Madame Blavatsky on Progress and Culture.

Abstract and train of thoughts

Burning heretics and witches by the hecatomb is neither culture nor progress. It is evidence that Church is a dead body.

The Church is ungrateful to woman, and woman is no worse than a willing martyr. 5

Women should avoid the Church like a plague. 7

Real spiritual culture emanates from within outwards. Materially-centred culture and "civilization" are no better than whitened sepulchres full of dead men decaying. 8

Semite culture is pre-eminently that of a small tribe, with national features and idiosyncratic defects that characterize many of the Jews to this day: gross realism, sensuality, and self-laudation. Such defects stagnate moral progress and stifle spiritual reformation. 8

Were Jews were forced to break with Judaism, where is that other creed which could guide their lives? reflects a Chief Rabbi. 9

In the days of Lucullus, he who, instead of using daintily his three fingers, used the whole hand to fish a piece of food out of the dish, sinned as much against propriety, as he who puts his knife to his mouth while eating, in our day. 10

Brahmans use no forks, but they take a full bath and change entirely their clothes before sitting clown to dinner during which they wash their hands repeatedly. 11

Spiritual progress relates to the inner man; worldly progress, to gadgets and gizmos. 12

Not one atom of moral improvement do we find in Christendom since the establishment of the religion of Christ. Outward polish, inward roughness and rot. 12

From Amazons' theo-astronomical dance around the Sun, at the Mysteries, to women whirling round the ballroom clasped in the arms of strangers, of men who are neither their husbands nor their brothers, progress has been on a downward spiral. 12

Suggested reading for students.

She being dead, yet speaketh. 14

Burning heretics and witches by the hecatomb is neither culture nor progress. It is evidence that Church is a dead body.

Mated with a squalid savage — what to me were sun or clime?
I the heir of all the ages, in the foremost files of time —

. . . . . .

Not in vain the distance beacons. Forward, forward let us range,
Let the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change.
Thro' the shadow of the globe we sweep into the younger day;
Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay."

— TENNYSON, *Locksley Hall*, lines 177-84

First published in *Lucifer*, Vol. VI, No. 36, August 1890, *pp.* 441-50.
Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (PROGRESS AND CULTURE) XII *pp.* 266-79.
Frontispiece by Georges Croegaert.

WE, OF THE CENTURY CLAIMING ITSELF AS THE XIX[TH] of *our* era, are very proud of our Progress and Civilization — Church and Churchmen attributing both to the advent of Christianity — "Blot Christianity out of the pages of man's history," they say, "and what would his laws have been? — what his civilization?" Aye; "not a law which does not owe its truth and gentleness to Christianity, not a custom which cannot be traced in all its holy and healthful parts to the Gospel."

What an absurd boast, and how easily refuted!

To discredit such statements one has but to remember that our laws are based on those of Moses — life for life and tooth for tooth; to recall the laws of the *holy* Inquisition *i.e.*, the burning of heretics and witches by the hecatomb, on the slightest provocation; the alleged right of the wealthiest and the strongest to sell their servants and fellow men into slavery, not to carry into effect the curse bestowed on Ham, but simply

> . . . to purchase the luxuries of Asia by sup plying the slave market of the Saracens;[1] and finally the *Christian* laws upheld to this day in England, and called women's *disabilities*, social and political. Moreover, as in the blessed days of

[1] *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, by H.H. Hallam, LL.D., F.R.A.S., *p.* 473 [1871 ed.]. The author adds:

> "This trade was not peculiar to Venice. In England, it was very common, even after the Conquest, to export slaves to Ireland; till in the reign of Henry II, the Irish came to a non-importation agreement which put a stop to the practice."

