

**GOTTFRIED DE PURUCKER on
HOW TO APPROACH and HOW TO GIVE OUT TRUTH**

[*Man in Evolution*, pp. 3, 5-7, 10-11 (1st edition 1941)]

There is Truth in the universe. What is that Truth? It is the universe itself, or rather the nature of the universe as manifested in the operations of that universe, which is thus self-expressing itself. Its laws are the courses of action of that universe manifesting itself in cosmic terms; and a true philosophy, a true religion, a true science, attempts to interpret these essentials in formulations of thought. The illuminated human intellect can so interpret these essentials because we, as offsprings of the universe, have all the faculties and powers latent in us that the universe has, expressing themselves in us as our own powers and faculties. Thus we have the organs to understand the universe, and this understanding comes to us through the unwrapping of the enshrouding veils of our nature.

(...)

Yet, though truth comes ultimately from within, we can learn much from the fruitage of the mature thought of another mind. Even though it is an importation into our mind and is not the fruitage of our own inner revelation, we can learn much from what great and good men may tell us if we take it into ourselves and honestly ponder over it and seek to understand it.

A man comes to me and tells me something, and says, "This is a truth." I should say to him, "I will examine it; it may be true, but it is not true to me until I have proved it by submitting it to the tests of my own inner consciousness. When I have proved it, then it is true to me, but I am going to bring to bear upon your statement every faculty that I have within me: spiritual, intellectual, mental, psychic, emotional, yea, and those minor faculties in which we live on this our present sphere of matter, and which collectively form what we call the brain-mind- fancy, instinct and common reason." Then if I find that the statement is true, I am willing to accept it, and I will accept it, and I will thank him for having brought me something that I did not know before.

What did Paul of the Christians mean when he said to "prove all things and to hold to that which is good"? Who is the judge of the good? Is it not the inner faculty of judgment and understanding? Or are we going to take somebody's say-so and prove all things that come to us by that some body's say-so? If so, we are merely testing one dogmatic declaration by another dogmatic declaration, and this we positively refuse to do.

Anything you accept from outside, you take either on trust or on faith, unless you have the faculties developed within yourselves of judgment, discrimination, intuition, and understanding, these four being fundamentally one. Is it not therefore clear that the information enabling one to prove all things is the developing of the inner eye, so to speak? Where else on earth, or in the heavens, or in the regions under the earth, could such an infallible touchstone be found?

Hence, if you want to prove all things, then do it in the manner that Paul of the Christians said, and that all other great philosophers and thinkers have said: Cultivate within yourself your inner faculty of understanding; and this can be done by deep thinking, meditation, refusal to accept others' say-so, by the exercise of will-power in an inflexible determination to solve questions for yourself, cost you what it may.

Such mental and spiritual exercise develops the faculties within you; or, to put it more truly, tears down the barriers preventing those faculties from expressing themselves; tears away the veils from before the face of the inner spiritual sun, whose rays are those inexpressibly fine things within

yourself. Do this and exercise yourself in it, and as surely as the sun deluges the earth with light will you attain to what you are seeking, the faculty of proving all things by knowing them for true or for false. There is the whole thing in a nutshell.

There is a tremendous responsibility involved in the giving out of truth, or what purports to be truth. Few men have any realization of the enormous power of ideas over the understanding. The spread of religions, the ready acceptance of philosophical principles, the luxuriant growth of political fads, are all examples of the manner in which men may be swept from their intellectual and moral moorings of principle by the ideas sweeping over their minds and overwhelming both will-power and sense of moral responsibility. It is by no means a truth, as every sane man knows, that ignorant dabbling with a fact of Nature will inevitably produce nothing but things that are good. If so, then, to use a figure of speech, a little child could safely play with dynamite, an idiot could enter a chemical laboratory and safely experiment with various kinds of explosives. Nature is impersonal; as the old saying goes, the rains from heaven fall alike on the just and on the unjust; but it is in the mind and heart of man that reside the sense of moral responsibility and the understanding of what that responsibility means.

(...)

The Theosophist, however, has no sympathy whatever with the idea that knowledge should be kept in secret and limited to a particular class of men, let us say to a particular priesthood of science, and that the public should be kept in real ignorance of the truths of being. The Theosophist has combatted that idea from the foundation of our Society in 1875. But you can receive nothing unless you have the receptive faculty in yourselves. You must have cultivated a certain power of understanding before you can understand; and thus while we say that knowledge is sacred and should be held as such and communicated only to those fit and ready to receive it, this does not mean that knowledge should be kept in the hands of a certain caste, to be communicated to one's fellows only by dribblets, when the holders of that knowledge think that such communication is proper. What we ask for is guarantees of fitness, and anyone possessing these guarantees and proving them is, we say, by law and by intrinsic fitness entitled to have all that we can give. But any retention of knowledge merely from motives of individual selfish or caste egoism, we claim to be wrong and improper.
