

THEOSOPHICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Articles by H. P. Blavatsky

PSYCHOLOGY—THE SCIENCE OF THE SOUL
PSYCHIC AND NOETIC ACTION
THE DUAL ASPECT OF WISDOM
DIALOGUES BETWEEN THE TWO EDITORS

H. P. BLAVATSKY SERIES • NO. 31
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (MYSORE) PRIVATE LTD.
BANGALORE 560004

FOREWORD

THE writings of H.P.Blavatsky do not easily fall into formal categories. Her magazine articles in particular were produced with a driving purpose that cared little or nothing for the divisions or “fields” of modern learning, so that any classification of these papers is at best a loose designation rather than a showing of what H.P B. had to say on a given subject. She wrote out of the wholeness of the Theosophical philosophy, and she wrote for students of that philosophy, not for scholars or academicians.

But since in many of her articles there are regions of general emphasis which correspond in some degree to conventional divisions of learning, and since both students and inquirers have a natural interest in what the chief founder of the Theosophical Movement wrote in these areas, an effort has been made to select and publish in association certain important contributions which seem clearly related by their content.

The four articles in the present collection are united by psychological themes, although they also reach into other areas of thought.

The first article, “Psychology, the Science of the Soul,” appeared in *Lucifer* for October, 1896, more than five years after the death of the writer. An editorial note following its somewhat abrupt ending explains that “the manuscript here unfortunately breaks off.” An obvious value of this discussion is its vigorous critique of the psychological conceptions which resulted from the materialist assumptions of nineteenth-century science.

“Psychic and Noetic Action” is a two-part article published in *Lucifer* for October and November, 1890. Here the writer examines the shortcomings of the then prevailing “physiological psy-

chology,"going on to review the thought of a distinguished academic dissenter, Prof. George T. Ladd, of Yale University, who was also critical of the psychology of the time. (It is evident that William James, often called the founder of American psychology, followed Ladd's lead, and the present-day revival of James's views gives H. P. B.'s "Psychic and Noetic Action" a particular importance.) This investigation of Prof. Ladd's philosophical psychology takes the discussion far beyond critical objection to Western psychological science. In this discussion H. P. B. makes direct encounter with the problem of "freewill," dealing with it in terms of the Theosophical psychology (the "principles" of man's nature). There is also illuminating consideration of particular psychological processes and phenomena in the light of the Theosophical teachings, including a general account of the psychopathology of mediumship.

"The Dual Aspect of Wisdom," from *Lucifer* for September, 1890, has the effect of restoring to Psychology its ancient role of hand-maiden to Philosophy—making it once again a *science*. The article also unveils some of the occult wisdom hidden in Christianity by relating passages in the Bible to the teachings of occult psychology. Spiritual philosophy and psychology are fused in this discussion.

"Dialogues between the Two Editors" appeared in *Lucifer* for December, 1888. The "two editors" are H. P. B. and Mabel Collins ("M.C.") and their exchange ranges over a wide terrain of psychological and occult material. Few articles show as clearly as this one the extraordinary breadth of the Theosophical psychology when applied to questions so widely different as creative writing on the one hand, and the gross phenomena of Spiritualism on the other.

In conclusion, it might be remarked that because the science of psychology has itself undergone numerous transformations since these articles were written, and is today breaking out into other fields, notably into philosophy and religion, the reader may be glad of Madame Blavatsky's failure to restrict her writings to academic bounds. Actually, the various "break-throughs" which have been accomplished by Psychology in recent years seem to have added a strongly contemporary flavor to these writings of H. P. Blavatsky, all originally set down between 1888 and 1891.

PSYCHOLOGY

THE SCIENCE OF THE SOUL

ETHICS and law are, so far, only in the phases where there are as yet no theories, and barely systems, and even these, based as we find them upon *a priori* ideas instead of observations, are quite irreconcilable with one another. What remains then outside of physical science? We are told, "Psychology, the Science of the Soul, of the Conscious Self or Ego."

Alas, and thrice alas! Soul, the Self, or Ego, is studied by modern psychology as inductively as a piece of decayed matter by a physicist. Psychology and its mother-plant metaphysics have fared worse than any other sciences. These twin sciences have long been so separated in Europe as to have become in their ignorance mortal enemies. After faring poorly enough at the hands of mediaeval scholasticism they have been liberated therefrom only to fall into modern sophistry. Psychology in its present garb is simply a mask covering a ghastly, grimacing skeleton's head, a deadly and beautiful upas flower growing in a soil of most hopeless materialism. "Thought is to the psychologist metamorphosed sensation and man a helpless automaton, wire-pulled by heredity and environment"—writes a half-disgusted hylo-idealist, now happily a Theosophist. "And yet men like Huxley preach this man automatism and morality in the same breath.... Monists¹ to a man, annihilationists who would stamp out intuition with iron heel, if they could." . . . Those are our modern western psychologists!

¹ Monism is a word which admits of more than one interpretation. The "monism" of Lewes, Bain and others, which endeavors so vainly to compress all mental and material phenomena into the unity of One Substance, is in no way the transcendental monism of esoteric philosophy. The current "Single-Substance Theory" of mind and matter necessarily involves the doctrine of annihilation, and is hence untrue. Occultism on the other hand, recognizes that in the ultimate analysis even the Logos and Mulaprakriti are one; and that there is but One Reality behind the Maya of the universe. But in the manvantaric circuit, in the realm of manifested being, the Logos (spirit), and Mulaprakriti (matter or its noumenon), are the dual contrasted poles or bases of all phenomena—subjective and objective. The duality of spirit and matter is a fact, so long as the Great Manvantara lasts. Beyond that looms the darkness of the "Great Unknown," the one Parabrahman.

Everyone sees that metaphysics instead of being a science of first principles has now broken up into a number of more or less materialistic schools of every shade and color, from Schopenhauer's pessimism down to agnosticism, monism, idealism, hylo-idealism, and every "ism" with the exception of psychism—not to speak of true psychology. What Mr. Huxley said of Positivism, namely that it was Roman Catholicism/wm w Christianity, ought to be paraphrased and applied to our modern psychological philosophy. It is psychology, *minus* soul; psyche being dragged down to mere sensation; a solar system *minus* a sun; *Hamlet* with the Prince of Denmark not entirely cast out of the play, but in some vague way suspected of being probably somewhere behind the scenes.

When humble David seeks to conquer the enemy it is not the small fry of their army whom he attacks, but Goliath, their great leader. Thus it is one of Mr. Herbert Spencer's statements which, at the risk of repetition, must be analyzed to prove the accusation here adduced. It is thus that "the greatest philosopher of the nineteenth century" speaks:

"The mental state in which self is known implies, like every other mental act, a perceiving subject and a perceived object. If then the object perceived is self, what is the subject that perceives? or if it is the true self which thinks, what other self can it be that is thought of? Clearly a true cognition of self implies a self in which the knowing and the known are one—in which subject and object are one: and this Mr. Mansel *rightly holds to be the annihilation of both!* So that the personality of which each is conscious, and of which the existence is to each a fact beyond all others the most certain, is yet a thing which cannot truly be known at all; *the knowledge of it is forbidden by the very nature of thought.*"³

The italics are ours to show the point under discussion. Does this not remind one of an argument in favor of the undulatory theory, namely, that "the meeting of two rays whose waves interlock produces darkness." For Mr. Mansel's assertion that when self thinks of self, and

2 The Higher Self or Buddhi-Manas, which in the act of self-analysis or highest abstract thinking, partially reveals its presence and holds the subservient brain-consciousness in review.

3 First Principles, pp. 65, 66.

is simultaneously the subject and object, it is "the annihilation of both"—means just this, and the psychological argument is therefore placed on the same basis as the physical phenomenon of light waves. Moreover, Mr. Herbert Spencer confessing that Mr. Mansel is right and basing thereupon his conclusion that the knowledge of self or soul is thus "forbidden by the very nature of thought" is a proof that the "father of modern psychology" (in England) proceeds on no better psychological principles than Messrs. Huxley or Tyndall have done.⁴

We do not contemplate in the least the impertinence of criticizing such a giant of thought as Mr. H. Spencer is rightly considered to be by his friends and admirers. We mention this simply to prove our point and show modern psychology to be a misnomer, even though it is claimed that Mr. Spencer has "reached conclusions of great generality and truth, regarding all that can be known of man." We have one determined object in view, and we will not deviate from the straight line, and our object is to show that occultism and its philosophy have not the least chance of being even understood, still less accepted in this century, and by the present generations of men of science. We would fain impress on the minds of our Theosophists and mystics that to search for sympathy and recognition in the region of "science" is to court defeat. Psychology seemed a natural ally at first, and now having examined it, we come to the conclusion that it is *as suggestio falsi* and no more. It is as misleading a term, as taught at present, as that of the Antarctic Pole with its ever arid and barren frigid zone, called southern merely from geographical considerations.

For the modern psychologist, dealing as he does only with the superficial brain-consciousness, is in truth more hopelessly materialistic than all-denying materialism itself, the latter, at any rate, being more honest and sincere. Materialism shows no pretensions to fathom human thought, least of all the human spirit-soul, which it deliberately and coolly but sincerely denies and throws altogether out of its catalogue. But the psychologist devotes to soul his whole time and

4 We do not even notice some very pointed criticisms in which it is shown that Mr. Spencer's postulate that "consciousness cannot be in two distinct states at the same time," is flatly contradicted by himself when he affirms that it is possible for us to be conscious of more states than one. "To be known as unlike," he says, "conscious states must be known in succession" (see *The Philosophy of Mr. H. Spencer Examined*, by James Iverach, M.A.).

leisure. He is ever boring artesian wells into the very depths of human consciousness. The materialist or the frank atheist is content to make of himself, as Jeremy Collier puts it, “a very despicable mortal ... no better than a heap of organized dust, a talking machine, a speaking head without a soul in it . . . whose thoughts are bound by the law of motion.” But the psychologist is not even a mortal, or even a man; he is a mere aggregate of sensations.⁵ The universe and all in it is only an aggregate of grouped sensations, or “an integration of sensations.” It is all relations of subject and object, relations of universal and individual, of absolute and finite. But when it comes to dealing with the problems of the origin of space and time, and to the summing-up of all those inter- and co-relations of ideas and matter, of ego and non-ego, then all the proof vouchsafed to an opponent is the contemptuous epithet of “ontologist.” After which modern psychology having demolished the object of its sensation in the person of the contradictor, turns round against itself and commits *hari-kari* by showing sensation itself to be no better than hallucination.

This is even more hopeless for the cause of truth than the harmless paradoxes of the materialistic automatists. The assertion that “the physical processes in the brain are complete in themselves” concerns after all only the registrative function of the material brain; and unable to explain satisfactorily psychic processes thereby, the automatists are thus harmless to do permanent mischief. But the psychologists, into whose hands the science of soul has now so unfortunately fallen, can do great harm, inasmuch as they pretend to be earnest seekers after truth, and remain withal content to represent Coleridge’s “Owlet,” which—

Sailing on obscene wings across the noon,
Drops his blue-fringed lids, and shuts them close,
And, hooting at the glorious sun in heaven,
Cries out, “Where is it?” . . .

—and who more blind than he who does not want to see?

We have sought far and wide for scientific corroboration as to the question of spirit, and spirit alone (in its septenary aspect) being the cause of consciousness and thought, as taught in esoteric philosophy. We have found both physical and psychical sciences denying the fact

point-blank, and maintaining their two contradictory and clashing theories. The former, moreover, in its latest development is half inclined to believe itself quite transcendental owing to the latest departure from the too brutal teachings of the Buchners and Moleschotts. But when one comes to analyze the difference between the two, it appears so imperceptible that they almost merge into one.

