

THE THEOSOPHIST

Edited by C. JINARĀJADĀSA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
On the Watch-Tower	361
Individualism and Humanitarianism in Buddhism. C. JINARĀJADĀSA	368
Feelings in Rocks. C. W. LEADBEATER	372
Adyar. CONSTANCE MEYER	378
Spirituality and Politics: Communism in History (<i>Concluded</i>). GIUSEPPE GASCO	381
Shudra Rule and Welfare. L. FURZE MORRISH	390
The Lines of Limitation. J. M. ANGERVO	395
The Higher and Lower Mental. D. JEFFREY WILLIAMS	402
Juvenile Delinquency. (<i>Story</i>). F. H. ALDHOUSE	405
Human and Cosmic Views of God. A. HERBERT PERON	409
The Law of Right Relationships. N. SRI RAM	415
Reviews	421
Supplement:	
Official Notice	425
1951 Convention	425
Theosophists at Work around the World	426
International Directory	429
Index, April-September 1951	i, ii

THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE

ADYAR, MADRAS 20, INDIA

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY was formed at New York, November 17, 1875, and incorporated at Madras, April 3, 1905. It is an absolutely nonsectarian body of seekers after Truth, striving to serve humanity on spiritual lines, and therefore endeavouring to check materialism and revive the religious tendency. Its three declared Objects are :

FIRST.— To form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or colour.

SECOND.—To encourage the study of Comparative Religion, Philosophy and Science.

THIRD.— To investigate the unexplained laws of Nature and the powers latent in man.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

Resolution passed by the General Council of the Theosophical Society on December 23, 1924

As the Theosophical Society has spread far and wide over the civilized world, and members of all religions have become members of it without surrendering the special graces, teachings and beliefs of their respective faiths, it is thought desirable to emphasize the fact that there is no doctrine, no opinion, by whomsoever taught or held, that is in any way binding on any member of the Society, none which any member is not free to accept or reject. Approval of its three Objects is the sole condition of membership. No teacher or writer, from H. P. Blavatsky downwards has any authority to impose his teachings or opinions on members. Every member has an equal right to attach himself to any teacher or any school of thought which he may choose, but has no right to force his choice on any other member. Neither a candidate for any office nor any voter, can be rendered ineligible to stand to vote, because of any opinion he may hold, or because of membership in any school of thought to which he may belong. Opinions or beliefs neither bestow privileges nor inflict penalties. The Members of the General Council earnestly request every member of the Theosophical Society to maintain, defend and act upon these fundamental principles of the Society, and also fearlessly to exercise his own right of liberty of thought and of expression in proof, within the limits of courtesy and consideration for others.

FREEDOM OF THE SOCIETY

Resolution passed by the General Council of the Theosophical Society on December 30, 1950

The Theosophical Society, while co-operating with all other bodies whose aims and activities make such co-operation possible, is and must remain an organization entirely independent of them, not committed to any objects save its own, and intent on developing its own work on the broadest and most inclusive lines, so as to move towards its own goal indicated in and by the pursuit of those objects and that Divine Wisdom which in the abstract is implicit in the title The Theosophical Society.

Since Universal Brotherhood and the Wisdom are undefined and unlimited, and since there is complete freedom for each and every member of the Society in thought and action, the Society seeks ever to maintain its own distinctive and unique character by remaining free of affiliation or identification with any other organization.



THE THEOSOPHIST

ON THE WATCH-TOWER

*The Theosophical Society is responsible only for its
Official Notices appearing in "The Supplement".*

MR. HESKETH PEARSON in his biography of Bernard Shaw quotes Shaw as saying to him that Annie Besant once proposed to him "a contract of cohabitation," and that Shaw rejected it as "worse than all the vows of all the churches on earth—I would rather be legally married to you".

**Bernard Shaw and
Annie Besant**

This statement has been taken up by the American weekly *Time*, which has an international circulation. This magazine has made a habit of particularly pouncing upon anything that may appear to the public as damaging to Theosophists—possibly because of the large number of Catholics who are its readers. The publication of course has taken as genuine Mr. Pearson's report of what Shaw is said to have said.

Mr. Shaw in the preface to his early novel, *Cashel Byron's Profession*, describes thus how the book first appeared in a magazine:

"On the passing of *To-day*, I became novelist in ordinary to a magazine called *Our Corner*, edited by

Mrs. Annie Besant. It had the singular habit of paying for its contributions, and was, I am afraid, to some extent a device of Mrs. Besant's for relieving necessitous young propagandists without wounding their pride by open almsgiving. She was an incorrigible benefactress, and probably revenged herself for my freely expressed scorn for this weakness by drawing on her private account to pay me for my jejune novels."

In Mrs. Besant's *Autobiography*, she speaks of Bernard Shaw as follows :

"At this time also I met George Bernard Shaw, one of the most brilliant of Socialist writers and most provoking of men; a man with a perfect genius for 'aggravating' the enthusiastically earnest, and with a passion for representing himself as a scoundrel. On my first experience of him on the platform at South Place Institute he described himself as a 'loafer,' and I gave an angry snarl at him in the *Reformer*, for a loafer was my detestation, and behold! I found that he was very poor, because he was a writer with principles and preferred starving his body to starving his conscience; that he gave time and earnest work to the spreading of Socialism, spending night after night in workmen's clubs; and that 'a loafer' was only an amiable way of describing himself because he did not carry a hod. Of course, I had to apologise for my sharp criticism as doing him a serious injustice, but privately felt somewhat injured at having been entrapped into such a blunder."

Forty years ago when I happened to ask Dr. Besant about Bernard Shaw, she used the same word "aggravating" as one particular characteristic of him. Can one imagine that a woman who has found a man to be constantly "aggravating" would ever have proposed any kind of

cohabitation with such a man? The supposition is utterly incredible, unless of course the woman was head over ears in love with the man. I presume this is what Shaw would like us to believe. But one would hardly gather this from what Mrs. Besant has written about Shaw in her *Autobiography*.

All who have read the prefaces to his plays know how Bernard Shaw was very much the centre of his universe, and had a conceit of himself which really deserves the word "tremendous," though he was a staunch worker for socialistic reform. He certainly was a genius, and I am the first to admit that I have enjoyed every one of his plays with an intense appreciation of their wit. All the same, there are two other striking instances which show that Bernard Shaw was utterly unreliable as to facts.

When Shaw was in Ceylon, he gave an interview to journalists, which was copied in papers in India and Ceylon. In the interview he said that it was he who gave Annie Besant *The Secret Doctrine* to review. He stated: "I gave her the book to review." But why should one imagine that it was he who gave *The Secret Doctrine* to Annie Besant to review? The book was sent for review to Mr. W. T. Stead, editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and not to Bernard Shaw who probably was unknown to the publisher of the book. But Annie Besant says in her *Autobiography* regarding the incident:

"Mr. Stead gave into my hands two large volumes. 'Can you review these? My young men all fight shy of them, but you are quite mad enough on these subjects to make something of them.' I took the books; they were the two volumes of *The Secret Doctrine*, written by H. P. Blavatsky."

One might think that perhaps Mr. Stead had asked Bernard Shaw to give the books to Annie Besant when next

he met her, but Annie Besant definitely says: "Mr. Stead gave into my hands two large volumes."

The Secret Doctrine was published in 1888. Annie Besant reviewed it in 1889. She published her *Autobiography* in 1893—four years later. It is some *forty years later* that Bernard Shaw makes his statement. Now, in a court of law, whose statement would be admitted as more reliable—that of a person who narrates an incident only four years after it happened, or that of a person whose memory is forty years old?

In the same interview Shaw states that when he knew Annie Besant was going to review the book, he said:

"I . . . asked her whether she was quite mad and whether she knew that Madame Blavatsky's shrine at Adyar had just been convincingly shown up as a fraud by an Indian gentleman named Mohini at a meeting of the Psychological Society at which I was present."

Here Bernard Shaw's memory of events is completely muddled. He was evidently present at the meeting when Mr. Hodgson of the Society for Psychical Research presented his famous (or infamous?) report declaring H. P. Blavatsky as a trickster and a fraud. This incident has been described by Mr. A. P. Sinnett and also by Miss Francesca Arundale. The "Mohini" referred to was a young Indian lawyer of Calcutta who was sent by the Mahātmas to London in 1884 to help in the work of the London Lodge. As Mohini Chatterji had received several *Letters* from his Adept Guru, Mahātma K. H., (which I have published from the originals at Adyar), and was a staunch supporter of H. P. Blavatsky, it is more than outrageous to say that H. P. Blavatsky "had been shown up as a fraud by an Indian gentleman named Mohini". Bernard Shaw is again utterly muddled on this matter. Mohini

Chatterji did not speak at the meeting at all, but Colonel Olcott did. Many were much impressed by the striking Indian in London (at that time very few Indians in their Indian dress were to be seen in London society circles), and evidently Bernard Shaw was impressed by the appearance of the Indian. Then long after, in reviewing the incidents of the meeting of the Society for Psychical Research, he gets the incidents mixed up, and remembering that H. P. Blavatsky was "shown up as a fraud," attributes that action not to Mr. Hodgson, but to the Indian gentleman.

When one takes note of these curious inaccuracies made by Bernard Shaw regarding historical events (recorded by others at the time), one may well question whether the idea of "a contract of cohabitation" may not have been the result of a misunderstanding or faulty memory of conversations between him and Annie Besant, of course influenced by the extraordinarily enlarged sense of ego in Bernard Shaw.

But even *if* (and I desire to emphasize *if*) such a conversation did take place, would it not surely be one of a special intimate nature, to be kept by both in the strictest secrecy? When I went to England as a lad of fourteen, I learned from the men among whom I moved for eleven years that there are certain "things no man can do"—the word "man" meaning a *gentleman* with the highest connotation which the word bears in English minds of culture. And among the things which "no man can do" would surely be conversing to another on such an intimate revelation in the life of a friend,—for Annie Besant was regarded by Bernard Shaw as a friend, to whom he presented one of his books of plays with the inscription "with love from".

In spite of Bernard Shaw's keenness to introduce new moral values in the minds of men, on one matter at least

Shavian ideas, when put into practice by their author, differ greatly from our standards of behaviour in human relations.

