

5 THEOSOPHY

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

5.1 Introduction

¹The planetary hierarchy decided that esoteric facts could begin to be publicized from the year 1875 on. The only causal self available for this mission was Blavatsky, who through incarnations in the West had become familiar with its views. Blavatsky became a pioneer of the esoteric knowledge. She was given the task of breaking with secrecy.

²The Theosophical Society was founded in New York in 1875. Its mission was to work for a universal brotherhood and to further the exploration of reality by all conceivable means. Blavatsky, who was the spiritual leader of the Society, soon moved its headquarters to Adyar, Madras, India. She was well aware of the limitation of the yoga philosophy, but it displayed great advantages over Western philosophy with its agnostic, not to say antimetaphysical, stance. The yogis possessed emotional objective consciousness and so they were cognizant of a superphysical reality.

³The Theosophical Society was from the beginning an abortive undertaking. What the planetary hierarchy desired was not an esoteric society but a universal brotherhood. The publication of esoteric facts would have to come second. The least experience should have made it clear that such a society presupposed members who had attained the stage of humanity or at least the stage of culture. K. H. says expressly that the purpose was to start an institution that would “arrest the attention of the highest minds”. However, the members never cared for the universal brotherhood but wanted more esoteric facts. After Blavatsky had passed away, the quarrel about which “facts” were facts began, that utterly ridiculous dispute about dogmas that must never be held, about unsolved problems, about views constructed without facts or with too few facts. No wonder that the Society was a great disappointment to the planetary hierarchy. That was not the worst of it, however. The worst of it was the dispute about the leadership, which split the brotherhood.

⁴The theosophical epoch proper was short: 1875–1895. When Blavatsky died in 1891, a discord arose between Besant and Judge about the vacant position. The friction between them went on until 1895, when the Society split into two sects, the Indian and the American. The Society betrayed its mission of being a universal brotherhood with tolerance as its first principle. Those having understanding resigned their membership. The parody of universal brotherhood became too manifest. It is an indication of the theosophists’ blindness that they did not realize that by splitting, the Society severed its connection with the planetary hierarchy definitively. Exclude but one, and the connection with the “higher” is no more. Not even that much did the theosophists realize. Well, the same is true of all sects. You could demand more of the theosophists, however. One more triumph of the black lodge. The different “authorities” of the Society had their followers who quarrelled about various dogmas. Those factions of opinion divided into different lodges. More and more people left the Society, which led a languishing life. According to 45-self D.K., it has had its day as have the other occult sects started before the year 1920.

⁵The two initiators of the publication of esoterics, 45-selves M. and K. H., said as early as in 1882 that the Theosophical Society was an attempt that had failed. They had seen the futility of trying to liberate the West from its ideologies. They admitted that the planetary hierarchy, who in 1775 considered that the issue was broached too early and were against the experiment, were right. They considered, however, that the Society could make useful propaganda, since the esoteric knowledge had been permitted for publication. It only remained for them to withdraw and let the impulse do its work. They did nothing to save the

Society when it was attacked either. Nor did their chief permit any further intervention. As the Society split, the fiasco was obvious to all who understood something. Anyone who violates the law of unity severs the connection with the planetary hierarchy.

⁶It was a big mistake to give the Theosophical Society that name. It is true that the esoteric knowledge was its basis, and Blavatsky certainly knew what she was speaking about. She could not make the knowledge comprehensible, however, and the attempt she made came long after Sinnett published his works.

⁷Because esoterics was permitted for publication after 1875, the planetary hierarchy chose to portion out facts little by little to prevent, if possible, the knowledge from being degraded and idiotized. The drawback to this was that the presentation could never become a systematic, surveyable whole, but facts were isolated, out of rational contexts.

⁸Those who tried to make a thought system were bound to fail. Among those who did, Sinnett, Judge, and Steiner are especially noticeable. They complemented the too few facts extant with their own speculations. This is always an abortive undertaking, since there is no possibility of guessing right. Instead, a miserable pseudo-knowledge was obtained. We must simply wait until we have received sufficient facts, something that people seem to find immensely difficult. That is also the reason why people are confused by all the ideologies that are fabricated to an ever increasing extent. People possessed of common sense simply refuse to have anything to do with such things.

⁹The first and only one who made esoterics a fully comprehensible mental knowledge system was Leadbeater. And as a reward for his work he got the silence treatment when he was not scornfully set aside, or slandered. In that case, Alice Bailey made common cause with the Tingleyans. If she had started from Leadbeater instead of Blavatsky, she would have been able to treat of the world view.

¹⁰Mankind receives all the facts that it will need to understand reality and evolution and that it cannot ascertain itself. However, it is the business of men to put these facts into their right contexts and so make an overview system.

¹¹It is by no means strange that this does not succeed when first attempted. Very few people seem to grasp that, however.

5.2 The Split of the Theosophical Society

¹After the Theosophical Society split in 1895, the rebelling American Section was led by W. Q. Judge (who died in 1896), and after him by Katherine Tingley.

²When a president was to be elected after Blavatsky, Judge claimed that the “masters” had appointed him her successor: an absurdity to those who know the standpoint of the planetary hierarchy. It is up to human beings to manage their own affairs. It is better to draw a veil over the conflicts that split the Society into an Indian-European and an American sect. The whole of it was a deplorable affair, which harmed the cause of the esoteric knowledge, the cause for which the planetary hierarchy had been working so long and which is the most important one for mankind.

³In its attempts to prove that Judge was right in his claim, the American Section has invoked all the recognition and praise that Blavatsky heaped on Judge. That demonstrates an almost incredible naïveté. As if not anybody could make a mistake! And what do they know of Blavatsky’s opinion in this very case? Or of the standpoint of the “White Lodge”? Anyone who cannot see that division cuts you off from unity and thereby from the power of unity is bereft of even an elementary understanding of life.

⁴To defend the division of the Society, they even forged letters from Blavatsky and the planetary hierarchy. From what is stated in those letters it is clear that they cannot have been written by their alleged authors. Blavatsky could never have written of Judge “as a part of herself since several aeons...” Nor could she have written in a letter to Judge (publicized by

Tingley in 1932): “The trouble with you is that you do not know the great change that came to pass in you a few years ago. Others have occasionally their astrals changed & replaced by those of the Adepts (as of Elementaries) & they influence the outer, and the higher man. With you, it is the NIRMANAKAYA not the ‘astral’ that blended with your astral.” The whole of this passage is sheer absurdity, veritable nonsense.

⁵Adepts would never change and replace people’s emotional envelopes. A nirmanakaya has left the human evolution and cannot incarnate. A nirmanakaya as an emotional envelope is really too grotesque. An “outer” influence should have been noticed by Judge. The “higher man”, Augoeides, need not be replaced by another being. No change was noticeable in Judge’s production, no new facts from “higher worlds”, which should have been the case if he were the receiver of “higher inspirations”. His culminating achievement, *The Ocean of Theosophy*, demonstrates his real incompetence. “Those of the Adepts as of Elementaries”: the height of stupidity!

⁶Another mistake that Judge made was that he appointed Tingley his successor. She did her utmost to thwart all efforts made to reunite the two societies. When it proved difficult for the American Society to assert itself in competition with the great literary output of the Indian Adyar Society, she initiated a series of speculations that led her sect further astray. The knowledge system that Purucker elaborated on her initiative is an imaginative construction to be classed among the occult pseudo-systems that become ever more numerous and only have a disorienting effect. You must be blind not to understand what “powers” she was serving.

⁷It should be added that the Indian Society never responded to any of the attacks directed against it by the American Society.

⁸The planetary hierarchy has not given out the knowledge of the fifth natural kingdom in order that individuals in the fourth natural kingdom should fight about it as they do about everything else.

⁹Judge writes (in *The Ocean of Theosophy*) that Blavatsky gave us “the most important system”. This expression is quite abortive. Blavatsky did not give us a system, for she lacked the qualifications to do so: a philosophical and scientific training. She gave us thousands of esoteric facts. It was Besant and Leadbeater, the latter in particular, who put those facts in their right contexts, so that they could be systematized. Judge probably “sensed” that a system was necessary, since he attempted one, although he was unqualified for the task. Not all are chosen of those who believe themselves called. And those who believed themselves called discredited the cause they wished to promote. They brought theosophy into ridicule.

¹⁰It is typical of that American sect which seceded from and split the Theosophical Society that it is ignorant of the existence of the planetary hierarchy and the planetary government. Its paper pope is Blavatsky’s *The Secret Doctrine*. That sect refuses to accept any one of the many facts that were later permitted for publication through disciples of the planetary hierarchy. Thereby it demonstrates that it has never grasped the knowledge of reality but turned theosophy into a belief system with authorities and dogmas. That is the beginning of idiotization. Anyone who asks “who said it?” lacks the system where every fact has its given place in a self-evident context and from where the correctness of new data is clear. If the right system is lacking, the whole teaching will remain unclear and the dependence on authority will be a necessary consequence.

¹¹Also Besant, who became the head of the Adyar Society, made several serious mistakes. Her claim, that “no one in the world could be a disciple of the Masters of Wisdom unless they had been so notified” by herself, demonstrates what mistakes even causal selves can make. No human being can be a link between a disciple and his teacher. In time Besant became a spiritual dictator who demanded blind obedience to her decisions. Her intimation that it was on the “orders of the Masters” demonstrates that her contact with these was not as perfect as she believed. Once again it must be emphasized that the planetary hierarchy does not give

instructions for the management of organizations. Formerly, its members gave personal instructions to their disciples in matters concerning their consciousness development. That was a quite different matter. That, too, has been changed, however. Nowadays, they teach only groups of disciples who have acquired group consciousness and are in telepathic contact with each other through their common group envelope. This group envelope consists of causal, mental, and emotional molecules from the envelopes of all the group members, later also essential molecules are added. This group envelope is dissolved only when all the group members have acquired 45-consciousness.

¹²Again and again it must be pointed out that there is nothing that can be called “blind obedience” in the disciple’s relation to the planetary hierarchy. Every disciple is responsible only to himself as his own sovereign. On the other hand, he does not stand a chance of reaching higher worlds, higher kingdoms, unless he gains a knowledge of the Law and learns how to apply that knowledge without friction. He may or can never ever be or become a blind tool without full individual responsibility in all respects. The Law does not know of obedience or commands or orders, and is no directing or commanding authority. Is it in accord with the laws of nature and the laws of life, or is it in conflict with those laws? That is what matters. The spiritual dictatorship of the churches is “illegal”. The fact that organizations must have leaders is another matter, a physical condition. But nobody can ever acquire the right to be a “mediator” between the monads in lower kingdoms and the monads in higher kingdoms. Nobody can be discharged of his responsibility for himself.

5.3 Belief and Dogmatism

¹In the Theosophical Society, H. P. B(lavatsky)., Annie Besant, and C. W. Leadbeater were disciples of the planetary hierarchy. This does not mean, however, that they did not misinterpret much of what they saw. Blavatsky as well as Besant and Leadbeater asserted vigorously that they could certainly make mistakes and that they were not at all infallible as to the esoteric knowledge. They all made mistakes. The fact that uncritical theosophists regard them as infallible only demonstrates that to those theosophists esoterics is a belief system, not a mental system they have studied thoroughly.

²There are errors everywhere, and they are not corrected, so that people shall learn to acquire an independent judgement. Those who believe, those who ask “who said it?”, those who need authorities, should join societies for believers. Anyone who comprehends need not ask. All that is believed turns into illusion or fiction even if it is a fact in itself. This can be easily ascertained. The never-ending division of the Theosophical Society shows that the Society is largely made up of believers. The Society’s claim of being the one and only mouthpiece of the hierarchy is not legitimate. It was once but is not any more.

³Even if in the Adyar branch of theosophy they have managed to keep up the appearance of unity, the inner division nevertheless has manifested itself in the different lodges. For instance, one lodge accepts Blavatsky, Besant, and Leadbeater as authorities, whereas another lodge considers only Blavatsky as valid. That is what happens when you lack the ability to judge for yourself and “believe” in authorities. Then division is inevitable, which the hundreds of Christian sects demonstrate.

⁴A certain statement by Blavatsky was misunderstood to the effect that the planetary hierarchy would let us hear from them only in the last quarter of each century. Such an assertion is absurd. No one can foretell what the hierarchy intend to do, since this is decided at each new meeting, at which all new proposals made are examined by all the members. But the statement has had its consequences. Theosophists could not believe in anything that was made public after the years 1875–1891 (Blavatsky died in 1891). It is particularly characteristic of general injudiciousness that it believes blindly without comprehension or

understanding. It has faith in the prophet it has chosen, and then it is no use for anyone else to say anything else.

