

सत्यान्नास्ति परो धर्मः ।



*There is no Religion Higher than Truth*

# THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

BOMBAY, 17th September 1933.

VOL. III. No. 11.

## Food and Spiritual Life

In *The Theosophist* for April 1884, commenting upon the views of a Hindu student, D. K. M. wrote the following, which will answer some questions we have received on the subject of what is the best food for man. In that connection it is well to bear in mind also the words of W. Q. Judge written to London Theosophists very soon after the death of H. P. B. "One eats meat, another does not. Neither is universally right, for the kingdom of heaven does not come from meat, or from its absence." (*Letters That Have Helped Me*, p. 74) The principles of this problem will be found in the Gita-XVII, and each person has to learn to make his application of these principles:—

Theosophy admits of no dogmatic assertion of the fitness of things; therefore no particular kind of food is ordered imperatively, neither is there any that is "forbidden" or "prohibited" in the strict sense of the terms. The Occultist, after careful investigation of all the facts and circumstances of the *whole* case and their impartial consideration with a broad and enlightened vision, *recommends* a certain course of action as the best. He always takes his stand in the middle, and, surveying the lines pointing to the extremities, comes to a decision. There are people who argue that destruction is the order of the universe, and everywhere we see one creature preying upon another, itself being the food of a third, and that it is therefore perfectly natural for people to kill animals for food. There are others who say that everywhere is to be seen in nature a feeling of love,

an affection—the mother taking care of the children and so on. Therefore no life should be destroyed. There are not a few who say that they use animal food merely because they find animals already dead or killed, but that on no account would they allow slaughter intended solely for themselves. A dispassionate consideration of these three arguments is now necessary. The first class show that they have not risen above their animal nature. Otherwise they would see that this beastly tendency, this desire for the assimilation of animal food with their physical frames, has the effect of chaining them down to a physical plane from the meshes of which no rising is possible unless a more human feeling begins to assert itself. The latent spark of this noble feeling is inherent in animals too, for if they did not have it, they would not feel that tenderness towards their young which they manifest. This class, therefore, we must leave out of consideration for the present. The sophistry of the third class is self-evident. Our answer to them is that they must remember that an appreciable decrease in the number of flesh eaters must have the effect of lessening the number of slaughtered animals. If they use the flesh of dead animals, they may just as well be asked to follow the example of the Chinese who do not spare the flesh of dead persons. We must now divert our attention to the second class. If the theory that no life should be destroyed be carried to its legitimate extent, the very existence of man would become impossible, for even the air he breathes is full of animalculæ, which he must

inhale when the respiratory process is in operation. Nay—we can go still further: the ONE LIFE permeates *all*; each and every atom has latent life in it, and therefore every atom we displace in our movements is an injury to life. The great problem is how to get out of this difficulty. The Occultist recognises the important fact that everything in nature progresses gradually and nothing is achieved by starts or jumps. At the same time he realises that destruction and creation are relative and interchangeable terms, since destruction relates only to form—the substance remaining always permanent—and that the destruction of one form is the creation of another. These relative ideas therefore cease, when the phenomenal and noumenal are blended together into THE ONE SUBSTANCE. The aim of the Occult Student is therefore to gradually progress on the path of perfection, so that he may get out of this world of forms and be merged into the ARUPI TOTALITY. This is not the work of a day, nor of a few years, but of *ages*. He therefore gradually by a special training induces in himself such conditions as would enable him to rise higher and higher on the path of perfection. He does nothing violently: he only anticipates, by his knowledge, the usually slow process of Nature, and he conforms his mode of living to the then conditions of his existence, bearing also in mind that it is but temporary since a higher state of existence requires a better mode. The neophyte gradually leaves off eating until he reaches a stage where no food is necessary. And the ultimate stage is that where all relativity ceases and he identifies himself with the ABSOLUTE EXISTENCE. So long, therefore, as we are in the phenomenal world, we cannot but guide our actions by the law of relativity and have always to make a choice between two evils. A true philosopher, one who has put himself *en rapport* with his *Buddhi*, makes the right choice. It is for this reason that Occult Science is useful. It gives its votaries a right sense of discrimination and enables them to adopt only that course which would not come in the way of progress, while ordinary humanity, engulfed in the trammels of *Avidya*, gropes in the dark and many a time does exactly the opposite of what may be conducive to progress. This should not be assumed to mean an occultist is infallible; but by his superior knowledge he is in a better position to do what is right than one whose perceptions are clouded by *Maya*. This explanation, I believe, is sufficient to show that *no hard and fast rules can be laid down for general guidance*. There is an infinite gradation of progress towards the ABSOLUTE, where alone all difference can come to an end. As regards the use of animal food, the answer to the first class of men under consideration covers the point.

