"The Question of G. de Purucker"

A Reply to a Reply

OPENING WORDS

Our article The Question of G. de Purucker has recently received a lengthy response from Jon Fergus and Pierre Wouters, titled "The Question of G. de Purucker" - A Reply and which can be read by clicking here.

As we are on friendly terms with both the writers, the latter of whom is a fellow associate of the United Lodge of Theosophists, we are aware that their critique of our own critique of some of Gottfried de Purucker's assertions and teachings has by no means been written in a spirit of unfriendliness or "attack."

Indeed, the writers personally invited and encouraged us to write a response to their paper and in the email they sent out when making it public, they specifically stated:

"We would also like to make it clear that this essay represents an amicable exchange of ideas with the author of the original article under consideration and that we are on brotherly terms on an individual basis."

Let it therefore be understood that this response is written in like manner and, it is hoped, with the same amicability.

In an initial email response to their paper, prior to its publication, we addressed several of the points raised therein which we considered to be inaccurate and suggested that this email could perhaps be included as an appendix to their paper when published, so that readers could assess both sides of the "debate" at the same time and in the same place.
We informed our friends that if they would be willing to do this, we would gladly include the whole document - i.e. their perspective and ours - on our website, for all to see and from which all could then draw their own conclusions impartially.

Our suggestion, which we considered most reasonable, was declined; hence the writing of this present article as a means of separate response.

"OCCULT SUCCESSORSHIP"
- AN ISSUE WHICH CANNOT BE IGNORED

In the "Opening Words" of Messrs. Fergus and Wouters' paper, it is said:

"Nor are we here to debate or discuss "successorship," "leadership" or the "occult status" of any individual."

We are inclined to question whether it's truly possible to disconnect the teaching from the claims of the teacher, when we are dealing with someone who has made such claims and assertions and been accepted in such a lofty position and status as described in the first part of our "The Question of G. de Purucker."

In a letter dated 29th July 1929 which was sent to all members of the Point Loma Theosophical Society, Purucker announced his new Leadership role in the following terms, “K.T.” referring to Katherine Tingley, who had just passed away:

“All the Comrades here feel a supreme confidence in the future, for they know that the Work is fully safeguarded, and thanks be to the immortal gods! they trust the one who now assumes the reins of government in the line of succession from H.P.B., W.Q.J., and K.T. … In assuming the heavy burden of responsibility that has devolved upon me by K.T.’s appointment of me to succeed her … I realize that, due to the work of our blessed K.T., more even than to the work of my two previous great Predecessors, our members have been trained, taught to reflect and to have an intuitive realization of what the Theosophical Movement means, not only to ourselves, but to Humanity. …

“Even as were my three great Predecessors, so am I, utterly devoted to the Cause of the Great Ones. … Thrice recently, before and since the passing of K.T. has one of the Great Teachers been with me here in Loma-land. I will open my heart to you and tell you something. The two Masters who originally founded the Theosophical Society, and who are the Chiefs of the E.S., are still working with the Society both inner and outer, and for it. … Each of these two has progressed far along the Path of Initiation since H.P.B.’s days, … I have seen and conversed with Master M within this last month, and twice has Master K.H. been in my office, once alone, and once with a chela, who said not one word, but whom I knew to be a Tibetan of high esoteric rank. These conversations are of course a very holy and precious treasure to me, and in them I was shown the future of the
Society, what to expect and what to look forward to; and I again pledged myself in a manner of which I may not speak, but which I feel it my duty to tell you of. …

“I have opened a little to you the door that was opened to me. I hereby give you my full confidence and trust, and assure you that even as you will be loyal and devoted to me, your Leader and Official Head, and your Teacher of the E.S., so shall I be utterly devoted and true to you. May the sublime Light of the Great Lodge, the Light of the Tathagatas, burn in your hearts and minds, and lead you into ways of peace.

“Written in the Masters’ names, and under the authority that has devolved upon me, this twenty-ninth day of July, 1929, according to the current calendar, at the International Theosophical Headquarters, Point Loma, California.” [bold added]

In a second general letter, issued in September of that year, he informed the members that, "The spiritual and intellectual forces pouring through me from the Great Lodge at times seem almost to tear into pieces the fabric of my being, so strong are they," and added:

“O! the brilliant, magnificent promise of the future! If I can only infuse into the membership of our Society all over the world, the enthusiasm, the power, the Lodge-force, that is now pouring through me, our successes will be unspeakably brilliant! You will assuredly receive in time some of this Lodge-force; for as I am the intermediary or mediator between the Great Lodge of the Masters of Compassion and Wisdom and the general membership of the T.S., and more particularly of the E.S.: being the channel through which the Lodge-forces pour: so also am I therefore the Teacher, and will hand on what I may and can to those who prove themselves fit and ready to receive.

“Consequently, it will be my duty as soon as time and strength permit me to do so, to issue new E.S. teachings of a far deeper and more esoteric kind than those which were issued even by H.P.B. or by W.Q.J., or by our Beloved, Katherine Tingley. This I can do for the simple reason that these, my three great Predecessors, never had the opportunity to do what Karma now impels and compels me to do: to besiege the Portals of Destiny and to open a way into the Mysteries, because the members, through the life-work of our beloved K.T., are now ready to hear and therefore to receive what I can give them — an opportunity of incalculably splendid promise which neither H.P.B. nor W.Q.J. nor even K.T. had.” [bold added]

If all of Purucker's teachings can be demonstrated, on philosophical grounds, to be in harmony with and not to contradict those of H.P. Blavatsky, well and good. We are aware and appreciate that there are some students in today's Theosophical Movement who believe that all matters such as this should be dealt with and addressed solely from their philosophical basis, leaving historical matters and personality issues aside, regardless of what claims may have been made and what damage may have been done, both to the general understanding and conception of what Theosophy is and to the Movement as a
whole. We should not re-energise past conflicts and disagreements, it is said, but leave them in the past, where they belong.

Whilst it is admitted that they belong in the past, they are unfortunately very much with us in the present.

The Point Loma Society split into two several decades ago as a result of "Successorship" disputes and today the respective leaders of "The Theosophical Society - Point Loma" (now headquartered in the Netherlands) and "The Theosophical Society - Pasadena" both claim to be the one true and official "Occult Successor" of HPB in a direct and unbroken lineage via William Q. Judge, Katherine Tingley, G. de Purucker, and others.

