothing or can lapse into nothing is a "verbal proposition which we can by no amount of effort translate into thought," and at the end of every demonstration whether wheat or man we reach a conviction, the truth of which is centered in an axiom: "All that is in the world will stay in the world until the planetary plan is fulfilled.

Re-birth and re-life must go on till their purposes are accomplished. Nature does nothing by leaps. Anything which in our thought suggests a possible future equally as well expresses an achieved past by a continuous effort, though forms may differ. A thing is different from another because it has been differentiated, yet they are identical in a more general aspect. If we recognize the One in the Many we do not thereby refuse to admit the many in the one. The "flux and reflux" of the Second Postulate is forever at work. The words are as true to-day as they were long ago, when uttered by the Sage of Koheleth:

"One generation goeth and another generation cometh; and the earth abideth. The wind goeth toward the south and turneth about unto the north; it turneth about continually in its course, and returneth again to its circuits. All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the

place whither the rivers go, thither they go again. That which has been is that which shall be, and that which hath been done is that which shall be done. There is no new thing under the sun."

All tidal ebb and flow, flux and reflux again. And all in this world. As Emerson puts it:

"When I talked with an ardent missionary and pointed out to him that his creed found no support in my experience, he replied: 'It is not so in your experience, but it is so in the other world.' I answer: 'Other world! There is no other world. God is one and omnipresent; here or nowhere is the whole fact.'"

And man is here; here to stay until perfected, if the wisdom of the ages is to predominate over a superficial and unscientific theology.

Indirectly, strong proof is oftimes given to the doctrine of Reincarnation when it was not so intended. A case in point is that of the ingenious chapter by Henry Drummond on Conformity to Type. He was endeavoring to apply what Darwin called the Law of Unity of Type, to his theory of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and had quoted Huxley at the microscope, showing that at the start, the apple which fell in Sir Isaac Newton's garden, Newton's dog Diamond, and Newton himself, began life at the same point, because there could be detected no difference between the sets of germs, vegetable and animal, or between oak and palm, worm and man; all start in life together, no matter into what strangely different forms they may afterwards develop, no matter whether they are to live on sea or land, creep or fly, swim or walk, think or vegetate,—in the embryo, or protoplasmic form as it first meets the eye of Science, they are indistinguishable.

As Huxley has stated it, "Protoplasm, simple or nucleated, is the formal basis of life," and Huxley was more largely quoted by Drummond:

"Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle, and the plastic matter undergoes changes so rapid and yet so steady and purposelike in their succession that

one can only compare them to those operated by a skilled modeller upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions, until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules, not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. * * * One is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion, that some more subtle aid to vision than an achromatic would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skillful manipulation to perfect his work."

Drummond pursues the thought and adds that "the artist is not working at random, but according to law. He has his 'plan before him.'" One artist makes all the dogs, another makes all the birds, "a third makes all the men" [the forms of men, he ought to have said]. Moreover, each artist confines himself exclusively to working out his own plan. He appears to have his own plan somewhat stamped upon himself, *and his work is rigidly to reproduce himself.*

No better reasoning according to the teaching of the East could have been given on the facts, but Drummond may have been thinking deeper than his readers imagine, for he admitted emphatically that Emerson was the first to teach him to see with his "mind's eye." But to go further with him, take the following:

"What goes on then in the animal kingdom is this—the Bird-Life seizes upon the bird-germ and builds it up into a bird, the image of itself. The Reptile-Life seizes upon another germinal speck, assimilates surrounding matter, and fashions it into a reptile. The Reptile-Life thus simply makes an incarnation of itself. The visible bird is simply an incarnation of the invisible Bird-Life."

Could anything be more corroborative of the doctrine of re-incarnation? Of course, the visible bird, if simply an incarnation of itself (as with the Reptile-Life) must be a recombining of a former force of the same kind. Drummond was hardly able to ignore the broad doctrine in science of the conservation of energy and the persistence of force, as the following will show, though he used the argument to fortify another point of view:

"We should be forsaking the lines of Nature were we to imagine for a moment that the new creature was to be formed out of nothing. *Ex nihilo nihil*—nothing can be made out of nothing. Matter is uncreatable and indestructible; *nature and man can only form and transform.* Hence when a new animal is made, no new clay is made. Life merely enters into already existing matter, assimilates more of the same sort and *re-builds it.* He must have a peculiar kind of protoplasm, a basis of life and that must be already existing. Now he finds this in the materials of character with which the natural man is previously provided."

If Drummond's entire chapter is carefully analyzed there will be found a desperate effort on the part of a Scotch Presbyterian to be scientific at the same time he enunciates a doctrine of his creed which is unscientific and this one error is what caused the thinking world to assert almost unanimously that the book labeled "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," was as great a failure as any attempt of the kind that had ever been exploited, though the aspiration of Drummond was sincere enough.

In the able work of Professor E. B. Wilson of Columbia College, New York, "The Cell in Inheritance and Heredity," there is disclosed by the microscope wonders which eclipse in interest to the Theosophist all the fables of Arabia. A bit of protoplasm, the size of the point of a pin, is discovered to be a small universe with its central, animating, star, (for it shoots out rays) called the Centresome. This small planet traverses its circuit, circling other bodies scattered about like other planets, called the chromosomes, and these in turn float about in a liquid something which may be likened to our all-pervading ether as postulated by modern science, or the Akasa, as defined by the scholars of the East, called in this newly-discovered cell, "the liquid in the meshes," kept in by delicate mesh work called the protoplasmic reticulum, all surrounding the contained matter, scattered in this revealed space. The nucleus is a large body, and the nucleolus is inside the nucleus, another small

universe within the larger. But the mathematical accuracy of nature commands our reverence. These small planetary bodies, the chromosomes in that cell, always appear with precise accuracy, twenty-four to the lily and kindred plants, and sixteen always to man or ox, and to many of the order of mammalia. No chance here; thorough system in the reappearance of life. Every cell carries with it these wonderful characteristics, and the unfolding of this miniature solar system, as told by Science, is as fascinating as the astronomical dissertations on our larger system. Yet, with all the research in this direction, Prof. H. W. Conn, of the Chair of Biology in Wesleyan university, closes his excellent little handbook, "The Story of the Living Machine," with the following paragraph:

"The great problems still remaining for solution, which have hardly been touched by modern biology in all its endeavors to find a mechanical explanation of the living machine, are, therefore, three: First, the relation of mentality to the general phenomena of the correlation of force; second, the intelligible understanding of the mechanism of protoplasm which enables it to guide the blind chemical and physical forces of nature so as to produce definite results; third, the kinds of forces which may have contributed to the origin of that simplest living machine upon whose activities all vital phenomena rest—the living cell."

With all due deference to the Professor who is established in a university the name of which—"Wesleyan"—indicates its professed thought, we humbly submit a method of thought begotten of "pagans" who spoke Sanscrit and who studied on the gravest problems of life for centuries, who have never been excelled on certain lines of thought. They labeled this system the "Tattvas" which means "Nature's Finer Forces." In this branch of their scientific thought they dwelt on the "kinds of forces" alluded to above, and in their conclusions they would not, though "pagans," use these words: "the mechanism of protoplasm which enables it to guide the *blind* chemical and physical forces of nature;" and in that same

esoteric school, though it may not be final, or the last word in the consciousness of individual man on the Universal Mind, they have offered a rational, consistent and all-comprehensive solution of the problem of the "relation of mentality to the general phenomena of the correlation of force;" and wider yet, in the amazing sweep of comprehension they posit these activities, the "Tattvas," as operating in Nature through Reincarnation. They would not lose sight of the self-evident truth that Nature shows no favor to the great over the small. Sirius is but a segregated portion of Cosmic matter, as is the radiant star labeled the Centresome (sometimes called "mother star") the one-hundredth part of the point of a cambric needle; or the ultimate atom, whether an actual particle of matter or a simple vortex of motion "the fifty millionth part of an inch" as Lord Kelvin estimates it. The scientist has ceased to discriminate between the great and the small. The telescope seeks out the larger, the microscope the smaller. All are dominated by law; all accord to their functions with the second postulate of Theosophy; all ebb and flow; all disappear to reappear; "With the outgoing Breath forms appear, with the indrawing Breath forms disappear" is the old Eastern teaching. It is the oneness of the Greek concept, the Theos, not the manifested Zeus. It establishes the same thought that the supreme effort of the One is to evolve conscious life out of the misnamed "inert material." This is by the method of the A U M of the Sanscrit Formation, Transformation, Reformation, upon which the whole structure of Reincarnation is founded, the three working aspects in Nature's great laboratory, and brooded over by a higher power above the physical, all emanating from the ONE.

The religious aspect of the great problem merits some attention. The candid and self-investigating pew-worshipper asks in good faith: "Why has this great truth been concealed so long from the religious consciousness? When

revelation came to us by the church, or by a book or a creed, or a ritual and prayer book, why is this all omitted?"

The Theosophist gladly accepts the challenge to defend his position. The fact that a belief in Reincaranation is now spreading over Christendom, proves the very heart of the doctrine. It is simply reincarnating itself as truth once more, in the minds of men, without the aid of paid propaganda, or organized institutional support. It was the belief of early Christendom. It was afterward anathematized by the Church then dominant. It was crushed, but "Truth crushed to earth will rise again," and this is merely stating Reincarnation by an accepted aphorism.

In the year 553 A. D. at the Council of Constantinople the anathema went forth. Please observe the date carefully. It was past the middle of the sixth century, the date which Alison's history of Europe assigns for the Dark Ages, or Middle Ages, already well set in. The archaeologist can restore the thought of that day with astounding accuracy of likeness to the original. And this restoration is true in its scientific fidelity, as literally true as in the restoration of even the humdrum life of old Nippur, through the discoveries of Prof. Hilprecht, of the University of Pennsylvania; as substantially true as the restoration of insect life from the mud deposits of one million or two million years ago, found fossil, engraved, as it were, upon the rocks or embedded in their hard mass.

The social nature of the people of Christendom in the year 553, when Theosophists were officially ordered to go to hell because of their belief, together with the religious consciousness of that date are as open to the archæologist as is the organized structure of an animal or a plant to the comparative anatomist. It is as easy to reconstruct the then sociological conditions as it was for George Ebers to give us a picture of the splendor of Pharaonic times in Uarda; or a representation of Egypt under the Persian Empire, in "The Princess"; or of the Hellenic period under

the Ladiges in "The Sisters," of the early growth of Christianity under the Roman Empire in "The Emperor," or of the anchorite spirit in the deserts and rocks of the Sinatic Peninsula, in "Homo Sum."

Gregory Nazianzen, a saint, as designated in Church terminology, who studied in Athens for ten or twelve years (ending in 356) only thirty-one years after the Council at Nice, was presiding officer of a Council held in that city. This is what he said of the chosen delegates of Christian thought at that early, and relatively, that pure period:

"I have never known an assembly of bishops to terminate well. They strive only for power. They behave like angry lions to the small, and like fawning spaniels to the great. It would seem as though a herald had convoked to the Council all the gluttons, villains, liars and false swearers of the Empire. I will never sit in one of these assemblies of cranes and geese."

Yet the Council over which he presided was relatively respectable compared to the gathering of 553. The Archæologist discloses a greater decadence in that time than we can historically state of Spain's retrogression covering the same length of time, of late history. The accelerated speed which had characterized the backsliding of spiritual advisers was shockingly manifest. It was bad enough at the first Council, as Dr. Momerie states, "when Constantine himself was disgusted at the conduct of the theologians who claimed to be under the immediate control of the Holy Ghost. It was worse at a subsequent Council, and on a parallel with the best efforts of modern Tammany, when the bishops first on the scene tried to get the vote taken before the other bishops could arrive. It was still worse at the third of these deliberate assemblies, afterwards nicknamed the "Robber Council," when the Right Reverend, the Bishop of Constantinople, knocked down and trampled on the Right Reverend, the Bishop of Alexandria, and kicked him till he died."

The picture of the later period, 553, for dissoluteness, debauchery and filth in personal conduct excelled them all, for the environment condoned such actions on the part of holy men set apart for religious purposes. It was a matter of course, and so established by archælogical research that they were not only the gluttons and villains and liars Gregory had dubbed them, but they openly brought to the Council City their mistresses and courtesans, warranted presumably by the scriptural record of good and holy men of old who had concubines. And this Council served notice officially on the Reincarnationists to proceed to hell or abandon their belief in the preexistence of souls. For fear that there may yet be Theosophists who have not been personally served with such notice, the author, without court fee will perform the function of deputy:

"If any one shall teach a fabulous pre-existence of souls and the consequence of this, a monstrous restoration (or rebirth) let him be accursed."

To make quite sure that this is the exact wording of the anathema, Mr. George M. Coffin, late President of the Theosephical Society in Washington, D. C., exhibited a letter from the Jesuits' College of St. Francis Xavier, of New York, giving a translation of the original as above with the following in parenthesis:

"First canon against Origen of the Fifth Oecumenical Council, the second of Constantinople, A. D. 553, from Denzinger Enchiridian, p. 73, Niceburgi, 1865."

Dr. L. Mosheim, in his "Church History," London edition, 1819, Vol. II, p. 135, says: "The tenents of Origen which gave most offense were: 1. The pre-existence of souls which Origen considered as sent into mortal bodies for the punishment of sins committed in a former state of being. 2. That the torments of the damned will have an end."

It had been the teaching of Plato a thousand years before the gathering at Constantinople. Plato had studied in

the East. Pythagoras before him disseminated the same teaching, and he, too, had traveled East. The atmosphere of Alexandria, the seat of the greatest university known at the beginning of the Christian era, was surcharged with this philosophy which taught Reincarnation as the only consistent method of accounting for conditions as they existed. The students of the Hillel school of Jewish thought and the thinkers of the school of Gamaliel deliberated upon the plan and proclaimed their belief in it as we can now prove by archæological authority. The thought had entered into the Aramaic dialect as is attested by recovered literature. Its plausibility had filtered even to the orthodox minds of the peasantry of Palestine as proved by Scripture. When Herod heard of Jesus he said: "It is John the Baptist whom I beheaded in the prison." Others said the Nazarene was Elias who had been dead for hundreds of years but whom the peasantry believed would come back.

Gibbon, the historian, who had followed the trail of this thought into the belief of the people, wrote:

"The Jews were persuaded of the pre-existence, transmigration and in the immortality of souls, and providence was justified by a supposition that they were confined in their earthly prisons to expiate the stains which they had contracted in a former state."

Cicero alludes to the doctrine frequently, and let it be remembered in passing, that Cicero had been initiated into the solemn Mysteries and had acquired a knowledge of the principles which pervaded the Esoteric philosophy recognized by the Masters of Wisdom in those guarded retreats, or "Lodge-Rooms," as the more modern citizen of our civilization would term them.

Caesar informs us that it was believed in by the Gauls, who, he says, in this faith were able to despise death.

Seven-tenths of the people on the globe believe in it now, and the accessions to the ranks of the "Reincarnationists," as some people in church circles flippantly designate

them, are amazing both as to number and influence. There are thousands of unenrolled Theosophists to one who is on the roster, who adhere to it. There are able defenders of the principle who know nothing of Theosophy, nor do they seemingly care to. The arguments percolate from the press in all directions because of the logical necessity of the case, that if a soul is to be immortal, it must have preexisted. A beginning here at birth and an immortality hereafter as postulated in theology is unthinkable.

As an instance of the growing importance of the thought, Mr. Orlando J. Smith, President of the American Press Association, who knew nothing of Theosophy by personal study and who had never devoted time to an investigation of the culture, wrote a book which flooded the market at the small price of 25 cents called "Short Views of Great Questions" wherein the logical deduction by inductive reasoning made the doctrine of Reincarnation more practicable, and more easily thinkable than can be found in the published efforts of any Theosophist of our day.

But a word of caution to the reader of this excellent production is in order. Theosophists do not agree with the author's idea of transmigration of souls into animals or insects. The old doctrine of Metempsychosis was elaborated by priestcraft as have many other doctrines been thus formulated for the purpose of preying on the minds of the ignorant by force of fear. The clear teaching of Theosophy is, that no backward course is taken in the orderly trend of evolution. Having reached the human estate the progress is as through a swing-door which opens but one way. Man having reached man's place in Nature takes the stand for weal or woe. He is the chooser of his own course. It may be backward or forward. He cannot stand still. It is the law of Reversion to Type in Nature. And on this principle Drummond wrenched a meaning to suit his theological aim, and lost in

the attempt. It is true that he enunciated a Theosophic as well as a true Christian point of view when he stated.

"If a man neglect himself for a few years he will change into a worse man and a lower man. If it is his body that he neglects, he will deteriorate into a wild and bestial savage—like the de-humanized men who are discovered sometimes upon desert islands."

But let it be emphatically understood that Theosophists are good to animals. They, too, have souls. The beasts below us are too good to be condemned to receive the souls of de-humanized men. The teaching of the Sages, not the priests, held that thoroughly evil human souls bereft of all spiritual ties, by atrophy and non-user of privileges through repeated reincarnations, extending over a long series of milleniums, in order to give the Ego every possible chance, to kindle the last glimmering spark of the inner light, are doomed to Avitchi, which is a loss of individuality; the loss of the stubborn power of permanence; out of tune with the Infinite, and resolved back into the whirl of original atoms. Nothing is lost. No annihilation, simply a reforming into the originating centers of force to pass a long pilgrimage on the round of necessity. But the poor animals, themselves on the way upward in the course of evolution and soon to be men, are not to be inflicted with the most dangerous element in nature, the souls of intellectualized brutes. Apply the wise saying of a modern thinker: "The more I see of dogs, the less I think of men."

Where Drummond failed, according to the Theosophist's point of view, was wherein he stated that which is diametrically opposite to the older and purer teaching. He makes man come into the world at the start, a depraved being. The Theosophist claims that he comes originally and always, essentially divine. If he becomes otherwise, it is all in the becoming. But let Drummond be heard:

"The Bible view is that man is conceived in sin and

shapen in iniquity. (We know that is the Bible view, and hence we are Theosophists.) And experience tells him that he will shape himself into further sin and ever deepening iniquity without the smallest effort, without in the least intending it, and in the most natural way in the world if he simply let his life run."

The Theosophist holds a different view of the "most natural way." Nature put him here in a natural way, and if he had conformed to Nature and Nature's laws he would have been acting in the "most natural way." It is because he acts in an unnatural way that he gets into trouble, and as he is self-conscious and possessed of the power of choosing he must pay the penalty—make his own Karma—his effects from causes. A prominent Methodist preacher whose name is known over the continent throughout the sphere of influence of that denomination said but a few years ago in a sermon, justifying the doctrine of total depravity, that "babes born into the world are devils in bud." The Theosophist answers that they are "gods in embryo." The two schools cannot function on the same mental plane with such fundamental opposites to start from.

Recurring again to the prevalent misconceptions of Theosophic teaching concerning Reincarnation, the indiscriminate interchangeability of the words "Transmigration" and "Metempsychosis" need passing notice. When the definition of the former was coined years ago, for Webster's Dictionary, quoting Sir T. Browne, born 1605, that transmigration meant:

"The passage of the soul as an immortal essence at the death of the animal body it had inhabited into another living body whether of a brute or a human being,"

the reading world was not as familiar with Sanskrit translations as now. It is but three quarters of a century ago since able dissertations issued from Christian publishing houses declaring that Buddha must have been the Egyptian

Bull-Apis. Sir William Jones was as equally certain that he was no other than the Scandinavian Woden. It is only since 1837 that the first translations were made concerning Buddhism, by the deciphering of the rock-cut edicts of Asoka the Great in Garnar by the archaeologist, James Pramsep. In 1844 the first rational, scientific and comprehensive account of the Buddhist religion was published by the eminent scholar, Eugene Burnouff. Since then, a long list of authorities figure in presenting this old faith each from his own point of view, but H. Dharmapala, of Ceylon, stated publicly at the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago that to two agencies the better understanding of Buddhism is due—Sir Edwin Arnold's incomparable epic, "The Light of Asia," and the Theosophical Societies. And during the past quarter of a century these Societies have had a rigorous task in endeavoring to correct the far-spread misconceptions concerning Reincarnation.

Transmigration and Reincarnation are not synonymous terms. Man reincarnates in man only, never to beasts or lower orders.

Metempsychosis, the other variant can be traced by the archaeologist to priestly (not prophetic) teaching. The Standard Dictionary, relied upon at present by scholarly seekers, gives place to this quotation from C. W. Hutson's "Beginnings of Civilization":

"The Hindoos originated and elaborated the doctrine of metempsychosis, or the transmigration of souls, a sort of erratic and morally judicial evolution."

Degraded Hindoos, crafty priests, it is true, formulated such teachings in order to dominate the ignorant, but the true Hindoo is, and ever was, far from believing such a plan in the cosmic process. Many Christians believe that a Jewish brigadier stopped the sun to allow him time for a few more whacks at the other fellows, but the cultured citizen of modern thought would hardly dare confess that he believes it, or ever did think it probable.

The action of the Council at Constantinople deserves investigation from another point of view, and one not frequently alluded to in the brief treatises on reincarnation, issued in an argumentative strain, viz., the motive behind the action. The subject of the pre-existence of souls had been before the church advocates for time long prior. The anathema of 553 was considered really the ending of the subject, not its beginning. As there cannot be a feud running over stretches of time without two parties to the quarrel, so here, the Archaeologist can enter with firm tread.

Virgilius was Pope, his accession dating 537 A. D. He was succeeded two years after the Council by Pelagius I. To count backward a hundred years, without giving all the Popes in line, we find St. Hilarius ascended to the seat in 461. That one century is sufficient for the purpose, though agitation on the subject is found prior to that date. Large bodies move slowly, especially the great corporation embodied in Roman Catholic symbolism. Organization began, practically, with Constantine in 325. The great compromise had been fitting itself to conditions, or, as the scientist would say, struggling to conform to the new environment. The vast machine was in fair lubrication when Hilarius began, but minor questions were always in order and the pre-existence of souls was in the category of such questions. As an institutional church, more than a means for the betterment of men's ways, everything must conform to the institution. The Roman—the ethnic—impress was over all; the State, the institution, was all, the individual nothing. Here we strike the dominant key note, the vibrating influence which controlled action. An institutional church could not live where individuals believed and taught that they had lived before; that "each life the outcome of the former living is"; that man saves himsélf by his own effort; that priests and mediators have no control over the forever onward pilgrimage of the soul which was seeking its own per-

fection, impelled by the great law of Karma, which cared nothing for Popes, priests, prelates or councils.

With this emphatic issue before the contending parties, we take this thread to guide us through the maze of warring words which preceded the curse launched forth in that epoch of ignorance that swamped Europe for a thousand years, sweeping away philosophy and science as so much enmity to the great machine. If it could be believed that Paul meant it when he said: "Whatsoever a man sows that shall he reap," the man—the individuality, is the one concerned. If he must come back to earth to do the reaping, the glittering rewards in the materialistic heaven are nullified. Then, as now, serious minds believed that:

"Who toiled a slave may come anew a Prince
For gentle worthiness and merit won;
Who ruled a king may wander earth in rags
For things done and undone."

Could it be possible to hold a huge machine together with such ideas current? The very delegates to that august body might reap in another life their sowing in gluttony by starving in the slums. Justice ruled, according to the "Reincarnationists" of that day, and it is even now held that if priests knew more of justice in the rational procedure of the Cosmos, they would crave less for pardon.

It was believed then, as now, that

"Within yourselves deliverance must be sought;
Each man his prison makes,"

and that "Man hath no fate except past deeds.

"Higher than Indra ye may lift your lot,
And sink it lower than the worm or gnat;
The end of many myriad lives is this,
The end of myriads that."

The Institutional church was patterned after the Roman Empire in its administrative and legislative functions. Initiative was throttled. All must think the same, as the

institution orders. Alison, in his History, states that a nation that thinks all one way does not think at all.

And modern theologians of all sects have not improved radically from their early conceptions of importance to the church as an institution over all. When Mrs. Annie Besant, the Theosophist, after deserting the church in which she was raised (Episcopalian), had floundered in bleak materialism, still struggling for a better light, she sought the Rev. Dr. Pusey, and said, after a long discussion: "I must find out for myself what is true." The Doctor replied: "It is not your duty to ascertain the truth. The responsibility is not yours, so long as you accept what the Church has laid down for your acceptance."

It was a broad chasm which separated the believers in Reincarnation from the theologians who sought to throttle them, and the chasm is still unbridged, the reasoning on each side is as of old. The deep thinkers who followed the teachings of the Sages, the philosophies of Plato, of Pythagoras, of Thales, argued as does the author of "Short Views of Great Questions":

"Justice cannot be built upon a foundation of injustice, nor morality upon a foundation of immorality. If God or Nature has created one man good and another bad. then God or Nature has been unjust. If God or Nature has created a vicious, base or depraved creature, then God or Nature has been immoral. The creative theory has been the blunder of the ages. It has set man wrong in all of his eternal reckonings. It is as though the whole of our arithmetical calculation were based on the presumption that one and one make three. Justice can be established only upon one theory—that the soul of man is pre-existent, and after-existent, immortal and eternal. This philosophy alone maintains the responsibility of man, the freedom of man and the dignity of the soul of man."

The writer of the above quotation, as before said, knew nothing of Theosophy as a system of thought when he issued his remarkable book, but he reasoned for the dignity of the

soul of man, the individuality, as did the champions who were cursed by the institutional church in 553. And his reasoning warrants another selection for the very reason that he is not an enrolled Theosophist:

"Man will forever be what he makes himself. His follies and vices are his own; his strength and goodness are his own. From the awful responsibility of himself he cannot escape. Suicide cannot kill him; death cannot destroy him. No ritual, ceremony, fasting, confession or repentance; no imploration, prostration or sacrifice to the gods; no form of faith can save him. He has no friend at court; no attorney can appear for him. The Law works silently, constantly. * * * Man need not grovel or abase himself. He is older than the city of Rome, older than the Pyramids, older than the Koran or the Bible, older than any book ever written or printed, and he will survive them all."

Let it be understood that the matter of history as set forth thus far herein is not an attack upon the Catholic Church as we observe it in our day in America. Far from it. Theosophists could not, in the face of their proclamation, that they are in accord with all who seek the betterment of men's ways, ignore the grand and noble departure of the modern church, its generous and earnest work for the humanities, its establishment of Father Matthew societies and its elevated spiritual teaching where educated and liberal priests have control. As it was but natural from their point of view for some of the Christian Fathers to believe in Reincarnation, so to-day, we find by observation that many Catholics endorse it, and even after the anathema it was not stamped out of Catholic Europe, for we trace it to the times of Bonaventura and Eregina and to the studious monks of all nations. And Christian thought is veering round to the very principles upon which Reincarnation is founded. even if an effort is made to keep shy of the pivotal essential that we come back again and again until perfection is reached, as witness the following extract from a sermon by the esteemed Cardinal Gibbons:

"All the works of God have striking characteristics. They all have the divine stamp of individuality. There are no stars alike in magnitude and splendor, there are no two leaves of the forest alike, there are no two grains of sand absolutely identical, there are no two human faces alike in the vast congregation before me, there are no two dispositions in all respects identical.

"Every one of you is a world to yourself. Every one of you has a separate existence and a special destiny. Each of you were created alone. You have a separate growth, a separate sanctification, a separate death. You are judged alone, you are punished alone. You are rewarded alone. There is no such thing as a vicarious birth, a vicarious growth, a vicarious sanctity, a vicarious death and judgment. Each one of you stands on his own foundation. What a man soweth that shall he also reap."

"*The Jewish Comment*," of Baltimore, in publishing the above, added:

"The last paragraph standing by itself would seem positively anti-Christian, and certainly enunciates sound Jewish doctrine."

The Theosophist will add that it certainly enunciates sound Theosophic doctrine, and serves to show the trend of thought of our great men. But those words could not have been uttered without protest at Constantinople in 553 A. D.

Resuming, now, the processes by which life can succeed life on this earth by re-birth. The most familiar object lesson given to children of the East is that of a thread, which stands for the continuity of existence—the individuality. On this endless chain are strung beads, each one representing a separate life, a distinct personality. The thread is the immortal self, the Reincarnating Ego; the beads the personalities, the masks, the outer covering of matter. The experience of each bead is assimiliated by the thread. It is the continuous entity that returns, life after life, to form new beads to form new coats of skin. At each return it is drawn by natural affinity to the race, family and environment suitable to itself; these forces in the plane of subjec-

tive chemistry working as definitely and surely as they do on the physical plane.

Does this conception do violence to scientific thought? Throw an acid into a standpipe tank of a hundred thousand gallons capacity, and let each gallon represent a solution of a thousand alkaline bases, and the acid will select that one, even if in the remotest corner at the bottom, and that particular one only for which it has the greatest affinity. Does not Science postulate orderly flying of atoms? The Theosophist simply believes that these small dynamic vortices are guided by the Great Intelligence, the Great Breath, and with the further insistence that they are a part of it; possessing the same intelligence, in kind, but not in degree, with potencies of more complex manifestations. When atoms group into molecules, the same rational order is observed. Each goes to its own. Each holds its own. Can we expect a paradox—that a Humboldt as a power of permanence, because possessed of marked reality, should seek affinity with a power almost wasted by atrophy, by non-user of faculties? Humboldt himself stated a broad truth which can be here appropriated: "Only what we have wrought into character during life, can we take away with us." What else could he expect to take? The force of the statement is apparent. The power "wrought" suggests the hammering into solidity by his own effort the experience of his own life. He had earned it by effort—the great law in evolutionary activity. It was his own; he and none other had any moral right to carry it over. Chance is eliminated. Voltaire had an insight into the justice of Nature's workings:

"I have consumed forty years of my pilgrimage * * * seeking the philosopher's stone called truth. I have consulted all the adepts of antiquity, Epicurus and Augustine, Plato and Malebranche, and I still remain in ignorance. All that I have been able to obtain by comparing and combining the system of Plato, of the tutor of Alexander, Pythagoras

and the Oriental, is this—Chance is a word devoid of sense. The world is arranged according to mathematical laws."

We have heard it said that what we are at the end of this life we shall be when the next begins. Could we expect that we should be something different? Plotinus amplified the reasoning of his day on this line and summed it up as quoted often by Theosophists: "The soul at death becomes that power which it has most developed." It became that power by the process of becoming, by individual effort. It persists because of the power developed. And Emerson accentuated the thought in one of his epigramatic flashes:

"He who would be a great soul in future, must be a great soul now." And again : "As we are so we associate. The good by affinity seek the good; the vile by affinity, the vile."

Why multiply quotations? There are exhaustive treatises on the one topic—Reincarnation, in the libraries. A recent canvass of the Professors in the chairs of the 144 colleges of India shows nearly a unanimous assent in the doctrine. A similar canvass of teachers in the institutions of learning in all other countries (including the Sufi Professors in Mohammedan colleges) exhibits an amazing preponderance in its favor, the German and French conspicuously so, and in the United States where chairs are held in conformity to the sectarian bias of the institutions there are found many who desire that their names be not quoted but who confidentially assert that this ancient thought is reviving in our consciousness and that it can be safely admitted that instead of working injury to conduct in life, it would foster motives that would act as corrective to many of the senseless predicates of dogma and creed.

For an elementary study, and for logical reasoning on the merits of the case, "Short Views of Great Questions" before referred to excels all, and it may again be enforced by adding that its greatest merit is owing to its disinterested

traverse of the theme, the author being outside of the culture.

The question is frequently asked, "Why do we not remember our past lives?" The sages teach, and to good purpose, that soul memory of the individual is not the brain memory of the personality, and they add that it is a blessing to humanity that we do not remember in detail. It is even taught in the Occult Science: "Kill in thyself all memory of past experiences." This is better teaching than that which implores the already burdened mind to "weep over past sins," in more practical parlance to "cry over spilt milk." *Nil desperandum* is the clarion blast from the teachers of the ages. The effects of past lives are registered in the Individuality and a vibratory thrill or current can awaken these registered points as naturally and as easily as the voice can be reproduced a thousand miles away and a hundred years from now, from the almost invisible dots on the cylinder of a phonograph. The voice itself was not preserved on that small drum; but the power is there and registered, to reproduce the spoken words when swept by a vibration which will awaken the tones of old.

