

THE CANADIAN THEOSOPHIST

VOL. 45, No. 2

TORONTO, MAY-JUNE, 1964

Price 35 Cents

The Theosophical Society is not responsible for any statement in this Magazine, unless made in an official document



HELENA PETROVNA BLAVATSKY

August 11, 1831 - May 8, 1891

*This editorial was written by
Henry T. Peterson, Dec. 1891*

MADAME BLAVATSKY

(An Editorial In The *New York Tribune*, May 10, 1891)

Few women in our time have been more persistently misrepresented, slandered, and defamed than Madame Blavatsky, but though malice and ignorance did their worst upon her, there are abundant indications that her life-work will vindicate itself, that it will endure, and that it will operate for good. She was the founder of the Theosophical Society, an organization now fully and firmly established, which has branches in many countries, East and West, and which is devoted to studies and practices the innocence and the elevating character of which are becoming more generally recognized continually.

The life of Madame Blavatsky was a remarkable one, but this is not the place or time to speak of its vicissitudes. It must suffice to say that for nearly twenty years she had devoted herself to the dissemination of doctrines, the fundamental principles of which are of the loftiest ethical character. However Utopian may appear to some minds an attempt in the nineteenth century to break down the barriers of race, nationality, caste, and class prejudice, and to inculcate that spirit of brotherly love which the greatest of all Teachers enjoined in the first century, the nobility of the aim can only be impeached by those who repudiate Christianity.

Madame Blavatsky held that the regeneration of mankind must be based upon the development of altruism. In this she was at one with the greatest thinkers, not alone of the present day, but of all time: and at one, it is becoming more and more apparent, with the strongest spiritual tendencies of the age. This alone would entitle her teachings to the candid and serious consideration of all who respect the influences that make for righteousness.

In another direction, though in close association with the cult of universal fraternity, she did important work. No one in the present generation, it may be said, has

done more toward reopening the long-sealed treasures of Eastern thought, wisdom, and philosophy. No one has done so much toward elucidating that profound wisdom-religion wrought out by the ever-cogitating Orient, and bringing into the light those ancient literary works whose scope and depth have so astonished the Western world, brought up in the insular belief that the East had produced only crudities and puerilities in the domain of speculative thought. Her own knowledge of Oriental philosophy and esotericism was comprehensive. No candid mind can doubt this after reading her two principal works. Her steps often led, indeed, where only a few initiates could follow, but the tone and tendency of all her writings were healthful, bracing, and stimulating. The lesson which was constantly impressed by her was assuredly that which the world most needs, and has always needed, namely, the necessity of subduing self and of working for others. Doubtless such a doctrine is distasteful to the ego-worshippers, and perhaps it has little chance of anything like general acceptance, to say nothing of general application. But the man or woman who deliberately renounces all personal aims and ambitions in order to forward such beliefs is certainly entitled to respect, even from such as feel least capable of obeying the call to a higher life.

The work of Madame Blavatsky has already borne fruit, and is destined, apparently, to produce still more marked and salutary effects in the future. Careful observers of the time long since discerned that the tone of current thought in many directions was being affected by it. A broader humanity, a more liberal speculation, a disposition to investigate ancient philosophies from a higher point of view, have no indirect association with the teachings referred to. Thus Madame Blavatsky has made her mark upon the time, and thus, too, her works will follow her. She herself has fin-

ished the course, and after a strenuous life she rests. But her personal influence is not necessary to the continuance of the great work to which she put her hand. That will go on with the impulse it has received, and

some day, if not at once, the loftiness and purity of her aims, the wisdom and scope of her teachings, will be recognized more fully, and her memory will be accorded the honor to which it is justly entitled.

SPIRITUAL ADEQUACY

BY MONTAGUE A. MACHELL

"Have perseverance as one who doth for evermore endure. Thy shadows live and vanish: that which in thee shall live forever, that which in thee *knows*, for it is knowledge, is not of fleeting life, it is the man that was that is, and will be, for whom the hour shall never strike." *Voice of the Silence*.

The "mystery" of life can never be exaggerated, but orthodox religion, for many generations, has insisted upon man's inadequacy to resolve it. From a multitude of motives, religion has made its solving contingent upon the acceptance of an outside assistant possessed of professional competence not available to the layman. Upon this contingency has been built an enormous ritual, ceremony, organization and tradition dependent for its perpetuation upon the layman's *spiritual inadequacy*. Organized religion, that fabulous, world-wide hierarchy and power complex is maintained solely by man's acceptance of the role of a penitent, dependent at all times upon the "Organization" for such spiritual enlightenment as its earthly agents deign to vouchsafe him.

This state of affairs, which enjoys a steadily diminishing acceptance at the hands of men and women capable of deep, independent thought, has given all religious and philosophical thought an unfortunate bias. Rebelling against a monopoly of spiritual enlightenment to which a powerfully entrenched minority lays claim, society, stamped with the habit of dependence, finds itself more or less incapable of discovering some source of strength that may take the place of a spiritual dominance from without. The search for this source encourages

an ever more intense investigation of the question "What makes a man tick?"

Human nature, being the amazingly intricate affair that it is, endowed with powers and capabilities, any one of which *might* be a clue to the overall mystery, invites a search that may well be interminable and in the end unrewarding. One has only to pick up a magazine devoted to literary reviews, with an up-to-the-minute survey of current novels, essays and biographies, to realize to what amazing lengths writers will go to find some adequate explanation of life *independent* of generally accepted religious doctrines. In side-stepping dogma, however, too many tend to dispense with a spiritual core to all life, leaving one with little more than a glorification of unending and undependable attributes or aspects of mere physical existence. This, possibly, is the source of a dangerous inadequacy of so many theories of living; in too many instances dependence is placed upon aspects of human nature that are inconstant and *inadequate*.

Behind this error, I would say, is a still more serious one regarding the nature of the universe man inhabits, this, in its turn, partly due to the doctrine of man's dependence upon a source outside himself for guidance and growth. Rarely does one come upon even a suggestion that man inhabits a universe *spiritual in origin*, governed by immutable spiritual law. Rarer still, perhaps, is the occurrence of any suggestion that *man and his universe are one and inseparable*, spiritual in essence and in destiny, fields of realization of a sublime spiritual goal.

In that eternal duality that is inseparable from a world of time and materiality, we witness the everlasting transmutation of the material into the spiritual. Perhaps a better expression might be the constant *discovery* of spiritual significance in material manifestations. For wherever Spirit puts on a material mantle, as in the case of man's incarnations on earth, Spirit is dimmed, hampered, obscured, and, in some rare cases, *banished!* But save in those cases of extreme tragedy, it burns on in every human life, inextinguishable, splendid, real and *adequate*. An awareness of its enduring adequacy is a positive *sine qua non* to any rewarding pattern of life.

When you or I plan an ocean voyage we surrender ourselves to an element over which we have no control. We are land creatures. The Atlantic ocean is an enormous, overwhelming element beyond our power to deal with. But upon planning this sea voyage we do not run around hysterically seeking "Higher Authorities" from whom we may obtain spells or devices that will enable us to pit our meagre powers against this foreign element, the sea. We take passage on a large ocean liner we know to be seaworthy and thoroughly adequate to withstand the worst weather we are likely to encounter. This done, we go aboard prepared to *enjoy* a delightful sea voyage upon a vessel designed and constructed *primarily* to prove adequate to the element to which it is committed. This is, mere common sense. To be sure, there are people who get their thrills from going over Niagara Falls in a barrel, and others who enjoy navigating the oceans of the world in craft of inadequate draught. But the average traveller enjoys the comfort of proven seaworthiness when committed to the foreign element of the Atlantic ocean.

The thought suggests itself that upon incarnation the Spiritual Self of man is committed to a foreign element, vast and overpowering. Having been committed to this material world in accordance with Spiritual Law, such committal *must* have a very real

purpose, and that purpose *must* be capable of fulfillment by man. And since this committal is an incident in a spiritual pattern that is timeless and limitless, it obviously cannot be dependent upon arrangements made by a religious minority in any age. The soul of man ante-dates all such arrangements, by millenia of time, and hence *must from the beginning* have been adequate and self-sufficient in any universe dedicated to the pattern and destiny of Spiritual Unfolding.

Obviously, then, if we would seek to understand the why and the wherefore of life on earth, we must first draw near to *THAT*, of which Life is the servant — the Spiritual Self — realizing that *IT* alone is enduring, deathless, unconquerable — *adequate!*

In no sense is this a discovery of merely incidental importance since, if it be true, it transfers man's responsibility for his life pattern from an *inadequate* governing minority outside himself to the sole adequate governing power *within himself* — his own Spiritual Reality. It makes him actually and absolutely the *maker of his own destiny*. He can declare with the poet:

"I *am* the master of my fate! I *am* the captain of my soul!"