⁵It seems not to have been understood that it is man's first duty to use his common sense, although this was the Buddha's most important saying. He realized the necessity of training teachers of common sense. This means above all liberating mankind from all who dogmatically preach some temporary system. The truth for anyone is what he can accept. That is the only protection from "patented truths", the only way of liberating us from countless ideologies that will always wash over poor mankind. Accept only what common sense realizes to be right! But that also presupposes that you want to demonstrate the errors in all systems and can do so. The Buddha's saying can also be formulated differently: thou shalt not believe! Belief proves that you have not comprehended. And to accept such things is to idiotize reason. There is a fundamental difference between believing and assuming for the time being, the same difference as between dogma and hypothesis.

5.4 Proselytizing

¹Only mentalists are able to comprehend (let alone understand) the esoteric knowledge system. What has harmed the Theosophical Society is its proselytizing and its admitting emotionalists instead of only mentalists with a philosophical and scientific training.

²By its indiscriminate proselytizing the Society attached to itself a conglomeration of diverse individuals at the stage of civilization who were incapable of striving for unity, curious of magical phenomena and moreover full of all manner of illusions and fictions, believers who asked "who said that?". That question alone is so miserably revealing.

³It is not at all hard to understand that outsiders looked upon the Society as some sort of a new religious sect the members of which considered themselves "chosen" and in advance of the rest of mankind in their development.

⁴The leaders should have realized that only those who were former initiates and so had the esoteric knowledge latently were able to grasp esoterics and to put isolated esoteric facts into comprehensible contexts by their own work

⁵Most theosophists have had incarnations in India; they have the ideas of karma and reincarnation latently and recognize them in theosophy. But the yoga philosophy is exoteric, and theosophy was intended to teach esoterics, the knowledge of the planetary hierarchy. Theosophy has failed in its mission.

⁶It is by no means strange that the planetary hierarchy has positively dissociated itself from the whole of the theosophical movement. That movement has harmed esoterics by its irresponsible pseudo-teachings. It has become a sect among the other sects. It disputes about dogmas and authorities, which demonstrates that it has never understood what it is about.

⁷The Theosophical Society has certainly paid for admitting anyone indiscriminately. It is the mass of those ignorants who have held up the Society to ridicule by babbling about everything they believe they have understood without comprehending even the most basic things. They twaddle about the masters and their will just as the priests about the will of god. They chatter about their own and other people's incarnations as if they could know anything about them. They drivel about karma, although it has been vigorously pointed out that human beings are not in a position to judge the effects of the law of reaping. How about pledging the theosophists to silence when admitting them to the Society? That could be useful.

⁸If the theosophists do not want to teach and practise universal brotherhood and to regard their tiny fragments of the esoteric knowledge as unimportant and nothing to parade or dispute, they could as well disband their society. There are other "schools" that are far ahead of them in esoteric knowledge, schools that make demands on their pupils and require to see results of their tuition.

5.5 Sectarian Strife

¹It is strange, this antagonism between different “esoteric” societies: between different theosophical sects, between theosophists, anthroposophists, and Rosicrucians.

²Annie Besant tried to give Alice Bailey the silence treatment, and Alice Bailey feigned that she had hardly read any other theosophical authors than H.P.B.

³Also esoteric leaders can be unnecessarily sharp and even unjust in their opinions of each other, and this does not promote the common cause. For instance, Alice Bailey took many opportunities to display her contempt for the great Leadbeater and his “astralism”, and she made very unfavourable statements about him in her autobiography. Criticism is justified when based on facts, but not personal attacks, however much you talk of love and unity.

⁴It is high time it were made clear: C. W. Leadbeater is the only theosophical writer having a scientific way of looking at things, objective and studded with facts, a typical representative of the fifth (the mental) department. He is the model of a teacher of esoterics, the one whom Laurency placed foremost of them all in that respect. The fact that he sometimes made mistakes does not detract from his importance as an esoteric pedagogue.

⁵Another writer who strongly emphasized the materiality of higher worlds was Professor Hohlenberg, in his book on yoga.

5.6 Esoteric Knowledge is not for the Immature

¹The question is whether mankind was immature for esoterics, whether the knowledge should still be taught under a pledge of silence to those who were mature for initiation into the secret knowledge orders. In any case all theosophists, anthroposophists, and Rosicrucians should be told not to drivel about what they believe to be esoterics. They believe they know, and their unreliable and irresponsible chatter can only harm esoterics. The result has been that the public with ridicule and contempt refuse to examine such a pseudo-philosophy. Pythagoras was very wise in forbidding those admitted to his knowledge order to speak of esoterics, and even to ask questions to those of higher degrees, during the first two years. After two years of thorough study most students probably are able at least to ask rational questions. As it is among theosophists, even newcomers believe themselves able to teach outsiders. Particularly typical of general injudiciousness.

²The esoteric knowledge entails certain risks. Its most important part (treating of the motion aspect) cannot be given out to a mankind that is at or near the stage of barbarism. The knowledge is not for the “immature”. To a certain degree the knowledge is protected, to the extent that people deem it “impossible to grasp”. But there are too many pouncing upon it who can just misunderstand it (which all existing occult societies have demonstrated). In so doing they harm both themselves and the “cause”. And there is a phenomenon akin to religious obsession that has landed many people in mental hospitals. Quite apart from the fact that none too few people have made themselves important because of a theoretical learning they have received for nothing and therefore think they are “on the path”, this almost ineradicable conceit that always confuses learning with wisdom. Much learning does not in the least indicate a higher stage of development. There are countless “memory geniuses” at the stage of civilization. The satanists are experts on esoterics.

³There are other risks as well. Ideas are energies and these must get an outlet. In those who teach the forces act through their throat centre. That is why teachers seldom are practitioners as well.

⁴Moreover, the knowledge entails responsibility, a reality that mankind at its present stage of development and in its ignorance of the laws of life does not understand in spite of its experience from Lemuria and Atlantis, largely because it does not discover the connection between effect and cause but philosophizes on imaginary causes instead of the real ones.

5.7 *The Failure was Inevitable*

¹Such as the planetary hierarchy planned its first appearance (at a time when it deemed a third sinking in the manner of Lemuria and Atlantis unavoidable – mankind did something similar itself by its world wars), the leaders must have realized that this attempt was bound to fail. Not even the human élite was mature for the knowledge of reality. And the consequence – the many misleading occult sects (after the knowledge was publicized) – also demonstrated that the attempt failed.

²Considering mankind's general stage of development, the blindness of the theologians, the disorientation of philosophy, and the incredible conceit of science, it was inevitable that the so-called educated people would shower scorn, ridicule, contempt and all manner of infamy upon H. P. Blavatsky, who by publishing her *Isis Unveiled* was the first one to put forward the basic view of reality held by the planetary hierarchy (the fifth natural kingdom). The two most important esoteric researchers next to her, Besant and Leadbeater, suffered the same fate, this time from dogmatizing followers of Blavatsky as well. It is typical that in such cases the planetary hierarchy lets the matter take its course. The individual incarnating must do his work at his own risk, and mankind must show where it stands. It will all be put down to the account of the common responsibility.

³It can be ascertained that Blavatsky as well as Besant and Leadbeater made a lot of mistakes and often gave proof of surprising injudiciousness. Such things are unavoidable, to be sure, since perfect judgement in general technical and political life problems is not obtained until the individual acquires 45-consciousness.

⁴Neither Besant nor Leadbeater was in a position to carry on in the right way the work the planetary hierarchy had begun through its special instrument, Blavatsky, who acted only on direct instructions from her teachers (M., K.H., and D.K.). Besant and Leadbeater were obliged to follow up the work on their own. As time went by, it became increasingly evident that the instructions Besant thought she had understood were largely misconceived. Clearly, Besant and Leadbeater were not in such a direct contact with their teachers as Blavatsky was, who was their amanuensis. The result was a fiasco for the Theosophical Society.

⁵K.H., at that time still a 45-self, explained to his newly accepted disciple C. W. Leadbeater that the teacher does not tell his disciple what to do but that the disciple must find this out himself. Otherwise the disciple would reap the good sowing of his obedience only, but not that of his work. The “uninitiated” have often demurred to this right method. They have argued that in the present emergency, when mankind is faced with the danger of its total annihilation, such a method could be suspended. The times would not permit of the application of this method. It would be too risky to let the disciple make mistakes. That method was what caused the failure of theosophy. The principle that disciples (being ignorant of the plan and incapable of implementing it) are to be entrusted with such important assignments may be in accord with the law of reaping and the law of self-realization. But the disciple should renounce this good sowing, and he certainly does so gladly, if in that case the work can be perfected. Otherwise there is but a minimal prospect of success at the present stage of mankind's development.

5.8 *The Importance of the Theosophical Society*

¹Of all opinions, the one containing the most fictions will always prevail, since it best agrees with the authorities of the day. Of all the occult sects, theosophy contains the most facts, and so is the furthest removed from fictionalism.

²Theosophy has by nature proved to be as dogmatic as other sects. However, an esoteric society must be open to the new facts and ideas that are continually received from the planetary hierarchy. Theosophists have made much of an unguarded word of Blavatsky to the

effect that after her new facts would not be publicized until the year 1975, which not even her teachers could know and certainly could not have said.

³With all its dogmas, with all its erroneous views, the Society nevertheless has contributed to teaching two basic facts of life: the reality of reincarnation and of the law of reaping. And it has also cleared away that Indian superstition found among yogis, metempsychosis (saying that man can be reborn as an animal). The return from a higher to a lower natural kingdom is not a law of life.

⁴In addition, the Society has made it clear that there are higher worlds and higher natural kingdoms. That is about as much as the mass of theosophists have comprehended. It is in any case more than any other society did before theosophy.

⁵Happily more and more spiritualist circles have acknowledged that Blavatsky was right in her teaching on reincarnation. In the emotional and mental worlds you do not acquire any new qualities and abilities necessary to your further evolution.

⁶Where the opinion of the public on the Theosophical Society is concerned, it should just be said that it is worthless as it is on most issues. If a misconception has once entered into public opinion, it is as good as ineradicable. Few there are who take pains to examine the matter themselves, the masses only parrot, and this parroting generally becomes tradition through the generations. Journalists all too often make use of opportunities to show off their learning and contribute to maintaining superstitions, for newspapers are read by all.

⁷Regrettably, there is still reason to remind the readers of Blavatsky's assessment of journalists as "the mercenaries and parasites of the Press, who prostitute its more than royal power, and dishonour a noble profession."

5.9 Conclusion

¹Attempts have been made to write the history of the Theosophical Society, but they are, like all history, erroneous, however favoured by appearances they might be. Its history should be written, however, for anything equally instructive on stupidity and commonness, enthusiasm and sacrifice, injudiciousness and conceit in such a concentrated form is hard to find: a study in psychology.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

5.10 Introduction

¹Blavatsky says herself that if she had not been “awakened” by her teacher, she would not have become conscious in her brain that she was a causal self.

²She had innate clairvoyance and as a child she had many occult experiences, without understanding what it all was about. In her incarnation as Paracelsus, she had become a causal self. But in her incarnation as Cagliostro, she knew nothing about it until she was “awakened” by Saint Germain.

³Also the Indian Subba Rao was a causal self, but became aware of it in his brain only through his contact with Blavatsky.

⁴Many people are disciples of the planetary hierarchy without even suspecting it. As a rule, they have incarnated, being determined to make a certain contribution and accomplish it without knowing why.

⁵The examples given demonstrate how impossible it is for outsiders to judge a man’s level of development and how things are in a poor way as far as the possibilities of self-knowledge are concerned.

5.11 Blavatsky’s Authorship

¹Blavatsky’s two major works, *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*, are studded with quotations from books and manuscripts in libraries all over the world. Only an esoterician can understand how these quotations were produced from books that Blavatsky never studied. The learning that is extant is accessible to a causal self whenever he wants to know it. What has ever been written is indelible in the globe memory.

²Having examined the quotations, scholars state that most of them have been taken from existing works, and so they think that Blavatsky read them. She never set foot in a library. She said to her niece: “You are very green if you think that I actually know and understand all the things I write. How many times am I to repeat to you and your mother that the things I write are dictated to me; that sometimes I see manuscripts, numbers and words before my eyes of which I never knew anything?”

³Some idea of how a causal self works can be had through a letter from Blavatsky to Colonel Henry Steel Olcott. The quotation is from Olcott’s *Old Diary Leaves*: “She wrote me that it [*Isis Unveiled*, recently begun] was to be a book on the history and philosophy of the Eastern Schools... She said she was writing about things she had never studied and making quotations from books she had never read in all her life.” Olcott goes on to say: “She worked on no fixed plan, but ideas came streaming through her mind...” Moreover: “Whence did she get this knowledge?... she had not learnt it at all, whether from one source or another; but when she needed it she had it.” Many people testified later how they had opportunities to observe her writing at her desk and how she (as Olcott wrote) “would suddenly stop, look out into space with the vacant eye of the clairvoyant seer, shorten her vision as though to look at something held invisible in the air before her, and begin copying on her paper what she saw.”