Indeed, the champions of science now say that the belief that sensation and thought are but movements of matter—Buchner’s and Moleschott’s theory—is, as a well-known English annihilationist remarks, “unworthy of the name of philosophy.” Not one man of science of any eminence, we are indignantly told, neither Tyndall, Huxley, Maudsley, Bain, Clifford, Spencer, Lewes, Virchow, Haeckel nor Du Bois Raymond has ever gone so far as to say that “thought *is a* molecular motion, but that it is the *concomitant* (not *the cause* as believers in a soul maintain) of certain physical processes in the brain”. They never—the true scientist as opposed to the false, the sciolists—the monists as opposed to the materialists—say that thought and nervous motion are the *same*, but that they are the “subjective and objective faces of the same thing “

Now it may be due to a defective training which has not enabled us to frame ideas on a subject other than those which answer to the words in which it is expressed, but we plead guilty to seeing no such marked difference between Buchner’s and the new monistic theories. “Thought is not a motion of molecules, but it is the concomitant of certain physical processes in the brain.” Now what is a concomitant, and what is a process? A concomitant, according to the best definitions, is a thing that accompanies, or is collaterally connected with another—a concurrent and simultaneous companion. A process is an act of proceeding, an advance or motion, whether temporary or continuous, or a series of motions. Thus the concomitant of physical processes, being naturally a bird of the same feather, whether subjective or objective, and being due to motion, which both monists and materialists say *is*

5 According to John Stuart Mill neither the so-called objective universe nor the domain of mind—object, subject—corresponds with any absolute reality beyond “sensation.” Objects, the whole paraphernalia of sense, are “sensation objectively viewed” and mental states “sensation subjectively viewed.” The “Ego” is as entire an illusion as matter; the One Reality, groups of feelings bound together by the rigid laws of association.

physical—what difference is therebetween their definition and that of Buchner, except perhaps that it is in words a little more scientifically expressed?

Three scientific views are laid before us with regard to changes in thought by present-day philosophers:

Postulate. “Every mental change is signalized by a molecular change in the brain substance.” To this:

1. Materialism says: the mental changes are caused by the molecular changes.

2. Spiritualism (believers in a soul): the molecular changes are caused by the mental changes. [Thought acts on the brain matter through the medium of Fohat focussed through one of the principles.]

3. Monism: there is no causal relation between the two sets of phenomena; the mental and the physical being the two sides of the same thing [a verbal evasion].

To this occultism replies that the first view is out of court entirely. It would enquire of No. 2: And what is it that presides so judicially over the mental changes? What is the *noumenon* of those mentalphenomena which make up the external consciousness of the physical man? What is it which we recognize as the terrestrial “self” andwhich—monistsandmaterialists notwithstanding—does control andregulate the flowofitsownmentalstates.Nooccultistwould for a moment denythatthematerialistictheoryastotherelations of mind and brain isinitswayexpressiveofthetruththatthesw/?e/-yzc/7z/ brain-consciousness or “phenomenal selfisboundupforallpracti-cal purposes with the integrity of the cerebral matter. This brain-consciousness or personality is mortal, being but a distorted reflection through a physical basis of the manasic self. It is an instrument for harvesting experience for the Buddhi-Manas or monad, and saturating it withthe aroma of consciously-acquired experience. But for allthatthe”brain-self “isrealwbileit lasts,and weavesits Karma asa responsibleentity. Esoterically explained it is theconsciousness inhering in that lower portion of the Manas which iscorrelated with the physical brain.

Lucifer, October & November 1890

PSYCHIC AND NOETIC ACTION

I

“ . . . I made man just and right,
Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall,
Such I created all th’ ethereal powers
And spirits, both them who stood and them
who fail’d,
Truly, they stood who stood, and fell who
fell . . .” —MILTON

“ . . . The assumption that the *mind is a real being*, which can be acted upon by the brain and which can act on the body through the brain, is the only one compatible with all the facts of experience.”—GEORGE T. LADD, in the *Elements of Physiological Psychology*.

A NEW influence, a breath, a sound—”as of a rushing mighty wind”—has suddenly swept over a few Theosophical heads. An idea, vague at first, grew into a very definite form, and now seems to be working very busily in the minds of some of our members. It is this: if we would make converts the few ex-occult teachings, which are destined to see the light of publicity, should be made, hence forward, *most subservient to, if not entirely at one with modern science*. It is urged that the so-called *esoteric*¹ (or *late esoteric*) cosmogony, anthropology, ethnology, geology—psychology and, foremost of all, metaphysics—having *been adapted into* making obeisance to modern (hence *materialistic*) thought, should never henceforth be allowed to contradict (not *openly*, at all events)” scientific philosophy.” The latter, we suppose, means

¹ We say “so-called,” because nothing of what has been given out publicly or in print can any longer be termed esoteric.

the fundamental and accepted views of the great German schools, or of Mr. Herbert Spencer and some other English stars of lesser magnitude; and not only these, but also the deductions that may be drawn from them by their more or less instructed disciples.

A large undertaking this, truly; and one, moreover, in perfect conformity with the policy of the medieval Casuists, who distorted truth and even suppressed it, if it clashed with *divine Revelation*. Useless to say that we decline the compromise. It is quite possible—nay, probable and almost unavoidable—that “the mistakes made” in the rendering of such abstruse metaphysical tenets as those contained in Eastern Occultism, should be “frequent and often important.” But then all such have to be traced back to the interpreters, not to the system itself. They have to be corrected on the authority of the same Doctrine, checked by the teachings grown on the rich and steady soil of *Gupta Vidya*, not by the speculations that blossom forth today, to die tomorrow—on the shifting sands of modern scientific guesswork, especially in all that relates to psychology and mental phenomena. Holding to our motto, “There is no religion higher than truth,” we refuse most decidedly to pander to *physical* science. Yet, we may say this: If the so-called *exact* sciences limited their activity only to the physical realm of nature; if they concerned themselves strictly with surgery, chemistry—up to its legitimate boundaries, and with physiology—so far as the latter relates to the structure of our corporeal frame, then the Occultists would be the first to seek help in modern sciences, however many their blunders and mistakes. But once that over-stepping material Nature the physiologists of the modern “animalistic”² school pretend to meddle with, and deliver *ex cathedra dicta* on, the higher functions and phenomena of the mind, saying that a careful analysis brings them to a firm conviction that no more than the animal is man a *free-agent*, far less a responsible one—then

2 “Animalism” is quite an appropriate word to use (whoever invented it) as a contrast to Mr. Tylor’s term “animism,” which he applied to all the “Lower Races” of mankind who believe the soul a distinct entity. He finds that the words *psyche*, *pneuma*, *animus*, *spiritus*, etc., all belong to the same cycle of superstition in “the lower stages of culture.” Professor A. Bain dubbing all these distinctions moreover, as a “plurality of souls” and a “double materialism.” This is the more curious as the learned author of “Mind and Body” speaks as disparagingly of Darwin’s “materialism” in *Zoonomia*, wherein the founder of modern Evolution defines the world idea as “contracting a motion, or configuration of the fibres which constitute the immediate organ of Sense” (Mind and body. p. 190. Note).

the Occultist has a far greater right than the average modern “Idealist” to protest. And the Occultist asserts that no materialist—a prejudiced and one-sided witness at best—can claim any authority in the question of mental physiology, or that which is now called by him the *physiology of the soul*. No such noun can be applied to the word “soul,” unless, indeed, by soul only the lower, *psychic mind* is meant, or that which develops in man (proportionally with the perfection of his brain) into *intellect*, and in the animal into a *higher* instinct. But since the great Charles Darwin taught that “our *ideas* are animal motions of the organ of sense” everything becomes possible to the modern physiologist.

Thus, to the great distress of our scientifically inclined Fellows, it is once more Lucifer’s duty to show how far we are at loggerheads with exact science, or shall we say, how far the conclusions of that science are drifting away from truth and fact. By “science” we mean, of course, the majority of the men of science; the best minority, we are happy to say, is on our side, at least as far as free-will in man and the immateriality of the mind are concerned. The study of the “Physiology” of the Soul, of the Will in man and of his *higher Con-sciousness* from the standpoint of genius and its manifesting faculties can never be summarized into a system of general ideas represented by brief formulae; no more than the *psychology of material nature* can have its manifold mysteries solved by the mere analysis of its physical phenomena. *There is no special organ of will*, any more than there is a *physical basis* for the activities of self-consciousness.

“If the question is pressed as to the *physical basis* for the activities of self-consciousness, no answer can be given or suggested. . . . From its very nature, that marvelous verifying *actus* of mind in which it recognizes the states as its own, can have no analogous or corresponding material substratum. It is impossible to specify any physiological process representing this unifying *actus*; it is even impossible to imagine how the description of any such process could be brought into intelligible relation with this unique mental power.”³

Thus, the whole conclave of psycho-physiologists may be challenged to correctly define Consciousness, and they are sure to fail, because Self-consciousness belongs alone to man and proceeds from

3 *Physiological Psychology*, etc., p. 545, by George T. Ladd. Professor of Philosophy in Yale University.

the SELF, the higher Manas. Only, whereas the psychic element (or *Kama-manas*)⁴ is common to both the animal and the human being—the far higher degree of its development in the latter resting merely on the greater perfection and sensitiveness of his cerebral cells—no physiologist, not even the cleverest, will ever be able to solve the mystery of the human mind, its highest spiritual manifestation, or in its dual aspect of the *psychic* and the *noetic* (or the *manasic*),⁵ or even to comprehend the intricacies of the former on the purely material plane—unless he knows something of, and is prepared to admit the presence of this dual element. This means that he would have to admit a lower (animal), and a higher (or divine) mind in man, or what is known in Occultism as the “personal” and the “impersonal” *Egos*. For, between the *psychic* and the *noetic*, between the *personality* and the *individuality*, there exists the same abyss as between a “Jack the Ripper,” and a holy Buddha. Unless the physiologist accepts all this, we say, he will ever be led into a quagmire. We intend to prove it.

As all know, the great majority of our learned “Didymi” reject the idea of free-will. Now this question is a problem that has occupied the minds of thinkers for ages; every school of thought having taken it up in turn and left it as far from solution as ever. And yet, placed as it is in the foremost ranks of philosophical quandaries, the modern “psycho-physiologists” claim in the coolest and most bumptious way to have cut the Gordian knot for ever. For them the feeling of personal free agency is an error, an illusion, “the collective hallucination of mankind.” This conviction starts from the principle that no mental activity is possible without a brain, and that there can be no brain without a body. As the latter is, moreover, subject to the general laws of a material world where all is based on necessity, and where there is no spontaneity, our modern psycho-physiologist *has nolens volens* to repudiate any self-spontaneity in human action. Here we have, for instance, a Lausanne professor of physiology, A.A. Herzen, to whom the claim of free-will in man appears as the most *unscientific* absurdity. Says this oracle:—

4 Or what the Kabalists call Nephesh, the “breath of life.”

5 The Sanskrit word Manas (Mind) is used by us in preference to the Greek Nous (noetic) because the latter word having been so imperfectly understood in philosophy, suggests no definite meaning.