This audacious and astounding claim, the falsity of which has long been amply demonstrated in such books as the ULT's "The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950" (part of which has been reproduced in our article The Point Loma & Pasadena "Successorship" Claim Exposed) is apparently now meant to be left unmentioned and unchallenged by anyone and primarily for the sake of greater "tolerance" and "unity" in the Movement!

Would this be the attitude adopted by HPB, WQJ, or Robert Crosbie (founder of the ULT); to stay politely quiet and diplomatic about such matters? If only we could focus purely and solely on the philosophy itself…but we cannot and our duty will not yet permit us to.

As we see from the above quotes, Purucker's ideas were put forth by himself - and accepted by many - as being the words of the official Messenger of the Masters and not as being the interpretations or intuitive reasonings of a simple student of Theosophy.

His work and writings are all defined by the "Occult Successorship" notion and to us it seems very odd that this is not mentioned or explained even once in our friends' paper when it is obviously so important. Surely the readers have a right to know how Purucker viewed himself and what he said about his role and status, when it has such a direct bearing on the air of authority that pervades his writings and statements.

But the writers are more emphatic in their announcement email:

"As made VERY clear in the "Opening Words" of the essay, the writers are NOT AT ALL interested in the "successorship", "leadership" nor the "occult status" issues - whether they are perceived to be true or untrue - that have been claimed or refuted by students in the past as we deem ourselves not to be competent in that area of criticism and judgment."

If "we deem ourselves not to be competent in that area of criticism and judgment" then we presumably are not in a position to reliably affirm or deny anything at all that may be said or claimed by or for anyone in regard to the "Successorship" issue.
It thus seems that the writers are saying that for all they know, G. de Purucker may well have been the true "Occult Successor" of HPB. Following the same principle in a logical manner, it would similarly be the case that for all the writers know, Annie Besant may have been the true "Occult Successor" or that perhaps both of them may have been. This seems a curious stance to take, as we were of the understanding that sufficient evidence has already been available and well presented for many years in regard to this matter.

We will now address, in order, several of the points which have been commented upon.

Some of the matters raised by our friends are certainly valid and although we do not agree in full with any one of their points, we will here respond only to those about which we have most to say.

THE ANIMAL SOUL

Page 12 of the Reply to our article is headed "Point #3: Animal Soul vs. Kama-Rupa."

It responds to our criticism of G. de Purucker's "taking literally of the symbolically descriptive term “animal soul” for the Kama principle in man and teaching that the individual’s Kama principle is in fact a Monad which in the distant future will become an actual animal."

However, having read through the response or intended rebuttal to this several times, we find ourselves having to conclude that we have somehow been completely misunderstood.

Their response does not at all address the issue and seems to be based on a misconception that we were objecting to Purucker's use of the term "animal soul" for the Kama or Kama Rupa principle in the human constitution. We were of course making no such objection and are well aware that this term was by no means a Purucker innovation but one used frequently by HPB and the Masters Themselves.

It is not the term "animal soul" to which we object, nor even the idea that the elemental lives or energies constituting the Kamic principle may at some far distant point evolve their way through the various kingdoms of Nature, animal kingdom included. That with which we took issue was Purucker's explanation of why the "animal soul" is thus called.
As we stated, it is thus called in a "symbolically descriptive" sense and our friends have provided quotes which confirm this and which thus strengthen rather than weaken our own point.

**PARABRAHM, BRAHMAN, BRAHMA NEUTER**

Point #5 (beginning on p. 18) states that "the fifth point of contention" made in our original article is:

"His teaching that Brahman and Parabrahman are not one and the same thing but that Parabrahman is higher than Brahman and means "Beyond Brahman." In fact it means “Beyond Brahmā” and also “Supreme Brahman,” not implying that there is a supreme Brahman and a less supreme Brahman, but that Brahman IS the Supreme. Brahman and Parabrahm (or Parabrahman) are synonymous terms belonging to Hindu philosophy and are used by HPB and the Masters in the same sense in which Hinduism uses them, which was apparently misunderstood or disagreed with by de Purucker."

The main arguments used to challenge this statement of ours seems to be derived from the explanations of scholars, academics, and Purucker's own assertions, rather than by comparing Purucker's assertions with those of HPB.

Our friends say that "strictly speaking, and according to these Sanskrit scholars, “parabrahma” would not mean “beyond brahma” but neither would it mean “beyond brahmā.” This latter definition is what appears in the Theosophical Glossary, but let us remember that HPB was not alive to give a final proof-run through this book before it was finalized."

That is correct but she was certainly alive when she wrote and published that “The IT is, in the Hindu philosophy, Parabrahm, that which is beyond Brahmā, or, as it is now called in Europe, the “unknowable.”’’ ("Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge" p. 2)

Despite the argument seemingly proffered that HPB would have "corrected" her "Theosophical Glossary" entry for "Parabrahm" if she had lived long enough, let us take a look at it. It is to be found on p. 248 of that book:

"Parabrahm (Sk.). “Beyond Brahmnā”, literally. The Supreme Infinite Brahma, “Absolute” – the attributeless, the secondless reality. The impersonal and nameless universal Principle.”

We were once informed by a fairly prominent member of "The Theosophical Society - Point Loma" that HPB must have made a typographical error in such instances and that what she "really" intended to write was "Beyond Brahman" which would conveniently make her definition of Parabrahm or Parabrahman match that of Purucker. But we are not interested here in speculation and guesswork but in finding out what those who originally presented these Theosophical teachings to us have actually said.
In Chapter 10 of his rendition of the Bhagavad Gita, William Judge provides a definition in a footnote of what “Parabrahm” means, after Arjuna says “Thou art Parabrahm!” to Krishna. His footnote says that the definition of “Parabrahm” is “Beyond Brahmā.”

On p. 11 of “An Epitome of Theosophy” he says that Brahman means “the impersonal Parabrahma.”

In a Glossary published by himself, we find this entry: “BRAHMA: the Absolute, Parabrahman.” And this: “PARA-BRAHMA (also PARA-BRAHMAN): the Absolute, above all, yet in all and containing all; Brahma, the Unknowable, above and beyond Brahmā and all creators.”