And then, in a footnote:

> "William of Malmsbury accuses the Anglo-Saxon nobility of selling their female servants, even when pregnant by them, as slaves to foreigners." This is the Christian mode of dealing as Abraham with Hagar with a vengeance!

our forefathers' ignorance, we meet now with such choice bits of unblushing *blague*[1] as this,

> "We speak of our civilization, our arts, our freedom, our laws, and forget entirely *how large a share of all is due to Christianity*."[2]

Just so! "our laws and our arts," but neither "our civilization" nor "our freedom." No one could contradict the statement that these were won in spite of the most terrible opposition by the Church during long centuries, and in the face of her repeated and loud anathemas against civilization and freedom and the defenders of both. And yet, notwithstanding fact and truth, it is being constantly urged that even the elevated position (?!) of the Christian woman as compared with her "heathen" sister, is entirely the work of Christianity! Were it true, this would at best be but a poor compliment to pay to a religion which claims to supersede all others As it is not true, however — Lecky, among many other serious and trustworthy writers, having shown that "in the whole feudal legislation [of Christendom] women were placed *in a much lower legal position than in the Pagan Empire*" — the sooner and the oftener this fact is mentioned the better it will be for plain truth. Besides this, our ecclesiastical laws are honeycombed as has been said, with the Mosaic element. It is *Leviticus* not the Roman code, which is the creator and inspirer of legislation — in Protestant countries, at any rate.

Progress, says Carlyle, is "living movement." This is true; but it is so only on the condition that no dead weight, no corpse shall impede the freedom of that "living movement." Now in its uncompromising conservatism and unspirituality the Church is no better than a dead body. Therefore it did and still does impede true progress. Indeed, so long as the Church — the deadliest enemy of the ethics of Christ — was in power, there was hardly any progress at all. It was only after the French Revolution that real culture and civilization had a fair start.

Those ladies who claim day after day and night after night with such earnest and passionate eloquence, at "Woman's Franchise League" meetings, their legitimate share of rights as mothers, wives and citizens, and still attend "divine" service on Sundays — prosecute at best the unprofitable business of boring holes through sea water. It is not the laws of the country that they should take to task, but the Church and chiefly themselves. It is the *Karma* of the women of our era. It was generated with Mary Magdalene, got into practical expression at the hands of the mother of Constantine, and found an ever renewed strength in every Queen and Empress "by the grace of God." Judean Christianity owes its life to a woman — *une sublime hallucinée*, as Renan puts it. Modern Protestantism and Roman Catholicism owe their illegitimate existence, again, to priest-ridden and church-going women; to the mother who teaches her son his first Bible lesson; to the wife or sister who forces her husband or brother to accompany her to church and chapel; to the emotional and hysterical spinster, the admirer of every popular preacher. And yet the predecessors of the latter have for fifteen centuries degraded women from every pulpit!

---

[1] [mendacious boasting, humbug]

[2] Rose

In *Lucifer* of October, 1889, in the article "The Women of Ceylon," we can read the opinion of Principal Donaldson, LL.D., of the University of St. Andrews, about the degradation of woman by the Christian Church. This is what he said openly in the *Contemporary Review:*

> It is a prevalent opinion that woman owes her present high position to Christianity. I used to believe in this opinion. But in the first three centuries I have not been able to see that Christianity had any favourable effect on the position of women, but, on the contrary, that it tended to lower their character and contract the range of their activity.

How very correct then, the remark of H.H. Gardener, that in the New Testament,

> . . . the words sister, mother, daughter, and wife, are only names for degradation and dishonour!

The Church is ungrateful to woman, and woman is no worse than a willing martyr.

That the above is a fact, may be seen in various works, and even in certain *Weeklies*. "Saladin" of the *Agnostic* gives in his last "At Random" eloquent proofs of the same by bringing forward dozens of quotations. Here are a few of these:

> Mrs. Mary A. Livermore says: "The early Church fathers denounced women as noxious animals, necessary evils, and domestic perils."
>
> Lecky says: "Fierce invectives against the sex form a conspicuous and grotesque portion of the writings of the fathers."
>
> Mrs. Stanton says that holy books and the priesthood teach that "woman is the author of sin, who [in collusion with the devil] effected the fall of man."
>
> Gamble says that in the fourth century holy men gravely argued the question, "Ought women to be called human beings?"
>
> But let the Christian fathers speak for themselves. Tertullian, in the following flattering manner, addresses woman: "You are the devil's gateway; the unsealer of the forbidden tree; the first deserter from the divine law. You are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed God's image — man."
>
> Clement of Alexandria says: "It brings shame to reflect of what nature woman is."
>
> Gregory Thaumaturgus says: "One man among a thousand may be pure; a woman, never."
>
> "Woman is the organ of the devil." — St. Bernard.
>
> "Her voice is the hissing of the serpent." — St. Anthony.
>
> "Woman is the instrument which the devil uses to get possession of our souls." — St. Cyprian.
>
> "Woman is a scorpion." — St. Bonaventure.
>
> "The gate of the devil, the road of iniquity." — St. Jerome.

