

THEOSOPHY

IN RELATION TO

HUMAN LIFE

*Four Lectures delivered at the Twenty-ninth
Anniversary Meeting of the Theosophical
Society, at Benares, December, 1904.*

BY

ANNIE BESANT



BENARES AND LONDON.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

1905.

PRINTED BY FREEMAN & CO. LTD.,
AT THE TARA PRINTING WORKS, BENARES.

All Rights Reserved.

Registered under Act XXV of 1867.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
LECTURE I.	
THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO RELIGION	1
LECTURE II.	
THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO SOCIOLOGY	31
LECTURE III.	
THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO POLITICS	60
LECTURE IV.	
THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE	93

LECTURE I.

THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO RELIGION.

BRROTHERS:—The subject I have chosen for the four lectures to be delivered at our Theosophical Convention this year is one which seems to me eminently suitable for the times in which we find ourselves. For many many years now, alike in the East and in the West, Theosophy has been spreading, has been making its way, has been drawing to itself public attention. We find, as we glance around us, that the meaning of its work is canvassed, that the goal of its work is questioned, that the nature of the work is not understood; and it seems to me therefore that it might be a wise thing to put here, in these Convention lectures, on permanent record what one at least of the workers for Theosophy thinks and sees as to its meaning, as to its goal, as to its work. I would not, in doing this, claim in any way to force on my fellow members an interpretation with which possibly they may not agree, a view from which they may desire to dissent. It is the glory of the Theosophical Society

that while it bases itself on one strong rock, that of universal brotherhood, which exists because there is but one life in every living thing, while on that there is absolute unity amongst us, on every other point of intellectual opinion the Theosophist is free, and not bound to any one's opinion. He must bring things to the judgment of his own intelligence, and none must dare to fetter the mind of the individual man.

Therefore I do not claim in any way to put forward my views with authority. Let them have such authority as comes to them from the truth they contain. For no honest thinker, no man who believes in God, can desire to wield authority save such authority as truth may give to his utterances ; for there is but one authority in the whole world, and that authority is truth ; and just in proportion as our words accord with the truth eternal will they share that eternal authority that belongs to truth alone.

That is the reason for the choice of the subject of these evening discourses.

One word on the subdivision that I have made: Theosophy in relation to Religion, in relation to Sociology, in relation to Politics, in relation to Science. These four subdivisions of thought seem to me to occupy practically the whole of human life. I want, if I can, to show you how far Theoso-

phy bears on the great problems which every nation has to solve at the present day.

I need not pause upon the word Religion, for this evening lecture will explain it. By the word Sociology, I mean all those problems that concern society in its building up, in its growth and evolution, whether they bear on education, whether they bear on criminology, whether they bear on any relation of man to man within the limits of an orderly society.

By Politics, I do not mean the trivial question whether this man or woman shall have a vote, or has not a vote, or such like trifles. I mean Politics in the old meaning of the word—all that concerns the well-being of a nation, the administration of a nation, all that is of concern in the national household. I mean that administration of the nation in detail on which the happiness of the nation depends far more than it does on the form of the supreme Government that rules it. I want to show you how far Theosophy, in putting forward the true view of human duty, conduces to the happiness of the nation in this vast sphere of national Politics.

Lastly of Science. I desire if possible, however inadequately, to say something of what Theosophy has done in the realm of science to make possible the discoveries of late years, and I shall be

audacious enough to point out something of what Theosophy may hope to do with regard to discoveries in the future. Such is the broad outline of the subject to which I would draw your attention to day, and the three days that follow.

Let us, after this preamble, turn at once to the relation of Theosophy with Religion. I shall have naturally in dealing with that to speak also of its relation to religions. Religion in its essence is everywhere the same, but in its manifestations it differs with national or racial opinions, traditions, customs, and so on. So that our subject will include both Religion and religions, and we shall have to see the bearing of Theosophy on both of these.

First, as to the meaning of the word Theosophy. If we translate the word, we find at once that it means divine wisdom: God-wisdom. But such a translation of the word by itself is not enough, for it is not sufficient to give us a clear idea of what Theosophy is. We naturally ask: what connotation does this word bear in the minds of men who use it, and what connotation did it bear in the past? That connotation is best explained by showing what meaning it has borne in the past in men's minds, what its meaning is from the standpoint of history, and from the standpoint of philosophy.

For this word "divine wisdom", or "God-wisdom", does not come before the world now for the first time. Go back some seventeen centuries, and you will find that at that time among the Greeks—the leading nation of thinkers, though they were slowly passing into decay, and had largely handed over their thought to Alexandria—this word was used in its Greek form by the great Greco-Egyptian philosophers, the Neo-Platonists.

Now we find also another word which is used, hand in hand with the word Theosophy, and the meaning of both is the same. That word is "Gnosis"—a Greek word meaning knowledge. Pause for a moment on that word, for it is of vital importance in the brief survey of the past that we are taking. Gnosis means knowledge. But what knowledge? Not knowledge in general, not ordinary everyday knowledge, like science. The word "Gnosis" has a specific philosophic meaning, and it is this meaning in which it is used among the Grecian and Greco-Egyptian philosophers. Its meaning is the knowledge which is denied in the modern word "agnostic", "without knowledge", more familiar than the original word Gnosis. That which is denied in the modern term "agnostic" is the possibility of man's knowing that which is beyond the reach of his senses and his intelligence, of his rising above the phenomenal, of his knowing

the existence whence he comes, the source from which his life is drawn. It was a word chosen by Professor Huxley to define his own position: that man by the senses might observe material phenomena; that man by the intellect might draw conclusions from those observations, and thus build on the foundation of observed facts a philosophy of the universe and of life; but that beyond that he could not go; that he had no faculties whereby he might travel farther, or discover anything in the vast region of the unknown, beyond the grasp of the senses and the intellect. That was the position asserted by Professor Huxley, and the word "agnostic" was adopted by one leading scientific man after another, as marking definitely their position as regards this question of knowledge. Agnosticism does not mean a denial of God, as some people inaccurately think, but a declaration of the incapacity of man to know the Reality behind phenomena. Such a Reality might, or might not, exist; man had no means of coming to a decision on the problem. A man might know where the senses guided, and where the intellect illuminated; but beyond that there was a fathomless darkness which no human plummet might fathom—no human intellect might avail to sound that depth. As against that confession of human impotence, Theosophy rises up as the

Gnosis, again asserting that the physical is not the only region into which man can penetrate. Again, as in ancient days so in our modern times, is heard the proclamation of the existence of the Gnosis, the declaration that man can *know*—not only believe, not only hope—beyond the limits of the senses and the intellect. For beyond your senses and your intellect, there is something else, that which makes you man, Spirit linked to the body by intelligence; for man is Spirit, not only intelligence; man is Spirit, not only a bundle of senses; and that Spirit is one with the Spirit universal, and therefore can know the Supreme who is kin to himself.

But we need not stop in Greece and Egypt in our search for the meaning of the word Gno-*is*, or Theosophy. We come in our search after the meaning of this word to the land which is the mother of religions, the sacred land of India. There we find again in the Saṃskṛit tongue exactly the same word. It is Brahma-Vidyā. What is Brahma-Vidyā? A clear and definite answer is given to that question by an authority which, for the most of us, at least, needs nothing more behind it to give it weight. I mean that portion of the Vedas known as the Upaniṣhats. It is written in the first section of the first *Muṇḍak-upaniṣhat* that: "The son of Shanaka, the great

householder, approached, according to the rite, Aṅgiras, asking him: Who is it, O venerable, by the knowledge of whom this all becomes known?

“He said to him:—Two sciences must be known, thus tell us the knowers of Brahman, the supreme and the lesser.

“The lesser comprehends the Rik, the Yajur, the Sāma and the Atharva Vedas, accentuation, ritual, grammar, glossary, prosody and astronomy. Again, the supreme is the science, by which that Indestructible is comprehended.”

There you have the two forms of knowledge—the Apara-Vidyā, or lower, that includes every sacred Scripture, all ceremonial and ritual, and everything which is not the knowledge of the Supreme. Then the Para-Vidyā, the supreme Vidyā, that which being known all things are known, that is the knowledge of Brahman Himself, the supreme, the indestructible, the eternal. This is the kingly knowledge, kingly secret, राजविद्या राजगुह्य, after which the Sages have striven; this the knowledge to which Rāja Yoga leads; this the Science of Peace which nothing may avail to shake: the knowledge of the One, supreme, eternal, changeless. This is Theosophy.

Man then, Theosophy declares, can know God. But how? There is only one way of knowing anything, and that is by having in you something

which answers to the object which is to be the object of knowledge. If the eye answers to the waves of light, it is because the ether within the eye vibrates synchronously with these rays; both vibrating together, the object is seen. If a man can know God, if it be possible for him to know the Supreme, if Theosophy, Gnosis, Brahma-Vidyâ, be a reality, and not the vain dream of a fevered imagination, then it must be because, within the cavity of the heart of man, there dwells THAT which the whole universe is unable to contain, because the Spirit of man is one in its essence with the eternal Spirit, and the God within responds to the God without. Thus and only thus is possible knowledge of the Divine. Is not that what we have learned of old? is not that what all great Scriptures teach us, what all great religions proclaim? and where so plainly, so definitely, as in this most ancient of all living^g faiths? Was it not spoken again by Shrî Kṛiṣṇa, when He declared the nature of the Spirit in man? did He not say of the Jîva that came forth to be clothed in matter, that it is **ममैवांगः**—a portion of my very Self, mine own Self; such is the Jîva which is the Spirit in man. Who does not know that Mahâvâkya of the Veda, its very foundation, **तत्त्वमसि**, THAT art thou. This is the Vaidik teaching. This is Theosophy.

This reproclamation came to the modern world, which had forgotten the splendour of the immortal human Spirit, and hence inevitably denied the possibility of man knowing God.

Theosophy came into the world when materialism had triumphed on the one side, and on the other superstition was rampant—materialism stabbing Religion, superstition choking and strangling it; by the reproclamation of the Para-Vidyâ, of the Gnosis, it brought light to the world that was in darkness.

That is the first thing to understand about Theosophy. It is not a set of doctrines; it is not particular beliefs. It is not this or that, about which men quarrel. It has no particular sacred books, no particular rituals, no particular customs, nor social order. It is neither a social nor a political organisation. It is the Para-Vidyâ; it declares that man, who is divine, may know the Divinity he shares.

I used two words, materialism and superstition. Let us define these two words, for these two things are the two great forces which cannot exist when the light of Brahma Vidyâ, or Theosophy, illumines the world. Scepticism, by itself, the attitude that doubts, that challenges, and that questions, is a legitimate attitude of the intelligence; it serves a great purpose, and is a necessary factor in human

evolution. Without that tendency to question any folly might pass current in the minds of men. Without the challenging of the critical intellect, any vague fancy might take on itself the authority of divine revelation. There is no safety for a man surrounded by illusion, by the snares of ignorance, save in the exercise of the critical intelligence, which, like that liquid which tests gold, tests a statement and separates false from true ; it is this which summons every intellectual proposition into the court of intellect, and judges it. But scepticism goes beyond its province when it denies facts which are not before the court, and for which evidence is not tendered, instead of only leaving them aside as unproven. It loses its value when it exchanges the attitude of question for that of denial. It ceases to be legitimate, when it ceases to be a means—a means to the discovery of intellectual truth—and becomes materialism ; it is then no longer scepticism, but is a theory of life based on a partial view of human nature, and an inadequate survey of the facts of life. The eye cannot appreciate sounds, nor the ear fragrances ; and the intellect, fettered in the physical brain, cannot appreciate the things of the Spirit, nor can it even observe through the physical senses the phenomena of the superphysical worlds.

Scepticism spread far and wide in the West dur-

ing the first three quarters of the nineteenth century. Why did it spread? It spread because those in the East and West who were the exponents and custodians of religions, could not answer the questions with which intelligence plied them. They opposed a dull and dead mass of authority to the challenge of the quick and living intelligence. Whether you go to the East or to the West you find the same thing. People ask: "Why is this? Tell me what it means. Explain to me this ceremony. Prove this doctrine." And in both East and West the continual answer is: "You must believe it; you must believe it. Thus saith the Lord. Thus is it written." But man is so made by God that he cannot believe where reason does not illumine, where thought does not hold aloft its torch, and the result of the impotence of religionists was that scepticism led to materialism. If they had been able to answer these questions, to guide and explain, then scepticism would have set religions free from superstition, and have made them firmer and stronger than before. But when religious leaders cannot answer such questions, and cannot sympathise with them, then scepticism impatiently knocks the whole fabric down, and thus the triumph of scepticism means the condemnation of the religious teachers of the day.

Then came the other enemy, superstition.

What is superstition? Superstition is the making of the non-essential essential, the making of the subordinate principal, the making of that which is unimportant vital. That is what superstition means. It does not mean belief in this, that, or the other. It means that the mind has turned things upside down, has exalted some trivial, some unimportant, detail into the place that ought to be occupied only by the fundamental truth. It is the tāmasic quality which “seeth all things subverted.”¹

I may tell you a little story; for then you will always know what superstition means; you will never confuse it with Religion. There was once a holy man who used to offer sacrifice daily, and, being a kind and gentle man, he had animals about his house. One of these was a cat. The cat, being very fond of his master, would go to him, thus disturbing him in the midst of his sacrifice; so he tied up the cat to the bedpost, in order that it might not interrupt him. That was a simple and reasonable thing to do. But the man died, and the tradition of the man's sacrifice survived, and the idea arose that whenever a sacrifice was performed it was necessary that a cat should be tied to a post near it. As time went on, the rest of the sacrifice disappeared, but the tying of a cat to

a post remained ; and finally the whole ceremony consisted in the tying of a cat to a post. That is superstition. And the worst of it is that the trivial and unimportant, the things for which no reason can be given because the reason has long since passed away, is clung to all the more vehemently because it is not understood, and it is therefore supposed to veil a mystery. Such things are defended with far more bitterness and acrimony than things that are really important, for nothing arouses so much anger as questions which challenge a thing that its defenders do not understand.

Such superstitions were killing Religion on one side, while materialism was attacking it on the other. In such a world the Divine Wisdom was again proclaimed, and in it lay the remedy for these opposite diseases. The one thing that cures alike materialism and superstition is knowledge ; materialism cannot put aside the facts brought forward by a knowledge which overleaps the bounds of physical matter, and understands the world invisible as it understands the world visible. Superstition perishes when ceremonies are explained, and when it is shewn what is essential and is based on truth, and what arises only from ignorance and is non-essential.

Such, then, is the first great object of this reproclamation of the Divine Wisdom in the

modern world. Two forces were slaying Religion, and the Divine Wisdom, which was its mother, came to its rescue, to deliver and to save. It came whence all Wisdom had ever come to the world, from that company of the mighty Rīshis who have given to the world its religions. It came from the same who of old gave Hinduism to the first family of the Āryan race; the same who later on gave the religion of Zoroaster to the Iranians; the same who gave their knowledge to the Chaldeans and Assyrians, and built up their empire; the same who taught the Egyptians their marvellous knowledge; the same who later on gave to the world the faith of the Christ, and Islām.