Interestingly, although the Index volume to “The Secret Doctrine” published in 1997 was a publication by Theosophical University Press - the printing and publishing division of "The Theosophical Society - Pasadena" and hence an ardent promoter of Purucker's works and teachings - its compilers have recognised the terms “Parabrahm,” “Parabrahman,” “Brahman,” “Brahma” (without the accent) and “Brahma (neuter)” to be all identical and have listed the references to each of these terms under the one heading.

In the response to our article appears an excerpt from "The Secret Doctrine" Vol. 1, p. 406, which the writers preface as "including a translation by her [i.e. HPB] of a critical verse from the Bhagavad Gita," "critical" in that they believe it strengthens and supports their defence of Purucker's "Beyond Brahman" view of Parabrahm. To quote the relevant part of it:

"Thus, the Asvattha, tree of Life and Being, whose destruction alone leads to immortality, is said in the Bhagavatgita to grow with its roots above and its branches below (ch. xv.). The roots represent the Supreme Being, or First Cause, the LOGOS; but one has to go beyond those roots to unite oneself with Krishna, who, says Arjuna (XI.), is "greater than Brahman, and First Cause . . . the indestructible, that which is, that which is not, and that which is beyond them."

We cannot help but wonder why the writers take "greater than Brahman" to be a translation by HPB herself from the Bhagavad Gita. The quotation, from the eleventh chapter, is from one of Max Muller's translations. Besides which, it is an inaccurate one. In his rendition of the Gita, William Judge translates it as "greater than Brahmā" (p. 84) and all the other translations we have been able to consult, such as those by accepted Sanskrit scholars Swami Sivananda and A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada, respectively, also render this particular verse as "Brahmā" rather than "Brahman."

Keeping in mind "The Theosophical Glossary" entry for Parabrahm quoted above, let us see the entry for Brahma (p. 62):
Brahma (Sk.). The student must distinguish between Brahma the neuter, and Brahmā, the male creator of the Indian Pantheon. The former, Brahma or Brahman, is the impersonal, supreme and uncognizable Principle of the Universe from the essence of which all emanates, and into which all returns, which is incorporeal, immaterial, unborn, eternal, beginningless and endless. It is all-pervading, animating the highest god as well as the smallest mineral atom.”

Two things immediately catch the attention: (1) HPB clearly and unmistakably equates the terms "Brahma," "Brahman," and "Brahma the neuter." (2) She defines It in exactly the same manner as she defined Parabrahm. No distinction at all is made between the two.

HPB never says that Parabrahm means “Beyond Brahman.” She views the “Para” in “Parabrahm” as meaning “Supreme” and “Infinite.” This is the way the Vedanta philosophy of Hinduism views the term Parabrahm. If one reads the Upanishads and the writings of Vedantin philosophers and yogis, one finds Brahman and Parabrahman used perfectly synonymously and interchangeably.

When HPB uses any Hindu terms in a different sense from how they are generally used and understood in Hindu philosophy, she usually says so and explains it. She doesn’t do so with Parabrahm and we believe the reason is because she uses it the same way as the Hindus do, or, to be more precise, the adherents of the Advaita Vedanta form of Hinduism.

"The Parabrahm of the Vedantins is the Deity we accept and believe in." (H.P. Blavatsky, "The Key to Theosophy" p. 222)

Purucker writes:

“Remember that the First Logos is the cosmic consciousness, the summit or Brahman of any hierarchy, and these Brahmans are numberless in boundless Space. Every solar system is one such Brahman on the solar system scale; every galaxy represents or is one on the galactic scale; this is also the case with every planetary chain. Every human being has his own individual Brahman, the highest point of his being, his First Logos.” (“Fountain-Source of Occultism” Section 5)

Is this the Theosophy of H.P. Blavatsky? We leave it with our readers to decide.

It was Purucker who introduced the term "Hierarch" to use when speaking of the First Logos and other Logoi, "Hierarch" being suggestive of a Being or an Entity.

It is worth noting that our friends also use this term freely and introduce it into their own text and explanations as if it is a standard part of the original Theosophical terminology and vocabulary. After quoting on p. 5 from "The Mahatma Letters," for example, they write, "In regards to the idea that the Absolute is surpassed at some point, the distinction
must be made between the Absolute as the APEX or hierarch of a system and the Absolute \textit{per se}.

Again, on p. 7, after quoting from "Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge":

"The all-important distinction to be made here is between the “Absolute” as the Apex or Hierarch of a given system, and the Absolute \textit{per se}. There are, indeed, many “absolutes” in the sense of hierarchs, while there is only one Absolute \textit{per se}. This distinction seems to be missed [i.e. by ourselves] in the ten points of criticism, both in regards to this question and in regards to the following questions on parabrahma/brahma and on atman. It is a critically important distinction to be made if one is to understand the system and processes described in the \textit{Secret Doctrine}. This idea is also central to Purucker’s approach and must be understood if one is to correctly grasp the ideas he puts forth and the manner in which he presents them."

\textbf{ATMAN}

Our sixth point was "his teaching that the Atman is something individual for each person and can be spoken of in terms of “my Atman” and “your Atman,” something which HPB expressly criticises and denies in “The Key to Theosophy” and “The Secret Doctrine Dialogues” and which is also a misinterpretation of a Hindu philosophical term."

The writers of the "Reply" seem to either misinterpret these words or to read into it things that were never said and never intended. We have \textit{not} said in "The Question of G. de Purucker" or anywhere else that Purucker taught that we each have our own "eternally abiding and unchanging" individual Atman. The issue of "eternally abiding and unchanging" does not even enter in to what we have said and yet \textit{we} are criticised for supposedly criticising \textit{him} for supposedly saying \textit{this}!

We are well aware that in "Studies in Occult Philosophy" Purucker says - and our friends have quoted it - "My Atman - to illustrate because we are now speaking of the worlds of differentiation - my Atman will some day grow to be the divinity of a solar system."

Hence he is obviously not talking about an \textit{eternally unchanging} individual Atman but none can deny that he is clearly talking about an \textit{individual} Atman. And how does that tally with all of HPB's statements about Atman in such places as "The Key to Theosophy" and "The Secret Doctrine Dialogues," statements which in the response have been left unmentioned, unquoted, and completely unreferred to, as if they did not even exist?