Volumes could be written upon the meaning of this discovery in a man's life: of its power to reveal to him his everlasting Partnership in Life; his dignity as a Conscious Creator; his sublime heritage from endless generations of Lords of Life; of the pure joy knowing the Self to be *adequate* to the holiest and loftiest challenge Life has to offer. Standing upon the bedrock of one's Spiritual Identity, firm, joyous, unfearing, one is reminded of the words of Krishna in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

"These finite bodies, which envelope the souls inhabiting them, are said to belong to Him, the eternal, the indestructible, unprovable Spirit, who is in the body: wherefore, O Arjuna, resolve to fight."

AN ANCIENT UNIVERSALISM

BY ESME WYNNE-TYSON

During the research needed for my book on Mithras, I made a discovery which cannot fail to be of interest to all those—and especially to Theosophists—who believe in the necessity for spiritual unification if humanity is ever to achieve agreement, and lasting peace. This was, that had what passed for Christianity in the fourth century not achieved at least a nominal victory over its chief rival, Mithraism, the world might long ago have been united in a single universalist Faith—the system of solar monotheism, which was the hidden teaching behind the apparent polytheism of the pre-Christian era, and was eloquently advocated by the last champion of the Mithraic cult, the Emperor Julianus.

In his *Lettre a Berthelot*, Rénan observed that “before religion reached the point where it proclaimed that God should be sought in the absolute and the ideal, that is to say, outside the world, one cult only was reasonable and scientific, and that was the cult of the sun.”

Even in the day of Herodotus it is obvious, from his *History*, that this cult—the worship of the hosts of heaven—was universal, the same deities being worshipped under different names throughout the then known world. We also find Biblical evidence for this in Moffatt’s translation of Deut. 4: 19, 20, where it says:

Beware of looking up to the sky and then, as you see the whole host of heaven, the sun and moon and stars, letting yourself be allured to bend in worship of them. The Eternal, your God, has allotted them for worship to all nations under the broad sky, but the Eternal took you . . . to be a people of his own.

Here is a forthright statement (curiously obscured in the King James’ translation), that not only did men of old everywhere worship the hosts of heaven, but that such worship was ordained by God until He pre-

sented the Jews with a higher concept of Himself through the mind of Father Abraham. And although the Jews fiercely resisted the earlier Faith throughout the Old Testament, it is interesting to note that the wisest of their Kings, Solomon, shocked his subjects to the core by worshipping *Ash-toreth*, the Queen of Heaven! Yet this was *natural* enough, for she was not only the mother of all living, but also the Mother of the Gods, the source of all knowledge and wisdom, so how could a wise man refrain from worshipping her?

It is noteworthy, too, that, throughout the Proverbs, Wisdom is referred to as feminine:

Is not wisdom calling,
Knowledge raising her voice?

It is obvious from the description of Solomon’s Temple that it was a Temple of the Sun, and, like our own churches, built to face East, from whence the deity arises. Philo Judaeus writes of the sacred golden candlestick which was one of its ornaments, that it “was made having six branches, three on each side, and the main candlestick itself in the middle made the Seventh.” This Seventh, he tells us, symbolizes the Sun, with Saturn, Jupiter and Mars on one side, and Mercury, Venus and the Moon on the other. He then goes on to say, “The creator . . . wishing that there should be a model among us of the seven-lighted sphere as it exists in heaven, ordained this exquisite work to be made.” (*On Who is the Heir of Divine Things*, Vol. 1.XII:V. et seq.)

He also tells us that the priestly mantle of hyacinthe, purple and scarlet entwined with gold thread and glittering with precious stones is a “representation of heaven itself.”

The two emeralds on the shoulder-blades . . . are . . . emblems of those stars which are the rulers of night and day, namely the Sun and the Moon . . .

Six names are graven on each of the stones, because each of the hemispheres cuts the Zodiac in two parts . . . Then the twelve stones on the breast, what else can they be emblems of, except of the circle of the Zodiac?

According to Josephus, the great emeralds spoken of by Philo, were the Urim and Thummim, the oracles of God to which the Jews always applied for guidance in their affairs. He says that "Moses taught . . . how they should go forth to war, making use of the stones for their direction." (*Antiquities* Book VIII. Ch. IV:46.)

It will be remembered that Abraham came from Chaldea, the home of astrology and the worship of the hosts of heaven; and that Moses at the Court of Pharaoh was, according to Philo, instructed not only in the wisdom of the Egyptians but in the wisdom of the Babylonians, Assyrians and Greeks. It was impossible for either of these men wholly to dissociate themselves from the climate of thought into which they had been born. For all their great innovations, much of the former culture necessarily remained. And if the old religion could so permeate the strongholds of its chief ideological foe, it is obvious what a hold it had on the minds of men in general.

The curious thing about it is that, despite its apparent polytheism so much denounced by the Jews and Christians, it was essentially, and according to its esoteric teaching, monotheistic: the most ingenious exercise ever practised on the theme of the many in the One. As Martianus Capella of the fourth century, in describing the ubiquitous sun-god, wrote in *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*:

The Latins call thee Sol, for that in solitary splendour thou art highest in rank after the Father, and from thy sacred head adorned with its twice six rays, golden beams shoot forth, furnished thus, men say, to equal the number of the months and the seasons determined by thee . . . Thee the Nile reveres as Serapis, Memphis as Osiris, other

cults as Mithra, or Dis, or savage Typhon. Thou art fair Attis, too, and the gentle boy of the curved plough. Ammon also of the parched Lybian desert, and Adon of Byblos. So under various names the whole world worships thee.

The polytheism of paganism, therefore, seems to have been the deliberate disguise of a fundamentally monotheistic idea, and a well-kept secret of the Mystery religions. It is most interesting to trace the evidence of this in the cautious writers of antiquity, many of whom, such as Herodotus, Virgil, Apuleius and Julian, were initiates, and, as such, bound to an irksome secrecy. But it is made quite obvious by them all that the many gods and goddesses are but aspects and attributes of the one Supreme Being, which was always represented as androgynous; Bacchus being Helios as the ripener of the vine; Hercules, the sun in his strength; Aesculapius, Sol as the healer; Minerva, born from the head of Zeus, is naturally his intelligence, called also Athene or Cybele. Herodotus shows us how even Pan is really the King of Heaven in disguise, for not wishing to be seen by the importunate Hercules, Jove flayed a Ram and appeared before him wearing its skin and head. Hence even the fearful Goat of Mendes is really only God in disguise.

Tammuz, Merodach, Baal, Shamash, Jupiter, Jove, Apollo, Mithras, Bacchus, Attis, are all but names for one and the same deity, the universal Helios, each with his distinctive myths and rites. That St. Augustine was aware of this bewildering and intricate synthesis is obvious from Chapter XI of *The City of God*, which is headed: "On the multitude of gods which the Pagan doctors avouched to be but one and the same Jupiter."

But he does not give this theme the sober consideration it deserves; instead, he scoffs at it:

Let him be Jupiter in the sky, Juno in the air, Neptune in the sea . . . Proserpina in the earth's lowest part, Vesta in

the household fire . . . Sol, Luna . . .
Appollo . . . Mercury . . . Janus . . . Sat-
urn . . . Bacchus . . . Ceres, Diana, in
men's wits Minerva . . .

He does not deny that the pagans worship one God under many forms and names, male and female, but he deploras the worship of God in such a piecemeal manner. The pranks of the pagan gods offend him, and he objects—very properly—to their morals. Therefore he rather dishonestly refuses to follow up the argument, and turns quickly to another subject.

In many parts of the ancient world it was the *Queen* of Heaven who was the supreme deity: Ceres in the Eleusinian Mysteries; Isis and Cybele in the Egyptian and Phrygian cults; but the goddess was but the reflected light, the female aspect, of the King of Heaven whose light was ONE. When Isis appears to Apulius in a vision (*The Golden Asse*, Book II. ch. 47), telling him that she is also Minerva, Venus, Diana, Juno, Bellona, Hecate, and so on, she refers to herself as “*chiefe* of powers divine”. In other words, she was wholly identified with Helios, whether he was known as Mithras with Melissa, Attis with Cybele, or Osiris with Isis. The Emperor Julianus called attention to this age-old synthesis in his Hymns to King Helios and the Mother of the Gods, in which he equated Helios with Jupiter, Jove, Apollo, Attis and Mithras, the last being the name under which he and the legionaries worshipped the sun-god. And when the Roman conquerors first introduced the cult of Mithras into Britain, they found its rites already established among the sun-worshipping Druids. But before Julianus could achieve his great ambition to reverse his Uncle Constantine's ruling that an already paganized Christianity should be the State religion of the Roman Empire, he came to an untimely end in his war against the Persians from whose religion Mithraism was originally derived.