There is one fount from which all true religions arise. There is one great company of God-illuminated men, of liberated souls, of muktas, who are the spiritual Guardians of the world; in Their hands is the treasure of the Divine Wisdom, and They have supplied it to the world according to the need of every nation and race.

Theosophy came into the world; it proclaimed itself, and at first it was only met with jeering and with ridicule. But what has happened since it was proclaimed, we shall presently see.

Let us now turn to the theosophical teachings subsidiary to the main affirmation, and see what relation they bear to the teachings of the various

world-faiths. The Divine Wisdom proclaimed again the great fundamental truths of all religions. These truths are: the one Existence, one without a second; the manifestation of Ishvara in triple form, the Trimûrti; the existence of spiritual Intelligences, who are the administrators of the will of the Supreme; the identity of the human Spirit with the Supreme, and the gradual unfolding of the powers of that Spirit imprisoned in matter by repeated reincarnations or transmigrations; the changeless law of karma, under which the whole of that chain of births and deaths is forged; the existence of man in three worlds, and not in one only, the well-known Trilokî, so that he dwells in these three worlds, and the wheel of births and death continually revolves therein. These are the universal and permanent truths of all religions; of one or another of these, a separate religion sometimes temporarily loses sight; some may be veiled or forgotten for a while, but without these no religion can perfectly carry on its work. Outside these are all rituals, ceremonies, and social customs, which differ in different religions, although rites and ceremonies also bear a strong family resemblance, being symbolical of common truths, or dealing with natural facts everywhere present. These minor details the Divine Wisdom explains and justifies, whenever they are based on facts.

You must bear in mind in considering Theosophy in relation to Religion these three main facts: (1) man can know Him from whom he comes; (2) there are doctrines which are common to all religions; (3) there is a vast variety of subsidiary matters connected with the various religions.

With regard to the first, the great truth that man can know God, that is the essence of Theosophy, and it ever re-iterates it in the face of agnosticism and materialism. With regard to the second, theosophical teaching comprises the fundamental doctrines that I have just enunciated, those necessary to every religion for its effective working; it is the mission of Theosophy to restore to each religion any one of these truths which, in efflux of time, may have slipped out of its recognised teaching. With regard to the third, the varieties of ceremonies of forms and of customs, by its knowledge of the invisible worlds Theosophy explains and justifies them where they are true, and points out their baselessness where they are superstitions. That is the outline of its work.

Now what has it done? We turn to concrete facts, patent to observation, in order to see whether its theoretical mission has been practically carried out. The two religions of the world first chosen to receive the great impulse of new life by the Rishis of old, were the two ancient faiths, mother

and daughter, Hinduism and Buddhism. These were the two religions into which the vivifying flood of renewed life was first poured. The message went to the Buddhist countries, and if you want to know the result of this flood of life, look, as one specimen, on Ceylon. The Buddhist religion in that island was practically dying out; it was losing its power over the hearts of its votaries; children were educated by missionaries, Roman Catholics and Protestants; their plastic minds were taught to despise the Buddha and to bow before Jesus Christ; men were ashamed to be known as Buddhists, and regarded their adherence to their ancestral faith as a thing to be excused, to be explained. Look at Ceylon now. What a change! Nearly two hundred schools¹ are scattered over that island, every one of which is in the hands of Buddhist teachers, and in each of which the religion of the Buddha is taught to the children of Buddhists. Thousands upon thousands of children—a trifle over half the school-going population of the island—have thus been rescued from perversion to Christianity, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, and their feet tread the noble eightfold path which their fathers for over two thousand years have trodden. Had Col. H. S. Olcott done nothing in his life but lead the island of Ceylon once more to the feet

¹ 178 schools exactly.

and the light of the Lord Buddha, as His land and His people, he would have deserved well of that mighty religion which is the most extended amongst the religions of the world, and which is now showing in Japan what it can inspire in its votaries of courage, patriotism and loyalty unto death.

If you want to know what has been done, do not take my words, which are those of an advocate, but take the statements of the Christian missionaries, with regard to their ever-increasing difficulties, in the reports which they send to England. See how they ask for more money, because Government grants in aid of their schools have decreased in consequence of the ever-lessening number of children, sent up by them for examination ; and how they are afraid that they must close a number of their schools, unless the deficiency of Government aid can be made good by contributions from abroad. You may read the complaint of a missionary, who said that wherever he went he met signs of Buddhist propaganda. Take another testimony: Theosophy, led by Col. Olcott, is now redeeming Ceylon from the western curse of intoxication, which had spread over the island with the disregard of the Buddha's precepts. The people, having again returned to the Buddhist faith, that curse is being driven out of the land. No less than 180000

Buddhists, who had forgotten their ancient faith, have now signed a pledge against liquor, and have thus so injured the liquor trade that the Governor has informed the Legislative Council that they must reckon on a loss of at least seven lakhs of rupees in the revenue from excise. Such is the result of the renewed observance of the precept of the Lord Buddha.

Pass from Buddhism, and let us see what Theosophy has done for Hinduism, the mother of Buddhism. Some of the elder among you can remember that when you were in schools or colleges, your faith and reverence for the Vedas had vanished; you were proud of your B. A. and M. A. degrees, but cared nothing for your ancient treasure of sacred literature, and could not even read the language in which it was written. You know that the young men of 25 years ago were ashamed of their glorious heritage, aped the Europeans in their manners and customs and ideas, and thought it superstition to believe in the Devas and to show reverence for their faith. Truly was it a splendid civilisation they boasted! They showed their modern culture by sneering at that which had been the greatness of India, and were proud of their ignorance of the philosophy which has helped forward the evolution of the world.

Is that true now? you know it is not. You

know that from one end of the land to the other Hinduism is again lifting up its glorious head. You know that fathers are learning from their boys the religion that they themselves had forgotten. You know that boys are crowding wherever the message of Theosophy goes, in order to hear something of the religion of their fathers. A few days ago, wishing to see how far the religious instruction given in our College was effectual, I read the answers to the examination papers given by the boys in the School Department, and found the boys explaining clearly the fundamental truths of their religion. I then felt what was being done for the growing generation in India with regard to religion—religion on which its greatness in the future depends, as its greatness depended upon it in the past.

It is not only in the matter of education that we find Hinduism is being revived and Hindus are bestirring themselves. The people are now proud of their religion. They are feeling that they have something to give to the world; they are striving to be worthy of the greatness from which they have fallen, and to regain that greatness. We see that as Theosophy spreads, Hinduism revives, because it receives a current of the divine Ancient Wisdom, which vivifies its forms and makes its reality felt.

The next of the faiths touched by the Ancient Wisdom was the religion of Zoroaster, that exists only in fragments in the present day. That faith also has shewn a renewed activity; the materialism which was killing it has been checked; its value has again been recognised by its adherents; its children are being taught its precepts, and its women are studying it with eagerness. Much still remains to do, but much also has been done.

Next comes Christianity. It had lost much of the old teachings. It had forgotten the doctrines of reincarnation and karma, and the vicarious atonement for the sinner had taken the place of the just and righteous law of God. Mysticism had vanished under the flood of rationalism, and educated Europe was turning its back on Christianity. But how the aspect of affairs has changed! In every country of Europe where Theosophy has spread, Christianity has become more and more spiritual, more and more vital, more and more liberal. One Christian clergyman after another has declared his belief in reincarnation. The Church of England is now discussing it; some vehemently reject, others accept, this ancient doctrine, and the whole feeling of the Christian public towards it has changed. Moreover, a strong tendency towards mysticism is showing itself on every side; there is a growing recognition of the powers of the

worlds unseen, and an active interest is replacing the conventional faith.

The last of all the faiths to be touched by Theosophy is Islâm. That also is just beginning to thrill in answer to it, and there are signs that ere long it will fully benefit by the stream of life which seeks to pour into it.

My Brothers, most of you are Hindus. Is it for that that you should be indifferent to the other religions of the world? The Christian may be narrow; the Musulmân, if he does not understand his great Prophet, may also be narrow. They both welcome converts, and gladly take within their faiths those who were born outside of them. Therefore it is not quite so blameworthy if they are narrow and militant, for they say to men of other faiths: "Your religion is imperfect; come to us, and we will teach you a better way." But the Hindu cannot say that. The Hindu, who will not accept within the limits of his religion any one who is not born of Hindu parents, he surely has the duty of widest liberality in matters of religion, and he must recognise the value of the religions of other countries even as he prizes his own. If you accepted converts from outside, then, though it would be a pity, you might become narrow in your sympathies. But now you must not, you dare not, be narrow. Hinduism has never been illiberal; it has

always recognised many religions, and has always said that every religion was good and useful to those to whom it was given. Few things have given me a greater shock, as shewing how illiberal some Hindus have become, than when I read in an Indian paper that Annie Besant showed that she did not really care for Hinduism, because she urged on Christians that their religion was at its root Theosophy, and tried to help the Christians to understand and live their own religion better. Surely that is not right; it is the duty of the Theosophist to help the religion of a country, wherever he is. His duty is to work for the religion in the midst of which he finds himself. We do not try to convert and proselytise. We do not ask a Christian to leave his own faith and to adopt another—especially one that would not accept him if he came to it—any more than we ask you to leave your faith and accept another. We must not grudge to any people their share of the Divine Wisdom, which belongs to all alike. Divine Wisdom knows no exclusion, knows no barriers. Divine Wisdom is like the sun in heaven, that shines alike on every man and every creed, and knows no exclusion. I should be false to all that I believe most fervently, most profoundly, if—because to my own mind the Hindu presentment of truth is the most perfect and the most satisfactory, and

because I love it—I did not put the great truths of the Divine Wisdom in Christian terms to Christian people, and declare that Theosophy is as much esoteric Christianity, as it is esoteric Hinduism, esoteric Buddhism, esoteric Muhammadanism. If that makes my Indian brothers despise and suspect me, let it be so ; helping humanity is greater than helping a single people ; loyalty to truth is greater than loyalty to a creed. It is true that in my English speeches I said frankly : “ I am not a Christian,” but I spoke to them and helped them as earnestly as though I were a Christian, and I shall continue to do so. Theosophy does not make converts. That is its glory. It asks every man to live, to believe, to spiritualise, his own faith. It asks every man to search into his own faith. It declares that there is one Religion, out of which all religions spring, and that those are nearest to the heart of things who are full of love, compassion, and toleration. Thus Theosophy amongst religions is a peace-maker ; it teaches their fundamental unity amongst every external diversity ; it leaves to every religion its own peculiarities, only explaining them so as to make them intelligible, and so as to enable it to defend itself against the attacks of unwise religionists belonging to the other religions of the world, as well as against materialism and superstition.

Take one example. We wish to have explained the meaning of Shrâddha. It is not only the Hindus who feel for their beloved dead, and strive to help them on the other side of the grave. The Roman Catholic has his masses, and prays for his dead. Theosophy explains both the Hindu Shrâddha and the Roman Catholic mass for the dead, on the same lines. The Hindu Shrâddha, complete in itself, though little understood, can be justified step by step by the knowledge we have acquired of the other world. The same study justifies also the prayers for the dead of the Roman Catholic, and enables him to defend his practices as much as the same knowledge enables you to defend yours. There, then, is the value of Theosophy ; to every religion a servant, to help, to explain, and to defend.

What is the condition of the new life flowing from the ancient fount into each of the religions of the world one by one? We know from the words of Shri Kṛiṣṇa Himself that in process of time, by the efflux of time, knowledge decays ; and when knowledge decays, They who first gave it send out a fresh stream of knowledge, so that the decay may be remedied and new life may animate.

But there is one condition attached to this inflow. Only those religions can profit by it, who accept the channels by which that life is poured

forth. Buddhism welcomed the message of Theosophy, and revived. Hinduism welcomed it, and it revived. So also with Zoroastrianism and Christianity, and they revived. Islâm is just beginning to open its gateway to it, and we shall find the same result there.

But the condition cannot be changed. Refuse the channel, and the stream that flows through it will not fertilise your fields. Where a river comes down from the great heights of the Himâlayas and spreads itself through the plains, the husbandman cuts channels into which the water may flow, so that his fields may be fertilised and his crops may grow. And the channels into the fields of religions from the river of Theosophy are those who join the society, and thus connect their own organisations with the main body. In proportion as the members of each religion join the Society and work with it, so will be the amount of spiritual life which will flow into that particular faith for the fertilisation of its fields. Such is the law. It may not be changed. Woe unto that religion that rejects the teachings of the Ancient Wisdom, and turns its back on the heralds that proclaim it. Woe unto it! for, as once said a great prophet to an ancient nation: "Your house shall be left unto you desolate." The choice is with every religion to which we go; it does not lie with us. We are

but the messengers and heralds of the Kings of the Himâlayas. You do not value a herald or messenger for himself ; the messenger is but a servant. The value of the herald is in the Sovereign who sends him out, and the messenger is but the carrier of the message which means life or death in its acceptance or rejection.

We, who proclaim to-day the message of Theosophy, are nothing more than mere heralds, mere servants of the Great Ones, clothed in the garb which They have put upon us, symbol of the knowledge which They have given, and by which we can illumine the religions of the world. This is the work placed upon our shoulders.

Worthless as individuals, utterly unimportant as men and women, we have yet the dignity of our office upon us, which, as heralds and messengers, we maintain. Choose you whether you will listen to the message, or cast it back. The work of the embassy is only to deliver the message, and to leave to those who are responsible to give reply in acceptance or rejection. The religions of the world to-day are a critical position. Before them lie death and renewal of life. The embassy bearing Theosophy from the Kings of the Himâlayas is sent forth into their midst, and the message is proclaimed. Hinduism, like every other faith, has now its opportunity. Accept it, if you will ; reject

it, if you choose. If you accept it, new life will flow into the Hindu religion, and time will bring you back to your great place amongst the nations of the world ; reject it, and the downward course will be followed by the coming generations, will still draw the feet of India, till she vanishes from the eyes of men. It is for you to choose, and you are responsible. It is for you to say, "come," or "go." Heralds have no interest in their message, save in its faithful delivery. That faithful delivery we are struggling to fulfil. Our part we are loyally striving to do. That task we are endeavouring to accomplish. Say you "Aye," or "Nay," exactly as you will.

SECOND LECTURE.

THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO SOCIOLOGY.

BROTHERS :—Those of you who keep at all in touch with the literature of our time, must have noticed, in reading that literature, one marked fact that continually emerges: the absence of any coherent sequence of thought on, of any synthesis of, life. When you have read a book like Myers' *Human Personality*, or some other book on science, religion or sociology, a feeling rises up in the mind, in face of the vast mass of facts and the absence of arrangement, that if only the writer had studied Theosophy how much more illuminative his book would have been. That is specially true as regards the science of sociology. It is very young as a science. Practically it does not measure a hundred and a half years of life, so far as western civilisation is concerned. In reading various books, various magazine articles, and various discussions in newspapers on social problems and on social questions, one cannot but notice the absence of illuminative ideas, of guid-

ing principles by which proposals may be measured, of some standard of right thinking whereby we may be able to judge of the value of particular proposals.

