dote @ 1940?

Dear Jim:

Your mother has given me the questions in your last letter to answer. I shall see what I can do. However I am not entirely clear as to the problem in your mind. The difficulty, I supect, is largely a matter of terms - the old problem which seems to take more time and thought than anything else. If you can succeed in passing through the morass of confusion of terms, without feeling tempted to pull out your own hair, or the other fellow's, you will have done better than I did. Even in the primary literature, such as the "Secret Doctrine" and the "Mahatma Letters", , this difficulty is apparent, though there was a real effort to attain clarity. When, in addition, you read the writings of others you enter a veritable sea of confusion in which the thread of Truth can be followed only by the use of intuition and acute analysis. In my own writings I attach the highest importance to clarity, yet to achieve clarity in the rigorous or mathematical sense has the effect of making one obscure to those who have always thought with fuzzy concepts, and that means about 99% of all human beings. The result is that one finds himself between the devil and the deep blue sea, for to achieve clarity is to become obscure for most people and to reach the understanding of most people and to use words in a way that seems to reach most people is to employ concepts that are so fuzzy and inchoate that they are entirely useless for good workmanship. I shall try to answer what I think your problem is. If I fail to hit the mark then you can come back with other questions.

Your questions are: "How can a Disembodied Entity meet its Ego? What is it that is left when an entity goes through Kama Loka? I was of the opinion that all that was left was the Higher Manas, Buddhi and Atman. Elso what is an Entity?"

l. We will start with the last question. The best place to start is the dictionary as then we have the authentic common ground of social discourse. We will lay primary emphasis upon the fundamental meaning of the word rather than any derived or popular meanings. From this as our starting ground we will make such modifications as are necessary to meet the special needs of the concepts with which we deal. This is the way I write - I often look up words I am familar with and find that there is much I hadn't known about them - and if the person who reads my writings will use his dictionary, rather than being satisfied with his general impression of meaning, he will get at my real meaning much better. So much for that.

Now "entity" we find, is the abstract noun corresponding to "ens". So we look up "ens". "Ens", we find, is "that which in any sense is; an object; something that can be named and spoken of." Now, a great light suddenly break upon our consciousness. An entity is anything which is an object of consciousness and hence is not a "Self" which is always a subject to consciousness. "Self" is not an entity but that

t (

ant copy

Jones Jones

which is aware of entities. The Subject or the Self can never be aware of itself as an object and, hence, not as an entity. Hence pure self-consciousness is a state of consciousness wherein there is no content or object - in other words, there is no awareness of entities in that state. However, the self-consciousness can be combined with consciousness of objects at the same time, but this is a matter of the co-existence of two kinds of consciousness. (N.B. I am using self-consciousness in the strict sense and not in the way Dr. Bucke uses the term in "Cosmic Consciousness". Keep+ing this fact in mind you will not be confused.)

2. "How can a Disembodied Entity meet its Ego?" I am not clear as to your reference here but I shall discuss the subject at some leangth hoping that I may hit the vital point at some place. Now we must consider what is meant by "Ego. First we will turn to the dictionary. Here we find: "The 'I'; that which feel, acts and thinks; any person's 'self', considered as essentially the same in all persons." Now we are beginning to get into real deep water. For in Theosophical usage, in the psychology of C.G. Jung and in much philosophy it is necessary to distinguish between different phases of the subjective side of man and, in order to do this, the words "I", "Self" and "Ego" have to be used with different meanings. (In the "Voice of the Silence" you will find "self", "Self" and "SELF" and each reference is different". Do you begin to see why a real philosopher finds the popular usage of language of but little value to him? The Sanscrit is much richer in terms for these discriminations than English.) Now take the term "SELF" (spelled with capitals, though in practice this is not always done and you will have to discriminate) and it is understood as meaning the same as Atman. In this sense there is only one "SELF" and it is identical with Divinity. It is the same in you and me and every creature whatsoever. It is in no sense an "entity" or "ens". This SELF is often symbolized by the sun and in certain mystical realizations or experiences It may appear like a Sun which is so bright as to dull the light of the outer sun. Now, we have one physical sun, but it may be reflected in every pool of water in the world and so when we look at the reflections we may say that there are many suns. In a similiar sense we may say there are several selves. But in this sense the Self in you is different from the Self in me and in other creatures. (Note, the word is spelt with small letters this time.) Now, in our usage the word "Ego", spelled with a capital E, means this "Self". It is the Inner, Higher or Reincarnating Ego discussed in last portion of the minth section of the KKey to Theosophy." It is clear that this Higher Ego is not exactly the same as the pure SELF, yet it is in reality inseparable from the latter, just as the rays of the sun are inseparable from the sun save for analysis. A number of Higher Egos exist, but there is only one SELF. Thus we are all one and indivisible in the SELF, and yet many as dsitinguishable Egos. It follows that something of the quality of entityhood colors the Higher Ego, but it is not an object for our ordinary objective consciousness. But it does become an object for a very profound subjective



state, one which is really a high form of Samadhi. We may say that the Reincarnating or Higher Ego both is and is not an Entity. (You will have to become used to these paradoxes).