There was much on the higher levels of this universalist Faith so intolerantly dis-

missed as “paganism” by the Jews and Christians, that was good and true; and, as I have shown in *Mithras: The Fellow In the Cap*, a great many of its ideas and ceremonies have been preserved under the name of Christianity, but unfortunately not those most worthy of perpetuation. These are, however, to be found in the *Enneads* of Plotinus which the late Dean Inge, one of the most intelligent theologians of this century, endeavoured to bring to our attention in the '30s. Of the author he wrote: “It is to Plotinus more than to any other thinker that we owe a definite doctrine of spiritual existence”. He realized what most religionists tend to forget, that religion is but the means to this all-important end. *The Enneads* present the evolution of the God-idea to what Rénan describes as “the absolute and the ideal”, and constitute the ultimate development of what we have been taught to think of as heathen paganism, with Sol no longer the Supreme God but merely the symbol of that beneficent Parent of all, the Divine Mind, man's inseparable unity with which constitutes his immortality.

That this great work contains not only the essence of Platonism but also, since truth is *one*, the essence of the original teachings of Jesus Christ, will neither surprise nor alarm those who have already recognized the existence of a perennial philosophy on the higher levels of all the idealistic Faiths of both East and West. Indeed the fact that Pythagoras, Socrates, Gautama, Jesus of Nazareth, Sankaracharya, and Plotinus can be shown to have taught the same basic truths only confirms Bernard Shaw's dictum that “the test of a dogma is its universality.”

Help Nature and work on with her;
and Nature will regard thee as one of her
creators and make obeisance.

The Voice of the Silence

THE UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE AS APPLIED TO OCCULT PHENOMENA

From the point of view of religious faith, the educational systems of today present a curious and disturbing contrast of opposites. On the one hand, a number of colleges with religious affiliations include in their curricula instruction in their various faiths usually without at the same time imparting that questioning spirit which leads an individual to challenge what he is taught with critical inquiry. On the other hand, many secular universities have adopted a perspective which is a mixture of modern science and Freudian psychology. In these institutions, students are taught critical inquiry, faith in the scientific method. If any of the faith of their fathers remains, it survives only by being closeted off in a corner of the mind with a label, "do not touch." In short, religious faith is often maintained in this environment only by means of a kind of irrational desperation. To understand the need for balance between these two extremes of faith and skepticism, it is interesting to consider one of the many parallels or analogies which are thought by some to exist between occult law and that portion of natural law embodied and expressed in modern physics.

One of the cornerstones of modern physics, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, states that some of the fundamental parameters at the atomic level can never be measured or known except by statistical methods. A basic uncertainty concerning details must always remain because of fundamental limitations in all measuring instruments.

There is an analogous principle which we suspect applies to occult phenomena. This principle indicates that psychic affects must be determined statistically, that except in the hands of very unusual persons indeed, these effects must be sporadic and non-reproducible, and that both faith *and* skepticism in proper balance are necessary for growth and development.

A fundamental occult hypothesis states that man's thoughts interact in a world of their own to produce eventually tangible effects in his outward actions. A simple example of this interaction is provided by the various phenomena of mental telepathy. In the case of atomic physics uncertainty arises because the position and velocity of subatomic particles can be measured only by bouncing other such particles off those being observed while tracing their paths after interaction. Since the particles used as projectiles by the physicist are not ideal but have finite size and weight, they give only approximate information and seriously disturb the system under measurement.

The rub is similar with psychic phenomena. If, as our hypothesis states, thoughts have a reality of their own in a world of their own, we can perceive this reality only by testing it with other thoughts. Regardless of how data about this subtle thought-world enters our consciousness, we are unable to make use of it or otherwise integrate it with other data, without at the same time generating new thoughts which enter the subtle thought-world and disturb and alter the original reality. Thus any attempt to observe this world changes it so that we can never be quite sure of what is there at any one time.

Occult "science" has not developed to the point where the force of a thought can be measured quantitatively. But we do speak of thought-energy. Some thoughtforms are believed to have accumulated much energy over many generations, while others are much weaker. In general, the thought-energy contained in thoughtform is believed to be related to the total time, effort, and attention put into it by its makers. We might represent a thoughtform as a multi-dimensional vector whose magnitude is proportional to this total thought-energy. A small observing thought-vector will deflect

a high energy thoughtform only slightly. But if the thoughtform observed and the observing thoughtform are of the same magnitude, the resultant can be expected to a highly variable quantity. Thus the first conclusion which one might draw is that if one plans an occult experiment involving many successive observations, and if reliable results are required the total thought-energy being observed should be many times greater than that contributed by the observer.

This same line of argument followed to its logical conclusion will account for many of the observed difficulties in psychic research. One of the easiest ways to get convincing data in this field has been by after-the-fact documentation of spontaneous psychic phenomena. For example, a man has a serious accident and is unable to reach help. A close friend travels many

miles and drops in just in time because she somehow "knows" the help is needed. This kind of event is often recorded by psychic researchers in after-the-fact interviews. The skeptical thoughts of the researchers are too late to affect the outcome of the experiment. At most, they can affect only the memory of the incident. Here time is a buffer which gives some degree of isolation.

However, a scientist can seldom rest content with secondhand data recorded by untrained observers. One of the cornerstones of the scientific community is the custom of reporting experiments in sufficient detail that they may be duplicated by colleagues and checked for accuracy. It is at exactly this point that occult phenomena fail to meet the test of conventional scientific inquiry.

(Continued on Page 39)

FREEDOM

BY MABEL CARR

The subject is FREEDOM and whether we think of freedom as political, personal, intellectual, or spiritual, we all love freedom. Human beings spontaneously consider freedom as something desirable. The small child loves physical freedom and will run off if not watched. The teenager demands freedom from parental control. Adults usually think of freedom in the political sense, and we in Canada are very thankful to have as great a degree of it as we have. We are able to hold Theosophical meetings because we have political freedom, or freedom of speech as it is called. There are countries in which such meetings cannot be held. We can hold Theosophical ideas, live by them, and spread them.

Let us look at some of the other aspects of the quality of freedom. The definitions give more things it is not than things it is. For instance, it is described as exemption from slavery, confinement or constraint; but

it is also said to be liberty, independence, ease or facility of doing anything. I want to consider it as exemption from subjection to the will of others, and the effect of this not just outwardly, but inwardly as well. Let us consider personal freedom in the psychological sense and see how freedom applies to Theosophical students on our soul journey.

Personally, I think we should be free from the domination of others. The word domination comes from a Latin word meaning Lord or Master, hence to rule. It is not well that one person should dominate others. We need to develop self reliance, to learn to govern ourselves in accordance with the guidance of the higher self, the divine one within each of us. If we rely on our lower self, our personality, we act from self interest and would try in all probability to impose domination on others instead of allowing them the same freedom we wish for

ourselves. This is exemplified in the statement from our platform that each member may hold his own opinions but is requested to allow others the freedom to hold theirs. We may express our opinions, especially if we think they will be a help to anyone else, but we are not free to ram them down anyone else's throat.

Each lodge in the Canadian section of the Society is autonomous. In our Lodge we are aware that another Lodge in our own city operates on a somewhat different line of thought than our own and both are permissible within the Canadian Section. Likewise the Sections are autonomous within the parent Society whose headquarters are at Adyar, India. For instance our Canadian Section is known for its staunch adherence to the Blavatsky teachings, whereas some of the other Sections are inclined to follow Besant and Leadbeater ideas.

Freedom to hold our own opinions is not just something nice to have. It is a necessity for the evolving soul that is aiming to become one with the involved spirit. Why is it a necessity? Because blind belief cribs, cabins and confines, to quote the poet. If there is any blind belief you have held from childhood, not necessarily a religious one, just stop and examine it. See how it restricts you. One such belief held by many is the idea of the superiority of men over women. Of course that now-a-days is more of a controversy than a belief, but it is still held blindly by some. Well, if you examine the constitution of man as given in the Theosophical teachings, you find it applies to mankind without distinction of sex. Spirit has no sex (the Bible says in heaven there is no marrying or giving in marriage). Incarnating souls develop variations, some incarnating as men and others as women, for the sake of the experience they get that way. The belief that one is superior to the other encourages the quality of vanity in men, and lack of true self-reliance in women, so an understanding of the facts gives freedom to develop better qualities.

Another blind belief is the idea that right-

eous indignation is justifiable. Actually it is a hindrance, for indignation, righteous or otherwise, prevents one from seeing how best to help the underdog. The same fervor poured through compassion would give the power to see the right thing to be done.

Freedom to hold our own opinions is a necessity because each soul is different, each searches for the truth and must find it in his own way, and that way is conditioned by his past experiences. Some aspects of truth he accepts at first glance, having probably studied and made them his own in a former incarnation. At any rate he is ready for them. Other aspects he has to study and ponder over now, and his attitude toward them will be the effect of causes he has set in motion in this or some previous life. If he does not work through to a solution now, the same question will come round to him again later on, our experiences being cyclic. That is, the same type of experience comes to us periodically until we are through with it.

