

Can Theosophists Reunite?

Real Brotherhood Is Better Than Public Relations Exercise

The Theosophical Movement

00000000000000000000000000000000

The following text was first
published at “**The Theosophical
Movement**” Magazine, Mumbai,
India, in its March 2003 Edition.

00000000000000000000000000000000

**Unity has to be sought in
matters of principle, and the external
particulars will take care of themselves.**

There are some attempts being made today to reunite “Theosophists”. This raises certain fundamental questions: What makes for unity? Who are the Theosophists? What separated them?

Real unity is impossible if its basis is sought in this world where forms limit. It is in the world of ideas and ideals, of mind and of heart, that unity is to be sought. So, let us look for unity of Ideal and unity of Teaching.

Ideals relate to moral life, to our mind (thought, memory and anticipation), and emotions (affections and dislikes, sensibilities and sentiments). No one except the individual himself knows what these are. But there are certain great ideas which reflect universal truths and which need to be made living realities:

1. *Unity of our Spiritual Origin*, arising from the concept of One Impersonal God [1], should produce tolerance and Brotherhood.

2. *One Body of Wisdom* (or Knowledge) implies a common source of Truth from which all can derive help and guidance.

3. *One Law of the Universe*. “It knows not wrath nor pardon; utter-true / Its measures mete, its faultless balance weighs; / Times are as nought, tomorrow it will judge, / Or after many days” - ought to lead to non-acquisitiveness, generosity, harmony and concord.

The concept that the universe evolves as a whole, and that the progress of each depends on the general progress of all, produces non-violence, contentment with one's lot and a willingness to allow others their rightful place in the recognized scheme of things. This leads to the perception that the perfectibility of man is a possibility for each one of us and has become an actuality for some who have worked for it in the past. The Lodge of Masters can envisaged as an actual fact.

Who is a Theosophist? A person who appreciates the three objects of the Theosophical Movement as formulated in 1875 cannot in reality devote himself to one and pay scant attention to the other two. To the extent that he does so, he become lopsided. The designation "Theosophist", in fact, may be applied not merely to a member or associate of one group or another, but to all practitioners of the Theosophical life, of divine Ethics, of the one universal Philosophy, the one Wisdom-Religion. The true student of Theosophy becomes, or is, an occultist.

What has separated organizations of Theosophists? There are many reasons for this, and a recapitulation or analysis of these should serve only one purpose - avoidance of a repetition of errors. If unity on the physical plane is desired, then it must be preceded by unity on the inner planes of mind and heart, and by the redefinition of one's own aims and objects, which should be in line with the original Impulse.

Where to find the Lines laid down by the great founders of the Theosophical Movement? In the writings and teachings of H.P.B., the Masters' Messenger for our era - where else? Do those so-called "Theosophists" who have accepted others as their teachers and who disregard or underrate H.P.B. and her teachings *know* Theosophy? How many accept the false as the true without verifying things for themselves! This indifference leads to biased attitudes and false claims, and gives rise to disunity.

Unity has to be sought in matters of principle, and the external particulars will take care of themselves. If each one pays attention to his own work, his own virtues, and tries hard to reduce his real faults, unity will automatically result.

We do not need large numbers of people who call themselves "Theosophists" and pretend externally to be "united". We need an *inner* harmony and a *unity of aim, purpose and teaching*, achieved through individual study, discernment, discipline and sacrifice.

NOTE:

[1] "God". Letter 10 of "Mahatma Letters" defines the word "god" as a "misnomer" which creates confusion. The word is accepted in theosophy only as the universal law, or as Universal Nature, or both; not as any sort of "individual being".

000

"There are no barriers to Their (Masters') assistance, except such as personalities impose upon themselves." (Robert Crosbie, in "A Book of Quotations", page 16.)

Theosophy, True and False

Investigating What Theosophy Is, and Is Not

Steven H. Levy. M. D.

00000000000000000000000000000000

Steven H. Levy is an associate of
the United Lodge of Theosophists,
ULT, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA.

00000000000000000000000000000000

The study of Theosophy - true and false - is no small matter in the affairs of the modern Theosophical Movement and humanity.