“In the boundless physical and chemical laboratory that surrounds man, organic life represents quite an unimportant group of phenomena; and amongst the latter, the place occupied by life having reached to the stage of consciousness, is so minute that it is absurd to exclude man from the sphere of action of a general law, in order to allow in him the existence of a subjective spontaneity or a free will standing outside of that law”—(*Psychophysioogie Generate.*)

For the Occultist who knows the difference between the psychic and the noetic elements in man, this is pure trash, notwithstanding its sound scientific basis. For when the author puts the question—if psychic phenomena do not represent the results of an action of a molecular character whither then does motion disappear after reaching the sensory centers?—we answer that we never denied the fact. But what has this to do with a free-will? That every phenomenon in the visible Universe has its genesis in motion, is an old axiom in Occultism; nor do we doubt that the psycho-physiologist would place himself at logger-heads with the whole conclave of exact scientists were he to allow the idea that at a given moment a whole series of physical phenomena may disappear in the vacuum. Therefore, when the author of the work cited maintains that this said force does not disappear upon reaching the highest nervous centers, but that it is forthwith transformed into another series, viz., that of psychic manifestations, into thought, feeling, and consciousness, just as this same psychic force when applied to produce some work of a physical (*e.g.*, muscular) character gets transformed into the latter—Occultism supports him, for it is the first to say that all psychic activity, from its lowest to its highest manifestations is “nothing but—motion”

Yes; it *is* MOTION; but not all “molecular” motion, as the writer means us to infer. Motion as the GREAT BREATH (*vide* “Secret Doctrine,” *so* ^{sub voce})—*ergo* “sound” at the same time—is the substratum of Cosmic-Motion. It is beginningless and endless, the one *eternal life*, the basis and genesis of the subjective and the objective universe; for LIFE (or Be-ness) is *the fons et origo* of existence or being. But molecular motion is the lowest and most material of its finite manifestations. And if the general law of the conservation of energy leads modern science to the conclusion that psychic activity only

represents a special form of motion, this same law, guiding the Occultists, leads them also to the same conviction—and to something else besides, which psycho-physiology leaves entirely out of all consideration. If the latter has discovered only in this century that psychic (we say even spiritual) action is subject to the same general and immutable laws of motion as any other phenomenon manifested in the objective realm of Kosmos, and that in both the organic and the *inorganic* (?) worlds every manifestation, whether conscious or unconscious, represents but the result of a collectivity of causes, then in Occult philosophy this represents merely the A, B, C, of its science. “All the world is in the *Swara*; *Swara* is the Spirit itself”—the ONE LIFE or *motions* & the old books of Hindu Occult philosophy. “The proper translation of the word *Swara* is the current of the life wave,” says the author of “Nature’s Finer Forces,”⁶ and he goes on to explain:

“It is that wavy motion which is the cause of the evolution of cosmic undifferentiated matter into the differentiated universe. ... From whence does this motion come? This motion is the spirit itself. The word *Ama* (universal soul) used in the book (*vide infra*), itself carries the idea of eternal motion; coming as it does from the root, *AT*, or eternal motion; and it may be significantly remarked, that the root *AT* is connected with, is in fact simply another form of, the roots *AH*, breath, and *AS*, being. All these roots have for their origin the sound produced by the breath of animals (living beings)... The primeval current of the life-wave is then the same which assumes in man the form of inspiratory and expiratory motion of the lungs, and this is the all-pervading source of the evolution and involution of the universe. ...”

So much about *motion* and the “conservation of energy” from old books on *magic* written and taught ages before the birth of inductive and exact modern science. For what does the latter say more than these books in speaking, for instance, about animal *mechanism*, when it says:—

“From the visible atom to the celestial body lost in space, *everything is subject to motion* . . . kept at a definite distance one from the other, in

6 The Theosophist, Feb. 1888, p. 275, by Rama Prasad, President of the Meerut Theosophical Society. As the Occult book cited by him says: “It is the *Swara* that has given form to the first accumulations of the divisions of the universe; the *Swara* causes evolution and involution; the *Swara* is God, or more properly the Great Power itself (*Maheshwara*). The *Swara* is the manifestation of the impression on matter of that power which in man is known to us as the power which knows itself (mental and psychic consciousness). It is to be understood that the action of this power never ceases . . . It is unchangeable existences—and this is the “Motion” of the Scientists and the universal Breath of Life of the Occultists.

proportion to the motion which animates them, the molecules present constant relations, which they lose only by the addition or the subtraction of a certain quantity of motion*⁷

But Occultism says more than this. While making of motion on *the material plane* and of the conservation of energy, two fundamental laws, or rather two aspects of the same omnipresent law—*Swara*, it denies point blank that these have anything to do with the *free-will* of man which belongs to quite a different plane. The author of “Psychophysiologic Generale,” treating of his *discovery* that psychic action is but motion, and the result of a collectivity of causes—remarks that as it is so, there cannot be any further discussion upon spontaneity—in the sense of any native internal proneness created by the human organism; and adds that the above puts an end to all claim for *free-will*.⁷ The Occultist denies the conclusion. The actual fact of man’s psychic (we say *manasic* or noetic) *individuality* is a sufficient warrant against the assumption; for in the case of this conclusion being correct, or being indeed, as the author expresses it, the *collective hallucination of the whole mankind throughout the ages*, there would be an end also to psychic individuality.

Now by “psychic” individuality we mean that self-determining power which enables man to override circumstances. Place half a dozen animals of the same species under the same circumstances, and their actions while not identical, will be closely similar; place half a dozen men under the same circumstances and their actions will be as different as their characters, / *e.*, their *psychic individuality*

But if instead of “psychic” we call it the higher Self-conscious Will then having been shown by the science of psycho-physiology itself that *will has no special organ*, how will the materialists connect it with “molecular” motion at all? As Professor George T Ladd says:

“The phenomena of human consciousness must be regarded as activities of some other form of Real Being than the moving molecules of the brain. They require a subject or ground which is in its nature unlike the phosphorized fats of the central masses, the aggregated nerve-fibres of nerve-cells of the cerebral cortex. This Real Being thus manifested immediately to itself in the phenomena of consciousness, and indirectly to others through the bodily

7 “Animal Mechanism,” a treatise on terrestrial and aerial locomotion. By E. J. Marey, Prof. at the College of France, and Member of the Academy of Medicine.

changes, *is the Mind (manas)*. To it the mental phenomena are to be attributed as showing what it *is* by what it *does*. The so-called mental 'faculties' are only the *modes of the behavior* in consciousness of this real being. We actually find, by the only method available, that this real being called Mind believes in certain perpetually recurring modes: therefore, we attribute to it certain faculties. . . . Mental faculties are not entities that have an existence of themselves. . . . They are the modes of the behaviour in consciousness of the mind. And the very nature of the classifying acts which lead to their being distinguished, is explicable only upon the assumption that *a Real being called Mind exists*, and is to be distinguished from the real beings known as the physical molecules of the brain's nervous mass⁸

And having shown that we have to regard consciousness *as a unit* (another occult proposition) the author adds:

"We conclude, then, from the previous considerations: *the subject of all the states of consciousness is a real unit-being, called Mind: which is of non-material nature, and acts and develops according to laws of its own, but is specially correlated with certain material molecules and masses forming the substance of the Brain.*"⁹

This "Mind" is *manas*, or rather its lower reflection, which whenever it disconnects itself, for the time being, *v/hhkama*, becomes the guide of the highest mental faculties, and is the organ of the free-will in physical man. Therefore, this assumption of the newest psychophysiology is uncalled for, and the apparent impossibility of reconciling the existence of free-will with the law of the conservation of energy is—a pure fallacy. This was well shown in the "Scientific Letters" of "Elpay" in a criticism of the work. But to prove it finally and set the whole question definitely at rest, does not even require so high an interference (high for us, at any rate) as the Occult laws, but simply a little common sense. Let us analyze the question dispassionately.

It is postulated by one man, presumably a scientist, that because "psychic action is found subject to the general and immutable laws of motion, there is, therefore, *no free will in man.*" The "analytical method of exact sciences" has demonstrated it, and materialistic scientists have decreed to "pass the resolution" that the fact should be

8 "The higher manas" or "Ego" (Kshetrajna) is the 'Silent Spectator,' and the voluntary 'sacrificial victim': the lower manas, its representative—a tyrannical despot, truly.

9 Elements of Physiological Psychology. A treatise of the activities and nature of the mind, from the Physical and Experimental Point of View, pp. 606 and 613.

so accepted by their followers. But there are other and far greater scientists who thought differently. For instance, Sir William Lawrence, the eminent surgeon, declared in his lectures¹⁰ that: —

The philosophical doctrine of the soul, and its separate existence, has nothing to do with this physiological question, but rests on a species of proof altogether different. These sublime dogmas could never have been brought to light by the labours of the anatomist and physiologist. An immaterial and spiritual being could not have been discovered amid the blood and filth of the dissecting room.

Now, let us examine on the testimony of the materialist how this universal solvent called the "analytical method" is applied in this special case. The author of the *Psychophysiology* decomposes psychic activity into its compound elements, traces them back to motion, and, failing to find in them the slightest trace of free-will or spontaneity, jumps at the conclusion that the latter have no existence in general; nor are they to be found in that psychic activity which he has just decomposed. "Are not the fallacy and error of such an unscientific proceeding self-evident?" asks his critic; and then argues very correctly that:—

"At this rate, and starting from the standpoint of this analytical method, one would have an equal right to deny every phenomenon in nature from first to last. For, do not sound and light, heat and electricity, like all other chemical processes, once decomposed into their respective elements, lead the experimenter back to the same motion, wherein all the peculiarities of the given elements disappear leaving behind them only 'the vibrations of molecules'? But does it necessarily follow that for all that, heat, light, electricity—are but illusions instead of the actual manifestations of the peculiarities of our real world? Such peculiarities are not, of course, to be found in compound elements, simply because we cannot expect that a part should contain, from first to last, the properties of the whole. What should we say of a chemist, who, having decomposed water into its compounds, hydrogen and oxygen, without finding in them the special characteristics of water, would maintain that such did not exist at all nor could they be found in water? What of an antiquary who upon examining distributed type and finding no sense in every separate letter, should assert that there was no such thing as sense to be found in any printed document? And does not the author of "Psycho-physiology" act just in this way when he denies the existence of free-will or self-spontaneity in man, on the grounds that this

10 W. Lawrence, Lectures on Comparative Anatomy, Physiology, Zoology, and the Natural History of Man. 8vo. London, 1848: p. 6.

distinctive faculty of the highest psychic activity is absent from those compounded elements which he has analysed?"

Most undeniably no separate piece of brick, of wood, or iron, each of which has once been a part of a building now in ruins, can be expected to preserve the smallest trace of the architecture of that building—in the hands of the chemist, at any rate; though it would in those *of & psychometer*, a faculty by the bye, which demonstrates far more powerfully the law of the conservation of energy than any physical science does, and shows it acting as much in the subjective or psychic worlds as on the objective and material planes. The genesis of sound, on this plane, has to be traced back to the same motion, and the same correlation of forces is at play during phenomenon as in the case of every other manifestation. Shall the physicist, then, who decomposes sound into its compound element of vibrations and fails to find in them any harmony or special melody, deny the existence of the latter? And does not this prove that the analytical method having to deal exclusively with the elements, and nothing to do with their *combinations*, leads the physicist to talk very glibly about motion, vibration, and what not, and to make him entirely lose sight of *the harmony produced by certain combinations of that motion* or the “harmony of vibrations”? Criticism, then, is right in accusing Materialistic psycho-physiology of neglecting these all-important distinctions; in maintaining that if a careful observation of facts is a duty in the simplest physical phenomena, how much more should it be so when applied to such complex and important questions as psychic force and faculties? And yet in most cases all such essential differences are overlooked, and the analytical method is applied in a most arbitrary and prejudiced way. What wonder, then, if, in carrying back psychic action to its basic elements of motion, the psychophysicist depriving it during the process of all its essential characteristics, should destroy it; and having destroyed it, it only stands to reason that he is unable to find that which exists in it no longer. He forgets, in short, or rather purposely ignores the fact, that though, like all other phenomena on the material plane, psychic manifestations *must* be related in their final analysis to the world of vibration (“*sound*” being the *substratum of universal Akasa*), yet, in their origin, they belong to a *different and a higher World*

HARMONY. Elpay has a few severe sentences against the assumptions of those he calls “physico-biologists” which are worthy of note.