To sum up:—The attainment of freedom is the overcoming of obstacles or hindrances so that we may have a clear path to achieve that at which we aim. This is shown in the course of lessons on public speaking where Roy Mitchell gives us rules or methods by which we may remove from ourselves, physical, moral and mental limitations which would have been likely to impede freedom in delivering a lecture. So in our endeavor to raise the personal self so that it may become integrated with the higher self, we need to remove obstacles or hindrances. These are different for each one of us. Always in life we forfeit the lower to gain the higher and having attained the freedom of the higher, we are glad that we let go the lower. St. Paul speaks of himself as a bond slave to Christ in whom is perfect freedom. Perfect freedom is a quality of the Christ-principle, the divine oneness that is within each human being, and it is for us to learn to let that freedom shine through.

NOTES AND COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL SECRETARY

I regret to record the deaths of two members of Phoenix Lodge, Mrs. Gladys Miller of Burlington, and Mr. Earle Bradfield, the Secretary of the Lodge. Mrs. Miller who died on March 7 had been a member of the Society for many years and was an earnest student of the Ancient Wisdom. Mr. Bradfield, who died on Feb. 27 became a member in 1957, joining the Hamilton Lodge and transferring to Phoenix Lodge when it was formed.

Our condolences are extended to the families of both members and to the members of Phoenix Lodge.

* * *

The note in the last issue concerning a copy of the Peking Edition of *The Voice of the Silence* brought a prompt reply from Mrs. E. Fielding of The H.P.B. Library, North Vancouver, who informed me that, contrary to my understanding, this Edition is still in stock at the Library and is sold at \$1.00 apiece; also that the Library holds the plates so that another issue could be printed when required. Mrs. Fielding writes, "Mrs. Cleather and Mr. Crump were in Peking when they were bringing this edition out. The Tashi Lama was also in Peking and they had several audiences with him. As Mrs. Cleather's son spoke both Chinese and Tibetan, there was no need of an interpreter. The Tashi Lama said that *The Voice* was along the lines of his work and that was why he gave permission for the inclusion of his photograph, and he also wrote a short note for it. He was also very interested to hear about our Library and gave us a nice photograph of himself to hang on our wall, and also a beautiful incense burner. He also gave us permission to use his seal — see the heading on this paper . . ."

"I'm afraid the office of Tashi Lama seems to have died out with the death of the one mentioned above, even the palace at Tashi-lhum-po was utterly destroyed by a flood in 1954—in fact, the whole town of Shigatse was wiped out. The Dalai Lama is

merely the political head. I believe there is a so-called Tashi Lama around somewhere, but he is quite young and one never hears anything about him. On page 99 of this edition the Editors give a quotation from H.P.B. which shows the connection between the Tashi Lama and our Masters; this and the Maha Chohan's Letter all point to our teaching being Esoteric Bud(d)-hism; a much better name for it these days in the face of all the perversions and nonsense the public has been given in the name of Theosophy."

This Edition of *The Voice* is a faithful reprint of the first edition as published by H.P.B. and reproduces, as closely as local facilities permitted, the size, cover, make-up and pagination of the original. Copies may be obtained from The H.P.B. Library, 1385 Tatlow Ave., North Vancouver, B.C.

* * *

I was delighted to hear last month from the Secretary of Honolulu Lodge, Mrs. Margot Blaisdell Banks, who formerly lived in Toronto, worked at Hart House Theatre when Roy Mitchell was Director there, and attended his lectures at the Toronto Lodge. That was back in the 1920's and there are only a few left in the Lodge who remember those days, which, in retrospect, were golden-hued. But the name "Margot Blaisdell" is still remembered by those who were there then.

Mrs. Banks mentions her indebtedness to Mr. Mitchell and adds, "As Secretary of the Honolulu Lodge may I ask you to let your members know we are here and would be so happy to meet them? Anyone passing through can call me at 774831. We are a small group and feel rather isolated from the theosophical main stream, and our aloha to visitors will be warm."

* * *

I have much pleasure in welcoming four new members into the fellowship of the Society, Mrs. Ellen F. Fletcher of Victoria, Miss Ruth Hamilton of Canyon Lodge, Miss Dorothy Rosenfield and Mrs. M. Beedie both of Toronto Lodge.

THE ORGAN OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
THE CANADIAN THEOSOPHIST
IN CANADA

PUBLISHED BI-MONTHLY
AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MAIL BY THE POST OFFICE
DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA, AND FOR PAYMENT
OF POSTAGE IN CASH.

SUBSCRIPTION: TWO DOLLARS A YEAR



OFFICERS OF THE T. S. IN CANADA
GENERAL SECRETARY
D. W. BARR
52 ISABELLA ST., TORONTO 5, ONT.

GENERAL EXECUTIVE

CHARLES E. BUNTING, 75 Rosedale Ave.,
Hamilton, Ont.
T. G. DAVY, 138 Randolph Road, Toronto 17, Ont.
GEORGE I. KINMAN, 262 Sheldrake Blvd.,
Toronto 12, Ont.
MRS. C. P. LAKIN, S.S. NO. 2, 102 Floresta Court,
Ancaster, Ont.
CEDRIC WEAVER, 30 Orchard Park Dr., West Hill
Ont.
WASHINGTON E. WILKS, 925 Georgia St. W.,
Vancouver, B.C.
EMORY P. WOOD, 9360 — 86th St., Edmonton, Alta.
TREASURER: MR. RALPH A. WEBB

EDITORIAL BOARD, CANADIAN THEOSOPHIST
ALL LETTERS TO THE EDITORS, ARTICLES AND REPORTS
FOR PUBLICATION SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THE
EDITORS, 52 ISABELLA ST., TORONTO 5.

EDITORS: MR. & MRS. T. G. DAVY
LETTERS INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION SHOULD BE
RESTRICTED TO NOT MORE THAN FIVE HUNDRED WORDS

The editors reserve the right to shorten any letter unless the
writer states that it must be published in full or not at all.

PRINTED BY THE BEAMSVILLE EXPRESS.
BEAMSVILLE, ONT.

Our Editors, Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Davy, spent their holidays this year on a trip to the west coast and visited the lodges en route. I have received letters from the members of the western lodges telling of their happiness in meeting Mr. and Mrs. Davy and, judging from the warmth of the messages, our Editors have made firm friends wherever they went.

The following letter from Dr. W. E. Wilks of Orpheus Lodge speaks on behalf of the Lodges in and near Vancouver.

“We members of the Canadian Theosophical Society in Vancouver had a very enjoyable, profitable and interesting visit with Mr. and Mrs. Ted Davy, Editors of *The Canadian Theosophist*, on their holiday in the west recently. The gods smiled and gave us fine weather whilst they were in the city so that we were able to show them some of the beauties of Vancouver—the mountains are glorious in their snow just now.

“The Davys joined the members of the Orpheus Lodge in a regular meeting when the prospects of the Theosophical Movement were discussed. We had many other opportunities for long talks. One evening all three Lodges here were invited to meet our visitors at a semi-social gathering at the Vancouver Lodge, some members staying on talking until midnight.

“We are all very glad to have had the opportunity to meet Mr. and Mrs. Davy and to know that the Magazine is in such good hands.”

* * *

As mentioned in the last *Notes and Comments*, Toronto Lodge will welcome Miss Elouise Harrison of British Columbia on June 7, 8 and 9.

The *Toronto Theosophical News* lists a series of talks by Miss Harrison as follows: “Where is Man Heading?—Theosophic Ethics”, “You Can Determine Your Future”—a talk on the law of Karma and Justice, “The Wisdom of the Ancient Druids”.

We hope our readers living in Toronto and vicinity will make a special effort to hear and meet Miss Harrison on the above dates.

* * *

At the time of going to press we learned of the death on April 4 of Mrs. Ermina Holland. A member of Montreal Lodge, Mrs. Holland joined the Society in 1926.

—D.W.B.

ANNUAL ELECTION

Eight nominations have been received this year for the seven positions on the Executive Committee. The nominations include all standing members of the Committee together with Mrs. M. Howard of Montreal Lodge. Mrs. Howard was originally a member of Toronto Lodge but was demitted to Montreal Lodge when she and her husband moved to Montreal in 1962.

The Ballot papers will be sent out early in May. These should be completed promptly and returned to me in the addressed envelope which will be enclosed. Voting will close on May 31.

Only one nomination was received for the office of General Secretary and that was for the present incumbent.

—D.W.B.

"GOD'S LOVED ONES"

When India became independent, all schools were opened to children of the former "untouchables", the term "untouchables" was discontinued and persons of that large submerged group are now known as "Harijans" (God's loved ones).

The Olcott Harijan Free Schools were originally established by Colonel Olcott to serve the children of the community of untouchables in the area surrounding Adyar. The two schools receive some aid from the Government and from charitable agencies, but not enough to meet expenses and each year an appeal is made to Theosophists to help with donations.

The Schools are free, no fees are charged and needy students are supplied with free books and stationery, together with some food and clothing. Each pupil who has not had breakfast is given a cup of milk before he enters his class and a midday meal is served to some 700 children who would otherwise go without.