Here the questioner interposes another problem: "If the persisting Individuality—this Reincarnating Ego as you call it, gets back to earth by rebirth, what law of Nature do you quote; what gravitating force pulls it back?"

To answer this consistently with our view of Cosmic processes according to the Sages, let it be stated again that the Individuality does not "get back to earth" for the reason that it never left the earth. A change of condition, a transformed state, a supersensuous (not a supernatural) modification of consciousness does not of necessity demand a separate place, another world, an outside pool, an up-aloft reservoir. The sphere of influence, the magnetic field, the zone of odic force, or the Aura, as you choose, of this globe holds its own, and all of its own, and its diameter surround-

ing the dense ball is very great according to Eastern Physics. The Oversoul contains all souls as parts of itself, and the laws governing the parts are its own, but it need not logically follow that centers of intellect, will, energy and power of self developed Egos, which in their individual totalities contain attributes of character rather than physical atoms, need to have assigned to them forms of energy which are usually classified under the broad generalization of Science as the Correlation of Forces. Gravitation as part of a great law may be applied to entities listed as material, but attributes do not come under such inductive research.

So, following the solution of this profound problem, as taught by the wise men of old, Desire, the dominating force which controlled the Ego, will still hold it and hold it until the all controlling force is refined or exhausted. Therefore Desire causes the rebirth; its own desire, and not the desire of any other than its own; not blind force, or fate, or chance. Each goes to its own; each comes to its own. Each belongs by law to its own. A single life on earth, one half spent in sleep, and nearly one third in development from the babe to strong consciousness does not appear to the Theosophist as sufficient to exhaust experience on the plane of Desire, even at its lower rate of vibration, its denser form, through which most of mankind are at present functioning.

"The Second Truth is Sorrow's Cause. What grief
Springs of itself, and springs not of Desire?
Senses and things perceived mingle and light
Passion's quick spark of fire:

So flameth Trishna, lust and thirst of things,
Eager ye cleave to shadows, dote on dreams;
A false Self in the midst ye plant, and make
A world around which seems;

So grow the strifes and lusts which make earth's war,
So grieve poor cheated hearts and flow salt tears;

So wax the passions, envies, angers, hates;
So years chase blood-stained years

And drugged with poisonous drinks the soul departs,
And fierce with thirst to drink Karma returns;
Sense-struck again the sodden self begins,
And new deceit it earns."

If the pulling power of Desire which calls the individuality to an awakening again on the physical plane by rebirth seems an enigma to a certain class of Scientific thinkers, let it be remembered that in their text-books on chemical energy, we are compelled to admit that attraction and affinity are both psychical names for forces of which exact science is agnostic as to their essential nature and origin. Professor Otswald, of the University of Liepsic, allows freedom of thought on all lines pertaining to the unseen by stating :

"The more perfect the theoretical evolution of the sciences becomes, the greater will be the scope of their explanations, and at the same time the greater their practical importance."

It is therefore as legitimate to reason upon the attraction and affinity of great passions, sublime purposes, singular pursuits and pinings for baffled longings, as it is to cover pages with speculations on molecular and atomic motions, stored and kinetic energies. These and similar terms have no life, no warmth, no real meaning for the mind of man unless they are "filled with the blood which an interpretative imagination supplies," as Prof. Ladd of Yale University puts it. And the same eminent authority declares in his "Philosophy of Knowledge":

"But if Science means knowledge then it is necessarily not of the merely subjective, but of the trans-subjective too; and the logically established system of existing beings, actual forces and real relations conceived of as occurring in time and space, and so forming necessary conditions of all human experience *is* the transcendant."

The above quotation is thrown in because it is well to inform some readers that Theosophists have been content hitherto with dealing in terms merely of the subjective as opposed to the objective; but when the trans-subjective is postulated by a distinguished Yale Professor of Psychology, the odium hitherto cast on us for transcendentalism is wofully weakened.

There yet remains to be considered the necessity of choice of the three schools of thought now contending for position.

1. The orthodox idea that man was made from nothing, but begins to inherit immortality from birth.

2. The materialistic declaration of cellular transmission: all came from an original cell, and generation succeeds generation through the cells.

3. The Eastern philosophy which stands for the immortality of the soul, the individuated portion of the Great Oversoul, and its persistence by reincarnation.

The latter is gaining over the first two even in their strongholds. The cellular transmission theory is weakening with the development of newer light in other branches of scientific research. As for the first—the orthodox theory, it is simply ruled out of court by all thinking men.

A quotation from a Christian minister, Rev. James Freeman Clarke (Unitarian) will express the thought prevalent at this time in many sincere minds:

"It would be curious if we should find science and philosophy taking up again the old theory of metempsychosis, remodeling it to suit our present modes of religious and scientific thought, and launching it again on the wide ocean of human belief. But stranger things have happened in the history of human opinion."

An inquirer asks to be cited to a declaration by Emerson on this topic. There are many of them, but the following covers his personal belief:

"We must infer our destiny from the preparation. We

are driven by instinct to *hive innumerable experiences* which are of no visible value, and we *may revolve through many lives before we shall assimilate or exhaust them.*"

An interesting phase of the doctrine of Reincarnation is noticeable in the points of contact exhibited by the archaeologists now in the far East bringing to light aspects of former civilizations, which have disappeared only to reappear and disappear again, cities under cities. Here is an extract from a letter to *Biblia*, a magazine devoted to archaeological research:

"Undoubtedly similarities exist between the works of archaic Greek art and those of Egypt and the East. But we always have to ask ourselves, in this case as well as in others when such similarities are made the ground for far-reaching conclusions, whether the similarities are not due to the likeness in the phase of civilization attained by the several peoples all of whom are possessed of the same nature in the physiological and psychological constitution of their powers, both of perception and of creation."

This point is not new in scientific thought; it has been touched frequently by students of anthropology and strong reasoning defends the position that contact or touch need not be set up as a plea that one necessarily borrowed from the other. Then the borrowing must be from the universal mind which enables the various peoples, on account of "the likeness in the phase of civilization attained," to produce similarities, to become possessed of "the same nature in the physiological and psychological constitution of their powers, both of perception and of creation."

For this very reason, Theosophists, who have kept pace with the reasoning of the best anthropologists, assert that to-day in America, Grecian thought which was suffocated by dogmatic Christendom is reincarnating because in our utter freedom we have attained to just that phase of civilization which can naturally produce similarities.

Egyptian thought is noticed also, as our free and unhampered thinking is allowed sway. Take an instance; a

few years ago a single line of hieroglyphics found engraved in cold stone separated scholars into two camps because of the translations. One insisted that the six characters stood for "The manifestation of light," the other equally as obstinate declared the rendering proper—"The awakening of the soul." The war of words ceased when our phase of civilized thought had attained to such a likeness of the old that we could read them both in the higher sense; they mean the same thing in ancient Egyptian philosophy, and a later interpretation is found in the phrase—"An Awakening to the Reality."

Follow this aspect to the time of Arius the Lybian. The Council at Nicea threw him down, for he was literally on top. Unthinkable propositions in the procedure of the Universe were set up and held prestige through centuries of darkness and superstition. But the thought of Arius the Unitarian reincarnates again when a phase of civilization is reached which will allow a likeness to be reproduced. Will any thinker care to dispute the fact that the Unitarian faith to-day is of paramount influence among the most faithful of the reverent scholars?

A step later; will any researcher for truth fail to see that the seven points on which Pelagianism was condemned by the church in the Fifth Century are reincarnating again in the "liberal" thought of a more scientific Christendom?

Later yet, the burning of Bruno at the stake four hundred years ago did not crush the truth; his teachings are now very much in evidence, and as for the earlier Neo-Platonic teaching of Ammonius Saccas, Plotinus, and a long line of illustrious philosophers, it is markedly promient in all the new thought of this epoch; simply reincarnating.

Nor has scientific thought escaped the pressure of the same rigid law. The discussions at the present time on the ultimate atom by the two opposing schools, are but reincarnations of the old controversy between the followers of De-

mocritus of the materialistic trend, and Anaxagoras of the more elevated and sublime teaching. The latter will be better understood when a phase of enlightened thought shall manifest itself in the ultra-specialized school. It all tends to prove that states of consciousness are alike when civilization reaches a like plane, without touch or contact, and the Theosophist further alleges that such states of consciousness will reincarnate only when the conditions have become favorable to that phase which will allow a likeness to be reproduced. No archaeologist expects to find an Emerson manifest in the flesh during the Dark Ages. It required light, and a strong effulgence to admit such a state of consciousness to reincarnate. He proved to be nearer the plane of Plato. Nor would we expect to find an Edison domiciled next door to a Torquemada.

Therefore, it is consistent in the logic of a Theosophist to claim that there comes a time when the whole mass of Egos, which built up the splendor of ancient Egypt, and the "glory that was Greece," leave their already exhausted life experiences to seek fresh pilgrimages on the path to development toward the Perfect Man, brought about by Reincarnation, impelled by the Law of Karma, the three really essential tenets in Theosophic teaching.

The category of sects so laboriously tabulated by Renan as existing at the beginning of the Christian era, are in evidence in the differentiations of religious faiths in this land of free thought, and properly so, under the law of Karma, using Reincarnation as a method to exhaust all Desire on its plane. When Desire has been vanquished new Karma will be set up by as natural a cause.

The rich upon whom the curses of the poor are hurled are subservient to the same law. Divide all the wealth of the world to-day, and to-morrow the rich will be rich because of the law. It is the stewardship of riches that is

brought to book by Karma, not the mere act of possessing them.

"What hath been bringeth what shall be, and is,
Worse—better—last for first and first for last."

. . After sufficient experience on the plane of grasping desire, the avarice of greed will be transmuted by an alchemy that never deceives. There is the testimony of the ages by the sages that there comes a time when the wail is intoned —"all is vanity." Reincarnation is the only logical method known to the Theosophist by which this experience can be exhausted.

CHAPTER VI.

KARMA.

Only the latest dictionaries have the word Karma. Webster and Worcester had stereotyped their plates years before this significant Sanscrit term appeared in our literature. The Standard Dictionary lists it, with the definition:

An act; the effect of any act, religious or otherwise; the law of ethical causation regulating the future life; the inevitable retribution: an idea of Brahmanic origin, but developed by the Buddhists."

The following quotation is annexed to further elaborate the idea, taken from "Eastern Monachism" by R. Spence Hardy:

"The supreme power is Karma, the merit and demerit of intelligent existence. It is this that controls all things, sometimes acting in an aggregate capacity, as in the general economy of the universe; but more clearly seen in the effects it produces upon the individual being. From its consequences there is no escape."

Theosophical literature has enlarged the signification of the term until an apprehension of its awful meaning is felt in every domain of thought. It has become a convenient word expressing in an intuitional flash the whole import of the last clause in the paragraph from Spence Hardy; "From its consequences there is no escape."

If the word itself has been absent from our terminology, its central idea has been emphatically apparent. The cultured Greek with a lofty sense of justice, (and Karma al-

ways demands exact justice,) expressed its scope of action when he exclaimed: "The mills of the gods grind slowly though they grind exceeding fine"; but the soul force in this classic phrase was not more strenuously put than by the plantation darkey who believed in ultimate justice and cried with bitter emphasis—"He's sho' gwine to get his come-uppins." And do we not in our innermost being really believe that the persistent offender will at some time be brought suddenly to book when we say that "he will get his honest dues." Many there are, who attempt to believe when in a downward course that luck will favor them; they will not be found out. The law of Karma allows no escape from consequences, and as to this easing of conscience, Emerson said: "Shallow men believe in luck; strong men believe in cause and effect."

Occasionally a few insist upon Karma as being the law of Ethical Causation; both mean in the end the same. Both pertain to this world, and a violation of law on either plane brings its Karmic results, whether formulated with the nicety of rhetoric or as spontaneously put—"chickens will come home to roost"; all pointing to the deep truth in the familiar text—"Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." A greater significance is attached when it is found by critical research that every scripture known to man of any race, age, or clime has this central truth couched in the same epigrammatic form, all a warning that "your sins will find you out," and equally does the action of the great law register merit as well as demerit; "cast thy bread upon the waters, and it shall return" is another truism traced to every scripture thus far found and translated. "Give, that ye may receive," said the gentle Nazarene, and the same inspired teaching was given by all the Great Teachers, thousands of years before the Christ was set up as a new Ideal.

Christianity not only recognizes the essential scope of

Karma, but preaches it constantly, and to the credit of many of its modern teachers, most effectively. The reaping from the former sowing has become a logical sequence even if the word Karma is tabooed, because of pagan origin.

Nevertheless, the orthodox Christian and the Theosophist part company when in search of the harvest field. The latter believes that the reaping must be done where the seed was cast in sowing time. Oats sown on last year's stubble field cannot be reaped in some imaginary park located somewhere beyond the clouds. The earth is for the Theosophist; "sweet fields arrayed in living green" beyond an ethical Jordan, are for the too materialistic Christian. And this point raised may correct another error quite prevalent, that Theosophists "live in the clouds, beyond the stars." Never was a greater misconception of Theosophic thought uttered or written. The Theosophist is of this earth; he believes he has lived many lives here; will live many more until perfection is gained. Even then, as the Perfect Man, he does not leave the world; his mission under the great Law of Compassion is to help others to rise. Hence the loftiness of the teaching. Heaven is not a place; it is a state, a condition. It can be here better than far away. Deity is here and everywhere; no more elsewhere than here. The same law prevails over the universe. Heaven is here if we make it; hell is here.

The easy-going orthodox pew-worshipper tells us that all this sounds plausible but he would like a parallel in the processes of Nature to make the conception clear. He is confused on the one point that all can be on this globe. There must be other places better. The Theosophist bewilders him by having so many Planes and Principles operating here. Our answer is that they operate everywhere alike.

One of the concrete lessons given to illustrate the method by which the mind can grasp the fundamental ideas is an exemplification borrowed from one of the earlier lessons of

the school. Fill a barrel with apples. There is void space between them for another Plane of manifestation. Throw in marbles; the barrel is filled again after thorough shaking. So two things seemingly occupy the same space; two Planes in short, acting under two Principles. Now throw in shot; it is filled the third time. Follow with mustard seed; it is full once more. Pour in water which is molecular, though harder to hold in the tightened grasp of the hand than the mustard seed. Fill again with alcohol by pressure, and let it be hoped that no irreverent allusion will be made when we say that the barrel is now surely full. It is not; chemistry comes to aid, and molecular gases of finer vibration can be diffused. The all pervading ether, finer yet, will have its place in the interstices, and again the pure Akasa of the Eastern thought is finer far than the finest forces that interplay, finer than electricity, or magnetism which is higher. The end is not reached, for all things mentioned are on the physical Plane, on the Plane of Fohat—the Eastern term for that boundless energy so prevalent in modern science. Beyond Fohat, is Mahat, which includes mind and all its attributes. The Psychical constituents here enter into the combination. There is room for all; more planes, upon which more Principles function. Each atom, to the fifty millionth part of an inch (again quoting Lord Kelvin) is surrounded with a psychical sphere of influence, its magnetic field, its aura, or its odic force, or any other term at the pleasure of the thinker. The soul force, the "go" of it all, can find ample room for its subtle power; and the all pervading Spirit can brood over all; interpenetrate all, suffuse all. No two particles have yet anywhere touched; they can all bathe in the same great ocean of Spirit; each independent on its own plane; yet all co-ordinating.

Is this reasoning strained to a point tangible only in Oriental imagination? Take á modern authority for it. Prof. Jevons in discussing the scientific provability of bodies passing through each other says:

"'Solidity' is a mere sensuous illusion. When a rhythm favors, bodies can pass freely through each other. For anything that we can know to the contrary there may be right here and now, passing through us, and this world, some planet invisible to us, with mountains, oceans, lakes, rivers, cities and inhabitants."

Dr. Young also suggests that there "are worlds, perhaps pervading each other, unseen and unknown, in the same space." The Theosophist would use the word Planes, instead of worlds.

Prof. Du Bois in an address before the Bridgeport Scientific Society said:

"We admit as a physical fact, that at least within certain undefined limits in our organism, matter obeys will, and brain particles move at the impulse of volition. Now, molecules, the physicist tells us, are separated by spaces indefinitely great as compared to the size of the molecules themselves, and these spaces are filled with ether, which condenses around the molecules like the atmosphere of the earth. Within the limits of the cranium, then, we may conceive of a whole solar system in miniature. The whole great Universe with its suns and systems is represented in those tiny, whirling, moving brain particles. Now upon one of these little brain particles separated by an immense relative distance from its neighbors, let us imagine a race of tiny, intelligent beings like ourselves to live. One of these little homuncules looks off from his tiny earth with his tiny telescope as we do from ours and observes motions and bodies moving hither and thither."

And many more authorities eminently scientific can be quoted to sustain the one point here sought to be made plain—that all forces that act anywhere else in the Universe, act here. The Universality of Law, one of the cardinal tenets of Theosophy demands that all places are ruled by the Supreme Intelligence alike. And even this Great All is in and around every atom of its own evolution, or manifestation, or emanation, or creation, as the reader may choose.

It is true that there is an easy letting down of some of

the old theological teaching which controverted law, for instance wherein the sun went round the earth in the dogmatic teaching of Christendom by the saints, but the earth went round the sun as taught by sinners. But there are strange conceptions yet lingering in the minds of preachers, notably one, the most widely advertised of them all who delivered a sermon in Washington not many months ago, claiming to prove that our world, "the smallest of them all," was selected as the theatre for sin and sorrow as an awful example to others. For the benefit of our astronomers who do not rush to hear Talmage, nor have they officially credited him as the envoy extraordinary of the Great First Cause:

"Why did God let sin and sorrow come into the world when He could have prevented them from coming? I wish reverently to say I think I have found the reason. To keep the Universe loyal to a Holy God, it was important in some world somewhere to demonstrate the gigantic disasters that would come upon any world that allowed sin to enter. Which world should it be? Well, the smaller the world the better, for less members would suffer. So our world was selected. The stage was plenty large enough for the enactment of the tragedy. Although we know comparatively little about the other worlds, lest we become completely dissatisfied with our own, no doubt the other worlds have heard, and are now hearing all about this world in the awful experiment of sin which the human race has been making."

The last dozen words only in this strange medley of conjecture are worthy of notice by the Theosophist, "the awful experiment of sin which the human race has been making." If there is such a thing as sin, the human race surely made it, and the human race will reap from its own sowing, as a human race. The law of Karma applies to race, nation, family and individual; joint effects lead back to joint causes; individual effects to individual causes; all effects to cause; all demanding observance of law; that things out of equilibrium are constrained to reach exact adjustment. Nature's law is forever operating to bring about

equilibrium—exact justice, and to an exactness which does not allow in the scales a favor for an atom, if such there be, of the "fifty-millionth part of an inch."

Yet there is teaching abundant that will allow a murderer to be washed clean by some mystical eclesiastical passes at the last moment of a long and brutal life, and to add to the injustice, he is through-ticketed to Paradise on schedule time. The Theosophist prefers to accept the so-called heathen, or pagan, teaching.

"Also it issues forth to help or hurt,
When Death the bitter murderer doth smite,
Red roams the unpurged fragment of him,
On wings of plague and blight,"

and the unpurged fragments still roaming on wings of plague and blight, when critically studied in the light of a developing Psychology in the West and an older system of thought in the East, will account for man's own making of woe, here, if anywhere. And the opposite is equally true in the teaching of this old school which has brought consolation to many inquiring, investigating minds:

"But when the mild and just die, sweet airs breathe,
The world grows richer, as if desert stream
Should sink away to sparkle up again
Purer, with broader gleam.
"So merit winneth the happier age
Which by demerit halteth short of end;
Yet must this Law of Love reign king of all
Before the Kalpas end."

These Kalpas are the intervals of time between the manifesting and the disappearance of a world; cycles; periods of inbreathing and outbreathing, a moment, as we count time, for the ephemeral insect life; billions of years for a world life; both attuned to the same Great Breath. The law of Karma rules alike in both.

Some of the vagueness now current may be removed if a clear distinction is kept in mind between Karma and

Kismet. Both are quoted as Oriental in derivation, but they are not the same. The Mohammedan believes in Kismet; appointed lot, fate. It came down on Semitic lines. It is dominant now, where Arabian thought expands. F. Marion Crawford is usually quoted from his Paul Patoff: "Even Fate, the universal Kismet, procrastinates in Turkey." A traditional fascination seems to percolate through the masses everywhere even to the sentimental maiden of our own civilization who asks the jeweler to engrave on her wedding ring: "Kismet," the idea uppermost in her mind being that what is to be, must be; cold, uncalculating, even uncaused destiny; simply the lot by dice thrown from the foundation of the heavens and earth. The Arabs have an extensive and fascinating literature to this day as did a certain following in Chaldean thought centuries before Abraham was born. The archaeologist and the philologist find abundant traces of it in the old traditions of the Semitic nations, while Karma, which is not fatalism, had its origin as now traced, in the thought of the Aryan peoples.

From a strictly archaeological point of view, it will not be a loss of effort to follow the trail down, for that monstrous piece of Calvinism (first outlined by Augustine), the doctrine of predestination, can be better understood. Kismet, or fate, pure and simple, was embedded in Arabian thought before the advent of Mahomet. The dogmatic school which followed the spread of the Koran was as much at variance with the higher philosophical thought as is superficial Christendom now at odds with Herbert Spencer, or Emerson, or Goethe. This can clearly be established by the researcher who explores into the broad consistent thinking of the Sufis, the learned esoteric professors in many of the Mohammedan colleges, disciples of the old Chaldean culture. They derive much of their philosophy from their ancient sages; called the Arifs, corresponding to the Rishis of India; the Achi-u of Egypt.

Let the student note carefully that John Calvin, of the Geneva School, did not manifest as a teacher until he returned in triumph to that city in 1541 after vicissitudes that were anything but encouraging. Yet the Moors captured Cordova in 672 A. D. and rebuilt it, so that before its fall in 1236 it contained nearly a million inhabitants and 300 mosques, where the doctrine of Kismet, or fate, was dominant. During these centuries the industrious Caliphs, with their labor guilds and societies had overrun Europe, spreading their peculiar philosophical precepts. Is it any surprise, therefore, to the archaeologist to find the diffusion of this doctrine everywhere from Spain to Bagdad? Geneva got its share of it. It was mixed in the dough for the new baking. John Calvin's teachings show the effect of it. Predestination will be better understood by the young Presbyterian theologues when they can spread along side of compiled Calvinism, the thought that daily and yearly precipitated from 672 to 1541 A. D. It must be reckoned with. The Theosophist has been diligent in comparing notes on this line. The educated Arabians, the guardians of the old Chaldean esoteric lore, have fraternally rendered aid in the exploration. A new light is thrown on Calvanistic Predestination. The "great theologian" as he is called observed but half the law, one aspect of it, (so say the students of the East,) even on the Kismet side. The Karma aspect was utterly ignored. The great Jehovah of John Calvin is thus left in a bad plight. Calvinism, according to the Eastern reasoner, would not even dignify the new ideal of divinity with the generosity of a modern gambler who will act "square," at least. It made the ruling power worse, more severe than the ultimate of Kismet. It settled all without even the small consolation of a lucky throw. It killed hope effectually. It foreordained, whether or no! It was by decree. Here is the language, at which even a pagan worshipper recoils, and no religious faith thus far found by the

student of comparative religions can be matched with it for fanatical fury in design:

"By the decree of God and for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death."

"These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed."

Mark the cruelty which staggers the pagan (?) students in the 144 colleges of India! Yet from worse to worse :

"and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished. * * * As God hath appointed the elect to glory, neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, and sanctified and saved, but the elect only."

The last clause has a ring of Kismet, but the first part of the paragraph shows the interblending of Jehovistic, with Chaldean doctrine, transplanted by Arabian thinkers on Teutonic mythology. The fulness of this abnormal mental growth is not realized until another paragraph is digested:

"The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin to the praise of his glorious justice."

Primitive Shamanism as thus far brought to light by the archaeologist is not so frightfully cruel. A deity that would deliberately "ordain his creatures to dishonor and wrath to the praise of his glorious justice" is an ideal fitted to that cast of mind which Science labels—"psychically insane."

Karma knows neither wrath nor pardon. It stands for justice; exact, to all; not the elect to the abandonment of the non-elect.

"It maketh and unmaketh, mending all;
What it hath wrought is better than hath been;

Slow grows the splendid pattern that it plans
  Its wistful hands between."

It knows not wrath nor pardon; utter true
  Its measures mete, its faultless balance weighs;
  Times are as nought, to-morrow it will judge,
Or after many days.

By this the slayer's knife did stab himself;
  The unjust judge hath lost his own defender;
The false tongue dooms its lie; the creeping thief
  And spoiler rob, to render.

Such is the Law which moves to righteousness,
  Which none at last can turn aside or stay;
The heart of it is Love, the end of it
  Is Peace and Consummation sweet. Obey!"

The difficulty which besets the beginner in Theosophic study is the failure to draw a clear line between Karma and Kismet. This ought to be simple if the student will remember that his individual Karma is predestined to the extent only that he must experience the effects of causes set up by himself in his own past lives. In the very act of going through this experience he is learning that a new path for the future is more profitable than the old beaten track. The moment a new path is chosen with new purpose in life, destiny, fate, lot, Kismet, are broken. What was to be by predestination is changed by after destination; in other words new Karma is set up. The very result is a beginning, and a beginning, by the mere mention of the thought kills the power of Kismet. What was to be, by fate, cannot be, because man, the Thinker, says it shall not be. Man thus becomes the arbiter of his destiny; the architect of his fortune. "I will be what I will to be." Kismet has its rigid hard beaten rut, but man need not choose it. There is another path open to him when he desires. Even if suffering in physical pain because of deeds done in past lives, his heroic effort to overcome makes him rise on these "stepping stones of his dead self to higher things."

"Far hath he gone who treads down one fond offense."
Thus, new causes being set up, new effects must ensue.

This is the generation of new Karma.

"The Books say well, my Brothers! Each man's life
The outcome of his former living is;
The bygone wrongs bring forth sorrows and woes,
The bygone right breeds bliss.
That which ye sow ye reap."

"The old sad count is clear, the new is clean;
Thus hath a man content.
Make golden stairways of your weakness; rise
By daily sojourn with those phantasies
To lovelier verities."

When the Theophist reiterates, as he frequently does, that Karma in the operation stands for Justice, the theological hair-splitter demands that we make room somewhere in our thought for compassion, for mercy. No more lofty exposition of these opposite poles was ever given than by the Sages. If the stern exactness of Justice is to be insisted upon, who would, who could, stand? The Psalmist fully understood this. But if Mercy was to rule without Justice, who would care to stand? In either predicament, the economy of the Cosmos would be lopsided. The equilibrium of the six-pointed star of India and Egypt, the interlaced triangles, seen engraved on modern synagogues and on the window curtains of the halls of the Thirty-Second Degree of Masonry, do not altogether mean the exact adjustment of Spirit-Matter, the two poles of a manifested universe. There are great attributes which need to be brought into equilibrium, as taught in the Occult Science, and Justice and Mercy are included. The law of Karma demands exact rendering from both. The theologians have sent us in our youth astray on this thought.

A lack of the full import of Karma, has begotten much controversy from an ethical point of view, on the attitude of the faithful son in the parable, who was always just in his dealings, but the fatted calf was killed for the returned

prodigal only. The parable was some hundreds of years older than the gospels in both Brahminical and Buddhistic lore, but the latter will suffice to illustrate the Karmic principle. In the Buddhistic scripture it is designated as "The Lost Son."

The two parables agree substantially on the wretchedness of the wanderer, brought on by his own action. He was sowing to the wind to reap the whirlwind. But he turned, after bitter experience, and here we take the Buddhistic version:

"He happened to come to the country in which his father lived. And the father saw him in his wretchedness, for he was ragged and brutalized by poverty, and ordered some of his servants to call him.

"When the son saw the palace in which he was conducted, he thought, 'I must have evoked the suspicion of a powerful man, and he will throw me into prison.' Full of apprehension he made his escape before he had seen his father.

"Then the father sent messengers out after his son, and he was caught and brought back in spite of his cries and lamentations. And his father ordered the servants to deal tenderly with his son, and he appointed a laborer of his son's rank and education to employ the lad as a helpmate on the estate. And the son was pleased with his new situation.

"From the window of the palace the father watched his boy, and when he saw that he was honest and industrious, he promoted him higher and higher.

"After many years he summoned his son and called together all his servants, and made the secret known to them. Then the poor man was exceedingly glad and he was full of joy at meeting his father.

"Little by little must the minds of men be trained for higher truths."

The above is submitted to the reader for his own, (not his preacher's,) candid judgment as to the course which embodies both justice and mercy, whether that of the psychical display on the part of a father (which would have been natural in the eternal feminine in the mother as recorded in

the Christian gospel) or the constant, patient, and fully as loving course of the Buddhistic scripture.

In the Eastern thought the masculine and feminine are two opposite poles, as are justice and mercy. Karma keeps them at equilibrium. In the Occult Science handed down by the Great Initiates the interior of woman is masculine and the reverse holds for the feminine. The flowery orator who recites as a platitude that the "bravest are the tenderest" understands but the objective aspect of it. The scientific import will be better understood when the warring camps of psychology in the Occident, hardly a half century old, will give due consideration to the observation, experiment and induction of the most profound nature students the world has seen, a system formulated by the contemplative minds of sages and seers covering a period of thousands of years. By the older system, the father in the Buddhistic thought was both masculine and feminine. If he had been but masculine, there would have been need, because of stern justice, for a Queen of Heaven (clothed in vestments of gold and seated at the right hand of God as the Council of Trent stated it) to interpose for the wayward youth. It was not necessary in the Buddhistic occult science. The feminine was there, active, daily active at the window of the palace, watching the upward struggle of the prodigal. The fatherhood and motherhood derived from the Great First Cause were amply displayed by the parable. The sober, candid and just father of our advancing civilization, who would hardly rush out to the rebellious son and clothe him like a prince, and hail him to the world with honors befitting a Dewey just returned from great and good works, will see the ethical value of the Buddhistic teaching in contrast with the episode in the Bible version, where such action would have been entirely natural in the mother, who, true to her maternal attributes, would have caressed him even in the gutter. But the universe is not run by a woman,

by mercy personified, nor, happily, as the Theosophist believes, is it ruled by a man-god, an anthropomorphic creation of barbaric traditions who is implored frequently to "lay bare his strong arm" (in other words, to roll up his sleeve) before he takes his position behind our gun the better to butcher the fellow behind the other gun. Karma rules even the man behind the guns; and until we know more of the mysterious aims and ends of Karma as the great law, the expression of the Will of the Great All, there is nothing to prevent our believing, if we choose so to do, that men behind the guns against Spain may have been part of the reincarnations of the 340,000 and more who suffered under the Inquisition, and who were impelled by Karma to bring about equilibrium—exact justice. Nations have a Karma to exhaust. America is generating Karma now on many lines.

"Be not mocked; whatsoever a man sows that shall he also reap."

An additional point should not be omitted when comparing the wholeness of the operation of Karma, to the incongruous mixture of Kismet and Karma in Calvanism. The Geneva school lays stress on the eternal decree; to Will, as expressed by the decree. The philosopher of the East becomes the more shocked thereat, because in his thought Desire always stands back of Will. This is in accord with common-sense well regulated, for who ever heard of mortal intelligence willing a thing unless it was first desired? Therefore, the Vedic Sages sought the desire behind the Will as the mainspring of all motive. From this viewpoint, the ruling divinity set up by Calvinism becomes a thousand times more cruel and abhorrent. He not only decreed from all eternity his will, that his own creatures should be forever damned, but back of this he desired it, otherwise would not have willed it. Is it any wonder that sincere and honest Theosophists who were once worshippers in Calvinistic

churches can find a more rational solution of profound problems in the deep meditations of a long line of Nature students in the East, than by following John Calvin, who was born with the rickets, ran the gamut of diseases, and was so psychically insane as to glory, like his postulated divinity, in the green wood which he ordered for the burning of that good and pious Unitarian—Servetus? Theologian he was; but students of Karma do not choose to become theologians.