Unconscious of their error, the psycho-physiologists identify the compound elements of psychic activity with that activity itself: hence the conclusion from the standpoint of the analytical method, that the highest, distinctive specialty of the human soul—free-will, spontaneity—is an illusion, and no psychic reality. But as we have just shown, such identification not only has nothing in common with exact science, but is simply impermissible, as it clashes with all the fundamental laws of logic, in consequence of which all these so-called physico-biological deductions emanating from the said identification vanish into thin air. Thus to trace psychic action primarily to motion, means in no way to prove the “illusion of free-will.” And, as in the case of water, whose specific qualities cannot be deprived of their reality although they are not to be found in its compound gases, so with regard to the specific property of psychic action: its spontaneity cannot be refused to psychic reality, though this property is not contained in those finite elements into which the psycho-physicist dismembers the activity in question under his mental scalpel.

This method is “a distinctive feature of modern science in its endeavor to satisfy inquiry into *the nature* of the objects of its investigation by a detailed description of their *development*,” says G. T. Ladd. And the author of *The Elements of Physiological Psychology* adds:—

The universal process of “Becoming” has been almost personified and deified so as to make it the true ground of all finite and concrete existence. . . . The attempt is made to refer all the so-called development of the mind to the evolution of the substance of the brain, under purely physical and mechanical causes. This attempt, then, denies that any real unit-being called the Mind needs to be assumed as undergoing a process of development according to laws of its own. . . . On the other hand, all attempts to account for the orderly increase in complexity and comprehensiveness of the mental phenomena by tracing the physical evolution of the brain are wholly unsatisfactory to many minds. We have no hesitation in classing ourselves among this number. Those facts of experience which show a correspondence in the order of the development of the body and the mind, and even a certain necessary dependence of the latter upon the former, are, of course, to be admitted; but they are equally compatible with another view of the mind’s development. This other view has the additional advantages that it makes room for many other facts of experience which are very difficult of reconciliation with any materialistic theory. On the whole, *the history of each individual’s experiences is much as requires the assumption that a real unit-being (a Mind) is undergoing a process of development, in relation to*

the changing condition or evolution of the brain, and yet in accordance with a nature and laws of its own" (p. 616).

How closely this last "assumption" of science approaches the teachings of the Occult philosophy will be shown in Part II of this article. Meanwhile, we may close with an answer to the latest materialistic fallacy, which may be summarized in a few words. As every psychic action has for its substratum the nervous elements whose existence it postulates, and outside which it cannot act; as the activity of the nervous elements are only molecular motion, there is therefore no need to invent a special and psychic Force for the explanation of our brain work. *Free Will would force* Science to postulate an invisible *Free-Willer*, a creator of that special Force.

We agree: "not the slightest need," of a creator of "that special" or any other Force. Nor has anyone ever claimed such an absurdity. But between creating and *guiding*, there is a difference, and the latter implies in no way any creation of the energy of motion, or, indeed, of any special energy. Psychic mind (in contradistinction to maniac or noetic mind) only transforms this energy of the "unit-being" according to "a nature and laws of its own"—to use Ladd's felicitous expression. The "unit-being" creates nothing, but only causes a natural correlation in accordance with both the physical laws and *laws of its own*; having to use the Force, it guides its direction, choosing the paths along which it will proceed, and stimulating it to action. And, as its activity is *sui generis*, and independent, it carries this energy from this world of disharmony into its own sphere of harmony. Were it not *independent* it could not do so. As it is, the freedom of man's will is beyond doubt or cavil. Therefore, as already observed, there is no question of creation, but simply *of guidance*. Because the sailor at the wheel does not create the steam in the engine, shall we say that he does not direct the vessel?

And, because we refuse to accept the fallacies of some physiologists as the *last word of science*, do we furnish there by a new proof that free-will is an *hallucination*? We deride the *animalistic* idea. How far more scientific and logical, besides being as poetical as it is grand; is the teaching in the *Kathopanishad*, which, in a beautiful and descriptive metaphor, says that: "The senses are the

horses, body is the chariot, mind (*kama-manas*) is the reins, and intellect (or *free-will*) the charioteer." Verily, there is more *exact science* in the less important of the *Upanishads*, composed thousands of years ago, than in all the materialistic ravings of modern "physico-biology" and "psychophysiology" put together!

II

"... The knowledge of the past, present, and future, is embodied in Kshetrajna (the 'Self*')." —

—*OCCULT AXIOMS*

Having explained in what particulars, and why, as Occultists, we disagree with materialistic physiological psychology, we may now proceed to point out the difference between psychic and noetic mental functions, the noetic not being recognized by official science.

Moreover, we, Theosophists, understand the terms "psychic" and "psychism" somewhat differently from the average public, science, and even theology, the latter giving it a significance which both science and Theosophy reject, and the public in general remaining with a very hazy conception of what is really meant by the terms. For many, there is little, if any, difference between "psychic" and "psy-chological," both words relating in some way to the *human* soul. Some modern metaphysicians have wisely agreed to disconnect the word Mind (*pneuma*) from Soul (*psyche*), the one being the rational, spiritual part, the other—*psyche*—the living principle in man, the breath that *animates* him (from *anima*, soul). Yet, if this is so, how in this case refuse a soul to *animals*? These are, no less than man, informed with the same principle of sentient life, the *nephesh* of the 2nd *chapter of Genesis*. The Soul is by no means the Mind, nor can an idiot, bereft of the latter, be called a "soul-less" being. To describe, as the physiologists do, the human Soul in its relations to senses and appetites, desires and passions, common to man and the brute, and then endow it with God-like intellect, with spiritual and rational faculties which can take their source but in a *supersensible* world—is to throw forever the veil of an impenetrable mystery over the subject. Yet in modern science, "psychology" and "psychism" relate only to conditions of

the nervous system, mental phenomena being traced solely to molecular action. The higher *noetic* character of the Mind-Principle is entirely ignored, and even rejected as a "superstition" by both physiologists and psychologists. Psychology, in fact, has become a synonym in many cases for the science of psychiatry. Therefore, students of Theosophy being compelled to differ from all these, have adopted the doctrine that underlies the time-honored philosophies of the East. What it is, may be found further on.

To better understand the foregoing arguments and those which follow, the reader is asked to turn to the editorial in the September *Lucifer* ("The Dual Aspect of Wisdom," p. 3), and acquaint himself with the *double aspect* of that which is termed by St James in his Third Epistle at once—the *devilish, terrestrial* wisdom, and the "wisdom from above." In another editorial, "Kosmic Mind" (April, 1890), it is also stated, that the ancient Hindus endowed every cell in the human body with consciousness, giving each the name of a God or Goddess. Speaking of atoms in the name of science and philosophy, Professor Ladd calls them in his work "*supersensible beings*." Occultism regards every atom¹ as an "independent entity" and every cell as a "conscious unit." It explains that no sooner do such atoms group to form cells, than the latter become endowed with consciousness, each of its own kind, and with *free-will to act within* the limits of law. Nor are we entirely deprived of scientific evidence for such statements as the two above-named editorials well prove. More than one learned physiologist of the golden minority, in our own day, moreover, is rapidly coming to the conviction, that memory has no seat, no special organ of its own in the human brain, but that it has *seats* in every organ of the body.

"No good ground exists for speaking of any special organ, or seat of memory," writes Professor G. T. Ladd.² "Every organ indeed, every area, and every limit of the nervous system has its own memory" (p. 553 *loc. cit.*).

The seat of memory, then, is assuredly neither here nor there, but

everywhere throughout the human body. To locate its organ in the brain is to limit and dwarf the Universal Mind and its countless Rays (*the Manasa putra*) which inform every rational mortal. As we write for Theosophists, first of all, we care little for the psychophobic prejudices of the Materialists who may read this and sniff contemptuously at the mention of "Universal Mind" and the Higher *noetic* souls of men. But, what *is* memory, we ask. "Both presentation of sense and image of memory, are transitory phases of consciousness," we are answered. But what is Consciousness itself?—we ask again. "*We cannot define Consciousness*," Professor Ladd tells us.³ Thus, that which we are asked to do by physiological psychology is, to content ourselves with controverting the various states of Consciousness by other people's private and unverifiable hypotheses; and this, on "questions of cerebral physiology *where experts and novices are alike ignorant*" to use the pointed remark of the said author. Hypothesis for hypothesis, then, we may as well hold to the teachings of our Seers, as to the conjectures of those who deny both such Seers and their wisdom. The more so, as we are told by the same honest man of science, that "if metaphysics and ethics cannot properly dictate their facts and conclusions to the science of physiological psychology ... in turn this science cannot properly dictate to meta-physics and ethics the conclusions which they shall draw from facts of Consciousness, by giving out its myths and fables in the garb of well ascertained history of the cerebral processes" (p. 544).

Now, since the metaphysics of Occult physiology and psychology postulate within mortal man an immortal entity, "divine Mind," or *Afow.y*, whose pale and too often distorted reflection is that which we call "Mind" and intellect in men—virtually an entity apart from the former during the period of every incarnation—we say that the *two* sources of "memory" are in these two "principles." These two we distinguish as the Higher Manas (Mind or Ego), and *the Kama-Manas, i.e.,* the rational, but earthly or physical intellect of man, incased in, and bound by, matter, therefore subject to the influence of the latter: the all-conscious SELF, that which reincarnates periodically—verily the WORD made flesh!—and which is always the same, while its re-

¹ One of the names of Brahma is *anu* or "atom."

² Professor of Philosophy at Yale University.

³ *Elements of Physiological Psychology.*

flected”Double,”changing with every new incarnation and personality, is, therefore, conscious but for a life-period. The latter “principle” is the *Lower Self*, or that, which manifesting through our *organic* system, acting on this plane of illusion, imagines itself the *Ego Sum*, and thus falls into what Buddhist philosophy brands as the “heresy of separateness.” The former, we term INDIVIDUALITY, the latter *Personality*. From the first proceeds all the *noetic element*, from the second, *the psychic i.e.*, “terrestrial wisdom” at best, as it is influenced by all the chaotic stimuli of the human or rather *animal passions* of the living body.

The “Higher Ego” cannot act directly on the body, as its consciousness belongs to quite another plane and planes of ideation; the “lower” Self does: and its action and behaviour *depend on its free will and choice* as to whether it will gravitate more towards its parent (“the Father in Heaven”) or the “animal” which it informs, the man of flesh. The “Higher Ego,” as part of the essence of the UNIVERSAL MIND, is unconditionally omniscient on its own plane, and only potentially so in our terrestrial sphere, as it has to act solely through its *alter ego*—the Personal Self. Now, although the former is the vehicle of all knowledge of the past, the present, and the future, and although it is from this fountain-head that it “double” catches occasional glimpses of that which is beyond the senses of man, and transmits them to certain brain cells (unknown to science in their functions), thus making of man a *Seer*, & soothsayer, and a prophet; yet the memory of bygone events—especially of the earth earthy—has its seat in the Personal Ego alone. No memory of a purely daily-life function, of a physical, egotistical, or of a lower mental nature—such as, e.g., eating and drinking, enjoying personal sensual pleasures, transacting business to the detriment of one’s neighbor, etc., etc., has aught to do with the “Higher” Mind or Ego. Nor has it any direct dealings on this physical plane with either our brain or our heart—for these two are the organs of a power higher than the *Personality*—but only with our passional organs, such as the liver, the stomach, the spleen, etc. Thus it only stands to reason that the memory of such-like events must be first awakened in that organ which was the first to induce the action remembered afterwards, and conveyed it to our “sense-thought,”

which is entirely *distinct from the “supersensuous” thought*. It is only the higher forms of the latter, the *superconscious* mental experiences, that can correlate with the cerebral and cardiac centres. The memories of physical and *selfish* (or personal) deeds, on the other hand, together with the mental experiences of a terrestrial nature, and of earthly biological functions, can, of necessity, only be correlated with the molecular constitution of various *Kamic* organs, and the “dynamical association” of the elements of the nervous system in each particular organ.