⁴It is with considerable hesitation the present writer reports such things, because for one thing this is self-evident to “initiates”, and for another thing occult phenomena are unimportant in this connection, and, moreover, the uninitiated, who know or understand nothing, are always ready to demonstrate the superior scorn of their infantile minds. Those interested in the subject could read Countess Constance Wachtmeister’s book *Reminiscences of H. P. Blavatsky and the Secret Doctrine*. She lived with H. P. B. for several months and helped her make fair copies of her manuscript. Like so many other people she certified that H. P. B. had no books in her possession and never needed to consult the works of others.

⁵In her *Reminiscences of H. P. Blavatsky and the Secret Doctrine*, Countess Constance

Wachtmeister tells us an interesting episode. When in Sweden, preparing for a journey to Italy she was busy packing her travelling trunks and was just putting away her own note-book on the Kabbalah, she heard a voice: "Take that book, it will be useful to you on your journey." Astonished, she obeyed. Instead of in Italy she ended up with Blavatsky in Würzburg, Germany, through a chain of apparent chance events. Upon her arrival there, Blavatsky asked for the note-book, which Wachtmeister forgot she had packed away, and said: "Now turn to page ten and on the sixth line you will find the words..." It was right. Amazed, Wachtmeister asked what Blavatsky wanted these notes for. "Oh, for *The Secret Doctrine*," was the reply. Wachtmeister never realized the true significance of the episode. She was from the very outset to be liberated of her suspicions that Blavatsky was a charlatan. She should have understood that if Blavatsky, incredibly, needed to know what was written in the note-book, she could have read its contents independently of the distance, as she did with all the other thousands of books from which she quoted.

⁶A very learned gentleman (and professor) has set about judging H. P. Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled*. He quite frankly declares that there is nothing in that book which at the time of its writing was not known by the learned. This would imply that H. P. B. was only a compiler, a copier of what others had said. What the learned are able to judge! There is in that book much that the learned do not know yet. Not even one hundred experts on as many subjects would suffice to master all of that material. Add to this that it was written by an "uneducated" woman who did not even have a reference library at her disposal, who never received any education either at home or at any school or university. Anyone who faced with these facts does not grasp that the book in question is a "phenomenon" in itself is weak in the upper storey. But where do you find one single reliable statement by the learned and their parrots when it comes to esoterics?

⁷In her book *Isis Unveiled*, published in 1877, Blavatsky pointed out a lot of fundamental errors in the dogmatic views of medical science – to no avail, of course. One quotation of many may suffice: "A great truth was uttered some fifty years ago by Dr Francis Victor Broussais, when he said, 'If magnetism were true, medicine would be an absurdity.' Magnetism is true, and so we shall not contradict the learned Frenchman as to the rest."

⁸Blavatsky never received any education whatever and was quite unqualified to present a mental system acceptable to the intelligentsia trained in science and philosophy. She could produce however many facts. But she blamed herself for not being able to account for what she knew methodically and systematically. This is often the case with those who have acquired causal consciousness, if they lack the capacity for concretization. Their style of writing is aphoristic, and the combination of facts into a continuous logical whole is both unnecessary and painful to them.

⁹Leadbeater thought that Blavatsky's inability of methodical and systematic discursive thinking reminded of the thinking of the Atlanteans. He did not realize that it was due to her inability of mental concretization, a very common trait of causal selves, who do not need concretizing system thinking. That is the great difference between the mental idea and the causal intuitional idea.

¹⁰Blavatsky's both chief works, *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*, are proof enough of her knowledge of facts and her absolute unsuitability as a scientific systematician. How the subject should have been treated was demonstrated by Sinnett in his *Esoteric Buddhism*, in itself an astonishing feat considering the few facts he had received in the letters from K.H. or at any rate could use in a first introductory outline. In writing this book, he proved to be the able man who could have given the West a fully satisfactory philosophical system, if he had received all the facts necessary to this.

¹¹With all its merits, Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled* nevertheless evinces so many deficiencies that you well understand the verdict of a then 45-self, that "it should be rewritten". Blavatsky

longed to rewrite it into a more comprehensible book, after her attention had been called to its shortcomings. Her *Secret Doctrine* was intended as a sort of substitute. Sinnett, who realized her incapacity and his own qualifications for a systematic treatment, clearly understood that the new book would be an omnium gatherum of facts like *Isis*, which proved true. H.P.B. was too old for the assignment. It is another matter that both works contain lots of new facts and, therefore, are veritable treasure-mines in that respect. These facts were given by many members of the planetary hierarchy. Putting these facts into their right contexts is a work that is entrusted to future generations of researchers. They will have to do something to receive the knowledge as a free gift. Hitherto they have been incompetent for that task, which they have convincingly made clear. When Rudolf Steiner did not measure up to this, he found it more convenient to make short work of Blavatsky. That is the most common method, very popular, infallible, and used by all washouts.

¹²The motivation why Blavatsky and not Sinnett was entrusted with the work was that Blavatsky had the “right” to do it, that her teacher had shown “ingratitude” if he had passed over her. Were there not other ways in which to show gratitude? The true explanation is certainly quite another one. Both M. and K.H., who in the year 1775 had voiced their desire to publicize the knowledge, hitherto kept secret, and after a great hesitation and against the advice of all were permitted to do so, realized soon enough (as early as 1882) that mankind was not mature and that the attempt made had been premature. They let the matter take its course and did not intervene. Blavatsky was to write her *Secret Doctrine*, which very few people could comprehend; science was to declare Blavatsky a fraud, and the Theosophical Society was to manage as best it could. It is true that both Annie Besant and Leadbeater were disciples of the planetary hierarchy, but discipleship was one thing, and their management of the Theosophical Society was another and their private business. The hierarchy did not concern itself with the society any more after the year 1895.

5.12 *Erroneous Statements by Blavatsky*

¹Regrettably, quite a number of statements that Blavatsky made have been turned into dogmas and made absolute in the manner of the “word of god” of the theologians. They were by no means infallible. In particular, two statements could be mentioned that have proved erroneous and misleading, with deplorable consequences. That is what happens when you “swear to master’s word” and take everything said as absolutely valid. The fact that Blavatsky was sometimes wrong does not detract from her capacity. Theosophists should stop criticizing their great leaders who are miles above them.

²The one error was her statement that after her death no new esoteric facts would be received from the planetary hierarchy until the year 1975. Not even her teachers could decide such matters. Besides, they, too, say quite a lot of things that are subsequently changed.

³Even in the planetary hierarchy there may be divergent opinions on what should be communicated (to both “initiates” and the uninitiated), and the time for its publication. Conditions in mankind could change so rapidly that new plans must be drawn up in the hierarchy, because it is impossible to foresee the future, which by no means agrees with their plans. The plan exists and will be realized. But how, when, and in what manner nobody can say.

⁴This mistake by Blavatsky had done immense harm. It had the result that both Besant’s and Leadbeater’s works were regarded with distrust. Taking this attitude, the theosophists demonstrated their inability to judge for themselves, inability to decide whether the new facts justified themselves by being evident explanations of realities previously inexplicable. The theosophists were believers, were in need of authorities and dogmas. How great her error was is clear from the fact that during the years 1920–1950 no less than 18 works were written at the dictation of 45-self D.K.

⁵The other error was the statement that certain parts of Europe, etc., would share the fate of Atlantis and “sink into the sea” in the middle of the 20th century.

⁶Such mistakes are still possible, if you take the discussions held in the planetary hierarchy for decisions made. All possibilities are considered and analysed. If you listen to the views of some certain member and take them as representative of the general opinion within the hierarchy, you will easily err. All the members are entitled to their own judgement, their own views. Everyone’s views are examined and discussed before the conclave makes a final, always unanimous decision, and this is submitted to the planetary government, which ultimately decides.

⁷There really was talk of the need of drowning Europe to liberate mankind from militarism, papistry, banksterism, and a lot of other things. The idea was abandoned when the great powers themselves through their two world wars carried out the purge of the greatest hindrances to further development. It became clear to thinking people what failures the ruling political, religious, social, economic ideologies were. It was also foreseen that mankind would obtain such weapons of mass destruction that it could carry out the annihilation itself without the intervention of the planetary hierarchy.

5.13 Blavatsky’s Teaching on the Worlds

¹In the old knowledge orders, they were content to afford knowledge of the lowest five atomic worlds (45–49). Blavatsky and Sinnett did the same in their accounts. Actually, the worlds of the physical planet (47–49) would have sufficed. Neither did Platon go beyond them, his world of ideas being the limit. (The essential world, world 46, gives access to the planetary chain; and world 45, to the solar system.) It is important to know the lowest three atomic worlds (47–49) somewhat, since the consciousness development of the lowest four natural kingdoms goes on in them.

²When Blavatsky spoke about the “astral world”, she meant the etheric world. The emotional world did not exist to her. Therefore, practically everything that Blavatsky wrote on the emotional world was erroneous and misleading, has caused innumerable misunderstandings and harmed the cause of the knowledge. Everything that was written on those two worlds only increased confusion, until Leadbeater published his investigations of the emotional world. The etheric world with its regions and the etheric envelope with its kinds of consciousness have not been explored very much. A superficial description of the centres of the etheric envelope has been deemed sufficient. This is because the pertaining energies are connected with the phenomena of magic, and mankind is not mature for that knowledge in millions of years yet.

³What Blavatsky wrote on “life after death” in the emotional world was a description of the causal self’s perception and did not agree with the “common” experience. This, too, has misled many people. Blavatsky is a typical example of the unsuitability of using first department people as teachers.

5.14 Blavatsky and the Phenomena

¹There were a crowd of people who were jostling around H.P.B. and were exceedingly unsuitable for esoteric studies. Sometimes you have to resort to drastic means to get rid of those craving for sensation. Only those who could see the difference between genuine and false “phenomena” were among the chosen. If there were people who suspected H.P.B. of fraud, she always arranged things so that they had their suspicions confirmed. What they said about it afterwards was their own business. She could not say to them: come back one hundred incarnations hence, and there is perhaps a chance for you.

²There is no sense in proselytizing for hylozoics through magical phenomena. Those who are interested in such things are incapable of understanding hylozoics, and what are they to do

then with the esoteric knowledge? For them there is religion, philosophy, or science, which they are able to grasp and which afford them sufficient material for developing their power of reflection. As a 45-year-old said: "If our doctrine is erroneous, it will not become correct by magical phenomena." Even the black ones can work as great "miracles". Phenomena only prove that an individual has power over physical matter. To gain such power you need not be a causal self or have a knowledge of the superhuman worlds. The esoterician turns with his teaching to those who are past this infantile experimental stage. It was by her magical phenomena that Blavatsky harmed her own cause, a fact that, regrettably, she realized too late.

³The movement that Blavatsky's appearance in 1875 gave rise to made a stir in the entire educated world at the time. Scientists and scholars (quite apart from theologians), who almost all of them were physicalists, agnostics, antimetaphysicians, or skeptics, took up a hostile attitude to the "new Indian philosophy" from the very beginning. In order to destroy it in the scientific manner, the Society for Psychical Research sent a certain Richard Hodgson to India in 1884 to collect evidence against Blavatsky. This gentleman was to approach Hindu and other authorities to gain information from them about Blavatsky and also to learn their views on her.

⁴To understand the absurdity of that venture you must know something about the attitude of the Hindu pundits to the matter. The fact alone that the sacred books of the Hindus, the Upanishads and the other Vedic literature, had fallen into the hands of "Western barbarians" had stirred up an enormous bitterness in the whole of India. And then Blavatsky arrives, "betraying" their most secret learning. Their feelings were best voiced by an Indian initiate, the causal self Subba Rao, who wrote to Blavatsky saying that if someone had murdered her before she had managed to "betray their secret wisdom," then he had performed a good deed.

⁵Then a typical representative of the skeptics arrives and starts to interrogate them using the same method as the Scotland Yard detectives. The Hindu pundits were both amazed and happy. They were amazed at what they saw as an incredible ignorance and injudiciousness displayed by this barbarian. And they did what they in decency could do to confirm him in his delusions, being delighted that they could contribute to drawing the veil over their secrets again. We must forgive them the roars of laughter they produced after the "idiot" left.

⁶The illustrious society devoured with great relish all the perverse conclusions their committee member had arrived at, and declared in their report on Blavatsky that she was the biggest fraud of the century. And such a thing went down with almost all those in the West who had "believed in Blavatsky". Small wonder that the Hindus deemed themselves justified in considering all Westerners to be unworthy of their secret knowledge.

⁷And such an undertaking is called a scientific investigation.

⁸The accusations of fraud levelled at H. P. Blavatsky have been so firmly implanted in "public opinion" that it is no use even discussing the matter with the "learned". However, to anyone who will take the pains to examine the matter himself it may be pointed out that all of the accusations have been definitely demonstrated to be false. The accusations were based on the scientific assertion that magical experiments were impossible, since they conflicted with the laws of nature, and on Richard Hodgson's report. It should only be added that this Hodgson was completely unfamiliar with all things esoteric or occult, completely unacquainted with Blavatsky's literary output and anything concerning her personality. He was a fanatical antimetaphysician (not merely an agnostic or a skeptic) and had resolved to "put an end to all spiritist mischief". There is much more to be said, but this will suffice.