It would be a prized addition to our literature if a competent researcher could give us as clear and as convincing a treatise on Kismet, dating from its first conception among the Semitic peoples as has been presented by Charles Johnston, on the Karma lines in his "Karma: Works and Wisdom." As stated before in these pages, the author is known as the Prize Sanscrit Scholar of India, but his great merit lies in the deep intuitive perception of catching the finest and faintest shades of meaning, so often missed by the professional philologists.

In the work referred to, after a scholarly and painstaking abridgment of the vast subject, he states on p. 19:

"Karma gradually came to mean the works of the priestly system; and as these works had the attainment of material success and the delights of a sensuous paradise as their avowed aim, it was natural that the term should come to mean all works that made for these things—all acts and energies that had as their object a sensuous gratification, whether in this or another world.

"Underlying all this is the clear perception, everywhere present in Indian philosophy, that moral energies, whether good or evil, are real forces, *indeed the only real forces in* the universe. (Italics ours). The universe originally came into existence through the activity of moral forces; and what is true for the universal is also true for the individual—for man. Man has his being in moral energies; moral energies have shaped his exterior form and surroundings, and will shape his form and conditions in the future, in all worlds. And

these moral energies are not apart from or outside of him, but are intimately connected with his real Self.

"It lies solely with himself to which class of moral energies (to which self) a man shall give effect—whether to the glowing light in the inner chamber of the heart, which leads him away from selfishness and sensuality, away from his individual self to the Eternal (his real Self), or to the baser energies of lust and hate, of sensual and selfish indulgence, which lead him outward and downward, away from his immortal Self, to a sensual form which from its very nature and necessities involves him in hostility toward all other men embodied like himself. As is the desire of his heart, so is his will; according to his will are his works. The result, in the one event, is conscious immortality, above all selfish and sensual desires—conscious sharing in the powers and energies of the Eternal. In the other event the result is rebirth, under sensual and selfish conditions, in this world, or perchance a baser world."

It is due to the scholarship on ancient Semitic lines to record that there were Sages and Initiates among the peoples who flourished in their buried empires. It has been the misfortune of later history, colored by bigoted views and fanatical zeal, to dub all such heretics. The Sadducees, more of a class than a sect, among the Jews, that arose into prominence in the 2d century B. C. in opposition to the party of the Maccabees, held of human conduct. that it was within the control of man's own will. This was clearly not Kismet—lot, appointed fate.

And stranger yet is the fact that among the Parsees—the rigid adherents of the Zoroastrian teaching, there has been founded a Theosophical Society in India of influence and wealth, by means of which they have been enabled to trace their line of descent to an origin which tallies with Theosophic teaching, and have published a volume, to be followed by another on same lines, in which the law of Karma is recognized by their ancient seers and sages. In passing, it may as well be noted, that dogmatic missionaries might have labored through another geological age before they

could have made an impression upon these deep, brooding, meditative minds. Theosophy was accepted by them simply on its merits. This item is respectfully referred to the clergyman of Washington whose utterances as published stamp him also as a preacher rather than a teacher, who declared from his pulpit recently that Theosophy was a wretched failure, and who, in the same sermon preached rather than taught, that there was no historical evidence to support the statement that such a being as Buddha ever existed, but that the historical facts of the historic Nazarene were abundantly buttressed by the Bible! The action of Karma, in this case will reveal itself when in the future certain of his following will begin to search for themselves. The Parsees became Theosophists when they began a diligent search. It is the law of Karma, exemplifying itself. Action and reaction; cause and effect. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

CHAPTER VII.

THE GENESIS OF MAN.

Every now and then a new Garden of Eden is found; the discoverer is sure of it. The black-letter head-lines of the metropolitan journals inform the reader that at last the starting point of the human race is definitely located. Now it is Africa instead of Asia; again it is Yucatan, and then Peru; free America, the new land is after all the old land. Reaching to the prehistoric, it must have been Atlantis of 12,000 years ago; next it is the sunken Lemuria, the continent that went down in the Indian Ocean 30,000 years ago. Back of all these, in the dim twilight it might as well have been Maurigassama, another vast area which is alleged to have gone under the sea near where now are the Philippine Islands; still another lost country in the vicinity of Patagonia could have been the first of all; and so the isles of the sea far out in the Pacific, are but the tops of the tallest mountains which fell into the slimy ooze. The search incites new interest in the discoveries around old Nippur and more ancient cities are prophesied in the same vicinity in the near future. Old ruins in Cambodia arouse French investigators since their acquisition of part of Siam's territory.

Sven Hedin on his second trip in unexplored regions, supposed to be known only to the Thibetans, will surely find the very spot; other archaeologists in other directions promise certain results if the funds can be guaranteed. Speculative propositions abound concerning the rise and

fall of long stretches of solid land, as wherein by warrant of science, if a line is drawn from the Ascension Islands to St. Helena it will mark a continent which is now rising, so a line drawn between other points will indicate, as an offset, where a corresponding fall must have occurred, and with it the lost Garden of Eden as a matter of course.

All this literature saddens the heart of the dogmatic oracle who insists that Adam and Eve started the race 6000 years ago, and this is true because, as he says, the book of Genesis so records it; though just where this fact is so definitely registered in print is hard for the Theosophist to state, unless the marginal notes founded on Bishop Usher's chronology are claimed as inspirations. What if these zealous claimants for certain spots on the globe are all right, in an archaeological sense? And what if they are all wrong together with the Theologians in a more comprehensive sense? These questions are ever new, yet as positively old. A Theosophist reaching into the ancient wisdom finds that every race points back to its "Garden of Eden," or tantamount in meaning—its Golden Age. The divine origin of each, does not in the teaching, as taken from the sages, mean "a revelation from an anthropomorphic God, on a mount amidst thunder and lightning; but as we understand it, a language and a system of science imparted to the early mankind by a more *advanced mankind*, so much higher as to be *divine* in the sight of that infant humanity."

With this key one can readily grasp the fullness of Momsen's assertion that it is to be doubted, whether we in our boasted civilization are a whit in advance of the Egyptians in the time of Rameses II. So, too, can we apprehend the awful meaning in the declaration of Eastern students that the human race is a Kali Yuga Cycle, 5000 years behind, owing to arrested development brought about by man; his wars, his oppressions, his inhumanities to his fellow men. A statistician has estimated that even during the

short time of the Christian era, four billion lives have gone down in war, and priestcraft back of most of the slaughter. India is now in a state of degradation owing as much to priesthoods in her own environment as to conquests by ruder peoples.

But the question recurs: does a Theosophist know more of the origin of the human race on this globe than others? He can answer sincerely that the teachings of the sages seem to him the nearest approach to truth of anything on the same lines from other sources excepting always, the deductions of the modern scientist who seems to be in advance of his fellow-investigators because endowed with germs of more lucid insight, and a loftier prevision of thought; and this is simply stating that ancient reasoning is reincarnating, for mental development in due course of evolution enables an occasional "Saul of Science" to disclose, i. e., unclose what has too long been closed to the ordinary vision. Here is an instance of late utterance which tallies with the arcane wisdom of the East as will be demonstrated further on. This extract is from an editorial of the past year in a periodical devoted to archaeological discoveries—*Biblia*:

"The light thus thrown on the early history of Southern Asia will have an important bearing on the earlier chapters of Genesis. But it will do still more. It will probably help to clear up the obscure history of the supposed dispersion of primitive man from the *alleged* birthplace in Asia, and so it may aid in settling the *still open question*, whether mankind sprang from one stock, or was the product of evolutionary processes, taking place *simultaneously in several different parts of the earth*. The latter is the new theory (and the oldest wisdom according to the Theosophist).

"Coincidences in the history of the race development are *now held* by many to prove not necessarily a *common origin* and communication of tendencies, but *simply the orderly march of uniform law throughout the world*. Not only Biblical but evolutionary and social science will therefore eagerly await and welcome any light that Prof. Hil-

precht's find may throw into the dark corners of the past."

And in pursuance of this desire for "*any light*," let a Theosophist have a disinterested hearing.

The arcane teachings of the East state that man came upon this planet in streams of monadic essence in seven radiations. This does not mean seven definite lines striking seven particular spots, for seven Gardens of Eden would not obviate the difficulties always encountered in theological dogmatism. The seven came as do the seven colors visible to us; the seven notes in sound audible to us. Does not a dewdrop reflect the colors of the rainbow, on any spot on the globe? Do not sounds follow a law equally universal? And can a different law be postulated for forms under an even rate of vibration? Has the scientist been found who will assert that a snowflake will deviate from its obligatory form of six spindles, thence differentiating into multiform beauty as outlined in the fascinating study of the wave action in nature by Chladni? The law that operates anywhere operates everywhere.

And is not Nature true to her forms corresponding to numbers as demonstrated by Pythagoras who studied in the East? Has not Chladni, followed by others, demonstrated this? and does not the study of the ultimate cell show divine regard to groupings when the chromosomes appear twenty-four to the lily and kindred types, and sixteen to man's physical frame, as to mammalia in general?

Did a sponge start miraculously on some marine rock of Asia the rest of the globe waiting geological periods for it to disperse its kind over the waters of the hemispheres?

Did inorganic matter, with affinity for its soul force, coupled with motion of some degree, get its first cue from the All-Being in some little patch of Asiatic soil? Even the theologian will admit that the whole earth, as far as surface development above the deep showed itself, was governed by a law uniform throughout?

Did the Protozoa, with additional soul force, and further equipped with nervous material diffused through the mass acquiring automatism superimposed on motion, have one spot to the exclusion of all else as a creative point?

And would the following reign of Mollusks and Articulates with a further plus endowment of soul force (as sensation) with incipient ganglionic system somewhat discernible, acting with instinct, wait in the Occidental waters for the long pilgrimage of descendants from Oriental brine?

And would the fishes, reptiles, birds and mammalians, with their plus soul force—as intelligence, operating through well defined cerebro-spinal systems with action coordinated to the gift of intelligence, wait for future homes on distant continents, and far-off seas, until a dispersion from some chosen spot which would appear to be hallowed above other points?

And finally, with Man,—gloriously endowed with attributes still higher—his very distinct soul forces—Reason, Wisdom—Genius—plus acquisitions; are we called upon to believe that the Laurentian ridge, the oldest land in the geological text books of school days, waited for millions of years for a few stragglers of the human race to crawl over here by way of Bering Strait from a mountain-cooped section in the Tigris-Euphrates valley?

Further difficulty besets us, for after the crawling was well under way that our continent might have an earlier start, a certain personage, as we are authoritatively told, was ordered to build a boat to save himself and family only, thus drowning the crawlers.

A certain scientist of Washington whose name appears occasionally in the Smithsonian Reports, and newspaper articles, seems to be driven (from inherited conceptions probably) to argue that this continent must have been peopled by emigration from Asia, yet he labors daily surrounded with prehistoric relics of our own continent that should

suggest some concentration of intellect, even if he ignores the assumption of another scientist of world-wide fame that man was on this continent in the Pliocene, and that can reasonably be dated approximately at 400,000 years ago; and there may be more than a kernel of thought in the declaration of the late Prof. D. G. Brinton, of the University of Pennsylvania, an authority on Anthropology:

"There is not a single zoological specific difference to be found between the races of men."

Ethnically we can perceive differences. So in colors, if we could speak of them in a zoological sense, are they not all broken in upon us from their source—the white light—which includes all, and to which all are resolvable? Thus, the ancient books reasoned as compiled by the sages. The seven radiations came from a single source; emanated, as they expressed it. It is by this method of deduction that the Theosophist demonstrates the essence in man—the Knower, of the same potential powers as exist in the creative forces of Nature. Hence, to some, the strange language in the Book of Dyzan, the old esoteric manual:

"Seven times seven shadows were projected each to his own color. The Seven Hosts (emanations) who separated (projected).

"Animal man was ensouled with 'Pillars of Light' (Intellect).

"Life and consciousness were in every point of the universe.

"This monad falls into matter for the same reason that it afterwards ascends into spirit to complete the cycle of experience, for without such constant emanation and experience soul could not know itself."

This is why the ancients taught the music of the spheres because one aspect of force was sound; the world had been called forth by Sound and Harmony (as well as by Light (color) and Number (form) and constructed according to the principles of musical proportion.

The "Sensations of Tone" elaborated by Helmholtz,

proved that soul reincarnates, for the extension of this theory to the solution of a problem more than 2000 years old meant nothing less than the physical explanation of harmony as taught by Pythagoras, who learned it in the East. His "Klangfarbe" (tone color) rendered into coarser English as pitch, intensity, quality, is interpreted from Eastern thought as Vibration. And these vibrations touch every point of the globe. Did not Lockyer, the English astronomer, the other day insist that if the inhabitants of Mars really sent a message to us, it would not strike the instrument of Tesla alone, but touch evenly our whole sphere? So it is claimed by the Eastern teaching, that the "promise and potency," as we express it as moderns, in all matter, was in the whole vibratory thrill, the Great Breath, and wafted divinely to all points equally, never selecting a chosen spot or chosen people.

The Genesis of Man, therefore, according to the learned definition of Dr. Alexander Wilder, is not "generation" but "a coming out of the eternal into the Cosmos and Time"; a coming from *esse* into *existere*, or from *Be-ness* into Being, as the Theosophist would say. And this as simply as forms appear on the tightly-drawn drumhead of the Eidophone (form-sound), where the fine powder scattered evenly arranges into designs according to the purity or coarseness of the voice that speaks into the tube forcing the vibrations against the tympanum. The Native students of the East had pondered over such facts and left for our instruction:

"With the Outgoing Breath forms appear; with the Indrawing Breath forms disappear."

But the Psychological bearing on the question deserves some attention. In the line of development it is now conceded by the Chairs of Psychology that the study of mind in animals usually called comparative psychology, and the study of mind in the lower races of mankind called ethnic psychology prove scientifically that the animals have all the

kinds of consciousness man has in his objective functioning on the mental plane, though not so highly developed. The difference is in degree, not in kind. This is in line with the formula of evolution from the old Sanscrit:

"An element becomes a mineral; a mineral a plant; a plant an animal; an animal a man; a man a god."

The old teaching is further expanded by the declaration that as the soul of man was passing through a pilgrimage of all these kingdoms (the Fall into matter) and will evolve to higher yet, so the animals will follow in their turn and become men, and all animate nature will eventually become at-one-ment with the creative force. Did the fall of Adam affect the whole course of evolution in all its stages of progress? It must have taxed the early priestcraft to invent a curse which included even the dumb brutes on their upward and forward development.

There remains the ethical and religious aspect of the question. If there was no Garden of Eden as narrated in the Biblical Genesis and Theosophists have easily surrendered their belief in such a legend, there could have been no first pair of human beings. If not, there could have been no Fall (as stated in legendary form in Genesis); no special tree in the flora of that time; no talkative serpent; no driving out by an angel on picket duty with a flaming sword; no curse on either the first pair or their thousands of millions of descendants who were not *particeps criminis*.

Enough has been translated by the archaeologists that the warp and woof of the whole tale was borrowed from earlier tradition, and pagans though they were who recorded such legends with many versions, there is sufficient before us not only to discredit the whole fabric as fact, but much to instruct us how they viewed the allegory in their dogmatics and speculation.

Then, if there was no such Fall of Man, as science proves, there can be no need for Redemption. What was

there to redeem? And with this goes the dogmatic scheme of Atonement, and this, strange to say, was not fully elaborated for the knowledge of mankind until Bishop Anselm, father of the Scholastic theory, laid the orthodox doctrine of the Atonement in the Twelfth Century, a period not credited by enlightened minds as one which could solve problems in any other realm of thought of the rational order of the universe.

If the Vicarious Atonement goes, and the Theosophist thinks it has been going with accelerated speed, what necesslty for a supernatural Incarnation? With this borrowed idea, (for the older religions are full of a modified narration from an earlier conception,) there would seem to be little left for the partisan preachers to stand upon. The creeds are built on such supernatural postulates, but it is in the air that creeds must go. Yet Christianity in its purer interpretation need not go; it will be strengthened when rid of the abscesses.

One paragraph from the intuitive mind of Faraday is worth to the student who is honest with himself, all the hypothetical verbiage in the ecclesiastical libraries:

"I have long held an opinion, almost amounting to a conviction, in common, I believe, with many other lovers of natural knowledge, that the various forms under which the forces of Nature are made manifest, *have one common* origin; or, in other words, are so directly related and naturally dependent, that they are convertible, as it were, into one another, and possess equivalents of power in their action."

This early enunciation of new scientific thought has been enlarged upon by thinkers and investigators of every civilized nation until it seems as if the old thought of the six systems of Indian philosophy is reincarnating in the best intellects of our day and when duly grafted upon the Christian consciousness will result in something that can approach a rational religion.

That one common origin in Theosophic thought is in

the ONENESS of all. For classification and teaching purposes, an Emanation from the Great All is the Universal Soul; from this the Oversoul of our sphere; from this the individual souls of mankind, as set forth in the Third Postulate of the Philosophy of the School.

Some carping criticism occasionally appears concerning the enormous periods of time covered by Hindu chronology, and Egyptian as well. It is not absolutely essential that reliance be placed upon any calculation, ancient or modern, for whether computed in millions or billions of years the essentials of Theosophy—the aiming toward the Perfect Man by Reincarnation through the Law of Karma—would remain unimpaired. Nevertheless, a curiosity is manifested by the "man on the street" who asks concerning the theories which have been put forward in certain Theosophical books, the leading one being the quotation from the "Ocean of Theosophy" by W. Q. Judge, and many wish he had not incorporated it in such dogmatic form:

"The real age of the world is asserted by Theosophy to be almost incalculable, and that of man as he is now formed is over eighteen millions of years."

The reasoning back of the above statement is not, or should not be a shock to our modern scientific thinking, though the genuine Yankee asks "Why didn't you make it round numbers and call it 20,000,000 years and be done with it?" Simply because there was no valid reason to leave the problem as guess work. It was derived from a faithful traverse of the calculations of Maedler who proved to the satisfaction of many, if not all, that our whole galaxy of stars is revolving in a mighty circle, the star Alcyone, of the Pleiades, being nearest the central point, and that eighteen million two hundred thousand years elapsed for one revolution around this distant center. The credit of the mathematical problem may belong to Maedler, and others as well, who were working to the same end as is always the case as

proved by Psychology. The real merit of the conclusion claimed for the deep brooding meditative Hindu mind was the concomitant study of Vibration. They reasoned with their time-honored acumen that the rate of vibration which ever determines Form, had not appreciably changed for this planet, during this one turn. Therefore, if the ratio of vibration kept uniform, so did man's erect form. This conclusion also is held tentatively, awaiting disproval.

To follow out this reasoning let the reader ponder carefully the argument of Sir William Crookes, the great scientist, in his address to the Psychical Research Society wherein he demonstrates that if the rate of vibration on this globe was lowered but a degree, our forms would tend to the heaviness which would demand a support on all-fours; but let it, the rate, be raised but to an appreciable degree and we should become as the Greeks dreamed—"supremely tall and divinely fair," and we could walk on eggs without crushing them.

Whether we shall in the twentieth century recover all the hidden wisdom of the ages is a fruitless inquiry when studying the actual essentials of Theosophy; but these problems have a bearing in the class-rooms, and touch many stanzas of the old esoteric literature. Indirectly, all has a bearing on the study of the Genesis of Man, and it is some satisfaction to know from the letters sent from the far-East by the archeologists that they have concluded that Herodotus was not the "father of lies" as recorded by some superficial students because he reached back thousands of years; that Manetho the Egyptian historian probably knew more of Egypt than people in some college chairs who never saw a real Egyptian, dead or alive, and that whether his mention of the 36,525 scrolls meant only an occult reference to the twenty-five Sothiac cycles of 1461 years each, which it was considered covered Egyptian history, it certainly meant something beyond the ken of authors who have not broken

from their district school teachings of a Mosaic creation.

An evolutionist of the present day estimates time by millions and thousands of millions of years; a physicist from his point of view seeks to abridge, and Lord Kelvin after shifting around several times has come down to sixty millions of years. The astronomer who devotes a lifetime to his specialty as does Camille Flammarion is generous enough to remain non-committal, though he is willing to agree that we of the present age know as little of the ancient Zodiac as did Hipparchus who declared it to be of "unquestioned authority, *unknown origin and unsearchable antiquity*."

The Theosophist amidst the confusion of tongues on the exact date of the appearance of man on this earth, can reasonably accept for all practical purposes the short words of Prof. Dana of Yale, in his standard work on Geology, "Time is long; very long."

Would it not be well for the sticklers who take the Mosaic Genesis literally to give a disinterested hearing to, say, Prof. De Witt Hyde of Bowdoin College (as well as others) who sees in the Fall of Man a different interpretation (and closely allied to the teachings of old), and then from *such* a Fall, to begin on new lines for a further interpretation of Redemption, to be followed with a concomitant study of individual self-induced and self-devised effort to reach an at-one-ment with the parenthood Source, and then to accept other Incarnations of Great Teachers for other races, other ages, other environments? This would be constructive, not destructive and would clear the atmosphere of the discordant echoes from the bigoted cries of "Iconoclasm." If there is any well-grounded evidence that Ingersoll took away without replacing with a better belief—or something consolatory, there can be no such charge laid at the Theosophist's teaching. The members of the Society who were raised in the dogmatic faiths are the better judges, for they have canvassed both sides. The Theosophist maintains the attitude of the blunt Scotchman who avowed: "Honesty is the best policy: I have tried baith."

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PSYCHIC POWERS LATENT IN MAN.

The proper study of mankind is Man. Is all study of Man on lines not labeled "Theosophic" to be considered "improper"? Decidedly not; but a Theosophist can claim with some confidence that the wise Men of the East of whatever school, from Narada of India, to Plato of Greece, knew more of man than has been developed by the study of Psychology in the Occident since this, the most important of the sciences, began with serious stress about a quarter of a century ago.

A quotation from Camille Flammarion's recent work "The Unknown" is not out of place here to prepare the mind of the student for a thorough study of the psychic powers latent in Man:

"There exists in our cosmos a dynamic element, imponderable and invisible, diffused through all parts of the universe, independent of matter visible and ponderable, and acting upon it; and in that dynamic element *there is an intelligence superior to our own.* Yes, undoubtedly we think with our brains as we see with our eyes, as we hear with our ears; but it is not our brain which thinks any more than it is our eyes which see. What would you say of a person who congratulated a telescope on seeing the canals of Mars so well? The eye is an organ and so is the brain."

And the Theosophist follows, and says, "and so is the mind." The mind is an organ of Soul. The current modern teaching has been that mind is immortal; the teaching of the Sages is, and moderns are coming to it, that the Soul only is immortal, i. e., immortal in the sense that it retains

individuality. The Self of man persists, but the bodies and minds he wears are born and die.

The psychic powers latent in man are subject to the law of constant change; alternating from waking to sleeping; acting in conformity to the law under that aspect of the study covered by the A. U. M.—Formation, Transformation, Reformation.

As another evidence that modern thought is veering to the ancient reasoning, take an extract from one of the lectures of Prof. D. G. Brenton, late Professor of American Archaeology and Linguistics in the University of Pennsylvania:

"The real explanation of the origin of religion is simple and universal. Let any man ask himself on what his *own* religious belief is founded, and the answer, if true, will hold good for every member of the race, past and present. It makes no difference whether we analyze the superstitions of the rudest savages, or the lofty utterances of John the Evangelist, or of Spinoza the 'god-intoxicated philosopher'; we shall find one and the same postulate to the faith of all.

This universal postulate, the *psychic origin* of all religious thought, is the recognition, or, if you please, the assumption, *that conscious volition is the ultimate source of all Force.* It is the belief that *behind the sensuous*, phenomenal world, distinct from it, giving it form, existence and activity, lies the ultimate, invisible, immeasurable power of Mind, of conscious Will, of Intelligence, analogous in some way to our own; and,—mark this essential corollary,—*that man is in communication with it.*"

And this communication has been demonstrated for thousands of years. With proper study, the means of communication can be apprehended to a greater or less degree according to the fidelity and freedom of the investigator coupled with a rational grasp of these "unexplained" laws of Nature. Spiritualism, Christian Science, Mental Science, Faith Cures, and all modes of thought which claim connection with the Unseen Universe can, in a measure, though

not fully as yet, be rendered into intelligible conceptions. We shall do well to heed the counsel of Laplace:

"We are as yet far from knowing *all the agencies* of nature (he wrote *apropos* of psychic phenomena as displayed by what was then termed animal magnetism); but it would be unphilosophical to reject phenomena merely because they are inexplicable in the present state of our knowledge. Only we must examine them with the most scrupulous attention and determine up to what point we should multiply observations or experiments in order to obtain a probability superior to the reasons that may be brought forward for not admitting them."

Take the study of Spiritualism for instance. The Theosophist declares at the outset, supported by the wisdom of the ages, that the word to begin with is a misnomer. Indeed, studious members of that cult admit as much, and say that the name was thrust upon their school of thought by outsiders. This much was tacitly admitted at a convention (National Spiritualist) held in Washington but a few years ago where in the resolutions adopted as proclamation to the world they used a substitution: "indwelling energy." This step forward in line with the psychological study of the day will appeal to thinking people.

The Theosophist is consistent with the fundamentals of his culture when he rejects both spiritualism and spiritism as applying to individuals, dead or alive. If we hold that there are no *human* spirits known on earth, how can we admit that there are ex-carnate spirits of the same grade? In a prior chapter showing the distinction between Spirit and Soul as taught in the esoteric lore, Spirit is universal, as is the sunshine. It is neither mine nor thine, therefore human spirits do not exist; but souls are individuated, and in their long pilgrimage, if on the upward trend, are by effort, endeavoring to assimilate as much of this all pervading spirit as is possible. When the goal is

reached the individual Ego has become spiritualized. But if no effort has been made it cannot reasonably be stated that the erstwhile good-spirit force has become bad spirit. When we hear of bad spirits acting on human minds it is equivalent in Theosophic thought to saying black-whites, or white-blacks. It is beyond our conception of a rational order to say that badness is spiritualized. Then the query: "What becomes of badness in the world, if nothing can be lost or destroyed?" It remains, as taught in the esoteric books, on the psychic plane, the next to the physical, the coarsest of all planes counting from above, and man is always in communication with it. In this relatively coarse plane there cannot be, in consistent thought, black lights or white darkness. Spirituality is forever the same, an aspect of the Absolute, always light,—"The Great White Light" of esotericism.

Can there be ex-carnate souls? Most assuredly, if the teachings of all lofty souls are to be taken in preference to the materialistic thought of this age. Can these ex-carnate souls communicate with human beings on the *physical* plane. Not in Theosophic thought. And here, let it be understood that the Theosophist does not care to be aggressive or combative on this question. Many sincere people believe that they have communicated with the departed dead. The Theosophist has given serious and persistent study to the subject, and is prepared to say that on the given facts he is quite as well informed as the Spirtualist. The attitude of mind in which a Theosophist wishes to find himself is that of respectful attention, intellectual hospitality, and cordial sympathy; nay, even more, that of an ardent wisher that such a belief can have a warrant of certitude which will allow an embrace, for it would be a consolation beyond measure to know that it is true. But years of investigation, bolstered with a hope that it might be true, and with

a hope strong enough to lean toward the hypothesis more than an investigating mind should, there still remains the blunt conclusion that "dead men tell no tales."

"Who, then, does tell these tales? Whence come these strange messages?" is the impatient query from the believer. We answer as calmly and as soothingly as we can:—from the psychic forces latent in man, which are correlated to the mind of man in his subconscious states, and this mind, whether divided for teaching purposes in the ordinary objective, sub-conscious and, mayhap, the supra-conscious, is the same mind with which we are directly connected; or, as Prof. Bunton puts it, "*Man is in communication with it.*" The mind is not soul; it s an organ of soul, one of the differentiations of the Soul. The psychic force is not Soul, but another aspect. Psychical and mental are not synonymous terms in Eastern psychology.

At the 105th General Meeting of the Society for Psychical Research, London, May 18, 1900, the President, Mr. F. W. H. Meyers delivered the address which is respectfully submitted to the consideration of the reader of these pages. Only salient points can be touched upon. Here is one:

"And, in fact, this line of inquiry has already pointed us to a hidden, *subliminal world within us*, and through *that* world to an unseen, but responsive, spiritual world without."

Here the Theosophist would modify the last clause and teach from the "subliminal world within us," to the unseen *but responsive psychical* world.

Another suggestive paragraph from the same source may be pondered with grave interest:

"Yet let not those who mock at the weaknesses of modern Spiritualism ask themselves to what extent either orthodox religion or official science has been at pains to guard the popular mind *against losing balance upon contact with new facts*, profoundly but obscurely significant? Have the people's religious instructors trained them to investigate for

themselves. Have their scientific instructors condescended to investigate for them? Who should teach them to apply to their 'inspirational speakers' any test more searching than they have been accustomed to apply to the sermons of priest or bishop? What scientific manual has told them enough of the hidden powers *within them* to prevent them ascribing to spiritual agency whatever *mental* action their ordinary consciousness may fail to recognize as *its own!*"

This withering criticism of the preachers and theologians, from the scientific point of view of our age is well deserved. Had St. Augustine devoted his attention more to earth he would not have been mislead by phenomena which could have been explained by the pagans(?) of India. In his letter to Erodius, Bishop of Ugales, he makes mention of a young man who appeared to a great many persons after death and by that means "God permitted that they should be confirmed in the high opinion they had of his sanctity." His views, however, of cosmic processes, were limited by the ignorance of his age which held that it was impossible for the earth to be round because the people on the under side could not see the Lord descending in glory at the great day.

St. Thomas Aquinas, who is revered as an authority by Catholic universities and colleges leaves for posterity (see Mori's Catholic "Ages of Faith") that his sister, the Abbess of St. Mary of Capua, appeared to him after her death and told him of her state in heaven and of the condition of his two brothers, Andulph being still in Purgatory and Reynold already in Paradise. Again, one night, as the angelic doctor prayed in the church of St. Dominic, at Naples, Father Romain, to whom he had ceded the chair of theology at Paris, appeared to him, before the others heard of his death and told him he was among the blessed and answered many questions of St. Thomas, and to his query respecting heaven, replied "Sicut audivimus sic vedimus," (as we have heard so we have seen").

In our investigating age such incidents are common, yet explained, as they anciently were by the Wise Men of the East, and now by the Wise Men of the West, all are within the personality and not from outside sources.

What makes the subject still more interesting to the investigator, is the comment of the Catholic editor in this enlightened age of science, as follows:

"All modern writers hold, it is said, that the possibility of apparations or spirits must be admitted by every one who believes in the Deity and his supernatural omnipresence.".

Quotations are also made by the editor from church writers in support of the reappearance on earth of disembodied spirits. And the Theosophical investigator on these lines has found that church history abounds with such incidents through all the centuries, yet with no corresponding effort to instruct the people. No wonder the President of the Psychical Society asks:

"Have the people's religious instructors trained them to investigate for themselves?"

Nor need a certain class of Theosophists attempt to escape criticism. It is but four years since one of the prominent officials (called a "leader" in the publications) gave out to the world that in mid-ocean on a steamer, she had received a communication from Madame Blavatsky approving of the course then in progress, which course was certainly not approved by many of the more studious of the culture. As to the sincerity of this personality in thus enunciating such un-theosophical claims, there can be no doubt. All trance mediums are sincere from their point of view. When they see an apparition, the testimony of their senses is not easily shaken. When they hear voices they are equally positive of their right to declare, as did St. Augustine or St. Aquinas, that they *know* whereof they speak, and wild horses cannot drag them away from their sincere belief, but the scientific investigator, on the *same facts* can

intelligently demonstrate that all comes from within, all belongs to that realm included within the psychic powers latent within Man.

