



teozofija v sloveniji



Alexis Dolgorukii

WHAT IS THEOSOPHY: A PROCESS OR RELIGION?

Republished from the website www-parascience.org
alexis dolgorukii © 1998

Prispevki k raziskovanju zgodovine Teozofskega gibanja - v izvirniku

First let me make it absolutely clear what exactly it is I am talking about. I am talking about “theosophy” the thing itself, and not some or another organization misappropriating the name. I am talking about “theosophy” which is the speculative philosophical approach to the knowledge of all things that was first made famous in the 3rd century of the common era in Alexandria in Egypt, and of which the primary purpose, beyond the acquisition of knowledge, was to attempt to fend off the conquest of the world by ignorance and superstition, by which I mean to describe the Judeo-Christian world view.

Now I most distinctly do NOT mean the various Theosophical societies extant today, all of which are distinctly manifestations of the “religious urge,” and which therefore, are entirely dichotomous to the views and opinions and speculations of Plato, and both his precursors, and his Neo-Platonic successors.

Whether they are oriented towards a combination of Tibetan Tantric Buddhism and Brahmanism as is the Original Theosophical Society (Adyar) and its various National sub-sections, or towards “New Age Christianity” as is the Group that has evolved out of the writings of Alice Bailey (a position towards which the American Section of the Adyar Society is turning) all of the institutional Theosophies are basically religions with bodies of doctrines that are entirely dogmatic in their approach, and relatively rigid hierarchical World-views. These hierarchical views are far more consonant with authoritarian totalitarianism than they are with the nature of theosophy as it was in its third century format. The History of the various Theosophical Societies, and those of some of their more important leaders, shows an undeniable affinity towards various totalitarian-authoritarian political movements, such as German National socialism and Italian Fascism.

This association with Totalitarianism is particularly true of Annie Besant and Sri Ram and violently true of Charles Webster Leadbeater, who can only be described as both “The Evil Genius,” and the “dark nemesis” of the theosophical movement.

In this connection, as we are dealing with an organization whose motto is: “**THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH**”, perhaps it is time for some unpleasant truths in this regard to be

told. Perhaps it is time, and far past time, to discuss the faults and flaws of the Institution as an Institution, and then to go on and discuss its philosophical misalignment. In the course of determining whether theosophy is a process or a religion, we will be forced to examine the history of the Theosophical Society as that history very clearly contradicts both the motto of the society, and its famed “three objects.” After all, if “Universal Brotherhood” is your primary goal, totalitarianism is hardly the road to travel to reach it. Those a pretty strong statements and so now it behooves me to prove them.

Not too long ago, a correspondent of mine asked me a question regarding Adolf Hitler and Helena Petrovna Blavatsky. The correspondent had seen a television documentary which strongly implied a connection between Blavatsky and Hitler. I too, saw the documentary in question: “The Occult History of The Third Reich,” and like almost all television “documentaries” it was shallow and superficial and wrong on most counts. The television program in question is not the only source of this rumor, there are a number of books, some of them, not necessarily hostile to theosophy *per se*, that nevertheless echo the charge. Originally I rejected the charge entirely, but now after extensive research on the matter, I am forced to conclude that while there is no direct connection between my Cousin Yelena and Totalitarian Philosophy, there is an indirect possibility that she may have influenced certain Fascist philosophers in a direction she never intended, and there is a quite clear direct connection between The theosophical Society (as it came to be after Yelena’s passing) and both contemporary totalitarian elements such as National Socialism in Germany, and the Fascist Movement in Italy as well as with continuing totalitarian and hierarchical elements in society today. My research indicates that the primary channel for the connection between National Socialism and Theosophy was Charles Webster Leadbeater and his various closest associates and followers.

Now let’s get down to a less superficial discussion of the subject. First was there a “connection” between Hitler and HPB? No, of course not, she died in 1891 and he was born in 1889, it’s the same as with Hitler’s alleged connection with Richard Wagner who died in 1883. Hitler liked Wagner’s music, he also liked Franz Lehar’s music and Anton Bruckner was his “favorite” composer, but that is entirely irrelevant to Hitler’s activities as Head of the German State.

As far as I know the first intimations of a connection between Blavatsky’s book “The Secret Doctrine,” and the Nazis Racial Theories were made in a book called “**MORNING OF THE MAGICIANS**”, written by Louis Pauwels and Jacques Bergier (Published in France in 1960, and in soft-cover in The USA by Avon in 1964). These two investigators alleged, probably not incorrectly, that the “Secret Doctrine” and other Theosophical Writings had to some degree influenced the Nazis, especially in regard to their racial theories.

Now, I have two questions, which I deem of importance to ask: 1. If Hitler was an “avid admirer” of Madame Blavatsky, and therefore by inference of Theosophy as the Television program alleged, why was the Theosophical society outlawed in Germany shortly after Hitler’s accession to power? 2. If Hitler was “inspired” by Theosophy, why is it so many Theosophists were sent to Concentration Camps? I think it is pretty clear that neither Big “T” Theosophy or little “t” theosophy were anything that the National Socialists admired. I do however think that some of the people around Hitler used some of the ideas in “The Secret Doctrine” in their formulation of the Nazi racial philosophy.

On the other hand, it would be completely inaccurate to deny that any tie exists between “Theosophy,” by which I mean Institutional Theosophy, and The Nazis in Germany and the Fascists in Italy.

My research thus far indicates that it is not merely a distant and abstract philosophical tie, but an actual “overlap” of members. I do, however, believe that the average Theosophist was utterly ignorant of this connection and would have been horrified by it. Blavatsky herself was a social radical and revolutionary who was a close associate of Garibaldi's, and based both upon her personal writings, and what I know about her from private sources, she would have been a rabid anti-Nazi. But she was dead a long time before the Nazis began to appear. There were, however other important Theosophists we were tied to organizations which were clearly connected to the Nazis.

Let's look at Hitler's “sources.” It's pretty clear that his primary source was Friedrich Nietzsche's “Übermensch” or “Superman” theories, or more accurately, Nietzsche's sister's version of them.