This year, in addition to an operating deficit of some \$3,200.00, a further sum of \$8,000.00 is required to pay for some essential repairs and to provide clothing for the children. Our Canadian members have

responded generously to this need in the past, and those who wish to donate this year should send their gifts by registered mail to "The Olcott Harijan Free Schools", Adyar, Madras 20, India. Miss Joan Morris, formerly Secretary of the Canadian Federation, is now in charge of the Schools' Foreign Correspondence.

—D.W.B.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

The Editors

The Canadian Theosophist

Sirs: Mr. Sattelberg's rejoinder to my own remarks in the Jan.-Feb. issue questioning the value of "organized" Theosophy in a SOCIETY, is not usefully to the point. I would like to cite a few more facts surrounding the issue. Complacency about the present nature of Theosophy will not do; nor is the wild fallacy that I am creating the impression of the Ancient Wisdom as having "passed its high water tide of purposiveness and utility", a valid conclusion. Resentment of the facts stated is but natural to thousands of Theosophists, brought up as they have been, in the pseudo atmosphere of the Leadbeaterian regime. Everything hangs upon one's interpretation of the term SOCIETY. The fallacy that a corrupt association of officials could ever be a vehicle for Theosophia must go. That is the exact present position.

As to the membership: certainly there is plenty of zealous effort everywhere to spread something—but what? Intense study of the actual Mahatma Letters in the British Museum has convinced me of their genuine origin and value: but to equate these 'Letters' with published Theosophical doctrines is a sheer impossibility. These 'officials' have moved heaven and earth to discredit the genuine character of such documents; every excuse and dodge has been invented to cover up the ghastly travesty these officials have fostered. The prejudiced pin-head mentality of these aging officials is pitiful and painful to observe: the efforts of the writer to expose the racket

met with ostracism, calumny, and the savage spite such false teaching could inevitably engender.

If this is a statement made in acceptable sincerity, of what use is such a SOCIETY? None whatever. To 'criticize' is held to be *unspiritual*; "informed opinion" at the official level has made me an "emissary of the Dark Forces"; and other 'spiritual' chat is continually levelled at dozens of objectors like myself. H.P.B. died broken hearted by the constant failure of her 'esoteric groups', aggravated by the insane efforts of Mr. Sinnett to discredit H.P.B.'s gentle correction of his own 'planetary chain' delusions. Thus the 'Messenger' endured a dreamland-edition of her own message being pushed down her aging throat! Original teachings became palsied and forced into the 'blinkers' of popular intellectualism and psychic nonsense. Sinnett finally descended to searching for the "Masters" through the dignified reliability of a 'planchette'! Charming folk, these early Theosophists; their incredible antics made the existence of an exoteric SOCIETY the sorry legacy we justly scorn today.

Well, Mr. Sattelberg, one would like your dream of an acceptable Theosophy to be a go-ahead affair, but the picture gets worse as each Theosophical skeleton is unearthed as the *cause* of present disaster. Only by burning every Leadbeaterian book could one feel safe from the lethal consequences of early blunderdom. E. L. Gardner must squirm when he reads those small pamphlets on 'Planetary Chains' and their illogical correspondences: how shall we be rid of them?

I wish that your own diagnosis of Theosophical failure really were confined to the "sluggish and apathetic within our ranks": the real causes are very much more painful than that. Any SOCIETY must finally wilt, even if the *genuine* core of its teaching is falsified. The spiritual can never be made a lasting mockery by a worldly 'fiddle'. Useless to say that 'Tea-party Brotherhood' is all that matters: even Buddha definitely

headed his 'Eightfold Path' with 'Right Doctrine' as the most important of all. Love, Purity, and other attributes are well down the list! Why? Without Right Doctrine there *must* be chaos—just like the present Theosophical chaos. Thus the Master writes: "Our doctrine knows no compromises. It either affirms or denies, for it never teaches but that which it knows to be the truth". This may sound dogmatic and assertive to the mind of the West: the doctrine has to be tried and studied individually, but at all events, the point of Right Doctrine is endorsed.

The Mahatma Letters, as the source of modern Theosophy, should first be consulted before any notions of 'Basic' Theosophy find themselves in print. We have had enough piffle already.

—Grahame W. Barratt

☆ ☆ ☆

*The Editors,
The Canadian Theosophist*

Regarding the review of Arthur H. Nethercot's book, *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant*.

Perhaps Mrs. Besant was faced with the problem of cleavage that is discussed in Volume II of *Esoteric Psychology*, P. 415. From the standpoint of the author, psychology is the major science today. "It holds the fate of humanity in its grasp. It has the power (rightly developed and employed) to save the race." As he points out on P. 409, problems are of two kinds: (1) of integration; (2) the sense of duality. The fact faces all of us as we advance, the soul must govern and its instrument in the warfare is a consecrated mind. In *The Science of the Emotions* Bhagavan Das surveys the problem of emotional nature. Victory descends from above and cannot be worked up from below. The selfish Will is faced with the higher Will of the Divine Nature and is the deciding factor.

It is the story of Arjuna and Kurukshetra, the problem of the individual and of humanity as a whole. We all have to face the problem. We face the middle way and

choose through right discrimination leading to right action, and this is made possible by practised dispassion. Through the practice of mindfulness we attain clear comprehension in its four phases and the solution is seen.

We all are misunderstood and wreck our lives due to the powerful emotional nature that has served us well formerly but requires the orientation of the blissful nature that opens the intuitional activity and eventual release.

—P. M. Poulin

THE UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE AS APPLIED TO OCCULT PHENOMENA

(Continued From Page 33)

Let us imagine that a team of dedicated and dispassionate observers have conducted a series of experiments in thought-transference using appropriate scientific controls and have accumulated overwhelming evidence in support of the phenomena. Let us say that all goes well until they publish their results. We can be sure that such published work will arouse controversy and, in fact, the better the work, the more challenging, the more heated is that controversy certain to be. Expert outside observers are called on the scene and suddenly the new results reported are no better than chance. The occultist would say, "Of course, new energies were introduced." The skeptical observer will say, "Of course, new controls were introduced."

Needless to say, highly skeptical investigators, even if they attempt the same experiments in all "good faith," are unlikely to achieve success. They have too much at stake in the experiment. The outward conditions will be right but the thought-world, where observations are made, will be greatly agitated by strong opposing forces — the accumulated unbelief of a lifetime.

The point of the foregoing example is that skepticism can be a dynamic destructive force in the subtle thought-world, which

when all's said and done, does not leave the field cleared for new construction, but littered with illusion of its own. One can conclude from this kind of argument, that a small group of persons can never expect to conduct convincing experiments for a large skeptical audience. They cannot marshal enough thought-energy, and the supply of lifelong opposing skeptics is virtually unlimited. Tenacious clinging to the skeptical view creates a block which for the skeptic makes his world view a bleak but accurate one. Subtle forces cannot reach him. He lives life utterly alone, sealed within his skin and five senses, a mortal creature of flesh whose only channels of sustenance are physical. But such need not be the case. The skeptic lives in a prison of his own building. He is a materialist in a materialistic world by his own choice. Others, however, may choose differently.

Skepticism versus objectivity:

Skepticism is full of desire (desire for security, among others) and constitutes a definite destructive or obstructive force in the thought-world. Objectivity, on the other hand, involves desireless observation. When the observer feels no strong desire concerning the outcome of the experiment, he achieves the "light touch" and his thoughts of observation are minimum, clouding the field only a little. Such non-attachment to results is a rare quality, indeed, and requires profound self-knowledge and arduous self-discipline in its achievement.

It is interesting that Gautama Buddha taught almost no theology and avoided mentioning God. Instead, he taught the elimination of desires, and techniques of living and of meditation all directed toward this end. It is the Buddhist teaching that when desire has been eliminated, one "sees" reality, and knows directly more than can ever be taught in a theology.

The role of faith:

Faith is a much used and abused word. At the beginning of its discussion, it might be well to define the faith of priestcraft so that it may not be confused with the dis-

cussion that follows. In the age old art of priestcraft, the goal is to enslave. A cute trick of circular logic can be used to achieve this goal. The organization wishing complete subservience teaches that salvation is dependent on belief. One is safe, therefore, only if he believes the approved dogma which includes salvation through belief or "faith." We suspect that this view of faith is a perversion of a useful human function, and the discussion which follows is not primarily concerned with salvation through belief in dogma.

In Book II of the *Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali* (Prabhavanda Isherwood translation), we find this instruction in the 33rd aphorism: "To be free from thoughts that distract one from yoga, thoughts of an opposite kind must be cultivated" (oppositely directed vectors cancelling to zero). Faith is thought-activity which is the opposite of skepticism. If skepticism is destructive, then faith is constructive.

At its best, such constructive thought-activity builds channels through which man receives his inspiration from higher levels. The first, the simplest, the most fundamental constructive thought required is that inspiration is not only possible, but is natural and available to anyone who seeks it; that there is a source of inspiration with which one can become aligned with resultant enrichment and ennobling of life. Notice that the opposite of this thought (that non-material inspiration is impossible and there is no source) would by the principles just described eliminate the possibility of contacting such a source should it indeed exist.