D. K. M.

## FORGET AND FIND YOURSELF

Everything of value has its base imitation, just as every true idea has its false presentment. It is true that one of the chief steps to the bliss of the spiritual life is self-forgetfulness, but the current idea of forgetting oneself is, alas, counterfeit coin. The true idea means losing the personal self, *because* one has found the real Self; the lesser gives way to the higher. The false idea of getting away from oneself means the loss, the scattering of even that personal consciousness, a state analogous to that of intoxication.

Intoxicants loosen the strings of the tongue and fling wide the gates of emotion, but it is a false sense of freedom that is felt. There is an equally false forgetfulness, an equally fleeting exhilaration in so-called relaxation, in absorption in music, or book or play, or film, in speed and sport thrills, or sex and sensuous delights, in the distorted practice of meditative mysticism, or any of the thousand and one things that deaden and drug the soul. True, they can give a temporary illusion of freedom, of "an increase in consciousness". So can madness, which may also produce an amazing increase in physical strength and agility. Yet no one would claim it as the natural way to grow strong. That demands deliberate control, and a well-balanced system of exercise. There is, too, the right way to gain the increase in consciousness, the true freedom from the suffering that surrounds the personal self. Self-forgetfulness is half the truth, the negative half. The positive aspect is Self-realization.

If one who craves for freedom from an existence that is painful, or sordid and humdrum, could realize that he, like Arjuna in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, has glimpsed, however momentarily, the fact that life is a battle-field, the fact that "Sorrow is"; if such a one, like Arjuna, could realize that he has to resist the impulse to flee from the fight and forget it, for the problem of his self-responsibility for suffering has to be faced, sooner or later; if such a one could see that suffering belongs to the personal self, ever desiring and thirsting for things for itself alone; if he could know that he is not that self, but in very truth the Divine Ego that goes from life to life, itself above pain and pleasure, above passion and ignorance; if he could learn that by raising his sense of identity from the plane of the personal being to that of the Ego itself, true peace and joy can be found; if such a one, perceiving all this, could begin to tread the way of the soul, forgetting himself in service for others, in true humility, seeking ever the Divine Self within by strong search and by questions,—then in him wisdom and joy and compassion would slowly begin to flower. No longer of the living dead, he would begin to *live*.

## “THOU SHALT NOT REVILE THE GODS”

[In the August *Aryan Path* on page 584 appears a comment on an action of the late Mr. Galsworthy showing his respect for the religious feelings of those who hold different beliefs from his own. Appropriately we reprint an extract from the editorial of *Lucifer* (Vol. IV, page 177, May 1889) of H. P. B.,—“Our Cycle and the Next.”—Eds.]

*The Pall Mall Gazette* had, in its issue of April 13th, some pertinent lines on the subject [Bill repealing the “Blasphemy Laws”]; its arguments, however, presenting but a one-sided view, and having, therefore, to be accepted *cum grano salis*. It reminds the reader that the true principle in the Blasphemy Laws “was long ago laid down by Lord Macaulay,” and adds:

To express your own religious or irreligious opinions with the utmost possible freedom is one thing; to put forward your views offensively, so as to outrage and pain other people is another thing. You may wear what clothes you please, or no clothes at all, in your own house, but if a man were to assert his right to walk down Regent-street clad solely in his shirt the public would have a right to object. Suppose some zealous man were to placard all the hoardings of London with “comic” pictures of the Crucifixion, that surely ought to be an offence, even in the eyes of those who do not believe the Crucifixion ever happened.