But Hitler was also very heavily influenced by the work of Guido von List, who had founded a Pan-Germanic Political faction with occult roots in 1909. There is no question but that von List, and through him Hitler himself, was heavily influenced by both The Golden Dawn and The Secret Doctrine. Both Guido von List and Adolf Hitler followed in a direct line of descent a tradition founded in “The Vehm” which was an Occult group active in Austria-Bavaria in the mid 19th century, but which (as is usual with so-called “Occult” groups) claimed an entirely unproven (and unprovable) origin in the middle ages. It was apparently involved in many totally illegal activities including ritual murder. The Vehm amassed a huge fortune which enabled it to fund a great many people and groups that, for humankind's sake, would have been far better had they not been encouraged in this way.

The Vehm apparently transmogrified into a number of other organizations. One was the so-called “Free Masonic Order of the Golden Centurium” which was an openly Demonological Group. Now, by “demonological” I do not mean to say that they engaged in dispassionate research into the nature of the spirits called “Demons,” for that is not what they were or did. They were anything BUT dispassionate. These people, totally wrongly, believed in “Demons” as extremely powerful agents of Evil, and worshiped them in fashions that appealed to the warped minds of those engaged in, what is only, and can never be more than, a phantasm of sick minds. The Cosmos contains many non-physical intelligences, but it does NOT contain “Demons.”

The Vehm was also the source of another organization, this one particularly significant to our discussion because of the later work and connections of some of its adherents. It was “**THE ORDER OF SATURN**” (Saturnian Order) and it was founded by a man named Joseph Maria Hoene-Wronski (1776-1853) who was the essential and basic teacher of a man named Alphonse Louis Constant but who is known to us primarily as Eliphas Levi and who is the most important source of Kabalistic teachings in the modern world. He was a close personal friend of Madame Blavatsky.

The relationship between Benjamin Constant and Joseph Maria Hoene-Wronski is one that is particularly troublesome to me personally as Benjamin Constant was such a good friend to Yelena Petrovna. Now, I can see no evidence that Constant was tainted by his connection with Hoene-Wronski or that he was a member of the Order of Saturn, but then members of that group kept their memberships and their activities strictly secret. It seems to me that it would be extremely peculiar for a man so attached to Judaic Esotericism as to change his name to Eliphas Levi to be part of the virulent anti-Semitism that was a characteristic of these groups and especially of The Saturnian Order and its outgrowths. It is, however, one suspicious element.

However, in her life Yelena Petrovna associated with many different people from many different backgrounds and philosophies, it's how she learned as much as she did. I know, that every word she ever wrote, and every word she ever spoke, both privately and publically, gave a clear indication that she would have been adamantly opposed to everything the Saturnian Order stood for.

There was also a Group, very closely connected with, if not almost identical to, "The Order of Saturn," called "The Vril" (a term for the Cosmic Harmonic or Qi, which was definitely "borrowed" from *The Secret Doctrine*) and then you find, as an outgrowth of "The Vril," ... "The Order of The Illuminati" (It had absolutely nothing at all to do with a much earlier organization of the same name, founded by Adam Wiesshaupt in 1776 in conjunction with, and supportive of, The American Revolution, which was distinctly radical-liberal and was closely associated with the Association of Adepts)) whose founder was a man named Theodore Reuss, who went on to found the OTO (Order of the Temples of The East) and this is the organization that gives us some surprising connections.

Not only was it the source of Aleister Crowley's Order of Thelema (originally a Saturnian concept) but Win Wescott was closely associated with it. He was the Founder of "The Order of The Golden Dawn" which had so many Theosophists and ex-theosophists as members (and Aleister Crowley as well) that it has always been considered an outgrowth of the Theosophical Society. That idea, by the way, is both true and untrue, "The Golden Dawn" would never have come into existence without the cross-fertilization provided by The Theosophical Society's "Esoteric Section" and the O.T.O. Among the other important people associated with the OTO was Dr. Rudolf Steiner, the General Secretary of the Theosophical Society in Germany, who went on to found the Anthroposophical Movement. He was, by the way, considered by Hitler to be a major enemy. And lastly, the most important connection as it concerns the Theosophical society: Dr. Franz Hartmann who was a very important theosophist indeed, having been an associate of Blavatsky's and also a very close associate of both Annie Besant and Charles Webster Leadbeater.

Now, there is some very clear evidence that Annie Besant was associated with Dr. Baron, Julius D'Evola (who was charged as a War Criminal in 1945) and through D'Evola with Benito Mussolini, "Il Duce". She arranged for Mussolini to write articles for her magazine "Star of The Herald of the East," which was the organ of the group designed to support the "Messiahship" of Jiddu Krishnamurti (who had absolutely nothing to do with all this as he was just a child). Copies are on file in both the Library of the American Theosophical Society in Olcott, Wheaton, Illinois and in The Library in Adyar India. I am sure they are also on file elsewhere. But Mussolini's articles can be read by anyone who chooses to look them up. This is not a connection I think healthy for The Theosophical Society.

Considering Annie Besant's immense authoritarianism, one is forced to wonder what other qualities she shared with the Fascists? There is another very questionable connection here. Julius D'Evola was the primary disciple of Rene Guenon who wrote a book so critical of theosophy that it almost completely destroyed The Theosophical Movement in France. What was Annie Besant doing being a close associate of D'Evola who was the closest associate of a man who was one of the theosophical movement's greatest enemies. Why too, were other very close associates of both D'Evola and Guenon, like Alain Danielou and Raymond Burnier (ex husband of the present International President of The Theosophical Society) so closely identified with Theosophy and Adyar in particular?