The word has power because it embraces ideas and ideals that unite many people from different backgrounds to work practically for the realization of a nucleus of universal brotherhood. The word inspires gratitude because it unites the present generation with the previous efforts of countless generations of sages, students and devotees who labored to preserve and promulgate these ideas and ideals so that we might still have access to them. The word instills hope for the future because its fundamental principles counteract the despair and fear caused by ignorance, superstition, prejudice, and materialism. No lover of truth cares to see such power for good misused or abused, consciously or unintentionally, by the spread of false ideas in its name. No one who aspires to be a servant of humanity wants to see a power for good ignored or ridiculed solely because of its misrepresentation. Such study is especially important for those who desire to fit themselves to be the better able to help and teach others, as well as warn them about pitfalls and obstacles along the way to the realization of the great objects of the Theosophical Movement.

The study of Theosophy, true and false, can begin with consideration of what is truth.

Truth has been defined as that which is known to be in accordance with the reality of the way things are in fact. Therefore, Truth requires a knower, knowledge or experience, and the thing to be known. Truth can be as multifaceted and relative as the variety of faculties of mind of the knower, the variety of time, place and condition of the experience, and the variety of objects to be known. There can be no absolute truth about anything in a world of objects and experiences as changeable, conditioned, varied, and limited as the mind itself. If absolute Truth exists, it cannot be of this earth. One might say that Absolute Truth eternally endures beyond the temporary existence of knower, the knowledge of it, and objects of every kind. Such truth is identical in essence with Deity and has its origin in the Divine Principle. The realization of Absolute truth is Divine Wisdom. The highest development of mind may allow one to perceive the Absolute truth that has always existed and will always exist, but such a mind or minds is not the origin or creator of that truth.

As there is relative truth and absolute truth, there are two ways one may view Theosophical truth.

“Theosophy, in its abstract meaning is Divine Wisdom, or the aggregate of the knowledge and wisdom that underlie the Universe - the homogeneity of eternal Good; and in its concrete sense it is the sum total of the same allotted to man by nature, on this earth, and no more.” [1]

Theosophy in its abstract sense is acquired by a psychological or soul state of higher intuition where the mind can perceive things in the interior or invisible world.

In its concrete sense, Theosophy is the archaic Wisdom-Religion, the esoteric doctrine once known in every ancient country. It included all knowledge of things occult and essentially divine. The Wisdom Religion, or Divine Wisdom, is the basis of all the world’s religions and philosophies. It is the sum total of knowledge and wisdom available to man on this earth. It is on this wisdom religion that Theosophy is based. It is knowledge that was directly revealed to human kind.

Whether one is referring to the archaic Wisdom-Religion, the ancient Theosophy taught in the Vedantic, Buddhistic, Magian, Zoroastrian, or Kabalistic systems, the Eclectic Theosophy of the Alexandrian Neoplatonic Schools, or modern Theosophy as it was recorded in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky (H.P.B.), the central idea of the Divine Absolute Essence is the same in all. The Deity, the One and the All, is incomprehensible, unknown, and unnamed. Deity as the All, the source of all existence, the infinite, cannot be either comprehended or known. It cannot directly will or create the universe. Above all Theosophy never materializes or personalizes the Absolute.

H. P. B. states that the definitions of Theosophy in dictionaries are pure nonsense and are based on either religious prejudice or ignorance. The Merriam Webster Dictionary defines Theosophy primarily as a “teaching about God and the world based on mystical insight.” The Oxford Dictionary defines it as “any of a number of philosophies maintaining that a knowledge of God may be achieved through spiritual ecstasy, direct intuition or special individual relations...” These definitions are not only inaccurate, they are logically absurd since no finite mind can have knowledge of the infinite let alone an individual relationship with that which is infinite and absolute. This is an example of a misconception of the fundamental teachings of Theosophy. However, it is not Pseudo-Theosophy.

Pseudo-Theosophy, as described by H.P.B., is assuming the name Theosophy for a system of teaching, and then ascribing to it teachings which are contrary or contradictory to it. They have no right to the name; however, by borrowing the name for their own purposes they create confusion as to what Theosophy really teaches.