Therefore, when Professor Ladd, after showing that every element of the nervous system has a memory of its own, adds:—“This view belongs to the very essence of every theory which considers conscious mental reproduction as only one form or phase of the biological fact of organic memory”—he must include among such theories the Occult teaching. For no Occultist could express such teaching more correctly than the Professor, who says, in winding up his argument: “We might properly speak, then, of the memory of the end-organ of vision or of hearing, of the memory of the spinal cord and of the different so-called ‘centres’ of reflex action belonging to the chords of the memory of the medulla oblongata, the cerebellum, etc.” This is the essence of Occult teaching—even in the Tantra works. Indeed, every organ in our body *has its own memory*. For if it is endowed with a consciousness “of its own kind,” every cell must of necessity have also a memory of its own kind, as likewise its own *psychic* and *noetic* action. Responding to the touch of both a physical and a *metaphysical Force*,⁴ the impulse given by the *psychic* (or psycho-molecular) Force will act *from without within*; while that of the *noetic* (shall we call it spiritual-dynamical?) Force works *from within without*. For, as our body is the covering of the inner “principles,” soul, mind, life, etc., so the molecule or the cell is the body in which dwell its “principles,” the (to our senses and comprehension) immaterial atoms which compose that cell. The cell’s activity and behavior are determined by its being propelled either inwardly or outwardly, by the noetic or the psychic Force, the former having no relation to the *physical* cells proper. Therefore, while the latter act under the unavoidable law of the conservation and correlation

⁴ We fondly trust this very *unscientific* term will throw no “Animalist” into hysterics *beyond* recovery.

of physical energy, the atoms—being psycho-spiritual, *not physical units—act under laws of their own*, just as Professor Ladd's "Unit-Being," which is our "Mind-Ego," does, in his very philosophical and scientific hypothesis. Every human organ and each cell in the latter has a keyboard of its own, like that of a piano, only that it registers and emits sensations instead of sounds. Every key contains the potentiality of good or bad, of producing harmony or disharmony. This depends on the impulse given and the combinations produced; on the force of the touch of the artist at work, a "double-faced Unity," indeed. And it is the action of this or the other "Face" of the Unity that determines the nature and the dynamical character of the manifested phenomena as a resulting action, and this whether they be physical or mental. For the whole of man is guided by this double-faced Entity. If the impulse comes from the "Wisdom above," the Force applied being noetic or spiritual, the results will be actions worthy of the divine propeller; if from the "terrestrial, devilish wisdom" (psychic power), man's activities will be selfish, based solely on the exigencies of his physical, hence animal, nature. The above may sound to the average reader as pure nonsense; but every Theosophist must understand when told that there are Martians as well as kamic organs in him, although the cells of his body answer to both physical and spiritual impulses.

Verily that body, so desecrated by Materialism and man himself, is the temple of the Holy Grail, the *Adytum* of the grandest, nay, of all, the mysteries of nature in our solar universe. That body is an iEolian harp, chorded with two sets of strings, one made of pure silver, the other of catgut. When the breath from the divine Fiat brushes softly over the former, man becomes like into /mGod— but the other set feels it not. It needs the breeze of a stronger terrestrial wind, impregnated with animal effluvia, to set its animal chords vibrating. It is the function of the physical, lower mind to act upon the physical organs and their cells; but, it is the higher mind *alone* which can influence the atoms interacting in those cells, which inter-action is alone capable of exciting the brain, *via the spinal "centre" cord, to a mental representation of spiritual ideas far beyond any objects on this material plane.* The phenomena of divine consciousness have to be regarded as

activities of four minds on another and a higher plane, working through something less substantial than the moving molecules of the brain. They cannot be explained as the simple resultant of the cerebral physiological process, as indeed the latter only condition them or give them a final form for purposes of concrete manifestation. Occultism teaches that the liver and the spleen-cells are the most subservient to the action of our "personal" mind, the heart being the organ *par excellence* through which the "Higher" Ego acts—through the Lower Self.

Nor can the visions or memory of purely terrestrial events be transmitted directly through the mental perceptions of the brain—the direct recipient of the impressions of the heart. All such recollections have to be first stimulated by and awakened in the organs which were the originators, as already stated, of the various causes that led to the results, or, the direct recipients and participators of the latter. In other words, if what is called "association of ideas" has much to do with the awakening of memory, the mutual interaction and consistent interrelation between the personal "Mind-Entity" and the organs of the human body have far more so. A hungry stomach evokes the vision of a past banquet, because its action is reflected and repeated in the *personal* mind. But even before the memory of the personal Self radiates the vision from the tablets wherein are stored the experiences of one's daily life—even to the minutest details—the memory of the stomach has already evoked the same. And so with all the organs of the body. It is they which originate according to their animal needs and desire the electro-vital sparks that illuminate the field of consciousness in the Lower Ego; and it is these sparks which in their turn awaken to function the reminiscences in it. The whole human body is, as said, a vast sounding board, in which each cell bears a long record of impressions connected with its parent organ, and each cell has a memory and a consciousness of its kind, or call it instinct if you will. These impressions are, according to the nature of the organ, physical, psychic, or mental, as they relate to this or another plane. They may be called "states of consciousness" only for the want of a better expression—as there are state of instinctual, mental, and purely abstract, or spiritual consciousness. If we trace all such "psychic" actions to brain-work, it is only because in that mansion

called the human body the brain is the front-door, and the only one which opens out into Space. All the others are inner doors, openings in the private building, through which there are incessantly the transmitting agents of memory and sensation. The clearness, the vividness, and intensity of these depend on the state of health and the organic soundness of the transmitters. But their reality, in the sense of truthfulness or correctness due to the "principle" they originate from, and the preponderance in the Lower *Manas* of the *noetic* or of the *phrenic* ("Kamic," terrestrial) element.

For, as Occultism teaches, if the Higher Mind-Entity—the permanent and the immortal—is of the divine homogeneous essence of "Alaya-Akasa,"⁵ or Mahat,—its reflection, the Personal Mind, is, as a temporary "principle," of the Substance of the Astral Light. As a pure ray of the "Son of the Universal Mind," it could perform no function in the body, and would remain powerless over the turbulent organs of Matter. Thus, while its inner constitution is Manasic, its "body," or rather functioning essence, is heterogeneous, and leavened with the Astral light, the lowest element of Ether. It is a part of the mission of the Manasic Ray, to get gradually rid of the blind, deceptive element which, though it makes of it an active spiritual entity on this plane, still brings it into so close contact with matter as to entirely becloud its divine nature and stultify its intuitions.

This leads us to see the difference between the pure noetic and the terrestrial psychic visions of seership and mediumship. The former can be obtained by one of two means; (a) on the condition of paralyzing at will the *memory* and the instinctual, independent action of all the material organs and even cells in the body of flesh, an act which, once that the light of the Higher Ego has consumed and subjected for ever the passionate nature of the personal, lower Ego, is easy, but requires an adept; and (b) of being a reincarnation of one, who, in a previous birth, had attained through extreme purity of life and efforts in the right direction almost to a *Yogistatt* of holiness and saintship. There is also a third possibility of reaching in mystic visions the plane of the higher *Manas*; but it is only occasional and does not depend on the

will of the Seer, but on the extreme weakness and exhaustion of the material body through illness and suffering. The Seeress of Prevorst was an instance of the latter case; and Jacob Boehme of our second category. In all other cases of abnormal seership, of so-called clairaudience, clairvoyance and trances, it is simply—*mediums hip*.

Now what is a medium? The term medium, when not applied simply to things and objects, is supposed to be a person through whom the action of another person or being is either manifested or transmitted. Spiritualists believing in communications with disembodied spirits, and that these can manifest through, or impress sensitive to transmit "messages" from them, regard mediumship as a blessing and a great privilege. We Theosophists, on the other hand, who do not believe in the "communion of spirits" as Spiritualists do, regard the gift as one of the most dangerous of abnormal nervous diseases. A medium is simply one in whose personal Ego, or terrestrial mind, (*psuche*), the percentage of "astral" light so preponderates as to impregnate with it their whole physical constitution. Every organ and cell thereby is attuned, so to speak, and subjected to an enormous and abnormal tension. The mind is ever on the plane of, and quite immersed in, that deceptive light whose source is divine, but whose body—the light waves on the lower planes, infernal; for they are but the black and disfigured reflections of the earth's memories.

The untrained eye of the poor sensitive cannot pierce the dark mist, the dense fog of the terrestrial emanations, to see beyond in the radiant field of the eternal truths. His vision is out of focus. His senses, accustomed from his birth, like those of a native of the London slums, to stench and filth, to the unnatural distortions of sights and images tossed on the kaleidoscopic waves of the astral plane—are unable to discern the true from the false. And thus, the pale soulless corpses moving in the trackless fields of "Kama loka," appear to him the living images of the "dear departed" ones; the broken echoes of once human voices, passing through his mind, suggest to him well coordinated phrases, which he repeats, in ignorance that their final form and polish were received in the innermost depths of his own brain-factory. And hence the sight and the hearing of that which if seen in its true nature would have struck the medium's heart cold with horror,

⁵ Another name for the universal mind.

now fills him with a sense of beatitude and confidence. He really believes that the immeasurable vistas displayed before him are the real spiritual world, the abode of the blessed disembodied angels.

We describe the broad main features and facts of mediumship, there being no room in such an article for exceptional cases. We maintain—having unfortunately passed at one period *of life personally through such* experiences—that on the whole, mediumship is most dangerous; and *psychic* experiences when accepted indiscriminately lead only to honestly deceiving others, because the medium is the first self-deceived victim. Moreover, a too close association with the “Old Terrestrial Serpent” is infectious. Theodic and magnetic currents of the Astral Light often incite to murder, drunkenness, immorality, and, as Eliphas Levi expresses it, the not altogether pure natures “can be driven headlong by the blind forces set in motion in the *Light*”—by the errors and sins imposed on its waves.

And this is how the great Mage of the XIXth century corroborates the foregoing when speaking of the Astral Light:

“We have said that to acquire magical power, two things are necessary: to disengage the will from all servitude, and to exercise it in control.

“The sovereign will (of the adept) is represented in our symbols by the woman who crushes the serpent’s head, and by the resplendent angel who represses the dragon, and holds him under his foot and spear; the great magical agent, the dual current of light, the living and astral *fire* of the earth, has been represented in the ancient theogonies by the serpent with the head of a bull, a ram, or a dog. It is the double serpent of the *caduceus*, it is the Old Serpent of *Genesis*, but it is also the *brazen serpent of Moses* entwined around the *tau*, that is to say, the generative *lingha*. It is also the goat of the witch-sabbath, and the Baphomet of the Templars; it is the *Hyle* of the Gnostics; it is the double-tailed serpent which forms the legs of the solar cock of the Abraxas: finally, it is the Devil of M. Eudes de Mirville. But in very fact it is the blind force which souls (*i.e.*, the lower *Manas* or *Nephesh*) have to conquer to liberate themselves from the bonds of the earth; for if their will does not free ‘them from this *fatal attraction*, they will be absorbed in the current by the force which has produced them, and *will return to the central and eternal fire*.’”⁶

The “central and eternal fire” is that disintegrating Force, that gradually consumes and burns out the ATflmtf-rw/?tf, or “personality,”

in the Kama-loka, whither it goes after death. And verily, the Mediums are attracted by the astral light, it is the direct cause of their persona “souls” being absorbed “by the force which has produced” their terrestrial elements. And, therefore, as the same Occultist tells us:

“All the magical operations consist in *freeing* one’s self from the coils of the Ancient Serpent; then to place the foot on its head, and lead it according to the operator’s will. ‘I will give unto thee,’ says the Serpent, in the Gospel myth, ‘all the kingdoms of the earth, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.’ The initiated should reply to him, ‘I will not fall down, but thou shalt crouch at my feet; thou wilt give me nothing, but I will make use of thee and take whatever I wish. For *I am thy Lord and Master!*’”

And as such, the *Personal Ego*, becoming at one with its divine parent, shares in the immortality of the latter. Otherwise. . .