C. JINARĀJĀDĀSA

* * * *

The extremes to which regimentation can go is demonstrated in a recent report via Vienna by the Correspondent of the London Times. It seems that in Czechoslovakia all children on leaving school at 14 will be directed by the School Leaving Commissions to whatever branch or department of industry or agriculture the State decides. Very few will be permitted to obtain any higher education or acquire any capacity to serve the national development except in an economic sense as labourers. The only exception to this assignment programme will be in the case of those who volunteer—
Unreconcilable at the age of 14—to serve in the mines or heavy industries.

What a travesty this is, is easily recognized when we remember how few young people of maturer years than 14 find themselves congenially employed in their first jobs. The finding of one's place preliminary to settling down to a lifetime of happiness in work is often a matter of several years and several changes of employment. The extent to which opportunity and freedom for such change and search exist is almost a measure of the evolution of the nation.

We cannot believe that any government bureau has developed the wisdom to foretell for 14-year-old children the nature of employment that to them will be congenial and productive of happiness. Clearly the State in this instance is not serving the citizen, but the citizen, even the child, subserves the State, not as a full contributor to its welfare with the maximum of inherent capacity and interest, but as a victim of a system limiting his expression and controlling his life.

The Ego in each, the divine element reflecting God in man, seeking Self-expression through repeated incarnations as a means of evolving the God-nature, finds little opportunity where the dignity of the individual is not recognized and freedom for fulfilment is environmentally denied.

The individual Theosophist may be of any political or ideological persuasion—his membership in the Theosophical Society places no restriction upon him—but it is difficult to reconcile the idea of an evolving and searching Selfhood or Ego with any substantial limitation of human freedom.

* * * *

A new source of design for textile and other patterns has been discovered in the study of the crystal formations natural to certain elements and components.

Atom Patterns Intriguing patterns present themselves to the student of crystallography, and as perception becomes more acute through increased basic knowledge and finer instruments, a world of new wonder and beauty opens up to the investigator. A report tells of designs based upon the crystal structure of molecular mica and nylon as well as of the element aluminium, while a particularly beautiful and delicate design is discovered in the emerald.

Well it is for humanity that these natural designs should be unlocked and their beauty applied to fabrics and other decorative purposes in substitution for some of the bizarre products of men's imaginations that convey anything but beauty to the eye. The further science delves into Nature the more inexhaustible becomes the supply. That God geometrizes has long been known, and Dr. Bosant and C. W. Leadbeater set forth some of these designs in *Occult Chemistry* many years ago. Industry today presents the same truth in woven and printed fabrics that will presently reach the markets of the world.

SIDNEY A. COOK

INDIVIDUALISM AND HUMANITARIANISM IN BUDDHISM

By C. JINARĀJADĀSA

THERE are two contrasted themes in Buddhism, each seemingly contradicting the other. In the teachings of the Lord Buddha we find Individualism carried to the utmost limit, but at the same time there is taught also Humanitarianism of the loftiest kind. The Lord's teaching was that men are being carried away on three currents, which are those of desire, anger and illusion.

The Pali word for desire, *rāga*, does not cover merely bodily lusts as usually understood, but every kind of desire, even of the highest aspiration, if it is inward-turned. Constantly men of spiritual life become so immersed in the problem, of each in his own self, that he does not realize that after all each individual is one link in a great chain, which is Humanity.

The word, *dōsa*, is translated as hatred, but it covers more than violent anger, since the word signifies also every kind of resentment, impatience and irritation, however small it may be.

The third stream is *mōha*, which is usually translated as illusion. Perhaps it is only at the final stage toward Liberation that a man understands what the word signifies, which is the faculty of seeing "the-thing-as-it-is". We

little realize how we are surrounded by a fog of religious, national and cultural traditions, as also by the subtle tradition of our own temperament, brought from past lives. As we try to examine anything outside of ourselves, we see each thing distorted, as a straight stick looks bent because of the refracting medium of the water in which half of the stick is immersed.

In the Lord's teaching the continual emphasis is that each man by himself must "work out his salvation with diligence". Even the Lord Himself is not more than a fingerpost showing the way; He is not a "Saviour" who carries on His shoulders others who are aiming to "cross the stream" to Nirvāna. In Buddhism, then, we have the ancient Hindu teaching, "See the Ātman by the Ātman," meaning that each individual must see the great Self by means of the little self within him. It is this teaching, when dissociated from Humanitarianism, that brought India into a great tragedy. In one of the *Mahatma Letters*, the Adept Morya thus describes the glory of India when Buddhism was the main influence, and the loss to India when the influence of Buddhism passed away:

"There was a time, when from sea to sea, from the mountains and deserts of the north to the grand woods and downs of Ceylon, there was but one faith, one rallying cry—to save humanity from the miseries of ignorance in the name of Him who taught first the solidarity of all men. How is it now? Where is the grandeur of our people and of the one Truth? These, you may say, are beautiful visions which were once realities on earth, but had flitted away like the light of a summer's evening. Yes; and now we are in the midst of a conflicting people, of an obstinate, ignorant people seeking to know the truth, yet not able to find it for each seeks

it only for his own private benefit and gratification, without giving one thought to others. Will you, or rather they, never see the true meaning and explanation of that great wreck and desolation which has come to our land and threatens all lands—yours first of all? It is *selfishness* and *exclusiveness* that killed ours, and it is selfishness and exclusiveness that will kill yours—which has in addition some other defects which I will not name. The world has clouded the light of true knowledge, and *selfishness* will not allow its resurrection, for it excludes and will not recognise the whole fellowship of all those who were born under the same immutable natural law.”

It is this tendency to self-centred salvation that is avoided in Buddhism by the true Buddhist who applies the teaching given by the Lord: “Just as a mother loves her child, her only child, so let a man love all beings.” In another place it is mentioned how the man on the road to true Nirvāna radiates to the four quarters, and to above and below, tenderness and hope and benediction.

It is because of this wonderful blend of highest Individualism and perfect Humanitarianism, embodied in the personality of the Lord Buddha Himself, that one of the great Adepts, known in Theosophical circles as the Mahā-Chohan, speaks of how the Adepts are “the devoted followers of that spirit incarnate of absolute self-sacrifice, of philanthropy, divine kindness, as of all the highest virtues attainable on this earth of sorrow, the man of men, Gautama Buddha”.

No purer expression of this lofty compassion, characteristic of Buddhism, can be found then in H. P. Blavatsky's *Voice of the Silence*:

“Let thy Soul lend its ear to every cry of pain like as the lotus bares its heart to drink the morning sun.

“Let not the fierce sun dry one tear of pain before thyself hast wiped it from the sufferer’s eye.

“But let each burning human tear drop on thy heart and there remain ; nor ever brush it off until the pain that caused it is removed.

“These tears, O thou of heart most merciful, these are the streams that irrigate the fields of charity immortal. ’Tis on such soil that grows the midnight blossom of Buddha, more difficult to find, more rare to view, than is the flower of the Vogay tree. It is the seed of freedom from rebirth. It isolates the Arhat both from strife and lust, it leads him through the fields of being unto the peace and bliss known only in the land of silence and non-being.”

Will the blend of perfect Individualism and most pitiful Humanitarianism, once upon a time truest Buddhism, become once again an influence in the world ?

C. JINARĀJADĀSA

What is important for us now is that we should regard all mankind, not with hostility, but in that friendly attitude which is watching for an opportunity to serve. When we feel deep affection or gratitude towards some person we watch constantly for an opportunity to do some little thing for him to show our gratitude, our respect, our affection, or our reverence. Let us adopt that attitude of ready helpfulness towards all mankind ; let us be always prepared to do whatever comes to our hand—ever watching for an opportunity to serve our fellowmen, and let us regard every contact with another man as an opportunity of being useful to him in some way or other. In that way we shall learn to build into our character these important virtues of love and unselfishness.

C. W. L.

FEELINGS IN ROCKS

By C. W. LEADBEATER

(Concluded from page 307)

QUESTION: It seems so strange that human beings, when they hear of the Path, could not all be quickly brought along; one wonders where that urge starts?

C. W. L.: As I say, that urge exists in a blind kind of way even in these rocks. It is not consciousness; it is the faint stirrings, the beginning of consciousness; it is more attenuated than it is possible to describe in words, but there was certainly in this rock at National Park the affection for that boy, and a certain amount of affection for me afterwards, and the feeling that it wanted to rise towards us so that the affection, vague as it was, elementary as it was, yet acted to raise it very, very slightly. Well, I think that might be intensified. It is the life in it that you try to stir up and that life responds. A precious stone, a jewel, responds very quickly, and even the second choice, not the stone of the Ray itself but the second choice, as it were, such things as lapis lazuli, even those respond very quickly. Very much more quickly than this poor old thing.

QUESTION: This rock will last for ages; is the same life in it?

C. W. L.: In most cases; but if somebody took a fancy to it and tried to evolve it, that part of the life would flow

away and the rest of the mineral monad would flow in and the rock would not know anything different.

QUESTION: If the rock split up?

C. W. L.: You would divide the life, and the two parts would evolve separately. But it would not like the process.

QUESTION: What happens to the few that go on as jewels?

C. W. L.: Their next step is vegetable. Each jewel belongs to a certain Ray, and it must go into a vegetable of that same Ray. Supposing this rock went on until the end of the Manvantara, then its life would have to go in the next Manvantara into some kind of vegetable, into whatever is the Ray of sandstone, and it would go into something fairly low down on that line, whereas if it got up to being a jewel on this Ray it would go on into something much higher up.

It is difficult to differentiate things when they are so low down as that. I should require to make some more investigations before I could generalize, but I just see certain points. I am not quite sure. The tourmaline is in some ways better in its feelings than the ruby. I can't tell you exactly what I was trying to get for you. The tourmaline line seems to lead me towards the amethyst, which is not the line to which it belongs, and then we draw up into roses, and the roses become deer. Whereas if you follow the other line you find yourself among the lilies, and then from the lily you get on to the cat line. Before we put any of these things down in books we must try forty, sixty, a hundred experiments. Try it all over and over again a number of times. I have tried a few different lines and found those converge, but I should have to do a great deal more work than that before we could arrive at anything conclusive. It is possible to know that a precious stone passes into the vegetable kingdom, into a flower-bush

like the rose, and from that you can follow up into the animal.