I have long been wondering how Annie Besant, the friend (Mistress for 12 years) of George Bernard Shaw, co-founder of the Fenian socialist Movement, and famous Liberal, became associated with Julius D'Evola who was a very High Ranking Fascist, a close associate of Rene Guenon who was a principle enemy of the theosophical movement, and like so many other people associated with Guenon, a homosexual, and like many of his associates deeply involved in anti-altruistic magic. These people are not viewed by me as antithetical because of their homosexuality, after all I am myself a homosexual, but because of the character of their sexual activities. Sexual Magick is a terribly abusive, oppressive, and harmful practice. It was the primary feature of the Saturnian Order and regularly included ritual murder. In many cases this practice included the sexual abuse of children (both heterosexual and Homosexual in nature) this is unforgivable by any standards, and anyone who so indulges the bestial side of human nature is worthy of the strongest condemnation.

I'd really like to think that Dr. Besant was a dupe, an innocent dupe. But that's really hard to swallow when one remembers that she was clearly one of the most brilliant woman of her age. Now she was clearly a dupe of Charles Webster Leadbeater, there's absolutely no question in my mind as to that, but that concerned psychic phenomena, something with which she was totally unfamiliar. Fascism, on the other hand was a political and social theory and that was a subject with which she was familiar and expert. There is an explanation though, and that is she was taken in by the Hierarchical aspects of Charles Leadbeater's fantasies and saw them brought into reality by totalitarian governmental systems. After all when one has accepted the totally authoritarian aspects of the Hierarchical system represented by "The Masters," one has already accepted the basic premise upon which totalitarianism is based.

There's a name which turns up with amazing and dismaying frequency in the biographies of many important members of the Thule Group and The Nazi Party. That same name also turns up with amazing and horrifying frequency in the biographies of many prominent Theosophists. That name is the aforementioned Theodore Reuss, who founded the so-called "Order of Illuminatii." Reuss was also one of the founders of the Egyptian Rite Masonic Orders (probably spurious in nature and kind) which eventually merged into the OTO. We already know that Reuss was associated with Franz Hartmann and Rudolf Steiner but now I find there was another OTO connection. Both Bishops James Wedgewood and George Arundale were members of the faction of the OTO connected with the Saturnian Order and regularly engaged in sexual magic and child molestation. They were the people who connected Besant with D'Evola.

Now, at the same time, there was a man named Vyvyan Deacon, who was a spiritualist medium and a descendent of Robert Browning the Poet. He was associated with CWL in the early days of CWL's psychic career, Deacon was also the head of the OTO in Australia when Leadbeater was in residence there, and had a "retreat house" outside of Sydney near where Leadbeater also had a summer residence. Vyvyan Deacon and James Wedgewood were the links joining Leadbeater with the history of sexual magic in the West. Deacon was a member of the T.S., the E.S., the order of the Star, and The Old Catholic Church (which became the LCC). He was, as I observed earlier, a leading member of the German O.T.O. and the Order of Saturn.

This is a mass of connected and very curious information. It will, as I said earlier take me a long time to completely "make sense" out of it. But I do think there are connections established which should

never have happened. I started this because I was utterly horrified by any implication of a connection between Theosophy and Nazism/Fascism as I bear a tremendous animus against those organizations and the people in them.

When the Allied Armies entered the Concentration Camps at the end of World War II, my Father was with them, and, fortunately or unfortunately as the case may be, I was with him. I was 10 years old. I will never in this life forgive the Nazis/Fascists for what I saw there. Nor will I ever forgive the Germans who were adults during that period.

I certainly can't say that a connection has been proved without any doubt, but I also cannot say that the connection can be disproved without a doubt.

There is a real "mystery" here and I intend eventually to get to the very bottom of it. But I am including what I have so far uncovered in this essay because it is so very contradictory to the purpose and goals of the original programme of the theosophical movement.

This authoritarian approach is very clearly demonstrated by the administrations of Adyar itself, and by its American Section which is rapidly turning into a totalitarian state under the dictation of John Algeo who is clearly moving his section in a strongly Judeo-Christian oriented direction. This is very clearly demonstrated by the catalog of the Quest Publishing Company which is full of "New Age" nonsense, and Christian propaganda. This is also very clearly demonstrated by all of these Institutional Theosophical groups attempts to control the dietary and sexual discretionary liberty of their memberships. I am currently counseling several young people from various countries whose lives have been totally harmed by the puritanical nonsense preached by elder theosophists who got them early enough in life to harm them.

When an individual gives up any of their personal choices at the behest of a group, they are, in essence, giving up the right to any personal liberty at all. This kind of control is the worst aspect of all religion. What has happened, unfortunately, is that: slowly but surely, since the time the Original Program of the Theosophical Society was totally changed by the removal of the Society and its founders to India, and even more so since the death of the founders; the various Theosophical Societies have become nothing else but cults. I think that by this point in time, it's pretty clear to almost anyone that cults are, to say the least, pernicious.

Religion has absolutely nothing to do with the nature of theosophy except as one of the many belief-structures theosophy was intended to comparatively evaluate. It is absolutely clear to anyone with any sense of history at all, that theosophy was intended as a counterpoise to religion. To the original 3rd century founders of the field of totally intellectual investigation and comparison and evaluation called theosophy, and in fact, in the very first years of its 19th century incarnation as well, it was simply an iconoclastic catalyst. Its goal was not simply to teach people how to think for themselves as regards the subject of speculative metaphysical philosophy, but to provide them with a methodology for so doing. This methodology is most clearly delineated by the "Three Objects" of the 19th Century Society.

Let's take a moment to look at those "three objectives."

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH!

“SATYAT-NASTI-PARO-DHARMA ... - There is no religion higher than truth”. That is the motto that drew me to theosophy in the first place. It certainly wasn't my relationship to Yelena Blavatskaya, for while I had heard about her from my elders it was mostly in the context of her being the “family black sheep and scandal.” But as they say “No one is a prophet in their own family” (please forgive the paraphrase).

By the time (26 years ago) I “discovered” the motto of the theosophical movement, I had long since discarded religion as anything but humanity's worst oppressor, mankind's worst enemy. So, when I found the motto: “There is no religion higher than truth,” it stunned me, and, as I believed I had already spent most of my life in an excruciating search for precisely that “truth”; I was instantly fascinated.