“How, then, can the system be judged by the standard of those who would assume the name without any right to it? Is poetry or its muse to be measured only by those would be poets who afflict our ears?” [2]

True Theosophy is divine wisdom about “God” if *It* is defined as the unknowable absolute principle which manifests in nature. True Theosophy is divine wisdom because it is the accumulated record and experience of god-like human beings who have developed their intellectual, psychic, and spiritual faculties to a degree that allows them to investigate the hidden or occult departments of nature. True Theosophy is divine wisdom because it was taught to infant humanity and impacted into the spiritual center of human nature. It is both an

inspiration and self-evident truth. It is: “That ‘faith’ which, being primordial, and revealed directly to human kind by their progenitors and informing EGOS (though the Church regards them as the ‘fallen angels’), required no ‘grace’, nor blind faith to believe, for it was knowledge.” [3]

True Theosophy is not a theory or speculation. It is not a consensus of opinion or a doctrine derived by synthesizing elements from different ancient religions or philosophies. It was not invented by H.P.B., nor was it drawn by her from pre-existing religious teachings. True Theosophy never profanes the sacred by materializing the Absolute, personalizing the divine creative forces of nature, or by charging money for initiation into divine wisdom.

“Every Theosophist, then, holding to a theory of the Deity ‘which has not revelation, but an inspiration of his own for its basis’, may accept any of the above definitions or belong to any of these religions, and yet remain strictly within the boundaries of Theosophy. For the latter is belief in the Deity as the ALL, the source of all existence, the infinite that cannot be either comprehended or known, the universe alone revealing It, or, as some prefer it, Him, thus giving a sex to that, to anthropomorphize which is blasphemy. True, Theosophy shrinks from brutal materialization; it prefers believing that, from eternity retired within itself, the Spirit of the Deity neither wills nor creates; but that, from the infinite effulgency everywhere going forth from the Great Centre, that which produces all visible and invisible things, is but a Ray containing in itself the generative and conceptive power, which, in its turn, produces that which the Greeks called Macrocosm, the Kabalists Tikkun or Adam Kadmon the archetypal man, and the Aryans Purusha, the manifested Brahm, or the Divine Male.” [4]

Compare these statements by H.P.B., with the following words written by a student of Theosophy:

“The obtaining of ‘a direct knowledge of God’ is, as we shall see in dealing with the religious aspects of Theosophy, the ultimate object of Theosophy, as it is the very heart and life of all true Religion; this is “the highest knowledge, the knowledge of Him by whom all else is known.”

“Theosophy, in a secondary sense the above being primary, is the body of doctrine obtained by separating the beliefs common to all religions from the peculiarities, specialties, rites ceremonies, and customs which mark off one religion from another, it presents these common truths as a consensus of world beliefs, forming in their entirety, the Wisdom Religion, or Universal Religion.”

If this were the sincere expression of a student of Theosophy, we could pass it by as a genuine misunderstanding or misstatement of the nature of Deity and the nature of Theosophy as divine wisdom. What student can claim faultless comprehension or expression of the teachings? However, this student claimed to be in direct communication with Mahatmas and became one of the foremost student-teachers and leaders in the Theosophical world in the 20th Century. So, it cannot be ignored.

The statements of this student on the nature of divine wisdom are contrary to those recorded by H.P.B., since both cannot be true and both cannot be false at the same time. Theosophy cannot teach that God is knowable and unknowable at the same time. If it does not teach that God is knowable, it cannot deny that God is unknowable at the same time. The Wisdom-

Religion cannot be taught to be direct knowledge and a consensus of beliefs at the same time. Theosophy cannot teach that the Wisdom-Religion is not knowledge and deny that it is not a belief at the same time. This is an important lesson. Whenever two statements are made that are contradictory, one is Theosophy true and the other is Theosophy false. This is the gold standard we can use to weed out the false from the true. We then have to compare the two statements for consistency with the rest of the teachings and the soundness of their respective premises.

Those who believe that they can know God, the Absolute unmanifested reality, and personalize their relationship to its divine manifestations are more vulnerable to be the deceivers, the victims of their spiritual pride and vanity. Those who believe that Theosophy is a matter of opinion or belief, rather than direct knowledge, are more likely to be the deceived, being the victims of their own ignorance and prejudice.