The ruby—it seems as though it came from the tourmaline, but that is not its regular line. Now, here is one which comes from an opal, but that is not usual—a big white arum lily.

QUESTION: Will there be certain stones which are like a race?

C. W. L.: It will make something of a race character. The rose belongs to an order, the camelia is the same family. It is the great orders that belong to Rays. Generally one of these things is the topmost thing of a Ray. The elephant is the head of his Ray. The Second Ray is always associated with the elephant; he is supposed to be the wisest of the animals. The elephant makes a very good friend when he has once made up his mind to be friendly. The cat is on the Fourth Ray; the animal belonging to the First Ray is now extinct. I began with the tourmaline, expecting to be led to the ruby. It may be our classification of those secondary stones is not so certain. I have put tourmaline as following from the ruby.

QUESTION: What about sapphire?

C. W. L.: A Bodhi tree, as far as I can see¹. It would probably tend towards the roses and the deer. I am not sure; that is almost guess work because it is just a classification of probabilities. The elephant is the head of the Second Ray, and I suppose you get all those pachydermatous creatures on that Ray also.

If you would go to work to develop clairvoyance sufficiently you could take up one of those lines. I have not the time nor has the President, because the moment you can see anything at all They seize upon

¹ Pippal, *ficus religiosa*.

you for other sort of work. There are so many things just like this. I do not suppose they help us forward in our evolution, but they would be interesting to know. You can look up all past history and correct it. It is generally very badly incorrect at present. You read always of amazing things in history, and when you look back for those scenes they simply do not happen. There are many hundreds of directions in which we might work clairvoyantly and find out things of intense interest. Go ahead and work at it.

Reply to Question: You would begin to develop sensitiveness bit by bit, begin to try to see and feel, and you work up to it gradually and when the right time comes probably your Master, whoever that may be, will seize upon you and tell you what to do. At least, that is what happened to me. But two of the high pupils devoted about a year's work to getting me through.

QUESTION: Did you do it in a year?

C. W. L.: I have been doing it ever since. The bulk of the work was done in that year 1885 because the circumstances were just suitable. I was practically alone at Adyar, which was then just a jungle. I really had no pressing work except to edit THE THEOSOPHIST, so there I was and we put a good many hours of each day into this business of development. It was painful, but it was done. In regard to all of you here one result of all that effort we are making in the Centre is that we have there a very strong impetus of force which helps people forward, and you all get along more or less fairly swimmingly. But I wonder what you will do when you get away from The Manor and go out into the world where you will find it a sudden drop? We are all thinking along the same line and we are all pushing forward in that way, and of course every one is helping the other by that train of thought. Probably some

of you have noticed what a big difference it makes when you go over into the town. You go into the town and for an hour you are going in and out of those shops, and you are surrounded by a totally different set of vibrations. I do not say that they are specially bad vibrations. Sydney is as good as any other city, but they are different vibrations, and therefore when you come back you are tired out. When you come back into The Manor it is coming home, it is a river of peace that you dive into. Suppose you have to live permanently away from the stream, it would make things harder, and yet every one of us will have to do that some time, because after all we are training ourselves in order that we may be able to do work.

QUESTION: Will the time come when you keep the right atmosphere even though away?

C. W. L.: That comes to every one of us, but it takes time. After all, if we do not keep the right attitude, it does not mean weakness so much as a lack of superlative strength.

QUESTION: Are the nature-spirits still with us?

C. W. L.: Yes, and you see not far away there are a pair of lovers, and that ought to attract enormously all the tree spirits. Only the quaint thing is it does not,¹ and they have all come to us, which means just one thing and cannot mean anything else: that among us, who are all friends and fellow-disciples, there is more and stronger affection than there is between those two people who are obviously what is called in love. There is no escaping it; that is so, because the creatures know—you can't deceive them. We saw a thing very like that when we were staying at National Park. A pair of lovers were staying at the hotel on their honeymoon and we thought we should cease to be the centre

¹ As the emotions were coarse with unattractive vibrations.—C. J.

of attraction, but the nature-spirits all abandoned the lovers and concentrated upon us. There are thousands and thousands of trees in National Park, and as you walk along, all these creatures used to focus themselves upon us and turn as we passed. You would see these tree spirits revolving slowly as we passed and they would follow as far as they could. At night the spirits of the trees would leave their trees and thousands of them came down to the hotel. When they get away they always take some approximation of the human form. All things do that. It appears to be the form chosen by the Logos for this system, and all the creatures in it seem to recognize it as a superior form and they all try to take it when they get out of their bodies—animals much less than vegetables, because they have much more decided personalities of their own. The spirit of the tree generally shows itself as a human form. Mostly they give you a feminine impression—mostly they are the forms of women—wood nymphs and that sort of thing. Some of them are beautiful and graceful and there appears to be a great difference in age.

QUESTION: As the tree grows do they take an older form?

C. W. L.: Some of them do take a much older form, and though I do not know, I suppose it is because the tree is older. They always take some half-human form. The spirits of the fir-trees look as if they were built of the fir branches, a sort of fairy appearance—a sort of fir creature, as though he were clothed in fir. Of course, you must remember that most trees live much longer than we do.

C. W. LEADBEATER

ADYAR

BY CONSTANCE MEYER

ADYAR is all things to all people. If I were a great painter I would paint beautiful pictures of Adyar. If I were a poet I would write a great poem. If I were a singer I would sing continuously of Adyar, melodies of many themes and varieties. If I were a musician I would compose an oratorio or a symphony about Adyar. But I am none of these things, so let us first see what three personages say of Adyar.

Dr. Besant tells us: "The residents in Adyar form a single body, and each person is a cell in that body. We are very different, for we belong to many different Nations. . . . To live in Adyar is as good as to visit many countries; our prejudices and conventions are chipped away, and we learn to recognize the One Life in some of its many forms."

Dr. Arundale writes: "Adyar is a Heaven in this outer world of ours, with many of the features characteristic of the Heaven-worlds so beautifully described to us in our Theosophical literature. Adyar is a reflection of its Inner Counterpart, of which many have heard and a few know. To this Inner Counterpart ADYAR lives in perfect adjustment, receiving and sending forth that Rhythm whereby all living things move ever onwards to their splendid destiny."

J. Krishnamurti says: "Adyar is and always has been, a spiritual oasis to which the weary traveller looks for comfort and repose. . . ."

"I have visited many a wonderful land and seen many a famous sight, but there is none to equal the extraordinary intangible something of our Adyar. There is an atmosphere there that does not exist in many a church and temple, and there is a Presence there that we expect to perceive in a sacred shrine."

In the book, *The Devachanic Plane*, we are told that each experiences Devachan according to his capacity to receive Devachan and each is entirely happy with what he experiences. His cup of experience, small or large, is entirely full. The seamstress described in that book, the tradesman, the family man, the little girl, the Greek woman, were all as intensely happy in Devachan as they were capable of being.

This is true of Adyar. The stranger finds in Adyar a deep sense of peace, and his soul throbs in harmony with that peace, and he is content. Another, with perhaps a slightly larger capacity, finds the joy of Adyar. A third unites his heart and mind with the bliss of Adyar. But of peace, joy and bliss, which is greater or less if the soul has experienced to its full capacity and recognizes no more? That much is enough.

Of Theosophy given to the modern world, it is written that only one corner of the veil has been lifted, but there is veil upon veil behind. Strangers at Adyar see beauty of sky, tree and flower, and are happy. They find a harmony as the Devas sweep through the casuarina trees. But the stranger who lifts one corner of the veil of Adyar and comes home, finds—who knows what? Perhaps first of all a Work and a Dream. As he continues the Work becomes Beauty and the Dream becomes Reality.

There is a passage in a Hindu Scripture which very much describes Adyar :

“ Wonderful, wistful, to contemplate !
 Difficult, doubtful to speak upon !
 Strange and great for tongue to relate,
 Mystical hearing for every one !
 Nor wotteth man this, what a marvel it is,
 When seeing, and saying, and hearing are done ! ”

Truly, of Adyar one can say :

“ Nor wotteth man this, what a marvel it is,
 When seeing, and saying, and hearing are done ! ”

Again if you ask me, “ What is Adyar ? ” I would reply,
 “ Yon bright star.”

CONSTANCE MEYER

FREEDOM

I beat my wings against the bars of God ;
 To lift a wing, to lift and sing.
 This I must do, no longer wait
 At heaven's gate.

The bars were melted by the power of God ;
 I stood on high, stood free to fly.
 This I did not ; I turned away,
 I had to stay.

Share with me, waiting ones

EVELYN BENHAM BULL

SPIRITUALITY AND POLITICS

COMMUNISM IN HISTORY

By GIUSEPPE GASCO

General Secretary of the Theosophical Society in Italy

(Concluded from page 336)

Social Democracy

THE participation of the workpeople in the political life of the European nations began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and characterized public life, and was the first evidence of the workers' organizations, which arose under the auspices of the class warfare proclaimed by Karl Marx as a fitting means for securing the power needed for the communistic reform of society. Thus Social Democracy arose, which in the first decade of our century influenced the political life of all the European nations, except Russia, whose semi-feudal and authoritarian regime estranged that vast State, spiritually and politically, from the European order.

The workers' representatives who participated in the governments of France, Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia and England, acquired that political experience which excludes the sedition and egotism of class and faction, and they learnt how the modern State is the harmonious synthesis of the interests of all, since it is the expression of the spirit of Justice and Freedom and the guardian of

all civil rights, and so ensures the civil and moral life of organized society. This political sagacity, which was called collaborationist, in France and Italy was encouraged by Masonry, which acting in the name of Brotherhood, Liberty and Equality, exercised the humane function of softening social clashes; by bringing together men of diverse political and religious views, it accomplished the priceless task of mutual understanding, and thus rendered possible their collaboration in the administration of public affairs.