Now Theosophy in these matters, as in all others, throws light on the subject as a whole. I shall try to show you now how, on this young science of sociology, Theosophy throws its illuminative light. Looking at the various social ideals which are put forward, we will try to measure them by the standard of theosophic principles, and we will see if that enables us to understand them better than even their own exponents may understand them; while at the same time it will enable us to group them into a comprehensive whole, to choose the true and reject the false, and build up a sound edifice of society which may be worthy to form a temple of humanity.

Now I am going to-day to try to put before you the principles of sound Sociology. To-morrow I shall try to show you the application of these principles to particular cases.

I prefer to speak of the principles and their application, rather than to use the more ordinary names of theoretical and practical. Because when you say theoretical, people fancy that you are talking in the air; and when you say practical, they restrict the meaning of the word to things with

which you may, as it were, knock a man down. But you must know that there is no true practice without a true theory behind it, and working without a theory is the most hopelessly unpractical method that you can select. It means a waste of time in constant experiments, a constant running down blind alleys, and finding there is no way out. The great fault of modern Sociology as of modern politics, is that it lives from hand to mouth, without any theory which can be applied to the problems of the moment, with some hope of final solution.

At the same time certain theories have been put forward, only they are not very effective in the solution of the problems of the day. I want to glance at those theories, so that we may understand where Theosophy comes in, and how it enables us to test sociological ideas and form rational judgments upon them.

Now at the beginning of the 19th century and the end of the 18th century, Sociology may be said to have taken shape under the influence of certain great writers, at first French and American, and a theory of Society was put forward. It was a legal theory—a theory based on legal ideas—the theory that Society was based on a contract between man and man. The idea spread to England and definitely established itself there.

As you read Bentham, as you read the famous French writer, Jean Jacques Rousseau, as you read the *Rights of Man* by Thomas Paine, you find yourself face to face with the legal conception of society. Men are supposed to have been born free and independent, clothed with certain rights, which belonged to them as free-born men. The cry of the rights of man rose first in America in the Declaration of Independence; it echoed in France as the war-cry of the Revolution, and then overran the whole of Europe. And it raised a passion of enthusiasm, it inspired a resistless energy, that made the banners of republican France fly victoriously over the battlefields of almost every country in Europe.

That idea being accepted, Society is thought of as founded on a contract, admittedly imaginary, in which every man surrenders some of his inherent rights, in order that by that surrender of some of his rights, enforcement of other rights may be secured—since there is a greater power of defence, of compulsion, in the hands of Society, than can be found in the hands of the individual, however strong. That is the legal theory of Society, accepted at the time by most thinkers, on which the Society of the West has gradually grown up: a basis of individual rights, narrowed by the surrender of some of them by those who possessed

them, and who vested in Society, or in the nation, the powers which were really theirs, and which were only justly to be exercised by the nation in virtue of their consent. Hence the idea that it is not just to rule a man, it is not just to tax a man, except by his own consent ; and hence every man, and logically every woman, has an inherent right to a vote, apart from every qualification for its wise exercise. The democratical idea of Society is based on the rights of man.

Gradually, as science made its way in biology, another theory of Society arose. It was a biological view, that regarded Society as a living organisation, or rather a living organism. The theory of Darwin swept everything before it in the world of science ; it was applied to the evolution which may be seen in the history of a State, and to the growth of a nation. The organic idea of Society is that it is a natural growth, the growth of a living thing, which develops according to fixed laws, which slowly evolves under the pressure of surrounding circumstances. This theory made its way to the front ; the legal theory of Society for the most part disappeared, and the biological theory of the evolution of Society gradually took its place in the world of western thought. Nevertheless it remains the basis of all "self-governing" States, and though disowned theoretically it is

acted on in practice everywhere, and is implied in all democratic constitutions.

That theory of the growth of Society by evolution is true. But, as presented by science, it lacks much of the truth which ought to be built into it. Science presents the growth of Society as an evolution under the pressure of surrounding circumstances, but misses the unfoldment of a life independently reacting on the circumstances and not merely their product. As you read the studies of those who have written on the subject, you find them concerned entirely with the way in which the social qualities have developed under the pressure of surrounding circumstances. You miss the re-action of the indwelling life, which is the source of those social qualities. Let me very briefly sketch the history of the theory, in order that you may bear it in mind and see its merits and its defects.

Out of the sex-feeling between man and woman, the basis of the family—conjugal union—is made. From that union spring the children, who complete the unit of the family. Husband, wife and children, there is the fundamental unit; from the aggregation of such units Society is formed. To maintain that unit help and mutual defence are called forth; members of the family support and guard each other. Many of these units come together, in order that they may form a stronger unit, and defend each

other against external aggression. As families come together, they make a tribe, and the necessities of existence within the tribe involve certain obligations between its members, and the recognition of certain duties to each other. There must be some recognition within the tribe of the duties that each owes to each, otherwise the tribe could not hold together against the aggression of other tribes, and maintain its own existence. It is an enlarged family. The members of the tribe must not rob each other. They must not murder each other. They must not injure, mutilate, or crush each other. They may rob those outside the limit of the tribe. They may murder those who are not of their own tribe. They may swindle, harm, or otherwise injure those who are not members of their own tribe. But the germ of law, the enforcement of duty, is sown within the limits of the tribe, as the germ of duty is sown within the limits of the family, and so begins the organisation of Society.

As neighbouring tribes find themselves under pressure of attack from others, they draw together and make up a nation, and thus morality and law, which had grown from the family to the tribe, now extend from the tribe to the nation. The nation must not allow robbery within its own borders. The law punishes it. It must not allow murder within its own realm. The law punishes it. And

many forms of injuries that may be worked by man on man are forbidden within the area of the nation, because they weaken national life. But outside the limits of a nation, all these moral laws fall away and disappear. Robbery ceases to be robbery when the nation seizes the land of a weaker people, and makes them its subjects. Murder ceases to be murder, when it takes the form of war, and makes orphans and widows by tens of thousands instead of by individuals, and makes misery wide spread and universal. Instead of being murder, it is then called glory. Under this pressure from outward circumstance, the scientist traces the evolution of Society; from family to tribe, and from tribe to nation. Family morality, tribal morality, national morality—so far the evolution of Society has gone. International morality is, as yet, evolved.

What does Theosophy say to that theory? Yes, there is truth in that main idea. The growth of a family into a tribe, of tribes into a nation, is a fact constantly repeated in the evolution of mankind. But it is not due alone, as scientists imagine, to the pressure of external circumstances, forcing men into the recognition of the duties and obligations before which all civilised societies bow; the earliest growths were other than this, and the earliest drawings of families

and tribes together were due to an element that the sociologist does not recognise. Society has its inception not only from without, but also from within. It is the expression of an unfolding life, unfolding under the guidance of authority, under Beings more developed than the rest over whom They rule, and its earlier stages are thus facilitated. Theosophy tells us of an infant humanity, round whose cradle stand the lofty Rishis, themselves the fruit of a long past world, who have come to this world for the training of its young humanity, to guard its infancy, to support its tottering steps, and to make its progress more rapid by the proclamation of fundamental principles of right and wrong. Slower, unspeakably slower, would have been human evolution, had men had to discover by experience alone the conditions without which the organisation we call Society is impossible. But when the law was proclaimed: "You shall not rob," or: "If you rob you will suffer," then when a man robbed and suffered for robbing, the law and the suffering came to him as related the one to the other, and he recognised the relation between them far more rapidly than would have been possible had he only remained an observer of external events, without the authoritative voice of law.

When we look back into the beginnings of human Society, we do not find a nation of savages

slowly groping its way towards the light, and gradually becoming members of an organised Society. There is nothing more marvellous in ancient history than the way in which every great civilisation of the past seems to have been born full grown, and not as an infant. Go where you will. Take Egypt if you like. It is declared by the Egyptian archaeologists that they can find no time when Egypt was barbarous, savage and uncivilised, without law, without polity, and without religion. On the contrary, says Bunsen, Egypt sprang upon the stage of history full grown and clothed in all her powers.

That is not only true of Egypt. It is true also of all the older civilisations of the world; and those who see with eyes keener than the physical, and are able to look back over uncounted generations, and scan the story of the long-past world, tell us how long ere the great Aryan race was born in its northern home, there were empires and vast civilisations ruled over and guided by divine Kings, mighty Initiates, sublime Rishis, who gave laws to their nations, and whose gigantic monuments, raised with a strength and skill that no modern engineer can parallel, still remain as wonders of the world.

That wondrous civilisation of Atlantis that grew and spread over the lands which are now the

Atlantic Ocean and America, and extended eastwards over Egypt, China and Japan ; that mighty civilisation which left its traces in Mexico, Peru and South America, bore witness to the perfection of the social organisation of its prime. Society was then built on the model of the family, in which the elders ruled with unquestioned authority, and the younger obeyed with submissive reverence. It was a perfect socialism under autocratic rule. On the rulers the whole burden and responsibility of the State. For the ruled, all that could conduce to health, happiness and growth. Disorder, poverty, suffering, were the condemnation of the governor in whose district they appeared. An ill-managed household was the fault of its heads, not of its younger members. The well-ordered, well-guided family was then the model to which the State conformed. Within a family duties only are taught ; rights are unknown ; and so it was in the State ; each man had his status and his duties, and had no need to claim his rights, all that was due to him being paid as a matter of course. Thus, under tutelage, evolved the earliest civilisations, and not, as western sociologists imagine, by the pure pressure of external necessities, Nothing more marvellous than to go back in history and see how a people evolved.

Take the **Āryan** people to whom its **Manu** gave its lands, its social polity and organisation. Was He a mere savage, a barbarian, groping about in the dark, and collecting together some fragments of morality gained by experience, that he might gradually by their aid build up a people? Was He not a divine King, a mighty Lawgiver, who saw not only with the eyes of matter but with the eyes of Spirit, and founded a Society on a basis which has lasted for tens of thousands of years, and has not yet vanished from the face of the land? You have an example of the divine Kings in **Shrî Râma Chandra**, the **Avatâra**, the ideal King; and you can see there the growth of a people guided, nurtured, supported, and trained by their Head, whom they recognised as supreme.

That stage passed away, beautiful, innocent, happy, with the beauty and innocence of childhood, for though the Kings were mighty, the people were as children. The time came when it was necessary that the child should grow into youth and the youth into man. Then came the great growth of **ahamkâra**, the I-making tendency. Instead of submission to the Divine Ruler, the assertion by the individual of his own claim and his own rights. "I," "mine," "you," "yours," these were heard everywhere in Society, and for a time over the greater part of the world, faded away the ideal of

a family ruled by its elders, and peoples became rather like school-boys left without any teachers, with no elders to guide them. Every intermediate condition was, of course, found, but the trend of the social current was in this direction.

There took place a great growth of what is called "individualism." The man asserts himself with all his strength and vigour. He declares that he himself will stand on his own feet. He himself will find his own way. He will grasp what he can, hold as much as he may; he becomes enamoured of discussion, dispute, controversy, competition, drunk with the "joy of battle." Force, first of the body and then of the keener brain, becomes the ruling power.

Now this stage of individualism has great advantages and also great evils accompanying it. It is the merit of Theosophy that, in tracing the divine guidance of the world, it sees why a stage which may seem repellent, unlovely, mischievous, harsh, has its place in the perfect evolution of man.

Individualism has its work. It taught a man to be keen, strong, capable, virile, able to hold his own against the world; often harsh, often cruel, often self-assertive, often inclined to trample upon others in his passionate desire to assert himself. But these things do not matter in the long run, when the many days of lives, making one life, are seen.

it is only the fault of the youth going out into the world. There is no need of heart-break over it ; it is but a transitional stage, which will yield good harvest in the future. At this stage of social evolution some men grow very rich, and so on the other hand others grow miserably poor. One man accumulates millions for his own use ; another has not a crust whereby his family may be fed. A most unlovely civilisation, although within it there are possibilities of better things than those which could grow in the guarded and beautiful civilisation of child-humanity. The evils that came along with this individualistic civilisation were the oppression by the rich of the poor, the practical selling of man as though he were a chattel in the market place. True, it is not now a selling of the man's body, such as we find in slavery, but it is in many ways worse than chattel slavery. For a slave has at least his value as an animal. His master has paid money for him. He feeds him and clothes him ; he does not overwork him, because he is a valuable piece of property. When he is old and helpless, his master supports in his old age the man whose youth and manhood had been utilised in his service. I am of opinion that chattel slavery is in many ways not as bad as industrial slavery. I speak of what I know, and I have struggled with these problems for many of the years

that lie behind me in the past. You do not literally buy a man in the open market; you only buy his labour; he is not a man, he is a "hand," in the ordinary talk of industrialism. You have no duty to him, save of paying him his wages; you have no human relation with him. You buy his labour when he has strength, but when he begins to weaken you throw him aside; he may starve or die, but you have no further responsibility for him. You merely buy another hand, and similarly throw him aside again when he is useless. That has been the outgrowth of individualism; the miseries of the producers have grown beyond bearing in western lands, and there has been a revolt against that theory, and the revolt is known as socialism.

Stop for a moment upon this new theory. The idea had been that every man may buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, whether he buy goods, or human lives.

Against this view of human relations the social conscience began to assert itself. Social feeling began to say: this is not right, this is not just. Law was invoked to guard the feeble party, the sellers of labour. Children's labour was within certain limits forbidden, beyond these regulated. Women's was regulated, and men's to some extent circumscribed. Then it was thought that no modifi-

cation could make successful a system based on a wrong foundation, and the theory of the socialistic State arose. Every one was to have equal opportunities. Every one was to be educated in every way in similar fashion. Every one was to have as much power as anybody else. Everything was to be decided by the vote of the majority. Every one was to be compelled to labour, and every one to have a fair share of leisure. The organisation of labour was to be such that out of it general happiness and comfort might result, instead of immense wealth on one side and terrible poverty on the other.

The idea at once struck root. Hearts broken by the spectacle of the misery of the poor, of labour wars, and of many other diseases of our Society grown mad with individualism, welcomed the new ideal. The pressure of a poverty growing ever more discontented forced men to consider the conditions of their times, if only to escape the revolution of hunger and despair and hopeless misery. A new theory was built up on a new economical basis. Man was no longer to be sold as a labourer, as cattle and goods are sold. Society must manage all manufactures, Society must organise industries, Society must control all distribution of wealth, and in this way poverty would disappear and happiness would take its place.

There were clearly many advantages in this idea, if it could be worked at all, but there were also some disadvantages. Men have seen that as a rule a man is more or less lazy; unless he is forced to work, he will not work. Men have pointed out that those who were industrious would, under this plan, have to support the idle, and it would be very hard to apply pressure, which was not the pressure of hunger, on the indolent, too careless to contribute their share of labour for the good of society. If this stimulus of hunger was done away with, competition would disappear, and the want of the stimulus of need would deprive men of energy, and reduce them to a dead level of mediocrity—not a desirable outcome of the organisation of society.

To these arguments, counter-arguments are readily available, but we have no time to pursue this controversy.

To-day these two parties stand opposite to each other in the different countries of Europe, in America, and in Australia, and will stand opposite to each other in India, unless you learn to understand the subject, and learn wisdom by the experience of others instead of by struggle and competition.