Just so. Be religious or irreligious, in our age, as much as you like, but do not be offensive, and dare not “outrage and pain other people.” Does *other* people mean here Christians only, no other persons being considered? Moreover, the margin thus left for the jury’s opinion is ominously wide, for who knows where the line of demarcation is to be drawn! To be entirely impartial and fair in their verdict in these particular matters, the jury would have to be a mixed one and consist of six Christians and six “infidels.” Now we have been impressed in youth that Themis was a blindfolded goddess only in antiquity and among the heathen. Since then—Christianity and civilization having opened her eyes—the allegory allows now of two versions. But we try to believe the best of the two inferences, and thinking of law most reverentially, we come to the following conclusion: *in law*, that which is sauce for the goose must be sauce for the gander. Therefore, if administered on this principle, the “Blasphemy Laws” must prove most beneficent to all concerned, “without distinction of race, colour or religion,” as we say in theosophy.

Now, if law *is* equitable, it must apply impartially to all. Are we then to understand that it forbids “to outrage and pain” *anyone’s* feelings, or simply those of the Christians? If the former, then it must include Theosophists, Spiritualists, the many millions of *heathens* whom merciful fate has made Her Majesty’s subjects, and even the Freethinkers, and Materialists, some of whom are very thin-skinned. It *cannot* mean the latter, *i. e.*, limit the “law”

to the God of the Christians alone; nor would we presume to suspect it of such a sinful bias. For “blasphemy” is a word applying not only to God, Christ and the Holy Ghost, not merely to the Virgin and Saints, but to every God or Goddess. This term, with the same criminal sense attached to it, existed with the Greeks, the Romans, and with the older Egyptians ages before our era. “Thou shalt not revile the *gods*” (plural), stands out prominent in verse 28 of chapter xxii. of *Exodus*, when “God” speaks out from Mount Sinai. So much admitted, what becomes of our friends, the missionaries? If enforced, the law does not promise them a very nice time of it. We pity them, with the Blasphemy Laws suspended over their heads like a sword of Damocles; for, of all the foul-mouthed *blasphemers* against God and the Gods of other nations they are the foremost. Why should they be allowed to break the law against Vishnu, Durga, or any fetish; against Buddha, Mahomet, or even a spook, in whom a spiritualist sincerely recognizes his dead mother, any more than an “infidel” against Jehovah? In the eyes of Law, Hanuman, the monkey-god, has to be protected as much as any of the trinitarian god-heads: otherwise law would be more blindfolded than ever. Moreover, besides his sacredness in the eyes of the teeming millions of India, Hanuman is no less dear to the sensitive hearts of Darwinists; and blasphemy against our first cousin, the tailless baboon, is certain to “hurt the feelings” of Messrs. Allen Grant and Aveling, as much as those of many Hindu theosophists. We grant that he who makes “comic pictures of the crucifixion,” commits an offence against the law. But so does he who ridicules Krishna, and misunderstanding the allegory of his Gopi (shepherdesses) speaks foully of him before Hindus. And how about the profane and vulgar jokes uttered from the pulpit by some ministers of the gospels themselves—not about Krishna, but Christ himself?

And here steps in the comical discrepancy between theory and practice, between the dead and living letter of the law. We know of several most offensively “comic” preachers, but have hitherto found “infidels” and *atheists* alone sternly reproofing for it those sinning Christian ministers, whether in England or America.

---

Oh spare us still the Western joke  
When joss-sticks turn to scented smoke  
The little sins of little folk  
That worship at Kamakura.

—RUDYARD KIPLING

## ON THINKING FOR ONESELF

Though man a thinking being is defined,  
Few use the grand prerogative of mind;  
How few think justly of the thinking few!  
How many never think who think they do!