Probably the second oldest question humans have asked is “What is truth”? Not what is true? But what is “TRUTH,” the thing in and of itself? Well, I have come to view it as a euphemism for “REALITY,” and when I encountered the motto of the theosophical movement I intuitively felt that here was something that could help me to reach a vantage point where perhaps I could perceive some idea of what reality actually was, a place to stand where I could learn what was “true” and what was “not true.”

The oldest question of all the many questions that humans have asked is: “What is going to happen to me when I die”? It seemed to me that theosophy as a process, could answer that question too. In fact, it seemed to me that the theosophical process was far more likely to achieve that goal than either “religion” or “pure science.” The reason for that is this: religion, historically always used the fear of death as a way to force people to accept its own views on the topic which were largely based on ignorance and whose motivation was largely the attainment of power and control. For the truth about the subject actually liberates people from the oppression of religion.

Science is prevented from answering the question, as the truth of both the greater reality and the post-mortem state is not in any way amenable to the “scientific method.” But that is probably going to change as Particle Theory and Quantum Theory and the contemporary cosmology that accompanies those disciplines, forces science to re-examine its perceptions of reality.

Now, the other important thing about the theosophical movement is its “Three Objects,” three different venues for the expansion of one's consciousness and awareness. In the light of an avowed dedication to the fact that “There is no religion higher than truth” the greatest thing about theosophy in my eyes is the fact that the three objects are pursued in the light of that motto. Not “religiously” but in the clear-eyed search for “truth.” When one uses the three objects as a methodology to seek out the “truth” of what the nature of reality, the nature of the human condition, really is, or at least, really may be, in a way which rejects the religious urges that have always harmed the human race, one has the potential to really make the world a better place than it is, or at least far better than it has been in the past.

Today, however, there has been a parting of the ways, and Institutional Theosophy has become a religion based on Yelena Blavatskaya's writings viewed as “revealed truth” and that is pure religion, and ONLY religion, and nothing else. Because of that, theosophy has completely lost its potential as a process productive of significant growth. When Institutional Theosophy became a religion, that motto became meaningless and misleading. If “there is no religion higher than truth”? What then is a

religion that falsely calls itself Theosophy, and believes its Core Doctrines (Dogmas) are revealed truths?

They falsely deny that they have become a religion, but they believe in revealed truths from the “Masters of the Wisdom” and they are as authoritarian as any Church, so their denials are like bubbles in the wind, soon evaporated.

I will discuss each of the “Three Objects” in the light of how one proceeds in reaching out to that “object” using the motto “There’s no religion higher than truth” as one’s methodology.

THE THREE "OBJECTS" OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY:

1. To form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of Race, Creed, Sex, Caste, or color.
2. To encourage the study of comparative religion, philosophy, and science.
3. To investigate unexplained laws of nature and the powers latent in man.

As I see it “objects” mean to say; “objectives,” or “goals,” or “purposes,” and when these three sub-objectives have been gained the over-all “goal” of the theosophical movement, which is so clearly expressed by its motto, will have been gained. As it is for the theosophical movement, so too, it is for the individual theosophist.

As Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya constantly reiterated: **“THEOSOPHIST IS, WHO THEOSOPHY DOES”**.

THE FIRST OBJECT:

TO FORM A NUCLEUS OF THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY, WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF RACE, CREED, SEX, CASTE, OR COLOR.

I must commence by saying that to me, this object alone makes the theosophical movement worth saving. It does not however, make the Theosophical Society “worth saving” because, as it has manifested since the early 20th century, The Theosophical Society has lost all comprehension of what this “object” means to say, and has lost all perception of what the goals of this object may be.

How so? What do I mean to say by those words? What I mean to say is this: unfortunately, the first object, like all too many theosophical precepts have been made to be entirely hypothetical. The contemporary Theosophical Society is an elitist, exclusive, excluding organization which has entirely mistaken the meaning of the word “nucleus.” They have made the error of assuming that THEY were the “nucleus,” and that simply being members of The theosophical Society and calling each other “Brother” and “Sister” was all they needed to do in that context. While within their own “inner circle” they perhaps practiced a policy of relatively few “distinctions,” they do not extend that point of view to humanity as a whole. To make matters worse, far worse, their “inner circle” the so-called “Esoteric Section” takes “Theosophical Core Dogma” as their “creed” and relegates to outer darkness all those who do not share that dogma with them. They are also extremely puritanical, and as a result they are sexist in the extreme. They are, in fact, everything the theosophical movement was established to combat. They are what makes of the Theosophical Society, a Cult!

But now, let’s take a look at the object itself:

TO FORM A NUCLEUS OF THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY, WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF RACE, CREED, SEX, CASTE, OR COLOR.

The language of any period reflects the attitudes, values, and preoccupations of that period. The language used by those who founded the Theosophical Movement in 1875 may be one of the major problems confronting those who are working in the field today, and it is especially problematic to those young people who are first coming into touch with theosophy.

The 19th century dealt in “black and white,” in absolutes, in absolutely precise definitions of things such as “right and wrong.” The 19th century was totally optimistic, self-assured, and absolutely certain it knew all things. We have come now to the 21st century. The 21st century does not think in terms of “black and white,” it thinks entirely in terms of “shades of gray.” The 21st century comes very close to an absolute denial of the very existence of “black and white,” and correctly so. The 21st century is extremely wary of precise definitions of anything because it knows from experience that definitions of things, and identification of things, change with terrifying rapidity. The 21st century is afraid to define things in terms of “right and wrong,” what it really feels better about doing is defining things in relativist terms, once again correctly so. The 21st century is almost totally pessimistic, and given the history of the human race during the intervening period of time (1875-1997) The 21st century isn't sure of anything that it may know, and isn't sure it knows anything. Given the information and knowledge “explosion” of the past 50 years, that too is hardly an unreasonable attitude. The people of the 19th century and those of us who are about to enter the 21st century have so very little in common as to history and attitude that language, instead of being a tool for communications, is rather a barrier to them.