Although collaborationist politics was effectively impressed with realities, and although it aided the work-people no less than other classes, in so far as it set the States going on the path of social reform and peaceful progress, it did not everywhere find political men in agreement with it. In Italy, above all, intransigent tendencies arose, which with various qualifications fostered the precept, raised almost to a political programme, of class warfare, and proclaimed economic communism, with dictatorship of the workers as the goal to be reached by any and every means. These trends, as the unforeseen result of the strife between the various political parties and classes, brought about the advent of the Totalitarian States, of national and racial character in Italy and Germany, and communist in Russia.

The world experienced, and it continues to experience, state totalitarianism in a measure not ever reached before in the past, and history is already recording the destructive consequences of state totalitarianism of national character, which is in doctrinal and practical conflict with every form of collaboration that is not of the subordinate or subservient type.

The Communist Totalitarian State is based on force or a powerful police, like the national totalitarian states, but differs from these by the social principle which informs

it—social equality based on the abolition of the right of individual ownership—and which at the moment constitutes a danger for the democratic states, in that it nourishes class hatred and fires hopes in the paid workers and in those intellectuals who are in search of novelty and easy jobs.

And note the paradoxes of history: while the masses of humanity, tired of war and longing for a condition of security and peace, were all hoping that the hour had finally arrived when they could forget their anguish and all their sufferings, behold! all unforeseen, Russia suddenly in Europe and in the world, assumes the role of German Nazi-ism, showing her disposition to hegemony and political domination, under the label of Communism—which, to the proletarian and distant masses, appears like the sunshine of the future, but which, in reality, is the most tremendous and perfect system of police-ridden and oppressive organization that the world has ever known. Russia's ex-Allies, who during the war had neither the time nor the opportunity for studying the psychology of the men who stand at the head of the Soviet regime, have been disillusioned by the behaviour of their Ally of yesterday. Just when it seemed that the danger to the freedom of the world had disappeared with the downfall of the national totalitarian regimes, they became aware that, with victory, they had once again to face Russian Communism no less dangerous and insidious than the Nazi-ism of Germany.

Such are the lessons of history!

At this point we may be comforted if we turn our thought to the Great Hierarchy that directs the evolution of the world. From that Source we have had valuable revelations of the dangers to humanity through the medium of the *Letters* of the Mahā-Chohan and of the Masters to the pioneers of the Theosophical Society. But the

answer to the many questions which arise from the present situation in which humanity finds itself, can only be found within our own hearts and intellects. Can we reconcile the great ideals of human brotherhood with class hatred, with the hatred which exists between nations, with the technicalities of sabotage and armed revolts against the democratic states? One has to bear in mind that evolution cannot be turned from its course, and that the rule of the great Occult Hierarchy, supreme regulator of evolution, must prevail, despite the ill-directed efforts of man. Therefore, Communism which is based on hatred cannot become a world order.

Politically, and perhaps even for karmic reasons, Communism has been able to triumph in Russia. The Communist revolution carried out, above all, the punishment of the selfish, anti-social, ruling class, who had maintained the bondage of the soil up to the middle of the last century, who had kept the masses in ignorance, and allowed fearful misery to exist alongside the mediaeval privileges of caste, and who had shown themselves incapable of fulfilling their mission. In the chaos which followed the first war, the Communist group took possession of power with one stroke of the hand, represented power in the highest degree, and for the moment were the only authority capable of giving directives and issuing orders. The implementation of the violent Communist programme clashed with human nature, which, even among the uncultured classes, recognizes intuitively the justice of possessing and of disposing of the fruits of one's own labour, and the natural right of the individual to defend his own personal property. Nevertheless, the organizing capacity of the rulers of the Communist State, with their violent fanaticism, overcame every obstacle, and turned the Russian nation into a pre-eminently Totalitarian State.

And from this pattern Fascism, like Nazi-ism, was drawn up, from the organization of the political police to the directing of education by the State and the dictatorial ideas of the governing body.

Even the Youth Organizations were inspired, if not actually copied, from the Russian Communist State, which taught the heads of the Totalitarian States to wage a crusade against liberal thought, as represented by literature, and above all to control education in the public schools and Universities. A campaign against the older people was carried out, because it was realized that those who had acquired culture, and who had an experience of past times, would all naturally oppose the new regime. So Youth was elevated in calculated stages to the point of mythical power, for the new tyranny had cunningly judged that it would be far easier to construct a foundation of security on the young people, who, never having had any political experience, would be more pliable and less considerate.

But the principles developed by the Totalitarian States, which are contrary to human nature and to the intrinsic force of evolution, are destined to disintegrate. The structure of the States must change with the lessening of the state of hypnosis, to which so many souls have succumbed, under the influence of forces operating from the lower astral and lower mental planes, and as their consciences awaken to the Divinity which is Truth, Freedom, Brotherhood, Humanity.

Conclusion

Humanity at the present time is about half-way through its long evolution through races and sub-races on each of the seven globes which make up our Septenary Chain. Many millions of years lie behind us, and millions more are ahead

of us. This, therefore, must be borne in mind by those who would give to our present humanity a definite formula for its politico-social organization. Humanity is composed of diverse individual karmic heredities, and of diverse experiences connected with the varying spiritual age of each individual. One cannot logically admit that a kindergarten could cater for University students, nor that a University regime would be suitable for little children, yet such a paradoxical situation would be created, in a totalitarian communist regime, which perforce expresses itself and is maintained by violence, obliterating all freedom and rendering all individual initiative impossible. The abasement of character through the development of intrigue, falsehood and espionage, in a word, a deadening of the Spirit, would be the fatal consequences of such a regime.

Freedom, dignity, and the individual conscience would disappear in such an order. Physical needs might perhaps be satisfied, but moral and intellectual life would be cancelled out, and with them would disappear competition, the free choice of work, free association, the incentive to produce, the joys of ownership, and all the stimuli which induce progress. The human family in the totalitarian systems—and Communism is the prototype of such systems—is like a *herd* that only wants to be led to adequate pasturage, as Mazzini pointed out.

The spiritual doctrine teaches us: "Each man is his own absolute lawgiver, the dispenser of glory or gloom to himself; the decreer of his life, his reward, his punishment."

Thus we may not judge as anti-spiritual the politico-social system that impedes the attainment of a condition contrary to the fundamental moral freedom which makes man his own ruler; but we must regard as anti-spiritual and contrary to human nature the regime of tutelage, which cramps and confines the development of

the human soul. Students of social problems, and especially Theosophists, must realize another thing of great importance: that the Great Ones, who in the great revolutions of history have often intervened in human affairs so as to avoid evolutionary deviations, continually inspire humanity, not only so as to permit the natural expression of all human possibilities, but also that human intelligence should not be turned away from the fundamental goal of all progress, namely, *the internal development of conscience*, which does not derive from external conditions or surroundings, but from individual will rightly directed.

The Great Teachers of humanity have taught and continue to teach the great principles which men must apply in order to solve social problems in their national and international organizations. These principles are well known to Theosophists. They are solidarity, brotherhood, rectitude in national and international relationships, and co-operation in moral and material spheres. A national organization which seriously applies these principles would be able to abolish poverty, cruelty, wrong-doing, and to point out to all men the way to a joyous and happy life.

But is the social problem, then, insoluble except by Communism?

The social problem which in the modern world has arisen from the mechanization of industry, the function of which as producer of wealth is social, but whose ownership is individual, as the profits are individual, requires, according to the Communist doctrine, the abolition of the middle classes. But the world is not composed only of machines, middle classes, and workpeople; there are also the country folk, the artisans, the merchants, public and private employees, who make up the great majority of all civilized nations and who must therefore be considered in any just solution of the

problem. It is necessary therefore to seek some other solution to the social problem which will embrace human nature as a whole and encourage the development of a Social Conscience, and of human solidarity. The natural solution which is in harmony with the Great Laws of Evolution is in the following premises, as given by Mazzini :

“ It is not necessary to do away with ownership, because today this belongs to the few ; the way must be opened so that the many may acquire it.”

“ The combination of capital and labour in the same hands emancipates the working classes and prevents them from being dominated by capital.”

The acquisition of property is not only a fundamental right of man, but it is the lawful reward of his efficiency ; to abolish it would be to suppress the main incentive to human effort, and to restrain the freedom of man in the use he makes of the fruits of his labour. However, it is possible to emancipate the wage-earner in the factories, through the medium of *co-operation*, which favours the combination of capital and labour in the same hands.

A government that is truly progressive and educative could advance the times by putting into effect a programme based on the principle of co-operation, by relevant rules, whereby a part of the profits gained by industry would be converted into shares and assigned to the workers, thus giving them a progressive co-interest in the activities of industrial establishments. The mines and great systems of communication could, in the national interest, be nationalized, but taking into consideration the poor success of state-owned administrations, it would be preferable to pave the way to co-operative administration for these also, or through the creation of bodies controlled

but not administered by the State. The small and medium-sized holdings in rural districts could, by means of co-operation, be enabled to avail themselves of all the skill of technical art, thereby increasing their production to the advantage of the national aggregate.

The purpose of this article is simply to indicate that it is possible to solve present problems and ensure the freedom of labour, without recourse to the revolutions so dear to those who are often among the failures in life. When we talk of social reform, we must not forget that present-day hierarchical society is the result of the free play of natural forces, represented by human intelligence directed by the will. With all our imperfections, we are the fruit of this free play of will—which ceases to be natural or the expression of karmic forces, when the political government becomes dominated by violence. Nor must we forget that the way of human progress is shown by the Laws of Evolution, not by outbursts of revolution—these latter being *explosions* of passion expressed in destructive violence.

Human evolution is the progressive manifestation of the Divinity within us, up to the point where each man realizes that he “is his own absolute lawgiver, the dispenser of glory or gloom to himself; the decreer of his life, his reward, his punishment”.

G. GASCO

Facts are true as far as they go: they themselves are unalterable, but we may see them differently.

C. W. L.

SHUDRA RULE AND WELFARE

BY L. FURZE MORRISH

IN this article the word "Shudra" is not intended to refer only to that caste in India, but to the proletariat, or "Fourth Estate," everywhere. The Four Castes of Manu, being sociological Constants in every type of Aryan civilization, may be translated into modern terms of the present Body Politic. As man has almost invariably built his social structures on the pattern of his own body, we may enumerate the four castes as follows :

1. The "Eyes"—Seers or Lawgivers—the First Estate.
2. The "Brain"—Executives, Planners or Law-makers—the Second Estate.
3. The Digestive System—Distributors, Merchants, Economists—the Third Estate.
4. The Hands and Muscular System—Routine-workers—the Fourth Estate.