—JANE TAYLOR

Left to itself, man's grasp of truth should grow apace with his moral and intellectual advance. Dogma, however, is the Procrustean bed. The position taken by any organized religion which claims infallibility and demands assent to its dicta is just that of the robber of Greek legend. Is any man too short for Procrustes's bed? Let him be violently stretched to fit it! Is it too short for those who have outgrown it? Cut off whatever part extends beyond it!

The attempt to make men think as they are told to think never has been a thorough success. The most rigidly enforced creeds have succeeded but in freezing the surface of the stream of thought. Even when conformity with the views of the majority has been enforced at sword's point, the swift current of private speculation has raced beneath the surface ice of lip-assent, breaking through here and there in the irrepressible rapids of heresies of greater or less moment.

The right of freedom of thought, however, has been hardly won. Down the centuries the martyrs to the right to their convictions have laid down their lives rather than conform to the views of the majority. All honour to their courage and their stand, however little the views to which they clung commend themselves to-day. We owe them a great debt of gratitude that now we may think what we will and none may say us nay.

The Roman Catholic Church, to a great extent, and other organized creeds each in its own measure, holds in reserve the thunder-bolts of its anathema to cut off heretics from hope of Heaven, but happily the days of stake and rack are past. The anathema can terrorize only those who recognize the priestly power to make it effective. The sleep of the thorough-going heretic is disturbed no whit by any curse in prospect or in actuality.

But with the danger of thinking for oneself has passed, for many people, much of its zest. Heresy is no longer interesting. It makes no demands on courage. With the challenge to independent thinking on religious lines has passed much of its attraction. The stream of thought has passed beyond the stage of waterfall and rapids to settle into the slow swing of gentle current.

We need a renaissance of thought to divert to the conquest of ideas some of the energy devoted now to the advance of material civilization. Man is a thinking being. It is at the risk of stunting his intellectual growth that he takes the line of least resistance in his attitude towards any vital point.

Woe unto him who accepts the anodyne of ready-made creeds on such questions as relate to his own nature and place in the evolutionary scheme, the purpose of life, the goal, and how to reach it!

While bizarre concepts may mark a stage in original thinking, as in the crude, challenging radicalism of the youthful intelligentsia, sanity and balance characterize the outlook of those who think things through. Truth being one and clash between facts impossible, it stands to reason that open-minded search will lead at last to similar conclusions. Therefore those who lead the van of evolution, the great Teachers of every age and clime, are in fundamental agreement in their statements. But they know far better than to try to force acceptance even of their universal truths.

For the race at large that unanimity is ages hence. It will be hastened to the extent that the duty as well as the right of independent thought is recognized and exercised, cost what it may.

## MAKING A NEW WORLD

*The Hindu* (15th August) reports a speech of Sir S. Radhakrishnan from which we extract:—

Intellectual advance is not going to heal the wounds of the world. In the last war intellectuals played an enormous part. It is not so much an intellectual change that is required as a psychological change. Our environment has to be so altered and transformed that it would unconsciously change the baser instincts in man into virtues conducive to the progress of the world.

But who is to effect the change? Can change in outer environment transform the inner character or deepen soul-perception? A true note is struck by Mr. C. B. Purdom (*New Britain* 26th July)

There can be no new culture, no New Britain, without personal remaking, without a spiritual, that is an individual, rebirth. New Britain will not be born out of institutions, either old or new, but out of reconstructed personalities, out of originality in British men and women. It is originality that is our greatest need: free men and women who do not imitate but are themselves, who practise no false obeisance but are able to look other men straight in the eyes and in the consciousness of their own integrity dedicate themselves to the liberation of mankind. We need a social contract between such persons. Rousseau's social contract was a mere fantasy, for men never agreed to establish society. But a social contract can now be made because men and women are free to make it. Unless it is made we shall build no New Britain.