Pass from the theories, and again let the light of Theosophy shine forth. The whole human race

is one family, a vast brotherhood, one life circulating in all veins, and that life divine. If that be so, then the true ideal of the human State *is* the family, in which there are elders, equals and inferiors, and the duties of each depend on the place which he occupies in the family order. That was summarised in the great socialistic saying which is also profoundly theosophical: "From every man according to his capacities; to every man according to his needs."

That is the rule of a family. Those who are elder and stronger bear the burden of the family, according to their capacities. The child in the cradle does nothing, but receives according to his needs. No one says: "The baby is young and cannot work, therefore let him starve;" no one says: "The baby is ignorant, and therefore let us take advantage of his ignorance." That is the true ideal. The true ideal of human Society is the ideal of a family, and if that is worked out into practice you will build a Society which will endure. Socialism in its main idea is true, but not the democratic Socialism which gives equal power to ignorance and wisdom, equal power to vice and virtue, equal power to industry and indolence, equal power to sage and criminal. Democratic Socialism is impossible; it is against the order of nature; but a Socialism that may be

called hierarchical is the ideal of the future.

Now what do I mean by that? A form of it was seen in the government of the divine Kings. That has passed, and man has to grow into his own divinity. Slowly and gradually, by the struggles and blunders of the unguided democracy, men are growing weary of contention and inefficiency, and are beginning to see the foundation of the nobler social order, where the wisest shall guide, where the holiest shall inspire, where the authority of wisdom shall be the basis of the throne, and where the law shall be the expression of the consensus of the wisest heads, and not of the greatest number of the emptiest. That is what we learn from the theosophical idea of humanity, which sees elders, equals, and younger on every side, and knows that while they all are one brotherhood, within that brotherhood are elder and younger, and that all are not of the same age and growth.

Now individual efforts to redress the miseries of Society have led to many socialistic schemes. But all of these have broken down in practice, after a longer or shorter time. I have often seen young men and women in the dawn of life, full of enthusiasm, full of self-abnegation, throwing all their means into a common stock, buying a piece of land, and trying to live there as brothers. A few years have passed, and the whole thing has

broken up under the stress of the innate selfishness of man. There is one of these schemes that remains in history as a great example—the splendid scheme of Robert Owen, the man of marvellous unselfishness, of wealth and of nobility of character. He gave his property; he gave his thought and life; he founded a society, in which all children were to be educated, where all adults were to be laborious, where all were to be happy. But there was no authority to which all were willing to submit; no religious bond, which might bind heart to heart; and the whole thing after a time came to an end; quarrels, dissensions and jealousies broke up this Arcadia into fragments, and Robert Owen turned aside, sad at heart, declaring that out of men educated in an individualistic society you can never build up a state of social harmony. Many another has had the same experience.

What is then wanted? we find that every scheme has split on the same rocks. First the absence of trust one in the other. Suspicions arise, due to the ascribing of evil motives, the imagining that one or the other wants to gain unfair advantage. Want of trust—that is one rock on which these schemes have inevitably split.

The second rock is want of reverence. The assertion of each that he is as good as the others; the refusal to admit superiority, and the meeting of

it with jealousy instead of with gladness and honour; the refusal to give to knowledge, to purity, to nobility of life, the power to guide and the authority to direct. Want of trust and want of reverence, these two are the fatal rocks on which every scheme has broken.

How are they to be gotten rid of? Now it is useless to preach trust, where there is nothing trustworthy; and it is no good blaming men who do not trust others, when the others do not show the qualities that secure trust.

If you want to see trust between man and man, there is only one way to make it. That is by so building the character, that a noble character shall attract public confidence. That is why Theosophy begins with the individual, and lays stress on the building of character. That is why it lays down, as a fundamental principle, the need for ennobling the man before you can ennoble the State. You cannot build a great State, till citizens worthy of freedom are there. You cannot make a brotherhood, unless first you are present to act in a brotherly way.

There it is that Theosophy comes in to explain why all these noble schemes have failed, and must continue to fail, while men begin at the wrong end. No law, no scheme, no plan for human redemption can succeed, unless it is built on the

rock of noble character, character that compels trust, because it shows itself to be trustworthy.

Character, then, is the first thing needed for building Society, and then reverence—reverence for the Supreme, as the fount of all authority ; reverence for the wise, as those who by experience know how to guide ; reverence for the ruler, as the one who has on his shoulders the heavy burden of direction, of self-abnegation ; reverence for parents, as those who have given the body ; reverence for the aged. This is the reverence that is wanted.

Now in modern Society this is very much lacking ; the democratic spirit has thrown aside reverence for age, for learning, for authority vested in an individual. You see in this the natural defect of youth, the self-assertion of the foolish youth, who has not borne the heavy burden of a family, and is therefore reckless in his ignorant criticism and lack of consideration for his elders. The youth is more self-assertive than a man of mature age, because the man of mature age knows the burdens of a family, and is therefore gentle in his criticism of others.

Theosophy teaches us to try to make in ourselves a trustworthy character, and to cultivate the quality of reverence. There are many of us who are good to our equals ; that comes easily. There are many of us who are good to our inferiors ; that also is

easy, because the sense of our superiority produces compassionate and gentle feelings. But many are unable to look up as well as to look down, to reverence as well as to be compassionate. It is in our duty to our superiors that most of us fail, far more than in our duties to our equals and inferiors. So that the Theosophist, who is building his character for the future, and understands what is wanted for a safe and lasting organisation of Society, should build into his own individual character the qualities that are wanted for the good citizen of the future, the basis of a happy and prosperous Society, and in this way should build for to-morrow and formulate what is necessary for the work of the generations of men that will follow him.

It is not only in this general line that Theosophy points out the way on which we should go. The great doctrine of re-incarnation and its application to the problems of Sociology are necessary, in order that we may understand, discuss, and guide.

Take for instance the social condition of the people. Has it ever struck you that as you make those social conditions, you are making the condition that attract suitable Egos to take birth among you? I say suitable Egos, because there are Egos suitable for, fitted for, circumstances of every kind, each type demanding such circumstances as are conducive to the next stage of its growth. If you

make bad conditions, the *suitable* Egos for them will be those who are little developed, who are poorly evolved. If you make good conditions, you will draw into your midst highly evolved Egos, who will find their suitable ground in the favourable conditions that you have created. This is the doctrine which I have preached in the West. There is need for it even more in the West than in the East. In the West you have slums of the most ghastly description. I can hardly make you realise the horrors of the slums of London, Liverpool, Sheffield, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and other western towns. People crowded together, three or four generations living in a single room, and that room built below the surface of the ground, where the light of the sun never penetrates and scarcely one fresh breath of air is ever able to come. Others crowded up in miserable garrets, at the top of five or six storied houses, where a mother is bringing forth her child into the world with another child lying already dead, and a grandmother laying out the corpse, two or three men quarrelling over their drink. All the horrors that you can think of are crowded together in the miserable slums of these cities. What kind of Ego can come into this surrounding? what kind of provision does England make to attract suitable Egos? Such conditions can attract only the savages whom its arms have

slain, whose countries it has taken by force or fraud; and a large part of the worst types of the children of the London slums are nothing but reincarnated savages, who have no moral sense, who have come to learn the rudiments of moral lessons under these terrible conditions, and who form a constant menace to the stability of the State.

Now while I allude to the conditions of the West, and it is a dark picture, you have also to think of the same question here. Arrange your social conditions on the plan of the noblest and the best, if you desire your country to rise in the scale of nations. Some of the western conditions are good, and there is many a noble Ego that has been evolving in the East for incarnation after incarnation, who now is being born in some western land, so that he may utilise there what he learned here, and then bring back the message to his ancient birth-place.

How are you to make suitable conditions for the re-incarnation of advanced souls? First, some families must live in a way so simple, so noble, and so pure, that the elect Egos shall find fit parentage and fit atmosphere. Then you must not in your great cities, like Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, allow to grow up slums which resemble to some extent the slums of the western lands. The message has been sent to you by plague

to warn you of this coming danger. Nature has spoken by plague, as men would not listen to her when she spoke in the voice of compassion and sympathy. For Nature is just ; she teaches first by examples, and then she teaches by precepts, if examples are rejected and denied. And if both these are rejected, then she teaches by the scourge of plague, famine, and death, so that men shall learn the lesson even in their death-agony, and come back wiser when their next birth comes.

Then you must give good education, easily to be reached. The advanced Ego wants to come into surroundings where he will find materials that can lead him into a higher stage of evolution. We do not want merely education of the upper classes, but a widespread education carefully designed to meet national needs, that leaves no child in ignorance, and that looks upon none as beyond the touch of human love.

Another vital matter. Not only better surroundings physically, not only good conditions for all, but also an improvement of the status of women in the land. What waste of material would it be for Those who love not only India, but the world at large, what waste of material to send into the Zenana her who was Gârgî, her who was Maitreyî, her who was Sâvitri, or her who was Shakuntalâ ;

what would they do here? What work would they find ready to their hands? They were wise; they knew the conditions of Society; they knew the various needs of men; and they won the supreme knowledge, the knowledge of the Highest, which made them worthy to stand as mothers of a mighty race.

So long as you leave your women ignorant, untrained; so long as you treat them as children, rather than as helpmates, leaving superstitions to them while you take the wisdom and learning for yourselves; so long as you selfishly hold the key of knowledge and lock its treasures away from your wives and daughters, so long must younger souls take birth in the bodies of your women; sweet, loving, devoted, in truth they mostly are, often exquisite in dainty grace, but, except in rare cases, not fitted to be mothers of heroes and leaders of men, who go out into the world to strive and conquer.

Thus should you apply reincarnation to Sociology, and thus should you use theosophical knowledge to solve the problems that are before us today. Then how swiftly might India rise. Training yourselves to grow in character and in reverence, helping all that are around you, you will call into reincarnation again in India the noblest souls that are awaiting rebirth, and they would be glad to crowd into the land sacred by its past, although decayed in its present.

Other points also arise with which I have no time to deal. The question of criminalology, the right treatment of the criminal population. You have to remember the law of karma, and accept that law in dealing with criminality. You should keep criminals under restraint, firm not cruel, educative not vindictive, inspiring them with better desires, that in another life may blossom into good deeds. You must not hate the criminal, you must not despise him. he is only ignorant ; You were criminals in times gone by, and by your own experiences have risen to your present respectable situation. The criminal is also a God in the making, only younger in this cycle of time and space.

Such are the lessons then which we learn from Theosophy. Reincarnation, Karma and Brotherhood, those lie at the basis of sound Sociology, and where they are disregarded no strong and useful structure of Society can arise.

I come back at the very last to Brotherhood. Brotherhood is the basis of our movement, and you know that it is the first object of our society, which none may deny who would enter within our ranks. Because in the near future a nobler Society has to be built, because in the years that lie in front a nobler Sociology is to be proclaimed and taught ; therefore in the forefront of our movement stands

the proclamation of the Brotherhood of Man. The basis of that future society is to be Brotherhood, and nothing else is possible. Civilisations in the past have arisen, splendid in their strength, magnificent in their glory, but they were founded on the negation of Brotherhood, and therefore inevitably they failed. You must recognise the law of God which makes men brothers; nothing can stand against that law; if you ignore it, or deny it, then it breaks you. The law cannot change. The law is unalterable. In it there is no possibility of swerving, nor of being ever thrown aside. Disobey it, and the civilisation perishes, as history has told of all the unbrotherly civilisations of the past. Willingly take it as your guide in life, as your judge in conduct, make your will accord with the law and follow it, and then you base Society on a rock which no floods can overflow, which no earthquake can shake, no winds can break down. A Society founded on Brotherhood is a Society which will endure.

THIRD LECTURE.

THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO POLITICS.

BROTHERS :

WHEN we look over the different nations of the world we find, naturally enough, wide and deep differences in what is usually call the practical life of the people. We find various forms of Government. We find various arrangements for carrying on the Administration—republican and monarchical, constitutional and autocratic monarchs and emperors, and so on. These various forms of political arrangements meet us on every hand. When you come to ask what is the duty of a member of the Theosophical Society with regard to the politics of the nation to which he belongs, the answer must be to a very large extent vague and indeterminate. He must always be law-abiding and peace-pursuing, but a member born under one form of Government will have duties in detail different from those of the member who is born under another.

Moreover, inasmuch as Theosophists are men and women of the world, like others, they

are different in their opinions and in their temperaments, looking at all questions through the atmosphere of their own ideas, beliefs and prejudices. This being so, there must be amongst Theosophists great differences of opinions as regards political action. That, however, does not very much concern us. For clearly a member of the Theosophical Society is as free to form his political opinions as a member of any other organisation. Only the Society, as a Society, can take no corporate part in any special line of political activity, in the narrow sense of the word; for, containing members of all shades of political thought, the Society as a whole cannot be committed to any special or particular line—conservative, radical, liberal, monarchical, republican, socialist. It is not those subdivisions with which we are concerned.

I am going to take politics in a very very much wider sense than that which is concerned with the squabbles of political parties. In these the members of the T. S. may or may not mix. If they do mix in them, they must do so as individual men and women, and not as members of the Society.

It is universally admitted that Government exists not for its own sake, but for the sake of the governed. The judgment passed by history on a Government turns upon the happiness and prosperity of the people over whom that Government rules. You

find this principle laid down in the most ancient Hindu Shâstras, as much as by the most modern political reformer who is anxious to make the world better. It is in fact one of those maxims that no one disputes, that the Government of every land exists for the good of the governed. We saw, in looking at the principles of Sociology yesterday, that at one time States and Nations were guided by the illuminative wisdom of the divine Kings. Long after They had passed away, the forms of Government adopted in human States preserved the family patriarchal character. We often hear the phrase used, "paternal rule." Now paternal rule is an admirable thing, provided the father who exercises it is thoroughly unselfish and is really much older and wiser than the children he controls. If he thinks of the good of the family and not of his own comfort, if he studies the welfare of the children and disregards his own pleasure, then no Government can be more perfect than that true paternal Government where love and wisdom illuminate the mind of the Ruler. But where only the form remains and selfishness wields the sceptre of absolute authority, then the evils of such a form of Government arise, and autocracy without divine illumination becomes a yoke intolerable to be borne. What autocracy is where it lives for itself, and not for its people, where it is selfish, unwise, cruel, and timid,

you may see in the great object lesson given by the Russian Tsardom during the last century, a lesson that is showing its inevitable results to-day. All the noblest of the people, the flower of the nation, were driven into exile, were sent into the mines of Siberia. Wherever a head arose above the rest in nobility of character, in devotion to God, in love of education, in service of the people, there that head was struck at and its wearer had to expiate his crime in the misery of exile to Siberia. What has been the result? Never had an autocracy a more splendid opportunity than that offered to the Russian Tsardom ere the outburst of devotion to the people, born of sympathy and self-sacrifice, changed into the outburst of despair embodied in the Terror. Then came what was once graphically called by a political writer "autocracy tempered by assassination." The last resources of a people mad with despair have been used, because unrighteousness held the sceptre of absolute authority. The whole country is convulsed by internal discissions, while she herself is in death grips with a foe strong enough to hold his own against her men. We read day after day in the papers in one column of the continual victories of Japan, and in the next column of the violent disturbances, remonstrances passing into riot, of the people, and the effort to hold down by force the whole of the Russian

nation under an authority not based on justice and compassion, that exists for itself and not for the benefit of the ruled.