And that affects theosophy and theosophists.

A word in the paragraph that presents the “First Object” which is more than slightly problematical is “Brotherhood.” You will notice that it is capitalized. The 19th century tended to capitalize things, and that entailed a certain breathless attitude which was unfortunate then, and is rightly seen to be impossible today. But today, in the 21st century (well almost) an awful lot of people tend to find that term not simply off-putting but very insulting. One doesn't have to be what Rush Limbaugh calls a “femi-nazi” to see why they find it insulting. There are two kinds of humans (well, at least superficially there are), males are, and can be “Brothers,” but woman cannot. Woman are and can be, “Sisters,” and of course, a man cannot. But where does a “Universal Brotherhood” leave women? It leaves them nowhere at all.

Now I am certain that there was nothing intentionally exclusionary meant by the use of the term but, that was the 19th century, those people thought in those terms. This is the 21st century, we know that although some still do think in those terms, none of us should. Today the only possible replacement for what the 19th century meant when they said “Universal Brotherhood,” would be “World-wide Human Amity.” These are positive changes that can and should be made. You will notice I exchanged the word “universal” for “world-wide,” because “world-wide” or “planetary” defines the parameters in which humanity can effect things. “Universal Brotherhood” is a term with absolutely no real meaning, while “world-wide” or “planetary” does have meaning. The “Universe” is an immense venue to which the population of this planet have only the most limited access. I think it wise to confine our efforts to that venue in which we have some possibility of success.

Semantics aside, one can hardly take exception at the first object, the sentiments are admirable, but it no longer says what it did in 1875. In a way, while things are hardly “coming up roses” for the human race, it’s come a long way since 1875.

Adolph Hitler performed one major positive service for humanity. He, certainly without any express intention, made it clear to most, but not all, of humanity that as regards any religious, racial, ethnic, or creed-based hatred, while people may have these beliefs and feelings, it is not permissible to act on them in the world today.

Racial, ethnic, and sectarian biases may in fact be the most intractable problem the Human Race has to face. But while, in even the long run, biases may be almost impossible to eradicate, humanity can surely eradicate the public expression of those biases. Hitler’s (and Germany’s) treatment of the Jews was so unspeakably obscene that it permanently made such treatment of anybody, no matter who or what they may be, almost entirely unthinkable, although Jugoslavia and Northern Ireland and certainly Ruanda are clear exceptions to that idea. It shows we still have a very long way to go.

Today, thanks to Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, and Nelson Mandela and so very many others, racism is on the retreat. It is clearly not anywhere near defeated or dead but it is no longer respectable and everyone knows it!

What is called “sexism” is also on the retreat, and being a male chauvinist is a major cause for embarrassment. Except perhaps in certain locker rooms where emotionally immature males of various ages tend to congregate. But even there, its expression is furtive. Sexism, as regards women, isn’t entirely gone, but it’s going, it’s going! But another form of “sexism,” homophobia, has a long way to go before it’s truly “on its way out,” and homophobia is every bit as evil as misogyny. Both homophobia and misogyny are largely justified by religion, but theosophy is supposed to be religiously unaffiliated or unsectarian. The fact that it isn’t free of religion and religious mores is clearly shown by the fact that the “Inner Circle” of the Theosophical Society (Adyar) is clearly and unabashedly homophobic.

But then again, it’s also unabashedly sexophobic, which is a manifestation of psychosis.

Now, were it not so entirely negative, it would be amusing because the Theosophical Society’s history is what it is because of the contributions (both very positive and very negative) of homosexuals.

Yelena Blavatskaya was a lesbian, and a cross dressing Lesbian at that. Her contributions were both positive and vital. After all, there would be no theosophical movement were it not for her.

The negative contributions, and they were extremely negative indeed, as they were what changed theosophy into a Religion, were those of Charles Webster Leadbeater, George Arundale, and James Wedgewood, the three self-appointed Bishops who can be said to have set institutional Theosophy on the road to self-destruction. All three of these men, apart from being the founders of the Liberal Catholic Church which they made an intrinsic part of the Theosophical society (Adyar), were members of an organization devoted to Ceremonial Magic, The O.T.O.; which was connected very closely to the Thule Group which was an arm of the Nazi Party, and to the Order of Saturn, which was a ceremonial magical circle devoted to rites which were focused on sexual magic and human sacrifice.

“Caste” of course, is, in our times, totally “out the window” there is only one country where the word “caste” had meaning and it is now totally illegal in India, though of course, hardly non-existent.

So really, what does the “First Object” really mean to say in the 21st century? It means to say:

1. TO FORM A NUCLEUS OF PLANETARY, MULTI-CULTURAL, MULTIRACIAL, INTERDEPENDENCE AND MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY BETWEEN ALL SENTIENT BEINGS, ABSOLUTELY REGARDLESS OF ANY KIND OF DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS.

That says exactly the same thing, but in doing so it neither offends anyone or refers to evils long past, just gone, or in the process of going. Actually, I rather think it has much more to say, and far more intrinsic validity than the original version.

Now, I suppose the logical question at this point is: How does the “first Object” contribute to the process of self-development that theosophy really is? Well, to me, at least, it’s pretty self-explanatory. Look at what the “First Object” (as amended) says. Do you not realize what becoming aware of even the possibility of “planetary interdependence” and “mutual responsibility between all sentient beings” does to an individual’s consciousness? When an individual carries their quest for that reality which is “Higher than religion” to a point at which the relationship between all sentiences becomes a viable perception, then that awareness certainly “contributes to the process of self-development that theosophy really is.” No one can come to this level of deep awareness, both of “The Nature of The Human Condition” and “The Nature of the Greater Reality,” without a tremendously thorough effort to complete the tasks implied by the other two “Objects.”