Take Ribot, for instance, and he is but one of the thousands who are persistently investigating on these lines. Has he not convinced the studious mind that our ordinary thinking is but an infinitesimal portion of the thinking of the psycnic personality? From this grows, also, the duplex personality, and the triple, and one case is now engaging the scientists where six personalities are clearly defined and functioning at intervals in one organism.

The reason why space is given these quotations is, that for the past eighteen years the Psychical Research Society has devoted candor and care to the phenomena which are grouped under the "Psychic Powers latent in Man," as the Theosophist designates them. The Presidents rank with the best thinkers of our age, to wit: Prof, H. Sidgwich, 1882-1884; Prof. Balfour Stewart, F. R. S., 1885-1887; Prof. Sidgwich, again, 1889-1892; Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M. P., F. R. S., 1893; Prof. William James, Harvard University. 1894-1895; Sir William Crookes, F. R. S., 1896-1899. Yet the President of the past year states in his address:

"May not the instances where adequate precautions have been taken, adequate record made, be counted on the fingers of one hand?"

This, in reference to those to whose care responses from the unseen world have been hitherto left. Nevertheless, one point stands out clearly which can be demonstrated by a canvass of their fifteen published volumes, the *hidden forces within!* All investigation from other sources corroborates this position. Even in the phenomenal case of Miss Helene Smith, given by Prof. Flournoy in his recent work "From India to the Planet Mars," although this intelligent woman may "insist with stoutest boasts" that she sees the ghosts, and may claim with a never-failing confi-

dence that is assuredly convincing to her own senses, that she knows Leopold, sees him, hears him, understands him—in spite of this the learned Professor of Psychology from the *same* facts, as scientifically insists, that it is all "within her."

So, too, the Theosophist has been taught in the esoteric books. All is within. According to tenets long held by investigators in the Orient, if the soul of man on earth ever gets into comunication with an ex-carnate soul, the living must mount to the dead, not the dead descend to the living. Soul may mount to soul in rational thought, but the contact will not be made through the medium of any of the five senses, nor will it be made on the physical plane.

Therefore, if Saul traveled to the Witch of Endor to evoke the dead Samuel, he carried the ghost of Samuel within him. The witch could not produce it. She did not keep dead men's forms on tap for all comers, nor do modern mediums. Sensitives who seek such phenomena generally perceive that which most interests them. Other callers who are in grief and wish to hear rather than see, generally hear that which mostly interests them. The process is intelligently understood under psychological law.

These strange cases, weird, uncanny, fascinating, and bewitching to many, are referable to the subdivisions now recognized as valid under the headings of hypnotism (pathological as well as normal); automatism (motor and sensory); telepathy (individual or collective); apparitions; natural somnambulism (as well as hypnotic); double or multiplex personality; clairvoyance, clairaudience, psychometry, suggestion, (auto and collective); veridical dreams, and an almost endless possibility awaiting the student as effort brings in fresh facts to analyze, label or appraise.

And with the forthcoming of these new phenomenal aspects of the psychic powers latent in Man let it not be

forgotten that Professor Ladd who occupies the chair of Psychology of Yale University with such great distinction, says that as man has reasonably been functioning in the past with more than twenty senses, instead of the traditional five, and will yet use twenty more in the course of due evolution, it must always be kept steadfastly in mind that *all is within.*

It may be gathered from the above broad generalizations that the human organism is the harmonious working—the association of parts within a whole. As such this individual organism is a formal community of effort and will. As Lewes would put it, from his viewpoint—a sensory commune," but this limits the whole to sensory conceptions, well enough as to parts. A complete "connexus of activities" is another way of attempting to state it, but the idea uppermost in the minds of many would be, activities on the physical and even the mental planes. This would not cover all. *All*, in the mind of the Theosophist, means what it says; *all* the powers and forces of the Universe thus flung at man, centered in him until he becomes a veritable constellation of powers. If they are dormant or merely latent, it is because organized effort has not been put forth tending to the end—Perfect Man. That end is attainable in the far-off event by development, this through growth, this by organization of *all* the parts. The Theosophist is forever seeking further illumination on the processes to bring about the end—the Perfect Man.

And here, a pause demands some correction as to a proper understanding of illumination. Let an average man on the street ask another of same grade of culture, as is usually done, "What are these Theosophists driving at, anyway?" "O, they claim some direct illumination or something of that sort. I looked up the word in the dictionary and that's what I gather." The author of these papers received from an intelligent lady who has devoted years of

study to all phases of faith, the information that a Theosophist could, in his own opinion, sit in quiet retreat and be illuminated from outside sources far above the ordinary mortal, and she added, that perhaps the psychical predominated in such people. Such misconceptions are prevalent, and a word or two by way of correction is in order.

The Theosophist, if sincere, is the last in the world to expect any thing without effort, which he recognizes as a great law of Nature, and when Prof. Goldwin-Smith in his "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence" states that perhaps, after all, we may discover effort to be *the* great law of Nature, he is sapping and mining very close to the ancient fortifications of esotericism, which declares, and reiterates by manifold methods of reasoning, that only by man's individual effort; independent of Pope, prelate, priest or preacher can man attain his salvation and this by means of an illumination which lights the path. How is this illumination to be obtained?

Take an utterance from Tyndall, who admitted that he gathered much of his insight by following Emerson:

"Thus we see that Newton first pondered his facts, illuminated them with persistent thought, and finally divined the character of the force of gravitation. But having thus traveled inward to the principle, he had to reverse his steps carry the principle outward, and justify it by demonstrating its fitness to external Nature."

Mark the steps: "first pondered his facts." No sitting down here to mystic contemplation (which is well enough in its way whether studying the Cosmos, or trying to work out a patent), and waiting for some shower from outside to come without effort from within; but he, *himself* "illuminated them with persistent thought." This persistent thought, known as "intensity," in Psychological text-books, caused the light which manifested as illumination. How often we hear of one who by persistent thought for years on an invention has been brought to the full light in a dream—he

"dreamed it out" as he expresses it. But going off into sleep for the sake of dreaming never took out a patent. Dogs dream. This persistent thought has left its stored energy in the subliminal depths; registered there; it has been working there under the unremitting law of unconscious cerebration until there comes a moment of fulfillment when he can rush out into the street as did one of old and yell "Eureka" *I* have found it with a strong emphasis on the *I*.

But after the stage of illumination has been reached, more remains to be done. Newton next "*divined* the character of the force" upon which he had been illuminated by persistent thought. The Theosophist claims no more for his method of procedure. Nothing supernatural comes to him; the very word is expunged from his working vocabulary. Supersensuous has a meaning to the student of Occultism, but in using it, the idea of miracle is blotted from thought.

The moment we utter the word "supersensuous" as contrasted with "supernatural," we are in the domain of the psychic forces, but this, does not mean that we leave the physical plane as a definite place to enter one above, which might be inferred from the prefix "super." It is higher in the rate of vibration, but both planes are within, together with other planes, still higher, each with a higher rate of vibration. Is this line of reasoning vague to the reader?

Adopt a parallel to make it clear. A few years ago the savants met in England at their annual association for the advancement of Science, and divided into sections as they are for the simplifying of the vast work. Section A devoted to "Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity" made its annual report. In brief, it stated that fifty years ago five stations were established for the study of Terrestrial Magnetism: America, England, France, Germany and Russia, one each. Only the one in Russia is of any practical moment now. Why? Because in the other countries

electricity has multiplied its agencies for power, light, heat, chemistry, etc., until the vibrations have surcharged everything where it works, and the city of Washington is cited as being so thoroughly saturated that even the water and gas pipes in the earth are disintegrating because of the action of currents, whether escaping or not, is indefinite in said report.

The observer will see in every direction wires overhead and conduits underneath, as well as motor power on the surface, generating currents which preclude the working by observation and experiment of the finer force of magnetism. The magnetic instruments are too delicate to respond in such a chorus of relatively coarser vibrations. On the material plane, as some Theosophists would reason, these finer instruments should be taken to Russia or some other secluded retreat where the results of civilization will not hinder. This is generally an argument of a few of the ultra-mystic school, and of convents and nuneries in all ages when monarchism flourishes under priestly patronage, from the earliest in Egypt, India and Chaldea to the present day.

But the studious Theosophist who first ponders the facts, and illuminates them with persistent thought in order to divine the character of this finer force of magnetism, will have none of this "non-earthly" procedure. Man is not a delicate instrument set to a rate of vibration that is difficult to hold "static" in his environment. He is a magnet himself. He feels the electrical forces, but is so constituted that it is ever seeking equilibrium—adaptation. He will overcome all even if the modern civilization shall "criss-cross" every square inch of his welkin with wires and wireless contrivances. Give him time to adapt his organism to these newly developed agencies and he will surmount all, by using all, to develop still higher powers, until the dream of Bulwer Lytton may become a reality as foreshadowed in "The Coming Race." But this dream will

never be realized, according to the reasoning of the Theosophist by running away from the currents to some retreat.

The psychic forces, next to the physical, all within man, must be passed through by experience and overcome; not that they are base and ignoble, but that there are higher planes to enter before the Perfect Man can stand as the climax of all that is now possible in our ideals, and when that stage is reached, it is even then in the line of reasoning that higher conceptions will be evolved, but nothing in Theosophic thought was ever evolved until it was first involved—all within again.

Higher conceptions, higher planes and kindred phrases necessary in the explanation of phychic forces are apt to draw the fire of the over-exact carper. All the shafts which have been hurled at "Transcendentalism," and "Occultism" as studied in the East seem to be specially aimed at the Theosophist. Here is a specimen as given by a reverend gentleman in a popular book on religion:

"Theosophists profess to possess certain powers over nature by which communication between one mind and another may be made at a distance and intercourse held with disembodied spirits by certain media called Mahatmas, who are supposed to possess spiritualistic gifts of a superior order."

Does this oracle of orthodox spleen know that in the Theosophic glossary, the Christ, the Buddha, the Mahatma, have precisely the same signification? And why should not they be "supposed to possess spiritualistic gifts of a superior order," if they have assimilated the all-pervading spirit until it can be rationally stated that they have become spiritualized. As to "holding intercourse with disembodied spirits," no Theosophist of an inquiring cast of mind ever believed it a possibility on the physical plane; he is clearly taught that until further perfected, men are not fitted to receive communications from a higher world. It is held rational in his comprehension of the cosmos that by growth

and development which but few have ever attained, planes above the physical can be reached, but as to communications between mind and mind at a distance, which is Telepathy, the Theosophist will not shirk the charge, nor will any student of the psychic forces latent in man care to, after investigation of the records of India, and the East generally, for thousands of years. Even nearer home, this power has again and again been demonstrated. But perhaps the best answer to such cavil is a quotation from the writing of one who is rated as a scientist—Alfred Russel Wallace, in his work recounting the wonderful achievements of the past century:

"The great lesson to be learnt from our review of this subject (psychical research) is, distrust of all *a priori* judgments as to *facts*; for the whole history of the progress of human knowledge, and especially of that department of knowledge now known as psychical research, renders it certain that, whenever the scientific men or popular teachers of any age have denied on *a priori* grounds of impossibility, or opposition to the laws of nature, the facts observed and recorded by numerous investigators of average honesty and intelligence, *these deniers have always been wrong*. Future ages will I believe be astonished at the vast amount of energy and ignorance displayed by so many of the great men of the century in opposing unpalatable truths, and in supposing that *a priori* arguments, accusations of imposture, or insanity, or personal abuse were the proper means of determining matters of fact and of observation in any department of human knowledge."

It is needless to quote Sir Willaim Crookes for his defense of telepathy has become familiar to the civilized world, and his deductions founded on induction are not to be laughed away.

If the materialistic philosophers will but devote serious study to the psychic life in micro-organisms and follow it step by step in the human endowment they will find much that has been corroborated in the ancient thought of India and Egypt. Even the Jains, a comparatively small sect in

India, have a scientific literature which treats elaborately of the minute divisions of the human beings, and their wise men have long before the discovery of the microscope, as Virchand A. Ghandi told us at the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, been able to tell how many organs of sense the minutest animalcule has, and he referred his hearers to Jain biology, zoology, botany, anatomy and physiology. Their excellent psychology was founded on the psychic life of micro-organisms. And the largest encyclopedic work in existence is the Buddhist Tangym including 255 volumes. In Thibit is another vast collection; and Brahmanical as well as Hindoo literature is correspondingly large.

It would seem as if the excellent work begun by Genevese, Peter Huber (1810) had been almost suffocated by the dogmatism of the materialists. He proved by observation and experiment in the study of ants that they could communicate with each other at a distance by a language of which the methods elude us. Even the ancient Egyptians believed this of the scarabee.

When the Theosophist endeavors to introduce Oriental thought and uses the terminology peculiar to the Eastern investigators, Vibrations being one of the important classifications in the processes of Nature, the specialist in a department of Western thought is apt to sneer at the words which are used only as vehicles of thought. Here less tolerance is shown than in the colleges of India. No teacher there would object to Tyndall's terse terms, such as, wherein he speaks of the ether:

"This all pervading substance takes up their molecular *tremors* and conveys them with inconceivable rapidity to our organs of vision. It is the *transported shiver* of bodies countless millions of miles distant, which *translates* itself into the human consciousness, etc."

The Oriental can surpass Tyndall in glorious imagery and subtle reasoning, but both mean the same thing, and

in attempting to make plain to the student the procedure we must use such striking figures of speech as are available.

But even an occasional Theosophist has not proved himself infallible or carefully judicious as, for instance, in adopting the word "astral" into the terminology. At its ultimate analysis it proves to be but the lowest plane of vibration of the all pervading Akasa, or ether in modern science. The word and its accompanying thought has wrought mischief in the ranks of the non-studious members of the Society who apparently forget that it is not an essential in the teachings. When the author of these papers delivered a lecture in Washington a few years ago, attempting to explain that the real meaning in the Sanscrit was a projection of consciousness, not the astral body, some sharp criticisms followed, but happily, there seem to be others, in India, who are endeavoring to make clear the teaching, as witness the following from "*The Theosophical Review* (December, 1900) published simultaneously at Adyar, Madras, and Benares:

"Now there are many terms current among Theosophical writers which could easily be improved; of these we will instance only one, and from one we can learn to estimate the value of the rest. The term 'astral' is a literary abomination. It has no *raison d'etre;* it is a medieval invention tangled up with the misunderstood tradition of astrologism. It has a precise meaning you will say, and we must be precise in these scientific days. It *had* a precise meaning in the days of Paracelsus, for it designated the subtle envelope influenced by the stars. But nowadays there are thousands of people who accept the idea of the 'astral body' but who are not prepared to ascribe any validity to the 'science of the stars.' They may be right or they may be wrong in the claims of astrology, but it is unwise to tie round the neck of the doctrine of a psychic envelope in man what the majority regard as the millstone of astrologism, and this is practically what is done by labelling it 'astral.' "

The loosely used term, "astral-body," has been made to

cover every kind of phantasmal or "spiritual" appearance of the human form, all under the psychic powers latent in Man, and the well directed jest that Theosophists are the only people who can be in two places at the same time would be well merited if such teachings were allowed to continue.

Conan Doyle in his "Mystery of Cloomber" aimed to make a book that would sell, and by pandering to the "eternal gullible" he succeeded at the risk of building the greatest marvel on astral bodies yet conceived in the fertile imagination of any novelist of our day.

F. Marion Crawford was not far behind in his "Mr. Isaacs." Both these fertile authors had warrant for their plots in the silly stuff put out by certain Theosophical writers, and having thus the material furnished, they had to do that which the successful novelist aims to do on the *sub rosa* understanding of the craft—"If you are going to lie, tell a big one. It pays."

During the last decade the scientists of the Western thought have devoted some attention to the evolutionary feature of psychical development. Anthropological societies refer to Huxley's pioneer work in 1863—"Man's Place in Nature." The Theosophist has studied his utterances with candor and found that when he is guided by specialists the following paragraph is not alluded to:

"At the same time no one is more strongly convinced than I am of the vastness of the gulf between civilized man and the brutes; or is more certain that whether *from* them or not, he is assuredly not of them. No one is less disposed to think lightly of the present dignity, or despairingly of the future hopes, of the only consciously intelligent denizens of the world."

And this "only consciously intelligent denizen of the world" is the Man, the Thinker, the Knower, of Theosophic thought. He is formed in his psychical endowment of the *combined attributes* of all below him. He carries all phases

of psychical activity that can be discovered from the micro-organisms, to the most intelligent of the animals. He is the sum total of all, yet we can say with Huxley, that he is not *of them*, even if indirectly *from them*.

A word on the phases of thought which pass under the labels of Mental Science, Christian Science, etc. From the point of view of the investigating Theosophist, they, like all schools, have much good in them, and much that can be discarded as non-essential. Mental Science leads in rational and consistent presentation. It has proven its claims in thousands of instances and will continue to grow into favor if it can clear its camp streets of demagogues and charlatans. It has the seal of approval of all antiquity on its side when properly represented, and be it said to the credit of the school, it is consistently, persistently and sincerely endeavoring to get at the real fundamentals of the Psychic Powers latent in Man. The able scholarship already enlisted in its cause will save it, finally, from those who for avarice and greed have brought disrepute upon its teachings, and the same may be said of Theosophy.

But as to Christian Science, while the thousands who are now in its culture are sincere, and praiseworthy for laudable effort, nevertheless the charge can be filed that they have not exercised with vigor all the thought with which they have been endowed. Why the term "*Christian*" should be appropriated is an enigma to the scientific archaeologist as well as to the careful philologist. Reduced to its simplest statement, it is a school for will-culture, and properly conducted, as it is in many instances, merits more praise than sneers; but the method is very old. It would have been nearer the spirit of stern equity had it been labelled Pagan Science, for the pagans excelled on the same lines anything which has yet been presented under the discipline of the Christian school. A transition is already discernible; schisms are reported and for just cause. It will

be found an utterly impossible feat for Mrs. Eddy in her official capacity as pontiff to hinder investigation in this scientific age. Science will purify the thought of her followers and correct errors as it ever has when allowed free scope. It has purified religion to a great extent and the process is still in active operation. Mrs. Eddy's fundamental concepts are as far from scientific demonstration as was that of St. Augustine whom some Christians regard as gifted with an insight into the ultimate realities.

Theosophists here and there are "healers" as well as Christian Scientists, but they do not tag their method with any name, nor do they accept money for their work on such lines. If they find that because of a peculiar endowment, which is common to certain individualities of the race as far back as human records go, they are enabled to do a fellow mortal a service, it is rendered freely and without pecuniary charge. If a tag is really necessary to the Theosophist, any, or all, can be used; Krishna Science, Zoroastrian Science, Buddhistic Science, Osirian Science, Mahometan Science, even Mormon Science, for some of the Mormons have developed as high powers on this line as others of the moderns, but they are all included from a Theosophist's point of view under the Psychic Powers latent in man.

The Theosophist has allied his investigation to that of the best of the medical profession which recognizes that the aim of medicine is not to destroy the disease, but rather to stimulate the resisting forces of the body. On this line of treatment the whole logic of a profession assumes a new aspect, and with it all phases of psycho-therapeutics under whatever name. The real danger in all the systems relying on mental agencies, while helpful when wisely employed, is, that they lead to the neglect of ordinary medical treatment. The physical system when invaded by an overwhelming force of the "little lives" so well explained in the old Sanscrit and recognized in modern practice as microbes,

bacteria, etc., needs more than the powers of the best will culture to dislodge the already fortified enemy from their well entrenched captured territory.

More than one inquiring mind has asked the author after a lecture devoted to the latent powers within, "What of the forces which must come from without?" This can best be answered by grouping all under the convenient term of the scientist—"the environmental stimuli." The Theosophist fully appreciates the desire of the investigator who seeks to know. A full answer to all is thus far, in research, beyond the grasp of any mind now functioning on earth. Recall the quotation from Laplace. We are far from knowing all. But the teachings of the old sages of the East are more explicit than any given modern science. When such a broad generalization as "environmental stimuli" is given, let it be taken for granted as the Theosophist is taught that the whole universe is our environment, and we are far from knowing all the forces inherent in the "great all" which stimulate. The message bearing action from without acting on the within, even in a single case requires deep and searching study. But general principles prevail; nothing can be evolved which was not at first involved. The interaction of the two constant forces involves a comprehension on all planes—physical, mental, psychic, spiritual. In Theosophic teaching, Man is directly in communication with each of these planes. According to his self-induced effort will he respond to outside stimulus. In the realm of psychism alone, without a scientific habit of thought he becomes the prey of dangerous forces, which lead to mental and spiritual wreck.

A quotation from the second of the lectures of Professor Brinton on "Religion of Primitive Peoples" will serve to awaken a desire for further search into this interesting study:

"Such are some of the potent stimuli which stir the

depths of man's psychical nature, awakening in him the belief in unknown powers far beyond his ability to measure or cope with. Not from any conscious act of intelligence, not from any process of voluntary reasoning, is that belief born, but from the unknown, the unplumbed abyss of the sub-conscious mind.

Let not this be considered as something degrading to the religious conceptions themselves. Though all are drawn from out the human spirit [soul] itself, and are nowise the direct relatives their believers think them, yet who dare measure the height and the depth of the sub-conscious intelligence? It draws its knowledge from *sources which elude scientific research*, from the strange powers which we perceive in insects, and other lower animals, almost, but not wholly, obliterated in the human line of organic descent; *and from others, now merely nascent or embryonic*, new senses, destined in some far off aeon to endow our posterity with faculties as wondrous to us as would be sight to the sightless."

The Theosophist can readily endorse the statement of the eminent Professor, that the subliminal depths draw "Knowledge from sources which elude scientific research" but he will as readily maintain that great investigators of old have drawn much that is unknown to the modern researcher, and this stored knowledge is available in the esoterlc books of the Sages. On that knowledge one of old was enabled to write for all posterity in the Sanscrit Upanishads:

"THERE IS NO LIMIT TO THE KNOWING OF THE SELF THAT KNOWS."

CHAPTER IX.

TRANSCENDENTALISM, MYSTICISM, OCCULTISM, ESOTERICISM, AND OTHER TECHNICAL TERMS.

When the carper refers to certain high-flown terms which he has seen in Theosophical terminology, he is at pains to state that in the "whirligig of time" these things appear in the evolution of thought, but he has not for a moment considered that the Theosophist uses the word "Cycles" to express the same idea. A strict defining of both would bring the two minds *en rapport*. But whether cycle or whirligig, the following extract which will explain itself, is from the pen of John Quincy Adams.

"The sentiment of religion is at this time, perhaps, more potent and prevailing in New England than in any other portion of the Christian world. For many years the establishment of the Theological school at Andover, the Calvinists and the Unitarians have been battling with each other upon the Atonement, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the Trinity. This has very much subsided, but this wandering of minds takes the place of that and equally lets the wolf into the fold. A young man named Ralph Waldo Emerson, a son of my once loved friend, William Emerson, and a classmate of my lamented George, after failing in the every-day avocation of a Unitarian preacher and schoolmaster, starts a new doctrine of Transcendentalism, declares all the old revelations superannuated and worn out and announces the approach of new revelations and prophesies."

One in a million to-day may, perhaps, recite a line or word, of what the dead Adams may have said or written, but millions in all languages are hoarding as jewels the

aphorisms of Emerson. His works have been translated into the tongues of all thinking peoples, and the remarkable tendency at present is to more fully grasp what was so feebly understood even by his intimate friends, when Adams and others were denouncing him, and labelling his teachings as the "saturnalia, or excess of faith." Emerson was the first to introduce the deeper thought into America, and it is safe to say that there are more unenrolled Theosophists of the Emersonian cast of mind, than ever were on the rosters of the Society.

A generation preceding, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe impressed the thought of his day with sublimer conceptions of the universe, his "Westoestlicher Divan," a remarkable collection of Oriental songs and poems, surviving the thunders of the partisan pulpits and altars of Germany and neighboring bigoted nations.

A century cycle back of the transcendental Goethe another great soul appeared—Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz, to whom, (the authorities now seem willing to agree), the credit is given for discovering the differential calculus independently of any knowledge of Newton's method of fluxions, so that each of these great men in reality attained the same result for himself. And authorities equally eminent are willing to agree that in the advanced state of our thought, he is entitled to the crown of victory in controverting Locke's rejection of innate ideas, holding that there are necessary truths which cannot be learned from experience, but are innate in the soul, capable of being called forth by circumstances. The pulpit curses against him were strong enough to bewilder the populace and prejudice those in civil authority against him, for his funeral was shunned by royalty and its retinue to which, he by right had claims; also by the learned societies to which he belonged, for fear of pulpit ostracism. Yet his statue in majestic grandeur stands forth in the National Library building at Washing-

ton, an answer to the world that "truth crushed to earth will reincarnate," as the Theosophist puts it. The heresies of yesterday are the beliefs of to-day.

Transcendentalism is so much an accomplished fact in the present exalted consciousness that it is doubtful if even a materialistic thinker can be found who will care to state that a human being can exist in the realm of pure thought, without betraying the very evidence of a something transcendent. It is not many years ago since a Washington scientist who had earned the reputation of very definite materialistic thinking, in a brochure accepted without spice or scruples the term "Transcendental Biology."

Back of Leibnitz, reaching to Plato, and far back to the sages of the older world, the Transcendentalists have left the most enduring crystallizations of thought. When properly understood, the term loses much of the odium which has been cast upon it by an ultra school. As used in the philosophy of Kant, applied to all those principles of knowledge which are original and primary, involving such necessary and strictly universal truths as to transcend all truth derived from experience, which must always be contingent and particular, the term was accepted by a large following of philosophical thinkers, but the Theosophist, in his comprehension of Truth, as a whole, is not a Kantian, nor is he, if a thorough-going Theosophist, a follower of any special school; by his very habit of thought brought about by training in Theosophical class-rooms, he is a synthesizer; he puts all together because there is good in all. The process of elimination is an arduous one; the forever reaching for the "picked minority of the qualified fittest" requires his noblest effort, but always, and in all, he is a transcendentalist for he is, ever on this plane of vibration, reminded that:

"These are the things you see;
The unseen things are more."

If the average reader cannot be convinced by the reasoning coupled with the intuitions of the Transcendentalist, of the practicability of such teachings, perhaps a partial entrance into his consciousness may be effected by simply quoting the well known, but not so well understood, saying of that master of English epigrams:

"There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in your philosophy."

When Theodore Parker, in 1847, said of Emerson: "I believe he is having a greater influence on the thought of the world than any man living," he but expressed the opinion of the deepest thinkers of the day, however reluctantly they may have acquiesced in the statement. There is no dispute as to the fact judged from the present power of his transcendental teachings. He prepared the soil of Puritanical New England for the sowing of the Theosophical thought, but at a great cost of effort. He wrote "Nature" in 1836 and it took twelve years to sell 500 copies. In 1847 while Parker was clinging to "Locke on the Human Understanding," and Bronson Alcott hugging his Plato, Emerson was delving deeply into the Bhavagad Gita, a text-book in Theosophical classes always. This was about thirty years before the formation of the Theosophical Society in New York.

The incident related by Charles Malloy concerning the purchase at a book stall, in London, of a second-hand copy of the Bhavagad Gita, by Emerson, may seem trivial to those who have not studied the ancient wisdom. It could not be chance; it was his Karma to encounter it then and there. When he came to America and gave forth his comprehensive interpretations, a mutual friend asked Theodore Parker what he thought of Emerson going so deeply into the Gita. Parker answered that he feared Emerson did not understand it. His questioner replied, "I don't think he does understand it—as you do."

Here was the secret of Emerson's teaching which so staggered not only John Quincy Adams but others; they could not possibly understand it as Emerson did; they were simply not prepared for it; had not reached that limit of inspiration in the evolution of mind. The present generation assimilates it readily. Yet Emerson was actually teaching all the essentials of Theosophy, viz.—the Perfectibility of Man, brought about by repeated lives (Reincarnation) compelled by the force of Karma (the law of cause and effect, action and reaction).

He wrote the poem—"Brahma," publishing it in the first number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, in June, 1857, nearly twenty years before the Theosophical Society was formed, and though it brought forth the ridicule of the superficial reader, it contained, as his best biographer, Charles Malloy states, the whole of the Gita. Let the Theosophical student scan it studiously and see if it does not:

"If the red slayer think he slays
Or if the slain think he is slain,
They know not well the subtle ways
I keep and pass and turn again.

They reckon ill who leave me out;
When me they fly, I am the wings;
I am the doubter and the doubt,
And I the hymn the Brahmin sings."

In those days this was transcendental with a power, but not more so to the student than another poem from which the following is an extract, and a convenient one for a scientific series of lectures which now gladly publish it on the covers of each book;

"A subtle chain of countless rings,
The next unto the farthest brings;
The eye reads omens where it goes,
And speaks all languages the rose;
And striving to be man, the worm
Mounts through all the spires of form."

And this bold statement of the doctrine of Evolution was made in 1847, ten years before Darwin's "Origin of Species," and twenty years before "The Descent of Man." Yet the same thought, paraphrased by a Theosophical speaker from the platform during the first year of the Twentieth Century is met by an exclamation from a newspaper in New York in the following strain:

"Surely here is wisdom from the gods and it takes the gods to understand it."

And surely here again it may be returned that from the sordid setting of certain editorial chairs no seraphic faces could be expected to glow and gleam with the purest and intensest light while dollars and cents represent all that is transcendent in their environment. The motive force urging man towards the attainment of his ideals is the transcendent with the Emersonian student, and the transcendent is now, after struggle for perfection, in the ascendant. As a school of thought it is here to stay.

Mysticism has, somehow, with a bad odor, entered into current writings and sayings, being the next stage, the necessary product of Transcendentalism, so it is said, and is set up by many who ought to know better, for that which is vague and illusive in philosophy. John Stuart Mill is frequently quoted, wherein he states that: "Whether in the Vedas, in the Platonists, or in the Hegelians, mysticism is neither more nor less than ascribing objective existence to the subjective creations of our own faculties, to ideas or feelings of the mind, and believing that, by matching and contemplating these ideas of its own making it can read in them what takes place in the world without."

There is more than a grain of truth in the charge, yet mysticism properly understood is not the frightful bugbear it has been sketched. Certain aspects of it deserve rebuke, and certain devotees calling themselves Theosophists are not guiltless of foisting upon the school a vapid mysticism

from degenerated teachings of the East, begotten of brain-diseased monks and recluses.

Professor Goldwin Smith says, speaking as he thinks he does, for the culture of modern times, that we are done with mysticism forever; but Balfour in his "Foundations of Belief" claims that it always has been, as it always will be, a factor in the exalted consciousness of man. These opposite conclusions from two English writers suggests to the man on the street, that he may pay his money and take his choice.

The thinking man of our epoch will be keen enough to note that, whereas Prof. Goldwin Smith in his "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence" attempts the role of a severe critic and wants to deal a blow at mysticism (for which he cannot be censured considering what has passed under the term for centuries) nevertheless as a thinker, and a free one at that, he betrays the pure mysticism which is innate and which he could no more shake off than he could his very soul force. Scattered through his book are the following expressions which clinch the intrinsic, the stored ripeness of his own wisdom, and which a Theosophist who can retain belief in a Mysticism properly interpreted, respectfully refers to the candid reader, as evidence that Balfour is right when he declares that it remains an undying element in our nature:

"If there is a soul of the universe, and if it holds communion in any way with the soul of man, such a belief would seem likely to be no mere hallucination."

"It is conceivable that good and beautiful character may be prized by the soul of the universe, if the universe has a soul, as capable with union with itself, and that it may thus transcend the limits of our being here. If this is but a hint, on a question so dark and of such overwhelming importance, we may gladly welcome the faintest gleam of light."

"Good character only could have a life-giving affinity to the power of good.