⁹Esotericians do not have an easy time. They meet with opposition from all skeptics, scientists, philosophers, and theologians in the West and from all the yogis in India.

¹⁰Paracelsus was considered the biggest fraud of the 16th century; Cagliostro, of the 18th century; and Blavatsky, of the 19th century. That individual certainly learnt what it costs to be ahead of one's times.

5.15 *Blavatsky and the Moralists*

¹Dr Franz Hartmann, who lived long under the same roof as Blavatsky in Adyar, told many anecdotes about that venerable, revered lady. She was characterized by her unrestrained temperament and her loathing for false piety, hypocrisy, and all manner of conventions. With great humour he would tell how "she swore like a trooper, smoked like a chimney, and bragged about her illegitimate children, when she wanted to shock the hypocrites." She made a drastic description of her wedding night with old General Blavatsky. When he wanted to claim his conjugal rights, she picked up a silver candelabra and banged it on her husband's head so that he went down. Thinking that she had killed him, she dressed quickly, rushed down into the stable, saddled her horse, and rode away to her relatives' house. She said that she actually did not know how the general fared.

²The story might have been dramatized, for Blavatsky knew the art of making the audience live all the adventures she had experienced. Nobody doubted that the details might have been embellished to their amusement. But they enjoyed the dramatization terrifically. And that was the intention. Funny stories cleared the air when the people present made the atmosphere too stuffy for her by their devoted worship. And she always saw to it that all and everybody got a humorous treatment so that they sobered down.

³As regards the brag about the illegitimate children and all the scandalous stories that people concocted freely and to excess to revenge her unconstrained ways with those well-mannered ladies and gentlemen, it really should not need to be said that they were groundless. Olcott demanded vigorously that before her death and cremation she should be examined by two eminent physicians (to put an end to the slander). The doctors in question could certify that not only did she never have any children but she could never have had any. One could think such a measure unnecessary, for, as Blavatsky always asserted "what on earth does their slander matter, which you will anyhow never avoid". At the end of her life, however, she realized that she had unnecessarily contributed to harming her own mission. People know how to revenge imaginary wrongs, and the "black ones" do all they can to neutralize the messengers from the planetary hierarchy. That is very rewarding as well, because people must have targets for their fretting hatred. Blavatsky regretted that she had tried to fight moralism with her demonstrative contempt for the moral fictionalism ruling. As idiotized as people had been made by their moral conventions, you only repelled those who otherwise could have been interested so much that they took pains to examine esoterics.

⁴In his book, *The Real H. P. Blavatsky* (London, 1928), William Kingsland tries in every way to explain H.P.B.'s faults and failings and to defend her from the attacks of the moralists. In so doing he only demonstrates that he is a moralist himself. It is about time esotericians refused to waste their time on defending themselves and others from the attacks of hatred. All are imperfect in the fourth natural kingdom. It is a demonstration of too great ignorance of life to defend someone from the moralists, who regard it as their duty to judge and condemn, being blind to their own faults and failings, not seeing that stupidity, which is worse than a crime, sowing the worst sowing conceivable. The moralists fall below the limit of the human. Such people have placed themselves beyond the pale and could be safely left to their fate. The laws of destiny and of reaping will teach them something different in due course of time. From esotericians you should first and foremost expect that they have thrown off the current moralist views and valuations, which are hostile to life. They should know that whenever a man has acquired a knowledge of reality, all his faults and failings are strengthened and appear to outsiders in a false light. They should see that it is not because of his imperfections

that an individual has attained the stage of culture, humanity, or ideality. And what is considered is the stage attained. The rest is the individual's private business.

⁵You must be an esoterician to understand what the lack of balance and the "eccentricity" of many esotericians are due to. The human organism, brain and nervous system in general, are not adapted to use in an expedient manner the atoms and molecules of higher kinds that are brought in through the new, revolutionary ideas. Since about one hundred years psychology has thought itself capable of ascertaining that "genius" is an abnormal phenomenon related to insanity. This is how it must appear to the psychology of our times. It does not possess the facts requisite to correctly explaining the phenomena of the "soul". As usual they start from the assumption that psychology is in a position to explain everything, not suspecting the fact that the psychological systems on which they base their opinions are fiction systems.

⁶There are those who pay regard to people's prejudice and conventional moralist views to win them more easily and be able to help them. There are others who tilt at moralism, because they have seen that it is satanic, being a poisoned weapon: the "moral right" to judge and condemn other people. Moralism is what envenoms relations between people by all that gossip and slander, all that which increases hatred and makes love impossible. Whenever anybody appears with some work that could afford people a better insight and understanding of reality, the moralists have managed to "neutralize" him by their gossip, so that nobody cares for his work. In that way they tried to assassinate Blavatsky as well as Besant and Leadbeater. Besides, when will people learn to make a distinction between persons and ideas? The work stands and falls with its content, whether this content agrees with reality or not. The person, the question of "who said it", is entirely irrelevant. When will people start thinking for themselves instead of idiotically parroting what stupidity or deficient understanding pleases to proclaim?

⁷Many people have wondered why H.P.B. failed so stupendously when anyhow she was a messenger from the planetary hierarchy, specially commissioned with making the knowledge public after it had been kept secret during 50,000 years. But that knowledge is for those who have become mental selves and is not intended for emotionalists or religious believers. For the masses, theosophy would have become a new religion, and that was not the purpose. Therefore, her work had to be destroyed, and that was done through the usual authoritative scientific expertise, which always thinks itself able to judge all of which it lacks knowledge and understanding. According to those authorities, her magical experiments conflicted (as all other magic) with the laws of nature and so were nothing but frauds, even if they could not be exposed. Then they chose another expedient, namely the trick commonly resorted to when nothing else is of avail: casting suspicion on her character and intentions. And that is always an infallible means when dealing with this race of moral hypocrites who deem violations of the eleventh commandment, "thou shalt not let thyself be caught", unforgivable.

⁸This was foreseen and was connected with her bad sowing still remaining, which appears in her horoscope.

⁹Her work lives on, however, being intended for those who have remained seekers and have not got stuck in any one of the countless ideologies of ignorance.

¹⁰The fact that Blavatsky is still generally considered an exposed fraud might be called an inconceivable triumph of the black lodge.

OTHER THEOSOPHISTS

5.16 Olcott

¹The first president of the Theosophical Society, the American colonel Henry Steel Olcott, and the vice president, editor-in-chief Alfred Percy Sinnett, were two opposite types. In his unconventional style, Olcott could speak of 45-selves as “the boys”, whereas Sinnett to be able to speak of them had to put on a white tie. Olcott was a disciple of the planetary hierarchy (M.), but Sinnett was not. Olcott sacrificed all for the cause: his position, wealth, comfort, being always prepared to acknowledge any mistake, humble, and perfectly devoted. Sinnett, too, had the courage to fight for the cause and brave the prejudice of the whole world, but remained a highbrow, who considered the esoteric knowledge to be only for the select few.

²Like Blavatsky, Olcott was completely devoid of all formality, unctuousness, affected so-called spirituality; he was matter-of-fact, sane, and natural. His American “unconventionality” was an abomination to most people, to Sinnett in particular. Such a behaviour was necessary, however, to clear the air of the poisoning, lying spiritual stuffiness that has of old been part and parcel of the theological atmosphere. We have to learn naturalness, learn to see that the chimney-sweeper may be as good an esoterician and disciple as anyone else and that spreading manure in the fields is as much spiritual activity as preaching to all the people.

5.17 Sinnett

¹Sinnett made the acquaintance of H.P.B. in 1879–1880. Being her pupil, it was clear to him that she had learnt what she knew through “teachers in a secret knowledge order in Tibet”. He was eager to come in contact with these teachers, which was arranged through Blavatsky’s agency.

²The planetary hierarchy, who saw that Sinnett was qualified to make valuable propaganda for the esoteric knowledge, permitted 45-self K.H., who had been Blavatsky’s teacher, to answer the questions that Sinnett needed to have clarified to elaborate an esoteric knowledge system. It is a proof of his intellectual capacity that Sinnett could write his *Esoteric Buddhism* on the basis of that material, make so much of so few real facts. K.H. recognized him to be a “brilliant author”, and justly so. Not many writers would have achieved anything so significant, relatively speaking, starting from that material. Besides, the enterprise would seem to have been hopeless, since you cannot ask the right questions in matters about which you know so little

³The very idea of answering question enabled K.H. not to give out more facts than the planetary hierarchy permitted for public knowledge. Otherwise former Pythagoras most simply could have sent Sinnett the Pythagorean knowledge teaching (*The Knowledge of Reality*, 1.4–1.41), and mankind would have received a fundamental knowledge system. It was not to be that simple, however. A veto was interposed from “higher quarters”. There were several reasons for this. A weighty reason was that mankind was to be taught an efficient lesson and learn to see the difference between true and false teaching. Mankind has not learnt this yet.

⁴Because of an irremediable misunderstanding, Sinnett eventually took up a hostile attitude to Blavatsky, which had the effect that K.H. in 1884 (after giving several warnings) finally broke off the correspondence. Sinnett had not understood more of the possibilities of spiritism than that he believed he could establish a communication with K.H. through mediums. He did not know that mediums cannot reach beyond the resources of emotional consciousness and that the planetary hierarchy never concern themselves with anything in the emotional world. Therefore, he fell victim to the illusory communications of his various mediums.

⁵The correspondence between Sinnett and K.H. was published in 1923, after Sinnett's death, by T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., London.

⁶On account of their heterogeneous content, these letters have caused much wonder, and as usual a lot of unreliable conjectures and suppositions have been put forward. It should be appropriate to put the matter straight.

⁷It is a fact certified by D.K. that most of the letters were authored by Blavatsky herself, which else appears highly probable. The accusation of forgery is unjustified, however, since it was done with K.H.'s permission.

⁸It seems quite improbable that K.H. should have devoted time to such a correspondence. This is easier to understand when you know that he had several causal selves as disciples to whom he could entrust this task. Such disciples have the right to use their teacher's handwriting, so that no outsider may suspect that not the master himself was the writer. Of course, such amanuenses receive general directions as to the content of what they are to write, but as to the rest it is left to them to formulate the answer.

⁹In such cases, "H.P.B." as well as "K.H." are pseudonyms of a whole "office of a department". Many individuals have wielded the pen. The consciousness of community enables them to apprehend the intentions of their chief and also to render them in words characteristic of the author. It is quite impossible for outsiders to decide whether their apprehension was exact. Notoriously, even direct quotations were misapprehended, if fresh amanuenses were commissioned to the task.

¹⁰Quite a few of the letters are of such a character that K.H. cannot have been their author. When Sinnett asked K.H. whether he could publicize the letters in extenso, he met with a flat refusal. It was left to his discretion to make suitable excerpts. The editor of the book just mentioned was fully aware of this condition. Nevertheless he publicized it all, displaying an impudence typical of Western occultists. When you now in what way these letters were produced, you can just regret such a disregard of all consideration. The ends do not justify the means. And his capacity was not sufficient for him to understand the effects. Even if the true authors had a general power of attorney to pen the letters in their teachers' name (convinced as they were that in any case the essential was correct), the understanding reader clearly realizes that they would not have been so formulated by their alleged authors. In fact, very few of these letters were authored by them, and it is easy to distinguish them among the about 140 letters remaining. Injudiciousness takes them all to be genuine, of course. And this has had deplorable consequences. No mahatma writes such things: gossips and gives moral opinions.

¹¹The much-discussed letter commenting on the Kiddle address should have been a sufficient warning not to take everything at face value. Should, but alas! You must not expect even a wee bit of common sense.

¹²A brahmin, reviewing Sinnett's book *Esoteric Buddhism*, opined that several facts presented in that book, such as karma, kama loka (the emotional world), manvantara (period of activity), pralaya (period of passivity), etc., could be found in vedanta and hence were incorrectly stated to belong to Buddhism and a special esoteric doctrine within Buddhism.

¹³The fact that certain basic esoteric facts are to be found in exoteric systems is taken as proof that esoterics is neither esoterics nor particularly typical of Buddhism. He forgot to mention the many new facts to be found in Sinnett's book. Moreover: the fact that the doctrines of the esoteric Order of Vyasa and the esoteric Order of the Buddha agree in all essentials surely does not prevent the Order of the Buddha from possessing more facts, so that the title Sinnett gave his book was entirely justified. Each order certainly has the right to attach its own name to its presentation of the knowledge of reality, however much this presentation may have in common with those of the other orders. The criticism of the brahmin

may be cited as an instance of how religious fanaticism stupidizes people and blinds them to the simplest logic.