Next, let’s examine those other “two Objects”:

2. TO ENCOURAGE THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY, AND SCIENCE.

Because of language, this “object” seems to say “To encourage the study of comparative religion, comparative philosophy, and comparative science.” But it doesn’t really, nor did it then. It is meant that theosophy is an inter-disciplinary discipline in which the members are encouraged to compare religions with one another, and to compare religions with philosophies, and compare both religions and philosophies with science.

Of course, science wasn’t really much in the 19th century. We all of us know that the greatest majority of scientists who ever lived are alive right now. Where modern science differs from 19th century science is that in the 19th century scientists, for the most part, were pompous bores who were absolutely sure they knew absolutely everything. There was a particularly typical French Academician, Auguste Comte (the founder of Positivism), who said (and acted upon it by utterly refusing to read anything that was produced contemporaneously) that: “There is nothing left to learn.” Boy, was he ever wrong!

Today our scientists are fully aware that they’ve grabbed only the “tip of the iceberg.” The more they learn, the more they realize they know nothing! And thanks to Werner Heisenberg, they aren’t even sure they can know anything.

H.P.B. made it very clear in her own times that it was the divorce between religion and science in the third and fourth centuries of the common era that was the cause of most of humanity’s troubles. The religion she was referring to was pre-Christian Paganism which was not at all hostile to learning and thought, as its conqueror, Christianity was. She also made it clear that one of the primary goals of theosophy was to re-marry science and religion. Needless to say, the child of that marriage would be a philosophy!

It would need to be so because as it stands today, “science” and “religion” are entirely dichotomous. Now it is absolutely clear that “the study of comparative religion” does **NOT** mean to “start a religion.”

The comparative study of religion leads only to two clear realizations. The first of these is that all religions have very much in common. The second realization is that none of that commonality is good, or humane, or beneficial to human evolution of consciousness. It is absolutely clear to me that the deeper one studies religions on a comparative basis, the less religious one becomes. There’s a third realization too, and that is that religion has absolutely nothing at all to do with spirituality. And that is why religions and the religious are so entirely hostile to theosophy *per se*. It is quite distinctly true that the various Institutionalized “Theosophies” are utterly hostile to “theosophy” *per se*.

One of the things I find really awe inspiring is that they had almost no “science” at all to study in 1875! While we, modern theosophists, we have far too much science for any one human being to encompass in even a life-time of study! The H.P.B. of pre-1878 would certainly have been joyously excited by that! And so, in view of both modern language requirements and contemporary realities, I’d change the second “Object” to:

2. TO ENCOURAGE AND FACILITATE THE COMPARATIVE AND EVALUATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS, PHILOSOPHIES, AND THE SCIENCES, ON AN INTER- DISCIPLINARY BASIS.

Once again, I have to say that the modern version says more to a contemporary person and it also describes what we, as theosophists can do, and should want to do. That is if we are interested in going back to the original program which Blavatsky and her associates intended to be the purpose of the movement.

Next:

3. TO INVESTIGATE UNEXPLAINED LAWS OF NATURE AND THE POWERS LATENT IN MAN.

This one is currently the “theosophical problem child.” The current leadership are terrified of this one! But let’s look at its language first and then I will talk at length on what I perceive to be the causes of that terror.

Linguistically, the time that has passed since 1875 has served to make this sentence utterly meaningless and, in fact, funny, to most intelligent people. This is so because in 21st century idiom it says absolutely nothing at all. “Unexplained Laws of Nature,” in our times, is a completely ridiculous concept. We have learned so much since Einstein’s introduction of his “General Theory of Relativity” that the idea of something called a “Law” of nature is deemed as quaint, dated, and more than faintly ridiculous.

We are now coming to understand that in “nature,” or perhaps better stated, in “reality” (such as it may be) there are perhaps certain principles, but they are never invariables. “Laws” are, of course, total invariables. We are beginning to surmise that in reality everything is variable. That phrase could only have emanated from the 19th century, it is virtually meaningless in the 21st century.

Next, we come to an even more importantly damaging phrase and the conception that goes with it. "The Powers Latent in Man"! It's completely obvious that the founders intended meaning for that phrase was "The Powers Latent in Humankind," but today people just don't feel comfortable with the word "man," unless a particular "Man" is what is being discussed.

It may seem extreme, but it is in fact little things like using the word "man," when "human" is meant, that put people off! The other problem is the use of the word "powers," that word was silly in the 19th century and it's far sillier today. There is an idea implicit in the word "power" which has nothing at all to do with theosophy, or with the evolution of consciousness; which is, when all is said and done, what theosophy is "all about," in fact, it's what everything is all about.

The early 20th century, and the entire history of humankind before that time should have served to convince humanity that "power" and "powers" are truly "dirty words." It is the mind-set that accompanies the word "power" that has caused theosophy to theologize itself and to create a totally imaginary hierarchy to go with that "power." The ideas and ideals that go along with the words "power" and "hierarchy" were intrinsic to the 19th century, but they are utterly antithetical to the 21st century. The Theosophical Movement that is trying, not too hard though, to survive into the 21st century, is what astrology buffs would call "Piscean" in the extreme. People need to understand that "Hierarchy" is out! "Power" is also out! In order to be meaningful and relevant to people of the last part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, this "object" needs to be restated something like this:

3. TO EXPERIMENT AND RESEARCH THE REALITY OF THE LIFE EXPERIENCE, THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PHYSICAL AND THE EXTRA-PHYSICAL, AND THE PARAPHYSICAL ABILITIES WHICH ARE LATENT IN ALL SENTIENT INTELLIGENCE. (*Sentience is one thing, and intelligence is another*)

In other words: "To experiment in the fields of psionic and noetic research." That's what Blavatsky and her original associates had in mind, but over a century ago it was not something about which one could really speak intelligibly. In 1875 the idea of actual scientifically oriented methodic research into anything was just really taking hold for the first time since Francis Bacon proposed what is called "The Scientific Method" in the 17th century, based upon Bacon's clearer understanding of what Aristotle had taught on the same idea 20 centuries earlier.