"Here, if at any point in history, we may believe that the spirit of the world, if the world has a spirit, was at work."

"These things may even be accepted on the supposed evidence of a spiritual sense illuminated by divine influence."

"We fail to conceive infinity, yet we are sure the universe is infinite. For the purpose of natural theology it might be well to say Power or Soul of the Universe, instead of God."

All this from a mind severely taxed by the rigid methods of exact induction, and an apparent self-forced position not to accept any thing, unless coordinated to sense relations, is remarkable, and whether the eminent writer may will or no, the mystic process as above confessed is clearly working in his mind. He is, however, a fair example of the so-called brainy men of our day who rely mainly on the testimony of the senses.

However, the opposite extreme should not be resorted to, according to the counsel of the sages during the ages. The intoxication of the mind should not be allowed to pass as mysticism. We are too far advanced in the science of Psychology in this progressive age not to be able to mark the line which legitimately separates the two methods of entering states of consciousness.

But a word from another thinker can throw light upon the problem. Camille Flammarion in his chapter on Incredulity in his recent work—"The Unknown" says:

"In analyzing the testimony of our senses we find that they can deceive us absolutely. We see the sun, the moon and the stars revolving, as it seems to us, round us. That is all false. We feel that the earth is motionless. That is false, too. We see the sun rise above the horizon. It is beneath us. We touch what we think is a solid. There is no such thing. We hear harmonious sounds; but the air has only brought us silently undulations that are silent themselves. We admire the effects of light and of the colors that bring vividly before our eyes the splendid scenes of nature; but in fact there is no light, there are no colors.

It is the movement of opaque ether striking on our optic nerve which gives us the impression of light. We burn our foot in the fire; it is not the foot that pains us, it is in our brain only that the feeling of being burned resides. We speak of heat and cold; there is neither heat nor cold in the universe, only motion. Thus our senses mislead us as to the reality of objects round us. Sensation and reality are two different things.

"August Comte and Littre have apparently striven to trace out for science its definite, its positive way. It tells us we are only to admit what we can see, or can touch, or what we have heard. We are to receive nothing except the clear evidence of our senses, and we are not to endeavor to know what is unknowable. For a half century these have been the rules which have regulated science in the world."

So it seems that it is possible for a false science to exist, as well as a false mysticism. The canons of common sense should regulate both. John Stuart Mill in the quotation, from his point of view, saw mysticism in its irrational form. The world has been filled with it for centuries. The archaeologist traces it to the temples of Egypt whence it percolated to the Sinaitic peninsula. It is found in its extravagant cast wherever monasticism has endeavored to do that which John Stuart Mill charges—"the ascribing objective existence to the subjective creations of our faculties." So that, if a monk sets out to see his Lord, he will see him; he works himself toward that end until his brain has become physiologically diseased, and he, in addition, has become psychically insane. The Buddhistic monk can cultivate trance states and realize the object sought for in apparition, more speedily because of the better methods of training. The monks of Rama, claiming to be the oldest as an order now in existence, by certain practices outdo them all. Every nation, of which we have recovered record, exhibits procedure which approaches the now acknowledged delusions of overwrought psychical practices.

But the Theosophical student does not forget in his re-

search, the declaration of Herbert Spencer that in such universal customs we are to search for the truth in them, for they are founded on truth. And the truth we find, when we attain to a true apprehension of what a true mystic may reach. He aims for reality. In many cases, differing in degree, not in kind, the real has been found. Whether we adopt the reasoning of Recejac in his "Basis of the Mystic Knowledge" or follow Professor Ladd in his "Philosophy of Knowledge," or have recourse to the declarations of many of the wisest of the wise who have ever lived on earth, we are forced to the belief that in Freedom alone, can each for himself, attain to that which will be true for himself, and for no other self unless that self can take it as belonging to itself. But the revelation will come to him through intuition, and not by sensation through the intellect.

The moment we reach the plane of thought where we rest conviction on what comes through the intuition we encounter afresh, the assaults of that class of thinkers who deny that there can be certitude in intuitional knowledge, and, the issue being joined on this point, we come to the discussion of another term which has become a veritable bogy—Occultism.

The easiest way to open the case before the great public jury, which shall determine as to facts, is to refer, in passing, to a strenuous effort by Professor Joseph Jastrow, University of Wisconsin, in the *Popular Science Monthly*, September, 1900, on "The Modern Occult." Twenty-four pages are devoted to the threshing of opinions on certain ideas which were old before Christianity began, old before the Pyramids were built, and as old as the Proto-Aryan, if we ever find traces of that first stock. Forasmuch as the Professor's effort may tend to morally criminate the many phases therein discussed, including Christian Science, Spiritualism and other cults let these appear in court by attorney, or in person,

as they may choose. The appearance herewith is in behalf of Theosophy, which is traversed in the complaint with some specification and detail.

But, inasmuch as less scoring is exhibited toward this culture as compared with the others, it would seem as if the school was not quite so reprehensible. Due regard for chivalrous treatment should also be acknowledged, for in closing that particular section of the contribution the following is given:

"The modern Theosophist seeks to appeal to men and women of philosophical inclinations, for whom an element of mysticism has its charm, and who are intellectually at unrest with the conceptions underlying modern science and modern life. Such persons are quite likely to be well educated, refined and sincere. We may believe them intellectually misguided; we may recognize the fraud to which their leader resorted to glorify her creed, but we must equally recognize the absence of many pernicious tendencies in their teachings which characterize other and more practical occult movements."

This is gracious treatment in a fighter who seeks the aggressive. Theosophists as graciously bow to the Professor and proceed to thank him for the deserved compliment, for it has been amply demonstrated in all parts of the world that Theosophists are quite likely to be "well educated, refined and sincere." It is equally as true that there can be discovered an "absence of many pernicious tendencies in their teachings which characterize other and more practical occult movements."

As to the rebukes given, both direct and implied, a genuine Theosophist will again render thanks, if the charges are true. He is a friend who can convince a friend of fault, and he is the truest friend who can receive a merited admonition when given in a friendly spirit. The Theosophist embodies such friendly action in the teachings. It comes down from the sages and is evident in Theosophical literature.

But, in a trial before the tribunal of the public consciousness, stern justice will allow the Theosophist a fair defense; he may be heard. So, admitting part of what has been charged, a specific denial can be entered as to many of the allegations therein. Thus, while it may be true that the attitude of the student of occultism is that of one seeking to solve an enigma, to find the key to a strange puzzle, it is not as equally true, because a few of the ultra class adopt such practice, that the studious Theosophist will start search for a "mystic charm, some talismanic formula, some magical procedure, which shall dispel the mist that hides the face of nature and expose her secrets to his ecstatic gaze." There have lived in the history of the world many who could be enumerated under such a class, but Professor Jastrow is utterly ignorant of the intensely earnest methods of the Theosophist if he assumes that such practices are countenanced. His utterances have weight because he is the occupant of an important Chair in a university which does credit to the state of Wisconsin, hence the necessity of meeting such statements by a bold denial. A Theosophist aims by honest, persistent *effort* to "dispel the mist,' and this is the one all-encompassing, masterful effort by which the correct solution is to be discovered or revealed.

We have diligent students in the realm of Psychology in the Theosophical classes of every nation on the globe. They inherit psychological teachings from past-masters in that science of mental operations and states of consciousness, that were thousands of years old before a chair of psychology had been endowed in Wisconsin or any other place in the Occident. These ancient teachers long ago settled the truth contained in the following by Professor Jastrow:

"As our ordinary senses and faculties are obviously insufficient to accomplish such ends," etc.

This is exactly the position of the modern Theosophist. But it is not fair, not true, that to accomplish such ends, "supernatural powers must be appealed to," for the Theosophist has from the beginning tabooed the word supernatural. The "supersensuous" is admitted, and if this realm is not recognized in the classes taught in the said university, it is, perhaps, because the teaching is yet in its infancy. There are Professors in the colleges of India who could teach a few things of importance to such an institution.

As to the specification that "a transcendental sphere of spiritual activity must be cultivated capable of perceiving through the hidden symbolism of apparent phenomena, the underlying relations of cosmic structure and final purposes," the answer could well be sustained that such a charge could apply not only to a Theosophist, but to an Emerson, because of his writings; to Fiske, because of his "Cosmic Philosophy"; to every exalted state of consciousness which has manifested in the flesh as far back as human records go.

The gist of the case appears in the next step of the Professor's argument. He maintains that to reach this transcendental sphere, which "form of occultism reaches its fullest and purest expression in Oriental wisdom-religions, long periods of training and devotion, seclusion, contemplation of inner mysteries, lead the initiate through the various stages of adeptship up to the final plane of communism with the infinite and the comprehension of truth in all things."

Now, with all due deference to the Professor, who is esteemed by the author because of his eminence in other departments of scientific thought, and because of his chivalrous deportment as an antagonist on any question,—it is sufficient to state flatly, that he could not have been well-informed on the subject which so earnestly engaged his attention.

The Theosophical Society in America, to which the author is allied as a member, never held any such ideas. Indeed, the very opposite is the teaching. Our duties are in this world; we are here, as we believe, by the law of Karma; personally we had no choice as to the coming, and we shall have as little as to our going; but we are of this world, and shall not attempt to run away from it. Our duties are in the world, not in caves, nor in cave-temples, nor in crypts, nor in monasteries, nor in seclusion anywhere. Even if an opportunity should offer, and a retreat be furnished, a true Theosophist would disdain to accept the training. We stand with Dr. Lyman Abbott, in his "Theology of an Evolutionist":

"Man cannot grow from innocence to virtue without temptation. * * * * There can be no virtue without temptation. An untempted soul may be innocent, but cannot be virtuous, for virtue is the choice of right when wrong presses itself upon us and demands our choosing. How can we have courage, unless there is danger and apprehension of the danger? How can we have patience, unless there are burdens to be borne and a desire to remove the burdens? How can we have fidelity, unless there is some trust to be maintained and some temptation calling on us to leave the trust and be false to it? The scorn of the 'goody-goody' is justified, for 'goody-goody' is innocence, not virtue; and the boy who never does anything wrong because he never does anything at all is of no use in the world. Temptation is struggle, and virtue emerges from struggle. And we cannot have the choice of right without the possibility of doing wrong."

The "long periods of training in seclusion by contemplation of inner mysteries and the leading of the initiate through the various stages up to adeptship" may have a charm for a certain class of Theosophists who belong to other camps, but if they continue to press such teachings upon this Western life, which of itself came about through the law of Karma, certainly not by chance, the inevitable

result must be that the discriminating public will accept the conclusion of Professor Jastrow:

"But when such views are forcibly transplanted to our age and clime, when they are decked in garments so unlike their original vestments, particularly when they are associated with dubious practices and come into violent conflict with the truth that has accumulated since they first had birth, their aspect is profoundly altered and they come within the circle of the modern occult."

Hence, it is not surprising that criticism should seek the warrant by which such transplanted practices evolve into schools for training, and a supposed curriculum for a college, the object of which is the revival of the Ancient Mysteries. Surely, there is cause for the Professor's declaration that they are "decked in garments so unlike their original vestments, particularly when they are associated with dubious practices," and the ardent students of the ancient lore are innocently burdened with the opprobrium thus cast upon them.

The practical American citizen will be sure to ask if even the most conscientious Theosophical student knows aught of the Ancient Mysteries. An equally practical answer from a Theosophical point of view is that there is nothing hidden that shall not be found out. It is not claimed that all has been found; but much has been recovered.

Will it be denied that Gen. Albert Pike, whose monument is seen in Washington, did not recover much of the essential meaning of the ancient teachings? The reader is respectfully referred to his "Morals and Dogma," a work that should be studied by all earnest searchers. Or will it be denied again that the equally arduous effort of Gerald Massey passes for naught? And what of the long line of archaeological explorers since the first publication of the work of Champollion? Every civilized nation has, to-day, somewhere in the East, one or more expeditions seeking to

recover the ancient thought, and they are succeeding with marvellous accuracy.

The long and useful career of Prof. Max Muller as a teacher should count for something on this line, and this is what he said in his "What India Can Teach Us":

"If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of them which well deserve the attention of those who have studied Plato and Kant, I should point to India?

"If I were to ask myself from what literature, we here in Europe, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, and, in fact, more truly human a life, not for this life only, but for a transfigured and eternal life, again I should point to India."

The Theosophist endeavors to assimilate this teaching so highly recommended. The Society has for twenty-five years been earnest in its research. It has been found profitable. But in this finding, there is no aggressive effort to thrust such gained insight upon the American consciousness. There should be no bigoted fling at Theosophists because they have found by the comparative method, beginning with the Vedas of India, that there is good in all scriptures, and plenty of error in each, even under the "shadow of the cross" to quote the flingers.

As to another pleading from another source, of a partisan zealot, that "far away and beyond the superficial fascination and glamor of these old religions, there is that in them which fails to convince and control even the most ignorant child of Christianity," allow the Theosophist, in addition to Prof. Max Muller, to name Prof. Flint, in the stronghold of Scotch Presbyterians who, in his lectures to the universities declared again and again that the teachings of the Sanscrit and Pali writings were "needed to modify Christianity, and modify it for the better."

Dr. Paul Deussen, of the University of Kiel, Germany, is not graded by broad men as an "ignorant child," yet he declares, on issuing recently his second volume of the voluminous history of philosophy, that the culminating point of human thought, Vedic and pre-Buddhistic, has never been excelled.

Rev. Lyman Abbott, and a galaxy of liberal Christians of our day, including all our poets, in particular, are not to be classed as "ignorant children" yet they have borrowed, and so openly acknowledge, great ideas from Oriental thought, and the able Theosophical periodicals now published in every reading nation testify by their intrinsic merit that they are not anti-Christian. Nevertheless, these same publications find ancient and venerable imposture in all religions, and Christianity has an abundant share. It is found, too, that religions make Bibles, and not Bibles religions. The foundations of religions are deeper than books, and to reach the depths which contain the basic principles is the effort of true Occultism, however little Professor Jastrow may apprehend this important fact.

While an additional specification admits that because of a growth of a more rational consciousness "miracles are no longer performed, and no immediately practical ends are proclaimed," nevertheless, "the Mahatmas are giving intellectual instructions, enormously more interesting than even the exhibition of their abnormal powers." This leads the average reader again to the conclusion that Theosophists still continue to believe in the miraculous, even though it is said "miracles are no longer performed." As if Theosophists ever did believe in miracles! This is a serious charge against a school of thought which will not recognize anything supernatural in Nature. The profession of belief in the miraculous, on the evidence offered, says Prof. Huxley, would be simply immoral. This will apply to a Theosophist as well as to the average Christian

who professes a belief in miracles on slender testimony. If sins are to be graded according to enormity, a rate well up in the scale has been assigned to that which is termed rashness of assent. Because an enthusiast in a certain camp in Theosophy declares that which is slightly supported by evidence it need not be accepted. It would, certainly, be rash to assent to it; as rash as it is to assert it.

Ingersoll did a great work for the Christian church in exposing that element in it which could be classified under no other term than that of the ridiculous. Many sensible preachers have thanked him for the good wrought and Theosophists who have the good of their cause at heart can thank Prof. Jastrow for all that he has done in exposing the irrational in certain camps. The Professor, if just, ought to thank the Theosophist for showing him wherein he is committing an ungracious error, in combating that which is imperishable in the world's thought. Occultism in its broadest apprehension embodies this undying, imperishable gift to the consciousness of man. What is charged by the Professor under the title of the "modern occult," is not, by any manner of means, that which is understood by the student as Occultism pure and simple.

Differences of opinion may occur as to such distinctions; as to their proper definitions; as to the outcome of each. But it is useless to argue further with Professor Jastrow, when he appends in a note the following:

"While I regard the acceptance of telepathy as an established phenomenon, as absolutely unwarranted and most unwarranted and while I feel a keen personal regret that men whose ability and opinions I estimate highly have announced their belief in a spiritualistic explanation of their personal experiences with a particular medium, yet my personal regret and my logical disapproval of these conclusions have ob viously no bearing upon the general questions under discus-

sion. The scientific investigation of the same phenomena which have formed the subject-matter of occult beliefs, is radically different in motive, method and result from the truly occult.

Is it so radically different in motive, method and result? The scientific investigation of the same phenomena is exactly that which is engaging the best efforts of many Theosophists. They are using their reason in order to verify their intuitions. They have accomplished more on this line of procedure than can be credited to Chairs of Psychology, speaking generally, and it is found that in the domain of a pure Occultism, there have been substantiated facts, rather than assertions. The student of the Esoteric lore never forgets the rule of Faraday—accept a fact, but cross-examine every assertion.

Psychology, according to the Theosophist, is exactly what the term indicates—Psycho-soul, and logos-discourse. It is more than a science of the mind; the mind is but a function of the soul force. The Eastern Psychologists thousands of years ago determined the status of the problem by noting this distinction. The soul force of a man is the whole of the "go" of a man, not a part of it. Occultism, when comprehended by a modern Psychology, will be compelled before it dives much deeper into the unplumbed abyss, to realize this fact and this distinction. It will not settle problems on the "threshold" to use one of the technical terms; nor will the grave questions obtain solution by postulating finalities in the subjective mind, or the subconscious mind, or the subliminal consciousness, or any other term adopted for teaching purposes and for classification.

Much of the confusion in the public mind regarding Occultism has arisen because of the inordinate desire of certain so-called teachers to further their special methods of study. Theosophy suffers thereby. Here it is a native

Hindu, who announces that he is prepared to open a class, and the fees are named for so much a lesson, or a term. The moment this practice is observed, no matter by whom. it is un-Theosophical. It is the glory of Theosophy that fees are never to be asked for teachings which aid in the betterment of men's ways. Theosophical lecturers study their subjects deeper than do most preachers, yet their discoveries are always freely given. It is a deep-seated principle in the culture that the best things in this world should be given away, and emphasis is placed on the esoteric saying, now paraphrased into English and used as a motto in other societies: "All that we can hold in our cold dead hand, is what we have given away."

These teachers of classes in the different cities have obtained most of what they profess to know from esoteric studies introduced mainly by the Theosophists during the past twenty-five years. There is much good in many of them, but the Theosophist refuses to recognize them as valid, or even efficacious so long as the practice is continued of selling such gifts at so much per head. It is anything but pure Occultism.

An educated gentleman from India who has taught classes according to the methods which his sect (a small one at that) approves, was asked by an inquiring clergyman whether they knew anything of Theosophy in his native country. He answered that his sect knew nothing of it, and he had met but few people in the Orient who had. Suppose, now, the questioner had asked him if he knew aught of Atma Vidya? The Sanscrit words would have caught his ear in a moment. Atma means soul, and Vidya, knowledge. He would have answered readily: "That's just what I am endeavoring to teach in my classes in Occultism. Yet Theosophy in the Greek thought is the same as Atma-Vidya in the Sanscrit. The basic principles are the same in the books of both. This oriental scholar was at

the Parliament of Religions and represented about six millions of people out of nearly four hundred million who rest their belief on the essentials of the Vedas. He used the following language:

"If religion is not wholly that something which satisfies the cravings of the emotional nature of man, but is that rational demonstration of the cosmos which shows at once the why and wherefore of existence, provides the external and all-embracing foundation of natural ethics, and by showing to humanity the highest ideal of happiness realizable; in other words, religion, instead of being a mere matter of faith, might well become the solid province of reason, and a science of religion may not be so much a dream as is imagined by persons pledged to certain conclusions."

Whereupon, another educated Oriental, who also teaches classes, and who claims to know all about Atma-Vidya in Sanscrit, but never heard of the Greek term Theosophy in his home, was introduced to the august presence of that memorable Parliament, and because he belonged to an older and more numerous sect, used the following language:

"From the high spiritual flights of philosophy, of which the latest discoveries of science seem like echoes, from the *Atheism of the Jains* to the low ideals of idolatry and the multifarious mythologies, each and all have a place in the Hindu's religion. Where, then, the question arises, where then the common center to which all these widely-converging radii converge? Where is the common basis upon which all these seemingly hopeless contradictions arise."

And this same teacher, by his method of Occultism, after acknowledging his sectarian bias, and flinging a thrust at the other fellow who is atheistic, reminds the Theosophist that not only is human nature alike in the Occident and Orient, but that there is sufficient to do yet, in the line of investigation by the comparative method, so diligently pursued in Theosophical classes, and it is also found that these warring sects, as well as contending factions in Christianity, have at the basis a common essential

foundation, which, from the author's point of view, is more clearly elucidated in the study of Occultism in Theosophical groups, than has been found thus far, judging from results, in the course of instruction in paid classes, no matter how eminent the teacher may have been heralded to the world.

But the Theosophist who proclaims to the world that all the truth is with him is committing a serious blunder. The tentacles of an aspiring ambition, if such a term is allowable, are reaching out with freedom but there is more to be learned by the individual in his utter freedom than can be imparted by any so-called "Outer-Head" of a school. It is well to note the following from Recejac:

"We are not in possession scientifically of the laws of life, and still less so of the ultimate conditions of thought; and these 'psycho-mystic' facts, these appearances of spiritual autonomy, take place at boundary point between the Life which we know so imperfectly, and Freedom, which has nothing empirical about it. Should Determinism succeed in course of time in bringing them within the tables of its prevision, it would assuredly be the supreme triumph of science and the end here below of all wonder."

The above quotation is reverently submitted for the benefit of those who take without due allowance the professions of a certain class of Occultists who claim such an intimate, such a detailed knowledge of the Devechanic planes.

The same author continues, while discussing the degraded forms of mystic infatuation:

"But the Mysticism which we have in view has nothing at all in common with mere wonder or curiosity; it has no impulse towards the Absolute to discover 'the new,' but its impulse is to discover the better. *The true field of Mysticism is the Infinite of Reason and Freedom.*" Our minds carry in themselves the laws native to them of Duty and Perfection, not empirical laws; under the guarantee of absolute obedience to these laws, or rather by virtue of its own

moral autonomy, there is no novelty which can astonish Mysticism. It can no more be 'shocked scientifically' than it is susceptible of the vulgar forms of wonder; the sense of the '*Possible*' which is the honor and life of Reason is really *latent faith*, an unavowed sense of the Infinite."

And after all the abstruse and transcendental literature upon this sublime study has been assimilated, there can be found no better summary than that given by Herbert Spencer, and none would care to rate him with the "cranky Occultists." He says:

"The final result of speculation is * * * * * that the power which manifests itself in the material universe is the same power which in ourselves is manifested as consciousness."

Then it is the divinity within, and Occultism has aspired to nothing higher than a knowledge of this kingdom. If preachers could follow the trail in history and ascertain how many Masters had used the expression, "The Kingdom of God is within you," they would not wonder why the Theosophist insists that the world has never been left without the witness of such an indwelling kingdom.

Balfour, in his "Foundations of Belief," corroborates this reasoning; exceedingly broad, but who can say it is not in accordance with the higher teaching of the greatest thinkers of all time:

"I like to think of the human race, from whatever stock its members may have sprung, in whatever age they may be born, whatever creed they may profess together in the presence of the One Reality, engaged, not wholly in vain, in *spelling out some fragments of its message*. All share its being; to none are its oracles wholly dumb. But it is not, I think, inaccurate to say that every addition to knowledge, whether in the individual or the community, whether scientific, ethical, or theological, is due to a co-operation between the human soul which assimilates, and the Divine Power which inspires. And whatever be the terms in which we choose to express our faith, let us not give color to the opinion that His assistance to mankind has been narrowed down to the sources, however unique,

from which we immediately and consciously draw our special nourishment."

And this unique source from which most of us have drawn our special nourishment has been on Jewish lines. Greek philosophy, it is true, was superimposed in the palmy days of the Alexandrian University, but how few of our preachers have given serious attention to the Mysteries, the Greater and the Lesser, of Greece? When allusion is made, it is usually with a sneer, yet for two thousand years these were the appointed means of higher culture and the channels through which the loftier aspirations found expression. Only the debased forms are quoted, but would any serious mind for a moment think that Cicero would ask to obtain initiation into these solemn Mysteries if they were so low as depicted? It was in these studies that he learned the deep truths which are at the basis of a true Occultism. There was a significant meaning in the phrases used by him:

"Death is a law, not a penalty.

"The wise man, ever serene and composed, is moved neither by pain nor sorrow, by fear nor desire. He is equally undisturbed by the malice of enemies, or the inconstancy of fortune."

One can almost catch the echoes from the Bhagavad-Gita. Cicero was, however, but one of the long list of intellectual giants who chose initiation into these profound studies. The basic truths underlying all the ceremonies, all the symbolism, are recognized by the student of the esoteric philosophy, the same substantially in all the nations of the East, and becoming the same in the West by the interblending of thought.

Another technical term found frequently in Theosophical literature, but seemingly not so alarming to the Western thought, is Vibrations. Since the interesting disclosures of Science in the aspect of wave action in nature, and the

tabulated wave lengths in etheric vibration, the study has become intensely fascinating even from a materialistic point of view. But in the Sanscrit, studied as the Science of the Finer Forces,—"The Tattvas,— the investigation gains in enchantment. It includes all the scientific thought on Color, Form and Sound. These old evolutionists were no strangers to cosmic processes.

Tattva is compounded of Tat, which means That; vah means, thou art. *That thou art.* The word *That* implies that which is ineffable; we can know but aspects of it, as manifested. One such aspect is the Great Breath, the breath which moved upon the face of the deep and caused manifestation. "With the Outgoing Breath, forms appear; with the Indrawing Breath forms disappear." Breath is synonymous with Spirit.

Therefore Tattva, as a word used in its scientific sense in India, is a mode of action translated by Rama Prasad, M. A., who issued the first work on this line for the Theosophical Society, wherein he described the Tattva as "the central impulse which keeps matter in a certain vibratory state," and he adds, "every form and every motion is a manifestation of the Tattvas," in their differentiation, singly or in conjunction, as the case may be.

States of consciousness come under this interesting classification of Sanscrit science, hence its importance in a rational study of Occultism. It is a profoundly interesting psychological presentation of views which must be reckoned with by the modern Chairs of Psychology, whether they will or not. It is on such lines that the study of Occultism seeks guidance in deep and charming research. The Theosophists have from the moment of organization given rational and reverent study to this comprehensive science.

The conjunction of the positive and negative phases of any force as delineated in the Tattvas is but the same as the "pairs of opposites" so feebly understood and interpret-

ed in subsequent schools. George Hegel, who wrote fifty years ahead of his time, grasped the ancient thought, and did not Lord Kelvin but four years ago state that we must pay more attention to the "pairs of opposites?" Truth will reincarnate, when man has reached by evolutionary processes a stage fitted to assimilate it. The Svastica, the oldest symbol in the world, a universal sign for a general idea, by its very shape embodies this thought, and it is strange that the investigating archaeologist has not ere this detected it.

Devechan is another term which is considered technical in the thought of the school. It is a Thibetan word, from *Deva*, gods, and *chan*, abode. It means in religious thought, the same as Svarga in the Hindu, or Nirvana in the Buddhistic, or Heaven in the Christian thought. It is not a place or site; it denotes a state of bliss which one enjoys after death, and in their true meaning, all are here, in this world. There is no other world except as planes of consciousness. When man has his highest desire he has reached heaven, and he can reach it here when perfected as a man. The Eschatology of the Orientals is rich in imagery, and their language allows latitude in expression, but these questions to the investigating Theosophist are valuable, mainly, when pursuing the comparative method of study.

These, with many other terms which have crept into the Western thought, are all comprehended under the general classification of Esotericism. The scientist boasts that "science has no secrets." Yet, peradventure, the same boaster may be a Mason of a higher or less degree. Ask him if he will divulge the secrets thus learned. As an ethical point, it may not be wise to withhold teachings from any inquiring mind, but it has always been held that it is not profitable to cast pearls before swine.

From the foundations of learning there have been esoteric teachings, taught to and known by only an inner cir-

cle of disciples; belonging only to the initiated. The term in literature is applied to the mysterious doctrines of the Pythagorean school; but there were esoteric schools earlier in Egypt which the new science of Epigraphy (Symbolism) is now trying to decipher.

India for thousands of years held secret certain teachings and initiations were allowed only to particular castes. Religious teachers of all ages are recorded as having taken their disciples apart for private instruction.

But it is not correct to state, as does the Standard Dictionary, that Esoteric Buddhism is Theosophy in its latest development. It has been studied in Theosophical classes, it is true, but by the comparative method. Much of it is utterly rejected by the studious Theosophist. So with the Alexandrian Judaism, much is discarded as peculiar to that environment, but it is necessary to study it in order to reach the state of consciousness which could evolve such conclusions. And when all is studied all can be summarized into the three essentials of Theosophy—The Perfectibility of Man, brought about by Reincarnation (for one life is not sufficient to perfect anything), and this by the law of Karma, cause and effect. "Whatever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

CHAPTER X.

A THEOSOPHIST'S ATTITUDE TO CHRISTIANITY.

The bitter attacks from pulpits on the teachings disseminated by Theosophical Societies are clearly traced to preachers of a less degree of culture. Men of light and leading in Liberal Christianity are too broad to descend to such fanatical zeal; their points of view are from pinnacles; they represent Christianity rather than Christendom. To their comprehensive sweep of gaze Christianity is a point of view; to the Theosophist, his system of thought is a point of view. Even heresy is but the looking at truth from another point of view.

It need not astonish the reader to learn that the Theosophist in our civilization is an ardent upholder of a true Christianity; nevertheless, he is proclaimed as an iconoclast. This hue and cry has been non-suited before the open court of public opinion. It is generally found as a specified item in sacerdotal pleadings, wherein it is also averred that if one brick from the cunningly adjusted fabric of orthodoxy is removed, or one line of the Hebrew Scriptures proved erroneous, God would vanish from the world, heaven and hell become empty names, all motives for doing good be annulled and the earth become a blank and dreary wilderness.

But here comes one who is both preacher and teacher, Rev. Dr. Momerie, who figured conspicuously at the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, and who was expelled from his professorship of Logic and Metaphysics at King's Col-

lege, England, by the Episcopal Church for his advanced, though thoroughly Christian views. In his able work, "The Future Religion," chap. VI, "Clerical Untruthfulness," he states:

"When ecclesiastics speak of truth—or, as they generally call it, *the* truth—they are thinking only of orthodoxy; they mean not verified facts, but unverified opinion. And in defense of unverified opinion they have rarely hesitated to lie."

Rather severe language for an eminent clergyman, but impressive when the sublime character of the author is taken into account. He quotes from an early church authority: "It is our bounden duty to lie and deceive, if thereby we can catch souls," and in ending the chapter uses these appalling words:

"The majority of ecclesiastics are indifferent, if not opposed, to truth. And when I think of their modern devices—such as willful prevarication, deliberate ambiguity, and, worst of all, the conspiracy of silence—I confess I almost wish we were back to the plain, straightforward lying of the early Fathers. It was so much easier to deal with, so much less damaging to truth."

Rev. Heber Newton, Episcopalian, New York, is another instance. Whole pages of his writings can be placed in a Theosophical periodical, and if the source is concealed the context will be accepted as Theosophical Christianity. But what of a certain Episcopalian clergyman of Washington to whom an inquiring lady of his parish went for an explanation of certain tenets of Theosophy? "O, that was exploded a thousand years ago." If so, the investigator, whether the lady in question or a student of the esoteric lore will further ask: "How do you account for the fact that Prof. Max Muller and many others eminent in archaeological and philological research admit that Theosophy was a "*venerable name* well known to the early Christian Fathers?" Where did they get this knowledge which is defined

by the same eminent authorities as "the highest to which the human mind can reach?" Must we much longer in this progressive age, remind the bigoted oracles that the thinking world accepts as true, the fling of the students of the German universities—"The preachers have been kicked into every reform."

The Theosophist, in his comparative study, is glad to give shelf room to books from such students of Christianity as Charles Kingsley, Lyman Abbott, N. D. Hillis, Phillips Brooks, J. Minot Savage, Heber Newton, Robert Collyer, William Ellery Channing, James Martineau, and a host of other pioneers eminent in Christian thought. Yet not one of these is rated as "straight evangelical," by the majority of those who profess to believe that they were called specially to save the world. Nor does the Theosophist accept the conclusions from even these great lights as an entirety, for they, too, differ, according to their points of view.