Now the nations grow inevitably out of the paternal form of Government with the drawing back of the divine Rulers and the kingship of lesser men, men more on a level with those they govern. The change was necessary, in order that intelligence might develop, in order that individual intelligence might grow. And then came, and is still going on, what may be called the trial of the democratic theory—Government by the people, by the majority vote.

I say "still going on"—for the judgment of the world on the success or failure of democracy is still in the balance, is still "on the knees of the Gods." We look over the nations of Europe, and what do we find as regards social happiness and prosperity, as regards the condition of the people, under a theory of government which places, as I pointed out yesterday, ignorance on the same level as wisdom, which gives to the want of knowledge of national affairs the same power as to the profoundest study of political and economical problems?

This question of government by suffrage, on which I shall touch a little towards the end of what I have to say, is on its trial before the world

to-day. What, under it, is the condition of the masses of the people, whose happiness depends less on the laws made by the Government, than on the effective organisation of labour, the rightful education of children, both boys and girls, the healthy condition of the nation physically, intellectually, morally and spiritually? I look across the leading nations of the world, and on every side I see the signs of industrial anarchy; and industrial anarchy means family and individual distress, a terrible competition that crushes the life out of the people, and makes a continual presence of harassing anxiety which eats the very heart out of their lives. I see on every side what is justly called the war of capital and labour.

Now the word war, or the word strife, is not here an empty word, not even a metaphor or an exaggeration; but it is rightly applied to the combats between the capitalist on the one side and the skilled labourer on the other.

Take America, where you have practically manhood suffrage, where all that the suffrage can do has been done for long periods of time, and where the so-called "rights of man" have their fullest and completest exposition. What do you find there? Industry is there in its most anarchical condition, and force, not justice, decides every quarrel.

Starvation of workmen is pitted against bankruptcy of employers; the menace which is the nearer compels submission. Neither side wins because it is in the right; it wins only because it can hold out the longer. A great manufacturer struggles with his organised labourers about the question of wages to be paid week after week. The manufacturer guards his silent factories with soldiers, with armed workmen who are on his side, with wire fences all round his domain through which are running electric currents, so that any one touching the wires may be felled to the ground by the electric shock, to die or recover as he may; a scientific defence against the danger of attack from the workmen on strike, who are equally prepared to use force to seize or destroy the whole business that they regard as not yielding them their fair share of the profits. Thus you have a literal war, and the resources of civilisation, such as electricity, are used to defend the property of the master against his workmen, used to safeguard the manufacturer against the so-called hands employed in his business.

That is the sort of struggle which goes on year after year in the various countries of the West that are called so 'free, and that are held up as models of civilisation—bitterest, harshest, most cruel and unrelenting where the political freedom is the

widest and the suffrage is most nearly universal.

Pass from that to another point in the struggle, which has yet wider effect. Workmen band themselves together to gain higher wages: they push their claims to a point where the manufacturer cannot produce the goods with profit and give that amount of wages to the labourers.

Lately in London a large order for ships was placed in the hands of a London ship-building yard. A winter of exceptional severity was threatening, and a large number of men were out of work and had to be supported by public charity. In the face of that state of affairs, the ship-builders claimed such a rate of wages that the master-builder was obliged to refuse the contract, and ten thousand pounds a week in wages were lost to London, and the men were left idle, because they would not work at a rate of wages which left a living margin of profit to the employer.

Not only do you find difficulties of this kind on every hand, but you also see that in many trades more goods are manufactured than the impoverished people are able to buy. Then there is a glut in the market, and prices go down; the manufacturers refuse to sell below the cost price, and while the clothes are rotting in the storehouses, men, women, and children are walking bare-footed and ragged in the streets. They want

clothing ; the manufacturers want to sell clothing ; but they cannot find any way by which to bring together the naked shivering body and the wasting clothes.

So great is the anarchy of industry where it is unregulated and unorganised, where the old intimate relation of master and man has become the mere cash connexion between employer and hands. You may say : “ Why do you tell us these things ? We have no industrial problem here.” I tell you, because here in India also, you are beginning to pass on to the same industrial system that is breaking down so hopelessly in Europe ; because those of you who take part in politics ought to understand the facts upon which national prosperity is based. What is wanted is not a mere empty vote that every workman should possess, —and if the workman has no “ right ” to it no one else has any “ right ”, but there is only an assignment of a “ duty ” to those fitted to discharge it for the general good—but the knowledge to organise, the skill to arrange, the unselfishness to co-operate the trust to aid in carrying out, and the devotion to work for the common object ; without these, any amount of suffrage is of the very smallest value, and with these no restriction of it can injure. Possession of it is a mere alluring mirage, and does not touch the difficulties of the people.

What then are we to turn to? I place before you the politics of a Nation as consisting of four great stages: First, Politics as they apply to individuals, Individual Politics, in which the individual can begin at once to make improvement. Second, Politics as they apply to the management and arrangement, the administration, of local affairs, affairs within a narrow area, Municipal Politics. Third, Politics as they apply to the law-making of a Nation, National Politics. Fourth, Politics as they apply to the relation of one country to another and to countries under other forms of government, a part that cannot be entirely left out of sight, International Politics. So that you have a great pyramid: first and widest, as base, the individual; the second, local stage, less wide; the third stage, still narrower, the national; and the fourth, narrowest of all, at the top, international. The first concerns every one in the State; the second concerns an educated minority; the third concerns the Parliament; the fourth concerns the Monarch and his Privy Council. In this division, I am giving, of course, only my own individual opinion. If you want to understand and work wisely, you must begin with the Individual Politics, and understand and practise properly the duties of a citizen of the State.

Now, here Theosophy helps us very much by

its declaration that we are all one body, all one life, all one brotherhood. It is on that teaching of brotherhood with which I ended yesterday, that you must begin your application of the principles to ordinary life. You have to create in yourself, and in those around you, that public spirit which regards the public interest just as it regards the private interest, and considers the welfare of the State as it considers the welfare of the family. Until that public spirit exists, absolutely nothing can be done. For it is that which makes a Nation. A Nation has no life where public spirit is not found.

Now that begins in the individual, not by talking but by practice, not by empty phrases on the platform but by work offered freely in every part of daily life. Let me show you by an illustration what I mean by public spirit. You expect a man to be more public-spirited than a woman, because a woman's interests are as a rule more narrow, being confined to the circle of home, than the interests of a man. The mother's interests are confined to her children, and the wife's to her husband. All questions with which she is occupied are questions of home, and her heart and intelligence are educated accordingly. And yet one of the sublimest examples of public spirit was lately shown by a woman in Japan. She was seen to be weeping after the news

of a great battle had come to the town, with the lists of the killed and wounded. Her friends went forward to comfort and console her, for they thought she was weeping for the death of her sons, whose names were numbered amid the slain. Three of the sons of her womb had given their lives for the sake of their native land, and the mother was weeping. Surely she was weeping over their foreign graves. No. It was not for that that her tears were flowing, that her heart was breaking. She turned, half indignant, to the friends who consoled: "What do you think I am weeping for? I am not weeping because my three sons have given their lives to their country; I am weeping because I have not another son to give his life for the land."

Now there is public spirit at its noblest and its highest, in the mother's heart that loved the country's welfare better than her children's lives; you cannot carry public spirit to a loftier height. I mean then by public spirit, this love of the public weal, this devotion to the common interest, this caring for the land and its people more than for one's own happiness and comfort. I do not suppose that that Japanese woman had a vote. I doubt whether she ever heard of a vote. But it is from such women that heroes are born into a nation, and where such women are found that nation has a certainty of life.

This is an individual thing. You have to create this first in your own heart, and then in the hearts of those around you ; and mind you, it means practice. It means that when your interest conflicts with the public interest, your interest should be pushed to the wall by you. When it is a question of your making some payment for the public benefit, it means that you take it from your own purse, and do not try to slide out of it by some evasion or by dishonest mental equivocation. It means the meeting of every obligation heartily and willingly, no matter how heavy a burden it may lay upon you. Unless you train yourself in these Individual Politics, you will never be able to build up a nation in the world. Individual Politics mean the building up of character, without which nothing can be done. Truth, honour, courage, uprightness, justice, generosity, dignity, courtesy, piety—these are the virtues that make the good citizen ; and it is because Theosophy enforces the building of character, and shows how to build it scientifically, that Theosophy is so valuable an agency from the standpoint of the State.

Next we come to the second part of politics, what I have called Municipal Politics. It is the duty of the richer, of the more highly educated, of the more highly placed, to use their money, their position and their education for the guiding and

the helping of their less fortunate fellow-citizens.

I shall take here a special example, for I want to give such necessary details as will make the general ideas clear. You have a large number of Zamindars who own large estates. One of the duties to be demanded from these landholders is that they shall train up one at least of their sons in the thorough knowledge of agricultural science. When he is so trained, he should go about among the ryots, and teach them better methods and wiser ways of working; the Zamindar should train and utilise in the part of the estate that he himself is keeping under personal supervision, the cleverest young men among his tenant's sons, and educate them in the use of the better-made instruments which agricultural science puts at his disposition, wherever the new is really better than the old. He should guide them in making experiments, and anything proved useful on his model farm should, by their intermediary, be introduced among the cultivators. He should show to them the best rotation of crops, and introduce new forms of plant-life, gained by skilful crossing or brought from other lands. He should distribute among his people the necessary seeds and the necessary instructions, by his students, presently to succeed their fathers in the cultivation of the land, and thus enable them to cultivate their plots to

better advantage. He should concern himself with the questions whether they are provided with seed for the next year's harvest, whether they need advances on fair and not ruinous interest, as did the Kings in the olden days, to enable them to sow for that coming harvest. The Zamindar should thus be the father of his tenantry, and, like a wise and noble father, should guide them along the road which leads to greater prosperity. There is no need of a vote to do this work of the Zamindar. It comes within the limits of the individual duty of those in the higher social ranks to bear the burdens of Municipal Politics, and, in an agricultural nation like India, there is scarcely one thing that would have more widespread results than this. Let us try to arouse the Zamindars to a sense of their duty, and let some, at least, make their own estates models for the surrounding people.

Then with respect to other forms of public work. Men of education and position should ever be ready to come forward to take the lead in that work over wider areas, with which I will now deal.

I read with great pleasure a pamphlet written by a thoughtful Indian, who pointed out how much might be done for the benefit of the village population, if only some men of thought, some men of position, would set to work to gather round

themselves the leaders of the village, and try to carry out in each village that which is necessary for healthy living.

Imagine for a moment a Zamindar, or any man of good education and social position, who called to his side the fathers of the village, the leaders who in days gone by had so much to do with village organisation and village administration. They take in hand the sanitation of their own village. They go about amongst the cottages, and see that sanitary conditions are observed. They teach the ignorant peasantry that to throw all kind of rotting matter just outside the doors of the cottages, and to leave it there for days as a breeding ground for all disease germs, is a crime against the village health. They explain carefully and patiently and repeatedly why these things ought not to be done. And they can fall back on the old *Institutes of Manu*, in order to influence the minds of those poor people whom all have forgotten and who have become sunk in ignorance. Is it not written in the Code of Manu that all filth, and even water used for washing, shall be carried away from the dwelling, and put far away from the houses where families reside? It is not written that scrupulous cleanliness is to be observed, and are not the means of cleaning walls, vessels, all articles, carefully laid down? Are not those old rules based

on sound sanitary science, and is not the neglect of all these rules responsible for much of the disease, and the spreading of infectious diseases, in our village communities at the present time? What can we expect, when near the door of every cottage there is a regular cesspool, to serve as a centre of propagation for the germs of the disease? These are but village politics. But they mean the difference between health and disease, comfort and misery, happy life or sad, and these are the duties of the leaders of the people, and the elders of the village should gather round their natural ruler, the Zamindar. Surely along these lines much is to be done that would train the workers and make better condition for those who labour.

Then applying the same principle to towns, always within the limits of the laws as they exist, it is desirable that earnest municipal work should be made more a matter of public duty than it is at present; the best men in the town should take an intelligent interest in local affairs, and learn to carry them on effectively for the welfare of the people. Now for this the necessary preparation ought to begin with the boys. Half the difficulties that arise in Municipal Politics turn on the fact that many who take part in them have not been trained in the accuracy, the rigid business habits, terseness, courtesy of speech, which are necessary

for the effective carrying on of public work. In the Hindu College we prepare our boys to take part in this share of the life of the nation. We have Debating Societies, where rules of debate are strictly enforced, where the speaker is obliged to conform to those rules which guide assemblages in all lands where local self-government is found. They are gradually trained to express themselves thoughtfully, courteously and tersely, and I have noticed during the last four years wonderful improvement in the way in which these lads discuss questions. I know, when they are men, they will carry into public life this knowledge of, this aptitude for, business, and will thus gain the respect of their English co-workers, and obtain for themselves far more weight when questions of importance arise to be discussed.

We have done more than that : we are trying to train them to think and to choose for themselves, and to guide their own affairs. Some said that we were very rash when we made over the whole power of management of the athletics of the College and School, save the choice of the President and the Treasurer of the Association, into the hands of the boys themselves. We gave them the power to elect their own committee, and the committee framed their bye-laws, and controls the funds obtained from game fees and the College grant. It

was said: "You will not be able to carry out your idea; the boys will make all kinds of foolish rules and waste the money, and you will have to break up your Association, and again make a despotic committee of elders, laying down its orders that the boys are obliged to obey." I do not mean to say that our lads did not make mistakes. They did make a mistakes in the beginning. They were learning to wield authority, and to bear the burden of responsibility which always accompanies authority. But I do mean to say that on the whole, the experiment has proved an admirable success, and that now the boys are guiding the affairs of their athletic Association thoroughly well, effectively and wisely, and are training themselves, by the guidance of their small Association, to guide larger assemblies in the days to come.

Why should not that training be carried on in other Schools of this country where they have similar boys? you can do it, if you will. But you have to care about it, and there is where the difficulty comes in. I know you approve it, and you cheer me when I urge it, but what I want is not your approval or cheers only, but that you should carry it on in your own places. You should not only applaud others, but do it yourselves. That is the difficulty everywhere. There is just the same difficulty in England, though public spirit is far more

widely spread there ; everywhere the cry is for more workers, for more who will work unselfishly and bear the drudgery of unpaid work. And you must remember that in England the higher classes in society have long been the unpaid workers, and their centuries of training in local administration have trained them to wield power in national politics. The classes that have not had this training use the larger power badly.