This of course equally applies to all other countries and more particularly to the teachers everywhere to whom Sir C. V. Raman, the great Hindu scientist, referred; speaking on education and teachers in modern India at Bangalore he said:

You are all familiar with the many difficult tasks of building the new constitution that is now engaging the attention of our rulers and many of our politicians. Out of this welter, out of this confusion and difficulty, we have to find a way out. I think it is not difficult to predict that the future of India will depend, to a very large extent, not so much upon our rulers or politicians, as upon our teachers and upon the spirit in which our teachers approach their tasks. (*The Hindu*—August 8th.)

## GOD AND DEVIL

*The Origin of Evil* by H. P. B. is the new U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 26; it is a veritable nugget out of which the student can fashion more than one ornament. Below we print some notes by H. P. B. on the same subject. They are from *Lucifer* Vol. III p. 171, for October 1888 and answer a correspondent's objections under the heading, "The Devil—Who is He?"

Next month will be published another pamphlet, also by H. P. B., entitled *The Fall of Ideals*, which deals with the same topic.

### (1) Devil and God are one and the same.

This idea is not original. . . . Lactantius, one of the Fathers of the Church, expressed it in no equivocal language, for he states that the "Word" (or Logos), is the *first-born brother of Satan* (*Vide Inst. div. Book ii., c. viii.*); for Satan is a "Son of God" (*Vide Job, ii., i.*)

### (2) "The Supreme" is both evil and good. This is a religious difficulty.

The "Supreme," if IT is infinite and omnipresent cannot be anything but that. IT must be "good and evil," "light and darkness," etc., for if it is omnipresent it has to be present in a vessel of dishonour as well as in one of honour, in an atom of dirt as in the atom of the purest essence. The whole trouble is that theology and the (even *militant*) clergy are not consistent in their claims; they would force people to believe in an infinite and absolute deity, and dwarf this deity at the same time by making of it a *personal* being with attributes, a double claim mutually destructive, and as absurd philosophically, as it is grotesque and soul-killing.

The fact then that by showing good and evil intermingled in the deity creates "religious difficulty," *i. e.*, "theological confusion," is the fault of and rests with the clergy and theology, and not at all with Mr. May. Let them drop their idea of a personal god with human attributes, and the difficulty will disappear.

### (3) Scriptures were written in order to make manifest what is good and what is evil.

The Scriptures were written to conceal the underlying allegories of cosmogonical and anthropological mysteries, and not at all "to make manifest what is good and what is evil." If our respected and reverend Correspondent accepts Eden and the apple *au serieux*, then why should he not accept "Crucifixion," as taught by his church, also? "To be crucified as a devil" is a queer phrase. We

have heard of several "Sons of God" crucified, but never yet of one single devil. On the other hand, if Christians accepted, as seriously as they do the "apple and the rib," the simple and impressive words of their Christ on the Mount, who says: "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake,"—then they would abstain from reviling and persecuting and saying all manner of evil against the poor Devil; who, if he is to be regarded as a *personality*, is sure to be "blessed," as no one from the beginning of Christianity has ever been more reviled and falsely persecuted than was that scapegoat for the sins of man! Finally:

If one takes "Good and Evil, or Jesus and the Devil," for personalities, then as no personality from the beginning of the world was free from evil, Mr. May's proposition must prove correct and the Reverend Mr. Headley be shown in a vicious circle of his own making. *Demon est Deus inversus* is said of a manifested, *differentiated* deity, or of the Universe of Matter. That which is *Absolute* cannot even be homogeneous, it is *Ain*—nothing—or *No-thing*; and if men of finite intellects will insist upon speculating upon the infinite, and therefore to them unreachable and incomprehensible, otherwise than as a necessary philosophical postulate, then they must expect to be worsted by that same philosophy.

## SANSKRIT AND SYNTHESIS

Mr. K. S. Ramaswami Sastri delivering the Inaugural Address to the Sanskrit students of the Presidency College of Madras said:—

Sanskrit study is the Cinderella among our studies. I am going to ask you to lift this Cinderella to the throne of power and to make her the queen of your studies. For any joint endeavours in that direction not only India but the whole world will be grateful to you.