Vision is measured on a descending scale from the relatively long sight of the Seers and Sages to the virtual blindness of the "Routineers," as the psychologist, Gerald Heard, aptly calls them. It is therefore obvious that if any of the four types usurps a function foreign to its nature, then there will be trouble, ranging from local difficulties to serious disaster. The Eyes are meant to see with ; you do not try to pick up objects with your eyes. On the other hand, only a blind man uses his hands to see with ; he makes slow progress and is likely to fall over obstacles and hurt himself. That is what always happens to any community when the Hands usurp the function of the

Eyes or the Brain, but it is very difficult to make many sentimentalists of today realize and admit this.

The succession of the four Estates is not a mere theory. It is part of a sociological rhythm which history has proved. Each type dominates in turn, and when the Fourth Estate in any community tries to take control, there is chaos, a breakdown in government, usually followed by a barbarian invasion ; and a new cycle begins.

India was originally and has always been a Seer civilization. India has always venerated and supported Seers and Yogis, even to the extent of maintaining a standing army of mendicants and fakirs masquerading as yogis. India went through the four stages in sub-cycles, and then the Second Estate took over.

Egypt was an Imperial Civilization of Priest-Kings. It too went through its four sub-stages.

Chaldea-Persia was the third type. It was a merchant-civilization, which opened the trade-routes of the world. The Chaldean astrologers and Seers gave way to the war-lords and then the Traders took over and began linking up the world, so far as it was known at the time.

The civilization of Greece and the Mediterranean World went through its four stages relatively quickly and then sank into anarchy as the mobs took over and began to discredit the old nature-religions. First Greece went through the cycle, and then Rome. The sub-cycles in Greece were :

1. The Greek Philosophers ;
2. Alexander the Great, and his Generals ;
3. The trading empire which followed Alexander ;
4. The anarchy which ensued.

In Rome the same cycle passed from the Etruscan and Sibylline Mysteries, through the Patricians and Emperors, to the mob again. With this a new cycle began.

No matter how primitive the creature, if it has sentient life, it must give consent of some kind to the impelling forces which actuate the system. An animal does this unconsciously by obeying the group-instinct. It has neither the inclination nor the ability to do anything else. All monkeys move from branch to branch, whereas goats leap from crag to crag, and are obviously content to do so.

Primitive man appears to have been much the same. He obeyed the forces which compelled his existence. Later he accepted whatever system he was born into.

So long as confidence remains in the Authority, whatever it may be, the system continues, but as soon as confidence goes, the system breaks down, and there is a period of "a-dharma". That is what happens at the end of each major cycle.

At the beginning of the cycle the Seers reveal a new level of Spiritual Authority and initiate the cycle, being able to see that amount of Spiritual "Purpose" which the coming civilization will be able to unfold. They give the laws and principles to be kept in view. The law-makers, or Second Estate, then establish the civilization, often by force and conquest. In due course the Third Estate builds up wealth and distributes it; and then luxury usually degenerates the community. The original "purpose" and "authority" become discredited. People begin to "rationalize" it, "see through it," outgrow its fables; and the system starts to break up. The Fourth Estate, losing its confidence and loyalty, or its "sense of fitness," refuses to obey orders and tries to take over. If it succeeds, chaos ensues, because "where there is no vision, the people perish".

This happened in Greece. The "Mysteries" became discredited, and materialism was rampant. At that point Christianity introduced a new level of the Spiritual Authority. The Fathers of the Church were of the First Estate.

They had gnostic powers and attracted allegiance, probably not unmingled with a certain amount of healthy fear on the part of the populace of what might happen to them if they misbehaved themselves.

After a time the feudal war-lords came to power in the Dark and Middle Ages, until it was found that wars on a big scale had to be financed. This brought the merchant class into prominence, and the Third Estate took over. The British Empire is an outstanding example of this. The "International Jew" became prominent.

Today we are at the point where the Fourth Estate is trying to assume power, and the existing interpretation of Spiritual Authority is wearing thin. People think they have "seen through religion". There is danger of chaos unless we go back to the Seers. A new level has to be tapped, and the Ancient Wisdom has again been presented to humanity by Those who preserved it during the previous cycle. New Seers will have to be trained, and it will have to be recognized that no community can survive unless each class does its own job properly, and leaves the others to do theirs. Anyone can call himself or herself a Seer or Seeress, as many try to do today, but the only satisfactory proof of Seership will be by test and experiment along scientific lines, if the would-be Seers can be persuaded to submit to such tests.

Christianity and to some extent Buddhism represent "welfare religions," in which rights of the individual play a large part. One of our ideals today is the Charter of Human Rights, enunciated by the U. N. This means the Welfare State. But it does not mean a woolly-minded condition of false sentimentality, in which natural laws of human inequality can be swept aside. The sentimental belief that because a man is a good engine-driver or busman, he can therefore automatically guide the State, is a typical

piece of the crooked thinking which goes with a Shudra cycle. If he should be a true Second Estate type, then he can rule, but not otherwise. A very unpalatable truth is that the "old-school-tie" individual generally makes a better Governor than the "honest workman," because the former often inherits the tradition and instinct, and is trained for the job.

This study of the Four Castes, or Estates, is a fundamental fact which cannot be ignored without disaster. It overrules all beliefs and opinions, because it is innate in every community, just as a physical body cannot function properly without the full complement of organs, working together in good health. There is no mere pious sentimentality in this. No humanity can survive long without a proper co-operation of the four types; which will no doubt explain the fierce antagonism of the Communist agitator who is instructed by his teachers to oppose all kinds of "reform" or "social co-operation" in western countries, because the said teachers know that co-operation is fatal to their success in undermining the western social structure.

We, who believe in peaceful solutions and brotherhood, know that co-operation is the secret of success, and are working for it, and not against it. That is why Theosophy and all its kindred movements are rated high on the Russian black-list of organizations to be banned whenever possible.

There is every reason to believe that the Co-operative State will follow present chaos and a new level of Spiritual Wisdom will be tapped and made known to humanity, as the "Water-Bearer" "pours out the waters of esoteric knowledge" upon the world in the coming age.

L. FURZE MORRISH

THE LINES OF LIMITATION

By J. M. ANGERVO

A FASCINATING conception among those well known in the world is the idea of the limit or the line. It is clearly defined in both philosophy and in the sciences.

In philosophy, manifestation implies limitation. The student of philosophy sees an object or concept as something separated from other objects or concepts by a limiting line or border. The existence and quality of the limit or line are recognized and analysed in the logical study of any object or subject. In all ages the conception of the limiting line has been a subject of deep interest and investigation by students of philosophy, all trying to penetrate the mystery of the line that divides matter from the Spirit.

In mathematics, one studies numbers, groups of numbers, and limit conceptions resulting from the use of methods of calculation. Ultimately it leads to limitations of various ideas of infinity. In fact, limit conceptions in the mathematical sense are so many and so important that hundreds of volumes on the subject may be found in a mathematical library.

In technical science processes where the analysis of matter is on a "hair's breadth" basis, the scientist clearly sees the idea of the limit or line from his own point of view, and is ever busy in finding improved ways of determining the limiting line with more ease and more and more precision.

Finally, in jurisprudence our lawyers and judges must deal with legal questions in connection with limits determined by man-made laws. Here it seems to me that the highest human justice can only be guaranteed and administered by those who have the inspiration to perceive and determine man-made limits in the light of Divine Justice.

In fact, the conception or idea of the limit or line is so wide-spread and deeply investigated that a comprehensive review of the subject is impossible in one article or lecture. It would require a series of articles or lectures and competence in all the fields—philosophy, mathematics, jurisprudence, and other sciences.

Although the idea has been discussed so extensively or just because of that, it may be approached from one more angle. Suppose that an individual, any one of us, endeavours to understand the idea of limitation; then two alternatives lie open to him. Either he approaches the matter from *above downwards*, trying to separate, to put a limit, to draw a line around already existing objects, matters and other conceptions as far as it is possible and necessary to do so; or he tries to approach this most remarkable and mysterious matter from *below upwards*, trying in his mind to reach or to define the universal limit, the line of manifestation, existence or life.

If we, to begin with, try to approach this question by analysing and drawing lines of limitation around everything that exists on the surface of the physical earth, and on other planes open to human analysis, we shall reach the same conclusion as the scientists of today. Thus we have to accept the separations and limitations which take place in practical life and which make it possible for some people to live a sheltered life whereas others are compelled to live in utter misery. It permits some to

cultivate a comparatively high physical culture, and denies to others even the most primitive needs.

Although this separation and limitation have created and probably will continue to create results as mentioned above, we need not be worried about the progress of the world because of limitation and separation. There is a general tendency found even in this condition which strives to unite the separated parts, proving that the separated parts are to be regarded as parts of a greater unity. A deeper philosophical conception of the limit leads us ultimately to realize that the existence of limits is a manifestation of the highest, by us limited, Divinity, which is growing from chaos to the highest glory of conscious progress. Thus, all parts separated by the limiting lines are united as belonging to the same Divinity. It is of no consequence whether we call it Universal Brotherhood or give it a different label which may serve the purpose. The mathematical conception of the limit leads ultimately, besides establishing the parts in abstract, to the verification of the close solidarity which exists between these abstract parts. It offers also a pattern for uniting all the concrete ideas that may correspond to these abstract conceptions. The same result follows an effort to bring about separations by extreme limitations. The closer we place the line, the closer we find the parts to each other, and following this course we also find that separating by limits is not the ultimate end but a means by which our highest but still limited conception of Divinity reaches the fulfillment of its own perfection. In order to reach this perfection in the best possible way, it has to consider the common welfare of all the separated parts, say, according to the principles of Universal Brotherhood. Likewise ideas of justice attached to the conception of limitation lead to the conclusion that the common good is the good of all,

that the common good does not in the least harm the rights of the humblest in growing independently towards his own goal of perfection. Simultaneously, as science has proved that the present conception of limitation has little rigidity, it has helped to bring about a greater understanding between the peoples behind these limit barriers. Just as the highest walls nowadays may be ignored by the aeroplanes and parachutes and the so-called long lines have proved to be short, so the intercourse between people and nations has become more many-sided. As we learn to look at our neighbour as our brother we become able to act towards him accordingly. Even though the present development of the individual shows an increasing tendency and a greater capacity towards separation and limitation, the realization about the earth forming a common unity makes it also possible for humanity to feel itself as One World. Thus, the principle of Universal Brotherhood progresses, paying no heed whether the progress is considered easy or painful. If we have the eyes to see, the goal is visible to us by this approach to the question of the limit—from *above downwards*, that is, by drawing limits round everything we know in the universe.