One most vital part of local politics is the establishment of Educational Boards everywhere throughout India, who should make their own Schools and guide the education given within those Schools. There is one phrase of mine that is becoming a catchword, "the fourfold education",—I read it in all sorts of different places—and it means education spiritual, moral, intellectual and physical ; that is now recognised as the right education for India. It is the duty of all of you to look into the educational condition of your own districts, and then to supply what is lacking. Make your Educational Board carefully, seeking for the most thoughtful and influential men of the place, and shape the education of your own children on your own lines. And if, after some experience, I may throw out one suggestion as to physical education, it is this. While you may have your boys taught European and other ordinary foreign

games, you should also have them trained in those admirable muscular exercises known as "Deshi Kasrat," indigenous athletics. You may see, in the Boarding-House compound adjoining, two big malkhams, posts, where our boys learn to exercise every muscle of the body, with a perfection of exercise that none of the western games can give them. This training is easily given ; the apparatus is very cheap. And the people who teach it do not ask high salaries. And it is a better training than any other training you can give, because every muscle of the body is developed. If proof is wanted, I may tell you that the boy who gained the first prize in the Boarding-House for physical development was a boy whose father had been wise enough to train him in the Indian muscular exercises, and so to develop the whole of his muscular system, and not only the arms and legs.

It is not only along these more familiar lines of education, but also on some other points also that I want to arouse your public spirit in this field of local politics. I want you to take up in your Educational Boards the question of agricultural and technical training, to open schools in the country where boys should be taught practically in the fields as well as in the class rooms. Do not leave the Government to do it. Do not wait till

the Government or the Viceroy opens up one establishment here and there. Government schemes are necessarily costly, because of the high price of European trained scientific professors, and they are consequently entirely above the means of the classes which require such education. Open your own technical schools under your own Educational Boards, and do not think you can do nothing because you cannot start with a splendid building crowded with costly machines. Begin in a small way, and grow. But when you have opened your school and have your boys in training, only a part of your work is done. Side by side with your Educational Boards, which should exist in every district, you must form a union of Rājās, merchants, and other employers of labour, who shall accept in their State offices, manufacturies, shops, and places of business, the youths who have gained certificates from your technical institutions. It is not wise to train a lot of boys and then to throw them into the world without providing for their being employed. Therefore, as you train the boys, train the princes and merchants at the same time, and get them to recognise the certificates of your technical schools, so that every boy may go out into a place open and ready for him. Princes are in need of skilled engineers, mineralogists, chemists, surveyors; manufacturer

want skilled overseers, all of which your technical schools will supply ; and so with one hand you will build up the education of the people and with the other revive your manufactures, and strengthen them by supplying skilled scientific trained labour, which is necessary for their successful carrying on.

When a man opens a manufactory he sends to England for a manager, and the manager so brought out becomes the master in a short time. You have to pay him a great deal, and he is not sympathetic with the Indian working people. Why cannot you train up your own sons to occupy these positions? Why cannot you educate them for these well-paid, responsible and useful posts? If in addition to that, you approach the various Princes and ask them, in their States, to give preference to the youths trained in your own technical institutions, you will find there a large area of employment for the benefit of the nation as well as for the individual.

I am trying to do this in my own small way, but it ought to be done by associations formed for the purpose. I keep a list of boys who will be ready to take up this work, and I talk to Indian Princes when I see them. But one person cannot do much in a little way like this. It must be done by yourselves.

Another thing that you must take up by these

same Educational Boards is the establishment of institutions for the study of the Indian system of medicine—Ayurvedic medicine. English drugs, English medicines, do not suit the Indian constitution. The physical heredity built on generations of livers on meat, beer, and wine, needs quite different medicines, and of different strength, from those required by people whose physical heredity, by abstinence from liquor and largely abstinence from meat, give more delicately balanced frames; the drugs that help the European body are likely to prostrate you, and you are letting your own system of medicine die out, while your boys crowd the Colleges where the European system is taught, instead of studying the more suitable system belonging to Indian medical science. If that be done, then a new source of wealth will develop, and medicinal herbs that go to waste and are utterly disregarded and forgotten now will be utilised. There is a large sphere of labour there for patriotic Indians, who are willing to sacrifice time and thought for the building up of the national system of medicine.

Do you see how wide is your sphere of Municipal Politics, how much it means, how thoroughly practical it is, and how you can begin the whole without spending one hour in agitation for votes. Nothing of that sort is wanted, for this lies within

your own power now.

But what about the next division, the Politics of the Nation. I am afraid that here I am a terrible heretic. I have seen so much of voting that I do not value it very much; I have seen and heard so much of the chatter of Parliament, that I am weary of it; and so, in truth, are thousands of thoughtful and educated people, who see Parliament year by year pouring out ever increasing floods of talk and less and less effective work, because members have to catch the votes of ignorant constituents, instead of serving the true interests of the nation. Very weariness of the incompetency of Parliament is driving people to see that the suffrage which puts the guidance of the State into the hands of people who know nothing about it is wrong. But of course that is not the popular view.

The business of the nation is the one business in the world which men are allowed to carry on while they do not know anything about it. You will not allow it in your own office. When you require a clerk on Rs. 15/ you take care that he is honest, that he can read and write, and knows a little arithmetic. But when it comes to voting, then the most ignorant man, who is absolutely innocent of any knowledge of politics, may give his vote, and it counts as much as the vote of the most learned. He may mark his cross, if he cannot write; his

voting paper is worth as much as one signed by a Gladstone or a Balfour. If you are travelling in a ship, will you take the handling of it out of the hands of the captain, who is trained in the science of navigation, and place it in the hands of a sailor, taken by lot, who does not understand logarithms and does not know how to calculate the position of the sun and find his position at sea? But that would be wisdom itself compared with the madness which places the affairs of the Empire in the hands of a vast uneducated proletariat, that knows nothing of what is wanted for the steering of the ship of the State. For in the first case, the worst that can happen is that the ship may go down; a few lives only would be lost. But when you put the guidance of the ship of the State into the hands of tens of thousands of ignorant people, if you wreck your ship, the whole of a great nation perishes and misery everywhere prevails.

I say I am a heretic in these matters. I would not give a vote in national affairs to any one who was not thoroughly well educated, who did not understand political history and political economy, who could not show his fitness for managing national affairs by the work done in the smaller spheres of individual and municipal politics. I would not give any one a vote until he was 50 years of age. This is not the modern view in the West, I know. But

who has the right to rule? The wise, the experienced, the thoughtful, those who have studied, and who understand men and life. Does the right to rule inhere in every headlong boy of 21, with no experience, no knowledge, and no training in political affairs, and who yet claims the right to balance his empty head against the heavy head of the statesman with half a century of experience behind him? It is the worst of madness. But the mere catchwords of political Shibboleths blind the eyes of men and destroy wisdom from amongst them. I know that this counsel of perfection will not be popular, until democracy has ruined many a nation and many a people, until at last nations will throw themselves at the feet of some military dictator, and learn wisdom by suffering. Then, and then only, will they begin to consider reason, and apply to the life of the State the rules which every man applies to his own affairs.

Still more closely this view applies where International Politics are concerned. If it be wrong and unwise to trust the ignorant with the politics of a nation, it is still more rash and unwise to put into their hands international politics. Those require the genius of a statesman and the experience of aged and long-trained men. A study of ancient occult records at a time when things were better managed than now, would lead to the control of international

affairs by a permanent Council of the wisest of the Empire, gathered round their Sovereign, to help him with their advice, counsel and experience. And that, the Monarch in Council, should be the highest authority in the nation. It should contain men of light and leading from every part of the Empire, who should be the Councillors of the Ruler, and form a steady, reliable centre of the national life, standing as its symbol before all other peoples.

I have had to touch but very lightly on these latter points, because they concern us less. We can do little with regard to international, or even national, politics. But the thing really valuable, on which a nation's life and happiness depend, is not the International and the National, so much as the Municipal and the Individual. The happiness of peoples depends not so much in International and National Politics as on Municipal and Individual Politics. If you can realise that, then India will indeed be helped.

I will finish with one suggestion which certainly comes within the limit of Individual Politics, but is of vital importance for the nation : and that is the ideal of manly and womanly honour that dominates the minds of the people. That word "honour" in western lands has a very peculiar significance. It means duty which is not compelled by law ; the inner recognition of a man as to what

he owes to the world. The nearest word here would be Dharma, the wide duty of man in every relationship of life. So keenly is that "honour" prized in western lands, that a man who would not hesitate to break the law of the State will not break the law of honour, if he is born a gentleman. It is more compelling as a duty than that which law can enforce. A man may leave his ordinary debts unpaid, but the debt of honour he must pay, and will rather commit suicide than fail in its discharge. However much awry may be the application in any instance—and it is often awry—it is none the less that binding sense of obligation unenforced by law that makes a nation great. It is called the Code of Honour. The ancient Kṣhattryas in this land had their Code of Honour too, binding on every member of the caste. You find it in the word Bushido in Japan. That was the Code of Honour of the Sumerai caste, the same as the Kṣhattrya caste here. A man must never break his word; he must never turn his back in battle; he must die rather than dishonour himself; he must commit suicide rather than allow his honour to be stained. That Code of Honour has gradually spread through the whole nation, and it has now become the standard of honour of the entire Japanese people, and you see the results in the success that they have won. There is a word here which carries the same

connotation. It is the word **Ārya**. Do you remember when Shri Kṛiṣṇa stood as charioteer of Arjuna, His friend and disciple, before the battle began; Arjuna's heart was failing him, and he cast aside his weapons and sank desponding in the bottom of the car. What was the reproach, so bracing and stimulating, which fell from the divine lips? "What conduct is this? It is unĀryan." That was the keenest reproach that those lips could frame. It carried everything with it. It meant cowardly desponding feeling, fear, and yielding in the face of danger and peril. The "unĀryan" was the uttermost condemnation that could fall upon a Kṣhatriya.

Why then not take that word as a battle-cry of your political action? Why not make that word the watch-word of your political associations? It has no connotation that would divide one Indian from another. There is nothing in it that carries with it any special creed or special sub-race; it means noble. The word **Āryan** is the grandest word that you can take as your standard of national feeling, as your principle of honour. Let it be to your boys the keenest reproach, when you say: "You are acting in a way unworthy of an **Āryan**." Let it be the keenest reproach to a girl who does a thing that she ought not to do, when you say: "My daughter, that is not worthy of an **Āryan**."

Let it be the inspiration to the man of the world, when custom tempts him with a false morality, whether of commerce or of profession, and let it turn him aside, saying : “ I cannot do it. I am an **Âryan**. I cannot enter into that transaction ; it is non-**Âryan**. I cannot break my word ; it is non-**Âryan**.” Raise high then the name of **Âryan**, and when you have lifted it high, live it ; when your nation has learned to live it, she will shine once again amongst the nations of the world.

FOURTH LECTURE.

THEOSOPHY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE.

BROTHERS :—

THE subject of the afternoon is a glorious one, and few subjects can arouse profounder interest than the subject of science as seen by Theosophy ; I do not know any subject which is more difficult to follow, if one desires to go into details, and unless I go into some details I cannot show you the relation of Theosophy to science, in order to enable you to utilise the facts, when you desire to speak of Theosophy, as a helper and benefactor of mankind. Indeed I rather feel that I shall to-day tax your patience, but you will have to pardon me for this, and I on my part shall do my best, encouraged by the idea that if the lecture be dull in the delivery, you will find it probably more interesting in the reading. I must to some extent deal with figures ; these may not make much impression when you hear them, but they are very effective when they appeal to the eye, and when you go over them half a dozen times and so become

acquainted with their full force, then you will find them interesting.

Science is based on the observation of physical facts, and after these observations are collected, they must be arranged, co-ordinated, synthesised, before they can claim the name of science. Science is the body of facts gained by observation, arranged and co-ordinated by the intelligence. A matter can only be said to have reached the stage of science, when it has passed beyond the stage of observation as an isolated fact, has been arranged in its relation to other facts, has been shown as rooted in the unity underlying all phenomena, and as in its place under those great and far-reaching laws and principles which are valid alike in the single planet or in a collection of solar systems in the universe. Plato said that the man who could see the One under the many, he regarded as a God. It is truly the work of science to find the One in the many, so that it ought to be the helper and handmaid of Metaphysics and Religion, bringing the record of the observations of phenomena, of facts, to strengthen the fundamental verities reached by the intelligence.

There are two ways of gaining a knowledge of the universe. There is the scientific way, by studying the effects of hidden causes, and reaching the causes by induction. The other way is the

metaphysical, beyond the physical, and that reaches principles by the Reason and then argues deductively from the general principles thus recognised to particular applications, which may then be observed by the senses. If we could have a perfect study of the world, we should have metaphysics, to begin with, where general principles would be laid down by the Reason; and then scientific observation to conclude with, verifying that which the Reason had deduced from unchangeable and eternal principles. That would be perfect knowledge, metaphysical and physical, wedded together and united into one, through the exercise of intellect making deductions, and the keenest observation of the senses to test and verify those deductions.

At present, however, metaphysical and physical sciences are rather at war. They are inclined to treat each other with mutual contempt. The metaphysician looks down upon the scientist as a mere crawler on the earth, and the scientist sees in the metaphysician a mere balloonist soaring in the impalpable atmosphere. We want to bring the two together in the service of Religion.

Of course it is in western lands, that what we now call science has obtained its greatest prizes. On the other hand, looking far back—thousands of years back—we find a science of the ancients

as splendid as the science of the moderns, a science built up by occultists as well as science built up by observers of physical phenomena. It is a remarkable fact observed by a scientific man of the present day—Sir Oliver Lodge—that modern science appears to be rediscovering some of the discoveries of ancient science which were lost sight of and forgotten. When a man like Sir Oliver Lodge makes such a statement, it is at least encouraging to those who, amid ridicule and obloquy, had upheld the principles of Eastern occultism, which is really a science, and had refused to be driven out of those ancient conclusions by the clatter and self-assertion of modern days.

I am obliged to bring a number of books with me to-day, and to trouble you with quotations, because a large part of my lecture will consist in justifying the statements of the *Secret Doctrine* by the discoveries of modern science. This marvellous work of H. P. B. was sent out to the world before its time. It makes a large number of statements regarding scientific truths, and, although most accurate, some of them have been very much ridiculed because they were not in accord with the then reigning science. Many are drawn from the ancient Hindu Purâṇas and other Shâstras, so that in justifying the *Secret Doctrine*, we are justifying, at the same time, the ancient scriptures of all the ancient

religions, who all teach the same fundamental facts as to the visible and invisible worlds. When H. P. B. published this book she made one general and interesting statement at the very outset. She remarked with regard to the contents of the book in the introductory pages: "Out of the many truths revealed orally to man in the beginning, preserved and perpetuated in the Adyta of the temples through initiation, during the Mysteries, and by personal transmission, they selected one or more of such grand verities—actualities visible only to the eye of the real Sage and Seer, and revealed them to the masses. Thus every nation received in its turn some of the said truths, under the veil of its own local and special symbolism, which as time went on, developed into a more or less philosophical cultus, a Pantheon in mythical disguise" (i, 20); and then she said: "The rejection of these teachings may be expected and must be expected beforehand. No one styling himself a 'scholar,' in whatever department of exact science, will permit himself to regard these teachings seriously. They will be derided and rejected *a priori* in this century (she was writing in the nineteenth) but only in this one. For in the twentieth century of our era scholars will begin to recognise that the Secret Doctrine has neither been invented nor exaggerated but, on the contrary, simply outlined; and finally that its

teachings antedate the *Vedas*. This is no pretension to prophecy, but simply a statement based on the knowledge of facts" (i. 21).