> "Woman is a daughter of falsehood, a sentinel of hell, the enemy of peace." — St. John Damascene.
>
> "Of all wild beasts the most dangerous is woman." — St. John Chrysostom.
>
> "Woman has the poison of an asp, the malice of a dragon." — St. Gregory the Great.
>
> Is it surprising, with such instructions from the fathers, that the children of the Christian Church should *not* "look up to women, and consider them men's equals"?

Withal, it is emotional woman who, even at this hour of progress, remains as ever the chief supporter of the Church! Nay it is she again who is the sole cause, if we have to believe the Bible allegory, that there is any Christianity or churches at all. For only imagine where would be both, had not our mother Eve listened to the tempting Serpent. First of all there would be no sin. Secondly, the Devil having been thwarted, there would be no need of any Redemption at all, nor of any woman to have "seed" in order that it should "bruise under its heel the serpent's head"; and thus there would be neither Church nor Satan. For as expressed by our old friend Cardinal Ventura di Raulica, Serpent-Satan is "one of the fundamental dogmas of the Church, and serves as a basis for Christianity."[1] Take away that basis and the whole struggle topples overboard into the dark waters of oblivion.

Therefore, we pronounce the Church ungrateful to woman, and the latter no worse than a willing martyr; for if her enfranchisement and freedom necessitated more than an average moral courage a century ago, it requires very little now; only a firm determination. Indeed, if the ancient and modern writers may be believed, in real culture, freedom, and self-dignity the woman of our century has placed herself far beneath the ancient Aryan mother, the Egyptian — of whom Wilkinson and Buckle say that she had the greatest influence and liberty, social, religious and political among her countrymen — and even the Roman matron. The late Peary Chand Mitra has shown, *Manu* in hand, to what supremacy and honour the women of ancient Āryāvarta had been elevated. The author of the *Women of Ancient Egypt* tells us that

> . . . from the earliest times of which we can catch a glimpse, the women of Egypt enjoyed a freedom and independence of which modern nations *are only beginning to dream*.

To quote once more from "At Random":

> Sir Henry Maine says: " . . . no society which preserves any tincture of Christian institution is likely to restore to married women the personal liberty conferred on them by the middle Roman law . . . "[2]
>
> The cause of "Woman's Rights" was championed in Greece five centuries before Christ.

[1] [Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Mœurs et pratiques des démons, p.* x]

[2] [*Ancient Law, p.* 158]

Helen H. Gardener says: "When the Pagan law recognised her [the wife] as the equal of her husband, the Church discarded that law."

Lecky says: "In the legends of early Rome we have ample evidence both of the high moral estimate of women and of their prominence in Roman life. The tragedies of Lucretia and of Virginia display a delicacy of honour and a sense of the supreme excellence of unsullied purity which no Christian nation can surpass."

Sir Henry Maine, in his *Ancient Law*,[1] says that "the inequality and oppression which related to women disappeared from Pagan laws," and adds: "the consequence was that the situation of the Roman female whether married or unmarried became one of great personal and proprietary independence . . . but Christianity tended somewhat from the very first to narrow this remarkable liberty." He further says that "the jurisconsults of the day contended for better laws for wives, but the Church prevailed in most instances, and established the most oppressive ones."

Professor Draper, in his *Intellectual Development of Europe*, gives certain facts as to the outrageous treatment of women by Christian men (the clergy included) which it would be exceedingly indelicate in me to repeat.

Moncure D. Conway says: "There is not a more cruel chapter in history than that which records the arrest, by Christianity, of the natural growth of European civilisation regarding women."

Neander, the Church historian, says: "Christianity diminishes the influence of woman."

Women should avoid the Church like a plague.