A more difficult approach to the subject is that which deals with the so-called celestial happiness and infernal suffering. During thousands of years and more in the history of the world there have been, and there are today, those who try to solve the problem of limitation from *below upwards*. This is done when we in our minds try to limit the universe, existence, knowledge, evolution, God. This is a common feature in all of us, and this effort to draw lines is an expression of our inner longing to grow, to reach closer to the absolute Divinity. This longing we express in creating limitations, restrictions, of the Highest. In this effort we draw, in fact, a limit or a line which, at least for

a time, is insuperable. We cannot presume that we are constantly advancing on the path, reaching beyond the very limits we have drawn ourselves, because in that case our life would be a perpetual progress which certainly is not the case. It is sad, almost tragic, that not even the religions hold the whole Truth. Each religion limits the immeasurable depths of the Truth of existence, giving forth only parts of the Truth. In founding the religions, we may presume that the limitations to be found in every one of them have meant a great sacrifice on the part of the Great Teachers, as each had to consider very carefully what and how much knowledge might safely pass on to the new human race and the new era starting on the path of progress—what kind of knowledge would best serve the need and help most efficiently the development of the particular race. Hence was drawn a limit in giving out the knowledge about the secret things of existence in a religion that millions of people have followed during long periods of time, during long eras this limited religion helping some to reach the highest conceivable bliss, dooming others to the suffering of deepest hell. Even such a limited religion means helping humanity a step forward on its difficult path towards perfection, serving also as a spring-board for new, far-reaching efforts.

Nevertheless, all the various religions and all the other distinctly limited expressions of Life are to be regarded as tragic in a triple sense, considering the immeasurableness of this very Life. First of all they are tragic as such, that there is drawn a limit round the knowledge concerning the universe and life. Secondly, the adherents of all the various religions sincerely believe that their particular religion holds the whole Truth. This very belief, that their own religion contains the whole Truth and consequently is the only right way to follow,

causes devotees of a religion to be bigoted and intolerant. Thirdly, every limit drawn around the supreme knowledge as we understand it means in reality a limit to our own progress. To pass onward is impossible until we, urged by an inner necessity, break through this limit in striving to reach the very source of knowledge which lies beyond it. This gives rise to speculations as to how much our progress has been delayed while we have been held up by this limit, and how much further on our way we would have progressed if we had not been entangled in the meshes of the limitations of the various religions.

Things being as they are it is comforting to know that, in the world of today, there exists a group of people, no matter how small this group may be, who have adopted as their guiding motto, "There is no religion higher than Truth." The relation between the Truth and the Knowledge as it is here understood, is that between the flame and the light. In the book *Light on the Path* it is said: "You will enter the light, but you will never touch the Flame." We may also now answer to Pilate's famous remark "What is Truth?" that "It is impossible to reach the extreme absolute Truth." The Truth, however, which we never will reach is all the same the very flame which illuminates every existing religion. It is the goal towards which we strive, knowing dimly that it is higher than all the limited religions. Naturally we strive towards this Truth through various stages of limitation, confronting limits and lines wherever we move. Every Theosophist knows, however, that the existing limits are drawn by himself, that beyond these limits there shines forth Truth which is higher than religion.

Thus, we do not say that H. P. Blavatsky has given us the whole truth, or that C. W. Leadbeater has explained all that may be revealed of the subtler worlds disclosed by

clairvoyance. We only believe that these, and many other great teachers, have to the best of their ability tried to explain the problems of our existence and the wonders of the universe, but that behind their deep insight of hidden things there exist still more far-reaching Truths waiting to be penetrated and conveyed to human beings in a conceivable way. The Truth that is higher than religion shines like a flame above all the limitations, above all the lines drawn by man, and it leads those who are aware of its existence to regions beyond all known lines and limitations.

In our strivings it is well to remember that there is a Truth higher than religion, that there is no limit to human progress. No limit exists that cannot be crossed; drawing lines is only the means, not the end. The more lightly we draw our limits, the more tolerant we are of the limits drawn by others, and all the more easy it is for ourselves to recognize new ways of Truth on the strenuous Path that leads to the Eternal Flame.

J. M. ANGERVO

The subject is one I have often spoken about, trying to show the absolute necessity of *limitation*. Goethe, somewhere, speaks of our finding our freedom through limitation. The great mystery is that the Infinite *can* be expressed in the finite. (This after all is the meaning of the INCARNATION.) It is through *limitation* that God shows Himself. But the very limitation is an expression of the Un-limited! . . . Spirit and form are not, fundamentally, two opposites. Each is an expression of the other.

S. RANSOM

THE HIGHER AND LOWER MENTAL

BY D. JEFFREY WILLIAMS

SOMEWHERE in *Talks on the Path of Occultism*, C. W. Leadbeater refers to a matter "above the line" that divides the Ego from the personality. There are other such lines. There is, for instance, the line that divides the higher and lower mental planes when viewed as levels on which the globes of a Chain may be found on Rounds higher than the fourth or the lowest Round.

On the fourth Round the seven globes occupy the lower mental, the astral and the physical—globes C, D and E, being on the physical level. In the third and fifth incarnations each Chain has its first and seventh planets on the higher mental, its second and sixth on the lower mental. One stage higher, the second and sixth are upon the higher mental, while the third and fifth are upon the lower. On a still higher stage, both the higher and lower mental levels are occupied by planets. The mental plane appears to have the distinction (on Rounds higher than the fourth) of having planets on its higher and lower levels, a distinction that it does not share with any other plane.

If one may speak in terms of fact, that appears to be an odd fact!

During the process of the Monadic descent or involution—by the way, should we not have a different name for the involution of the Monadic life in order to distinguish it from the general involutory process?—a unit of the

lower mental plane is "secured" by the Monad in addition to the mental permanent atom it attaches to itself. On no other plane does the Monad attach an extra unit to itself in that way. That also is an odd fact.

The causal body is situate, if one may use the expression, on the atomic sub-plane of the higher mental plane, and is "above the line" in that it is not normally influenced by thoughts about the external world of the personal life. The lower mind, on the other hand, is built up as a result of multifarious contacts with an external physical world in the main. The causal body and the lower (or concrete) mind are both "on the form side," and are both different expressions on the form side of something beyond or within them, something that we find it difficult to grasp, namely, *pure mind*. Mind, as such, appears to represent or reflect the spiritual Self on the life side. In terms of consciousness, it is something that exists apart from both the causal body and the concrete mind (or mental body). Both these form aspects of mind exist for the growth and evolution of the mind in the abstract sense. They are mere means to that end. The division of the mental "principle"—to use a word that has now gone out of fashion—into two such fundamental aspects, is a matter that we can long ponder over in our quiet moments.

The higher mental plane is the lowest world of the Ego, while the lower mental is the highest of the personality. Does this division reflect something still more stupendous on a still higher level of which we have no knowledge; and has it a reflection also on the physical level? Both Madame Blavatsky and Dr. Besant dropped hints as to the latter possibility.

Thought-images on the level of the lower mental take the exact form of the things that are clearly visualized or perceived; but thought-images on the higher mental, it is

said, are expressed or thrown out in various kinds of geometrical forms.

It is not easy to provide answers to questions that may be prompted by thinking over these few facts in relation to the higher and lower mental worlds. Perhaps, it is better that in this field, as in many others, we make our own discoveries and try to find the deeper significance of the unexplained, but odd, facts in our Theosophical teachings.

D. JEFFREY WILLIAMS

METAMORPHOSIS

If thought and feeling still contrive
 Shape-changings Ovid used to see,
 Let me be lured into a hive
 And turned into a honey-bee.
 Let me distil from choicest flowers
 Drops, golden, unbesmudged by loam ;
 And bring, to sweeten rainy hours,
 My contribution to the comb.

Yet, wherefore change, when I can reach
 On swift imagination's wing
 Gardens and fields of flowering speech
 Fragrant and meaningful, and bring,
 In spirit-calm or feeling-storm,
 Under the sky's observant dome,
 Sweet words to their well-shapen form,
 Honey to verse's honeycomb?

JAMES H. COUSINS

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

AN IRISH STORY

By F. H. ALDHOUSE

ONE fine day, two imps met on the road at KILLSALAGHAN. They wagged their tails with pleasure, for they were brothers. "Why if it is'nt Sombro. This is a bit of allright," said onc. "The top of the morning to you, Madco, old lad!" said the other. They gave each other an affectionate hug. "How is luck?" they both asked. "So, so," said Sombro.

"Nothing doing," added Madco. "Since that blurry Bishop Berkeley bumbled in like a bluebottle, things have simply flopped. Blast the old busybody. Business is burst up. And that's that. Something's got to be done, and done right now, or it's bankruptcy. And what will our master say then?"

"Plenty!" remarked Sombro. The imps whispered together. "We certainly might try it," Madco said. "Shut up!" his brother cried, "somebody might hear. A bird or a fairy would carry it straight to him and we should be for it, right then." "Which of us is going to bell the cat?" "Both." They whispered more and went off arm-in-arm.

Later Bishop Berkeley was informed that two remarkably intelligent and attractive boys, Samuel and Malcolm McDowel, had been placed by their uncle General Balar at Farmer McConel's fruit-gardens for a few weeks' holiday. "They are at school in Dublin," his chaplain explained. "Very nice youths they are, a Connemara family settled in

that County. No doubt of Spanish descent on the Mother's side ; they are quite brunettes."