That may stand as a general preface, and I begin with it because I want you to bear it in mind, as I take out statement after statement from the *Secret Doctrine*, and show you the same statements from the lips of modern science; I want you to see how the Masters of Wisdom are justifying Their disciple, and are showing out of the mouth of science the truth of the teaching she gave to the world in the last century.

First of all I am going to take the science of chemistry. I am going to take the sciences in order as regularly and intelligibly as I can. H. P. B. speaking of chemistry made certain remarks with regard to it: "Chemistry and Physiology are the two great magicians of the future, which are destined to open the eyes of mankind to great physical truths" (i. 281). "There is but one science that can henceforth direct modern research into the one path which will lead to the discovery of the whole hitherto occult truth, and it is the youngest of all—chemistry, as it now stands reformed. There is no other, not excluding astronomy, that can so unerringly guide scientific intuition, as can chemistry" (i. 635). That general statement of the value of chemistry has been very largely verified, for it is

from chemistry that has come the new view of the nature of the atom, and the discovery of radium, revolutionising all former views of matter.

The first point is this: Occultism has asserted, and the assertion is repeated continually in the *Secret Doctrine*, that there is only one fundamental element in the system, and that that one element undergoes numberless aggregations, dissociations and modifications, resulting in all the innumerable compound bodies, which are thus fundamentally one in essence and only one. The first proof of that from modern science came along the lines of the investigations of Sir. W. Crookes, who, in his magnificent sketch of the genesis of the elements, puts forward the idea of a primordial element for all physical matter, which he calls "protyle". That is, indeed, far below the Occult conception of the universe, which includes all the planes of the kosmos, but it is so far on the right lines, giving the "protyle" of the physical plane.

Then, in November, 1895, two of us looked more carefully into the constitution of a few chemical atoms. Those of you who have read *Lucifer* for November, 1895, will remember that atoms of hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen were investigated, and that these elements were broken up into finer matter, and that we traced them through four stages of dissociation until the limit of the physical,

the substratum, was reached, which was found to be identical throughout, save that it showed a slight difference of positive and negative, or male and female. I am inclined to think that closer observation would show other minute differences, missed by us in our then study. These observations for a time remained quite unverified and therefore without general credit, though it was seen that the number of component particles justified and explained the weight-numbers of the so-called elements. Presently orthodox science took up the constitution of atoms, and proved that our assertion of their compound nature was true. Prof. J. J. Thomson, dealing with the molecules of elements, specially the gaseous, and breaking them up by electricity, declared that their atoms were made up of particles identical in their nature, from whatever gas or whatever element the material was originally drawn. In Professor Rutherford's *Radio-Activity* (p.111) it is stated that physicists have found that chemical atoms can be broken up into bodies called electrons, whose masses are equal. Crookes' earlier theory was rendered more precise. And Prof. Rutherford also says that the "experimental results have led to the view that the constitution of the atom itself is very complex.....It has also indicated that the atom itself is not the smallest unit of matter, but is a complicated structure, made up of a

number of smaller bodies"(p. 1).

There are two important points come out of that. First these investigations have destroyed the earlier scientific idea that the atom of chemistry was a true atom, an indivisible particle, which was the foundation of the material universe ; that the atom was unchanged, indestructible, always remained unchanged throughout all changes of molecules, and was incapable of being changed—all that was entirely swept away. The breaking up of atoms by electricity proved that they were compound and not indivisible bodies. That was the first stage of the justification of the occult conception of the atom against the previous scientific idea.

Then, after the investigations showing the identity of the material of various "elemental" gaseous atoms, came to the world the famous discoveries of M. and Mme. Curie. They discovered Radium, the revolutioniser of the scientific ideas of matter. Prof. Rutherford found, as he went on investigating, that Radium changed slowly into Helium, another "element" hitherto known only as existing in the atmosphere of the sun. Not only we have this wonderful element Radium with its startling properties, but in addition to that the justification of the old occult claim that one element can be transmuted into another of a different chemical nature. For the first time in modern

days one "element" has been changed into another. Helium appeared as a product of radio-activity, and has thus shown that it is possible to transmute the so-called elements; that those elements are not only destructible but are transmutable; and thus another testimony was given to the occult contention, to the statement of the *Secret Doctrine*: "Chemistry," said H. P. B., will have virtually ceased to live; it will re-appear in its re-incarnation as New Alchemy or Meta-Chemistry."

But that is by no means all that chemistry has done. It has been discovered that the energy liberated by the dissociation of atoms justifies some of the most astounding of ancient statements. Listen for a moment to this assertion from the *Secret Doctrine*, and imagine the absurdity that it seemed to convey to the ears of the wise men of the west. H. P. B. says that Keely had discovered "the terrible sidereal force, known to and named by the Atlanteans Mashmak, and by the **Āryan** **Ṛiṣhis** in their *Astra Vidyâ* by a name that we do not like to give. It is the Vril of Bulwer Lytton's *Coming Race*, and of the coming races of our mankind. The name Vril may be a fiction; the force itself is a fact, as little doubted in India as the existence of the **Ṛiṣhis**, since it is mentioned in all the secret books. It is this vibratory force which, when aimed at an army from an

Agni-ratha, fixed on a flying vessel, a balloon, according to the instructions found in *Astra Vidyâ*, would reduce to ashes 100,000 men and elephants, as easily as it would a dead rat" (i. 614). H. P. B. knew this, and understood the laws of that force. It was used in battle in olden times, and slew hundreds and thousands of men. It sounds like a fable. What B. A. or M. A. will believe such a story as that? Yet I read in a recent paper on science, kindly sent me by one of our members, Mr. Sutcliffe, where he gives me some quotations from the latest scientific books, that the energy in the atom, considered as made up of electrons moving at the velocity of light, is 143,360 million times greater than that of the same mass of gunpowder exploded; i. e. the energy in the atoms of an ounce of water is equal to that liberated by the explosion of 143,360 million ounces of gunpowder, or 4,000,000 tons thereof. The velocity of the electrons as they issue from radium varies from $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{24}{25}$ of the velocity of light, and the probability is that they possess greater velocity in the molecule as the velocity diminishes rapidly after they leave it. Velocity in the molecule must take the form of vibration, since it is limited within the molecule; hence great velocity implies rapid vibration. An electron travelling at the velocity of light within a molecule would make at least 3×10^{16} vibrations

per second, or 60 times more than yellow light.

Dealing in this way with atomic energy we have put our finger on the secret of that ancient hidden force dealt within the Astra Vidyâ.

But even that is not all. We find that the energy liberated from Radium is of such a character, that it has entirely changed the conception of astronomers and physicists as to the possible duration of the solar system. Some of you may be familiar with the calculation of Lord Kelvin that the sun could not give out its energy for a period greater than a hundred million years, thus giving a hundred million years for what may be called the life of the sun. This period, though large, yet shrinks into nothing besides the period of time demanded by occult and Brâhmaṇical calculations. Some of you have read in the western books reflections about the "absurd figures of the Brâhmaṇas," about their Yugas and Mahayugas of years 15 figures in length. H. P. B. collected them, and remarked that they "dovetail pretty nearly with those of the secret works" (ii.73). But how could we have a Day of Brahmâ that lasts for 4320 millions of years in a solar system whose central sun gives out light and heat for a hundred million years only? But now every thing has changed, for a new source of energy has been discovered resident in the atoms themselves. Professor Rutherford,

writing on Radio-Activity says (p. 344): "If the energy resident in the atoms of the elements is thus available, the time during which the sun may continue to emit heat at the present rate may be from fifty to five hundred times longer than was computed by Lord Kelvin from dynamical data." Lord Kelvin, as we have just seen, gave one hundred million years for the life of the sun. Fifty times this, the lower figure, gives five thousand million years, and, as the Day of Brahmâ is only four thousand, three hundred and twenty million years, we have, on the lower of these computations, a few hundreds of millions of years more as the life of the sun than we want for the equivalent of a day of Brahmâ. That by itself is a very significant and startling fact. These old figures are justified by the latest calculations of modern science, and the "absurd figures" of your forefathers are now being repeated by leading scientific men.

Let me pass from that to another very interesting point—the disappearance of matter. H. P. B. in the *Secret Doctrine* speaks of "the necessary gradual and final re-absorption of matter into the laya state, that which science calls in her own way the 'point neutral as to electricity' [Crookes], or the zero point. Such are the occult facts and statement. They may be left with the greatest security and confidence to science, to be justified some day "

(i. 601). Is that day approaching?

When I was studying science for the London University, I was taught a theory as to a certain point called the absolute zero of temperature. It was said it could never be reached, for if it were reached all motion would stop. It was observed that as an element was submitted to greater and greater cold one after another of its characteristics disappeared. From that it was argued that if you could reach the absolute zero of temperature, all the qualities of matter would vanish, and it would become—what? perhaps imponderable ether. That was thought impossible, although occultism had asserted that manifestation was followed by disappearance, and disappearance by manifestation.

Now what do we find when we turn to the same question of the disappearance of matter, or "re-absorption into the laya state," and ask what are the latest statements of scientific authorities as to this? They tell us that matter is composed of electrons. The electron has been compared in size with an atom, and it is said to be to an atom as a fullstop on a printed page is to an English Cathedral. Suppose you had a building many many times larger than this hall, and compared it with a full-stop on a page of print; such is the relation of an electron to an atom, which is composed of many electrons. These are moving at tremendous velo-

cities, and Rutherford has shown (p. 111) that the mass of an electron varies with its velocity. Thus the "mass" of an electron has been calculated at about 1000th of an atom of hydrogen when the electron is moving at a low velocity; if this be taken as unity, then an electron moving at half the velocity of light would have a mass of 1.12; at $\frac{91}{100}$ of light-velocity a mass of 3.28; at $\frac{999999}{1000000}$ a mass of 10.1, and at the velocity of light the mass would be infinite. "For velocities varying from 0 to 1/10 the velocity of light, the mass of the electron is practically constant. The increase of mass becomes appreciable at about half the velocity of light, and increases steadily as the velocity of light is approached. Theoretically, the mass becomes infinite at the velocity of light, but even when the velocity of the electron only differs from that of light by one part in a million, its mass is only 10 times the value for slow speeds." (It follows from this that if the particles seen and counted by the observers at 18 in an atom of hydrogen were electrons—a matter I doubt—they must have been moving at a velocity differing from that of light by less than one part in a million. This by the way.) Now the velocities of the elec-

'It is at present an assumption that the electrical mass of an electron is the same as mass in the ordinary sense of the term. "Electrical mass" is an abbreviation for "inertia due to a moving electric charge.'

trons as they issue from Radium vary, and this seems to imply that their masses within the atom vary. In any case the lessening of their velocities would diminish their mass, and "matter" would thus appear to vanish. It will readily be seen that along these lines the old idea that there is a "Root of matter," and that the various densities of matter are due to velocities caused by the great Breath, becomes very intelligible. Matter "slowed down" would disappear, matter quickened would manifest. The greater the speed, the greater the mass. How airy, how intangible, does this seeming-solid matter become! how truly an illusion! we have reached along scientific lines a point that looks very much like "Pralaya," the vanishing of matter, which H. P. B. said depends for its aggregation and its densifying on the rapid movement of its ultimate particles. As they move faster and faster the matter becomes more and more solid. There is a strange and unexpected justification of one of the most reprobated conceptions of the ancient Hindu science.

I pass from chemistry. I have left out some of the most striking facts, such as the periodic table of elements, because they are not so modern. The table of elements of Mendeleef, based upon the septenary division, which led to the discovery of new elements because the chemists searched for

elements to fill up the gaps and they found them as they expected—this I have left out. It was done before the *Secret Doctrine* was written.

I pass from chemistry, then, to the science of Number, on which H. P. B. in her occult teachings has laid such remarkable stress. She says in the third Volume of her *Secret Doctrine*, what has proved a great difficulty to many of her devoted students: "Number underlies form, and number guides sound. Number lies at the root of the manifested Universe; numbers and harmonious proportions guide the first differentiations of homogeneous substance into heterogenous elements: and number and numbers set limits to the formative hand of Nature" (iii. 436). Thus taught Pythagoras, and thus said H. P. B. in 1888. In 1903 a learned man, Mr. Newman Howard, writing in the *Athenæum* on "A Synthesis of Cosmic and Æsthetic Rhythms," gives a mass of figures, showing that everything is built upon numbers. He shows, as Pythagoras told us thousands of years ago, that there are five regular solids, and only five possible, and that they bear definite numerical relations to each other; "their numerics are: faces, 4, 6, 8, 12, 28; points, 4, 8, 6, 20, 12...facial angles, 3, 4, 3, 5, 3. Collectively the facial angles provide the foundation of all their numerics" (*i. e.* 3, 4 and 5). "Plant organs are, with

few exceptions, in threes, fours or fives, or a binary progression...Mr. Jay Hambidge, in a paper read before the Hellenic Society, gave instances of curves, circles and ratios in plants, butterflies, etc. obtained from radii of these polyhedral proportions : the formula never failed him, he said." In architecture " the ratios of 3, 4, and 5 satisfied all the proportions of the peripteral temples," and similar rhythms are found in Greek and Gothic architecture. Many other examples are given, all proving the same point. *

H. P. B. says, again in the same third Volume, that sound and colour have a definite relation to each other, are definitely connected together. "Each prismatic colour is called in Occultism, ' the father of the sound ' which corresponds to it....This is the reason why sensitives connect every colour with a definite sound " (iii. 462, and see diagram II, opposite p. 462).

Not only does she tell us that, but she goes on to tell us that the colour green—the middle colour of the spectrum, between those that symbolise the material, red, orange, yellow, and those that symbolise the spiritual, blue, indigo, violet—the green interconnects with both. Green is the characteristic

* These extracts are taken from the *Theosophical Review* for June, 1904, pp. 289, 290, in which I drew attention to this remarkable article.

colour of the fourth Round, and it is the fourth colour of the spectrum and the colour of nature, and gives the number on which nature is built in this Round. Then she went on to tell us that the middle sound of the octave, the Italian *Fa* or the Samskr̥it *Ma*—beginning as is the use, with Do, Re, Mi, and after Fa, ending with Sol, La, Si—corresponds with the colour green, and that this colour and the note Fa are the colour and note of manifested nature. They represent Kâma-Manas, the ruling principle of the Round, with the upper triad, Âtmâ-Buddhi-Manas, above, and the lower triad, astral, etheric, and dense bodies, below.

That did not seem to me to signify very much at the time I first heard it, and many of her pupils made very little out of it. But those who have studied the intricacy of numbers have been led by that statement to a discovery as regards a certain number which serves as a multiple, producing some remarkable and significant ratios. Mr. G. E. Sutcliffe, of Bombay, has found that a number of important ratios = $\text{Pi}^1 \times 10^{12}$. Now this $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$ was found in a rather peculiar way, which he gives as follows: 4,300,360 years is a certain planetary cycle, and if this be taken as the Mahâyuga, 2000 of these give for one Day and Night of Brahmnâ

¹ Pi is 3 1415 4, the ratio of the diameter of a circle to its circumference.