Thus, it is amply proved that instead of an "elevated" position, it is a *degraded* one to which Christianity (or rather "Churchianity") has brought woman. Apart from this, woman has nought to thank it for.

And now, a word of good advice to all the members of Leagues and other societies connected with Woman's Rights. In our days of culture and progress, now that it is shown that in *Union* alone lies strength, and that tyrants can be put down only by their own weapons; and that finally we find that nothing works better than a "strike" — let all the champions of women's rights strike, and pledge themselves not to set foot in church or chapel until their rights are re-established and their equality with men recognized by law. We prophesy that before six months are over every one of the Bishops in Parliament will work as jealously as themselves to bring in bills of reformation and pass them. Thus will Mosaic and Talmudic law be defeated to the glory of — WOMAN.

[1] [*pp.* 153, 155, 156, 159]

Real spiritual culture emanates from within outwards. Materially-centred culture and "civilization" are no better than whitened sepulchres full of dead men decaying.

But what are really culture and civilization? Dickens' idea that our hearts have benefited as much by macadam as our boots, is more original from a literary, than an aphoristical, standpoint. It is not true in principle, and it is disproved in nature by the very fact that there are far more good-hearted and noble-minded men and women in muddy country villages than there are in macadamised Paris or London. Real culture is spiritual. It proceeds from within outwards, and unless a person is naturally noble-minded and strives to progress on the spiritual before he does so on the physical or outward plane, such culture and civilization will be no better than whitened sepulchres full of dead men's bones and decay. And how can there be any true spiritual and intellectual culture when dogmatic creeds are the State religion and enforced under the penalty of the opprobrium of large communities of "believers." No dogmatic creed can be progressive. Unless a dogma is the expression of a universal and proven fact in nature, it is no better than mental and intellectual slavery. One who accepts dogmas easily ends by becoming a dogmatist himself. And, as Watts has well said:

> A dogmatical spirit inclines a man to be censorious of his neighbours. . . . He is tempted to disdain his correspondents as men of low and dark understandings because they do not believe what he does.

Semite culture is pre-eminently that of a small tribe, with national features and idiosyncratic defects that characterize many of the Jews to this day: gross realism, sensuality, and self-laudation.[1] Such defects stagnate moral progress and stifle spiritual reformation.

The above finds its demonstration daily in bigoted clergymen, in priests and Rabbis. Speaking of the latter and of the *Talmud* in connection with progress and culture, we note some extraordinary articles in *Les Archives Israélites*, the leading organ of the French Jews, at Paris. In these the stagnation of all progress through fanaticism is so evident, that after reading some papers signed by such well-known names of *men of culture* as F. Crémieux ("Cléricalisme et Judaisme"), A. Franck, a member of the Institute ("Les Juifs et l'Humanité"), and especially an article by Élie Aristide Astruc, "*Grand rabbin de Bayonne*, *grand rabbin honoraire de la Belgique*," etc. ("Pourquoi nous restons Juifs") — no one can detect the faintest trace of the progress of the age, or preserve the slightest hope of ever witnessing that which the Christians are pleased to call the moral regeneration of the Jews. This article (not to mention the others), written by a man who has an enormous reputation for learning and ability, bears on its face the proofs of what is intellectual culture, *minus* spirituality. The paper is addressed to the French Jews, considered as the most progressed of their race, and is full of the most ardent and passionate apology for Talmudic Judaism, soaked through and through with colossal religious self-opinionatedness. Nothing can approach its self-laudation. It precludes every moral progress and spiritual reformation

[1] [Consult "The Origin of Good and Evil," and "The Original Sin is a Jewish invention," in our Black versus White Magic Series. — ED. PHIL.]

in Judaism; it calls openly upon the race to exercise more than ever an uncompromising exclusiveness, and awakens the darkest and the most bigoted form of ignorant fanaticism. If such are the views of the leaders of the Jews settled in France, the hotbed of civilization and progress, what hope is there left for their co-religionists of other countries?