Prof. S. Kuppaswami Sastriar who presided, commenting upon the lecture, said:—

Synthesis was the key-note of Hindu culture. If Hinduism was still alive, it was because that synthesis had been its key-note from earliest times down to the present day. Behind all their warring creeds and sects they found a running synthesis. That was the beauty of the Hindu religion. The followers of Siva and the followers of Vishnu had been fighting with each other on the question as to which was the greater deity. But even here the idea of synthesis had been worked out in a most beautiful way. The three deities, Brahma, Vishnu and Siva were represented to them as belonging to one happy family. In the sphere of Indian literature, too, synthesis was the key-note. (*The Hindu*—August 8th.)

## METHODS OF THEOSOPHICAL WORK

In my experience with the Theosophical Society I have noticed a disposition on the part of some members to often object to the methods of others or to their plans on the ground that they are unwise, or not suitable, or what not. These objections are not put in a spirit of discord, but more often arise merely from a want of knowledge of the working of the laws which govern our efforts.

H. P. B. always said—following the rules laid down by high teachers—that no proposal for theosophical work should be rejected or opposed provided the proposer has the sincere motive of doing good to the movement and to his fellows. Of course that does not mean that distinctly bad or pernicious purposes are to be forwarded. Seldom, however, does a sincere theosophist propose such bad acts. But they often desire to begin some small work for the Society, and are frequently opposed by those who think the juncture unfavourable or the thing itself unwise. These objections always have at bottom the assumption that there is only one certain method to be followed. One man objects to the fact that a Branch holds open public meetings, another that it does not. Others think the Branch should be distinctly metaphysical, still more that it should be entirely ethical. Sometimes when a member who has not much capacity proposes an insignificant work in his own way, his fellows think it ought not to be done. But the true way is to bid good-speed to every sincere attempt to spread theosophy, even if you cannot agree with the method. As it is not your proposal, you are not concerned at all in the matter. You praise the desire to benefit; nature takes care of results.

A few examples may illustrate. Once in New York a most untrue newspaper article about theosophy appeared. It was a lying interview. All that it had in it true was the address of an official of the T. S. It was sent by an enemy of the Society to a gentleman who had long desired to find us. He read it, took down the address, and became one of our most valued members. In England a lady of influence had desired to find out the Society's place, but could not. By accident a placard that some members thought unwise fell into her hands noticing an address on theosophy in an obscure place. She attended, and there met those who directed her to the Society. In the same town a member who is not in the upper classes throws cards about at meetings directing those who want to know theosophical doctrines where to go. In several cases these chance cards, undignifiedly scattered, have brought into the ranks excellent members who had no other means of finding out about the Society. Certainly the most of us would think that

scattering cards in this manner is too undignified to be our work.

But no one method is to be insisted on. Each man is a potency in himself, and only by working on the lines which suggest themselves to him can he bring to bear the forces that are his. We should deny no man and interfere with none; for our duty is to discover what we ourselves can do without criticizing the actions of another. The laws of karmic action have much to do with this. We interfere for a time with good results to come when we attempt to judge according to our own standards the methods of work which a fellow member proposes for himself. Ramifying in every direction are the levers that move and bring about results, some of those levers—absolutely necessary for the greatest of results—being very small and obscure. They are all of them human beings, and hence we must carefully watch that by no word of ours the levers are obstructed. If we attend strictly to our own duty all will act in harmony, for the duty of another is dangerous for us. Therefore if any member proposes to spread the doctrines of theosophy in a way that seems wise to him, wish him success even if his method be one that would not commend itself to you for your own guidance.