Now, let us suppose that you a re looking into a pool of still water and see the image of the sun. Then you take a mirror and hold it so that it reflects the sun in the water and you look in the mirror and see the image of the image. This second image is the ordinary personal "self" (spealed entirely with small letters). This is the Lower or Personal Ego as given in the "Key". This is what nearly every body refers to when he says"I", in common usage. It is, however, only a false or reflected "self". When Buddha denied the reality of the "self" it was this "self" that he referred to, not the great all-inclusive SELF. The"twofold selflessness" simply means that both the personal or lower ego and even the Reincarnating Ego are only reflections of the Eternal Reality or SELF. The lower or personal self has only the same kind of reality as that possessed by the image in the mirror I spoke of above. Smash the mirror and this self vanishes and really ceases to be. But the image in the water and the sun itself is not affected by the smashing of the morror. Now, when a man dies it is like smashing the mirror, only the physical death is not the whole of the process. Later, the second death follows and that completes the process. The two steps in death separate the Higher or Reincarnating Ego from two groups of principles. First, there is separation from the physical body and the life-principle that belongs to it, together with something of the vehicle of life, i.e., the astral body of linga sharira. But the body of desires, mainly assoicated with the more animal side of life, and the lower phase of mind or manas (i.e., that part which is lead by desire, wishfullthinking) these two generally continue for a time in association with the Higher Principles. (If a man who had a karmic life cycle of 70 years were to die by an accident at 40 he would have to live out the remaining 30 years before the second death could be completed. Under some conditions he might reincarnate again, with the old astral, or he might have the chance to enter inner schools of training or he might be put to sleep for this period. There are even other possibilities.) When death comes naturally from oldage, the lapse before the second death is normally quite short. When that happens, the body of desires (kama rupa) and the Lower mind (kama manas) separate from the upper Triad, save that the finer qualities of the personality go along with the Higher Triad, and in this sense something of the personality with the Higher Ego enter Devachan. Thus John Smith of objective incarnation continues to know himself as the same man in Devachan, but with the coarse earthy elements removed from his nature. Now, the two intermediate principles - the lower mind and the body of desires remain in kama loka as the shell and gradually disappear, in the normal case. They break up as Skandhas or as discrete psychical elements, which are reassembled when the Higher Ego returns again for reinacarnation, and then they attach themselves to the new man. This new man has a new personal

Alera de la constante de la co



12

ssifx ego, but the Higher Ego is the same. The new personal spif ego naturally has no memory of the cld personal ego since they are different. Yet they have similiar character since they are compounds of the same skandhas, though there is a progressive development as the result of growing experience. But, in contrast, the Reincarnating Ego has a memory that continues through all incarnations. Sometimes fragments of this memory are impressed upon the lower mind so that the personality sees past lives, but to do this at will is a power which can be attained only by realization of Enlightenment or Yoga.

Now, consider the shell that is left in kama loka after the second death. This is an entity or but no self or ego. I believe it is the meeting of this entity by the Higher Ego that you have in mind in your question. This question might have two references. First, when the Higher Ego descends for reincarnation it meets and unites with the re-assembled skandhas, or psychical tendencies. But normally, long before this the shell-entity has disintegrated into its component elements, and so we might question calling it even an entity at this stage. Still this might be the meaning you had in mind. Second, sometimes the cement that holds the shell together, owing to the strenght of unusual evil qualities, is so strong that the shell entity persists to the next incarnation. In this case it becomes the Dweller on the Threshold. (In this connection read the story of "Dr. Jekel and Mr. Hide.") The re is a third and distinctly superior possibility which exists for those who have entered the Path. It is said that normally, though not always, the Path-cycle takes seven incarnations. In this case the intermediate principles do not disintegrate, and when the disciple dies in one body, he may take a short rest in Devachan and then return meeting first his old intermediate principles and, with them, take a new incarnation.