“Pure universal Spirit.” ("The Key" p. 92)

“One with the Absolute, as its radiation.” ("The Key" p. 92)

“In reality it is no “human” but the universal \textit{absolute} principle of which Buddhi, the Soul-Spirit, is the carrier.” ("The Key" p. 93)
“We say that the Spirit, or *Atman*, is no individual property of any man, but is the Divine essence which has no body, no form, which is imponderable, invisible and indivisible, that which does not exist and yet is ... It only overshadows the mortal; that which enters into him and pervades the whole body being only its omnipresent rays, or light, radiated through *Buddhi*, its vehicle and direct emanation.” ("The Key" p. 101)

“We apply the term *Spirit*, when standing alone and without any qualification, to Atma alone.” ("The Key" p. 115)

“First of all, Spirit (in the sense of the Absolute, and therefore, indivisible ALL), or Atma. As this can neither be located nor limited in philosophy, being simply that which IS in Eternity, and which cannot be absent from even the tiniest geometrical or mathematical point of the universe of matter or substance, it ought not to be called, in truth, a “human” principle at all.” ("The Key" p. 119)

“Atma in reality is not a unit, but the one universal principle.” ("Dialogues" p. 550)

“Atman is the Universal ALL, and becomes the HIGHER-SELF of man only in conjunction with *Buddhi*, its vehicle, which links IT to the individuality (or divine man).” ("The Key" p. 121)

“*Buddhi*, receiving its light of Wisdom from *Atma*, gets its rational qualities from *Manas*. *Per se*, as something homogeneous, it is devoid of attributes.” ("The Key" p. 102)

“Atma, the “Higher Self” is neither your Spirit nor mine, but like sunlight shines on all. It is the universally diffused “divine principle,” and is inseparable from its one and absolute Meta-Spirit, as the sunbeam is inseparable from the sunlight.” ("The Key" p. 135)

“Neither Atma nor Buddhi are ever reached by Karma.” ("The Key" p. 135)

“The Buddhi, per se, has nothing to do with any qualification of anything: it is simply the vehicle of Atman, of spirit; and spirit is nothing. It cannot be said that it is something. It is that which has neither beginning nor end. It is the one thing.” ("Dialogues" p. 620)

“This “Higher Self” is ATMA, and of course it is “non-materializable” ... Even more, it can never be “objective” under any circumstances, even to the highest spiritual perception. For *Atman* or the “Higher Self” is really Brahman, the ABSOLUTE, and indistinguishable from it.” ("The Key" p. 174)

“Atma, the inseparable ray of the Universal and ONE SELF. It is the God above, more than within, us. Happy the man who succeeds in saturating his inner Ego with it!” ("The Key" p. 175)
“Atma and Buddhi cannot be predicated as having anything to do with a man, except that man is immersed in them. So long as he lives he is overshadowed by these two; but it is no more the property of that than of anything else.” ("Dialogues" p. 625)

“Atma, the impersonal divine principle or the immortal element in Man, undistinguished from the Universal Spirit.” ("The Key" p. 118)

“In hours of Samadhi, the higher spiritual consciousness of the Initiate is entirely absorbed in the ONE essence, which is Atman, and therefore, being one with the whole, there can be nothing objective for it. Now some of our Theosophists have got into the habit of using the words “Self” and “Ego” as synonymous, of associating the term “Self” with only man’s higher individual or even personal “Self” or Ego, whereas this term ought never to be applied except to the One universal Self.” ("The Key" p. 174)

“You have got no Atma, distinct from others. It is not yours; it is common property.” ("Dialogues" p. 624)

“Atma is nothing; it is all absolute, and it cannot be said that it is this, that, or the other. It is simply that in which we are – not only that we live and breathe and have our being, but in the whole universe, and during the whole Manvantaric period. Therefore, Atma is said to have Buddhi for a vehicle, because Buddhi is already the first differentiation after the evolution of the universe. It is the first differentiation, and it is the Upadhi, so to say, of Atma. Then Buddhi is nothing, per se, but simply the first differentiation.” ("Dialogues" p. 592)

“Understand me, Atman cannot be called infinite consciousness. It is the one Absolute, which is conscious non-consciousness. It contains everything, the potentiality of all; therefore, it is nothing and all. It is Ain Soph, and it is the Parabrahm and so on; many names you can give it. It is “No Thing,” you understand?” ("Dialogues" p. 593)

“Atma, the Symbol for the infinite, impersonal Principle.” ("The Key" p. 187)

“How can you give experience to that which is absolute? How is it possible to fall into such a philosophical error as that? The Atma no more belongs to you than to this lamp. It is common property.” ("Dialogues" p. 625)

“You must never say: “my Atma”; you have no Atma. This idea is the curse of the world. It has produced this tremendous selfishness, this egotism. … we say “we are,” “my Atma,” “my Buddhi.” Who are you? You are nobodies; you are something today, and tomorrow you are not. Even that disappears at the end of the Manvantara in the ONE.” ("Dialogues" p. 627)

Undoubtedly there is more to this subject, as also to every subject, and as is pointed out in the "Reply" there are a few places where HPB seems to imply - albeit without clarification or explanation - the existence of some sort of individual Seventh Principle.
The above passages and references, however, which far outnumber the latter, are ignored in the paper, perhaps because in so doing it becomes much easier to defend Purucker's teachings once again, which comes across - not only to ourselves - as one of the main aims of the paper, despite its claims to the contrary.

**ESOTERIC INSTRUCTIONS**

Point #8 addresses our mention of Purucker's "incorporation of HPB’s private “Esoteric Instructions” - which were never meant for publication by any means - into his public teachings and writings and attempting to expand upon them and provide many further additions to them, thus showing a lack of appreciation or respect for HPB’s clearly expressed wishes and the sacredness of the pledge of secrecy."

Curiously, our friends take a very lax position in regard to the publication and use of private esoteric materials.

In all fairness to them, they do include the following important detail, with their own underlining added by way of emphasis:

"In Mrs. Besant's "Third Volume" [of *The Secret Doctrine*, 1897] are incorporated the private papers originally issued by H.P.B. to the E.S., and in reprinting these Mrs. Besant . . . broke the seventh clause of her solemn pledge as a member of the Esoteric School. . . . (*The Theosophical Movement 1875-1925*, pp. 571-572.)"