[*The Path* for August 1891.] WILLIAM BREHON

Lord Buckmaster struck quite a Theosophical note in his speech on the Slaughter of Animals Bill in the House of Lords:—

I have nothing to say against the faith of Mohammedans and Jews, but if their religious sentiments require them to kill animals in a manner that we are satisfied causes unnecessary suffering and pain, I should certainly not be deterred by reason of the fact that it was part of their religious conviction from securing that they also conformed to the law. I am not prepared to say that the Jewish method of slaughter is cruel. That is a matter upon which I should want further information. But I wish to say that I am not prepared to accept a formula of any religious creed whatever as an excuse for inflicting wholly unnecessary pain and suffering upon animals.

Gandhiji answering some objections raised by a correspondent writes in *Harijan* for 5th August:

Just as there is identity of spirit, so is there identity of matter and in essence the two are inseparable. Spirit is matter rarefied to the utmost limit. Hence, whatever happens to the body must touch the spirit and whatever happens to one body must affect the whole of matter and the whole of spirit. But all my argument is useless if it cannot be sustained by practice. And if there is any soundness in it, the unbroken practice of all the sages and others from time immemorial clinches the argument. Sceptics, however, need not rely either upon argument or past testimony. Let them acquaint themselves with the rules and the science of fasting for purification and then test its efficacy themselves. That fasting does not appeal to people brought up in the midst of the dazzling materialism is an additional reason for people like my correspondent not to reject summarily one of the most potent methods of purification and penance.

## OUR PROGRAMME

## SUNDAYS

*Public Lectures*

On various phases of Theosophy.

These are meant for enquirers as well as to inform students, old and new, about the fundamental teachings and principles, a knowledge of which is of practical benefit to every mind and soul.

## WEDNESDAYS

*Questions & Answers*

Theosophy rejects blind belief and stimulates every one to seek courageously and question searchingly. Questions from new-comers, enquirers, as well as students are welcome. The answers given are not the opinions of any person but are the teachings of the Immemorial Philosophy. This meeting is not meant for debate, but is a gathering of earnest enquirers, seeking knowledge of eternal principles underlying their own lives and problems.

## FRIDAYS

*Study Class*

No one ever succeeded in shaping his life without acquiring real knowledge. This is not possible through mere listening to talks or only by asking questions; these two invariably lead the honest mind to study. Texts for study for October will be two U. L. T. Pamphlets—Nos. 1 and 26 on *Is Theosophy a Religion?* and *The Origin of Evil*.

These meetings commence punctually at 6-15 P. M.

## THEOSOPHY SCHOOL

SATURDAYS 2-30 TO 3-30 P.M.

Theosophical education endeavours to deal with each child as a unit, and to educate it so as to produce a harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, in order that its special aptitudes shall find their full natural development. It aims at creating free, and above all things, unselfish men and women.

At the same time there is a class for adults.

## READING ROOM &amp; LIBRARY

These are kept open on every weekday from 9-30 A.M. to 8 P.M. "Silence" is the only rule to be observed.

Neither for the Meetings, nor for Theosophy School nor for the use of Library is any fee charged. The Lodge and all its activities are founded on Sacrifice, reared on Sacrifice, and maintained by Sacrifice.

Those desirous of joining the U. L. T. are requested to study carefully the Declaration.

## DECLARATION OF THE U. L. T.

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable *Basis for Union* among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "*similarity of aim, purpose and teaching,*" and therefore has neither Constitution, By-laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that *basis*. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and it welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

*"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect yet belongs to each and all."*

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate; it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists.

Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance given to Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local lodges. There are no dues of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with.

Correspondence should be addressed to:

UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

51, Esplanade Road

BOMBAY

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

"What I do believe in is (1), the unbroken oral teachings revealed by living *divine* men during the infancy of mankind to the elect among men; (2), that it has reached us *unaltered*; and (3) that the MASTERS are thoroughly versed in the science based on such uninterrupted teaching."—H. P. B. in *Lucifer*, Vol. v, p. 157.

"The WISDOM-RELIGION was ever one, and being the last word of possible human knowledge, was, therefore, carefully preserved. It preceded by long ages the Alexandrian Theosophists, reached the modern, and will survive every other religion and philosophy."—*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 7.

"We have no two beliefs or hypotheses on the same subject."—*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 72.