I hope that somewheres in this long answer I have helped you. I have not answered the question "How", I realize but only given an outline of the process. The "How" might well be a life-study of an initiate in subtle psychology, and I have not specialized upon this question.

onsciousness continues into Devachan, and the latter is a reward for this best of the personal man. In the metaphysical sense Devachan is a state of illusion, though more real than physical life. He who has attained Enlighenment in sufficient degree will never eneter Devachan of another as an act of conscious as an act of conscious will. This is something very different from the ordinary case.

DL- End? or Messing

Del

Supplement to January 7, 1945 Letter to James Briggs

I do not know to what extent you and Helen are familiar with the constitution of man from the standpoint of esoteric psychology, but since my answer to your questions presupposed some knowledge of this subject, it seemed well to supply a supplementary treatment. To this you can add from your readings in *The Key* [to Theosophy], The Secret Doctrine and the Mahatma Letters. But I must warn you against certain difficulties. The first formulation of the Principles was partly a blind, but this blind was removed in greater or less degree as a body of students had done work over a period of years. If you do not bear this in mind, you may become confused by sensing contradictions. Thus the Mahatma Letters refer to the Principles in the terms authorized for Sinnett's Esoteric Buddhism. Here manas is not divided into higher and lower and the physical body is given as a Principle. Later, in the final form given somewhat in The Secret Doctrine and more fully in the "Esoteric Instructions," manas is divided into higher and lower and the physical body is not regarded as a Principle at all. You will find a reprint of the "Esoteric Instructions" in the third volume of The Secret Doctrine, although they were mutilated to some extent.

From the standpoint taken in the Secret Doctrine there are seven Principles. You will run across other standpoints in your reading, but leave them out of account for the present.

We may list the Seven Principles as follows:

1.	Atma	The SELF, the All-in-All.
2.	Buddhi	Spiritual Soul or Vehicle of Atman. Not an Ego unless united with Manas by spiritual Realization in which case the Divine Ego is born.
3.	Manas	The higher phase of Mind or the Reincarnating Ego. This Principle is active in abstract thought that is not related to wishing or concrete objects. The Ideas of Plato belong to this level.
4.	Kama Manas	Literally, the Desire Mind or the lower mind. This is the Raja of the senses referred to in <i>The Voice of the Silence</i> .
5.	Kama Rupa	This is the body of desires but not actually formed during life though it becomes such after death in forming the shell.
6.	Prana	Life, in the sense that supports the external organism. It is the only life known to physical science.
7.	Linga Sharira	Often called the Astral Body. It is the vehicle of life, and also the mold of the physical body.

Often it becomes necessary to divide these Principles into three groups as follows:

1. Lower Group	Consisting of <i>Prana</i> and the <i>Linga Sharira</i> . These are cut off with physical death and dropped.
2. Intermediate Group	<i>Kama Rupa</i> and <i>Kama Manas</i> . These continue in association with the higher principles until the completion of the second death.
3. Higher Group	Manas, Buddhi and Atma. This is the Immortal Triad.

The important question arises: Must we take this division of man on mere say-so or can we check it? In some measure it can be checked by the means of ordinary psychology, but the check on the higher aspects require the profound introversion of the mystical state. Now let us see what we can do.

- 1. The *Linga Sharira* or astral body: It is clear that there must be in nature some guiding principle that causes a body to take a certain shape and maintain it. The child of a man takes the shape of a human being and not that of a lion or a tree. Why is this? We take the material food and this, acted upon by the mysterious process of life, builds a form that in the case of a child is on the same pattern as that of the parents. With different living organisms the forms are different though the material elements and the life are the same. Clearly there is some guiding principle and this is what is called in occultism the *linga sharira* or astral body. We can see the necessity for some such principle, though we may know very little of its nature.
- 2. Prana. It is also reasonable to think that life as a pure energy must have some vehicle of a conducting medium that controls its organism. There is excellent reason to think that life is electricity. In fact, it is so said in the teachings. But it is also said that there is more than one kind of electricity. This statement even science confirms as we have found that there is a difference between the electricity conducted in wires and the kind which is sent out through space in electromagnetic waves. The idea is that human life would be a form of electricity, but of a subtler form than that used in industry. We can thus see how magnetic attraction and repulsion between human beings would be like ordinary magnetic attraction and repulsion. Now, in order that we may control electricity we must have a conducting media, transformers, generators, etc. A portion of such life, generated out of its root source, properly stepped down by a transformer and held in control by a vehicle is what supports a human being in ordinary life. Perhaps we should also introduce the notion of a storage battery which is charged by the generator and then the normal span of life would be measured by the period required to exhaust the battery. If one conserves his life-forces he lives longer. If he wastes them he does not live so long. One of the reasons for ascetic practices in Yoga is the conservation of this limited life-force until certain knowledge and powers are attained whereby one is enabled to tap deeper