Research into the Noetic and Psionic Sciences, in Europe and The West in the 19th century, was not simply in its infancy, but rather it was in its earliest gestation period. That is not true today, and if theosophy is to be seen as anything other than a quaint relic of the Victorian age, it had best start speaking in a contemporary idiom!

The primary trouble with all that antiquated language is actually "double trouble." One: It fences the greatest majority of eager young, intelligent, questing, people completely out of theosophy. Two: It fences the membership of the theosophical movement in! And that, in some ways is far worse, because it creates a condition that can only be described as intellectual and spiritual incest.

Now, I said I'd talk about why the current leadership is terrified of the "Third Object" and so I will. It's not a simple fear and it's not at all an entirely altruistic fear either. Its causes are complicated and involved, and like most human problems, based almost entirely in ignorance. There is an almost equal

amount of avarice involved. Not avarice for money or wealth, but avarice for power and the retention of power.

Despite the clear and undeniable evidence that Yelena Blavatskaya entire life was one continuous and very deep involvement with “Third Object Activities” on an astonishingly broad spectrum of paranormal talents (and radical, liberationist, politics) the first thing that has theosophical leadership in this generation terrified of the third object is history!

It is absolutely clear to anyone familiar with the subject that theosophy’s “bete noire” since the days of the “Report of the Society for Psychical Research” by Richard Hodgson, has been the almost complete misunderstanding of, and scandals arising from, the pursuit of “Third Object Goals.” This paranoia in regard to psychic activities was wildly exacerbated in the period between the death of H.P.B. and the “Krishnamurti Debacle.” It is quite clear that the whole process which led to Krishnamurti’s rejection of the status claimed for him by the Theosophical society (Adyar), could only be attributed to unrestrained, and utterly misguided, “Third Object activities,” on the part of a man (Charles Webster Leadbeater) who, while clearly “psychic,” was not entirely sane.

It is completely clear that Blavatsky and her associates made certain mistakes in the early days. Anyone who thinks that “mistakes” are impossible to either H.P.B. or her “associates,” just doesn’t know anything about them. H.P.B.’s associates became what can be called “antsy” about her predilection for shocking people as early as what I call “The Lamasary Period” during which time she was writing her masterpiece, “Isis Unveiled.” Because of this they had largely divorced themselves from her by the time she moved to India, where she was to prove very useful to an entirely different set of “associates.”

In any case, this was more H.P.B.’s mistake than that of her associates, as they had warned her that such activities would likely backfire, as of course, they did. But she, as always, was “all afire” with enthusiasm, and truly believed that she could only validate her philosophical teachings with “signs and wonders.” The preoccupation of both H.P.B. and H.S.O. with paranormal phenomena was the primary cause of the subordination of theosophy. Those “signs and wonders” led directly to Richard Hodgson! And so, instead of going down in history as a major philosopher, which is what she was, she went down in history as a “fraudulent medium” and a “charlatan” and a “seductress,” none of which she was.

“Signs and wonders” may have worked for the Christians, but they didn’t work for theosophy.

The “Third Object” wasn’t the mistake, it was wildly sensationalizing Blavatsky’s use of it that was the mistake.

Now that we have briefly discussed institutional Theosophy’s paranoia regarding the “Third Object,” I’d like to show how the second and third objects work in unison to create the perceptive comprehension of the first object that, in turn, leads to the apperception of “truth.”

“Process Theosophy” depends on the progressive comprehension of all that is to be learned from each of the “Three Objects.” There is not particular sequence in which the objects must be approached. I personally prefer a unified approach with some work going on in each of the three fields of activity. This is because the gains made in each field tend to complement one another.

Look at it this way, the “Second Object” is entirely intellectual-objective, the comparative study and evaluation of all the various religions, philosophies, and as many of the vast number of “sciences” as

is humanly possible provokes a synthesis of all that they are, and contain. This permits a person to perceive many things. One of the most important of these things is the really surprisingly vast number of connections and resemblances between the many disciplines included.

The “Third Object,” however is not at all intellectual, it is subjective-apperceptive and totally experiential. It is NOT as some people claim emotionally based, but psychically based and para-sensory experience really has very little to do with emotions. Though it is undeniably true that there are hallucinatory-delusional “experiences” based entirely on the emotions that masquerade as “psychic experiences.” This is one of the most dangerous aspects of all psychic activity, but it is no reason to avoid that kind of activity. It is one of the few things that has so much to teach us that one must accept the dangers and possibility of pratfall.

What one learns to understand via the “Second Object” when combined with one’s experiences of “The Greater Reality” through the development of “Third Object” facilities, leads one inexorably to the apperception of the union of all sentience that is the unified field of our cosmos. Once that apperception has been attained, so too has the goal of “The First Objective” and when that feat is accomplished, the motto of the theosophical movement, which is also its primary goal, is also attained.

There is another aspect to “theosophy” that is important. In its 19th century incarnation it had an additional purpose and that was to counter-balance the religious approach to materialism that was rapidly becoming the norm in the Western World. What “theosophy” is, is a process, it is not, and never should have become, a belief structure!

What happened is that “theosophy” was suborned and became “THEOSOPHY” which is an entirely different and utterly dichotomous thing. How this came about will be discussed in the second in this new series of essays: “THE SUBORNATION OF THEOSOPHY” which will be a discussion of the subornation of the 19th Century Theosophical society and of its founder Yelena Blavatskaya.

However, even though I have already briefly done so, in this essay I want to discuss more fully what theosophy is, and what theosophy must be once again in order to make the world a better place in which to live. I do want to make it clear though, that in order to be truly “theosophy,” something new and entirely different must come into being. The 19th century incarnation is a dead thing, too long unburied. And like all dead things too long unburied, it has begun to decompose, and in the process, to stink.

I am going to be speaking to you of theosophy not as a belief structure but as a process, which is clearly the only thing theosophy was ever meant to be. This is something to which I have already alluded. The goal of the “process” is the acquisition and intensification of the data-base which any person requires to understand the nature of the human condition and the place of that condition in the overall cosmos.