At its worst, however, faith can be limiting. It can be too specific, too detailed and exclusive in its outlines, so that the light of reality is unable to shine through without obstruction and excessive distortion. Exercise of man's ability to think is essential to his full development, and faith which excludes critical questioning thought may be useful for a time; however, there comes a time in evolution when these shackles must

be broken, however painful the process, to permit further growth, expansion and development.

We must conclude, then, that faith and skepticism form a pair of opposites between which careful balance needs to be maintained. Each carried to excess can form a prison which enslaves the consciousness. One must question without being needlessly destructive, and one must construct in thought-stuff without building prisons, cul-de-sacs or elaborate towers which, though beautiful or comforting in their seeming solidity, miss the point so far as evolution and growth are concerned.

There are, of course, higher aspects of faith not touched upon here. Every creative act begins with a faith that throws out the first tenuous threads of a web on which a final structure is built; but this is a subject for another time and issue.

Chiefly, it is important to remember that man is not an island in his thought; he is immersed in a sea of thought-stuff, a sea of which his own creations are but a small part. To maintain the required balance between faith and skepticism, this sea today requires considerable positive exertion. In short, often when one believes himself to be casually objective, he is instead being caught up in the thought-force of those around him, his family and his community. It is for this reason that we advocate frequent retreats to nature, and frequent meditation which exercises and maintains the channels of inspiration. For those to whom such channels seem not to exist, we suggest that an occasional meditation designed to affirm the possibility of such channels will help to strike the balance needed.

(This article originally appeared in *New Leaves*, September, 1963, and is reprinted by permission of the Editors. *New Leaves* is obtainable from Narasascawany, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.)

PARMENIDES AS SEEN THROUGH PLATO

BY PETER BANDTLOW

Parmenides was a great philosopher in the generation just preceding Socrates. Plato tells us that Parmenides came to Athens at the age of sixty-five, and there met and spoke with Socrates, who was at that time a young man. It must have been in the middle of the fifth century B.C., or shortly thereafter. Socrates, as a young man, was very impressed with him. "In later years he called him 'venerable and awful' and said, 'I met him when he was old and I a mere youth and he seemed to me to have a glorious depth of mind'."¹ Parmenides was a citizen of the city of Elea, and had much to do with legislation in this city. He is usually shown as a disciple of Xenophanes. "It has been pointed out, however, that there is no evidence for the settlement of Xenophanes at Elea, and the story that he founded the Eleatic school seems to be derived from a playful remark of Plato's which would also prove Homer to have been a Herakleitean."² There is much more evidence to show that Parmenides was a Pythagorean. He built a shrine to the memory of his Pythagorean teacher, Ameinias, the son of Diochaitas, "and this appears to rest on the testimony of the inscription in which he dedicated it." His name also appears in a list of Pythagoreans preserved by Iamblichos.

The form in which Parmenides wrote is very clearly considered by John Burnet.

Parmenides broke with the older Ionic tradition by writing in hexameter verse. It was not a happy thought. The Hesiodic style was doubtless appropriate enough for the cosmology he described in the second part of his poem, but it was wholly unsuited to the arid dialectic of the first. It is clear that Parmenides was no born poet, and we must ask what led him to take this new departure.³

Burnet then points out that it has been shown that in the Proem, Parmenides describes his ascent to the home of the goddess, a reflection of common ascents to heaven,

which were almost as common as descents into hell in the apocalyptic literature of those days, and of which we see reflections in the myth of Plato's *Phaedrus* and an imitation of, in Dante's *Paradiso*. Then Burnet says,

. . . if it was the influence of such an apocalypse that led Parmenides to write it in verse, it will follow that the Proem is no mere external ornament to his work, but an essential part of it, the part, in fact, which he had most clearly conceived when he began to write.⁴

As this seems to be the case, then it is to the Proem to which we must look for an understanding of the whole of his work.

He represents himself as having been borne on a chariot, attended by the Sunmaidens who are to guide him on his journey. They travel along the highway until they come to the gate of Night and Day, which is locked and barred. The key is owned by *Dike* (Right), the Avenger, who is persuaded to unlock it by the Sunmaidens. They go through the gate and are now in the realms of Day. The goal of their journey is the palace of a goddess, who welcomes Parmenides and instructs him in the two ways, the way of Truth, and the deceptive way of Belief, in which there is no truth at all. All this is described in a most matter-of-fact way. It is symbolical of his passing from error, or night, into truth, or day.

We have seen reason to believe that Parmenides was originally a Pythagorean, and there are many things which suggest that the Way of Belief is an account of Pythagorean cosmology. In any case, it is surely impossible to regard it as anything else than a description of error. . . . Further, this erroneous belief is not the ordinary man's view of the world, but an elaborate system, which seems to be a natural development of the Ionian cosmology on certain lines, and there is no other system but the Pythagorean that fulfills this requirement.⁵

The primary purpose of this paper is to try to summarize the method of thinking and philosophical system of Parmenides, as exemplified in Plato's *Parmenides*. This dialogue considers the Platonic concept of ideas, and attacks this concept. This is "certainly a curious procedure since in the end he apparently neither demolishes them nor establishes them—we are left in doubt."⁶ This dialogue begins with Cephalus, traveling with some friends from Clazomenae to Athens. They are met by Adimantus and Glaucon. Their purpose in taking the trip is to hear Antiphon, the half-brother of Adimantus, repeat a conversation which he heard between Socrates, Zeno, and Parmenides. The background of the conversation is as follows:

Zeno and Parmenides once came to Athens for the Great Panathenaea. Parmenides was a man of distinguished appearance. By that time he was well advanced in years, with hair almost white; he may have been sixty-five. Zeno was nearing forty, a tall and attractive figure. It was said that he had been Parmenides' favorite. They were staying with Pythodorus outside the walls in the Ceramicus. Socrates and a few others came there, anxious to hear a reading of Zeno's treatise, which the two visitors had brought for the first time to Athens. Socrates was then quite young. Zeno himself read it to them . . .⁷

After its reading Socrates asked Zeno if his precise purpose was to show that "unlike things cannot be like or like things unlike, it is also impossible that things should be a plurality; if many things did exist, they would have impossible attributes." Zeno replies that this is just the purpose of his argument and that he had written it as "a sort of defense of Parmenides' argument against those who try to make fun of it by showing that his supposition, that there is a one, leads to many absurdities and contradictions." And that "This book, then is a retort against those who assert a plurality." Socrates then points out that things both partake of being similar and dissimilar

at the same time and thus have a relation to both. He then says ". . . if anyone can prove that what is simply unity itself is many or that plurality itself is one, then I shall begin to be surprised." Parmenides then asks Socrates if he himself makes this distinction, "Do you believe that there is such a thing as likeness itself apart from the likeness that we possess, and so on with unity and plurality and all the terms in Zeno's argument that you have just been listening to?" To this question Socrates answers in the affirmative. Then Parmenides questions him further as to whether he believes in a form for abstracts such as "rightness" or "beauty". To this Socrates also answers yes. Then he is asked if he believes in such a form for man. To this Socrates replies that he is not sure. He then says that he thinks it would be absurd to say that such things as hair or mud also have forms. Parmenides then says to Socrates that he feels this way because he is young and that "youth makes you still pay attention to what the world will think." There is then an involved discussion in which Socrates tries to make clear his conception of the forms and their relationship to that which is related to them. Finally he states his best approximation of what he feels the situation to be ". . . the best I can make of the matter is this — that these forms are as it were patterns fixed in the nature of things. The other things are made in their image and are likenesses, and this participation they come to have in the forms is nothing but their being made in their image."⁸ Parmenides then shows what great difficulties Socrates will come up against if he tries to maintain that there is a form for each object. As to man's ability to know these forms, Parmenides says, "Only a man of exceptional gifts will be able to see that a form, or essence just by itself, does exist in each case, and it will require someone still more remarkable to discover it and to instruct another who has thoroughly examined all these difficulties."⁹ Socrates agrees with him. Parmenides then points out another difficulty with which he thinks Soc-

rates is already familiar. That is, if “. . . in view of all these difficulties and others like them, a man refuses to admit that forms of things exist or to distinguish a definite form in every case, he will have nothing on which to fix his thought, so long as he will not allow that each thing has a character which is always the same, and in so doing he will completely destroy the significance of all discourse.”¹⁰ As Socrates sees no way to overcome this difficulty, Parmenides says to him that he feels Socrates needs formal training. Towards this end Parmenides gives him this advice as to the method he should pursue. “If you want to be thoroughly exercised, you must not merely make the supposition that such and such a thing *is* and then consider the consequences; you must also make the supposition that that same thing *is not*.”¹¹ For example, Parmenides then uses the propositions *there is not a plurality* and *there is a plurality of things*. Socrates then asks him to use an illustration, taking it through to its logical conclusion. Parmenides agrees to do this and to consider the one itself, as in his original supposition. Parmenides starts out with these statements,

. . . if there is a *one*, of course the one will not be many. Consequently it cannot have any parts or be a whole. For a part is a part of a whole, and a whole means that from which no part is missing; so, whether you speak of it as ‘a whole’ or as ‘having parts’, in either case the one would consist of parts and in that way be many and not one. But it is to be one and not many. Therefore, if the one is to be one, it will not be a whole nor have parts.