sources of life. The traditional three-score years and ten may be conceived of as the average period for which the battery is stored, but this period may be shortened by wastage or accident, or it may be lengthened by conservation of life. There is a higher kind of LIFE which is unlimited, but this lower life is limited.

- 3. *Kama Rupa*. The presence of instincts, desires, conative impulses and affections is well recognized in our psychology. Many of these are simply of the kinds that are found in animals as well as man. These more animal qualities are called the *Kama Rupa*. In the case of some, the *manas* principles are paralyzed (due to karma), yet this one [still] has instincts, desires and affections. But it is a most distinct differentiation between *kama rupa* and *manas*. There are higher affections which have their seat in the upper triad, but these are not animal qualities at all and, therefore, not part of the *kama rupa*.
- 4. *Kama Manas*. This is the power of particularized thinking which is quite obvious that man does possess. This kind of thinking is normally led by desire or *Kama*. This is wishful thinking. The vast mass of human thinking is of this type. A man desires something which is not sufficiently easily attained [by] instinct to lead[ing] the way to the object. So he uses thought to attain the object of his desires. When the object of thought is Truth for its own sake, without the idea of an ulterior use, then the *kama manasic* element is greatly subordinated, though there is the shadow of a desire in wishing to attain Truth.
- 5. *Manas*. This is the higher mind. Only very close analysis will isolate this principle. Mostly we see its effects as the result of joining action with *kama manas*. It colors much of the thinking in science and philosophy and is present in thought devoted to philanthropic end. But the philanthropic motive requires more than higher and lower *manas*.

I have been able to study this higher mind in action, in a way that could be distinguished from the lower mind. The consciousness must be stilled for the time being. Then the higher thought happens of itself without there being any personal effort or preference. This thought does not use our conceptual forms but is rather like pure Meaning that is not embodied in concepts. This thought must be transformed through the lower mind with real effort before anything can be said or written, and then anything that can be said or written is only partly true of the higher thought. This takes skill and labor, a definitely directed effort. But the higher thought happens of itself. It is very satisfactory. One likes it, not because it satisfies his preformed desires, but rather as something so superior that it wipes out all possible desires that would move in an adverse direction. I have called it "Knowledge through Identity." This thought is suspended between Spirit and Matter, but has a natural affinity for Spirit. It may lead directly to *Atma*, or to *Buddhi* and then to *Atma*, or the Path may be to *Atma* and then back to *Buddhi*.

6. Buddhi. This is conceived as Spiritual Soul and as the vehicle of *Atma*, but it is a mode of consciousness which can be recognized, although it requires exceptional subtlety to differentiate it. If one studies this word, both in the Sanskrit dictionaries and as it is used in *The Secret Doctrine*, as well as in the *Theosophical Glossary*, it is clear that the basic

quality of *buddhi* is Intelligence. But this is a completely selfless and Divine intelligence, including the discernment between good and evil and the quality of Divine conscience. The completely selfless quality of *buddhic* Intelligence differentiates it from the higher Egoism of *manas*. Even pure Meaning or Significance carries an element of form or particularization superimposed upon pure Intelligence. But the sense in which we can call Meaning a kind of form is distinctly subtle. It is more subtle than the form of the most abstract concept which man can name or symbolize in higher mathematics. If we view form in a rising scale of subtlety we can distinguishing the following steps: first, sensible form, such as can be seen; second conceptual form which can be thought and named but not represented by a sensible model; third, form as Meaning, freed from the limitations of concepts, yet implying subtle particularization. Then, behind all this there is an entirely selfless and universal Intelligence and this is *buddhi*.

As one rises in the higher reaches of Consciousness one finds beyond the highest concept the Meaning which may be partly embodied in humanly thinkable concepts. Rising still higher he finds even Meaning lying below him. It is a sphere filled with Intelligence but having no particularized direction. It is not concerned with specific human purposes, though it may fill those purposes with Intelligence. Man adds the particularization. To experience or realize this Intelligence is also to know an indescribably sweetness that is entirely other-worldly. It is, indeed, a truly Divine Consciousness that has the quality of benevolence just as naturally and spontaneously as men feel selfish motives. To be bathed in *Buddhic* Consciousness is to be above the compulsion of all problems and without the need of thinking, since in the supernal Intelligence the knowing is universal and there is nothing to be attained. (For the all-knowing, there is no problem of attainment).