Enough, however. Blessed is he who has acquainted himself with the dual powers at work in the ASTRAL Light; thrice blessed he who has learned to discern the *Noetic* from the *Psychic* action of the “Double-Faced” God in him, and who knows the potency of his own Spirit—or “Soul Dynamics.”

⁶ *Dogma et Rituel de la Haute Magie*, quoted in *Isis Unveiled*.

Lucifer, September 1890

THE DUAL ASPECT OF WISDOM

No doubt but ye are the people and wisdom
shall die with you.

JOB xii. 2.

But wisdom is justified of her children.

MATTHEW Xi. 19.

IT is the privilege—as also occasionally the curse—of editors to receive numerous letters of advice, and the conductors of *Lucifer* have not escaped the common lot. Reared in the aphorisms of the ages they are aware that “he who can take advice is superior to him who gives it,” and are therefore ready to accept with gratitude any sound and practical suggestions offered by friends; but the last letter received does not fulfil the condition. It is not even his own wisdom, but that of the age we live in, which is asserted by our adviser, who thus seriously risks his reputation for keen observation by such acts of devotion on the altar of modern pretensions. It is in defence of the “wisdom” of our century that we are taken to task, and charged with “preferring barbarous antiquity to our modern civilization and its inestimable boons,” with forgetting that “our own-day wisdom compared with the awakening instincts of the Past is in no way inferior in *philosophic wisdom* even to the age of Plato.” We are lastly told that we, Theosophists, are “too fond of the dim yesterday, and as unjust to our glorious (?) present-day, the bright noon-hour of the highest civilization and culture”!!

Well, all this is a question of taste. Our correspondent is welcome to his own views, but so are we to ours. Let him imagine that the Eiffel Tower dwarfs the Pyramid of Ghizeh into a mole-hill, and the Crystal Palace grounds transform the hanging gardens of Semiramis into a kitchen-garden—if he likes. But if we are seriously “challenged” by

him to show “in what respect our age of hourly progress and gigantic thought”—a progress a trifle marred, however, by our Huxleys being denounced by our Spurgeons, and the University ladies, senior classics and wranglers, by the “hallelujah lasses”—is inferior to the ages of, say, a hen-pecked “Socrates and a crosslegged Buddha,” then we will answer him, giving him, of course, our own personal opinion.

Our age, we say, is inferior in Wisdom to any other, because it professes, more visibly every day, *contempt for truth and justice, without which there can be no Wisdom*. Because our civilization, built up of shams and appearances, is at best like a beautiful green morass, a bog, spread over a deadly quagmire. Because this century of culture and worship of matter, while offering prizes and premiums for every “best thing” under the Sun, from the biggest baby and the largest orchid down to the strongest pugilist and the fattest pig, has no encouragement to offer to morality; no prize to give for any moral virtue. Because it has Societies for the prevention of physical cruelty to animals, and none with the object of preventing the moral cruelty practised on human beings. Because it encourages legally and tacitly, vice under every form, from the sale of whiskey down to forced prostitution and theft brought on by starvation wages, Shylock-like exactions, rents and other comforts of our cultured period. Because, finally, this is the age which, although proclaimed as one of physical and moral freedom, is in truth the age of the most ferocious moral and mental slavery, the like of which was never known before. Slavery to State and *men* has disappeared only to make room for slavery to *things* and *Self* to one’s own vices and idiotic social customs and ways. Rapid civilization, adapted to the needs of the higher and middle classes, has doomed by contrast to only greater wretchedness the starving masses. Having levelled the two former it has made them the more to disregard the substance in favor of form and appearance, thus forcing modern man into duress vile, a slavish dependence on things inanimate, to use and to serve which is the first bounden duty of every *cultured* man.

Where then is the Wisdom of our modern age?

In truth, it requires but a very few lines to show why we bow before ancient Wisdom, while refusing absolutely to see any in our modern

civilization. But to begin with, what does our critic mean by the word “wisdom”? Though we have never too unreasonably admired Lactantius, yet we must recognize that even that innocent Church Father, with all his cutting insults against the heliocentric system, defined the term very correctly when saying that “the first point of Wisdom is to discern that which is false, and the second, to know that which is true.” And if so, what chance is there for our century of falsification, from the revised Bible texts down to natural butter, to put forth a claim to “Wisdom”? But before we cross lances on this subject we may do well, perchance, to define the term ourselves.

Let us premise by saying that Wisdom is, at best, an elastic word—at any rate as used in European tongues. That it yields no clear idea of its meaning, unless preceded or followed by some qualifying adjective. In the Bible, indeed, the Hebrew equivalent *Chokmah* (in Greek, *Sophia*) is applied to the most dissimilar things—abstract and concrete. Thus we find “Wisdom” as the characteristic both of divine inspiration and also of terrestrial cunning and craft; as meaning the Secret Knowledge of the Esoteric Sciences, and also blind faith; the “fear of the Lord,” and Pharaoh’s magicians. The noun is indifferently applied to Christ and to sorcery, for the witch Sedecla is also referred to as the “wise woman of En-Dor.” From the earliest Christian antiquity, beginning with St. James (iii, 13-17), down to the last Calvinist preacher, who sees in hell and eternal damnation a proof of “the Almighty’s wisdom” “the term has been used with the most varied meanings. But St. James teaches two kinds of wisdom; a teaching with which we fully concur. He draws a strong line of separation between the divine or *noetic* “*Sophia*”—the Wisdom from above—and the terrestrial, psychic, and devilish wisdom (iii, 15). For the true Theosophist there is no wisdom save the former. Would that such a one could declare with Paul, that he speaks that wisdom exclusively only among them “that are perfect,” 7.6, those initiated into its mysteries, or familiar, at least, with the ABC of the sacred sciences. But, however great was his mistake, however premature his attempt to sow the seeds of *the true and eternal gnosis* on unprepared soil, his motives were yet good and his intention unselfish, and therefore has he been stoned. For had he only attempted to preach

some particular fiction of his own, or done it for gain, who would have ever singled him out or tried to crush him, amid the hundreds of other false sects, daily “collections” and crazy “societies”? But his case was different. However cautiously, still he spoke “not the wisdom of his world” but *truth* or the “hidden wisdom . . . which none of the Princes of this World know (I Corinth. ii,) least of all the *archons* of our modern science. With regard to “psychic” wisdom, however, which James defines as terrestrial and devilish, it has existed in all ages, from the days of Pythagoras and Plato, when for one *philosophus* there were nine *sophistae*, down to our modern era. To such wisdom our century is welcome, and indeed fully entitled, to lay a claim. Moreover, it is an attire easy to put on; there never was a period when crows refused to array themselves in peacock’s feathers, if the opportunity was offered.

But now, when we have a right to analyze the terms used and enquire in the words of the book of Job, that suggestive allegory of Karmic purification and initiatory rites: “Where shall (true) wisdom be found? Where is the place of understanding?” and to answer again in his words: “With the ancient is wisdom and in the length of days understanding” (Job xxviii, 12 and xii, 12).

Here we have to qualify once more a dubious term, viz: the word “ancient,” and to explain it. As interpreted by the orthodox churches, it has in the mouth of Job one meaning; but with the Kabalist, quite another; while in the Gnosis of the Occultist and Theosophist it has distinctly a third signification, the same which it had in the original *Book of Job*, a pre-Mosaic work and a recognized treatise on Initiation. Thus, the Kabalist applies the adjective “ancient” to the Manifested WORD or LOGOS (*Dabar*) of the for ever concealed and un-cognizable deity. Daniel, in one of his visions, also uses it when speaking of Jahve—the androgynous Adam Kadmon. The Churchman connects it with his anthropomorphic Jehovah, the “Lord God” of the *translated Bible*. But the Eastern Occultist employs the mystic term only when referring to the re-incarnating higher Ego For, divine Wisdom being diffused throughout the infinite Universe, and our impersonal HIGHER SELF being an integral part of it, the *atmic* light of the latter can be centered only in that which though eternal is still individualized—

/e.,the noeticPrinciple,the manifested God within each rationalbeing, or our Higher *Manas* at one with *Bud-dhi*. It is the collective light which is the “Wisdom that is from above,” and which whenever it descends on the personal Ego, is found “pure, peaceable, gentle “ Hence, Job’s assertion that “Wisdom is with the Ancient,” or *Buddhi-Manas*. For the Divine Spiritual “I,” is alone eternal, and the same throughout all births; whereas the “personalities” it informs in succession are evanescent, changing like the shadows of a kaleidoscopic series of forms in a magic lantern. It is the “Ancient,” because, whether it be called Sophia, Krishna, Buddhi-Manas or Christos, it is ever the “first-born” of *Alaya-Mahat*, the Universal Soul and the Intelligence of the Universe. Esoterically then job’s statement must read: “With the Ancient (man’s Higher Ego) *is* Wisdom, and in the length of days (or the number of its re-incarnations) is understanding.” No man can learn true and final Wisdom in one birth; and every new rebirth, whether we be reincarnated for weal or for woe, is one more lesson we received at the hands of the stern yet ever just schoolmaster—
KARMIC LIFE.

But the world—the Western world,at any rate—knowsnothingof this,and refuses to learn anything. For it, any notion of the Divine Ego or the plurality of its birthsis”heathen foolishness. “TheWest-ernworldrejectsthesetruths, and will recognize no *wise* men except thoseofitsownmaking,createdinitsown image,born within its own Christian era and teachings. The only “wisdom” it understandsand practises is the psychic,the”terrestrial and devilish” wisdom spoken of by James, thus making of the *real* Wisdom a misnomer and a degradation. Yet,without consideringher multiplied varieties,there are two kinds of even”terrestrial” wisdom on our globe of mud— the real and the apparent. Between the two, there is even for the superficial observer of this busy wicked world, a wide chasm, and yet how very few people will consent to see it! The reason for this is quite natural. So strong is human selfishness,that whereverthere is the smallest personal interest at stake,there men become deaf and blind to the truth,as often consciously as not. Nor are many people capable of recognizing as speedily as is advisable the difference between men who are wise and those who only *seem* wise, the latter beingchiefly

regarded as such because they are very clever at blowingtheirowntrumpet. So much for”wisdom”in the profane world.

As to the world of the students in mystic lore,it is almost worse. Things have strangely altered since the days of antiquity, when the truly wisemade it their first duty to conceal their knowledge,deem-ing it too sacred to even mention before the *hoi poJloi*. While the mediaeval *Rosecroix*, the true philosopher, keeping old Socrates in mind, repeated daily that all he knew was that he knewnothing,his modern self-styled successor announces in our day, through press and public, that those mysteries in Nature and her Occult laws of which he knows nothing,havenever existed at all.There was a time when the acquirement of Divine Wisdom (*Sapientia*) required the sacrifice and devotion of a man’s whole life. It depended on such things as the purity of the candidate’s motives, on his fearlessness and independence of spirit;but now, to receive a patent for wisdom and adeptship requires only unblushing impudence. A certificate of divine wisdom is now decreed, and delivered to a self-styled “*Adeptus*” by a regular majority of votes of profane and easily caught gulls, while a host of magpies driven away from the roof of the Temple of Science will herald it to the world in every marketplace and fair. Tell the public that now, even as of old, the genuine andsincereobserverof life and its underlyingphenomena,theintel-ligent co-worker with nature, may, by becoming an expert in her mysteries thereby become a “wise” man, in the terrestrial sense of the word, but that never will a *materialist* wrench from nature any secret on a higher plane—and you will be laughed to scorn. Add, that no “wisdom from above”descends on any one save on *thesine qua non* condition of leaving at the threshold of the Occult every atom of selfishness,or desire for personalendsandbenefit—andyou will be speedily declared byyouraudienceacandidateforthelunatic asylum. Nevertheless, this is an old, very old truism. Nature gives up her innermost secrets and imparts *true wisdom* only to him,who seeks truth for its own sake,and who craves for knowledge in order toconfer benefits onothers,notonhisown unimportant personality. And,asit is preciselylothis *personal benefit*that nearlyeverycandi-date for adeptship and magic looks,and that few are they,who consent to learn

at such a heavy price and so small a benefit for themselves in prospect—the really wise Occultists become with every century fewer and rarer. How many are there, indeed, who would not prefer the will-o'-the-wisp of even passing fame to the steady and ever-growing light of eternal divine knowledge, if the latter has to remain, for all but oneself—a light under the bushel?