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

\* **Isis Unveiled**

Centenary Anniversary Edition. A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1877. Two volumes bound in one.

\* **The Secret Doctrine**

A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1888. Two volumes bound in one.

\* **Theosophical Glossary**

A photographic reprint of the original edition of 1892.

\* **Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge**

† **The Key to Theosophy** Paper Rs. 1-8  
Reprinted verbatim from the original edition of 1888.

† **Raja-Yoga or Occultism** Paper Re. 1  
A collection of important articles.

† **The Voice of the Silence** Cloth As. 8  
† **Five Messages to Theosophists** Paper As. 4

By W. Q. JUDGE

† **The Ocean of Theosophy** (Cloth) Re. 1  
† **Letters That Have Helped Me** (Paper) Re. 1  
† **Echoes from the Orient** (Paper) As. 4  
\* **The Bhagavad-Gita**  
\* **Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita**  
\* **The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali**  
\* **An Epitome of Theosophy**

\* These are costly American editions for which special prices are conceded to U. L. T. Students in India.

† For Sterling and Dollar prices apply to *The Aryan Path* Office, at 20 Grosvenor Place, London, S. W. 1, and 119 West 57th Street, New York, respectively.

U. L. T. PAMPHLET SERIES

1. *Is Theosophy A Religion?* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
2. *What Theosophy Is* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
3. *Universal Applications of Doctrine and the Synthesis of Occult Science* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
4. *Castes in India* . . . . . DAMODAR K. M.
5. *Theosophy Generally Stated* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
6. *Karma* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
7. *Ormuzd and Ahriman* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
8. *Reincarnation in Western Religions* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
9. *Reincarnation, Memory, Heredity* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
10. *Reincarnation* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
11. *Dreams* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
12. *Mind Control* . . . . . { DAMODAR K. M.  
W. Q. JUDGE
13. *Mediatorship* . . . . . H. P. B.
14. *H. P. Blavatsky* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
15. *On The Secret Doctrine* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
W. Q. JUDGE
16. *The Secret Doctrine Instructions* . . . . . { W. Q. JUDGE  
and others
17. *Truth in Modern Life* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
18. *Culture of Concentration* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
19. *Hypnotism* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
20. *Kosmic Mind* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
21. *Overcoming Karma* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
22. *What are the Theosophists Some Words on Daily Life* . . . . . { H. P. BLAVATSKY  
A MASTER OF WISDOM
23. *Christmas* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
24. *Cyclic Impression, etc.* . . . . . W. Q. JUDGE
25. *Memory in the Dying* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY
26. *The Origin of Evil* . . . . . H. P. BLAVATSKY

U. L. T. DIRECTORY

"Each United Lodge is wholly autonomous."

1. Amsterdam ... 30, Jasonstraat (1931)
2. Bombay ... 51 Esplanade Road (1929)
3. London ... 20 Grosvenor Place, S. W. 1. (1925)
4. Los Angeles ... 245 West 33rd Street (1909)
5. New York... 1 West 67th Street (1922)
6. Pacific Grove, Calif. Monterey Ave. (1931)
7. Papeete, Tahiti Quai d'Uranie (1932)
8. Paris... 14 Rue de l'Abbé de l'Epée 5<sup>e</sup> (1928)
9. Philadelphia ... 1711 Walnut Street (1925)
10. Phœnix, Arizona 33 West Washington Street (1930)
11. San Diego, Calif. 6th & E Streets (1931)
12. San Francisco... 4th & Market Streets (1910)
13. Washington D.C. 17th and Eye Street (1922)

The following magazines are published under the influence of different Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists:—

- Theosophy* (English)—Los Angeles now in its XXI<sup>st</sup> volume  
*Théosophie* (French)—Paris " " IX<sup>th</sup> "  
*De Theoscoof* (Dutch)—Amsterdam " " V<sup>th</sup> "  
*The Aryan Path* (English)—Bombay " " IV<sup>th</sup> "