Intelligence, in the sense of *buddhi*, is not to be thought of as identical with intellection. Intelligence, in this higher sense, underlies feeling and intuition as much as it does intellection. The point is that where there is no buddhi present either in direct or indirect sense, there is no intelligence. But we do commonly recognize the presence of intelligence even where we would not predicate the presence of intellection. We even speak of intelligent animals but never affirm that any animal is intellectual. Intellectuality is an exclusively human attribute and even among human beings is well developed only in the case of a small minority. It is an attribute of manas (in the generic sense) and this principle is the primary principle in man. (In fact, the word 'man' is definitely related to the Sanskrit 'manas' and means, essentially, the thinker. But the total being we call man is both an animal entity and a Divine entity, in the former sense, below manas, and in the latter sense, above manas. Every creature whatsoever is at least overshadowed by the highest principles but only in man and the man-god is manas incarnated. And, indeed, only in the case of the more advanced mankind is the higher manas really incarnated at all. Now, intellectuality implies manas, but pure intelligence does not necessarily imply manas. Where there is no Buddhi in any sense there is no intelligence.

7. Atman: In the Sanskrit dictionary, this is defined as "breath," "soul," "life," and "self." In the *Glossary* it is defined as "universal spirit," "the Divine Monad," and the "Supreme Soul." In the *Key* it is defined as "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.

Atma is both the One LIFE and the One SELF from which rays shine into all creatures. Considered as Ray, it appears as individual, but considered as Source, It is Universal. There is a mystery here that cannot be encompassed by the thinking mind. Atman is more than intelligence but rather the LIGHT behind intelligence. The LIGHT shining through buddhi becomes Intelligence, but taken apart from this subtle differentiation it is quite indescribable.

Atma, most certainly, is a great mystery. Qualities that we differentiate in objective consciousness are all united in Atma. Here, below, we are inclined to think of life and self as being quite different. Yet, in the highest sense they are the same. LIFE and SELF are identical, but this is much more than ordinary life and self and, yet underlies and interpenetrates the latter. Ordinary life is called prana and is distinctly limited in its action, but the higher LIFE is unlimited. The Hindus have a distinct name for it; they call it "Jiva." One who has attained a conscious identity with the higher LIFE is called a "Jivatman." Such a one has attained Buddhahood. It is possible for the higher LIFE to be introduced directly into the field of ordinary life by one who has become, in some degree, a Buddha. This is the primary function of the World Saviors. The higher LIFE redeems the lower life so far as it reaches and feeds the human soul with the Ambrosia of Immortal Life. This is the real essence of religious service, but most so-called religion is only a ghost of real religion.

Occultism teaches that *Atman* is *Brahman*. In our terms we would call *Atman* the SELF and Brahman GOD. So the above aphorism affirms the identity of the SELF and GOD. In the differentiated sense God seems to be that which is external to one's self and upon one is dependent as the supreme commanding power. On the other hand, the SELF is the most intimate inwardness. Thus God appears as beyond and the SELF as within. Yet, if one retreats into the depths of the "I" at the deepest point within he finds that GOD and SELF are identical. We might say that these two are the ultimate of the extravert and the introvert views, yet both views finally meet in the same Root Source. The more extraverted an individual is the more inclined is he to view GOD as the ultimate, while the more introverted individual tends to find the ultimate in SELF, yet each Path leads to the same Goal.

The Ultimate Reality, which is both *Atman* and *Brahman*, in its absolute purity, is without name. To say *Atman* is to emphasize the objective character. To view IT as both is to call it *Atma-Brahman*. But to view IT as not one and not many, that is, in strict purity, IT is without name, though words have been used to indicate IT. In this ultimate sense IT is an absolute VOID to human consciousness but in reality IT is absolute FULLNESS. IT is also DARKNESS and SILENCE, for the relative or particularized consciousness, but IT is really the source of all Light and Sound, the very essence of everything these words symbolize. It may be called absolute Unconsciousness and, equally, absolute CONSCIOUSNESS. It is possible for man to realize IT as CONSCIOUSNESS, but to do this he must shift his base of self-identity from ordinary

consciousness to the higher CONSCIOUSNESS. He can still possess ordinary consciousness, but he possesses it as a lesser capacity rather than as being identical with himself.