NOTES:

[1] “The Key to Theosophy”, H. P. Blavatsky, Theosophy Company, Los Angeles, p. 56.

[2] “The Key to Theosophy”, H. P. B., Theosophy Co., Los Angeles, p. 56.

[3] “The Theosophical Glossary” by H. P. Blavatsky, Theosophy Company, pp. 370-371.

[4] “What Is Theosophy”, an article by H.P.B.

The 3 Founders of the Adyar T.S.

Small Events Prepare the Dawning of a New Day

Cultural transformations don't occur in 24 hours. One must start an effort in the right direction - and then persevere. The days when Adyar Society considered William Judge was not one of the main Founders of the Theosophical movement may be about to be over by now.

The online biography of Mrs. **Radha Burnier** at **Wikipedia** is rather an official topic. If readers take a look at it, they will see that according to the biographers of Mrs. Burnier the theosophical movement has three main founders: H. P. Blavatsky, H. S. Olcott, and W.Q. Judge.

In the second half of July 2012, this appears twice at the entry, at its beginning and at its end, under the title “**Founders of the T.S.**”

The direct link is http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radha_Burnier .

The dawning of a new day is different from the passing light of a sudden lightening. It is gradual. It takes time. It enlightens it all in an enduring and progressive way.

‘Princess’, not even a modest ‘Baroness’, whatever I may have been before last July. At that time I became a plain citizen of the U.S. of America - a title I value far more than any that could be conferred on me by King or Emperor (...).” [1]

By the mid 1880s, while commenting in a letter to Mr. Alfred P. Sinnett on the several libels then circulating against her, H.P.B. made it clear she did not like to be called a “Madame”:

“That I never was Madame Metrovitch or even Madame Blavatsky is something, the proofs of which I will carry to my grave - and it’s no one’s business.”[2]

Advanced disciples are highly trained in truthfulness and sincerity, and she rarely used half-words.

In London, H.P.B.’s student Walter R. Old had not gone astray from the theosophical movement yet, when soon after her death in 1891 he wrote his testimony about her. While describing the way he was personally received by her when they first met, Walter reproduced her words:

“No, I will not be called *Madame*, not by my best friend, there was nothing said of that when I was christened, and if you please I will be simply H.P.B.” [3]

Although she was a Russian Countess by birth, she chose not to use the title. In the volume one of Henry Olcott’s long autobiographical work, “**Old Diary Leaves**”, one can find a quotation from a newspaper cutting dated 8 December, 1878. In it a reporter informs the public that she prefers to be called “HPB” -, since **she has “sent the title of ‘Madame’ to look for that of ‘Countess’ which she threw away before (...).”** [4]

When “The Voice of the Silence” was published in London, the Old Lady wrote this dedication to herself in her personal copy of the book:

“H.P.B. to H. P. Blavatsky, with no kind regards.” [5]

In the 21st century, no well-known woman is called “Madame”. Famous women are addressed by their names, and - in languages other than French - the word “Madame” has evolved for the worse since 19th century. In more than one context the term is now derogatory.

We can still find H.P.B. respectfully called “Madame Blavatsky” in the theosophical literature, and that is correct. Yet Sylvia Cranston had solid reasons never to refer to Blavatsky as “Madame” in her outstanding biography of H.P.B. Cranston’s work seems to be the turning point in the establishment of a new trend. All over the world, the number grows of students who refer to the founder of the movement as she preferred to be addressed.

NOTES:

[1] Quoted in the book “HPB - The Extraordinary Life and Influence of Helena Blavatsky, Founder of the Modern Theosophical Movement”, by Sylvia Cranston, published by Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam Books, New York, USA, 1993, 647 pp. See page 181, chapter “Last Days in America”.

Social change comes through individuals only, and it does not descend from the skies as many people seem to think. Leaving things to “time” and waiting perpetually for the anticipated change is a symptom of such an outlook. Theosophical Association can be looked as an effective agent for Spiritual Regeneration of mankind.

One’s Duty in Life

Life is connectivity. Because of the unity of all manifestation and inter-relationship at all levels, connectivity becomes the perennial factor in our life.