Cardinal Gibbons, a few years ago, delivered Christian teaching in a rural Maryland church. His theme was the story of the Good Samaritan. His exemplification of the details sounded like an echo from the Masters of Compassion of the ages. What marked the occasion was the emphasis given to the reminder: "A heretic did this good work."

Any Theosophical magazine in the world would cheerfully insert that Christian sermon and assert with all the vigor of the culture: "This is pure Theosophy in its ethical aspect." Yet, any one of these publications would refuse to accept dogmatic teaching from even so pure an exponent as Cardinal Gibbons.

From the day of his inception into a student class the Theosophist has been taught and it has been constantly impressed upon him, to look for *similarities*—not differences. Herein is the secret of the research which characterizes

the school. Along this line, the Theosophist can shed more light on Theology than can Theology on Theosophy.

Tradition gives way at every step of such critical investigation. The Bible curtains truth, all admit; nevertheless, it is found that all Bibles contain truth, differing in degree rather than in kind.

There is nothing new in the Christian Scriptures, according to the ablest archaeologists and philologists; but this ought to strengthen Christianity rather than weaken it, in that it shows the wonderful assimilative power of the system of thought. To a philosophical and scientific cast of mind it evolves into a consolation to know that many previous Scriptures have been distilled, until the very quintessence has been saved for the instruction of mankind; but controversial theologians who split hairs on "proof-texts" will have none of this; they insist that a new revelation was given for the elect alone.

The central figure of Christianity excels in what he did, not in what he said. He said nothing new; he brought no new truth. Truth is older than Christianity in its present aspect; Truth always was true, or it could not be truth. No great teacher, whether Buddha, Krishna, Zoroaster or Rama brought *new* Truth; they brought teaching calling men back to Truth. The Truth was always steadfast; it was man that had wandered astray. Their mission, according to Theosophical teaching was to call man back to the reality. The Real always was Real.

The Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule were taught by all the Masters thousands of years before our era. It is a waste of ink to attempt at this developed stage of research to deny, or attempt to refute, this statement. The Sacred Books of the East have been translated and are accessible. The myths and legends of the nations have been critically analyzed by a ripe scholarship, until our former method of surveying such fields has been exactly reversed.

As stated by Prof. Brinton, we are no longer to believe that religions developed from mythologies; the reverse is true—mythologies were derived from religions. Thus, Archaeology in its severe exactness confirms Theosophy.

Even Bunsen, a Christian in thought, was compelled after years of exploration and diligent study to write to his friend, Prof. Max Muller: "Christianity is nothing to me but a restoration of the ideals of humanity." Clement of Alexandria, in the second century, as an apologist for the early church, declared the same important truth. St. Augustine is on record to the same effect, and the most advanced of the modern archaeologists do not hesitate to announce that deeply cut into the granite of Ancient Egypt's monuments are the three significant words, *Uae—Maat—Ankh;* the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No wonder Taylor, an early explorer, wrote: "Bind it about thy neck, write it upon the tablets of thy heart—everything in Christianity is of Egyptian origin." Why have these three significant words been so long concealed? Simply because partisan writers could not see them, or did not choose to see them.

The Theosophist objects, at once, to the word—"everything," in Taylor's expression. The translations from the old Sanscrit were not available when he wrote, nor did we have the wealth of the old Zoroastrian lore, the religion founded on "Pure Thoughts, Pure words, Pure deeds." Nor had we gained the incalculable richness of the Esoteric Teachings, which yield the key to many hitherto perplexing problems. Nor had the Upanishads received that critical analysis now available; nor had the Vedas been studied with discrimination.

Entombed with the mummified remains of the well-to-do classes of ancient Egypt were quotations from their scripture, now erroneously called the "Book of the Dead." Ask the archaeologist how many times during the past

quarter of a century the following has been found with the bodies, placed there to testify as to religious life of the de ceased:

"He hath given bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, clothing to the naked. There is no accusation against him. Let him be favored amongst those who are favored."

And if the over-zealous dogmatic preacher thinks all the Egyptians were damned, because pagans, let him read the 125th chapter of the Book of the Dead. If they insist further, that the true Christianity of ancient Egypt 3000 B. C. was lacking in the highest thought, let them read the following extract which ought to convince a reasonable mind that their spiritual worship and moral code when correctly interpreted are as positively and distinctively monotheistic as the Jewish and Christian religions, and as an archaeologist recently wrote, "aye, more so":

"God is one and alone, no other with him, God is the Infinite One, the one who has made all things. God is from the beginning, and has existed from the beginning. He made all things after his way. He has endured for endless time and will exist hereafter forever."

Similar confession is found again and again in the ancient Sanscrit Vedas, in the Zend Avesta, in the Buddhistic books, in the Chinese sacred literature, in the Thibetan manuscripts—in the scriptures of all peoples. The accretions of priestcraft have disfigured the originals. The archaeologists and philologists can easily mark the line of retrogression in each. Christianity has shared the same fate. Plain language is in order. Priests and preachers have spoiled the character of the gentle Nazarene, as priestcraft in every other faith has spoiled the true character of the Founders.

Take the following instance as a piece of the current Sunday school teaching. This extract was clipped from the regular series, as published by the press under the head of

"Lessons," and these lessons are prepared by a "divine" who is accredited with great theological acumen:

"During our Lord's ministry demons took possession of the people and controlled their actions in a distressing way, as if to dispute His authority and test His power, presenting phenomena never witnessed before or since."

And this at the close of a remarkable century when it would seem as if the rational order of the Cosmos could be accepted as a fact even by the illiterate who somehow are aided in their "horse sense" to assimilate truth from the very air of their welkin. Is it any wonder that the great scientist Huxley raised a protest against the "dazing of the minds of children" in the Sunday schools?

Theosophists have passed through this painful experience of unlearning what was thrust upon the plastic consciousness, under the plea of the average preacher that, if the child can be left to their tutelage for the first seven years, the arch-enemy (whoever that may be) can have the remainder in term of life. If such teaching as the above quotation exhibits, is Christianity, then the Theosophist is done with Christianity as an effete piece of degenerated Shamanism, the voicing of the sacred Medicine Man. Professor Huxley gave the following as an answer to the "Three Bishops," and many good Christian people assent to it:

"The so-called religious world is given to a strange delusion. It fondly imagines that it possesses the monopoly of serious and constant reflection upon the terrible problems of existence; and that those who cannot accept its shibboleths are either mere Gallios, caring for none of these things, or libertines desiring to escape from the restraints of morality. It does not appear to have entered the imaginations of these people that outside their pale, and firmly resolved never to enter it, there are thousands of men, certainly not their inferiors in character, capacity, or knowledge of the questions at issue, who estimate those purely spiritual elements of the Christian faith of which the Bishop of Manchester speaks as highly as this Bishop does, but who

will have nothing to do with the Christian Churches, because in their apprehension, and for them, the profession of belief in the miraculous, *on the evidence offered, would be simply immoral.*"

The culture of our advanced civilization is taking away the practice of appeal to the ecclesiastical tribunal which prompts such Sunday school lessons. Under the New Psychology, the younger the child, the more imperative the need of an advanced teacher. Thinking people who live for their children are calling a halt. If Jehovah, or the devil, sent demons two thousand years ago to take possession of people as if to dispute the authority of a beneficent teacher and test his power, they are sent now. If not now, not then. A true light for such darkened counsel would be a careful perusal of "The Warfare of Science," accessible in any library, written by Andrew D. White, now Minister to Germany, formerly President of Cornell University.

Take another instance. A young preacher (Presbyterian South) fresh from his theological studies, assumed charge of his flock in the last year of the century just passed. His deportment as a pulpit orator was all that could be expected even in this fastidious period. His elocution bore witness to careful training, and altogether as a professional he was a pleasing study as a late product of our boasted schools. But he did no credit to the great sect which boasts of its learning when he delivered his sermon from the text in the first chapter according to St. John: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory." This is the substance of his preaching:

"No divine manifestation had ever before appeared in fleshly form. The nearest that human eyes had ever beheld anything that even indicated a divine appearance on earth, was the small light seen in the ark of the covenant; but this tiny glimmer was merely given as a reminder that a

greater light was to come, and even this dim flame was allowed to out a small portion of the world's population, and they the chosen people."

This synopsis is not exaggerated. It even lacks the vigor with which the young theological athlete emphasized it. Can any one wonder that Theosophy is spreading over the face of the earth with no paid propaganda back of it? The Theosophist is not long in the study-class before he learns something about that thaumaturgical process which produced the light in the sacred box, and how it was borrowed, as nearly all such contrivances were, from the ancient temple service of so-called pagans. If Christianity is to be defended by such trained preachers, the attitude of the Theosophist will not be warmly sympathetic. But happily, greater men are in the pulpits of Liberal thought, and the essentials of the teachings will be saved, and always with the aid of the Theosophist.

And now comes another, again a preacher rather than teacher. He, too, selects a text from the Gospel according to St. John; "He that cometh from above is above all," and this is how he proceeds to preach, for it certainly cannot be classed as teaching. Such parts of it as have an aspect of truth are misleading and untruth can as easily be spread by concealing part of the truth. It was John Stuart Mill who said:

"The besetting danger is not so much of embracing falsehood for truth as of mistaking part of the truth for the whole."

"Endeavors have been made to put Buddha, Socrates and others in the place of Jesus. Attempts in our own country and in Europe to introduce Buddhism under the title of Theosophy, and their wretched failure are familiar to every one. Enemies of Christianity will readily embrace any false system, however absurd, in place of a religion which condemns their sins and cranks and irresponsible people will run after every new thing that promises notoriety and the distinction of eccentricity. * * * * * * * * *

Who was Buddha? He was born, nobody knows when and nobody knows where. His birth and death range from 2000 B. C. to 543 B. C. Because of this uncertainty he has been declared by some eminent authorities to be a myth. Under a mass of miraculous tales Siddartha Gotama comes to us. Buddhist legends teem with miserable miracles attributed to him. It was only after he left the world that his disciples attempted to recall his sayings and doings, and everything pertaining to him, however extraordinary and incredible, was eagerly welcomed. Earliest compilations of Buddhists were A. D. 412, or 1000 or 2000 years after Buddha is claimed to have lived. From all the scholars who have written on the subject we do not know that Buddha ever lived; or if he lived, what he said or did."

Some of that congregation, as well as the readers of the paper which published the sermon, will ask sooner or later, as did Sir Edwin Arnold when he began the study of Buddhism,—"how is it that a third of mankind could have been brought to believe in blank abstractions, or in Nothingness as the issue and aim of Being?" If they are studious, and persevering, they will naturally consult the works of Prof. Max Muller, Spence Hardy, Rhys Davids, and a score or more of others more eminent in the world's scolarship than the authorities hinted at in the above quotation, which must have been extremely partisan and superficial, to say the least.

As a further fruit of study, they will soon learn that no religious teacher in the Buddhistic faith would speak of the gentle and lowly Nazarene in such a manner. The influence which made all Asia mild still persists. Buddhistic priests are courteous.

As to the festering sores which inflict such a widely spread faith, which the Theosophist admits, they can be accounted for by the candid historian. Sir Edwin Arnold states them succinctly:

"The extravagances which disfigure the record and practice of Buddhism are to be referred to that inevitable degradation which priesthoods always inflict upon great

ideas committed to their charge. The power and sublimity of Gautama's original doctrines should be estimated by their influence, not by their interpreters; nor by that innocent but lazy and ceremonious church which has arisen on the Buddhistic Brotherhood or 'Sangha.'"

Dr. Paul Carus, who is not a Theosophist, is issuing the "Gospel of Buddha" in paper covers at the low rate of 35 cents per copy. He is doing this in the interest of the "Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea." Many of the parables which Christianity borrowed can be found in that edition. Harvard University is surely not a Theosophical institution, yet it has been issuing cheap bound editions of Sanscrit literature for years, and the inquiring minds of our people are eagerly absorbing it. Other universities are engaged on the same line.

It seems, then, that it cannot be true as stated, that it is the attempt of Theosophy to introduce Buddhism in the sense as declared, to take the "place of Jesus." It is true, that Theosophists are aiding others to introduce Buddha's teachings to a place alongside those of Jesus, to convince people in the interest of an Universal Brotherhood and a true Christianity that their teachings were remarkably similar; but that they have been degraded, those of Buddha by priests who profess to be his followers, and those of Jesus, by preachers who shriek loudly for Churchianity and Christendom rather than for pure Christianity.

Change the name of the individuality—Buddha, to Jesus, along with the dates, and the very argument is presented which the preachers themselves have difficulty in answering. If there is no historical evidence for Prince Gautama, there is none for Jesus of Nazareth. If some eminent authorities declare the former to be a myth, there are also authorities eminent who declare the same of the latter. What manner of argument is this for a religious teacher to use against another faith? Is it necessary to pull down a devout neighbor to build up one's own dogma?

The law of Karma in its psychological aspect, which is unerring in its certainty, will surely overtake such partisan zeal. Must it be in order to ask that Rev. Dr. Momerie's chapter on "Clerical Untruthfulness" be read once more?

The Theosophist has consulted the authorities which are verily eminent, and has found that the Buddha born 2000 B. C. was but one of a line, the later and last in that faith being the one referred to as of 543 B. C. Intermediate Buddhas appear in the Pali books; the title means the Enlightened, from the verb *Buddh*, to know. These knowing ones of the Orient, were great Teachers, hence revered. Gautama won his enlightenment by arduous effort. Jesus of Nazareth, according to the Theosophist's reasoning came to be the Christ by effort. The student is not called upon to stone the one to exalt the other. Both were great ideals; both had a mission; both were Masters of Compassion; both appeared in the fulness of time for a great work, for the good of humanity.

If the Theosophist uses the terminology of his school and states that they came as Avatars, or teachers, or Divine Examples, or Mahatmas the partisan zealot affects a shock at such "dangerous doctrine"; but is it essentially any different from the beautiful expression of Lowell?

> "God sends his teachers into every age,
> To every clime, and every race of men,
> With revelations fitted to their growth
> And shape of mind; nor gives the realm of truth
> Unto the selfish rule of one sole race."

Thus, the Buddha, and prior Buddhas, came, and will come again, as the Theosophist believes, as Teachers of the Ways of Peace. The Books tell

"Where he passed and what proud Emperors carved his sweet words upon the rocks and caves."

And later books tell how these rock-cut edicts were effaced by an intolerant, bigoted and institutional churchianity, that posed as Christianity, for fear that an ignorant

following might possibly learn that the parallel between the birth of the Nazarene, and the birth of Buddha, could not be accounted for on the ground of coincidence. And even in late years, Christian apologists have attempted to make the Buddhistic account of later date than the Christian narration and have insisted that the Buddhist must have copied from the Christian. It is now well settled that the reverse is true; the account of Buddha's birth existed centuries before the Nazarene was born. The marks which attest the borrowing are but too apparent.

As to the item in this preacher's tirade against another faith:

"Under a mass of miraculous tales Siddartha Gotama comes to us. Buddhist legends teem with miserable miracles attributed to him."

The mass of miraculous tales is the work of a fanatical priesthood; but Christianity has been afflicted for centuries in the same manner by the same methods. Only since Science has begun its purification of religion have priests and preachers desisted from rehearsing the long list of miraculous stories that were once accepted. And true Christianity is suffering even now as is pure Buddhism from a tenacious adherence to *some miracles* which are supposed to be divine interventions or interferences in the rational order of things.

Buddha, as he is recognized by the ripest scholarship did not go about performing sacred tricks; in fact, it is found, by research, that he opposed such appeals to the consciousness of man. Jesus of Nazareth was not the sanctified juggler which dogmatic priests and preachers picture if the reverent scholarship of the day can be relied upon. Nevertheless, one phase of the controverted problem should not be overlooked. If the miracles attributed to Buddha are not to be credited, neither should those of Christianity, for it is found that the gospel writers, whoever they may have

been, copied with strict fidelity. Long before the advent of the Nazarene the accounts of these miracles were recorded, and can be found by the plodding student. Even before Buddha's time, the same miracles, speaking generally, are found in Brahmanical lore, and in the Magian (Persian) with the Wise Men of the East as the "star performers." The Theosophist discredits them all as miracles in the theological sense, i. e., supernatural.

The Theosophist of a scientific habit of thought stands with Huxley in his answer to the dogmatic preacher, who declared, addressing the investigators of the age:

"And I would warn you very distinctly against this new contrivance. Christianity is essentially miraculous and falls to the ground if miracles be impossible."

The great scientist answered:

"Well, warning for warning, I venture to warn this preacher and those who, with him, persist in identifying Christianity with the miraculous, that such forms of Christianity are not only doomed to fall to the ground, but that within the last half century they have been driven that way with continually accelerated velocity."

Lyman Abbott in his "Theology of an Evolutionist" explains much of the illogical mass which has piled high upon Christian teachings, and a Theosophist can have no serious objection to the views he puts forth. This discrediting of the miraculous will in nowise impair the exalted ideal who suffered for the good of others as has many another great soul in the world's history. The essence and value of an ethical principle do not need the re-enforcement of a miracle to make them more valuable or more essential. Deity never condescended to the wiles of a showman, personated as either a Buddha or a Christ, to make truth more valuable or more essential; nor is a miracle needed to convince an enlightened conscience that truth stands on its own merit.

Prof. William Kingdon Clifford, of England, did much to enlighten the minds of investigators in the strictly scientific realm; but he used the same clear, critical and analytical methods in other departments of thought, Here is one touching the "Ethics of Belief":

"The followers of the Buddha have at least as much right to appeal to individual and social experience in support of the Eastern Savior. The special mark of his religion, it is said, that in which he has never been surpassed, is the comfort and consolation which it gives to the sick and sorrowful, the tender sympathy with which it soothes and assuages all the natural griefs of man. And surely no triumph of social morality can be greater or nobler than that which has kept nearly half the human race from persecuting in the name of religion. If we are to believe his followers, he came on earth with a cosmic mission to set rolling the wheel of the law."

There may be an excuse for many preachers in suburban stations who have not the means to purchase books, nor access to libraries; but even without books, the press has freely given liberal accounts of the doings of the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, where many educated Buddhists were gladly heard. One of these learned men of the Orient quoted from the ancient history which is now accessible in our own libraries, to prove that the Emperor Asoka, 250-223 B. C., convened the first parliament of religions, and it is beginning to be realized that it was the greatest known in history. For seven months sessions were held and there were present over 1,000 scholars of India in that great city of Backnow; all creeds known were discussed. Every saying of Buddha was weighed; entries were made in their books which are now coming to light. As a result of that Congress, Asoka caused stones to be set up in all the provinces of his extensive jurisdiction, whereon he caused to be written:

"He who reviles the religion of others throws difficulties in the way of his own, for his conduct can not be right."

If it is true that only after Buddha left this world did his disciples seek to recall his sayings and doings, is it not equally true that the same may be said of the followers of the Nazarene? Where in the world is a single written word by the latter? And of what others have compiled, here is the summary: Jesus did 33 things; told 30 stories; all the words he uttered, as reported, can be spoken in less than 5 hours. It is not even settled which language he spoke.

The Parliament of Religions under the Emperor Asoka had an advantage; they were using the very language of the Great Teacher. While it may be true that no life of Buddha is contemporary, scholarship has settled it beyond dispute that at the beginning of the Christian era all the most important Buddhistic scriptures existed in the form or nearly in the form that we possess them now. And this is a most important fact to keep in mind, for it is the key to the copying and borrowing which is clearly well proven.

And again, it may be noted that the advanced scholarship of our day has decided that Jesus was but one year in active ministry as against the three years formerly held. The same scholarship has lengthened the years of Buddha's ministry; research confirms it.

Prof. Max Muller in his Science of Religion, p. 253. says:

"Between the language of Buddha and his disciples, and the language of Christ and his disciples, there are strange coincidences. Even some of the Buddhist legends and parables sound as if taken from the New Testament, though we know that many of them existed before the beginning of the Christian era."

The Christian writer, Bunsen, refers to these "strange coincidences" in his "Angel Messiah," p. 50, and declares that they could not possibly have occurred by mere chance. He endeavors to account for it as an orthodox writer naturally would by the assumption of a common source of in-

spiration and revelation, but is finally constrained to acknowledge that this explanation is not very satisfying.

The long list of scholars in the East who have investigated, and who have arrived at the same conclusion, is too formidable for space in these pages. It is simply sufficient to cover the ground by giving what is a summary of a Theosophist's point of view and this Theosophist, the author of "Mystic Masonry," Dr. J. D. Buck, of Cincinnati, President of the Theosophical Society in America:

"Tear every shred of history from the life of Christ, to-day, and prove beyond all controversy that he never existed, and Humanity, from its heart of hearts would create him again to-morrow and justify the creation by every intuition of the human soul and by every need of the daily life of man. The historical contention might be given up, ignored, and the whole character, genius, and mission of Jesus the Christ, be none the less real, beneficent and eternal with all its human and dramatic episodes. Explain it as you will, it can never be explained away; the character remains; and whether *Historical* or *Ideal*, it is real and eternal. The laying down of one's life for another has inspired the hope and brightened the lives of the down-trodden and despairing for ages. Is it a mere fancy or a designing lie? It will be urged by modern theologians that this view dethrones Christ. To this objection the answer is, that any other view orphans Humanity. It is far more important that men should strive to become Christs than that they should believe that Jesus was Christ. If the Christ-state can be attained by but one human being during the whole evolution of the race, then the evolution of man is a farce and human perfection an impossibility. Jesus is no less Divine because all may reach the same Divine perfection. It has also been shown that every act in the drama of the life of Jesus, and every quality assigned to Christ is to be found in the life of Krishna and in the legends of all the Sun-Gods from the remotest antiquity."

The legends associated with the birth and life of Buddha are copied from older sacred births, as were those

of the infant Jesus copied from Buddhistic records. The parallel is striking all along the line of research.

Krishna was God incarnate long before Buddha, by a miraculous conception termed immaculate; he was born in a dungeon, the walls of which were miraculously illuminated at the time of his birth; a chorus of angels sang at his birth; he was of royal descent and a long genealogy like that of St. Matthew is given to prove it; he was cradled among shepherds; was carried away by night, and concealed to escape the ruler of the country, who in order to insure the death of the infant deity, had decreed a general slaughter of babes throughout the land; he performed miracles in boyhood, including healing a leper, raising from the dead, and striking dead the persons who offended him; he learned all the sciences in one day and night, and so on.

Much of similar tenor is found in the Persian scriptures of the life of Zoroaster who was also born of a miraculous conception. The Mexican savior Quexalcoti; the Chinese savior Xaca, the first Chinese monarch Ya, and other so-called divine personages were all miraculously conceived; as were also, according to legends and traditions, Plato, Appolonius of Tyana, and numerous other mortals.

They were all called Sons of God. The appellation was common both before and at the time of Jesus. St. Basil who wrote nearly four centuries after the beginning of our era says: "Every uncommonly good man was called the Son of God." The Theosophist of to-day says, as did the Theosophist of the days of the Alexandrian University, before the gospels were written, that all men are the sons of God in the making if they choose to make themselves so; all men are essentially divine and can manifest this divinity if they so will; all men can become Christs if they choose to obey the Christos within (the Kingdom of God within you) to regulate their conduct in life. It is a question of doing, not believing.

The dogmatic theologian who affects some imputed power which warrants him to speak as an oracle for the Most High insists, that all the virtues, which the Theosophist cherishes as essential to the making of the Perfect Man, will not avail; even morality will not save him—he must *believe*, must have faith which will allow him to believe just what is laid down by authority and that the greatest sin is unbelief. If this is the test—this the criterion, then the Theosophist and the dogmatic Christian are again as on former points, at opposite poles. It will be impossible for the two to function on the same mental plane.

The Theosophist instead of believing off-hand, does exactly the opposite—he doubts, and justifies the action on the ground that honest doubt is the beginning of true piety. Man is a rational being; and as such, even admitting that all our knowledge is but qualified ignorance, it still remains true that he must doubt to investigate, he must investigate to believe. This may call forth the usual supply of theological thunder, but the answer of the Theosophist will be equally as loud, that free thinking is a badge of manliness, a divine right and privilege. And when mankind exercise more abundantly the prerogative of free thought in the interest of honest investigation, Christian ethics can still retain their hold; the Church as a social center and a reputed safeguard of social order will remain for the further betterment of men's ways; but the dogmas and creeds born in the centuries of darkness and superstition will go. Christianity will then be understood according to its earlier interpretations. Where is the theological chair in any of our sectarian institutions which will declare of Tertulian's statement in defense of Christianity, that anything can be found propping such doctrines as Original Sin, Total Depravity, Predestination, Grace and Atonement? And what of the Christianity of such Fathers as Origen, and Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria, and many other

names familiar to the student of the earlier Greek interpretations?

But the Theosophist by quoting these early authorities does not wish the reader to assume that his type of Christianity is to be found in its patristic form; neither is it in the medieval cast nor is it in the puritanical. The point of view has changed with the changes changing everything in our modern and liberal thought. It was the doubter who brought all this about.

"I am the doubter and the doubt,
And I the hymn the Brahman sings."

Uncultured faith and dogmatic agnosticism are both unphilosophical to the Theosophic cast of mind. The doubt brings about equilibrium. Had it not been for the astronomical doubter in the seventeenth century, the sun would be yet going around the earth in the theologies; the success of the doubt did not impair the essential faith in man. Had it not been for the doubter in the eighteenth century, the pulpits would be clinging to the literal six days' manufacture out of nothing of all the Universe visible to us; theology and geology seem to be getting on very well because of the doubt. It did not disturb the faith of those who gained broader and more comprehensive views by allowing hundreds of thousands of years to accomplish the ends sought by a Unity in variety. The struggle of the nineteenth century was mainly on biological questions, and they have won, though faith is not disturbed. Indeed, preachers are assuring us that Christianity never was in better shape. The opening of the twentieth century is on lines of the Higher Criticism which has not by any means reached high-water mark, and still the pulpits assert that Christianity is more firmly rooted than ever, and most of the educated clergy are accepting even the deductions of science, and Science by involuntary aid continues to purify Christianity.

But, unfortunately, the Liberal Christians are yet in a minority. The tyrannical hold of many of the christened clubs of Christendom yet suffocates by dogmatic teaching and fanatical zealotry. The spirit of true Christianity is fought as if it were really the "dangerous doctrine" it is dubbed. An instance: about ten years ago there appeared in a New York daily newspaper an editorial, in Christmas week, with the heading—"Christ the First True Gentleman." Sectarian journals shivered with the shock. To call such a sublime character a gentleman! The man on the street was not slow to answer, "Well, you would not care to say he was not a gentleman."

This incident carried deep meaning to many inquiring minds. The Theosophist was not slow in perceiving that the age was beginning to appreciate the true meaning of gentleness, and to recognize its highest type as exemplified by both Buddha and Jesus. The rank had been the guinea's stamp. Avarice, greed, brutality and oftimes barbarous deportment had won prestige in the eyes of the world. Preachers had cowed under the influence of the gilded epoch. The brute left over was manifesting, as it yet does, in those who have pushed to the front as does the strongest beast in the jungle. It was time for such an editorial, and it is to the glory of the press that it could disseminate such teaching. It taught the world that a definition of "gentleman" could be rendered which has not been excelled—"one who never intentionally gives pain to man or beast." The martinet in the army and navy needed to consider it; the narrow-grooved sycophant who has obtained by means fair or foul a position in the civil service or in large corporations, who had not the breeding of even the cosmopolitan, and who would prefer to wound the sensitive nature of a subordinate, needed admonition; a press lecture was better than a pistol shot. The age was ripe for it; the arrogance of capital has felt the growing tenderness of the

spirit of Buddha and the Nazarene; humanitarian societies received an impetus; the social tyrant recognizes that the world knows a sham when it sees it.

Ideas are transforming; the commonplace becomes transfigured in this enlightened day, and the Nazarene, greatest and gentlest Teacher of all history, is becoming more intelligently understood. Theosophy has aided in the teaching.

But here comes a Baptist preacher in Atlanta, who states from his pulpit that "Theosophy is an invention of the devil." He is answered, as a matter of course, and by one not on the roster of the Society, in a manner which shows the latent force of a true Christianity. His blast under the cloak of religion simply verified the saying: "Preachers have long tongues and the people have long ears." To such rant, from such a quarter, the Theosophist simply asks that the pew-holders in that congregation read James Lane Allen's "Reign of Law."

Another preacher at the National Capital, a Methodist, gains a momentary notoriety by a published sermon in which he wishes to have every book in the world burned that does not agree with the Bible. The Theosophist answers from his point of view that Truth can better be served by reading all books. The highest type of Christianity is found where this practice is dominant; the lowest where it is not. More books are now read than ever, and still the preachers maintain that Christianity is stronger than ever.

Once more; a concerted action seems to manifest in the bigoted sects when a body is cremated under the auspices of a Theosophical Society at a funeral ceremony. A bishop in Canada recently has called attention to the authority of the church which forbids such practice, and brands it with that well-worn word—"infidel." If issue is to be joined on this question at intervals, in order to bolster a declining

faith in the literal resurrection of the physical body, the Theosophist, in presenting his case in court, will prefer to place disinterested witnesses on the stand. It makes the case stronger before that great tribunal of the public consciousness.

Frances E. Willard, so long and so ably the head of the W. C. T. U., would hardly be called an infidel, yet this is what she, as a great teacher, left for instruction as to her own body:

"Holding these opinions, I have the purpose to help forward progressive movements even in my latest hours, hence hereby decree that the earthly mantle which I shall drop ere long, when my real self passes onward into the world unseen, shall be swiftly enfolded in flames and rendered powerless harmfully to affect the health of the living. Let no friend of mine say aught to prevent the cremation of my cast-off body. The fact that the popular mind has not come to this decision renders it all the more my duty, who have seen the light, to stand by it in death as I have sincerely meant in life, to stand by the great cause of poor, oppressed humanity. There must be explorers along the pathways, scouts in all armies. This has been my 'call' from the beginning, by nature; let me be true to its inspiring and cheery mandate even unto this last."

One of the ecclesiastics of a number who allowed themselves to be interviewed on Cremation stated that "none but advanced thinkers believed in it." It is very evident that Frances E. Willard is classed in the world's ethical literature as a decidedly advanced thinker. And there are many more; and the number is increasing, as attested by statistics. The intelligent people of the world are beginning to realize, with the aid of science, the teaching of Rev. Lyman Abbott:

"There is at death an end of the body. It knows no resurrection save in grass and flowers. The resurrection, the *anastasis* or up-standing as the New Testament calls it, is the resurrection of the spirit. The phrase "resurrection of

the body' never occurs in the New Testament. But every death is a resurrection of the spirit."

This is an advance, decidedly, on the old theological presentation, and is concurred in by a galaxy of men of light and leading, but a further progress, according to the Theosophist, will be made when the word "soul" is substituted for "spirit." As soul is individuated, has a "go" to it of its own, as explained heretofore, and as spirit is an all pervasive principle never individualized, neither *mine* nor *thine*, it would seem that for teaching purposes, the interchangability of soul and spirit could profitably be dropped. And, at all events, the less educated clergy, could well afford to drop entirely such an illogical, unscientific and irrational dogma as the resurrection of the physical body.

The stickler for orthodox tenets asks the Theosophist what his attitude may be toward the Ten Commandments. Simply this, that they were found to be good for the welfare of man a thousand years before the time of Moses, as is proven by the Assyrian tablets which contain analogous accounts of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge. This makes the Book of Genesis a collection of prehistoric traditions re-written, and traditions only, as is further proved by the more recent disclosures in archaeology. It is now generally conceded that even the Assyrians borrowed from earlier traditions. And these traditions are based on allegories wherever found and allegories to quote again from Prof. Max Muller "say one thing and mean another." Hence the utility of the secret doctrine to the Theosophist. It is a key to ancient allegories. It explains as nothing else can, at present. We may discover other keys.