8,601,120,000 years. This period, multiplied by the days of the year (365·256), yields $3\cdot1416 \times 10^{12}$. That is : a Day and Night of Brahmâ consists of $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$ of our days. A Year of Brahmâ thus consists of $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$ of our years, and an Age of Brahmâ of $\text{Pi} \times 10^{14}$ of our years. It is interesting to notice that, *taking the exoteric figures*, this $\text{Pi} \times 10^{11}$ represents one Day and Night + one Year + one Age of Brahmâ, and that “the 3, the 1, the 4, the 1, the 5, in the total—twice seven—represent 31415, the numerical Hierarchy of the Dhyân Chohans of various orders, and of the inner or circumscribed „world,” and “are worked out in the secret calculations to express the various cycles and ages of the First born.....*by a process we are not concerned with at present* (Secret Doctrine i. 117, 118; italics mine). The year of Brahmâ yields us this multiple $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$, which also is yielded by the following ratios :

$$\frac{\text{Day and Night of Brahmâ}}{\text{Day of 24 hours}} = \text{Pi} \times 10^{12} \text{ (as above)}$$

$$\frac{\text{No. of vibrations in green of spectrum}}{\text{No. of vibrations of Fa in Bass}} = \text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$$

$$\frac{\text{Diameter of orbit of Uranus}}{\text{Height of man (6 feet)}} = \text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$$

The green and the Fa give the connecting link between colour and sound. Now the octaves of sound advance as 1 : 2 : 4 : 8 : etc ; but of colour as

1 : $(2)^{\frac{5}{7}}$: $(4)^{\frac{5}{7}}$: $(8)^{\frac{5}{7}}$: etc ; hence the vibration of any colour may be found by taking the fifth power of the seventh root of the corresponding interval in sound. From Fa to Sol the interval is $\frac{9}{8}$; from green to blue $(\frac{9}{8})^{\frac{5}{7}}$. The present standard gives 176 vibrations for Fa in the bass, clef and the green (see above ratio) has $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$ as many ; if the colours of the spectrum be calculated on this basis, red has 450×10^{12} vibrations per second, orange 489×10^{12} , and so on up to violet with 705×10^{12} ; these numbers are for the vibrations at the beginning of the colour on the spectrum ; Preston (*Theory of Light*, p. 142) gives for red 444×10^{12} and for violet 707×10^{12} , a practical agreement. Now H. P. B. says (iii. 480), that " the true violet is a homogeneous colour with vibrations seven times more rapid than those of the red." Looking at the above, we see violet with vibrations less than double those of the red ; but if, remembering we are in the 4th Round, we take the violet three octaves higher, we have 3115×10^{12} , or just 6.92 times the vibrations of the red, a close enough approximation to seven times.

The ratio of the diameter of the orbit of Uranus to the ideal height of man, as 6 feet, may seem far-fetched ; multiplying the 6 feet by $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$ we have 3,570,000,000 ; Young, in his *General Astronomy* gives the orbit of Uranus as 3,563,800,000 miles ; now this orbit is the limit of our system, *i. e.*

the measure of the kosmic Man, and this to the measure of the earthly man is $\text{Pi} \times 10^{12}$. Uranus has a period of 84 years (12×7), the length of a healthy normal life; every 7 years a man's body changes, and Uranus changes his sign; every 3 years Uranus moves through an asterism of the ancient Zodiac $1/28$ of a circle; 4320 revolutions of Uranus (Uranus' years) give a planetary cycle, when 5 of the planets are together in a line; 8640 revolutions make the period when the poles are inverted, and yield the significant figures of one Day and one Night of Brahmâ, according to the exoteric calculation.

Thus far Mr. Sutcliffe; and it is worth while for the Pythagoreans amongst us to take up these calculations, examine them, and carry them on. When one and the same number gives the relation of the Day and Night of Brahmâ to our present day of 24 hours, the relation of the colour green to the sound Fa, the relation of the diameter of the orbit of Uranus of the height of man, it looks as though Mr. Sutcliffe had laid his finger on a key by which he may unlock many puzzles. It will reward the patience of the occult student to carry this investigation further, and to see how true it is that number underlies forms in the physical universe.

Let us pause over the question of yugas, and

make one allusion to Astronomy. I make it because of its peculiar character. A good many of you know something about the Zodiac, and know how the wise modern men have laughed at the notion that the Zodiac is the map in which the evolution of the universe is traced. They regard such ideas as superstitions, and have jeered at the idea that the Zodiac can possibly have any influence on the lives of men on earth. Yet Professor Geddes, writing in May, 1904, in the *Monthly Review*, on "A Gardener's View of Science," says that the Zodiac includes within it "a smaller, but to us all-important, cycle of nature-changes, inexorably determined on the earth by its annual journey round the sun...The ancient correlation of astronomy with climate and vegetation, and through these with animal life, with human occupation, is thus for us as fundamental as for primitive Science. That many a modern graduate in Science has never given an hour's thought or study to this simple subject is no doubt true; but this need not prevent our seeing that the re-investigation of this seasonal astronomy, seasonal biology, seasonal agriculture, is as legitimate a specialism as any other...[Above] rolls the Zodiac, with its seasonal signs. Around us grows the vegetable world in obedient response to these mighty influences, and within all we lead our human lives—of old obvi-

ously thus conditioned, now-a-days less obviously ; still, far more than we commonly realise...With this correlation of astronomic, organic and human evolution we have practically recovered the standpoint of the 148th Psalm, *Benedicite omnia opera* ; the sun, the moon, the world of life and labour, of duties and emotions, all becoming unified, as of old, within a single education, a single initiation in which cosmic unity and human ideal unite. We have too long lost the ancient tradition of science, and so have tended to undervalue this. Proud of our modern physics, our modern microscopy, and the rest, we tend to think there was practically no ancient science at all....These great religions, these great philosophies, were agreed in the essentially common conception of the universal order—astronomic, organic and human. Their differences are but secondary ; and thus we have reached the paradox that the simplest pre-historic worshipper at old Karnak, or on Ben Ledi, had a comprehensive and a unified idea of the general scheme of things. But that is to grant them a more comprehensive grasp of science than our modern specialists with all their discoveries—discoveries which are assuredly often, and doubtless oftener than we know, re-discoveries.” Thus is Astrology—“ the correlation of astronomic, organic and human evolution”—on the high road to scientific recognition.

There is another very interesting point that has arisen from the study of the Hindu Zodiac by Mr. Sutcliffe *with the idea that the ancients knew more on these matters than the moderns*. He considers that the fixed divisions of the ancient Zodiac depend on two fixed stars, Sirius and Vega. If a circle be drawn through these stars on the celestial sphere, it cuts the ecliptic at an angle of $88\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, nearly a right angle. The invariable plane of the solar system, as established by Laplace, is at right angles to this plane of Sirius and Vega. Among the most important results of this study are: the revolution of Sirius, Vega and our Sun round a common centre of gravity in a plane perpendicular to that of the solar system; one revolution of Vega round the common centre takes about 4320 years, the significant figures of the MahAyuga, according to the exoteric Hindu figures; the alternate conjunctions and oppositions of these three cause glacial and tropical periods, and gigantic geological catastrophes; conjunctions and oppositions of Sirius and Vega cause "tilting of the poles." H. P. B. declared that such a tilting took place, and was ridiculed for the statement; the next tilting should take place some ninety thousand years from the present time, when Sirius and Vega will be in opposition, and will make the things ready for the birth of the next great

Race round the North Pole. For every race is born round the North Pole of the earth, and the North Pole changes its place with the tilting of the Poles of the earth. Along that line there lies much investigation to be done, and many promising results may be expected.

If we turn from Astronomy to Physics, we find H. P. B. making most precise, but apparently, at the time, preposterous assertions. How, in an audience of western educated men, even though Hindus, am I to repeat the statements she makes in a most unblushing way? "The Occultists are taken to task for calling the Cause of light, heat, sound, cohesion, magnetism, etc. etc. a Substance.... In no way—as already more than once stated—do the Occultists dispute the explanations of science, as affording a solution of the immediate objective agencies at work. Science only errs in believing that, because it has detected in vibratory waves the *proximate* cause of these phenomena, it has, therefore, revealed all that lies beyond the threshold of sense...Occultism maintains that those etheric tremors are not set up, as asserted by Science, by the vibrations of the molecules of known bodies, the matter of our terrestrial objective consciousness, but that we must seek for the ultimate causes of light, heat, etc. in matter existing in supersensuous states—states, however, as fully objective to the

spiritual eye of man as a horse or a tree is to the ordinary mortal" (i. 560,561). "All the Forces, such as Light, Heat, Electricity, etc. are called the Gods" (i.735). The Noumenon of each force "is a conscious cause" (i,563.) She declares that light heat and electricity are not primarily modes of motion only, but that they are really substances; that they draw their substance from supersensuous nature, and are really connected with the great Devas. She asserts the existence of the Devas as agents in nature. The declaration that the forces of modern science are higher states of matter, which form in their highest state the substance of the bodies of these Devas, is indeed an audacious assertion; when everybody was declaring that light, heat, and electricity were mere modes of motion in the ether, she was saying that electricity is substantial, is atomic, and its cause is matter belonging to the higher realms, and forms the body of a Deva, who is the conscious force within. Of course everybody laughed at her.

Yet among the latest discoveries of modern science is the fact that electricity is atomic; that it is not a mode of motion, but is atomic. In fact atoms are now said to be made up of electricity, to be particles of electricity, and the old theory of these so-called modes of motion being real bodies comes back again into the modern world, and with

it must come the existence of those whose bodies are thus manifested in the physical plane. So when I told the boys of the C. H. C. that the Deva Agni was not a dream and a fable, but the mighty Being whose body was manifested in every flame of fire, I was only a few years too early, a few years before the discovery which has justified the same.

So does science come to the helping of the ancient occult teaching. The science of medicine tells us the same story. When I was last in England I found the despised science of clairvoyance was coming back under a new name, re-incarnated as a most respectable being. All of you know something of the Röntgen Rays, by which a bullet, for instance, may be discovered when embedded in the human body. These rays do not go through metal, but they can pass through human flesh. While I was in London, certain doctors in Paris published a set of observations on certain patients, who passed into a state in which they could see the interiors of their own bodies. A woman, suffering from appendicitis, saw in herself a small bit of bone fixed in the sac, and when they operated they found the bone exactly in the place she described by seeing within her own body. We always called this faculty clairvoyance. These doctors called it "internal autoscapy," which is indeed a fine and impressive name. Science had said clairvoyance was

a fraud. But now that they have dubbed it internal autoscopy, it is perfectly scientific. It is not the first time that science has performed a *volte face* under a new name. Exactly the same thing happened with mesmerism and hypnotism.

Archæology is another science which has done much to endorse occult views. In *Isis Unveiled*, H. P. B. characterised the late George Smith's chronology of the Chaldeans and Assyrians, which he had made to fit in with that of Moses, as quite fantastic (*Secret Doctrine*, ii. 730). He placed Sargon I about 1600 B. C. In 1887, Prof. G. H. Sayce placed him at 3750 B. C. "Perchance," she says drily, "in a few years more the 4000 years [of the Accadian monuments at Tel-loh] may be further extended." That has now happened. They have unburied cities as old as 8000 years before the birth of Christ, showing that the world was in a high state of civilisation ten thousand years ago. And this is but a tiny step back into the past. We must not forget that Atlantis and Lemuria are also being gradually recognised, though nothing is known of their civilisations from the historical standpoint.

Let me note the proof of a universal life, worked out by Prof J. C. Bose, who had justified the occult teaching that there is the same life in the metal, in the plant, in the animal and in the man ; and who,

you may remember, when he had shown to the audience of western scientists the experimental proofs thereof, finished up his splendid lecture with the quotation of that which he said his ancestors had chanted on the banks of Gangâ thousands of years before ; एक सत विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति : there is but one existence ; the wise call it variously.

Let me note also those strange N. rays, still challenged by the scientific world. They point to the approaching discovery of Prâna, of which occultism and Hinduism have taught you, which in the Prânamayakoṣha flows outwards from and circles within the body of the man, and leaves the body on death. Experimentation on these may lead to the scientific proof of the presence of the etheric double.

The support given to occult teaching by the New Psychology is so strong and so wide, that I have devoted to it a whole course of lectures, and will pass it over now.

The question of the nature of genius is being ardently debated, brought to the front by the extraordinary children who are now being born into the western world. A London journal remarks : "Asked to explain the causation of genius—since they maintain that causation is universal—men of science can only return a *non possumus*. So far is genius from being 'a transcendent capacity for taking trouble,' first of all, as Carlyle has it, that

it is rather, as in Franz von Vecsey's case, the capacity for doing without trouble that which other people cannot do with any amount of trouble."

Nor should we forget the remarkable essay by Prof. Mc. Taggart on "Immortality," in which he examines and rejects the various theories, save that of Reincarnation—a sign of the times, truly.

Lastly let us note the question of prayer, which Sir Oliver Lodge has taken up in such remarkable fashion. He has justified the use of prayer, on the ground that there exist many intelligent beings higher than the human, and that if you can persuade a man to put forth his power and thus dominate the lower mechanical forces without any breach in natural order, there is no scientific reason why a superhuman being should not also be asked to put forth his superhuman power to dominate the forces which man is unable to use.

Sometimes people ask, and with that I propose to close this long discourse, sometimes people ask: If it be true that the Devas hear and answer prayer, why is it that in the modern world scientific men can get by other methods the same results as the praying man obtains by worship? Let me answer that question. The Devas have two ways of working. If you read your ancient books, you will see that they may be moved to take action by worship, by prayer, by sacrifice, by rites

and ceremonies. That is one of their ways, and to that they are moved by supplications ; in answer to the prayer, they perform for the devotee that which he himself cannot do. Or, they may be made to work by Tapas. That is another of their ways. The Rishis of old, and others also, compelled the Devas to give them boons by force of Tapas. That last point, what does it mean ? The Devas have established a definite succession, according to their own natures : on this shall follow this ; there this, and so on. You may persuade them to start this succession by your prayer or sacrifice ; or by your own effort and exertions you may discover and touch the first point of the sequence, and the remainder must inevitably follow, because the Devas have established that law of working. That which men of old did by Tapas, generating force by the suffering of the body, and then by the trained will starting the first energy in the particular system of succession that would bring about the desired result, may be done by knowledge now, as it was done by knowledge then.

There is a Tapas of science of a noble kind, wherein by long austere endeavour, by sublime patience, and by unswerving perseverance, men penetrate into the secret ways of the Devas, and thus are able to bring about the results, according to the laws that the Devas have laid down. It is as

much the Devas working, whether it be their hand, or the hand of human knowledge, that touches the spring which sets that same sequence going.

If you master that idea, you will master the greatest lesson of all science, whether of the East or of the West, ancient or modern : that there is but one God, one Life, one Consciousness, throughout the whole of the Universe, that that God may be reached in many ways, and that by any way in which men seek Him, in that way does He welcome and help them.

—————:O:—————