The same is the case in the world of materialistic science, where we see a great paucity of really learned men and a host of skin-deep scientists, who yet demand each and all to be regarded as Archimedes and Newtons. As above so below. Scholars who pursue knowledge for the sake of truth and fact, and give these out, however unpalatable, and not for the dubious glory of enforcing on the world their respective personal hobbies—may be counted on the fingers of one hand: while legion is the name of the pretenders. In our day, reputations for learning seem to be built by suggestion on the hypnotic principle, rather than by real merit. The masses cower before him who imposes himself upon them: hence such a galaxy of men regarded as eminent in science, arts and literature; and if they are so easily accepted, it is precisely because of the gigantic self-opinionatedness and self-assertion of, at any rate, the majority of them. Once thoroughly analyzed, however, how many of such would remain who truly deserve the appellation of "wise" even in terrestrial wisdom? How many, we ask, of the so-called "authorities" and "leaders of men" would prove much better than those of whom it was said—by one "wise" indeed—"they be blind leaders of the blind?" That the teachings of neither our modern teachers nor preachers are "wisdom from above" is fully demonstrated. It is proved not by any personal incorrectness in their statements or mis-takes in life, for "to err is but human," but by incontrovertible facts. *Wisdom* and *Wisdom* are synonymous terms, and that which is false or pernicious cannot be *wise*. Therefore, if it is true, as we are told by a well-known representative of the Church of England, that *the Sermon on the Mount* would, in its practical application, mean utter ruin for his country in less than three weeks; and if it is no less true, as asserted by a literary critic of science, that "the knell of Charles Darwinism is rung in Mr. A.R. Wallace's present

book,"¹ an event already predicted by Quatrefages—then we are left to choose between two courses. We have either to take both Theology and Science on blind faith and trust; or, to proclaim both untrue and untrustworthy. There is, however, a third course open: to *pretend that we believe in both at the same time*, and say nothing, as many do; but this would be sinning against Theosophy and pandering to the prejudices of Society—and that we refuse to do. More than this: we declare openly, *quand meme*, that not one of the two, neither Theologist nor Scientist, has the right in the face of this to claim, the one that he preaches that which is divine inspiration, and the other—exact science; since the former enforces that, which is on his own recognition, pernicious to men and states—i.e., the ethics of Christ; and the other (in the person of the eminent naturalist, Mr. A.R. Wallace, as shown by Mr. Samuel Butler) teaches Darwinian evolution, in which he believes no longer; a scheme, moreover, *which has never existed in nature*, if the opponents of Darwinism are correct.

Nevertheless, if anyone would presume to call "unwise" or "false" the world-chosen authorities, or declare their respective policies dishonest, he would find himself promptly reduced to silence. To doubt the exalted wisdom of the religion of the late Cardinal Newman, or of the Church of England, or again of our great modern scientists, is to sin against the Holy Ghost and Culture. Woe unto him who refuses to recognize the World's "Elect." He has to bow before one or the other, though, if one is true, the other must be false; and if the "wisdom" of neither Bishop nor Scientist is "from above"—which is pretty fairly demonstrated by this time—then their "wisdom" is at best—"terrestrial, psychic, devilish."

Now our readers have to bear in mind that nought of the above is meant as a sign of disrespect for the *true* teachings of Christ, or *true* science: nor do we judge personalities but only the systems of our civilized world. Valuing freedom of thought above all things as the only way of reaching at some future time that Wisdom, of which every Theosophist ought to be enamored, we recognize the right to the same freedom in our foes as in our friends. All we contend for is

¹ See "The Deadlock of Darwinism," by Samuel Butler, in the *Universal Review* for April, 1890.

their claim to Wisdom—as we understand this term. Nor do we blame, but rather pity, in our innermost heart, the “wise men” of our age for trying to carry out the only policy that will keep them on the pinnacle of their “authority”; as they could not, if even they would, act otherwise and preserve their *prestige* with the masses, or escape from being speedily outcast by their colleagues. The party spirit is so strong with regard to the old tracks and ruts, that to turn on a side path means deliberate treachery to it. Thus, to be regarded now-a-days as an authority in some particular subject, the scientist has to reject *volens nolens* the metaphysical, and the theologian to show contempt for the materialistic teachings. All this is worldly policy and practical common sense, but it is not the *Wisdom of either Job or James*.

Shall it be then regarded as too far fetched, if, basing our words on a life-long observation and experience, we venture to offer our ideas as to the quickest and most efficient means of obtaining our present World’s universal respect and becoming an “authority”? Show the tenderest regard for the corns of every party’s hobbies, and offer yourself as the chief executioner, the hangman, of the reputations of men and things regarded as unpopular. Learn, that the great secret of power consists in the art of pandering to popular prejudices, to the World’s likes and dislikes. Once this principal condition complied with, he who practises it is certain of attracting to himself the educated and their satellites—the less educated—they whose rule it is to place themselves invariably on the safe side of public opinion. This will lead to a perfect harmony or simultaneous action. For, while the favorite attitude of the cultured is to hide behind the intellectual bulwarks of the favorite leaders of scientific thought, and *jurare in verba magistri*, that of the less cultured is to transform themselves into the faithful, mechanical telephones of their superiors, and to repeat like well-trained parrots the *dicta* of their immediate leaders. The now aphoristical precept of Mr. Artemus Ward, the showman of famous memory — “scratch my back, Mr Editor, and I will scratch yours”—proves immortally true. The “rising Star,” whether he be a theologian, a politician, an author, a scientist, or a journalist—has to begin scratching the back of public tests and

prejudices—a hypnotic method as old as human vanity. Gradually the hypnotized masses begin to purr, they are ready for “suggestion.” Suggest whatever you want them to believe, and forthwith they will begin to return your caresses, and purr now to your hobbies, and pander in their turn to anything suggested by theologian, politician, author, scientist, or journalist. Such is the simple secret of blossoming into an “authority” or a “leader of men”; and such is the secret of our modern-day wisdom.

And this is also the “secret” and the true reason of the *unpopularity* of *Lucifer* and of the ostracism practised by this same modern world on the Theosophical Society: for neither *Lucifer*, nor the Society it belongs to, has ever followed Mr. Artemus Ward’s golden precept. No true Theosophist, in fact, would consent to become the fetish of a fashionable doctrine, any more than he would make himself the slave of a decaying dead-letters system, the spirit from which has disappeared for ever. Neither would he pander to anyone or anything, and therefore would always decline to show belief in that in which he does not, nor can he believe, which is lying to his own soul. Therefore there, where others see “the beauty and graces of modern culture,” the Theosophist sees only moral ugliness and the somersaults of the clowns of these so-called cultured centres. For him nothing applies better to modern fashionable society than Sydney Smith’s description of Popish ritualism: “Posture and imposture, flections and genuflections, bowing to the right, curtsying to the left, and an immense amount of male (and especially female) millinery.” There may be, no doubt, for some worldly minds, a great charm in modern civilization; but for the Theosophist all its bounties can hardly repay for the evils it has brought on the world. These are so many, that it is not within the limits of this article to enumerate these offsprings of culture and of the progress of physical science, whose latest achievements begin with vivisection and end in improved murder by electricity.

Our answer, we have no doubt, is not calculated to make us more friends than enemies, but this can be hardly helped. Our magazine may be looked upon as “pessimistic,” but no one can charge it with publishing slanders or lies, or, in fact, anything but that which we honestly believe to be true. Be it as it may, however, we hope never

to lack moral courage in the expression of four opinions or in defence of Theosophy and its Society. Let then nine-tenths of every population arise in arms against the Theosophical Society wherever it appears—they will never be able to suppress the truths it utters. Let the masses of growing Materialism, the hosts of Spiritualism, all the Church-going congregations, bigots and iconoclasts, Grundy-worshippers, aping-followers and blind disciples, let them slander, abuse, lie, denounce, and publish every falsehood about us under the sun—they will not uproot Theosophy, nor even upset her Society, if only its members hold together. Let even such friends and *advisers as* he who is now answered, turn away in disgust from those whom head-dresses in vain—it matters not, for our two paths in life run diametrically opposite. Let him keep to his “terrestrial” wisdom: we will keep to that pure ray “that comes from above,” from the light of the “Ancient.”

What indeed, has WISDOM, *Theosophia*—the Wisdom “full of mercy and good fruits, without wrangling or partiality and without hypocrisy” (James iii, 17)—to do with our cruel, selfish, crafty, and hypocritical world? What is there in common between divine Sophia and the improvements of modern civilization and science; between spirit and the letter that killeth? The more so as at this stage of evolution the wisest man on earth, according to the wise Carlyle, is “but a clever infant spelling letters from a hieroglyphical, prophetic book, the lexicon of which lies in *eternity*.”

Lucifer, December 1888

DIALOGUES BETWEEN THE TWO EDITORS

ON ASTRAL BODIES, OR DOPPELGANGERS

MC, Great confusion exists in the minds of people about the various kinds of apparitions, wraiths, ghosts or spirits. • Ought we not to explain once for all the meaning of these terms? You say there are various kinds of “doubles”—what are they?

H.P.B. Our occult philosophy teaches us that there are three kinds of “doubles,” to use the word in its widest sense. (I) Man has his “double” or *shadow, properly* so called, around which the physical body of *the foetus*—the future man—is built. The imagination of the mother, or an accident which affects the child, will affect also the astral body. The astral and the physical both exist before the mind is developed into action, and before the Atma awakes. This occurs when the child is seven years old, and with it comes the responsibility attaching to a conscious sentient being. This “double” is born with man, dies with him and can never separate itself far from the body during life, and though surviving him, it disintegrates, *pari passu*, with the corpse. It is this which is sometimes seen over the graves like a luminous figure of the man that was, during certain atmospheric conditions. From its physical aspect it is, during life, *man’s vital double*, and after death, only the gases given off from the decaying body. But, as regards its origin and essence, it is something more. This “double” is what we have agreed to call *lingasarira*, but which I would propose to call, for greater convenience, “Protean” or “Plastic Body.”

M.C. Why Protean or Plastic?

H.P.B. Protean, because it can assume all forms; *e.g.* the “shepherd magicians” whom popular rumour accuses, perhaps not without

some reason, of being “were-wolves,” and “mediums in cabinets,” whose own “Plastic Bodies” play the part of materialised grandmothers and “John Kings.” Otherwise, why the invariable custom of the “dear departed angels” to come out but little further than arm’s length from the medium, whether entranced or not? Mind, I do not at all deny foreign influences in this kind of phenomena. But I do affirm that foreign interference is rare, and that the materialised form is always that of the medium’s “Astral” or Protean body.

M.C. But how is this astral body created?

H.P.B. It is not created: it grows, as I told you, with the man and exists in the rudimentary condition even before the child is born.

M.C. And what about the second?