> **Were Jews were forced to break with Judaism, where is that other creed which could guide their lives? reflects a Chief Rabbi.**

The article, "Why we remain Jews," is curious. A. Astruc, the learned author thereof, notifies his readers solemnly that the Jews have to remain *nolens volens* Jews, as not one of the existing religions could "satisfy the genius of the nation." "Were we forced to break with Judaism," he argues, where is that other creed which could guide our lives?" He speaks of the star that once arose in the East and led the Magi to Bethlehem, but asks, "could the East, the cradle of religions, give us now a true creed? Never!" Then he turns to an analysis of Islamism and Buddhism. The former, he finds too dry in dogma and too ritualistic in form, and shows that it could never satisfy the Israelitish mind Buddhism with its aspirations towards *Nirvana*, considered as the greatest realisation of bliss and "the most abstruse *consciousness of non-being*" (?) seems to him too negative and passive.

We will not stop to discuss this new phase of metaphysics, *i.e.*, the phenomenon of *non-being* endowed with self-consciousness. Let us rather see the author's analysis of the two forms of Christianity — Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The former with its Trinitarianism, and the dogmas of Divine Incarnation and Redemption, are incomprehensible "to the free mind of the Israelite": the latter is too much scattered into innumerable sects to ever become the religion of the future. Neither of these two faiths "could satisfy a Jew," he says; therefore, the Rabbi implores his co-religionists to remain faithful to Judaism, or the Mosaic law, as this faith is *the best and the most saving of all*; it is, in short, as he puts it, "the ultimate as the highest expression of human religious thought."

This ultra-fanatical article has drawn the attention of several "Christian" papers. One of these takes its author to task severely *for his fear of dogmas only because human reason is unable to comprehend them*; as though, he adds, "any religious faith *could ever be built upon reason*"! This is well said, and would denote real progressive thought in the mind of the critic, had not his definition of belief in dogmas been a *bona fide* defence of them, which is far from showing philosophical progress. Then, the Russian reviewer, we are happy to say, defends Buddhism against the Rabbi's assault.

> We would have our honourable friend understand that he is quite wrong in undervaluing Buddhism, or regarding it, as he does, as in finitely below Judaism. Buddhism with its spiritual aspiration heavenward, and its ascetic tendencies, is, with all its defects, most undeniably more spiritual and humanitarian than Judaism ever was especially modern Judaism with its inimical exclusiveness,

its dark and despotic *kahal*,[1] its deadening Talmudic ritualism, which is a Jewish substitute for religion, and its determined hatred of all progress.[2]

This is good. It shows a beginning, at any rate, of spiritual culture in the journalism of a country regarded hitherto as only *semi*-civilised, while the press of the fully civilised nations generally breathes religious intolerance and prejudice, if not hatred, whenever speaking of a *pagan* philosophy.

In the days of Lucullus, he who, instead of using daintily his three fingers, used the whole hand to fish a piece of food out of the dish, sinned as much against propriety, as he who puts his knife to his mouth while eating, in our day.

And what, after all, does *our* civilization amount to in the face of the grandiose civilizations of the Past, now so remote and so forgotten, as to furnish our modern conceit with the comforting idea that there never were any true civilizations at all before the advent to Christianity? Europeans call the Asiatic races "inferior" because, among other things, they eat with their hands and use no pocket handkerchiefs. But how long is it that we, of Christendom, have ceased eating with our thumb and fingers, and begun blowing our noses with cambric? From the beginnings of the nations and down to the end of the XVIIIth century Christendom has either remained ignorant of, or scorned the use of, the fork. And yet in the Rome of the Cæsars, civilization was at the height of its development; and we know that if at the feasts of Lucullus, famous for their gorgeous luxury and sumptuousness, each guest chose his succulent morsel by plunging his fingers into a dish of rare viands, the guests of the Kings of France did the same as late as the last century. Almost 2,000 years rolled away, between Lucullus and the Pagan Cæsars on the one hand and the latest Bourbons on the other, yet the same personal habits prevailed; we find the same at the brilliant courts of François I, Henry II, Louis XIII, and Louis XIV. The French historian, Alfred Franklin, gives in his interesting volumes *La Vie privée d'autrefois du XIIe au XVIIIe siècles*, *Les Repas*, etc., a mass of curious information, especially as to the etiquette and the laws of propriety which existed in those centuries. He who, instead of using daintily his three fingers, used the whole hand to fish a piece of food out of the dish, sinned as much against propriety in those days, as he who puts his knife to his mouth while eating, in our own day. Our forefathers had very strict rules on cleanliness: *e.g.*, the three fingers being *de rigueur*, they could be neither licked, nor wiped on one's jacket, but had to be cleaned and dried after every course "on the table cloth." The VIth volume of the work named acquaints the reader with all the details of the sundry customs. The modern habit of washing one's hands before dinner — existing now in truth, only in England — was strictly *de rigueur*, not only at the courts of the French kings, but was a general custom, and had to be repeated before every course. The office was performed at courts by chamberlains and pages, who holding in their left hand a gold or silver basin, poured with their right hand out of a similar jug, aromatic, tepid water on to the hands of the diners. But this was in the reign of Henry III and IV. TWO centuries later, in the face of progress and civilization, we see