As I see it, the place where the whole process went off-track, is when the founders of the 19th century organization chose the term “theosophy” to identify themselves rather than use the term actually favored by their third century predecessors, which was “Philalethians” or “lovers of truth.” It is far more difficult for a group called “Lovers of Truth” to become a religion than it is for a group who uses the easily misunderstood term “theosophy.” This is because the meaning of the word “theosophy” was completely subverted by two thousand years of Judeo-Christian lack of understanding. The term has been totally mis-defined.

The word “theosophy” does not mean “the wisdom of God” as most Theosophists believe, it means something entirely different. Now in the pre-Christian Classical, or “Pagan” belief system and world-view, Sophia, or “wisdom” was viewed as a divine figure. Two thousand years of Judeo-Christian propaganda has completely subverted what the ancients meant by such a thing.

While the Egyptians had a better and far less misleading word for the same thing; “Neter” or “Divine Principle,” the so-called Pagans (or at least the preponderance of their philosophers) viewed “Goddesses” such as “Sophia” as intrinsically principles. “Sophia” meant the principle that was wisdom or understanding. Because it is, or should be, completely clear, that wisdom is not simply knowledge in and of itself, but rather the comprehension or understanding of the complete contextual nature of that knowledge.

What “theosophia” meant to the ancients was not “The Wisdom of God,” but rather the ultimate comprehension of all things, which, I suppose, is a kind of divinity, but hardly a “God.”

“Gods” are entirely primitive conceptions. Religion is an almost entirely negative and harmful thing. There is no thing as oppressive upon human beings as is religion, nor has anything had a more deleterious effect on human evolution than religion. (For an extensive, indeed an exhaustive discussion on this subject see my Book: “Here We all Are ...”, volumes I & II)

“Philosophia” or philosophy, meant “the love of wisdom,” what “theosophia” or theosophy meant was that wisdom so complete as to be beyond human. To the ancient, a complete comprehension of the nature of the human condition conferred a status beyond that of ordinary human. Some call it enlightenment.

Now, what is the “process” and how does it function?

First let me outline the basic paradigm that underlies the premise that is process theosophy. It is based almost equally on science and philosophy. These are the ideas to which the process that is theosophy is designed to give understanding. Now while this may definitely seem to be a case of “putting the cart before the horse,” it is not. Process theosophy is not simply idle studies of various things, it is a concentrated study of reality itself, and of the nature of the human condition as it exists within the paradigm of that reality.

The Manifested Universe, or Cosmos, is an infinite, illimitable, unified energy field. That energy manifests itself as sine wave curves which function as carrier waves for the energy particles that are the only reality of which we are presently aware. Each of those particles represents a cosmos in embryo. This Unified Field also exhibits evidences of consciousness. The most likely purpose for the existence of the Cosmos (if it actually requires a purpose) is as a vehicle for the infinitization of consciousness and awareness both of self and not-self. When “consciousness and awareness” are combined, the result is called intelligence. The Cosmos is a milieu of intelligence becoming ever more self and not-self-aware.

Within this milieu, or cosmic environment, there are an infinite, and constantly growing, number of intelligences at various stages in their process of infinitization of awareness and comprehension of the whole. The Cosmos is self-created. There are no “Gods,” but discarnate intelligence is infinitely more common than carnate intelligence. Discarnate intelligence is permanent, carnate intelligence is ephemeral.

The Universe itself, is an entirely value-free information gathering system and bearing in mind how ephemeral and truly unreal physicality is, it is fair to state that nothing at all which an individual does while in the physical is going to have more than an attitudinal effect upon their post-physical future. Physical actions have effects only within the environment in which they occur.

A person, because of the things they do, and because of the way they think, and because of WHAT they think, create an environment which colors and flavors their personal trans-physical future. But that is only the way in which an individual influences their post-mortem future, it has nothing at all to do with the Universal Intelligence field.

There is no judgement, there is no retribution, there is only a personal post-mortem milieu which every individual creates for themselves. Naturally, WHAT they create for themselves is hardly independent on the belief systems which they hold.

THE ONLY THING IN THE UNIVERSE THAT MATTERS, IS INTELLIGENCE (CONSCIOUS AWARENESS). THE ONLY THING IN THE UNIVERSE THAT IS REAL IS ENERGY.

It is how that intelligence is utilized and how it processes and stores information that is critical.

That's what the Universe is all about, the infinitization of intelligence, and the processing and storage of information for the use of that intelligence. All information is valid, all information, and experience is the major source of information, is needful to the universal data-bank.

What an individual human being does with their personal information data-bank, matters only within their personal paradigm. It does not matter in the slightest within the universal paradigm.

That then, is the "answer, but what is the "question" that "Process theosophy" uses to reach that answer? The question is: What is truth? What is Real? And WHY? The process theosophist asks "What" and "How" but primarily they ask "Why"? It's relatively easy to find out "what." Once you have found out "what" it's not that hard to find out "How." The really difficult part of all this is to find out "Why"? And that is where Process theosophy serves to guide the way.

Now, in the very beginning of this essay I said that the "Three Objects of the Theosophical Society" as they were delineated in such unfortunate Victorian terminology in 1875, were nevertheless, a good guide to what process theosophy had to offer. But one has to understand that objectives 2 and 3 are the way to arrive at objective 1. For the absolute awareness of the essential unity of all things through energy is what one is guided to through the means of the various lines of study and research created by the 2nd and 3rd objects.

In closing I'd like to say that "process theosophy" is simply that: a "process" which creates a mind set in the individual "lover of truth." That "mind set" is the "process" itself. One must realize that "theosophy" is not a thing in itself but rather it is an action that leads to a vision of truth. It sets in motion a train of events and activities that lead to as complete a comprehension of the Human Condition as the individual seeker for truth is capable of attaining.

Helping people to experience and attain "process theosophy," is one of my major goals for the Ouroboros Center, a place where people who truly love, and seek, the truth may learn how to do so, and to do it.