"Indeed, O'Brien," the Bishop answered, "McDowel in Gaelic means son of a devil, but it is quite a common name. I suppose the original owner was a devil at a fight. It is a coincidence their uncle is Colonel Balar. Balar is Balor, the oldest spelling of that evil being's name. I am not of course suggesting anything." And both he and Chaplain O'Brien laughed.

For some weeks the Bishop heard nothing but praises of the young McDowels, they were so well-mannered, so gentle, so highly ornamental in the Cathedral of the Sacred Thorn at Cloyne. They played games with the country boys and excelled them in each, no false pride or nonsense of any kind about them. They never omitted a service on Sunday.

"You look worried, O'Brien ; why ?" the Bishop asked some weeks later.

"It is the growing underground evil influence amongst the youth here. Pilfering of fruit is no longer just a boyish prank. It is organized and serious. The perpetrators seem to be informed in advance of any traps to catch them, or to detect what they do with the spoil. The Church and clergy are being systematically disparaged and made ridiculous. Here are two verses quite little children have learned, but from whom ?

No wonder the parsons are such liars
And threatening us with infernal fires.
They worship one God with worship true,
His name is Spot Cash I'm telling you.

Whatever you want to do, go do it ;
If you miss your chance you'll surely rue it ;
Get your pleasure now, get it today, ~
For if you die, then dead you'll stay.

Even our two boy visitors are shocked. The country is worse, they say, than Dublin. Ah! if only the boys here were like them."

"I must make these model youths' acquaintance," Bishop Berkeley remarked. "It should be edifying, these bad times."

Bishop Berkeley was talking to Samuel and Malcolm in his study. He was quite friendly and fatherly but he was narrowly watching their faces. "My dear young friends, I have seen how devout you are in our Cathedral. You join heartily in the prayers and hymns, you are, I may say, re-collected." The boys smiled demurely at this praise and when the Bishop dropped his handkerchief and stooped for it, they exchanged an amused glance. It was over in less than an instant. Perhaps it was deprecation, in their modesty, of such high regard. The Bishop continued: "I wonder if one of you would kindly act as my server occasionally, your reverent assistance would be such a comfort?"

"We are not yet confirmed, my lord," they both spoke out together, "we could not communicate, and to approach so near, and yet to be so far, would be tantalizing. It would quite upset us, it would hurt us, it would so. . ."

Now Bishop Berkeley's manner and voice became masterful and stern. "I quite understand that such a close approach to *Sanctissimum* would be impossible for you. But I wished you to admit it yourselves. You are not human. You are demons bent on sabotage and sacrilege. But without human aid this profanity you could not dare." And pointing his finger at them he commanded: "Vanish all false deceptive appearances made by the enemy!"

What a change, where two well-dressed boys of the upper class had stood, were two cowering imps, creatures of and from the inferno. They made a wild attempt to

dash away, they were unable to move ; they began a frenzied chattering like apes, probably crying for mercy. The Bishop looked at them with disgust. " You have done harm here, you two, and I will see that you undo it. Who were the human lads you corrupted with your thieving and vile verses ? Answer truly or I will take such measures as will make you yell out the answers ! "

They gave the names in faltering tones. " Good," the Bishop replied, " you are not without foresight at least. Now listen to me ; tonight when the raid comes off you will lead it as usual. Then you will show yourselves to your victims *as I see you now*. Refuse or evade and you know the consequences."

" We tremble and obey," they muttered.

" And you will obliterate from all memories the words of your profane rhymes. What you put in, take out. I will aid you myself to do this if necessary, then get out of here, and come not hither again."

The imps fell upon their knees and with clasped hands implored his clemency. " Great High Priest, have some pity, we were agents of a terrible, ruthless master. If we return to him after obeying you, as we must and shall, what will be our fate ? Torture, unrelenting. Oh, do have mercy."

" Well, I will give you the chance you ask. There are wreckers on the coasts of County Cork and in my diocese. Appear to those who light false beacons, scare them away. Be guardians and agents of the Light. Then I guarantee and promise you that your dark master, personally or by his agents, shall never reclaim or touch you." He made a circle about them and sealed it with a cross.

" We will go. We will gladly, happily do your bidding. We are for the Light. Down Balor ! "

The Bishop smiled his approval. He blessed them.

F. H. ALDHOUSE

HUMAN AND COSMIC VIEWS OF GOD

BY A. HERBERT PERON

I N many cultures of the past, there is a tradition that may be found esoterically or exoterically which proclaims the existence of early seers and sages. In many instances the reference is to an organized school of knowledge and wisdom that transmitted its carefully guarded secrets to the carefully screened few. It appears that, until more recent times, there have been schools in various parts of the globe, like Pythagoras' School at Crotona. These were merely branches of the One School. We are told this school was and for that matter still is located on the northern side of the Himalaya Mountains. It is known today as the Great White Lodge.

This explains the "mystery" of the similarity of different religions in various parts of the world, and at varying periods. Esoterically compared, the differences generally dwindle to insignificance. Exoterically, the differences often comprise a varied presentation of the law that is best fitted to administer to those it is intended to reach.

H. P. Blavatsky, in her *Secret Doctrine*, puts it clearly: "To thoroughly comprehend the idea underlying every ancient Cosmology necessitates the study and comparative analysis of all the great religions of antiquity; for it is only by this method that the *root idea* ~~can be~~ made plain.

The original transcendental and philosophical conception was one."

But religions were not alone in drawing their sustenance from this One Source. There were also free lances, philosophers who had access to, and who relayed to their followers and to the world what they had gleaned from, this source. Perhaps the best known of these philosophers, certainly one whose influence on our civilization has been most profound, was Plato.

Now where should reasoning about God start? *Here*—on this objective earth where we seem to be on firm ground? Or should we start from the realm of Universals—the subjective universe? Here we have the real point of difference between the two opposing schools of thought. One can think of them as the inductive school championed by Aristotle, Bacon and Dewey; and the deductive school led by Plato, Galileo and Whitehead.

There are advantages to both methods; disadvantages, too. The pragmatic approach with reliance on experience and facts is excellent so far as it goes. Its weakness is highlighted by the short distance it travels. It does not, *cannot*, go far enough. It is significant that science, as well as religion, has been compelled constantly to change its "facts," to bring them up to date. Galileo had to fight not only the Church, but also entrenched scientific opinion of his day. At first this seems surprising. We know that the true planetary picture of the solar system was well known to the sages of antiquity. It is not so surprising when we realize how cut off the western world was from this source of knowledge.

The writings of Plato reveal rather convincingly that *he*, certainly, was not cut off; that *he* had ample access to the fountain-head of knowledge. Let us then examine some of the Platonic ideas. Plato's "Archetypes" can be related

to Universals. His Archetype represents the perfection that every concrete thing of that type tends to approximate. This signifies that every concrete thing in nature owes its existence, and what is equally important, its entire evolutionary process, to its Archetype—to the plane of Universals. You read practically the same idea in H.P.B.'s *Secret Doctrine*: "Occultism teaches that no form can be given anything, either by nature or man, whose ideal form does not already exist on the subjective plane; more than that, that no form or shape can possibly enter man's consciousness, or evolve in his imagination, which does not exist in prototype, at least in approximation."

Plato makes the observation that the Archetype is the limit approached but never reached by things; which reminds us of a similar statement in *Light on the Path*—"You will enter the light, but you will never touch the Flame." This Archetype or prototype idea, viewed from the objective side, results in what Plato terms "an imitation of God". Nor is this restricted to men. It embraces animals, organisms, even inanimate objects. To the extent that they show *organization* and internal order, they exhibit traces of the Divine.

Here, it seems to me, is a tremendously important pronouncement: *the relation and reference of organization and order to a Cause*. Here also is, perhaps, the most cogent and basic criticism that can be levelled at the naturalists. It is fairly easy to disavow a First Cause when you are dealing with a Chaos. It is quite another matter to repudiate a Cause when you are confronted with indisputable evidence of Order, Planning and Organization.

Plato defines perfection as completeness. In a philosophical sense they are practically synonymous. In Plato's day, the two opposing schools could be summarized in the expressions of Protagoras and Plato. Protagoras said:

“There can be no knowledge without the evidence of immediate experience”; (how like Dewey). Plato said: “There can be no knowledge without systematic thinking; without concepts sensation is blind.”

It was Alfred N. Whitehead who made the remark that all philosophy during the last 2,000 years is just footnotes to Plato's philosophy. So let us see what Whitehead has to contribute. His is called the Philosophy of Organism. He postulates *two* categories on the subjective (spiritual) plane. 1. Creativity, 2. Eternal Objects. It is confusing to many that Whitehead's Universals, his Eternal Objects, take a secondary place in the Cosmos. They are subject to the process of Creativity, therefore subject to change. How can that which changes be eternal? They might be construed simply as attributes; but Whitehead does not let us do that. He makes it clear that his Eternal Objects are forms of definiteness and pure potentials, which sounds much like Plato's Archetypes.

Perhaps a good deal of the trouble we have in understanding Whitehead and some others, is due to the inclination to think of the Cosmos in terms of the created universe, it *is . . . now*. Most philosophers, too, make their speculative take-off from this fixed viewpoint. Paradoxically, dealing with a “living” manifested universe can prove static if the screen shows a stand-still picture instead of a running film which covers all the stretches of time, starting with Creation.

H. P. B.'s *Secret Doctrine* demonstrates one of its many unique features by presenting to us the Cosmos in the labour pains of birth and creation. Note the difference. How much more easily Whitehead's apparent contradictions are ironed out. Remember he places his Eternal Objects as subject to Creativity, and therefore subject to change. We read in the second Stanza of Dzyan: “These Two are the

Germ, and the Germ is One. The Universe was still concealed in the Divine Thought and the Divine Bosom." H.P.B.'s commentary on this follows: "The Divine Thought does *not* imply a Divine Thinker." The universe, in its totality—absolute being with the past and future crystallized in an Eternal Present—*this* is Divine Thought reflected in a *Secondary* or *Manifested Cause*.