And, if it has no parts, it cannot have a beginning or an end or a middle, for such things would be parts of it. Further, the beginning and end of a thing are its limits. Therefore, if the one has neither beginning nor end, it is without limits.

Consequently the one has no shape; it is not either round or straight. Round is that whose extremity is everywhere equi-

distant from its center, and straight is that of which the middle is in front of both extremities. So if the one had either straight or round shape, it would have parts and so be many. Therefore, since it has no parts it is neither straight nor round.¹²

The rest of this dialogue continues in the same way with an argument and then a conclusion beginning with, “Therefore”. In order to avoid the necessity of having to repeat the whole in my own words, I will begin by stating each conclusion in turn, each time giving some of the reasons which Parmenides uses as support.

The one is not anywhere, being neither in itself nor in another. This is established because it is not in another or in itself. He shows this by saying that if it were in another it “would be encompassed all round by that in which it was contained, and “if it were in itself, it would have to encompass it, and nothing can be within something without being encompassed by that thing.” The one is immovable in respect of every kind of motion. The reason for this is that something in motion must either be moving in place or undergoing alteration. If the one alters, “so as to become different from itself, it surely cannot still be the one.” If it moves in place “it must either turn round in the same place or shift from one place to another.” However, to do this requires parts, and as the one has no parts, it cannot do this. The one will not be the same as another or other than itself. The reason for this is, “Were it other than itself, it would be other than one and so would not be one. And if it were the same as another it would be other and not be itself . . . Nor can it be other than another, so long as it is one. . . . Nor yet can it be the same as itself. For the character of unity is one thing, the character of sameness another.” With the above arguments and with yet more complexities, Parmenides goes on to make several other statements about the one “. . . the one cannot be like another or like itself. . . . The one cannot be like or unlike either another or itself.” “There-

fore, since it has neither one measure, nor many, nor few, and has no sameness at all, it appears that it can never be equal to itself or to another, nor yet greater or less than itself or another." The one cannot be younger or older than, or of the same age with, either itself or another. The reasoning behind this statement is that,

If it is of the same age with itself or another, it will have equality of duration and likeness, and we have said that the one has neither likeness or equality. We also said that it has no unlikeness or inequality. Such a thing cannot, then, be either older or younger than, or the same age with, anything.¹³

The one has nothing to do with time and does not occupy any stretch of time. The reason given for this statement is that whatever occupies time is always becoming older than itself, and the term "older" only has meaning in the sense of being compared with something younger. "Consequently, whatever is becoming older than itself, if it is to have something *than* which it is becoming older, must also be at the same time becoming younger than itself. . . . So, it seems, any one of the things that occupy time have a temporal character, must be of the same age as itself and also becoming at once both older and younger than itself. But we saw that none of these characters can attach to the one." A thing can only have being in one of three ways; either in the sense of past, present or future. As the one has nothing to do with time, it is not accurate to say that it is past, present or future, and therefore the one in no sense *is*.

Parmenides then goes back and reconsiders his hypothesis to see if he will reach any different conclusions. The conclusions which he reaches this time are as follows: Any 'one that is' is a whole and also has parts. What is 'one being' must be unlimited in multitude. If one is, there must also be number. "Thus not only is a 'one which is' a plurality, but unity itself is distributed by being and is necessarily many. Further, since its parts are part of a whole, the one, in respect of its wholeness, will be limited.

For the parts are contained by the whole, and the container must be a limit. Therefore, a 'one which is' is both one and many, whole and parts, limited as well as indefinitely numerous." Parmenides then goes on to show that a one such as he describes will of necessity have some shape, "straight or round or a mixture of both." And if it has these properties, they must of necessity be both in itself and in another. "Thus as a whole the one is something else; as all the parts of it is in itself, and thus the one must be both in itself and in another." The conclusion which Parmenides derives from this is that if the one has such a character it must be both at rest and in motion. His next conclusions after this second argument are that the one is and is becoming older and younger than itself and the others, and is not becoming older and younger than itself and the others. Since the one is in time and has the property of becoming older and younger, it has a past, future and present. Because of this, the one is, was, and will be, and is becoming, and will become.

Also, it can be said to have something, and there can be something *of* it, alike in past, present, and future. So there can be knowledge and opinion and perception *of* it; in fact we are now exercising all these activities with respect to it. Further, it will *have* a name and can be spoken of; indeed it actually is being named and spoken of. And all the other characters which belong to any other things of which the above statements are true belong equally to the one.¹⁴

Parmenides then goes through the argument a third time. This argument concerns itself mainly with whether the one is subject to assimilation or dissimilation, and how a thing comes to be and ceases to be, when it comes to be one, its being many ceases to be, and when it comes to be many, it no longer is. This third argument is a study of all the changes which may happen to the one if it exists.

In the next portion of his argument, Parmenides, supposing that there is a one, goes

on to say what must be said of things other than the one. He states that these others partake of the unity of the one. These other things are unlimited as to their number and as to the number of forms that they may take. The one is separate from the others, and they do not possess any of the characteristics which the one possesses. The hypothesis that the one does not exist is then considered. This non-existent one is found to have some of the same characteristics of the existent one. The non-existent one neither changes, nor has any motion, neither is it at rest (because it is nowhere). "Further, nothing that is can belong to it; to have a character that *is* would imply that it had being. Therefore it has not greatness or smallness or equality. Nor can it have likeness to, or difference of character from, either itself or the other. Parmenides then considers that if there is no one what would be true of the others. Each appears to be separate, appearing to be a one, but there is no one. "Thus, if there is no one, but only things other than the one, each of these others must appear both unlimited in multitude and limited, both one and many." His final conclusion to this particular line of enquiry is that if there is no one "the others neither are, nor can be imagined to be, one or many." This would strongly seem to indicate that, the previous statement betraying a rather illogical state of affairs, there is a one. This view is further supported in his statement that, "If there is no one, there is nothing at all." However, as a conclusion to his whole argument. Parmenides says:

It seems that, whether there is or is not a one, both that one and the others alike are and are not, and appear and do not appear to be, all manner of things in all manner of ways, with respect to themselves and to one another.¹⁵

It is interesting to note that Parmenides very definitely shows the influence of Pythagorean teaching in his argument that "it is the same thing that can be thought and that can be . . ." ¹⁶ This mirrors the Pythagorean idea of correspondence (probably

being deeply related to this schools' mathematical approach). This principle is the one from which Parmenides starts. "It is impossible to think what is not, and it is impossible for what cannot be thought to be. The great question, *Is it or is it not?* is therefore equivalent to the question, *Can it be thought or not?*" ¹⁶

The conclusion which John Burnet reaches in his *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Plato*, at the end of his consideration of Parmenides is:

Such is the conclusion to which the view of the real as a single body inevitably leads, and there is no escape from it. The 'matter' of our physical text-books is just the real of Parmenides; and, unless we can find room for something else than matter, we are shut up to his account of reality. . . . It deprives the world we know of all claim to existence, and reduces it to something which is hardly even an illusion.¹⁷

I disagree with this conclusion. I feel that Parmenides really refers to the non-material matrix of fields which have just recently been discovered by science. It is to this permanent ordering force to which he addresses himself. If the working definition of real is that which has the greatest duration, consistency, and continuity, then by comparison, the material world reflecting the order behind it, is in the truest sense hardly even an illusion. This statement seems both logical and provable, when taking a view of the universe from outside of our subjective feelings.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Edith Hamilton & Huntington Cairns *Plato The Collected Dialogues*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1961. p. 920.
2. John Burnet *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Plato*, London: Macmillan & Co. 1st edition, 1914. p. 64.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 64-65.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
6. Hamilton & Cairns, p. 920.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 921-922.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 924.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 925.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 929.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 930.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 931-932.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 934.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 942.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 956.
16. John Burnet, p. 67.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

BOOK REVIEWS

Memories, Dreams, Reflections, by C. G. Jung. Recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé; translated from the German by Richard and Clara Winston. Published 1963 by Pantheon Books, New York. 398 + xviii pages. \$7.50.

The life and work of Carl Gustav Jung will likely be remembered long after those of his contemporaries in the field of psychoanalysis and psychiatric medicine; not the least of his writings which will command attention from scholar and layman alike will be this book, his posthumously published autobiography.