H.P.B. The second is the “Thought” body, or Dream body, rather; known among Occultists as the *Mayavi-rupa*, or “Illusion-body.” During life this image is the vehicle both of thought and of the animal passions and desires, drawing at one and the same time from the lowest terrestrial matter (mind) and Aether, the element of desire. It is in its potentiality, and after death forms what is called in the East, *Bhoot*, or *Kama-rupa*, but which is better known to theosophists as the “Spook.”

M.C. And the third?

H.P.B. The third is the true *Ego*, called in the East by a name meaning “causal body” but which in the *rdTw*-Himalayan schools is always called the “Karmic body,” which is the same. For *Karma* or action is the cause which produces incessant rebirths or “reincarnations.” It is not the *Monad*, nor is *Manas* proper; but it is, in a way, indissolubly connected with, and a compound of the *Monad* and *Manas* in *Devachan*.

M.C. Then there are three doubles?

H.P.B. If you can call the Christian and other Trinities “three Gods,” then there are three doubles. But in truth there is only one under three aspects or phases: the most material portion disappearing with the body; the middle one, surviving both as an independent, but temporary entity in the land of shadows; the third, immortal, throughout

the *manvantara* unless Nirvana puts an end to it before.

M.C. But shall not we be asked what difference there is between the *Mayavi* and *Kama rupa*, or as you propose to call them the “Dream body” and the “Spook”?

H.P.B. Most likely, and we shall answer, in addition to what has been said, that the “thought power” or aspect of the *Mayavi* “-sion body,” merges after death entirely into the causal body or the conscious, *thinking* EGO. The animal elements, or power of desire of the “Dream body,” absorbing after death that which it has collected (through its insatiable desire *to live*) during life; *i.e.*, all the astral vitality as well as all the impressions of its *material* acts and thoughts while it lived in possession of the body, form the “Spook” or *Kama rupa*. Our Theosophists know well enough that after death the *higher* *Manas* unites with the *Monad* and passes into *Devachan*, while the dregs of the *lower manas* or animal mind go to form this Spook. This has life in it, but hardly any consciousness, except, as it were by proxy, when it is drawn into the current of medium.

M.C. Is it all that can be said upon the subject?

H.P.B. For the present this is enough metaphysics, I guess. Let us hold to the “Double” in its earthly phase. What would you know?

M.C. Every country in the world believes more or less in the “double” or *doppelgänger*. The simplest form of this is the appearance of a man’s phantom, the moment after his death, or at the instant of death, to his dearest friend. Is this appearance the *mayavi rupa*?

H.P.B. It is; because produced by the thought of the dying man

M.C. Is it unconscious?

H.P.B. It is unconscious to the extent that the dying man does not generally do it knowingly; nor is he aware that he so appears. What happens is this. If he thinks very intently at the moment of death of the person he either is very anxious to see, or loves best, he may appear to that person. The thought becomes objective; the double, or shadow of a man, being nothing but the faithful reproduction of him, like a reflection in a mirror, that which the man does, even in thought, that the double repeats. This is why the phantoms are often seen in such

cases in the cloth they wear at the particular moment, and the *image* reproduces even the expression on the dying man's face. If the double of a man bathing were seen it would seem to be immersed in water; so when a man who has been drowned appears to his friend, the image will be seen to be dripping with water. The cause for the apparition may be also reversed; i.e., the dying man may or may not be thinking at all of the particular person his image appears to, but it is that person who is sensitive. Or perhaps his sympathy or his hatred for the individual whose wraith is thus evoked is very intense physically or psychically; and in this case the apparition is created by, and depends upon, the intensity of the thought. What then happens is this. Let us call the dying man A, and him who sees the double B.

The latter, owing to love, hate, or fear, has the image of A so deeply impressed on his psychic memory, that actual magnetic attraction and repulsion are established between the two, whether one knows of it and feels it, or not. When A dies, the sixth sense or psychic spiritual intelligence of the *inner man* in B becomes cognisant of the change in A, and forthwith apprizes the physical senses of the man, by projecting before his eye the form of A, as it is at the instant of the great change. The same when the dying man longs to see some one; *his* thought telegraphs to his friend, consciously or unconsciously along the wire of sympathy, and becomes objective. This is what the "Spookical" Research Society would pompously, but none the less muddily, call *telepathic impact*.

M.C. This applies to the simplest form of the appearance of the double. What about cases in which the double does that which is contrary to the feeling and wish of the man?

H.P.B. This is impossible. The "Double" cannot act, unless the keynote of this action was struck in the brain of the man to whom the "Double" belongs, be that man just dead, or alive, in good or in bad health. If he paused on the thought a second, long enough to give it form, before he passed on to other mental pictures, this one second is sufficient for the *objectivizations* of his personality on the astral waves, as for your face to impress itself on the sensitized plate of a photographic apparatus. Nothing prevents your form, then, being seized upon by the surrounding Forces—as a dry leaf fallen from a tree

is taken up and carried away by the wind—being made to caricature or distort your thought

M.C. Supposing the double expresses in actual words a thought uncongenial to the man, and expresses it—let us say to a friend far away, perhaps on another continent? I have known instances of this occurring

H.P.B. Because it then so happens that the created image is taken up and used by a "Shell." Just as in seance-rooms when "images" of the dead—which may perhaps be lingering unconsciously in the memory or even the auras of those present—are seized upon by the Elements or Elementary Shadows and made objective to the audience, and even caused to act at the bidding of the strongest of the many different wills in the room. In your case, moreover, there must exist a connecting link—a telegraph wire—between the two persons, a point of psychic sympathy, and on this the thought travels instantly. Of course there must be, in every case, some strong reason why that particular thought takes that direction; it must be connected in some way with the other person. Otherwise such apparitions would be of common and daily occurrence

M.C. This seems very simple; why then does it only occur with exceptional persons?

H.P.B. Because the plastic power of the imagination is much stronger in some persons than in others. The mind is dual in its potentiality: it is physical and metaphysical. The higher part of the mind is connected with the spiritual soul or Buddhi, the lower with the animal soul, the Kama principle. There are persons who never think with the higher faculties of their mind at all; those who do so are the minority and are thus, in a way, *beyond*, if not above, the average of humankind. These will think even upon ordinary matters on that *higher* plane. The idiosyncrasy of the person determines in which "principle" of the mind the thinking is done, as also the faculties of a preceding life, and sometimes the heredity of the physical. This is why it is so very difficult for a materialist—the metaphysical portion of whose brain is almost atrophied—to raise himself, or for one who is naturally spiritually minded, to descend to the level of the matter-of-

fact vulgar thought. Optimism and pessimism depend on it also in a large measure.

M.C. But the habit of thinking in the higher mind can be developed—else there would be no hope for persons who wish to alter their lives and raise themselves? And that this is possible must be true, or there would be no hope for the world.

H.P.B. Certainly it can be developed, but only with great difficulty, a firm determination, and through much self-sacrifice. But it is comparatively easy for those who are born with the gift. Why is it that one person sees poetry in a cabbage or a pig with her little ones, while another will perceive in the loftiest things only their lowest and most material aspect, will laugh at the "music of the spheres," and ridicule the most sublime conceptions and philosophies? This difference depends simply on the innate power of the mind to think on the higher or on the lower plane, with the *astral* (in the sense given to the word by St. Martin), or with the physical brain. Great intellectual powers are often no proof of, but are impediments to spiritual and right conceptions; witness most of the great men of science. We must rather pity than blame them.

M.C. But how is it that the person who thinks on the higher plane produces more perfect and more potential images and objective forms by his thought?

H.P.B. Not necessarily that "person" alone, but all those who are generally sensitive. The person who is endowed with this faculty of thinking about even the most trifling things from the higher plane of thought has, by virtue of that gift which he possesses, a plastic power of formation, so to say, in his very imagination. Whatever such a person may think about, his thought will be so far more intense than the thought of an ordinary person, that by this very intensity it obtains the power of creation. Science has established the fact that thought is an energy. This energy in its action disturbs the atoms of the astral atmosphere around us. I already told you; the rays of thought have the same potentiality for producing forms in the astral atmosphere as the sun rays have with regard to a lens. Every thought so evolved with energy from the brain, creates *nolens volens* a shape.

M.C. Is that shape absolutely unconscious?

H.P.B. Perfectly unconscious unless it is the creation of an adept, who has a pre-conceived object in giving it consciousness, or rather in sending along with it enough of his will and intelligence to cause it to appear conscious. This ought to make us more cautious about our thoughts.

But the wide distinction that obtains between the adept in this matter and the ordinary man must be borne in mind. The adept may at his will use his *Mayavi rupa*, but the ordinary man does not, except in very rare cases. It is called *Mayavi rupa* because it is a form of illusion created for use in the particular instance, and it has quite enough of the adept's mind in it to accomplish its purpose. The ordinary man merely creates a thought-image, whose properties and powers are at the time wholly unknown to him.

M.C. Then one may say that the form of an adept appearing at a distance from his body, as for instance Ram Lai in *Mr. Isaacs*, is simply an image?

H.P.B. Exactly. It is a walking thought.

M.C. In which case an adept can appear in several places almost simultaneously.

H.P.B. He can. Just as Apollonius of Tyana, who was seen in two places at once, while his body was at Rome. But it must be understood that not *all* of even the *astral* adept is present in each appearance.

M.C. Then it is very necessary for a person of any amount of imagination and psychic powers to attend to his thoughts?

H.P.B. Certainly, for each thought has a shape which borrows the appearance of the man engaged in the action of which he thought. Otherwise how can clairvoyants see in your *aura* your past and present? What they see is a passing panorama of yourself represented in successive actions by your thoughts. You asked me if we are punished for our thoughts. Not for all, for some are still-born; but for others, those which we call "silent" but potential thoughts—yes. Take an extreme case, such as that of a person who is so wicked as to wish the death of another. Unless the evil wisher is a *Dugpa*, a high adept in black magic, in which case Karma is delayed, such a wish only

comes back to roost.

M.C. But supposing the evil-wisher to have a very strong will, without being adwg/?tf,could the death of the other be accomplished?

H.P.B. Only if the malicious person has the evil eye, which simply means possessing enormous plastic power of imagination working involuntarily, and thus turned unconsciously to bad uses. For what is the power of the “evil eye”? Simply a great plastic power of thought, so great as to produce a current impregnated with the potentiality of every kind of misfortune and accident, which inoculates, or attaches itself to any person who comes within it *Ajettatore* (one with the evil eye) need not be even imaginative, or have evil intentions or wishes. He may be simply a person who is naturally fond of witnessing or reading about sensational scenes, such as murder, executions, accidents, etc., etc. He may be not even thinking of any of these at the moment his eye meets his future victim. But the currents have been produced and exist in his visual ray ready to spring into activity the instant they find suitable soil, like a seed fallen by the way and ready to sprout at the first opportunity.

M.C. But how about the thoughts you call “silent”? Do such wishes or thoughts come home to roost?

H.P.B. They do; just as a ball which fails to penetrate an object rebounds upon the thrower. This happens even to some *dugpas* or sorcerers who are not strong enough, or do not comply with the rules — for even they have rules they have to abide by — but not with those who are regular, fully developed “black magicians”; for such have the power to accomplish what they wish.

M.C. When you speak of rules it makes me want to wind up this talk by asking you what everybody wants to know who takes any interest in occultism. What is a principal or important suggestion for those who have these powers and wish to control them rightly — in fact to enter occultism?

H.P.B. The first and most important step in occultism is to learn how to adapt your thoughts and ideas to your plastic potency.

M.C. Why is this so important?

H.P.B. Because otherwise you are creating things by which you may be making bad Karma. No one should go into occultism or even touch it before he is perfectly acquainted with his own powers, and that he knows how to commensurate it with his actions. And this he can do only by deeply studying the philosophy of Occultism before entering upon the *practical* training. Otherwise, as sure as fate — HE WILL FALL INTO BLACK MAGIC.