Nevertheless, a certain Presbyterian preacher, in Washington, a few years ago who advertised in advance that he would preach on Theosophy, stated in the sermon that he had spent two hours examining the Secret Doctrine, and had found nothing in it. It is fair to state that he spoke the

truth, for many a Theosophist has studied it for twenty years and has not, as yet, found all there is in it. But the preacher in question knew more about Theosophy after that sermon than before. He was answered by students who had spent many a two hours on the veiled teachings of the ancients.

A ritualist asks what Theosophists do with the Trinity in their studies. Simply trace it to its origins, and in the tracing find it is decidedly not a Christian symbol, but borrowed from older cults. In Egypt it was Osiris, Isis and Horus. In other nations it had peculiar names and meanings. In India it conveyed the most intelligent teaching. Creator—Preserver—Destroyer, as Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, and even in this classification it was intended to convey but a knowledge of these aspects of a One Power. No Sanscrit scholar ever became so unthinkable to himself as to attempt to crowd three persons into one. The Hindu philosopher when properly interpreted meant much the same as does the modern thinker who expresses his sublime thought of cosmic aspects as Matter, Force and Consciousness, or as the later school has it, Matter, Energy and Intelligence.

As a further result of research the Theosophist who is ever diligent and conscientious, seeking for the Truth, fails to find any rite, ceremony, or symbol in Christianity save those borrowed from faiths called pagan and heathen. If they serve, at their best, as instruments, it is well they were adopted; if they are revered as a "grace giving symbolism" as defined by a church authority, the Theosophist is candid in his criticism, and expresses but little reverence.

As to church edifices, which in our civilization are needed as a means to promote religion and not to be understood as constituting religion itself, the attitude of the Theosophist is that of harmony, but it seems as if the multiplication of such structures may become bewildering as dif-

ferentiation in the natural course of evolution into sects progresses. In the average rural towns of say three thousand inhabitants, there are from six to eight such establishments, all hating each lovingly for Christ's sake. The sermons preached in many of these provincial temples have the ring of the sixteenth century. It is to these we look for the most accurate mapping—the latest physical geography of hell; also for the most detailed anatomy and physiology of the devil. An estimate made with some care in a Maryland town a short time ago disclosed an annual expenditure of over ten thousand dollars to keep all the churches alive, for the three thousand inhabitants, of which the average attendance in all was about six hundred each Sunday. In the same town, for educational purposes, three thousand a year was all that could be available under the system prevalent. The Theosophist would ardently recommend that the situation be actually reversed. Give the ten thousand dollars to education. Get teachers rather than preachers is the plea of the Theosophist.

In all of the research, as far back as all records reach, it has not been found where the so-called Founder of any religion was ever present at the laying of a corner stone of any church. Indeed, the most careful search on this line, finds Krishna, Confucius, Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus and Mahomet, out among the people. It is always afterward that a ceremonious priesthood seeks to erect institutions in imitation of those which the Founders shunned, and it is priestcraft which pronounces them holy. The Founders are not on record as ever having performed such an office.

Nevertheless it is difficult to enumerate all the points of agreement and non-agreement when the Theosophist is compared and contrasted with the orthodox Christian. About the easiest way to dispose of the argument is to quote President Hyde of Dartmouth College:

"The business of the scholar is the pursuit of truth. He is to find out and formulate the facts regardless of creeds, teachings of traditions, decrees of councils, or votes of assemblies. If he does less than this, he is a coward and a deserter. If he does more, he is a demagogue and a charlatan.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SCIENTIFIC ASPECT OF THEOSOPHY.

In the Ancient Wisdom, Philosophy, Science and Religion were combined into one system; the grouping was called Wisdom. The modern Theosophist fails to discover wherein in our day one aspect of knowing can be more sacred or profane than another. The effort of the scientist to attain to the ultimate reality is as holy as that of the theologian.

Theosophy admits all physical laws discovered by science, but it asserts the existence of others which modify the action of those we ordinarily know. In the psychical domain there is warrant to assert that the ancients were superior in attainment. The Chairs of Psychology are now creeping warily to conclusions reached long ago.

Even so materialistic a reasoner as Prof. Ernst Haeckel, of the University of Jena, in his "Riddle of the Universe," is compelled to say:

"As the knowledge of Nature, the object of the present philosophic study, is itself a part of the life of the soul, and as anthropology, and even cosmology, presuppose a correct knowledge of the 'psyche,' we may regard Psychology (the scientific study of the soul) both as the foundation and the postulate of *all other sciences*. From another point of view it is itself a part of philosophy, or physiology or anthropology."

While the Theosophist may agree to such a statement, an exception, and a decided one, will be taken to the same author, wherein he states that "the supreme and all-pervad-

ing law of nature, the true and only cosmological law, is, in my opinion, the law of substance, in the sense that all other known laws of nature are subordinate to it."

Under this "law of substance" he embraces two supreme laws of different origin and age; the older, the chemical law of the conservation of matter and the younger, the physical law of the conservation of energy. But he gives no adhesion to any law of the conservation of a third factor in the universe, the *conservation of consciousness*. It is not so much that he ignores it; he denies it, as witness the following:

"These two great cosmic theorems, the chemical law of the persistence of matter, and the physical law of the persistence of force, are fundamentally one—still very far from being generally accepted. It is stoutly contended by the entire dualistic philosophy, vitalistic biology and parallelistic psychology, even, in fact, by a few (inconsistent) monists, who think they find a check to it in *Consciousness*, in the higher mental activity of man, or in other phenomena of our 'free mental life.'"

And to make his reasoning more forcible to his clientele he adds:

"Even the most elaborate and most perfect forms of energy that we know, the psychic life of the higher animals, *the thought and reason of man depend on material processes*, or changes in the neuro-plasm of the ganglionic cells."

The Theosophist parts company with Haeckel. His works have been studiously investigated, however, by the students of the Eastern lore for it is a rule to read all and compare all. His "Riddle of the Universe" is an abridgement—a clever summing up of his conclusions, reaching back some years.

But another riddle is presented in the able production of Prof. Goldwin Smith, who gives his "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence" and some very good guessing is presented

if a Theosophist may be allowed to pass in judgment upon it. Here is an extract to begin with:

"Is there anything to suggest a key to the nature and operations of the power which enters the universe other than the consciousness of upward effort in ourselves? In what we see there appears to be a general 'travailing' and a struggling towards perfection, as though something like effort and not flat were *the* law. From an atomic nebula without form and void our earth has come to be what it is. Man has risen from the brute and is rising still. The *effort is in him*, yet the force and direction must have been supplied."

In Haeckel's materialistic philosophy, this *force* and *direction* thus *supplied* are unaccounted for. The Theosophist seeks for them in the Universal Consciousness, and to his satisfaction, finds sufficient in the facts as manifested, to warrant the assumption that such is the source.

Pursuing the argument that *effort* may be, after all, *the* law of nature, the learned writer emphasizes the deduction as follows:

"Character can be formed only by effort, which implies something against which to strive. For aught we know, *effort*, or something which we can only describe as effort, not flat, or *mere evolution*, may be the real law of the universe."

Haeckel's *real law* of the universe is the law of substance. Both writers, in the attempt to solve riddles, each from his own point of view, come perilously near each other when touching the function of *affinity* or the cosmic process.

Haeckel speaks of the "fundamental *unity of affinity* in the *whole* of nature, from the simplest chemical process to the most complicated love story," and says it "receives empirical confirmation from the interesting progress of cellular psychology, the great significance of which we have only learned to appreciate in the last thirty years," and deduces therefrom a "universal soul of the simplest char-

acter for even the atom, and the same may be said of molecules which are composed of two or more atoms."

Prof. Goldwin Smith alleges that "good character only could have a life-giving affinity to the power of good." The power of affinity is postulated in both instances, but surely, one realm transcends the other.

Prof. Lester F. Ward, rated as the leading scientist of Washington, thinks he has discovered in one word a key which will unlock much of the mystery which encompasses us about. His talismanic word—to him almost a mantram—is *achievement*. Those who achieve are immortal; they live in the race to come after us. His argument is on lines parallel to Haeckel. The survivors are—to use Haeckel's terse term—"the picked minority of the qualified fittest." And these fittest, according to Prof. Ward, are those which have achieved.

The Theosophist demurs at such a sharp line. He rather clings to the line of effort. The man who *tries* to achieve is as valuable to nature's process as the one who is rated by philosophers as a success. The bones in the huge mound at Arlington, marked "The Unknown" indicate an immortality as enduring as the bronze figures on horseback apportioned to the reservations of Washington. Both made the same effort. The immortality is gained by the effort, not by what men measure, label, appraise or weigh, as achievement. If one tries, and fails, the effort saves him, not the measure of success from a human estimate.

Prof. Goldwin Smith, although not rated as a religious writer, comes nearer to a good "guess" at the riddle when he states:

"If, as our hearts tell us, there is a Supreme Being, He cares for us; He knows our perplexities; He has His plan. If we seek truth, He will enable us in due time to find it. Whether we find it cannot matter to Him; it may conceivably matter to Him, whether we seek it."

In other words, if we make the effort, we have done our best. If we have not achieved to the measure of Prof. Ward's philosophy all will be well, and this is but stating in a practical manner the law of Karma, the law of cause and effect, well canvassed and debated by the most astute reasoners the world ever saw—the sages of the East.

A word or two should be added in reference to the position taken by Prof. Ward, which smacks strongly of the Positivism of the day, that we are to live hereafter in the race. Prof. Goldwin Smith has ably met this presentation:

"Positivism hopes that it has indemnified, or more than indemnified, us for the loss of personal immortality by tendering an impersonal immortality in the consequences of our lives and actions prolonged through the generations which come after us to the end of time. But this immortality is not only impersonal, it is unconscious, and therefore, so far as our sensations are concerned, not distinguishable from annihilation. It is not even specially human; we share it with every motor, animate or inanimate, with the horse which draws a wagon, with the water which turns a mill, with the food which passes into the muscles of the consumer, with the falling stone.

* * * * *

Besides, all theories which pretend to console man for his mortality by making him a partaker in the immortality of his race, seem to encounter the objection that the race itself is not immortal. How long the planet which is the abode of man will last or remain fit for man's habitation, the oracles of science may not be agreed, but they appear to be agreed in holding that the end must come. If they are right, philosophy does but mock us when she bids us find our real spiritual life in efforts to perfect humanity, and our paradise in anticipation of the state of bliss into which humanity, when perfected, will be brought."

Suppose now, that the Theosophist is allowed a hearing in court. He insists on the "stubborn power of permanence in whatever has attained individuality." Faraday and Goethe have been quoted in prior chapters on this point. The claim is that the individual persists, while the race

may decay and die. The units of consciousness maintain their own according to the degree of effort put forth. What we have wrought in character we can take away, to again quote Humboldt. The units of the race reincarnate in the race, if the power of affinity thus draws them. With such a posit, Prof. Ward's tenet may be admissable, in all reason, that we live in the race to come, but a Theosophist insists that such another life will be the existence of the units. The dead to rise again must be born again, as a recent writer states it. Does not death feed life? But will the death of Prof. Ward feed a life or lives which made not corresponding effort? Who is to inherit his achievement but himself? Has any other self a claim to the sum total of his life effort? If man is to revert to the collective existence of the vegetable world and be pooled, such reasoning might stand. But Prof. Ward is an individuated portion of the Great-All Consciousness. Is it simply his name that will live on printed page? It will be contended that his thoughts will live as do those of Plato, of Goethe, of Emerson. But how much of Plato's thoughts have we? Must we take Jowett's Plato, with its English coloring and shading? Some do, but the riper scholarship of the age is beginning to discard it. The Theosophist would prefer the interpretative power of the French philosophers. Even Prof. Ward pays a tribute to the French thought as against the English. How many have understood Emerson? Has the race ever done justice to any great individuality? Why did Prof. Max Muller believe that he was the reincarnation of an ancient Hindu? Simply because he could appreciate the equity of nature in allowing him to do justice to *himself*. One short life is not sufficient, with all its possible achievement, to attain such a perfection as is idealized by the Theosophist in the final goal—the Perfectibility of Man.

In the broader generalizations of modern thought, camps are divided, the Materialists and Realists on one side,

the Idealists on the other. The Materialist believes in physical causation; the Idealist in mental or spiritual causation. The Theosophist aligns with the Idealist for he is forever striving after the realization of his ideals. The best of modern scientific thought is arrayed on this side. A strong illustration of reasoning on this line is given by Professor Du Bois of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College:

"If our intellectual action finds physical expression in nature, and not only reason but imagination is found to be an aid in physical investigation—may we not retrace our steps, and again define all science as *the verification of the ideal in nature.*"

This is Emerson's teaching, wherein he proclaims the universe an "externalization of the soul," and argues that everything in nature answers to a moral power. The Theosophist believes he is on safe scientific induction when he declares in conformity to the ancient teaching that it is the soul which has a material body or covering, not the body possessed of a soul as a property of matter. Matter obeys will; will is not the servant of matter. Mind creates, is creating, always has created. The creative mind in man is the same mind which is manifested in nature. It is active everywhere.

This leads an occasional belligerent to assert that Theosophy thus becomes Pantheism. In a general sense, such teaching elaborated by Spinoza is not rejected by the Theosophist, but in a specialized sense, the teaching held by the ancients of the more scientific cast of mind is that the former is Deity in Nature, while the latter is Deity in Man. The highest product in the process of evolution should certainly exercise more deific powers than the vegetable. Professor Lester F. Ward marks such a line, clearly, in distinguishing between man and the animals; the latter cannot change their environment—man can. And again to quote Professor Du Bois:

"What limit can we set to man's action? So far as we understand the constitution of the universe we live in, it is made sensitive to will, and through its whole extent it thrills at the touch of spirit hands. The action of man's will in such an universe may accomplish *any* conceivable result."

This is as broad in conception as the saying of the Upanishad: "There is no limit to the knowing to the Self that knows." Such is the ideal which to the Theosophist is always an impelling forward attraction,—the divine idealism of Emerson.

Tyndall, who confessed that he had been impressed with Emerson's thought dealt a blow to the materialistic school in that memorable address of 1874 before the British Association:

"Abandoning all disguise, the confession which I feel bound to make before you is that I prolong the vision backward across the boundary of experimental evidence and discover in matter, which we, in our ignorance, and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of every form of life."

That "promise and potency" *in* matter guiding and controlling, is more than the "substance" of Haeckel; more than the "one substance" of Spinoza; more than the "two substances" of Descartes; more than the "innumerable substances" of Leibnitz. It is the real *sub* (under) *stans* (to stand), it stands under all—the Great Breath in Eastern terminology, the Universal Consciousness in the classification of the West.

The dogmatic scientist (and there are such) asks the Theosophist, what broad classification he may be willing to adopt, if Haeckel's monism is discarded. To which it can be answered, that instead of making matter and energy *one*, (mono,) monistic, why not accept Herbert Spencer's threefold classification, Substance, Energy and Consciousness?

A monism can here be established, if Consciousness controls both substance and energy. Or, take the later classification, which seems to please some scientific reasoners,—Matter, Energy and Intelligence. The monistic idea here, would be in the *intelligent* control of the two subordinate aspects. Or, take again the classification which seems to dovetail with the thought of the Eastern Physics when properly interpreted, — Space—Motion—Consciousness. Here, too, the monistic postulate is in Consciousness which guides all modes of motion throughout all Space. And in this thought, Man is a center of consciousness, a unit, possessing that stubborn power of permanence because he has attained to a reality. He is certainly as real as a particle of oxygen. and this persists "if it pass into a thousand combinations, and lie hid for a thousand years," to quote again that instructive object lesson by Faraday. But the scientist will surely come who will reduce that particle of oxygen to its ultimate atoms, and if he does, it will still be claimed, as Faraday maintained, yet stronger proof, that the particle of oxygen was able to persist until forced apart; and this forcing will be done by the *mind* of man, a part of the same Universal Mind which guided that particle of oxygen to its purpose—its reality.

Professor Brinton in commenting on the powers of man by which he reaches with psychic processes other than reasoning, states:

"The teachings of the severest science tell us that Matter is, in its last analysis, Motion, and that motion is nought else than Mind; and who dare deny that in their unconscious functions our minds may catch some overtones, as it were, from the harmonies of the Universal Intelligence thus demonstrated by inductive research and vibrate in unison therewith."

In support of this position he refers to the results of the physical investigations of Helmholtz, and to their logical application to mental science, by George John Romanes,

in his *Mind and Motion*; to the position of Prof. Paulsen in his *Introduction to Philosophy;* and to such lines of thought as are presented in Prof. Dolbear's *Matter, Ether, and Motion.*

Professor Dolbear's work has a charm for the student of the ancient Physics, especially that phase which has recently engaged the more studious Theosophists in following the fascinating presentation by Mr. Thomas E. Willson, who for many years was the Librarian of the New York *World*, and who died recently, while continuing from month to month the deep study in the "Theosophical Forum" under the heading "Ancient and Modern Physics."

Mr. Willson stated in defining his position that our scientists are not exact in giving the atom two planes of vibra-

"It has Four. You merely surround it with etheric atoms, and this is correct so far as it goes. You only wish to explain physical problems. But there are other problems to be explained, problems of life and mind, and the same knowledge you have explains them as well as the others, if you simply avail yourselves of it. That you do not consider the atom as four-fold instead of two-fold is your own fault. I have not told you anything you did not already know. I have only asked you to apply your present knowledge of physics to these problems of life and mind, and apply your reasoning powers."

"The chording *vibration* in an atom of matter of
"The two planes produces Force, or phenomena;
"The three planes produces Life;
"The four planes produces Mind."

And in explanation, more in detail, as a summary of the chapters he is led to say:

"There is no 'oriental science' because the oriental does not attach the same value to merely physical knowledge that we do. But that must not be understood to imply that there is no oriental physics. In all matters that interest us now, so far as principles are concerned, the oriental knew

all that we know. He knew it thousands of years ago, when our ancestors were sleeping with the cave bears."

Perhaps no better use could be made of the few remaining pages of this book than to enlarge on many of the wonderful phases of the orientals so admirably disclosed by the gifted writer who has recently passed over to the plane he so well studied, but justice to the reader will demand, that along with the offering of such postulates, elaborate explanations should be given, for Mr. Wilson's condensation was for those who had devoted some study to modern physics.

This much, however, can be said on the general aspect of the case. The modern scientist is apparently loath to allude to anything pertaining to science which proceeds from the Sanscrit. There seems to be a studied effort to ignore the 144 colleges of India, many of which have Professors in specialization which will compare with other institutions of learning. Professor Max Muller in one of his addresses before the Oriental Society alluded to the fact that Englishmen seem to look upon the orientals as "niggers, whatever that term may mean." This, presumably, because the Hindus are a subjugated race. The French school of philosophers and scientists are more generous in treatment, and pity it is, that their works are not more speedily translated into English.

Nearly everything in Anglo-Saxon thought starts with Greece. This is, undoubtedly, owing to the fact that the curriculum of colleges places Latin and Greek as part of the regular prescribed course. It seems to be forgotten that we owe the roots of our language to the Sanscrit, which can be called the Mother tongue for all general purposes. India was the cradle of religions to keep again in the general sense; she gave the most exalted concepts which have endured; nearly all rites and ceremonies can be traced to Vedic and pre-Vedic thought. Evolution as a doctrine or

process in nature, was lisped by even the early Aryan children thousands of years before Grecian civilization attained its climax, yet Edwin Clodd labels his book on Evolution "From Thales to Darwin" unmindful of the fact that scholarship will not care to dispute that Thales, usually listed as the first of the Grecian Philosophers, traveled East to learn something, as did Solon, Pythagoras, Plato, and a list of others which would appear formidable if published.

On the whole, it seems not only superficial in many of our modern scientists, but absolutely silly to maintain that the ancients were ignorant of principles and processes in Nature claimed as patented by modern brains.

Recurring again to the series of chapters by Mr. Willson, he states:

"The oriental idea of the universe does not differ *fundamentally*, in its general conception, from that of modern science; but it goes farther and explains more."

There are students in other fields, notably the archaeological and philological, who insist that the ancient ideas of the cosmos differ from the best thought of our day in terminology only. The facts as they are disclosed from time to time seem to warrant such a position. In Psychology it is now quite well settled by those who care to investigate for themselves that the ancients were decidedly superior. But this is no discredit to the account of the moderns. It is but a quarter of a century since we have fairly gotten to work at it with an earnestness and a system; but the materialistic school seems doomed to the wall at every step forward.

Here is a case in point. We have been taught during the past forty years that the causes of the belief in immortality began with man's idea of his double. He had emerged from the brute kingdom until he became somewhat self-conscious. Looking down into a pool of water he saw an image of himself, therefore his double. Then in dreams he was

away and wandering in happy hunting grounds and doing things on the dream-plane which pleased him better than anything in his hard objective life; therefore, there was a sensuous plane beyond better than this.

The science of philology alone, has proved all this materialistic structure very precarious. Archaeology confirms it to a great extent. Psychology nails it to the not only improbable, but to the ridiculous. Wherever the mind of man has exercised the functions of intelligence, it has been met by a responsive intelligence which is universal and psychic in its power. Not a double; not a dream, but a something which stern and exact science is even now willing to group under that convenient term "environmental stimuli."

These crude teachings on "primitive man" by scientists who write in their libraries are being overthrown by searchers who dwell among tribes and know something of them. Herbert Spencer and Sir John Lubbock cannot in this existing age be accepted as the compeers of those who seek the psychic manifestations in the rudest peoples by sojourning in their midst. Even among these there is occasionally a miscarriage, especially by missionaries who are not equipped with the scientific habit of thought before setting out into the wilds.

An instance is quoted by Prof. D. G. Brinton in his "Religions of Primitive Peoples." A missionary, Bleek, among the Bushmen of South Africa, found them, as rated, the lowest of the human race; no temples, no altars, no ritual, and according to his estimate with no conceptions, even in the budding, of the faintest moral obligations; yet he filled in manuscript, he says, seventy-seven quarto volumes, and admits that he was far from exhausting the supply, of tales collected among them concerning their gods in their relations to men and animals. Had the missionary been trained to a proper appreciation of the scientific method of investi-

gation he might have asked himself, whence these thousands of tales? Something had been lost in the earlier history of these degenerated people, and what remained was the myths and folk-lore, and both had lost their original meaning.

Nevertheless, while stoutly contending for the psychic origin of nearly all phases of religion (or that which passes under the name of religion) let it be clearly understood that the Theosophist of a studious cast of mind does not wish to be enrolled with those who carry psychism, and psychical practices to extremes under the cloak of religious exaltation. Hysterical mania is easily defined and discernible by the formulated rules of a scientific psychology. Minds disordered by religious excitement whether at the noisy revival or in the more subdued ceremonies, are worked up to a high contagious pitch through collective suggestion. And in cases of auto-suggestion, many pretenders to knowledge on higher planes of consciousness follow crazily the disordered fancies of their sub-conscious selves, mistaking them for the inspiration of divine emanations. And Theosophy has suffered because of such pretenders who go about claiming that they have been trained by long effort to function on these high planes, and can bring back to the objective existence a clear memory of what they there perceived. These uncanny narrations are found in an occasional treatise labelled "Devachanic Planes" and the extravagance of vision is what has brought reproach on the system of thought known as Theosophy. It is in order again to requote the declaration of Professor Max Muller:

"Theosophy has been so greatly misapprehended that it was high time to restore it to its proper function."

The scientific study of Psychology will explain these mental states produced by long effort, and it will also explain why these so-called trained experts are as sincere as are the trance-mediums. In the "Guesses at the Riddle of

Existence" heretofore quoted, there occurs this telling paragraph touching these "trained" ones:

"He is, however exalted, merely imposing on himself. He creates by a subtle sophistication of his own mind the cloudy object of his faith and worship. He has himself written his Book of Mormon, and hidden it where he finds it."

There is yet open the mooted question of direct knowledge through Intuition. Many scientists deny it; others sustain it. The Theosophist adheres to it as part of the teaching of the ancient Psychology. Willson in his "Ancient and Modern Physics," following the lore of the East, takes a bold stand, and Theosophists almost unanimously follow him; they will cling to their position until convinced of error. He says:

"Knowledge comes to us in two ways, and there are two kinds of knowledge. 1. That which comes through our senses, by observation and experience. This includes reasoning from relation. 2. That which comes through intuition—or, as some writers inaccurately say, 'through the formal laws of thought.'

* * * * * * * *

Not our reason, but our intuition, said that the sun stood and the earth revolved daily. Ask the ablest living geographer or physicist to prove to you that the earth revolves daily, and he will reply that it would be the job of his life. It can be done at great expense and great labor, but that is because we know the answer and can invent a way of showing it, not because there are any observations from which a deduction would naturally follow. Nearly if not all our great discoveries have come to us through intuition, and not from observation and experience. When we know the lines on which to work, when intuition has given us the KEY, then the observation and experience men prize so highly, and the reason they worship so devoutly, will fill in the details. The knowledge that flows from observation, and the reasoning from the facts it records, is never more than relatively true; it is always limited by the facts, and any addition to the facts requires the whole thing to be re-

stated. We never know all the facts; seldom even the more important; and reason grasps only details.

We have yet to coin a proper word to express what comes to us through intuition. The old English word 'wisdom' originally did. The old verb 'wis' meant what a man knew without being told it, as 'ken' meant knowledge by experience. Try and prove by reason that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, or that a part never can be greater than the whole, and your reason has an impossible task. 'You must take them for axioms,' it says. You must take them because you *wis* them, not because you (ken) them.

* * * * *

The recognition of the two sources of knowledge, the work of the spirit within us and of the mind within us, is absolutely necessary to correctly comprehend the true significance of the results of modern science, and to accept the ancient."

As an additional suggestion before parting with the reader who may be interested in the higher thought of our day (and Theosophy always will, as it always has, when properly interpreted, thus absorb the highest thought)—attention should be called to a scientific reasoner of no mean merit, indeed, one eminent in the scholarship of the age, Professor C. Lloyd Morgan, of Bristol, England, who, in commenting on "Psychology and the Ego" says:

"Are we just set in the midst of a series of inevitable sequences, determinate with nothing to determine them, driven onward with nothing to drive them, purposeful without a purpose, rational without reason, phenomena without a cause, a riddle to which there is no answer, a monstrous puzzle-problem to which it is a mere waste of time to wish or hope for a solution? That depends entirely on whether we are content to accept a scientific interpretation of nature and of mind as the be-all and end-all of human endeavor. I am persuaded that science ought not to express an opinion for or against any of the metaphysical postulates above suggested. They lie beyond its special province—outside of the sphere of thought within which its opinions are worthy of the most respectful consideration. Science has indeed a

perfect right to assert that neither Force nor Will nor any underlying cause has any place within the ideal constructions which it is the business of science to develop. But it has no right to restrict all thought within the limits of its formulae. That some men of science seek to do so is unfortunately true; but it is a cause of regret to many who value and admire the achievements of science within its proper sphere.

* * * * *

Is there lying behind the phenomena with which biology and psychology have to deal a self or ego, of the existence of which we are assured with the assurance of conviction, and to the operation of which we can refer the phenomenal sequences? In a word, is there beneath the surface of bodily charges and psychological concomitants an informing spirit—a quickening soul? I do not answer these questions. My own opinion or even conviction could have but little weight. But every thoughtful man should give them careful and serious consideration, mindful of the fact that great thinkers, men of wide culture and piercing insight, men freed from the inevitably narrowing influence of specialism, men whose commanding intellect has emancipated them from the bondage of tradition, have given no hesitating answer. I do not counsel subservience to authority. No man's convictions can stand in the place of my own. But modesty, that crowning virtue of the nineteenth century, should at least make us pause before we proclaim that our own rush lights have more illuminating power than the standard lamps whose rays still shine, unquenched after the lapse of centuries."

Pursuing the thought of Professor C. Lloyd Morgan, the attentive Theosophist is forced to the conviction in common with most of the candid investigators of this wonderful era, that the study of Psychology is the most pressing need at this stage of culture. The wants of Psychical Research are emphasized at every fresh encounter in the procedure of investigation.

It would be well for Theosophical Societies, in the opinion of the author, to recall that whereas, when the Society was founded at New York in 1875 equal stress was placed

upon each of the three planks in the platform. Can it be consistently maintained that such is now the status? The first plank insisted upon the recognition of an Universal Brotherhood. Do not the Liberal pulpits do the work on this line in larger measure than can possibly the Theosophical Societies? The second plank was incorporated to lead to a study of ancient religions and philosophies. After a quarter of a century, do we not find that the Unitarian, Congregational, and other Liberal institutions, supported by the Higher Criticism are filling the field in a most acceptable manner?

But as to the third plane—the study of the Psychic Powers Latent in Man, and the unexplained laws of nature, how many, even of the liberal exponents are devoting due consideration to the solution of the thousands of problems which are constantly arising? The Society for Psychical Research in England, aided by its Branches in America, have done good work, and the Chairs of Psychology are aiding and abetting, but how much of this literature percolates among the people? What part of it is intelligible to the man on the street?

Here is a field where the Theosophical Societies can display their diffusive powers. On every hand there are forming so-called Occult Schools, claiming predicates that stagger the belief of the investigating mind. More than one asserts for itself a head, which is none other than the reappearance of Christ! Many are in regular communication, as they claim, with the noblest the world has produced, though dead for centuries. A diligent and systematic study of Psychology as taught in the Occident in contrast and parallel with the ancient Psychology would soon restore the mental balance of many of these over-wrought psychical natures. The churches will not be at pains to help effect a cure; the Theosophical Societies can, in their organized functions, do much to bring about normal adjustment—wholesome equi-

librium. Yet, let it be understood that such procedure, while conducted on scientific lines as to observation and experiment with its consequent induction as well as deduction must be in accord with a pure Science. The definitions of such a science would cover many pages, but for the author, it is sufficient to recall the penetrating insight of Professor Clerk Maxwell, who, declared that "all Science is but a disclosure of analogies."

Reasoning by analogy will aid in dispelling many of these crude theories born and bred in schools of thought which have their source in the Suggestion of certain so-called occult heads. It will not be a waste of time or effort for classes on Theosophical lines to begin a systematic study of Psychology, following the lead of, say, Professor Ladd of Yale, or any other competent author, always bearing in mind that a better knowledge of the science can be obtained by comparing it with the ripest of the Eastern scholarship.

Another charge made against the Theosophical Student classes is, that they read science into their theories; that having already a bias or preconceived notion that certain tenets of Eastern thought must be sound, the reenforcement is added by drawing on scientific principles as enunciated in the modern experimental knowledge of the West, thus making it appear to the public that Theosophy is as thoroughly scientific as any system of thought.

This accusation is not well founded. The Theosophist can as well answer that the modern scientists have read into their "working hypotheses" the very essentials of Eastern thought. It is the silliest position one can take to accuse a Theosophist of following the teachings consequent upon Evolutionary processes merely because Darwin, or Lamarck before him, first brought the doctrine to light. The East taught it twenty thousand years ago in India. It is so completely interwoven in the thought of their scholarship that

there is not now a trace of opposition to it. The clergy of all sects hold to it as part of the divine plan.

It would not require much ingenuity on the part of a writer who craved for a sensational notoriety to frame a tale which would show more than coincidences on the part of certain scientific investigations. A daring and reckless writer might easily state that everything of general principles was stolen from the East; but it is not necessary to resort to such rash assertion. It is sufficient to state that when thought becomes free, and the bonds of traditionalism and dogmatism are broken, civilization will naturally reach a phase or condition when these old thoughts are thought over again, and psychological law will sustain this stand. The fulness of time had arrived when Lamarck and Darwin could enunciate such teachings, and the reading world was ready to receive it. It belonged to the scholarship of the day because of its capacity to receive it and assimilate it.