We must connect ourselves with ourselves first, then with the environment around - including all living and moving beings and the nature. Connectivity includes: relationship; harmonious being; peaceful existence etc. Unity is a very expansive term besides being abstract; and it is not complete without “connectivity” however invisible and loose-knit it is.

This connectivity is both lateral and horizontal; and that is how we have hierarchies in Nature at various levels, without the notion of superiority or the other. Each ‘being’ in nature has an allotted job or role in the process and proceedings of the manifestation. This has to go on without much external stimulation but by an original inner urge. This is what we call finding out the (swa-dharma) individual course of a Life is connectivity.

Human duty (Manava-Dharma) is of supreme importance and therefore emphasized to a greater measure. We have the following explanation from Helena Blavatsky:

“Duty is that which is *due* to Humanity, to our fellow-men, neighbors, family, and especially that which we owe to all those who are poorer and more helpless than we are ourselves. This is a debt which, if left unpaid during life, leaves us spiritually insolvent and moral bankrupts in our next incarnation. Theosophy is the quintessence of *duty*.” [1]

She further elucidates:

“If humanity can only be developed mentally and spiritually, first of all, of the soundest and most scientific physiological laws, it is the bounden duty of all who strive for this development to do their utmost to see that those laws shall be generally carried out. --- The social condition of large masses of the people renders it impossible for either their bodies or spirits to be properly trained, so that the development is thereby arrested. As this training and development is one of the express objects of the Theosophy, the Theosophical Society is in thorough sympathy and harmony with all true efforts in this direction.”[2]

NOTES:

[1] “The Key to Theosophy”, H. P. Blavatsky. See the first half of Section XII, at p. 229 of the Theosophy Co., Los Angeles edition; or p. 227 of the Theosophy Co., Mumbai, India, edition.

[2] “The Key to Theosophy”, Section XII, p. 232-233 of the Theosophy Co., Los Angeles edition; or p. 230 of the Theosophy Co., Mumbai, India, edition.

Question and Answer: On Attachment to Brotherly Frauds

Question:

I don't know why one should accept the fact that there are Missionary and Ritualistic delusions in the Theosophical Movement. It would be too painful to have to renounce ritualism and walk by oneself through studying the original teachings of theosophy. Pious frauds may be fake, of course; but they are most cozy and comfortable. Nobody wants to face probations and difficulties. It would be cruel to take such lovely frauds away from students. Besides, one must be grateful and loyal to those who committed such sweet falsehoods as the Liberal Catholic Church, Neomasonic rituals and the Return of the Christ, using for that the holy names of true Masters. Or shouldn't we?

Commentary:

Attachment to conscious illusions, or to creators of illusions, is not a part of the theosophical agenda. Theosophists love truth. They learn from their mistakes. The theosophical movement must be truthful and sincere for its dharma and destiny is not to be a church.

The authentic sectors of the movement form since 1875 an instrument that helps regulate human karma, and this is no small business. The following statement was written by a real Mahatma, and it may help us understand some of the reasons for getting rid of old and well-known "devotional" mistakes as the Christian fraud of 1900-1934. The Master says:

"My friend, I have little if anything more to say. I regret deeply my inability to satisfy the honest, sincere aspirations of a few chosen ones among your group - not at least, for the present. Could but your [... lodge] understand, or so much as suspect, that the present crisis that is shaking the T.S. to its foundations is a question of perdition or salvation to thousands; a question of the progress of the human race or its retrogression, of its glory or dishonour, and for the majority of this race - of being or not being, of annihilation, in fact - perchance many of you would look into the very root of evil, and instead of being guided by false appearances and scientific decisions, you would set to work and save the situation by disclosing the dishonourable doings of your missionary world."**[1]**

It is possible and perhaps quite natural for the theosophical movement to re-establish a stronger link to Wisdom. Four points, among others, can make it happen sooner than later:

1) Being truthful to the full extent of one's possibilities; **2)** As a result of point one, giving up well-known falsehoods; **3)** Paying attention to the instructions given in the 1900 Letter; **4)** Being fully aware of the duty and responsibility of the theosophical movement towards the living karma and the future of humanity as a whole.

NOTE:

[1] "The Mahatma Letters", TUP edition, Pasadena, Letter LXV, p. 365.