Memories, Dreams, Reflections is a thrilling reading experience, a rare glimpse into the innermost reaches of the mind of a great man. In contrast to the usual autobiographical descriptions of people and places, here is a deeply introspective examination of the processes of the author's mind. The result, surprisingly enough, is a readable book in which we make acquaintance with a person endowed with unusual perceptive and analytical powers.

The man Jung who emerges from these pages is one struggling between two loosely defined aspects of the mind—between the personality and the individuality, perhaps. One of the outstanding features of these recollections is the degree of objectiveness he was able to attain when assessing them from the wisdom and experience gained in a busy eighty years. Various situations occurring throughout his life are analysed in the light of the expressions of his unconscious which manifested themselves mostly in dreams; his personal reactions to events are discussed with singular frankness.

His approach to the mysteries of life—the unexplained laws of nature—is refreshingly undogmatic and his conclusions demand close consideration from a Theosophic viewpoint. He seemed to have had an unusual number of psychic experiences, and if his interpretation of them does not coincide with our theories, they are not wholly incompatible with these, and their inspection should at least widen the limits of our

own understanding.

"Without being in a position to assert a definite opinion" on reincarnation, Jung nevertheless leaves the impression that he by no means discarded the idea of rebirth as improbable. Indeed, he was able to reflect:

"I could well imagine that I might have lived in former centuries and there encountered questions I was not yet able to answer; that I had to be born again because I had not fulfilled the task that was given to me. When I die, my deeds will follow along with me—that is how I imagine it. I will bring with me what I have done. In the meantime it is important to insure that I do not stand at the end with empty hands."

Jung left behind a voluminous literature describing his case work and experiments, and his discoveries will undoubtedly influence research on the human mind for many years to come. His scholarly works have enjoyed a remarkable popularity with the public, and thanks to modern education and communications there has probably never been an original thinker who had his ideas so widely and so quickly broadcast. This final work will usefully supplement much that had been written during a long and productive life, and remain a monument to one of the outstanding thinkers of the age.

—T.G.D.

☆ ☆ ☆

The Tarot For Today, by Mayananda. Published 1963 by the Zeus Press, London, England. 255 pp. Price 30 shillings.

The Alphabet of Thoth can be dimly traced in the Modern Tarot . . . The real Tarot . . . can be found only in the Babylonian cylinders, called by de Mirville, the 'rotating globes of Hecate.'

—*The Secret Doctrine*, III, 108.

This book, according to the author, is "simply the laboratory note-book of a student of the Tarot Trumps. The Minor Arcana are not considered." His "Horus arrangement" of the cards, we may add to the many schemes already in existence.

The author has read extensively and approaches the subject through an Eastern

mind. He quotes from and refers to all authorities from H.P.B. (see above) to Aleister Crowley's "last word"—the great "Book of Thoth".

Many interesting diagrams are included which show the writer's deep interest in symbology. Also there are pictures of the 22 Major Arcana of the Marseilles deck.

The book may lead the "enquiring mind" to an interest in the Tarot, but it is a must for the mature student of this fascinating subject.

. . . there exists a symbology of magic . . . of alchemy . . . astrology as well as the system of the Tarot which unites them into one whole. Each of these systems can serve as a means for transmitting the idea of unity . . .

—Gurdieff

The only way to deal with the ignorant is to bring them to the knowledge of their starry heritage.

—Crowley

—Jessie Webb

☆

☆

☆

The Ascent of Man, by Eleanor C. Merry, Published 1963 by New Knowledge Books, East Grinstead, England. xix + 462 pp. 57 shillings and 6 pence.

This is a revised and enlarged edition of a work first published 20 years ago under the title *I am: The Ascent of Mankind*. The author was a student of Rudolf Steiner, whose influence is noticeable in these pages.

Most of the major religious systems of the ancient world are covered briefly and represented with quotations from the various scriptures. The book would therefore serve as an elementary (albeit expensive) introduction to the study of comparative religion. Some of the views expressed, however, are unlikely to appeal to modern students. Few will ascribe to the theory that the development of the human Ego began in the Greek Age, or that the older religions and philosophies were evolutionary forerunners essential for the establishment of Christianity.

—T.G.D.

Science, Culture and Man. A collection of addresses given at the Science Seminar organized by the Maitreya Theosophical Centre, New Delhi, India. Edited by Bepin Behari. Published by Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, India, 1963. vxiii + 163 pp. Price 10 rupees.

Various aspects of the objects of the Theosophical Society are here considered by sixteen scholars. The Editor has divided the papers into three sections: the problems of human relationship; the implications of the study of comparative religion, philosophy and science; the origin of life and the evolution of forms and consciousness.

It is interesting to read the different points of view and although the ideas cover a wide range of thought, most merit our serious consideration. Some objections might be made regarding the Theosophical "authorities" quoted, particularly in the third section, otherwise the collection is a credit to the group which sponsored the seminar.

From the pen of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan is a beautifully-worded essay, "Transform the Nature of Man", in which he stresses the importance of establishing the universal brotherhood.

—T.G.D.

THE THREE TRUTHS

There are three truths which are absolute, and which cannot be lost, yet remain silent for lack of speech.

The soul of man is immortal, and its future is the future of a thing whose growth and splendor have no limit.

The principle which gives life dwells in us, and without us, is undying and eternally beneficent, is not heard or seen or smelt, but is perceived by the man who desires perception.

Each man is his own absolute lawgiver, the dispenser of glory or gloom to himself, the decreer of his life, his reward, his punishment.

These truths, which are as great as is life itself, are as simple as the simplest mind of man. Feed the hungry with them.

Idyll of the White Lotus

THE TORONTO THEOSOPHICAL

SOCIETY

BOOK CONCERN

52 ISABELLA STREET, TORONTO 5

Following are a few of the books and pamphlets for sale. A more complete list is available on request.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Collected Writings*

Vol. V	\$6.00
Vol. VI	\$5.00
Vol. VII	\$8.00
Vol. VIII	\$7.00
Vol. IX	\$7.50

MISCELLANEOUS

Reincarnation—An East-West Anthology	\$6.50
The Divine Plan. G. Barborka	\$6.50
The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett	\$6.00
Obituary: The "Hodgson Report" on Madame Blavatsky. A. Waterman	\$1.25
There is No Religion Higher Than Truth. E. L. Gardner	\$0.50
The Case For Reincarnation. L. Weatherhead	\$0.25
Evidence for Survival from Claimed Memories of Former Incarnations. Ian Stevenson	\$0.35
Does The Bible Teach Reincarnation and Karma? R. Katzunoff	\$1.00

We also have a few books left over which were marked down for a recent book sale. Inquiries invited.

CANADIAN LODGES

CALGARY LODGE:

Address enquiries to Mr. Stanley S. Elliott, No. 3, 1735 College Lane, Calgary, Alta.

EDMONTON LODGE:

President, Mr. E. P. Wood; Sec.-Treas., Mr. B. J. Whitbread, 10953 88th Ave.; Lodge Room, Room 2, Bradbury - Thomson Block, 10160 101st Street, Edmonton, Alberta.

HAMILTON LODGE:

President, Mrs. Clare Lakin; Corresponding Secretary, Miss L. Baldwin, 27 Melrose Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.

PHOENIX LODGE HAMILTON:

President, Mrs. Kathleen Marks; Secretary, Mrs. Isabella Brewerton, Lodge address, 49 East 7th St., Hamilton.

KITCHENER LODGE:

President, John Oberlerchener, 19 First Ave., Kitchener, Ont.

MONTREAL LODGE:

President, Mr. Fred T. A. Griffiths, 136 Clan-deboye Ave., Westmount, P.Q.; Secretary, Mrs. Mary Howard.

OTTAWA LODGE:

Address enquiries to Mrs. J. C. R. Hanley, 1818 Haig Drive, Ottawa, Ont.

ST. THOMAS LODGE

President, Benj. T. Garside; Secretary, Mrs. Hazel B. Garside, 81 Hincks St., St. Thomas Ont.

TORONTO LODGE:

President, Mr. G. I. Kinman, 262 Sheldrake Blvd., Toronto 12 (phone HU 3-5346). Corresponding Secretary, Miss Jane Angus. Lodge Rms., 52 Isabella Street, Toronto 5, Ont.

VANCOUVER LODGE:

President, Mrs. Buchanan; Secretary, M. D. Buchanan, 4690 W. 8th Avenue. The Lodge rooms are at 151½ Hastings St. West.

ORPHEUS LODGE, VANCOUVER:

President, E. F. Wilks; Secretary L. C. Hanson; Room 708, Lumbermen's Bldg., 509 Richards St., Vancouver 3, B.C.

CANYON LODGE, NORTH VANCOUVER:

President, Mr. Charles R. Carter; Secretary, Mr. J. B. Jefferson, 245 St. James St. W., N. Vancouver, B.C.

VICTORIA LODGE:

Apply to Mrs. J. Housez, 4030 Locarno Lane, Gordon Head, Victoria B.C.

WINNIPEG LODGE:

Apply to Mrs. W. Gilmour, Phone: 453-8525.