The supernal CONSCIOUSNESS above all relativity, including even Divine Intelligence and even the highest qualities, is beyond all positive description. IT is above both GOD and the SELF. IT includes Darkness and Light. Intelligence, GOD and SELF proceed from that CONSCIOUSNESS and still below lie all the multitude of differentiations and particularizations.

The number seven recurs over and over again. There are seven principles, seven globes, races, sub races, etc., seven planes, seven lokas, seven talas, seven tones, seven colors, a scale of seven in the arrangement of the chemical elements, etc. But one cannot help asking, why seven. It is not unnatural for the student to regard the selection of the number as quite arbitrary, unless it can be shown to have a logical ground or can be seen as a fact of experience. It is, however, possible to justify the septenary principle by a combined reference to experience and certain properties of number.

In the theory of permutations and combinations we have the following theory:

The total number of combinations of n things taken 1, 2, 3 . . ., n at a time, is 2^n -1.

By 'combination' is meant "a set of things or elements without reference to the order of individuals within the set." Thus {a, b} is the same combination as {b, a}. If we are given the value of 3, then 2ⁿ-1 becomes 2³-1, which equals 8-1 or 7. If then we can find three primary facts or elements in this psychological organization of men or in the organization of nature, then we can at once derive seven different facts; three of them primary and four secondary. If we analyze the complex of any state of human consciousness we can find three primary facts of which the following form would be typical:

- a. A Self or Subject.
- b. An object or the not-self.
- c. The relationship of consciousness between the Self and the not-self, or between the Subject and the Object.

You may call this the Knower, the Known and the Knowledge, or the Perceiver, the Perceived and the Perception, or you may conceive it other forms.

From these three elements or facts we derive the following combinations: a, b, c, ab, ac, bc, abc. This would give us an upper triad of primary elements and a quarternary of secondary elements; in other words, the three and the four, or the triangle and the square. The four secondary elements are: ab, or Self and not-self; ac, or Self and consciousness; bc, or not-self and consciousness; and, abc, or Self, not-self, and consciousness.

Elements when combined chemically produce compounds which have properties quite different from any or all of the component elements. Thus H and O are gasses at normal temperature which will burn if ignited together, but they produce H_2O , which is a liquid at normal temperatures that will put out fire. The same principle would apply above. We can illustrate the combination of three primary elements and four secondary facts in the case of color, where we have three primary colors and four colors resulting from combinations of these three.

We can further illustrate the fundamental character of the Three and the Four by certain primary facts in Geometry. The simplest closed configuration of three straight lines is a Triangle. The simplest rigid brace is three bars formed in a Triangle. A plane surface is uniquely determined by three points of a Triangle. The simplest configuration in three-dimensioned space is a configuration determined by four points, i.e., a Tetrad.

We may think of the Flame as symbolizing ideal or super-sensuous existence, hence formless for perceptive consciousness. Similarly, we may think of the figure in three-dimensional space as representing sensible or perceptive existence. Physical substance is always three-dimensional. The combination of the "formless" or super sensible with the formed or sensible world gives us three plus four or seven.

Not all seven-fold classifications would be duplications of each other; differences of this sort exist between authentic trans-Himalayan and cis-Himalayan esotericism. Yet both systems remain sound. There are different ways in which one can realize three primary elements and thus define his septenary classification. Thus differences in approach will result in differences in the form of the resultant philosophies, and yet such philosophies will be equally valid. But the difference here will be like that of transformation from one system of co-ordinates to another in mathematics. Thus we can say that Truth can have different forms for the thinker, but there always will be a common denominator. The three basic facts and the derived seven is such a common denominator.

The first fact or principle and the three facts or principles are different when we take different perspectives. *Atma* stands as first and *Atma-Buddhi-Manas* as the first three from the transcendental standpoint. But for the ordinary man, *kama rupa* or desire would stand as the first principle. From this base, the world can be viewed, a philosophy constructed and a social system evolved. It would result in a certain way of life, but it would be most unfavorable for opening the Door to Realization and for the solution of the deepest problems of the Soul. From the base of *kama rupa*, war, violence and separateness is inevitable.

If we wish to change this condition the key lies in the change of perspective or base of reference, as there is not satisfactory solution from the perspective *kama rupa*. For this reason the social problem is not primarily one of melioration but of transformation. Transformation has the significance of New Birth.

Franklin