¹⁴From the Preface to Sinnett's book *Esoteric Buddhism* can be quoted the following statements, which are still justified:

¹⁵"The esoteric doctrine, when properly understood, will be found to advance an overpowering claim on the attention of earnest thinkers. Its tenets are not presented to us as the invention of any founder or prophet. Its testimony is based on no written scriptures. Its views of Nature have been evolved by the researches of an immense succession of investigators, qualified for their task by the possession of spiritual faculties and perceptions of a higher order than those belonging to ordinary humanity. In the course of ages the block of knowledge thus accumulated, concerning the origin of the world and of man and the ultimate destinies of our race – concerning also the nature of other worlds and states of existence differing from those of our present life – checked and examined at every point, verified in all directions, and constantly under examination throughout, has come to be looked upon by its custodians as constituting the absolute truth concerning spiritual things, the actual state of the facts regarding vast regions of vital activity lying beyond this earthly existence."

¹⁶"The surrender to criticism which may sometimes, perhaps, be clumsy and irreverent, of doctrines which have hitherto been regarded by such persons as too majestic in their import to be talked of at all except under circumstances of befitting solemnity, will seem to them a terrible profanation of the great mysteries."

¹⁷Of course, Sinnett was duly derided by these authorities who can judge all of which they know nothing. An account of all the abuse, etc. that was heaped upon him would fill a volume. He was dismissed from his post as editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Pioneer*. Fortunately his private capital spared him a life in poverty. The planetary hierarchy was certainly proved right in its view that the time was not up for publication of the knowledge of reality. The knowledge is seen to be correct only by those who possess it latently, and very few of them are incarnated in such an age of transition as ours.

¹⁸Among theosophical leaders especially Olcott and Sinnett exaggerated the importance of Blavatsky's magical experiments. They did not realize that science was in no position to judge the pertaining realities and, consequently, that all such things would be rejected as fraud. This has been skilfully exploited by all the representatives of religion, philosophy, and science, so that the entire public opinion nowadays knows that theosophy is a false teaching for the injudicious. This outcome was predicted by 45-self K.H. in several letters to Sinnett, who nevertheless, with English bulldog obstinacy refused to listen to reason, and went on demanding more and more experiments until the planetary hierarchy had to prohibit the venture. The head of the third department tried in vain to console him by sending word saying "the doctrine we promulgate, being the only true one, must, supported by such evidence as we are preparing to give, become ultimately triumphant as every other truth". It must do so, even if it will take hundreds of years. The attempt to liberate mankind of its illusions and fictions is almost a Sisyphean labour. What has been hammered into the head from childhood has got a firm hold and is, moreover, reinforced on a daily basis through the never-ending parrotry by literature and public opinion of a learning that is 99 per cent erroneous in everything that cannot be ascertained in the physical world by everybody.

¹⁹It is to be deeply regretted that Sinnett did not receive the facts requisite to a fully satisfactory presentation of esoterics. His two works, *The Occult World* and *Esoteric Buddhism*, were brilliant achievements considering how little he had been told. Add to this such qualities he had as are invaluable in an esoteric writer. He comprehended what he wrote. He abhorred vagueness. He distinguished carefully between facts received and his own reflections.

²⁰Such a capacity should have been better used, the more so as he keenly desired to clear up in the jungle of occultism.

5.18 Hartmann

¹Franz Hartmann was a German physician, a devoted pupil of Blavatsky. When the Theosophical Society split in 1895, he sided with neither sect, but founded in 1897 in Germany his own society, Internationale Theosophische Verbrüderung. He made it his mission to demonstrate the similarities there are between Oriental and Occidental mysticism, to show that the differences are actually only apparent. Thus he was active mainly in the domain of emotional mysticism. He was not able to make his own contribution to the development of esoteric mentalism but contented himself with compiling excerpts from *The Secret Doctrine* of Blavatsky.

²The following quotation is a specimen of his peculiar style: “A quite considerable amount of learning can be stuffed into a brain during a life-time, and when death arrives, all of this worthless rubbish, which has not the slightest value in the kingdom of eternity, will nevertheless be abandoned – but making the divine lotus of the soul unfold in the sunshine of divine love may require many rebirths.” “Kingdom of eternity” and “divine lotus of the soul” are typical of Hartmann’s symbolism. The “kingdom” corresponds approximately to the “worlds of the undying knowledge”. The “lotus of the soul” is an allusion to the centres of the causal envelope. They form together a lotus that develops in three stages under the influence of causal, essential (46), and superessential (45) energies.

5.19 Besant and Leadbeater

¹Disciples of the planetary hierarchy are treated quite differently, altogether individually. H.P.B. was in a special position in relation to all the other disciples because she had a special assignment, she was handicapped in several respects (bad reaping), and so had not been able to carry out the works planned without practically daily assistance from some member of the planetary hierarchy (usually D.K.). She acknowledged that there was much of what she wrote that she did not comprehend. But having mental clairvoyance and mental clairaudience she was irreplaceable at the time.

²Besant and Leadbeater were in a quite different position. Their first novitiate disregarded, they were thrown upon themselves to solve their problems and those of the Society. Inevitably they made lots of mistakes in the process. Everyone can make mistakes. Blavatsky as well as Besant and Leadbeater, the three most prominent esotericians, asserted with vigour that they certainly could make mistakes and that no one should have absolute confidence in their statements. This is forgotten by those who need an “absolute belief system” to rely on. By rejecting Besant and Leadbeater the Tingleyan sect and other secessionist movements have demonstrated that they are believers and have never understood.

³It is understandable that both Besant and Leadbeater overestimated their own capacity and underrated that of Blavatsky. Causal selves have their limitations, too, and no one can assess anyone at a higher stage than his own.

⁴In her capacity as President of the Theosophical Society, Annie Besant eventually became something of a dictator for others. She invested her disciples with degrees that they could not attain. This is not said with the intention of detracting from her great contribution, but only to point out what risks all disciples run before they have become 45-selves. What in its turn protects disciples from embarrassing mistakes is their share in the great common consciousness of the planetary hierarchy. They all participate in the decisions made and measures taken by everyone.

⁵Theosophists have enormously overrated both Besant’s and Leadbeater’s capacity. The fact that they were causal selves means that they were able to ascertain facts in the molecular

kinds (not atomic kinds) of the worlds of man. This does not in the least imply that they were omniscient in the worlds of man. It does imply, however, that they were in a position to obtain the pertaining knowledge. It will take many hundreds of years of work until the monad has managed to acquaint itself with that enormous knowledge. And if the individual has not made sufficiently thorough inquiries, he can easily make mistakes. That is why all causal selves warn their pupils not to regard their statements as infallible.

⁶Everything they thought they knew about higher worlds (above 47) were such things as they could not know by themselves but was received knowledge as far as it could be rightly apprehended, which was not always the case. Even if causal selves have access to the consciousness of 45-selves, they cannot have an exact understanding of things that are beyond the reach of causal consciousness. There is always a great risk, even for causal selves, of overestimating their individual capacity. They, too, must learn by their mistakes, and these mistakes are warning signs to future causal selves as well. Only 45-selves need not make any mistakes, for they are always in a position to be informed through higher agencies.

⁷Another thing of some interest is the fact that causal selves have often snatched up ideas in the world of consciousness, ideas that they have found to be so directly illuminative that they have not bothered to ascertain the matter objectively as well. This was the case with Leadbeater. He could report ideas that some member of the planetary hierarchy had communicated to his disciples not affiliated with theosophy. Such a procedure might be permitted. Such as mankind is constituted once for all, however, this may lead to quarrels between different esoteric sects about the right of priority to the idea. We only hope that the sects will refrain from displaying such childishness in the future.

⁸Besant and Leadbeater carried out research of their own. They could to some extent ascertain facts in individual cases. That did not take them far, however, because of the immense difficulty involved in ascertaining facts correctly in the emotional and mental worlds. As long as they kept to physical facts, they were successful. But in higher matters it is increasingly difficult to distinguish between what you are seeing and what you believe you are seeing. If you do not have a previous exact knowledge of what it is you are observing, you will see it wrong. You will run particularly great risks if you try to interpret even such physical phenomena as have their true origin in atomic matter (cosmic matter) and not in molecular matter

⁹Thus Leadbeater made several mistakes in his comments on the energies of the centres of the etheric envelope. Primary matter is rotary, not spiral cyclic, as Leadbeater thought he could determine. The three original energies are not correctly indicated either. He also confused the energies of the sacral centre with those of the basal centre.

¹⁰Neither Besant's nor Leadbeater's capacities were sufficient for the perception of the realities of the causal world.

¹¹The only truly reliable authority on superphysical realities is, of course, the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, 45-self D.K. It has also been seen that only 45-selves are infallible in regard to facts in the three lowest atomic worlds (47–49). Also lower selves can be right, of course. But in their case it is not their own work but it is a gift from the planetary hierarchy, since they are tools that have been chosen to communicate (within the limits of their own understanding) facts and ideas for which the hierarchy considers the time has come.

¹²Leadbeater was an extravert and objectivist and explorer of the matter aspect. Besant was an introvert and subjectivist and took more interest in the consciousness aspect. They were two quite different types. And both did what they could with the people among whom they were working. They could have achieved more with people of another kind. That is true of all great researchers and teachers. They seldom have congenial pupils. What they write, too, is conditioned by their knowledge of how it will be understood and misunderstood. Generally speaking, they can give but little of what they know.

5.20 Leadbeater

¹Many theosophists make the big mistake of rejecting Leadbeater because he made mistakes. All teachers do before they have become 45-selves. And even then mistakes are possible because of a split attention. Nobody has been able as Leadbeater was to compile superphysical facts methodically into a system which is comparably easy to comprehend.

²Blavatsky demonstrated that the knowledge of reality was extremely old, but Leadbeater made a comprehensible mental system out of this knowledge. He corrected many misconceptions there were in the older theosophy. The fact that also Kleinias (45-self D.K.), a disciple of Pythagoras, could correct such errors and present quite another perspective on existence does not in the least detract from Leadbeater's great merit as an esoteric teacher and independent researcher. Properly speaking, his mistake was that he got to grips with problems that only 45-selves are able to elucidate. Leadbeater deserves a memorial as being one of the great ones of mankind and one of the greatest figures of the theosophical movement. The fact that his system soon became obsolete is entirely due to the revolutionary contribution of 45-self D.K. Without the foundation laid by Leadbeater, however, much of the material D.K. presented had been even more difficult to comprehend. It is to be deplored that D.K.'s amanuensis, A.A.B., in her interpretation exclusively used Blavatsky's wretched terminology. What was lacking from A.A.B was a philosophical and scientific training, a lack that she never realized. What we can learn from this lack and its consequences is the necessity for unambiguous, exact terminology, method, and system when writing for mentalists. Having an understanding of life is not enough.

³It may be said of Leadbeater that he was reliable when ascertaining facts, but that he often jumped to conclusions from his own observations. Also, he was not always clear about the limits to his own possibility of ascertaining facts. Relying on his own capacity for judgement, he could embark on speculation for which he did not possess the sufficient facts. He experimented quite a lot with such things as a causal self cannot understand or master. Only 45-selves always know how to learn what they want to know. A causal self is in no position to observe a solar systemic ruler. He could only perceive a sun of such an enormous intensity that his causal consciousness would be "dazed". Perceptible material forms are out of the question.

⁴Leadbeater himself was aware that he had made mistakes when working out his mental system and that facts had got into wrong contexts. He willingly conceded that he probably had made mistakes, which shows that he was aware of the difficulties of his work. And D.K. emphasizes that only 45-selves are in a position to ascertain all kinds of facts in the worlds of man and that they alone can avoid mistakes. It is also to be wondered why he used facts given out by D.K. and published by Alice A. Bailey in the journal, *The Beacon*, without acknowledgements.

⁵However, these mistakes are without consequence for his system at large, the first one correctly constructed in regard to the seven atomic worlds of the solar system and the five molecular worlds of man, the composition of matter, the difference between atomic kinds and molecular kinds, the seven atomic kinds and 42 molecular kinds of the solar system, the different kinds of consciousness, the different envelopes of man, etc. As regards all those matters there was a lamentable unclearness, which had such disastrous consequences for Rudolf Steiner. Attempts have been made to belittle Leadbeater's great contribution, of course, but posterity will recognize his merits. The fact that injudicious, fanatically Blavatsky-believing theosophists rejected Leadbeater only shows their own incompetence. They were never initiates of any Western knowledge order.