But then we are told that, "it also must be admitted by all of us today that a great deal of the truth on this subject is necessarily veiled in mystery and silence. In regards to Purucker, it must also be remembered that these materials had been published and widely circulated by theosophists long before Purucker made use of them, whether with his private students or publicly. They had, for all intents and purposes, become “public,” for better or for worse."

This effectively amounts to an excuse on behalf of Purucker as also on behalf of all others who have publicised and promoted such materials and teachings after they had already "been published and widely circulated" yet is also rather vague in its assertion that "it also must be admitted by all of us today that a great deal of the truth on this subject is necessarily veiled in mystery and silence." What does this actually mean?

Enough is not "veiled in mystery and silence" to enable us to know clear facts, such as the above reference from the book "The Theosophical Movement 1875-1925" about how these documents first came to be accessible to the public and the clear fact that they were only ever intended for seriously pledged members of the Esoteric Section, who had bound themselves by oath to abide by all the necessary rules and regulations.
As William Judge's "letter written to the members of the E.S.T. on December 3rd, 1894" is referred to and partially quoted in the response, we here reproduce our own reference to and comments upon it from our article *Respect for The Laws of Esotericism*:

"As if in defence of their promotion and public use of these Esoteric Instructions – always clearly marked “STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL” by HPB – some like to quote these words of Theosophical historian Michael Gomes: “In 1894 W.Q. Judge had notified members of his Esoteric School that HPB’s E.S. Instructions were ‘no longer secret.’”

“The Instructions have been released from secrecy,” people say. “Mr Judge himself made them public!”

"But this is not true and, as a respected historian and researcher, Gomes ought to know full well that he is conveniently only giving a very small part of the actual facts and seemingly presented in such a way as is bound to misrepresent the situation and mislead those who do not do their own research. Neither he nor anyone else have ever yet provided any actual documentation or reproductions of papers/letters to prove this claim. They have not because they cannot, as no such “general release from secrecy” exists.

"The following facts ought to be known about this particular document by William Judge, dated 3rd December 1894:

"(1) This was not a public release from secrecy, nor was it even made known to the members at large of The Theosophical Society, but only to those who were already pledged members of the Esoteric Section. They were the only ones who were informed – and privately so – of this lifting of restrictions.

"(2) Mr Judge wrote, “In accordance with order received from the Master, I hereby declare that Instructions I, II and III of this School are no longer secret, with the following exceptions . . . [which] are not relieved from privacy and cannot be discussed with non-members.” The “exceptions” which he then listed cover almost all the contents of those teachings and include those particular subjects and references which are the most commonly and popularly spoken about and publicised by those Theosophists who believe that this material is, or should be, publicly known. Thus that which was declared to be “no longer secret” actually amounts to hardly anything at all!

"(3) He also said, “The books should not be shown to non-members” and “Freedom of use or discussion of Instructions I, II and III should not go publicly to the extent of giving out the books or reading from them [i.e. publicly].”

"This document was therefore something very different from what some Theosophists have interpreted and claimed it to be. It gives no basis, ground, permit, or authorisation, whatsoever, for general publication, printing, reproduction, or use, of HPB’s private esoteric papers.
"No decent, legitimate, or authentic authorisation to make them public and available has ever yet been given. They have only been made public and available through the breaking of occult laws, principles, and bonds of trust." [bold in the original]

As is stated on p. 32-33, William Judge's message was addressed privately "To the members of the E.S.T." Hence it was for them, not for us, and it is a strange reasoning which makes us apply those words today to ourselves, as if they are giving us authorisation or permission to do something or other with these private materials.

The "Reply" says, in regard to Mr Judge's words, "There are fine lines here, and it is up to each student to decide how they feel about these materials and their use by various individuals and organizations over the past century and a quarter," but does not make clear what those fine lines are.

To many students of Theosophy, the "lines" in regard to these matters are very obvious and definite and that is that the documents and the vast majority of the teachings contained therein are still meant to be private and confidential. Such a notion understandably does not appeal to many but true esotericism is not at the mercy of our own whims and fancies. It has its own serious, sacred, age-old, time-tested, rules, laws, and principles, infraction of which will always bring the inevitable Karmic consequences.

But we are told, "Once again we must all be willing to admit that we do not have all the information necessary to know who violated any vows or trusts, who belonged to which "school" or was bound by which "oaths" or even "orders." To imagine that any of us can see so clearly into the past (or present, for that matter) is folly."

When things are known and recorded facts of history, we can state the facts, as and when necessary and appropriate. It is not a case of imagining that we can see clearly into the past.

Even if, for sake of argument, Purucker had never taken such a pledge (although it is known that he joined the Esoteric Section during the last few years of William Judge's lifetime), his incorporation of private and essentially secret information and references into his writings and teachings - as has also been done by numerous other prominent figures, including Annie Besant, C.W. Leadbeater, Alice Bailey, Helena Roerich (Agni Yoga) - is still gravely wrong in the opinion of many Theosophists and they ought to feel free to express this point and to stand by it, without being made to feel guilty for it. The other side of the "esoteric" argument does not have anything to support it except personal preferences, personal opinions, and an unwillingness to look the facts squarely in the face.

The following is excerpted from the article "Sectarianism Among Theosophists" which appeared in the ULT's "Theosophy" magazine in September 1924 and was republished in the Indian ULT's "The Theosophical Movement" for March 1950:
"In all these bodies [i.e. the various Theosophical groups and organisations], as well as outside them, are students who know the Truth, both of the philosophy and of history. They are aware of, and for themselves accept and study the Message of H.P.B. But what are they doing in regard to the corruptions daily presented as Theosophy? What are they doing with respect to the extravagant claims daily being heralded by exponents whom these students know to be false to the philosophy, false to their pledges, false to the truths of Theosophical history? The answer is, Nothing. Are not all such, however sincere, in fact unfaithful stewards? Is it true Brotherhood to permit to be taught as Theosophy that which one knows to be spurious, and *keep silent*? Is it true tolerance to work in the company of those who daily by their acts, their teachings, their statements, throw mud on the true Teachers, and *keep silent*?