Whitehead stresses that his Eternal Objects *are* Universals rather than concepts, essences rather than abstractions drawn from existence. In this respect, Whitehead maintains what might be called a *firm relationship* between Universals and Particulars.

Now this firm relationship between the subjective and objective planes, which is so important to us Theosophists, is not always preserved in idealist philosophy. Santayana, for instance, arrives at different conclusions.

"Essences," he states, "are altogether unaffected by the conjunction in which they occur, the flux of nature which sustains them, the existences they qualify. Essence carries its own light, which while unilluminated from any other source, serves to illuminate everything else. Essences by being what they eternally are, enable existence (nature, that is) to pass from one phase to another. Since existence is flux, and therefore in accordance with the Platonic conception of non-being, it follows that Essences do not exist. They *have being*. They *are* in their own right hence they cannot be conceived as abstractions, or as unrealizable generalities. Every Essence is universal . . . individuated internally by its character, not externally by its position in the flux of nature."

Thus far Santayana has proceeded fairly faithfully on the Platonic road. Now, when practically within sight of the goal, so to speak, he makes a sharp turn. He asserts that in relation to the flux of nature, the Essences are

powerless and inert. You will recognize there is some truth in this idea. It is true in reference to *part* of the flux, the lower kingdoms, of nature. Theosophists, generally, do not believe it is true of man, certainly not of highly developed man. For while the lack of relationship between physical and spiritual may exist to a great extent, there is ample evidence of a definite Link—a link *in man*, which portrays the functioning of a spiritual power (Essence) in varying degrees of force.

Santayana accuses Plato of making his Essences a potential of spiritual forces that select and determine on their own account, thus constituting a world of *substances* behind the flux of *appearance*. *Of course* Plato does just that in keeping with the ancient lore from which he drew. To bear out his criticism Santayana claims: "Essences do not pass in and out of the stream; it is the stream that passes from one Essence to another, under its own compulsion." Again a truth in part. The occult doctrine confirms that Essences, monadic essences, do pass "in and out of the stream" under nature's compulsion, without apparent will of their own. However, this again is applicable only to the lower levels of the evolutionary field. It may not be safe to postulate *one* single law to embrace the entire field of manifestation. We know there are laws that do not stand up in all instances. Since the ushering in of the atomic age classical mechanics has proved inadequate. New laws had to be evolved. Santayana and others fall too easily into the error of modern biologists in viewing the entire evolutionary scale as an uninterrupted continuum to which nothing new is ever added.

A. H. PERON

(To be concluded)

THE LAW OF RIGHT RELATIONSHIPS

By N. SRI RAM

SINCE there is only the One in truth and everything has come from that One, everything is related to everything else. This relationship is but an underlying pattern, a foundation, as it were, on which we have to build. All evolution is that building.

It is only as we begin to glimpse the Light that shines from above, that we begin to realize that all is Life, all is Law, and *all is relation* in Nature. If each one thinks of himself as he stands, he can see he is related on each side of him. He is a unit in a web of relationships, an intersection point of innumerable connecting lines. He is a point on a sphere round which and through which run an infinity of circles. The circles round him may be regarded as circles of environment; the circles through him the circles of life or consciousness relationship. Let us consider these latter lines. Some are vivified, some are not. The culmination of the evolutionary process is the galvanization of each of those lines. It is an interesting metaphysical question: Are the lines radiations from the point or is the point a point of unity for the lines? In other words, is individuality the creation of forces or the forces the raying out of the individuality? Is the Logos a centre for the Light of the Logos, or the Light the enlargement of the Logos?

Our relations are *outer* and *inner* ; because the universe is outer and inner. The outer relations are relations of Karma, the law of interaction ; the inner relations are relations of affinity, of Spirit, of Rays, sub-Rays, sub-sub-Rays and so on. As the outer and the inner come nearer to each other, as Heaven and Earth become united, as the conjunction of Spirit and Matter takes place—now they are in opposition—all things will be regrouped. The regrouping is a process in time.

The outer relations are of time, place and circumstances. Between the relations of matter and the relations of Spirit, are the relations we experience from moment to moment, that is, the relations or reactions of our consciousness. It is with this we are particularly concerned. For that which is of the Spirit—the Reality—is beyond us for the moment. And Karma we have to take as it comes, that is, the past Karma.

How are we related to others in our thought and feeling? How do we react? How do we respond to their presence? How do we act on them? Our relations are to persons as well as things. The inner attitude depends on understanding. All is relationship in life as we live it. All institutions are but a certain stabilization of relationships, laying the pattern for outer action, determining its nature within certain bounds. The outer is bound to follow the inner. For instance, if there is an inner feeling of equality with others, there will not be inequality for long in the outer conditions.

The outer world is a world of conflicts, especially at present. The conflicts are fundamentally conflicts of opposites: East and West, capital and labour, coloured and white, youth and age, new and old, man and woman, and so on. The first phase in any relation of opposites is indifference due to lack of contact, inner or outer. Then

contact leading to tension. Then the prevailing of the one over the other, domination by the one, suppression and exploitation of the other. Then discontent, resistance, rebellion, the disruption of the old relationship. Further conflict, now more as equals, with patched-up truces, compromises, uncertainty. Eventually a relation of harmony, of balance, co-operation with willingness of spirit, each party free, harmony in freedom.

We see this drama in racial and State relations, Britain and India, for example; also in the relations of capital and labour. Here we are in the stage of truces and compromise; we see it also in the relation between man and woman, although the process is very subtle here. Woman is no longer a chattel, but is not yet as free as some think. She is not free in many eastern countries, nor in the management of national and world affairs.

Every new idea is first treated with indifference, then, if it is important enough to disturb conditions based on the old, scoffed at, persecuted, then finally, as they prevail, and they must if they are the truth, accepted (even as a tyrant is accepted when he is victorious—"agree with thine adversary quickly") and even prided upon. The ideas of Copernicus (scientific ideas), the freedom of subject peoples, and religious toleration are outstanding historical instances.

There is an element of the opposite in any two individuals. No two persons are wholly alike. The difference asserts itself in situations as they arise, in the presence of third parties—whether persons or things—as they come into the field. We have all heard of the triangle in marital and (so-called) love relations. Any two individualities are opposites within a certain angle.

All opposites are really complementaries. They are causes of conflict as the consciousness identifies itself with the outer form and thus becomes subservient to it. The

forms are different, but they need not divide. However they do, while yet the consciousness is childlike (that is, ignorant) and gullible. The antithesis of self and other arises subtly and builds itself up through rehearsal in innumerable forms.

It is a habit of thought, due to an outward-turned consciousness. The externalization of the consciousnesses participating in the unity has to be bridged over by vibrations. But in this outer world the vibrations are various and discordant. Our problem is a problem of vibrations. These vibrations are at different rates, thus at different levels. One broad division amongst them is that to which we refer as the Ego and the Personality. The Ego's response is a harmony. The Devas conversing on the pure mental levels in sound converse in music. Their exchanges in colour are patterns of harmony.

All relations change, for relations are a life-process. Life is continuous action. It is response. When it ceases to respond it is dead. The changes are Karma; they are also initiated by volition. When changes due to Karma in the relationships of many lives. Even in one life-period there is change of relation between parent and son, between boy and girl, and wife, due to growth which is evolution. These changes lead to breaks if the relations are superficial. Frictions with others are largely due to lack of inner contact, or fullness of contact (communion), lack of depth. Each one is enclosed within himself, in a cocoon of thoughts, woven in a deceptive light. There is a rind or crust of selfishness and a play of false lights around it.

In any true relation there has to be a certain realization: first of the dignity of the other person, equality in dignity, in true estate, secondly of the difference, which calls for sympathy. All natural differences are specializations.

Each has its value. The male body gives certain experiences complementary to those of a woman. Each temperament (due to mixture of Ray qualities) has its charm, its special qualities. Each race, each religion, each culture gives the soul a bath in a certain type of influence needed to draw out its all-roundness. Each season of life has its purpose. In any scientifically devised scheme of life each will have its place, the help it needs, its opportunity to give of its special quality.

Unity and difference are both summed up in Brotherhood, which is a concrete and comprehensive relationship. Brotherhood recognizes differences, as in a family. It does not ever forget the unity. It is in fact an externalization of the unity. Brotherhood is the key to the solution of all problems; for it implies freedom, justice and co-operation. Brotherhood is a pure relation, for there is in it no possession, no idea of using or exploiting the other. Possession is for gratification; leads to conflict. The things we possess with our hearts possess us. The perfect, as well as the most dynamic relationship, from the inner point of view, is love. It is not a relationship of possession, it is not sentimentalism, it has nothing to do with desiring or glamour. It is a relation without traps, that is direct, not through mental constructions, a glamorous halo, the confusions of self-interest. It is heart to heart, the union of hearts, of consciousnesses.

Desire for gratification makes one selfish. The relation which uses another for one's gratification is essentially a false relationship, disguised, as it is so often, by a simulation of love. This is not to say that enjoyment is bad. It can be pure, the experience of a harmony; or it may be egotistical, a predicate that has always the subject of self". It is the desire for sensation which glours thought, makes it regard the false as the true, subjects

Manas to the modifications of the Astral Principle, Kāma Rupa.

All true and constructive and happy relationship is a relationship of freedom. The relation of a liberated man to all beings and all things is a free relationship. He incurs no debt. He contracts no bond. He is free of Karma. His progress is by the Law of joyous sacrifice which is giving. He has purged his consciousness of all elements in the sub-conscious, which extends like an accordion into section after section of the past. He is unconditioned and not self-enclosed. He has freed the present from the past. He is a centre of pulsating life no longer dead or inert; and as he vibrates like a wonderful drum, all things inwardly vibrate with him. He is one with all of them in the movements of his consciousness. His is a universal relation.

What can we do, where we are, to reach that state? The Lord Buddha laid down certain steps: Right thought, right thought, right speech, right action, right means of livelihood (I leave out the other steps which follow). What is right? That is the question. We have to examine ourselves constantly to see how far we are right. We do not go wrong; examine ourselves in our relations to all things. We can never have right relations with others until our thoughts of others express that relationship. Relationship is on all planes—in thought, feeling, and action. To be perfectly related with all is to be perfect.

N. SRI RAMANAMAHAJI