⁶Leadbeater was a causal self possessed of the ability to ascertain facts about the matter aspect in the worlds of man. He could follow an individual throughout his series of

incarnations and describe his experiences in the physical world. On the other hand, his innate capacity did not suffice for him to utilize the possibility of making the corresponding explorations in the consciousness aspect. Therefore, his descriptions of the past incarnations of individuals concern almost exclusively their physical lives and very little their consciousness development. There is a very small difference to be seen between the individual's last incarnation and the one immediately preceding it, but he largely makes the same mistakes in his new conditions of life. What is also lacking from Leadbeater's presentation is an account of the general consciousness development of mankind during the time of about 80,000 years covered by his studies of the incarnations of various individuals (especially those of Krishnamurti). He reports their physical lives only, and the temporary views the individuals held in various respects. Such things may be of some interest to ethnologists but is of no consequence for the understanding of the essential meaning of any incarnation, namely the individual's consciousness development. This is a deficiency that will be supplied by a 46-self in the 21st century, as we have been promised. The consciousness aspect is the essential one, not the matter aspect.

⁷Leadbeater's statement that life in the emotional world "seldom exceeds one hundred years" has proved to be a too wide generalization of his own experience. Quite a number of individuals have been found who have lived there for hundreds of years. The difficulty of data about the emotional world is that it has not been possible to obtain such facts from members of the planetary hierarchy, who do not concern themselves with the pertaining phenomena, but students are thrown back on what causal selves have been able to ascertain without a sufficient statistical material.

⁸No satisfactory explanation has been given of how such a phenomenon is possible as the much discussed John King that harassed Blavatsky without her being able to defend herself.

⁹Leadbeater made many mistakes about the etheric envelope and its functions, and his monograph on the chakras contains many errors. He confused the energies of the sacral chakra with those of the basal chakra (being in this respect as in several other cases misled by yoga authorities). Not sushumna but ida and pingala are functioning in the normal individual. The primary motion of the atom is rotary, not spiral cyclic.

¹⁰It is surprising that Leadbeater did not see that the passive causal being in the causal world is quite different from the supervisor, Augoeides; that the causal envelope is man; and that Augoeides is another individual. The fact that Leadbeater did not realize this is clear from his speaking about the Augoeides of 45-selves. The causal envelope is man's "soul"; Augoeides is an essential being (a 46-self) belonging to another evolution. Consequently, Augoeides is not man's "higher self", not his "soul", even though he performs that function until man is able to centre himself definitively in the greater causal envelope.

¹¹The processes of manifestation are inescapable, but how they occur cannot be foreseen. Leadbeater's assertion, that whatever the "monad" (Protogonos in the third triad) has decided for the individual is fulfilled, is erroneous. No individual may decide anything for another individual. If that were the case, it would abolish the law of freedom.

¹²It is strange that Leadbeater could not see that the issue of Mars and Mercury was about the two etheric globes (73 and 75) in the planetary chain of Terra. This demonstrates the risk of tackling problems that are at the uppermost limit to a causal self's capacity.

¹³It is also obvious that Leadbeater fell a victim to his attempts at exploring the essential world. It is clear that it is not sufficient to have acquired an essential envelope (46). It takes a considerable time before the causal self has learnt to use its functions faultlessly, has become an essential self.

¹⁴Leadbeater's account of the Pythagorean knowledge order (in an essay he wrote on the ancient mysteries) is incomplete in certain respects and so misleading. That order had more than the three degrees detailed by Leadbeater. The three degrees mentioned were only

preparatory. The true esoteric teaching was given in the subsequent degrees only. The fact that Leadbeater knew nothing of these higher degrees shows that he did not attain beyond the third degree. Brethren of lower degrees did not even know that there were higher degrees. They knew how to keep silent in those days.

¹⁵Leadbeater asserted that our planetary hierarchy came to our planet 16,500,000 years ago, although it was more than 21 million years ago. He asserted that Christos–Maitreya would appear in the 20th century, which is impossible. He asserted that the sixth root-race will appear 600 years hence. It will develop from the sixth sub-race of the fifth root-race, which has not appeared yet.

¹⁶The final part of a book Besant and Leadbeater co-authored, *Man: Whence, How, and Whither?*, deals with an imaginative construction by a mental deva in connection with a future race. It affords an interesting glimpse of the outlines of possibilities that even such devas can make beside their proper work. It remains unclear how much Leadbeater himself believed in their realization.

¹⁷Leadbeater's statement that the sixth root-race will begin around the year 2600 seems incomprehensible, the more so since he was particularly careful about his own observations.

¹⁸It has always been repugnant to the present writer to assume anything without sufficient facts and, where the esoteric is concerned, without facts from the planetary hierarchy. But we always have a right to analyse if we refrain from postulating:

¹⁹It has taken about ten thousand years for the fifth subrace of the fifth root-race to reach its present level, and it is none to boast of. It is hardly probable that the sixth subrace of the fifth root-race (which has just begun, with some few individuals in most countries, not in any particular country) would reach its maturity in less than five thousand years. And it is from that culmination that the sixth root-race will begin. If so, it would be when the vernal equinox is in Sagittarius.

²⁰Can Leadbeater's statement have reference to the sixth subrace, which should at that time have reached beyond the experimental stage?

THEOSOPHICAL FICTIONS

5.21 *The Theosophical Mode of Presentation*

¹“More light” is gained by disciples not through studies but through using energies. More important than preaching is serving human evolution, raising the standard of mankind in physical and cultural respect. More important than becoming “omniscient” of everything you will never find any use for is helping people with their physical problems. There are esoteric students who eagerly search for more and more facts in order to be esoteric experts. They waste an unnecessarily great part of their valuable time on things they do not need to know and things they are given for nothing when using it they can help others.

²It is quite another matter that there may be some specialist or other who has of old had the task of formulating in writing a mental system possible to grasp for the mode of comprehension prevalent at the time, using the facts that the planetary hierarchy consider belong to that stage of development. Such a specialist must therefore have mastered the system for his own part before considering himself able to formulate it.

³Working as a teacher you can proceed in two ways. Either you take in the learning existing, working it through so that it is turned into a living system. Then you are secure in your certainty that you have logically mastered your specialty, a security that is automatically imparted to your pupils. Or you are content with knowing just a bit more than your pupils and see to it that you keep your lead, so that your pupils do not realize how little you know. The latter method was used by the theosophical writers (for instance Sinnett, Leadbeater, and Besant). They learnt by teaching and writing. The result was, however, that their later works in too many respects demonstrated the deficiencies of their earlier works, a fact that the generally unwitting agents of the black lodge promptly exploited to cast suspicion on their works. Criticism can be done in different ways. The main issue here is the motive, as always: whether you intend to serve or to fight the truth. And the result clarifies the motive to the seeker of truth: whether the instinct of the criticizing individual has a right or wrong direction.

⁴According to the law of self-realization, the individual must seek by himself, find by himself, learn how to realize by himself. Whatever he is given for nothing through education, etc., is what mankind has once acquired and the individual has once learnt to comprehend to be able to understand it in future incarnations. The disciple of the planetary hierarchy may receive hints on how to seek, but that is all. That method is right, of course, since it is only by his own work that the individual develops. However, where the pioneers of the esoteric knowledge to be given mankind are concerned, the method mentioned is fraught with difficulties. You learn by helping others to understand. But the pioneers’ awkward attempts at learning by teaching others have not been conducive to the right formulation of the ideas and their insertion into their right contexts. The question is whether the method mentioned has not caused harm to esoterics in its theosophical presentation and not raised doubts, even though unjustified ones, about the capacity of the teachers. The question remains whether esoterics should not have been formulated into a unitary system from the very outset. Then we would have been spared those many occult sects claiming to give a more correct presentation of the knowledge and so leading people downright astray.

⁵When Sinnett put forward his attempt at an esoteric world view, he started from the matter aspect. Since the philosophy then ruling was subjectivist (it called itself euphemistically “idealist”), this was disapproved of. Besant, trained in philosophy and certainly influenced by advaita, attached herself to subjectivism, meeting with a strong approval for this. Leadbeater, being a realist and objectivist (fifth department), made the matter aspect the basis of his descriptions of reality. This was evidently disapproved of, and that was the reason why he later tried to avoid speaking about matter, using circumlocutions, which afforded his later expositions a vagueness alien to his earlier writings.

⁶However, the matter aspect is the incomparably most suitable aspect as the starting-point for hylozoics. It is also about time that esoterics adopted a scientific outlook. This is justified also because the ideologies ruling hitherto in subjectivist European and Indian philosophy have a spurious character and are of a wretchedly bad quality as well.

⁷What made Sinnett and Leadbeater succeed better than others in making esoterics comprehensible to the esoterically ignorant was the fact that they both started from the matter aspect. From the educational point of view, this starting-point is undoubtedly the best one for Westerners who, being familiar with chemistry, physics, geology, astronomy, and biology, have got the matter aspect for nothing, as it were. It is quite another thing that the consciousness aspect later proves to be the truly revolutionizing discovery. Using the matter aspect as their basis and the skeleton of a system provided by it, the writers mentioned anyhow made it easier for their readers to comprehend esoterics and to generally orient themselves in it.

⁸Basically, Occidentals are objectivists and Orientals subjectivists in regard to reality as well as to life. Both have their tasks to fulfil, just as every nation has to make its little contribution to universal development. Everyone can learn from all the others, but whatever is taken from others should be adapted to one's own character. Any attempt at putting Occidental culture on an Oriental footing is a mistake. The condition of culture is its basis in individual and collective character. In that respect, it must be deplored that Blavatsky, who was a pronounced Occidental, gave her *Secret Doctrine* such an Oriental form.

⁹The only two writers on esoterics who had the requisite training and background to present esoterics reliably and in a manner to satisfy educated Occidentals were Sinnett and Leadbeater. Regrettably, Sinnett had too few facts at his disposal for his instructive method to be displayed to full advantage. Leadbeater possessed, beside that quality, which made him the model teacher, such an extensive knowledge of esoteric facts that his system is both the easiest to comprehend and the richest in content to see the light of day till then. Of course, these two very capable men are the most disregarded writers.

¹⁰Blavatsky had no philosophical training. The philosophy presented in *Isis and Secret Doctrine* was not her own. Even in those writings there are Orientalisms with subjectivism and advaitism, which are untenable from an epistemological point of view. It is true that she says that hylozoism is the only right conception of reality, but she never clarifies that conception. We are given a mixture of subjectivism and objectivism that is neither the one nor the other, and this causes a confusion of ideas once again.

¹¹Blavatsky and Bailey were amanuenses who largely wrote down what was shown or said to them, being incapable of rendering the ancient symbols, intended for initiates only, into a comprehensible language. If knowledge is to be given to people, it should be comprehensible to educated Occidentals, not understandable only to those having a latent knowledge, to a small group of initiates. They say that Christos came to all mankind and that anyone writing for the intellectual élite only "is sinning against the masses", but then they use a language that is almost impossible to grasp even for the intelligentsia.

¹²Symbols afford no mental exactitude and clarity and therefore should be avoided when teaching people. That is a thing which esoteric writers should be able to see. Anyone who knows can write with exactitude. Riddles have no place in pedagogy. The vagueness indulged in from the very outset has harmed the cause of esoterics.

¹³It was unavoidable from the beginning that theosophical writers lacking in education should give out erroneous data. They worked unploughed soil. Of course they are blamed for their mistakes by the after-wise, who think they are wise because they are able to parrot. Mistakes were unavoidable. What could be criticized, however, is that those first attempts with all their errors are still printed in new editions. They belong in the archives of historical

research. If the works of Blavatsky, Besant, and Leadbeater are to be reprinted, they should be supplied with commentaries that correct their errors.

¹⁴Theosophists often found it difficult to decide when their leaders were speaking in their capacity as causal selves or as mere physical beings; two totally different things, to be sure. As physical beings they roughly could not know more than the authorities of public opinion said they knew. For instance, Leadbeater could say that anyone living on potatoes and cabbage subsisted on starch and water. That was the opinion held by the nutritionists of his time. Nowadays they hold other views.

¹⁵This is not the only instance of the mixture of esoterics and things exoteric to be found in theosophical literature, a jumble that was bound to harm the cause and gave many readers of that literature the impression of pseudo-knowledge. It was bad as well that believers who took their leaders for infallible supermen and were bereft of individual judgement accepted blindly everything told them as revelations. And the result was a new sect with a new dogmatism.

¹⁶In theosophy you are often faced with a mixture of a description of reality and an account of its genesis, and this confusion has the effect that the reader finds it difficult to get a clear idea of the one or the other. The aspects of reality are not treated one at a time, which is necessary to a scientific treatment.

¹⁷The presentations of esoterics given hitherto have suffered from their lack of clarity and system, quite apart from the fact that the three hylozoic aspects were never made the basis of the expositions, and the treatment became one-sided in consequence. The hylozoic mental system of esoteric facts has remedied this shortcoming, so that nowadays no warranted criticism from philosophical or scientific quarters need be feared. Unwarranted criticism only demonstrates the incompetence of the critics.

¹⁸It is not easy to formulate an esoteric world view comprehensible to the uninitiated, the ignorant of life with their almost ineradicable fictions about reality, moreover unwilling to put in work at anything so dubious, which the ruling authorities (accepted by public opinion) have declared to be the intellectual mishmash of mystagogues.