"Every Theosophist who believes it is enough for himself to know the true, for himself to eschew the false, and who is content to permit the huckster, the trader, the charlatan and the sectarian to defile and make mock of Messenger and Message, to delude and mislead the ignorant and innocent inquirer – without doing his utmost to expose the counterfeit and the fraud, is *particeps criminis*, is accessory to the blackest of crimes – the perversion of the pure teachings of the White Lodge into an instrument of Black Magic. It has been done before in the case of every great Message. It is in process before our eyes in the present state of the Theosophical Movement of our times."

Finally on this point, we read, "it should be noted that the Theosophical Society (Pasadena) has not published the ES Papers, nor can they be found on their website. Care and consideration seems to have been taken in the handling of such materials."

The fact that they have not published them nor included them on their website does not at all mean that "care and consideration seems to have been taken in the handling of such materials."

The numerous volumes of HPB's "Collected Writings" were *also* not published by the Pasadena Society, nor can they be found on their website, but this is simply because almost everything they put on their site is (and this is no criticism) from their *own* publications, their online publications page being headed "Theosophical University Press: Online Literature." Pasadena and Point Loma Theosophists are generally very keen on using and promoting the "Collected Writings" volumes and Purucker himself helped with their preparation. So, if this analogy be considered a reasonable one, the original argument does not hold fast.

Whether "care and consideration" has really "been taken in the handling of such materials" can be readily deduced from the inclusion of much of their content and concepts in the Purucker books which they publish.
CLOSING WORDS

In the "Closing Words" it is said that that "we, as common students, are certainly not in possession" of "definite terms for definite things."

We would unhesitatingly agree with this, *in regard to the truly and deeply esoteric terms and principles*, which we would not yet even be able to make any sense of. (See "The Secret Doctrine" Vol. 2, p. 641, for example.)

Yet "Definite Words for Definite Things" is HPB's own phrase and between p. 171-176 of "The Key to Theosophy" she presents just such definite words or terms in relation to definite "things" such as the Higher Self, the Higher Ego (these two terms often being confused or misused even by longtime HPB students), the Spiritual or Divine Ego, etc.

After this, she says that "If outsiders as well as Theosophists would agree to it, it would certainly make matters much more comprehensible." So we do have some definite words for definite things in the Theosophical teachings. It would be foolish for us to claim that we have the *last* word about any of them but is it not our task, duty, and responsibility to present HPB's teachings in the way that she presented them, including the "Definite Words for Definite Things" when she has given such?

There is certainly a fluidity in many of the Theosophical terms and definitions but a definite Teaching and Body of Knowledge underlies all of this.

Towards the very end of the article, the authors seem to suggest that we have become "too hung up on trying to cast down other theosophists, even if we think they are in err; casting them down does not raise us up."

It has never been our wish or intention to cast down anyone. While we disagree with some of the things Messrs. Fergus and Wouters have said and some of the approaches they have taken in their paper - as outlined above - we are nevertheless compelled to admit that we may have been somewhat hasty with some (not all) of our criticisms in "The Question of G. de Purucker" and most particularly in the way or wording with which they were presented.

As we have neither claimed to be nor viewed ourselves as infallible, we say this without hesitation or sense of shame or fear. We do however stand by our original article in essence and particularly in regard to all the points commented upon above.

In closing, we thank our friends for writing what they have, extend our fraternal greetings, and trust they have not taken offence with anything written here, and include the passages below, which they may wish to consider commenting upon and exploring in a subsequent paper. These are matters which we hardly, if at all, touched upon in "The Question of G. de Purucker." This is regrettable, as it would have been most interesting to
see whether these particular statements and teachings of Purucker can be supported or
defended at all in any clear way from HPB's writings.

FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE CONSIDERATION

(Taken from our article "The Divine Plan" by Geoffrey Barborka - A Review)

FIFTH ROUNDERS

"In their conceit and arrogance, as in their habit of materializing every metaphysical
conception and term without allowing any margin for Eastern metaphor and allegory, the
Orientalists have made a jumble of the Hindu exoteric philosophy, and the Theosophists
were now doing the same with regard to esoteric teachings. To this day it is evident that
the latter have utterly failed to understand the meaning of the term “Fifth and Sixth
Rounders.” But it is simply this: every “Round” brings about a new development and
even an entire change in the mental, psychic, spiritual and physical constitution of man,
all these principles evolving on an ever ascending scale. Thence it follows that those
persons who, like Confucius and Plato, belonged psychically, mentally and spiritually to
the higher planes of evolution, were in our Fourth Round as the average man will be in
the Fifth Round, whose mankind is destined to find itself, on this scale of Evolution,
immensely higher than is our present humanity. Similarly Gautama Buddha – Wisdom
incarnate – was still higher and greater than all the men we have mentioned, who are
called Fifth Rounders, while Buddha and Sankaracharya are termed Sixth Rounders,
allegorically. Thence again the concealed wisdom of the remark, pronounced at the time
“evasive” – that “a few drops of rain do not make the Monsoon, though they presage it.”

So said HPB in “The Secret Doctrine” Vol. 1, p. 161-162. Those who have been
described as “Fifth Rounders” and “Sixth Rounders” are spoken of as such
“allegorically,” she says.

The Fifth Round of the evolutionary life-wave through our planetary chain will not begin
until this present Fourth Round has come to a close, just as the Sixth Round will not start
until the Fifth Round has finished. But those individuals who, in the Fourth Round, are
“as the average man will be in the Fifth Round” or as the average man will be in the Sixth
Round, are termed Fifth and Sixth Rounders, in a purely allegorical and figurative sense.