A marked instance of such unjust inference against the Theosophists appeared in the Smithsonian Report of a few years ago, wherein, under the heading of "The Revival of Alchemy," the writer cast flings at the Theosophist who draws crowded houses to listen to views pretending to be scientific, and in the course of the narration much in detail was given in regard to the movement to resuscitate alchemical doctrines and practices which have been particularly successful in France, where there are to-day four societies and a "university" claiming to possess occult knowledge of hermetic mysteries. These secret societies are named "Ordre de la Rose-Croix," "L'Orde Martiniste," "La Societe d'Homeopathic Hermetique" and "L'Association Alchimique de France."

The writer says that the first two of these societies seem to work on lines similar to Free Masonry,

"And claim that their secret mysteries were bequeathed by the last sages of Atlantis and by the Lemures to their

brethren in Asia and Egypt, dwellers in sanctuaries whence issued Krishna, Zoroaster, Hermes, Moses, Pythagoras, and Plato. The priestly magi who preserved this lore in the temples of Thebes, Heracleopolis, Aphrodite, Ptah, and Serapis were succeeded by secret alchemical societies of the first centuries of our era; then followed the hermetic lodges of the Arabs, and these gave rise to the Templars, the Rosicrucians and the Martinists."

The average reader may not be interested in these claims, which at first blush, might seem extravagant, but wise men for centuries have been working on these lines and their conclusions are not to be laughed away. Bulwer Lytton was initiated into a society which carries a fund of ancient lore yet untraversed by any Smithsonian student thus far encountered by the author, and Wendell Phillips, when preparing his lecture on "The Lost Arts," gave hints to his intimate friends that there was in the world a custodian of much that is hidden. Canon Kingsley in his study of the Lost Atlantis had views similar. Leibnitz was acquainted with certain principles which he said he would not give out because the age was not ripe. The discoveries in the Sanscrit whetted the appetite of many a searcher. Had Professor Max Muller been in India instead of England he might have been initiated into certain truths, had he at the same time been free from bias, but he never would have been taken into the mysteries so long as he held positive ideas of Christian dogmas and traditions in reserve. One of the conditions of membership is that a man must be *free!*

There are men in France who are pursuing studies on lines little understood by writers in the vicinage of the Smithsonian Institution. A mere canvass of the roster of membership, in which appear names eminent in the world's thought, ought to convince a fair-minded observer that they are not on a "fool's errand" in their search for truth, nor are they wasting their time on trying to make gold by some alchemical process. It is something higher than gold which

engages their attention. What may be evolved from the joint labors of these studious searchers none can tell; but the world is being benefitted far more by their researches than by the materialistic outputs of those who cast reproach on their earnest endeavor.

The Theosophist who is an ardent searcher keeps in as close touch with these delving philosophers as his time and means will allow, and he can assert with all sincerity that while much has been revealed, there remains yet a vast ocean to explore, which too many of our scholars in Western thought have absolutely ignored.

Notwithstanding a defence of the French school of philosophers who are pursuing trails of lost lore, with an earnestness and method not unbecoming the true scientific spirit, yet it must be acknowledged that there are in France, as in other countries, certain camps which adhere to the vagaries of a vapid mysticism, and claim to be Theosophists.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTROVERTED QUESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.

Black-faced Gothic letters at the head of a column in a daily newspaper of Indianapolis carry these words—"DISCIPLES OF BLAVATSKY." This glaring announcement served the purpose of informing the public that "The Theosophical Society of America" was then in session at its annual convention in that city. It is presumed that the editor in charge of that paper really believed that Theosophists are, as he has signalized them, and the matter-of-fact business public who read that journal whatever else they may forget relating to the gathering of students, will surely retain that bold heading impressed with a clearness of imagination on the memory.

Many silly people in the world believe that Theosophists are naught else than disciples of Madame Helena Petrovna Blavatsky a Russian lady of noble birth, who is now dead but a decade, forgetful of the fact that Prof. Max Muller pronounces Theosophy as "that venerable system of thought well known to the Christian Fathers." And it appears strange, withal, that Madame Blavatsky should be credited as the founder of Theosophy despite the fact that it has been again and again published from her own pen that she did not claim to have brought the world anything new. Copying from Montaigne, she declared that she had brought to the West from the East, a bouquet of flowers, but all that she had contributed was the string that tied them.

A Theosophist who is true to the principles of his sys-

tem of thought is a disciple of nobody; he cannot be, if honest with himself and to the basic principles which he cherishes. He is an individual in the strictest sense, and realizes that he must stand alone; he came into the world alone, and will go hence alone. Adopting the forcible declaration of Horace Greeley he can consistently say: "I take no man's opinion, dead or alive, as my own." His Karma would not allow him to do otherwise.

Madame Blavatsky was an interpreter of Eastern lore; in that sense she was a teacher. Her writings speak for themselves and will endure if they coordinate with the truth; if not, they will perish from the earth. But they cannot be harmed by the scornful flings of pulpiteers who mould a false opinion by denouncing Theosophy as "Blavatskyism."

Not many months ago a paid article in one of the cheap magazines of the country appeared, written by one who pretends to know much of the psychic forces in nature and man, who gave as his heading, "Madame Blavatsky High Priestess of Isis." Here, again, a busy public will refrain from going into a rigid scrutiny of the points suggested. but the average American who loves fair play, and has inherently, the racial chivalry, will ask, as many did, why a man pretending to culture should not allow a woman to rest in peace without heaping calumny on her memory.

To all such assaults, the Theosophist who never saw Madame Blavatsky and knows her only through her writings, will answer that those nearest to her in domestic life were the better judges of her personality. The Countess Wachmeister, widow of the Swedish Minister at the Court of St. James, lived with her as a companion for three years during the period of her greatest trials and activity. The testimony of the Countess will outweigh that of the partisan maligner. Those who were her pupils are rated as of the refined, sincere, and educated classes, and they can give

in detail all that is necessary for the framing of a verdict.

Madame Blavatsky blundered in more than one instance, but none knew it better than herself, and no one regretted it so keenly as did she on the printed pages left us. She was human, therefore prone to error, but withal, a most remarkable woman. She is to be judged by her teachings, not by the slanders of those who knew little or nothing of her. But, whether good or bad, Theosophists are not her disciples, nor are they disciples of any personality that ever lived on earth, whether Krishna, Zoroaster, Osiris, Buddha, Jesus, or any human manifestation of light and leading. They are disciples of the synthesized thought of all great teachers; all the line from the Vedic Rishi, to our own Emerson, and many another great soul even in our own day and generation. They aspire to be in tune with the highest thought to which the human mind can reach, as well in Science as in Religion or Philosophy. Such a system of thought has to rest upon foundations apart from personalities, and must justify itself upon its own merits, meet the demands of reason, the moral sense and the higher intuitional nature.

Another controverted question gains a further impetus by an editorial in one of the most extensively circulated daily papers of New York, (The Journal). The editor in answering a Theosophist uses these words:

"Theosophy—which means 'the wisdom of the gods'—is a very charming philosophy; but the Theosophists pretend to a knowledge which we do not have, and which we really do not believe they possess. The only point in which we fully agree with Theosophists is this—that if there is immortality for man in future, there must have been immortality in the past. We must always have existed. Preexistence is logically necessary to immortality. Our correspondent insists: 'You, Mr. Editor, know as well as I know that the knowledge of immortality has been in possession

of the human race as far back as the records go.' No, we do not know that; we wish we did."

Here, the issue is joined without ceremony or special pleading; it is wholesome and refreshing because of its frankness. But the trial must be before the great open court of public opinion.

The gist of the case is—"as far back as the records go." There remains, therefore, the determination by the best thought of the age, the ripest scolarship, as to how far back records can be traced. It becomes an interesting search, and with confidence allied to assurance, the Theosophist claims he has won his case.

The most commonly accepted opinion, it is granted, is, that the oldest records are of the Hebrew race. This is now successfully refuted and archaeology will sustain the Theosophist. In order to present that side of the case it is but necessary to quote from a Sunday-school publication, where editorially the following is given as if by a court of final resort under the heading, "The Most Ancient Books":

"The most ancient books are the writings of Moses, and the poems of Homer and Hesiod. The earliest sacred writings of the Chinese are called the Five Kings, king meaning web of cloth, or the warp that keeps the threads in their place. They contain the best sayings of the best sages on the ethics—political duties of life. These sayings cannot be traced to a period higher than the eleventh century B. C. The 'Three Vedas' are the most ancient books of the Hindoos, and it is the opinion of Max Muller, Wilson, Johnson and Whitney that they are not older than 11 centuries B. C. The Zendavesta of the Persians is the grandest of all the sacred books next to the Bible. Zoroaster,whose sayings it contains, was born in the twelfth century B. C. Moses wrote his Pentateuch 15 centuries B. C. and, therefore, preceded by 300 years the most ancient of the sacred writings."

The above quotation is a fair specimen of the kind of archaeological literature certain educated (?) divines dole out to the people. For misrepresentation, and for lack of

a systematic knowledge of events as they have been unearthed by the philologists, archaeologists and astronomers of our day, it is, to say the least, almost inexcusable.

It is now well settled that the Egyptian Book of the Dead can be traced to about 6,000 years B. C. It is equally well established by native Sanscrit scholars that the Rig Veda, the oldest of the four Vedas (not three, as stated above) can be traced back to 4000 B. C. by certain reckonings, 5000 B. C. by other scholars, and even one authority now on that line of research states that 6000 B. C. will not be sufficient for certain specified portions of the Rig Veda. The Chinese Cyclopaedia is now given an antiquity of continuous thread of events of over 4000 B. C. and there are documents which have been inspected by both Japanese and European scholars in the Chinese text which antedate the Cyclopedias. The Hittites, a powerful nation, from whom the Jews borrowed much of their earlier traditions, have an hieroglyphic literature which no man living can translate. The discoveries in Crete show an earlier Grecian thought far antedating Homer or Hesiod. The Thibetan rolls show an antiquity equal to any of the above, and though problematical as yet, it is conceded that they must pertain to the earlier Turanian.

Yet in all of these early productions, and along with them, the baked clay tablets of ancient Nippur, brought to light by Professor Hilprecht, there is shown by unmistakable professions that man in the earliest of the early, and in all of these ancient civilizations, had a clear and pronounced belief in immortality, or to modify it, a trust in another life.

This ought to be convincing as to that part of the New York editor's statement—"as far back as human records go."

Professor Max Muller was in England, not India, when he wrote the edifying book, "What India Can Teach Us."

Therein, he stated, that he had no reliable evidence of Sanscrit writings earlier than 1200 B. C. But European scholars then in India answered him promptly that *they had evidence*, if he had not, of Sanscrit, even the Rig Veda extending more than 2000 B. C. The search continued, and finally one accomplished Hindu, Patek, by astronomical calculation, as stoutly maintained that certain verses must be as old as 6000 B. C., and in writing. The trail has been pursued by Theosophical scholars in India, and it is now put forth with assurance that the deeper they go into the search the more probable it seems that much more time must be allowed.

Even Prof. Max Muller, as late as 1892, in his inaugural address as President of the International Congress of Orientalists, was obliged to say:

"I must confess, the deeper we delve, the farther the solution of this problem seems to recede from our grasp; and we may here, too, learn the old lesson that our mind was not made to grasp beginnings. We know the beginnings of nothing in this world, and the problem of the origin of language, which is but another name for the origin of thought, evades our comprehension quite as much as the problem of the origin of our planet and of the life upon it, or the origin of space and time, whether without or within us.

* * * * * *

We are often asked why it should be impossible to calculate how many centuries it must have taken before that Proto-Aryan language could have become so differentiated and so widely divergent as Sanscrit is from Greek, or Latin from Gothic. If argued geologically, we might say, no doubt, that it took a thousand years to produce so small a divergence as that between Italian and French, and that therefore many thousands of years would not suffice to account for such a divergence as that between Sanscrit and Greek. We might, therefore, boldly place the first divergence of the Aryan language at 5000 B. C. and refer the united Aryan period to the time *before* 5000 B. C. That period again would require many thousands of years, if we are to

account for all that had become dead and purely formal in the Proto-Aryan language before it began to break up into its six ethnic varieties, that is, into Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, Greek, Latin, and Indo-Eranic.

If then we *must* follow the example of geology and fix chronological limits for the growth of the Proto-Aryan language, previous to the consolidation of the six national languages, *10,000 B. C. would by no means be too distant* as to the probable limit of what I should call *our historical knowledge* of the existence of Aryan speakers somewhere in Asia."

And the Theosophical students of India are pressing on this line with avidity. They discover at every step backward into time, that there was no period during which there were not wise men who believed in a life hereafter.

Gladstone followed this trail on the Semitic lines, and came to the same conclusion. The learned Professors in many of the Mohammedan colleges are on the same search, and prove as Max Muller said that on many points, so modern a language as Arabic is more primitive than Hebrew, while, in other gramatical formations Hebrew is more primitive than Arabic. Here, too, as far back as the records go, the higher thought of man believed in a life to come.

It may be as well to remind the busy man on the street, that modern scholarship dates the beginning of the Old Testament as we now have it, at about 500 B. C., when a layman named Nehemiah found in the archives of a Babylonian library an ancient document pertaining to Hebrew thought. If we could have had the traditions just as this book-worm found them, there would, perhaps, have been a more intelligent and scholarly presentation. But he called in the aid of Ezra, a priest, and here, the coloring of the partisan is laid on. When a priest finds anything in any language, race, or clime, it is apt to be moulded into a shape to conform to his sect, and his sect, is always *the* sect, *the* church, the *only church*. Nevertheless it will be

difficult to convince the hard-headed thinker of our day that Moses even if he wrote the Pentateuch, gave an account of his own death and burial. Ingersoll made a reputation on "Mistakes of Moses." The Theosophist is inclined to absolve Moses. He was dead long before the mistakes were made.

In further answer to the New York editor, the Theosophist takes a bolder stand than "as far back as the records go." He asserts that man believed in a future life *before there were records*, before the art of writing. This he proves by the aid of the greater light which the study of Psychology throws upon these grave problems, and it is consistent with the older wisdom of the Sages of the East. The "Oracles of Truth" it was said by the Wise Men, had been heard, *Sruta*, and from this arose the word Sruti, the recognized term for divine revelation in Sanscrit (see Sacred Books of the East, vol. 1, p. xiii). And this is in line with the reasoning of Professor Brinton, heretofore quoted. Man has always been in communication with the Universal Mind. He is part of the Universal Mind. He has always known more than writings could tell him. He believed in immortality before he discovered the means of transcribing his thought. Modern scholarship will sustain the Theosophist in this position. It will be disputed, however, by the Materialistic School, but the Theosophist is not prepared to accord to the Materialist the credit of the ripest wisdom of the day.

Yet another topic in controversy. It is charged by the partisan pleaders of orthodox pulpits and their subservient following that Theosophists readily lend their aid to every movement which aims to strike down accepted Christian observances, and emphasis was given recently on this alleged action of Theosophists, because they united in a protest against singing orthodox hymns in the public schools.

The Theosophist is here, as usual, misrepresented. It is not the singing of devotional hymns to which he objects. Cardinal Newman's great hymn, "Lead, Kindly Light" will be accepted by a Theosophist in the home circle or in the school for that matter, and many another production from Jew, Gentile, Barbarian, Greek, bond or free. The elevating influence of music is also heartily commended. But it is on the psychological ground that the objection primarily rests. The hymns create false ideals in the minds of the children. An inspection of a certain collection adopted by the School Board of the District of Columbia reveals the fact that a majority of the hymns keep the monotonous and un-American intonation of King, King, Crown, Crown, Sceptre, Court, Throne, Throne, and all the corresponding terms fitted to a ruler over subjects instead of a father over children. And aside from this psychological tendency to daze the minds of the youth, is the keeping before them false ideals, which are in direct opposition to the spirit of the Fathers of our Country. They had done with kings and thrones, and sceptres and crowns. They built a civil polity based on the dignity of Man. Every man his own priest and king! It was the slogan of the Revolution. It was woven into the thought of the Nation. It created that aspect of a higher evolution which now manifests as the *Initiative* in American character, and this keeping in chorus by a majority of the preachers the old ideas of the divine right of kings only further proves that of all the learned professions the clergy, as a rule, are the most impracticable, and least fitted to conform to any new environment.

The tendency now, even discerned by the average reader of newspapers, is toward a Christian Democracy, not an ideal structure patterned after decayed and effete monarchies or empires, keeping the ethnic impress uppermost. Hymns in the schools, the Theosophist would be glad to

hear, if attuned to the noblest ideals of the great new race which is forming on this continent, and it may not be considered presumptuous in the author, if he dare prophesy, that in accord with the unconscious cerebration which is ever at work, asleep or awake, the time will soon come, when a majority of the Catholic Church in America will see the injustice of adhering longer to a regal structure, which for its own perpetuation, keeps a majority of votes in Italy to beat off the rest of the world, at an election of a Pope.

Nor need this opportunity be allowed to slip without noting that the same inherited tendency has manifested in certain Theosophical camps. The worship of a "leader" is the case in point. In strict Theosophical thought there can be no "leaders" which can lord it over the individual Karma. Yet we have seen a body of Theosophists controlled by the suggestion of an ambitious "Head," and a vote given, overthrowing the autonomy established after the pattern of the United States constitution, and invested with powers which properly belong to a pontiff. This insane un-American tendency seems to have been bitten into the cells of a certain following.

There is reason for congratulation in the action of "The Theosophical Society in America" at its recent convention, whereby the future looks promising to the cultivation of a Theosophical Democracy. There is now no personal head as President or otherwise. The functions of the administration of affairs are now delegated to a Committee of Seven chosen from various parts of the country; and hereafter, whenever *three persons* gather together for a serious study of the principles of the culture, there is vested an autonomous power to regulate its own affairs. This action will appeal to thinking people and it will surely result on American soil, as do all such attempts, in a large and compact body held together by the principles inherent

in the teachings. There is no constitution, no dogma, no creed, no law, compelling people to be polite. Politeness grows because of its intrinsic merit. Theosophy will grow by the same power, actuating because of the truth disclosed. Theosophy cannot be claimed by right of "trade mark" by any camp, and an attempt to declare the other Society false and fraudulent will react on the bigoted partisans who make such charges.

One more controverted question. It is charged that the teachings introduced from the Orient unmake the strenuous life characteristic of the Occident. This, because it is found that Theosophists are opposed to war. They are opposed to war, and to the last day of their incarnation they will sit at the feet of teachers who proclaim against it. But this does not kill the lofty patriotic spirit which moves the American people to action for the perpetuation of their cherished ideals. At the founding of the first society in New York in 1875 two soldiers of prominence were leaders in the movement, Colonel Olcott and General Arthur Doubleday, one of the heroes of Gettysburg, and one of the committee of seven now constituted for "The Theosophical Society in America" is a Major General, a soldier of such purity of character as to call forth tributes of praise. The author of these pages served his country throughout the war of 1861-65. Numbers of veterans are enrolled among the Theosophists the world over. Yet all are opposed to war in the sense that the Theosophist is against it. All would again fight where patriotic duty calls for action.

Let the student recall the wisdom taught in the Bhagavad-Gita, a text book in Theosophical class rooms, wherein Arjuna, fearing to slay his own kin in battle arrayed on the opposing side begs Krishna for counsel, and utters with woe:

"When I shall have destroyed my kindred, shall I longer look for happiness? How, O Krishna, can we be happy hereafter, when we have been the murderers of our race?"

KRISHNA:

"Whence, O Arjuna, cometh upon thee this dejection in matters of difficulty, so unworthy of the honorable, and leading neither to heaven nor to glory? It is disgraceful, contrary to duty, and the foundation of dishonor. Yield not thus to unmanliness, for it ill-becometh one like thee. Abandon, O tormentor of thy foes, this despicable weakness of thy heart, and stand up!"

The question of a meat diet has entered into controversy at intervals. Certain Theosophists declaim against flesh eating; they are overcharged with Hindu teachings which are well enough in their own environment, and can be explained by the scientist as climatic, therefore seemly; nevertheless, it can be proven by the same course of severe reasoning that climatic conditions prevail here, also. The racial traits are to be taken into consideration, and the conclusion is well justified that while we do, perhaps, eat more meat than is for our own good, nevertheless, a teaching which would prohibit it altogether, is not called for at this stage of our evolution. Such ideas, when conforming with the best thought of the day, are wholesome, and lead the people to a wise discrimination, preventing abuse of the physical system. It is also to be considered, acting in accord with the highest authorities and personal experience as well, that abuse of the physical organism may result from a too forcible abstaining from that which our own Karma has implanted into our very cells. Yet, an occasional Theosophical writer or speaker, will grow vehement on this topic, ascribing all crimes to animal destruction, quoting Pope, who protested against "kitchens sprinkled with blood," and insisting that animal food *per se*, engenders crime. Plutarch is also referred to because he told

us that Pythagoras ate no pork, and wondered what first "led men to eat carcass."

Symbolism in Theosophy comes in for a share of animadversion. To the student it is valuable for its educational suggestiveness. The human race has not yet developed to that stage where an idea can be held in the mind, standing alone, in clearness of realization. Symbols aid: but they are not "grace giving" as Cardinal Manning declared of the symbolism of the Roman Church. The more recent term "Epigraphy," the art of deciphering the epigrammatic wisdom of the ancients embedded in hieroglyphics, is adopted by a certain school of archaeologists, but it will require time for the general public to become as well acquainted with it after having studied under the very comprehensive and not objectionable term-symbolism. Several symbols are displayed in Theosophical halls, and they serve the same purpose as do those of Free Masonry. They are instructive, not specially sacred nor holy.

A political gathering in the hall of the Theosophists on an off-night in Washington, brought out some strange comments as the ancient symbolism was scanned. One over-practical egotist declared that the "winged-globe" was borrowed from Baltimore, for he had seen it there on a Brewery sign!

This amusing incident, however, will not surpass the ludicrous aspect of the good Presbyterian brother at a weekly prayer meeting in one of the most costly edifices of the National Capital. Rising from his seat when he felt the strong pressure of the "spirit" moving him to "take part in meetin'," he surprised his hearers in declaring that right here at the great Federal Center, there were people who still "bowed down to graven images." The preacher who presided was so astounded to think that in Washington there could be such a heathenish practice in vogue that he

asked the brother to explain and state what class of citizens indulged in such forbidden rites. The sanctimonious brother arose again and said, "The Theosophists!" And many of that audience believe to this day that he spoke the truth, because, as a matter of course, a pious man one of the strictest of his sect, under the influence of the holy spirit could not possibly lie.

It was to enable the other side of a question to be seen that these pages were projected into the gaze of the public. Facts can be judged from another point of view.

An improtant item in the growing Theosophic thought in America is, that of defining the various camps. A lady in Washington who has traveled extensively in the East and has met Theosophists in all sections of the world, suggests that the confusion arising in the minds of the people can best be cleared by designating the members of the "Theosophical Society in America by the abbreviated title—"American Theosophists." To this, the author yields cordial assent. There is a camp calling itself "The American Section of the Theosophical Society." Section of what? A segment of a Society which has its headquarters in India. Its Australian contingent is called a Section. So with other Nationalites, or races, or peoples.

The Theosophical Society, as such, was organized in New York in 1875. Shortly afterward, Col. Olcott, its President, went to India and established headquarters there. Some difficulties having arisen the Americans seceded from the Society as thus planted in India, and in 1894 established at the convention held at Boston "The Theosophical Society in America." The autonomy has been American from that day. It is as legitimately an American institution as is the United States a distinct Government, the colonies having seceded from the Mother Country. The American Theosophists, as such, if the name can be adopted, can show

a trunk line of descent from the original society, and whether the secession was, or was not justifiable, it is too late now to attempt to remedy the status. The teachings in the American camp are thoroughly American as opposed to certain vagaries from representatives of the Eastern School.

Yet, looking at the future, the American Theosophists, realizing that there is good in all religions, all philosophies, all sciences, can still declare with George Washington in the opening article of the Treaty sent to the Senate in 1796, when discussing affairs with Tripoli:

"As the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion—as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of the Mussulmans, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony between the two countries."

The Father of His Country knew as much of the founding of this Nation as any of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention who sat with closed doors for four months in 1787, and who agreed that the proceedings should not be published until forty years had expired. An American Theosophist, in answer to Rev. Talmage, who cites the incident of a certain preacher demanding of Alexander Hamilton why the word "God" was left out of the Constitution,—would respectfully ask that the answer Hamilton gave to said preacher be published in the same sermon.

The Fathers in the Constitution were unquestionably the ablest body of jurists, legislators and statesmen that had ever assembled on the continent of North America. They knew what they were doing.

The words under the Great Seal of the United States express the true *American* idea:

"Novo Ordo Seclorem"—a new order for the ages; the

old had run long enough with its terrors mostly begotten by priestcraft. The figure on the obverse of the Seal, an unfinished Pyramid attested the monstrous, yet uncompleted work, but the triangular capstone poised above, ready to be fitted in the fullness of time, with the All-Seeing-Eye, the whole enclosed by the rays of a sunrise, signified a complete work, further emphasized by the inscription over it;—*Annuit Coeptis*—the year of a New *Undertaking*. And this Undertaking by Americans, was an endeavor to construct a synthesis, at once all inclusive. It sought to adopt all that had gone before; to found a model for a broad theory of ideas by which all the old could be supplanted without impairing the unity. That capstone would gracefully fit Egyptian Symbolism, for it and the incomplete Pyramid were borrowed from it; Chaldean philosophy and Parsee duty (to pure thoughts) pure words, pure deeds; Brahmanical spiritualism as well as its offspring, Buddhistic introspection; Greek philosophy and Roman law; Alexandrian University thought and Arabian secret lore combined with a true Christianity.

The American Theosophist desires to perpetuate the great UNDERTAKING symbolized in the Seal. To do this he realizes that while it has been claimed by an authority that

Hinduism builds on Essence.
Egypt builds on the Great
Zorostrianism builds on Light.
Confucius builds on Permanence.
Buddhism builds on Rest.
Greece builds on Beauty.
Mohammedanism builds on Will.
Christianity builds on Fatherhood.
Theosophy builds on Motherhood as well, and all of the above.

The whole can be fused into one and when the Pyramid is complete, a future religion will find a finished WHOLE.

And, in retaining all, we do no violence to the declaration of Huxley:

"The tendency of the enlightened thought of the day all the world over is not toward Theology but Philosophy, Science and Psychology. The fundamental principles of evolution are being accepted by the thoughtful. The bark of theologial dualism is drifting into danger."

Hence the American Theosophist endeavors to ascertain truth by the aid of a true science. He must do so if he is to keep up with the procession of the highest thought, and in doing this, he conforms again to Prof. Max Muller:

"Theosophy must occupy a position to that of the past, and express the highest thought of the time, as that thought widens with ever-growing experience. This is not a retreat but a change of front."

In this ever progressive march the essentials of a pure Christianity will be preserved intact, for what is pure as Christian, is pure as Buddhism, or any other religion in its purity. As Emerson justly said:

"To say that this, that and the other precept of the New Testament cannot be paralleled in the sacred books of the non-Christian religions,, only proves how narrowly we have read."

And Rev. John W. Chadwick makes a stronger declaration:

"There is not a single noble sentiment or lofty aspiration in the New Testament that cannot be paralleled in one or another of the other Scriptures of the world."

The American Theosophist, always adhering to American ideals, and standing for liberty of conscience, is a wholesome leaven in the lump. The bigotry of the orthodox churches is not yet effaced. The teachings of Jefferson and Madison on ethics and other matters outside the domain of active politics demand rehearsal in the by-ways as well as in text-books. It is only by thus renewing and reinforcing the motive power, not by defining morality that the great moral reforms and movements have been made.

It is due to Oriental scholarship that the gray twilight of ancient history has been illuminated as if by the rays of an unsuspected sunrise. We see *continuity* and *purpose* from beginning to end, where before we saw nothing but an undecipherable chaos. With every new discovery that is made, whether in the royal libraries of Babylonia, or in the tombs of Egypt, or in the sacred books of Persia and India, the rays of that sunshine are spreading wider and wider, and under its light the ancient history of our race seems to crystallize and to disclose in the very forms of its crystallization, laws or purposes running through the most distant ages of the world, of which our forefathers had no suspicion. Here it is where Oriental studies appeal, not to specialists only, but to all who see in the history of the human race the supreme problem of philosophy, a problem which in the future will have to be studied, not as heretofore, by *a priori* reasoning, but chiefly by the light of historical evidence. The Science of Language, the Science of Mythology, the Science of Religion, aye, the *Science of Thought*, all have assumed a new aspect, chiefly through the discoveries of Oriental scholars who have placed facts in the place of theories, and displayed before us the historical development, a worthy rival displayed by the genius and patient labor of Darwin.—MAX MULLER.

"There is one Supreme Mind which transcends all other intelligence. It pervades the system of worlds and is yet infinitely beyond it. I am myself a manifestation of the Supreme Being.

—HINDU.

Of Thy Divine power, the first word is Reason and the last is Man.

—PERSIAN.

He who made us is present with us though we are alone.

—EGYPTIAN.

A man may recite large portions of the Law, but if he is not a doer he is like a herdsman who counts the cattle of others.

—BUDDHIST.

To develop the principles of our higher nature is to know heaven. —CHINESE.

Cultivate piety and banish costliness from temples. —ROMAN.

He who gives should forget his gift, and he who receives should always remember it. —GRECIAN.

Wherever ye be, prove yourselves emulous in good deeds. —MOHAMMEDAN.

Blessed is the man whose conscience hath not condemned him. —JEWISH.

THE GOLDEN RULE.

The true rule in business is to guard and do by the things of others as they do by their own. —HINDU.

He sought for others the good he desired for himself. Let him pass on. —EGYPTIAN.

Do as you would be done by. —PERSIAN.

One should seek for others the happiness one desires for oneself. —BUDDHIST.

What you would not wish done to yourself do not unto others. —CHINESE.

Let none of you treat his brother in a way he himself would dislike to be treated. —MOHAMMEDANISM.

Do not that to a neighbor which you would take ill from him. —GRECIAN.

The law imprinted on the hearts of all men is to love the members of society as themselves. —ROMAN.

Whatsoever you do not wish your neighbor to do to you do not unto him. This is the whole law, the rest is a mere exposition of it. —JEWISH.

All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. —CHRISTIAN.

The Veda is the real Theogony of the Aryan races, while that of Hesiod is a distorted caricature of the original image. If new light is to be thrown on the most ancient and the most interesting period in the history of the human mind, the period in which names were given, that light must come from the Vedas. —MAX MULLER.

The history of philosophy in India is an abridgement of the philosophical history of the world. —COUSIN.

Professor Roth, in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vol. iv, p. 427, after quoting several passages from the Veda in which a belief in immortality is expressed, remarks with great truth:

"We here find, not without astonishment, beautiful conceptions on immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the view which has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Persia was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter."

He who gives alms goes to the highest place; he goes to the gods.

Where there is eternal light, in that immortal imperishable state, place me.

Where life is free, in the third heaven where all is radiant, there make me immortal.

—Rig Veda, i, 125, 56.

Where there is happiness and delight, where joy and pleasure reside, where the desires of our highest desire are attained, there make me immortal.

—Rig Veda, ix, 113, 7.

What is now called the Christian religion, has existed among the ancients ahd was not absent from the beginning of the human race. —St. Augustine.

The fathers and founders of the Chinese race appear to have been monotheists. They believed in an omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent Being, the moral governor of the world and the impartial judge of man.

—Rev. George Owen of Pekin.

In the higher and more gifted minds of the ancient Akkadian we find a pure monotheism.—Charles H. S. Davis—

Preface to the Book of the Dead.

Men are mortal gods, and gods are immortal men.

—Heriakleitos.

This is not a matter of to-day,
Or yesterday, but hath been from all times
And none hath told us whence it came, or how.

—Sophocles.

We Indians cannot die eternally; even Indian corn, buried in the ground, is revived and rises again.

—Ancient Peruvian Maxim.

Man, know thyself. —Greek Maxim.