¹⁹It was perhaps not very happy to appear before the world opinion with so few esoteric facts as the first theosophical writers had at their disposal. True, they succeeded in awakening the interest of those who had the knowledge latently and who by chance came in contact with "this kind of literature". But the frantic opposition and energetic attempted killings by all authorities have had the result that the public still after four or five generations hold the opinion that theosophy and similar teachings are some sort of ersatz religion for the dull-witted.

²⁰You need not wonder where stupidity actually is to be found in this case. Anyone who has reached so far that he is seeking for something else than physicalism has probably seen its shortcomings, and that alone should tell something to those who do not parrot the general senseless chatter but who think for themselves. Experience realizes that there is every reason to thoroughly examine everything that is frantically attacked by authorities. Truly worthless ideas are not attacked.

5.22 *Fictions about Matter*

¹The president of the Theosophical Society, Jinarajadasa, tried to explain the relation of the different (cosmic) atomic kinds to the (systemic) molecular kinds graphically by means of a diagram. This cannot be done. You cannot graphically represent the 49 different dimensions and their relations to each other.

²In theosophical literature there is mention of the mysterious elemental essence, the writers not knowing that this is a symbol referring to the involutory energies forcing the originally rotary atoms to assume their spiral cyclic motion. The constant error of this older esoteric

literature was that its authors wanted to explain many phenomena that could not be explained by the too few facts they had at their disposal.

³H.P.B. says in one place in *The Secret Doctrine*: “It is on the doctrine of the illusive nature of matter, and the infinite divisibility of the atom, that the whole science of Occultism is built.” This is typical of H.P.B.’s careless way of expressing herself. Illusion is imagination. The atom is no imagination but a reality. An imagination is not divisible. The atom is not infinitely divisible. A point is finally arrived at that is not further divisible, the primordial atom, the monad (“atom” means indivisible, “monad” means unity). It is true that the physical atom is made up of many billions of primordial atoms. Billions are not infinitude, however.

⁴How little theosophists have grasped of esoterics is instanced by an issue of the Swedish theosophical journal *Teosofisk Tidskrift* (March–April, 1955), where time is presented as a dimension, the fourth dimension, in accord with Einstein’s abortive hypothesis. In the same issue we are told that Platon considered time an illusion. No hylozoician does so, for he knows that existence has three eternal aspects one of which is matter.

5.23 *Fictions about Envelopes*

¹Some theosophists think that the etheric envelope accompanies the higher envelopes at the dissolution of the organism. This big mistake is due to the fact that the individuals of the fifth natural kingdom possess etheric envelopes as their only physical envelopes. These ignorant theosophists do not know that 45-selves, when necessary, form themselves all the envelopes they need in the worlds of man. Such formation of matter is the work of an instant.

²Man’s etheric envelope is always attached to the organism and dissolves in the same tempo as the cells.

³The theosophical assertion that the old causal envelope is dissolved when man becomes a causal self is erroneous. This happens only when he becomes an essential self and the monad has centred itself in the second triad essential atom. Only then will he be able to form his own causal envelope.

⁴One esoteric school spoke about the “three souls of man”: the animal soul (emotional consciousness), the human soul (mental consciousness), and the divine soul (causal consciousness). The divine soul was thought to reside in the second triad mental atom.

⁵Certain esotericians use the abortive expression, the “merging of the soul in the universal soul”. However, every monad has an unlosable share in the cosmic total consciousness and therefore cannot merge in something of which it is already a part.

5.24 *Fictions about the Self, the Triads, and Augoeides*

¹Many students of theosophical literature have vainly searched for the “self”, wondering where it is. They are aware that they are “selves”, but to theosophists the self is always something else and somewhere else. Theosophists appear not to have understood that the self is a primordial atom, that the self is the monad, that the self is the individual, and that the self is the personality, that the self is centred in the lowest triad. They seem to think that the self (which they call the “Ego”) is centred in the greater causal envelope and does not accompany the lesser, or lower causal envelope, the one incarnating (the triad envelope, the “personality”). They also have assigned the “self” to the third triad, which they call the “Monad” (a Greek word meaning unity), not understanding that the self, the monad, is a unity, an indivisible primordial atom, and not three, several, or many.

²The theosophical writers failed to mention the very self – the monad – the primordial atom in other connections as well. Everything they said about the “personality” (the first triad in its envelopes of incarnation), the “Ego” (the second triad), and the “Monad” (the third triad) concerned the relationship between these three triads, while they made the very self just about non-existent. Small wonder then than most theosophists have never reached any true clarity,

even if, generally speaking, they have grasped immensely more than those who have ended up in sundry pseudo-sects (the number of which is in constant increase).

³The theosophists never understood the continuity made up by the three triads. They called the first triad the “three permanent atoms”, although it consists of two atoms and one molecule, as do the two higher triads. They termed the second triad the “Triad” as though it were the only one and as though there were not two more triads. And they called the third triad the “Monad”, not knowing that this triad, although being the highest envelope for the monad in the solar system (43–49), is not identical with the monad in the original, Pythagorean sense of primordial atom – self. These misconceptions have occasioned an irredeemable confusion of ideas.

⁴The fact that the three causal selves of the theosophical movement, Blavatsky, Besant, and Leadbeater, are the authors of the fictions in question does not imply any disparagement of their capacity. However, even causal selves make mistakes when tackling problems that are beyond causal consciousness and its ability to judge. And causal consciousness is far from the “omniscience” theosophists seem to invest it with. The view originating from theosophy that the causal self is sovereign in the worlds of man (47–49) is a “qualified truth”. It is true that the causal self is sovereign in the molecular worlds (49:2-7, 48:2-7, 47:2-7), but lacks consciousness in the physical, emotional, and mental atomic worlds (49:1, 48:1, 47:1). However, it is the monad’s self-consciousness in the atoms that affords true understanding and leads to “omniscience” in the different worlds.

⁵Besant as well as Leadbeater could exactly describe and explain what they experienced. But they lacked the knowledge of hylozoics, and that is why their theories of the “self”, of the triads, and of Augoeides were erroneous. Where the triads are concerned, only 45-self D.K. gave out the necessary facts about them after 1920.

⁶Blavatsky never cared for any world view. She had access to “all” the facts in the worlds of man. But she was unable to put the facts into their correct contexts, to give a comprehensible account of the true relation between the monad in the lowest triad in the triad envelope and Augoeides in the causal envelope. The explanation she gave occasioned a lot of abortive speculation. It is part of the “heritage of Blavatsky” that certain esoteric writers do not clearly distinguish between these two individuals. This leads to unsolvable contradictions. Both the monad, or the self, and Augoeides are called the “Ego” or the “Soul”, which alone is misleading. The statement that “the Ego is becoming ever more conscious on his own plane” is in conflict with references to the “omniscience” and “omnipotence” of the “Soul”. At any event, Augoeides is not omniscient and omnipotent even within the solar system, since he is an essential self (46).

⁷Augoeides is a separate individual, does not belong to the human evolution, but to the parallel deva evolution. His mission is to watch over man as long as man lives in the physical world, see to it that his envelopes of incarnation function mechanically with the energies allotted to them and to try to influence the individual’s consciousness development. Moreover, he does what he can for his own development so that he at times omits his supervision. We understand him. Watching over those “idiots and scoundrels” (as human beings largely still are) must try him exceedingly.

5.25 Fictions about Discipleship

¹Theosophists (and their echoes in the Rosicrucian sects) have got a quite erroneous notion of the planetary hierarchy and its work, and this has become a serious hindrance to the planetary hierarchy. What is to be deplored in the theosophical presentation is that people’s attention is directed to the individual’s own development. That matter is of no interest to the planetary hierarchy. Augoeides takes care of it, if the individual listens to his inspirations. The members of the hierarchy seeks for co-workers and not for “disciples”. They are by no means

eager to be encumbered with more collaborators than they already have to waste their time on. This does not prevent them from taking those who have been able to self-activate consciousness in the higher mental molecular kinds (47:4,5). They do this exclusively because those individuals can help the hierarchy in its work for mankind, not at all to bring them over to the fifth natural kingdom. It is by demonstrating his capacity by making a contribution to the consciousness development of mankind that the individual shows that he is suitable as a co-worker.

²Theosophists seem to believe that they have a particular “master” in the planetary hierarchy who is eagerly waiting to make their acquaintance. That is wrong. There are no end of aspirants to discipleship, more than the members of the planetary hierarchy are able to take. The selection is largely determined by the aspirant’s extra qualifications and, above all, by his previous contacts with his teacher, contacts made while the latter was still a member of the fourth natural kingdom. When the individual has reached the verge of the causal stage (and not even one percent have of all who imagine it) he will have an opportunity to contact a disciple (by no means a “master”) and be put to tests that will demonstrate how much remains before he can enter a group without cumbering it.

³Man has no rights whatsoever to be accepted. He has to work for raising mankind to such a level that the planetary hierarchy stands a chance of reappearing.

⁴It is a debt to the collectivity he will never rid himself of, since without the collectivity he could not have developed at all. To be accepted as a disciple is what the gnosticians called to “receive grace” (an expression that has been totally misunderstood and distorted). Certainly the individual can force his way to be accepted on probation. The condition of this, however, is that he has reached such a capacity that he has acquired the twelve essential qualities without the guidance of a teacher, an achievement that at the present stage of mankind’s development can be described as superhuman.

5.26 Fictions about Esoteric Teachers

¹Theosophists appear to have got the idea that a disciple can just ask his teacher about everything he wants to know. A stupendous mistake. They seem to have misunderstood Leadbeater’s account of how the disciple can use his teacher’s subconscious to reach clarity whether his own conception is right. He is permitted to do this only during a short training phase before he is able to ascertain facts in the worlds of man by himself. If it were a normal procedure, it would conflict with the law of self-realization (saying that you must seek by yourself and find by yourself) and go against the necessary self-determination. It is the teacher that gives such facts as the disciple needs, facts which cannot be ascertained but in the fifth natural kingdom. The disciple never asks, for it is up to him to seek by himself and to find by himself. It is up to mankind to solve all the problems that can be solved in the human kingdom. And nobody will be accepted as a disciple who is unable to solve his own problems. He may receive help in the matter of other people’s problems, if they are of the kind and importance that a great amount of energy is needed.

²Theosophists believe that the Theosophical Society was the only contact the planetary hierarchy made with mankind and that their society alone possesses esoteric knowledge. This error is due to their misunderstanding of statements made by Blavatsky, who, to be sure, did not bother about exact formulations. Besides, she had a too extensive experience of being misunderstood whatever she said. This was inevitable, since the particular can be rightly understood only from the universal, and since this universal was absent, the possibilities of right conception were very scant. Regrettably, the elementary training given in the schools has not even taught pupils to see how reason works when logically comprehending things. That is why there is such disorder in intellectual life. When pupils are taught philosophy in

school they must learn about the misconceptions of reality contrived by ignorance but not what you should do to learn how to think. Typical!!

³Theosophists know nothing about societies that have teachers from the planetary hierarchy. Such societies are not intended for the general public, however. Their existence is mentioned just to assert that no society has any right to claim to be the “only right one”. Those who were once initiates and have the esoteric knowledge latently are not led astray by unwarranted claims. The uninitiated always run the risk of being overwhelmed by some false prophet.

⁴Where Besant and Leadbeater are concerned, 45-self D.K. has made a few statements that can be cited in this connection. Giving them full credit for their sincerity and capacity, he does not in the least conceal the fact that this capacity was overrated by theosophists. They were by no means as infallible as their followers claimed, and much of what they wrote is erroneous, particularly in the matter of the planetary hierarchy. He objects with vigour to the dictatorial manners exhibited by Besant. She conveyed to theosophists the notion that the “masters” desired this and that, ordered this and that, etc., which they never did and which according to the law they can never do. It wars against the law of freedom and the law of self-realization as well. The esoterician obeys his common sense only. When he receives some knowledge of the laws of life, common sense tells him that it would be foolish not to apply that knowledge. But these laws of life are no commandments or prohibitions or arbitrary inventions by a god. God is no personality. Higher natural kingdoms consist of collective beings made up of billions of individuals who in the course of evolution have reached ever higher kingdoms by rationally applying their knowledge of the laws of nature and laws of life.

⁵It was Leadbeater’s own idea to found the Liberal Catholic Church and by no means any proposal by his teacher, 44-self K.H.. It should be emphatically (cannot possibly be too often) asserted that the teachers in the planetary hierarchy never propose anything. That is quite simply “prohibited”, conflicts with the law of self-realization and the law of freedom.

5.27 Fictions about the Buddha

¹Sometimes you may hear theosophists invoking the saying of the Buddha that human reason is not able to solve the problem of existence and that it hence must remain a matter of belief and not a matter of reason. That is an instance of how anything can be misunderstood. Human reason, thrown upon its own resources, cannot solve that problem. The Buddha never said, however, that it cannot be solved if man receives sufficient facts from the planetary hierarchy. Everything recorded of what the Buddha said is what he said to the uninitiated. What he told his disciples has remained secret. The same is true of Christos.