This seems clear enough to most students of Theosophy but Barborka states on p. 344 of
his “Divine Plan” that “As there are some pioneers in the forefront of human evolution
who are undergoing their Fifth Planetary Cycle, the Fifth Round is indicated [i.e. on one
of his diagrams in the book] by means of an elliptical orbit, yet it takes place within the
field of activity of the Fourth Round. In other words, the Fifth Round is also being
accomplished in and on and through the series of all the globes of the chain.”
This is certainly not the teaching of “The Secret Doctrine”! But it is G. de Purucker’s teaching:

“The forerunners, called fifth and sixth rounders, are those advanced egos who, because of past relatively perfected experiences on the moon chain, are more evolved than the bulk of the life-wave. It is a simple thing: we have all grades of men, from the most unevolved on up to mahatmas and buddhas. The forerunners who are now in our fourth round are those individuals who, when they get the chance, leave the earth and run ahead; they forerun us, which merely means that while we are laboring along back of them on globe D they already have rushed ahead of us up the globes and down again in their fifth round. The sixth rounders are those rare flowers of the human race who are still more evolved than the fifth rounders; they have gone around twice ahead of us.” (G. de Purucker, “Fountain-Source of Occultism” Section 7)

It does not require great powers of spiritual perception to see how this is the very opposite of HPB’s remarks in “The Secret Doctrine” and a blatant contradiction of her words and explanations.

**TWELVE GLOBES IN THE PLANETARY CHAIN**

[Please note: we know this subject was briefly addressed in the "Reply" but feel that the writers did not specifically bring to light and clearly and openly address Purucker's own words and teachings in this regard.]

We include below the diagram from p. 200 of the first volume of “The Secret Doctrine” in which are shown the Seven Planes and the relation to these of the Seven Globes of our Earth Chain. The left hand side of the diagram gives the details as per the “Eastern Gupta Vidya,” i.e. the Secret Doctrine or Esoteric Science of the East, which is the Theosophy of HPB, WQJ, and the Masters. The right hand side shows the details as given in the Chaldean Kabbalah, with which we are not directly concerned at present.
If we pay attention to the Theosophical system, we can see that the Seven Globes belong to four different planes – the four lower planes of the Cosmos – and follow the pattern of a descending arc and an ascending arc, otherwise known as involution and evolution.

The “three higher Planes of the Septenary Kosmos” are described in that diagram as “The Divine and Formless World of Spirit.” These three higher planes are termed Arupa (literally “Formless” or “No Form”) planes whereas the four lower are called Rupa (“Form”) planes. It is interesting to note the following from HPB on p. 107 and p. 111 of “Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge”:

“In using the term “planes of non-being” it is necessary to remember that these planes are only to us spheres of non-being, but those of being and matter to higher intelligences than ourselves. . . . That which in the Secret Doctrine is referred to as the unmanifested planes, are unmanifested or planes of non-being only from the point of view of the finite intellect; to higher intelligences they would be manifested planes and so on to infinity, analogy always holding good.”

However, not the slightest indication or suggestion is ever made by HPB that there are an additional five globes; one on the very highest plane and two each on the second and third highest planes. This “12 Globes” idea was first introduced by G. de Purucker and is one of the teachings for which he has been most heavily criticised. And this is promulgated by Geoffrey Barborka in “The Divine Plan” without the slightest reference to de Purucker and in such a way as to make the uninformed student believe that it is the teaching of H.P. Blavatsky and “The Secret Doctrine.” Read his words from p. 343:

“There are three planes superior to the planes of manifestation, which may be termed the planes of the “Unmanifested” (for convenience and clarity), on which are stationed the Arupa-lokas (literally “No-form Worlds”). It may be pointed out that in The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett, it is stated that the conclusion of a Round occurs on Globe Z. By placing Globe Z on the First Cosmic Plane (the plane of the Unmanifested), this provides the clue for the commencement and conclusion of the Rounds. Each Round is thus accomplished, from the First Round to the Seventh Round in sequential order, by commencing and concluding on this Arupa-loka, (a globe without a manifested rupa). In order to call attention to its arupa character, Globe Z on the diagram [i.e. the diagram in “The Divine Plan”] is delineated by means of a dotted sphere, as are also the other four globes on Cosmic Plane II and Plane III. The diagram therefore illustrates the Rounds as commencing from a central point in Globe Z and also being completed on Globe Z.”

This may be described as mere speculation born from a strange misunderstanding; “strange” because to most students of the original Theosophical teachings it is sufficiently plain and clear that when the term “Globe Z” is used it is just another name for that which is sometimes also called “Globe G,” i.e. the Seventh Globe in the Chain, called either “G” because that is the seventh letter of the alphabet or “Z” as a means of indicating that it is the last globe.
If definitive proof is needed of this, we may mention that on p. 85 of those very same “Mahatma Letters” is the Masters’ own diagram titled “MAN ON A PLANET” and which shows perfectly clearly that what They sometimes call “Globe Z” is the Seventh Globe of our chain, the one which They also call “Globe G”. This also can be seen on the above diagram from “The Secret Doctrine” itself in which the Seventh Globe is labelled "G OR Z."

Far from being a “Theosophical Genius” as some describe him, de Purucker apparently could either not understand or not agree with the clear teachings of Theosophy and felt it necessary to invent a system all of his own.

Earlier we said: “If yet further proof is needed of the great wisdom of the Mahatmas in specifying and emphasising that Their Letters should never be published, it will be forthcoming shortly.” This is part of it and there is still more to come.

In the section “Rounds: Inner and Outer” of “The Dialogues of G. de Purucker” the student of “The Secret Doctrine” will be alarmed to find the following:

“Please remember with regard to this matter of rounds the following facts: first, the seven globes of the twelve are for convenience called the manifest globes or the globes of the rupa worlds, and the five upper globes are called arupa, not because they have no form, but to us in our present cognitional development they seem formless much in the same way as a thought is formless to us, and yet we know that thoughts are beings of form and that each thought imbodies an elemental.

“Now then, no round of the seven begins with globe A of the seven and ends with globe G of the seven, according to the exoteric teaching. That is correct as far as it goes. Every round whatsoever begins with the first or topmost globe, runs through all the globes of the descending arc to our earth or globe D, then ascends through all the globes of the ascending arc until the first is reached again, which we can call the first or the twelfth.

“The next thought to remember is that before the first of what are called by HPB the seven rounds, there are three elementary rounds. I myself wonder if that is a good word to give to these rounds; but I do not know a better. They are the rounds in which the elemental activities needed for the beginnings of the formation of the globes take place. This makes ten rounds. Then counting after this way, there are two rounds after the ten, making the twelve or closing out rounds before the chain dies; as the moon had died. Thus there are actually twelve rounds. The main or the most important to us at present are the seven manifest rounds, as we may call them; therefore particularly selected by HPB in her Secret Doctrine, as being exoteric teaching: but exoteric only because it was openly printed and published. Before she gave it out it had been for centuries esoteric.

“The third thing to remember about rounds is that there are inner and outer rounds, and these inner and outer rounds respectively have two meanings: the pathways or round-circulations followed by monads not only at death, but in sleep and during initiation, both
inner and outer, of which you have already studied and know at least something. The other significance of the terms inner rounds and outer rounds is this: that when the seven (or twelve) rounds of the life-waves of a chain have been run and are ended, there is always a certain number amongst the twelve classes of monads who then will graduate from the earth-chain, and in due course of time will take their next step to some other chain and begin in this sense an outer round for these graduated classes.

“Remember, the inner rounds we call the rounds of life-waves from globe A to globe G if you follow the septenary system, or globe one back to globe one or globe twelve if you follow the duodenary system. Thus the inner rounds are the rounds taking place along the globes of the chain, our own as an instance. The outer rounds are the peregrinations or pilgrimages of the same monads, when the time comes, to the other sacred chains of the solar system.”

**INNER AND OUTER ROUNDS**

As it is very relevant to the subject under discussion, we will quote from Letter #LXXXII (p. 392-393) of “The Mahatma Letters” in which the Master K.H. writes the following:

“With all that, you may feel sure that neither M. nor I have contradicted each other in our respective statements. He was speaking of the inner – I, of the outer Round. There are many things that you have not learned but may some day; nor will you be able to ever comprehend the process of the obscurations until you have mastered the mathematical progress of the inner and the outer Rounds and learned more about the specific difference between the seven.”

Earlier in this article it was said that “99.9% of the teachings of “The Mahatma Letters” will be found expanded and clarified there in “The Secret Doctrine,” along with a huge mass of further information and content. A handful of obscure sentences in “The Mahatma Letters” were not touched upon in “The Secret Doctrine,” such as the one which briefly mentions and simply states the fact that there are “inner rounds” and “outer rounds.” The Masters’ reticence and disinclination to elaborate any further on such matters should be indication that nothing is permitted to be given out regarding such subjects at this period in time.”

As “The Secret Doctrine” does not talk about the Inner and Outer Rounds, one might ask why Geoffrey Barborka devotes so much space to discussing them in “The Divine Plan” which purports to be “a Commentary on H.P. Blavatsky’s Secret Doctrine.” The answer is found in the fact that G. de Purucker taught at length on the Inner and Outer Rounds – or rather on his own theories and ideas about them – and, as we have now distinctly seen, Barborka’s aim is to promote “Theosophy” according to Purucker, not Theosophy according to HPB.

Barborka’s (and de Purucker’s) definition of the Inner Rounds is the normal understanding of what HPB simply calls “Rounds.”
“A definition has been given for the Inner Rounds, namely, the passage of the Monadic Hosts from globe to globe within the circuit of the seven globes of a planetary chain. . . . The Outer Rounds may be defined as the passage of Monads from one planetary chain to another planetary chain and beyond. . . . thus indicating that the circling is outside the “Home” planetary chain . . . This cyclic journey continues during the life of the Solar Logos, or during the period of a Solar Manvantara.” (“The Divine Plan” p. 379-382)

“The Outer Rounds may be defined as the passage of Monads from one planetary chain to another planetary chain and beyond.” By whom may they be thus defined? By now we know who and we know it isn’t H.P. Blavatsky.

“You see, I have explained that there are two kinds of rounds: the outer rounds and the inner rounds. The outer rounds are they which the life-hosts follow in passing from one solar planet – from one planet of the solar family to another planet of the solar family, such as from Venus to Earth, from Earth to Mercury, or from Jupiter to Venus, or again from Mercury to Mars. These are the outer rounds. There are wonderful mysteries connected with this.

“The inner rounds are the rounds pursued by the life-hosts in passing from globe to globe of any one planetary chain, such as the Earth’s planetary chain with its seven globes, such as the Venus planetary chain with its seven globes, or the Mars planetary chain with its seven globes, and so forth.” (G. de Purucker, “The Dialogues of G. de Purucker,” 11th December 1929)

Barborka goes on to say, “A passage will now be given indicating the cyclic journeys of the Outer Rounds” and proceeds to quote from “The Secret Doctrine” Vol. 1, p. 577:

“The Planetary origin of the Monad (Soul) and of its faculties was taught by the Gnostics. On its way to the Earth, as on its way back from the Earth, each soul born in, and from, the “Boundless Light,” had to pass through the seven planetary regions both ways.”

Two things become apparent: (1) This is describing a teaching from the Gnostic system and is thus not necessarily the teaching of the Masters although it may well be; (2) It does not say that “on its way to the Earth, as on its way back from the Earth” is referring to the ongoing cycle of death and rebirth. It may equally, if not more likely, be describing the initial descent of the Monad into incarnation at the start of a manvantara and its eventual ascent at the close or upon having attained final liberation.

Yet Barborka declares that the passage “[signifies] the cyclic journey of the Monad through the seven planets on its departure from the earth – when the Monad is liberated from its bonds by means of that which is called “death” on earth. Then when the return cyclic journey from the Boundless Light is made, the Monad again passes through the Seven Sacred Planets on its way to take on another vesture on Earth – to be born again, in order to take up the interrupted Circle of Necessity occasioned by its departure on the Outer Rounds. . . . When another phase of existence is entered into – known as “death”
. . . the Monad is enabled to continue its cyclic journeys to other spheres – first of all to the other globes of this planetary chain, then on to the other spheres with which it is linked. So that other Rounds are continued during the after-death state. . . . When a human being will have learned how to function consciously on the superior globes during the present Fourth Round, while the Human Host of Monads is carrying on its evolution on Globe D (in other words, functioning consciously while cycling on the Ascending Arc during the after-death states), such a one will have achieved the status of a Fifth-Rounder. Then, carrying the theme to its logical conclusion, when a Fifth-Rounder will learn how to perform the Outer Rounds consciously, he will be well on his way towards acting in the capacity of a Sixth-Rounder.” (p. 381, 369, 382)

This is not the authentic Theosophical teaching about either the Rounds or the after-death states and processes.

~ * ~
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