²Blavatsky mentioned something about the “failure of the Buddha”, and Leadbeater wondered much about how this could have happened. His “failure” was that he chose to enter the planetary government instead of preparing for his entry as a disciple in the solar systemic government, as had been originally intended.

5.28 “Initiation”

¹The theosophists’ unreliable twaddle about “initiations” has been deeply regretted by the planetary hierarchy. According to the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, D.K., their conception of the symbol of “initiation” is totally erroneous. This misconception has entailed that lots of people with a very mediocre emotional and mental development have fancied they are members of the planetary hierarchy. Conceiving of initiation as a gift from the hierarchy is a big mistake.

²Strictly speaking, “initiation” means nothing but “self-realization”. It is a confirmation of the individual’s self-acquisition of essential qualities and a higher kind of consciousness, an external recognition of the status he has attained, a recognition to which the individual is

entitled thanks to his own contribution to the hierarchy's work for mankind. The same is true of discipleship. You become accepted as a disciple because you are already a disciple, because you do the work that a disciple is supposed to perform, and you do it in the way a disciple must be able to. It should be obvious that this presupposes a knowledge of reality, common sense, and work put in.

³Regrettably theosophists have discredited the concept of initiation and spread entirely erroneous ideas about the pertaining realities, which the initiate never speaks of. In so doing theosophists (the Adyar society) have harmed their own cause to a great extent. 45-self D.K. deemed it necessary to regret this aberration and to inculcate the demand for absolute silence about the disciples' personal relationships with the planetary hierarchy. Discipleship certainly is no such easy acquisition as theosophists seem to imagine. The fact that those who have conquered causal consciousness, essential consciousness, etc., are officially recognized as such in a ceremony within the hierarchy is a matter that does not in the least concern outsiders. Nobody who is a member of the planetary hierarchy speaks of this to mankind at its present stage of development. Those who give themselves out as initiates are not.

⁴What stage of development the individual has attained remains his secret. None of the many admirers of H.P.B. knew her true stage of development and what higher kinds of consciousness she had acquired. This fact should have given some food for thought to those theosophists who can think a wee bit for themselves and not just parrot others.

5.29 "Masters"

¹In theosophy, they have wrought real mischief talking about so-called masters. It is high time such things were banned. By their unreliable chatter about the "masters", the theosophists have exposed the representatives of the fifth natural kingdom to ridicule. The same can be said of their idle talk about the reappearance of the world teacher, an event of which nobody has been informed and for which we may wait at least two hundred years yet.

²Where incarnating 45-selves and higher selves are concerned, it is easily seen that they must remain unknown to the "uninitiated". If not, their work would be thwarted by the injudicious who believe themselves able to form a right idea. In that respect, even the highest mental élite lack all the qualifications.

³In theosophical literature there is much talk about esoteric "masters", and some names have been delivered up to injudiciousness. It is all right to speak about the existence of the planetary hierarchy and their work for mankind. But never speak of their individual members! Let them keep the incognito they are entitled to! Our thoughts reach them and hinder them in their work. Their private lives are taboo, a rule that also holds good about the private lives of ordinary people to those who have seen the necessity of putting an end to the universal violation of the law of freedom. The fact that mankind has not recognized this is one of the many indications of its general stage of development and its total disorientation in life. Besides, it is ridiculous to speak of individual contributions in this case, a thing that outsiders can never judge, since all the members of the planetary hierarchy collaborate and most of the work is done by lower tools, the entire chain of disciples of lower degrees. A disciple of a higher degree must not do what one of a lower degree is able to.

⁴All individuals in higher worlds are busy exploring their worlds, solving their own problems of research, performing their functions in the world machinery.

⁵Blavatsky bitterly deplored that she ever talked about "her masters". She realized too late that the knowledge of their existence would result in an endless noise, unreliable talk, and all manner of fantasy. Theosophists and others would know everything about them and proclaim their will in the manner of the theologians' talk about the "will of god".

⁶The theosophical society is at the emotional stage and reduces the esoteric facts it has received to sentimental slush with sundry speculations that have no foundation in reality.

⁷The sentimental talk about “masters” and the belief that theosophists are specially elected for discipleship have had deplorable effects. General conceit, which always believes itself ready, has resulted in thousands of fools walking around drivelling about their degrees, and so demonstrating their level of development. They have not even reached the stage of culture, which their gossip, curiosity, interest in personalities, criticism, and slander should have made clear even to simple minds. It can be safely contended that anyone who believes himself ready is not, however many dreams, revelations, visions, etc., he or she has fallen prey to.

⁸Theosophists believe that 45-selves take an interest in all their misconceptions, mistakes, and stupidities, their personal problems.

⁹Many of them, incurable victims of “astralism” (emotional illusionism), which very few are able to see through because of their belief in their own splendid qualities, meet their masters in the emotional world, not suspecting that the “masters” in question are false replicas, even though very skilfully made and masked. Nothing is easier for the black ones than duping those who think themselves ready and in the glory of the emotional world making them believe they meet all kinds of exalted spirits and have high degrees conferred on them. The world wants to be deceived. Alas, how willingly!

¹⁰No esoterician lets himself be deceived, however, by those agents of the black lodge who act as masters in order to disorient and to lead astray, as always. The esoterician has to learn that everything in the emotional world is deception, intentional or unintentional. The same old story once again. Idealism and the nimbus of sanctity are not enough. Some knowledge of reality and common sense are required as well.

¹¹Those who “witness” to their acquaintance with “masters”, speak about their spiritual status, or purport to be initiates are at best self-deceived.

¹²The planetary hierarchy is in search for disciples to have efficient workers among people and for mankind. It is the individual’s own business to reach ever higher stages by his own striving. The work people do demonstrates their insight and capacity acquired.

¹³Blavatsky as well as Besant and Leadbeater made capital mistakes because they overestimated their own capacity. They made statements on things of which not even 45-selves have certain knowledge. Blavatsky conveyed to her pupils a totally false idea of the omniscience and omnipotence of her teachers, and that fiction led the theosophists to believe superstitiously in those masters as though they were gods. It is true that the 45-selves she was acquainted with were sovereign in the worlds of man (47–49), but from there to the lowest divinity (43-self) is a considerable distance, and 43-selves have 42 worlds to explore before they have reached their final goal. Within the solar system, they are certainly in a position to contact all higher selves and to learn from them. Maitreya learns much that is part of cosmic knowledge from members of the planetary government. Occultists should refrain from speculations on the knowledge, insight, and capacity of higher selves. All such things are unreliable chatter. To be sure, the planetary hierarchy have got a lot of fun out of this infantilism. Ignorance is bound to make all concepts absolute. Only when achieving perspective consciousness does the individual understand the right meaning of concepts by seeing the relations between things.

¹⁴When 43-self Christos–Maitreya assured his initiate disciples that, upon becoming 43-selves, they would be able to do even more marvellous things than he did, this was due to the fact that even the planetary hierarchy in the course of development gains an ever deeper understanding and thereby an ever greater “power”. He himself knows more and is more able today than two thousand years ago. It should be clear from this that the concepts of omniscience and omnipotence are relative.

¹⁵The theosophists’ talk about their “masters” demonstrates that they know nothing whatever of the capacities, life-tasks, etc., of these 45-selves. The fact that these higher selves, after 1875, when according to a decision by the planetary hierarchy the esoteric knowledge

should be allowed for publication, intervened personally lending their advice and assistance to the pioneers for this knowledge did not in the least imply that they were some sort of errand boys for those who sided with these pioneers.

¹⁶Ever since the “universal brotherhood” of the Theosophical Society split in 1895, the planetary hierarchy has let the society manage its own affairs without its participation. A society that has so little understood its true mission (to preach and practise brotherhood), disputing instead about fictitious dogmas, had proved to be a definite failure. Some few individuals (such as Besant, Leadbeater and others) could still contact their teachers, but that was quite another matter. Their management of the society had to be their private business which was no concern of the planetary hierarchy. This has also been firmly asserted by the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, 45-self D.K.

¹⁷The members of the planetary hierarchy cannot directly contact others than those who have reached at least such a level of development that they can be accepted as disciples, thus those who have acquired at least the lowest kind of causal consciousness (47:3). Other people would not tolerate the vibrations of a 45-self quite simply. It always confuses the esoterically ignorant that the disciple in a new incarnation knows nothing at all of his “spiritual status” until he achieves a new contact with the knowledge he once acquired. And it depends on his etheric envelope and on the condition of his brain whether he will succeed in remembering anew everything he knows in his causal envelope.

5.30 *Final Words*

¹All esoteric knowledge of reality is made up of facts received from the planetary hierarchy. Beginning in 1875, increasingly more facts were permitted for publication. They were eventually compiled into systems by a number of writers, Blavatsky, Sinnett, Besant, and Leadbeater, in the years 1875–1920. These systems are nowadays obsolete, due to the great number of new facts that were added in the years 1920–1950, correcting earlier misconceptions, which were inevitable due to the scarcity of facts. It is true of all the writers mentioned that they obtained their facts directly from the planetary hierarchy, which is not the case where other occult writers are concerned. However, even the systems of the former have been considered to be so deficient that the secretary of the planetary hierarchy (45-self D.K.) expressly states that the occult books published before 1920 should be relegated to the archives and be regarded as historical documents only. Their lack of facts makes them unreliable. Downright errors are to be found in them.

²The “esoteric” orders or societies that came into existence between the years 1875 and 1920 are characterized by dogmatism and diverse doctrines and, according to D.K., will soon have seen their best days. Those of their members who have common sense, perspectives, and a right orientation find their ways to “free” societies without any organization, only a list of members to enable them to find one another. They disregard differences of opinion in order to work the more efficiently for the realization of brotherhood, which is right now the one essential thing. Those who work for such aims have a hard task. Their work is seemingly destructive, since they try to liberate mankind from its disorienting ideologies. They stand alone and meet with little appreciation. The goal they have before their eyes is the reappearance of the planetary hierarchy, which is not possible as long as hatred reigns hindering the establishment of right human relations.

³Through their many tools (H.P.B., Leadbeater, and Alice A. Bailey in particular) the planetary hierarchy have given mankind so many facts that it can wander the path of self-realization itself by the aid of the Pythagorean hylozoic knowledge system (the absolute knowledge system). It is high time mankind were self-determined and tried by its own work to acquire the qualities and abilities that are necessary to enter the fifth natural kingdom.

Endnotes by the Translator

To 5.5. Johannes Hohlenberg. Danish painter and writer, 1881–1960. His book *Yoga i dens betydning for Europa* (Yoga in its Significance for Europe), was first published in Danish 1916 and in Swedish in 1920. It does not appear to have been translated into English.

To 11.7 Quoted from H. P. Blavatsky, *Isis Unveiled*, vol. II, p. 610.

“The *Chiefs* want a ‘Brotherhood of Humanity,’ a real Universal Fraternity started; an institution which would make itself known throughout the world and arrest the attention of the highest minds.” The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett, Letter No. 6, December 10, 1880.

To 22.3 This statement by H.P.B. is to be found in *The Secret Doctrine*, volume I, page 520 of the internet edition.

To 24.5 “Where the triads are concerned, only 45-self D.K. gave out the necessary facts about them after 1920.” This statement by Laurency may puzzle readers of the books of Alice A. Bailey, since where the triads are concerned she uses the terminology established by Besant and Leadbeater and criticized here by H.T.L. However, a close reading of some passages of *A Treatise on Cosmic Fire* (CF) makes it clear that the idea of three atomic triads was alive to the true author of this text, that is, D.K., not A.A.B. For an in-depth discussion of these issues, see my paper “Some Problems of Man’s Consciousness Development in the Alice A. Bailey Presentation of Esoterics and Their Hylozoic Solution”, which is posted on my website, www.hylozoik.se

To 24.6 “...certain esoteric writers do not clearly distinguish between these two individuals.” This has reference to statements in two books by Alice A. Bailey. The “Ego” is not omniscient or omnipotent in *Letters on Occult Meditation*, p. 27, where it is said, “... the Ego is becoming ever more conscious on his own plane, and ever more interested – *via the permanent atoms*, – in the life of the Personality.” Contrast this with three statements in *A Treatise on White Magic*, where the omniscience (p. 291) and omnipotence (pp. 153, 231) of the “Soul” are unequivocally proclaimed. The terms “Ego” and “Soul” are used interchangeably in Alice A. Bailey’s books.

The above text constitutes the essay Theosophy by Henry T. Laurency.

The essay is part of the book *Knowledge of Life Three* by Henry T. Laurency. Translated from the Swedish by Lars Adelskog.

Copyright © 2006 by the Henry T. Laurency Publishing Foundation.