[1] [Governing body of a former European Jewish community administering religious, legal, and communal affairs.]

[2] *Novoye Vremya*

this custom disappearing, and preserved only at the courts and by the highest aristocracy. In the XVIth century it began to fall into desuetude: and even Louis the XIVth limited his ablutions to a wet napkin. In the midst of the *bourgeoisie* it had almost disappeared; and Napoleon 1st washed his hands only once before dinner. Today no country save England has preserved this custom.

> **Brahmans use no forks, but they take a full bath and change entirely their clothes before sitting clown to dinner during which they wash their hands repeatedly.**

How much cleaner are the primitive peoples in eating than we are — the Hindus, for instance, and especially the Brahmans. These use no forks, but they take a full bath and change entirely their clothes before sitting clown to dinner during which they wash their hands repeatedly. No Brahman would eat with both his hands, or use his fingers for any other purpose while eating. But the Europeans of the eighteenth century had to be reminded, as we find in various works upon etiquette, of such simple rules as the following: "It is considered improper, and even indecent, to touch one's nose, especially when full of snuff, while eating one's dinner" (*loc. cit.*). Yet Brahmans are "pagans" and our forefathers Christians.

In China, native forks (chopsticks) were used 1,000 years B.C., as they are now. And when was the fork adopted in Europe? This is what Franklin tells us.

> Roasted meats were eaten with fingers as late as the beginning of this century. Montaigne remarks in his *Essais* that he more than once bit his fingers through his habitual precipitation in eating. The fork was known in the days of Henry III, but rarely used before the end of the last century. The wife of Charles le Bel (1324) and Clemence of Hungary had in their dowry each one fork only; and the Duchess of Tours had two. Charles V (1380) and Charles VI (1418) had in their table inventory only three golden forks — for fruit. Charlotte d'Albrey (1514) three likewise, which were, however, never used.[1]

Germany and Italy adopted the fork at their meals a century earlier than did the French Cornet, an Englishman, was much surprised, while travelling in Italy in 1609, to find "a strange-looking, clumsy, and dangerous weapon called a fork," used by the natives while eating. In 1651 we find Ann of Austria refusing to use this "weapon," and eating together with her son (Louis XIV) with her fingers. The fork came into general use only at the beginning of our own century.

[1] [Summarized from pages 1-2, 17, 18, 52. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]

Spiritual progress relates to the inner man; worldly progress, to gadgets and gizmos.[1]

Not one atom of moral improvement do we find in Christendom since the establishment of the religion of Christ. Outward polish, inward roughness and rot.

Whither then shall we turn to find a corroboration of the mendacious claim, hat we owe our civilization and culture, our arts, sciences, and all, to the elevating and benign influence of Christianity? We owe to it nothing — nothing at all, neither physically nor morally. The progress we have achieved, so far, relates in every case to purely physical appliances, to objects and things, not to the *inner* man. We have now every convenience and comfort of life, everything that panders to our senses and vanity, but not one atom of moral improvement do we find in Christendom since the establishment of the religion of Christ. As the cowl does not make the monk, so the renunciation of the old Gods has not made men any better than they were before, but only, perhaps, worse. At any rate, it has created a new form of hypocrisy — *cant*; nor has civilization spread as much as is claimed for it. London is civilized, but in truth — only in the West end. As to the East end with its squalid population, and its desolate wildernesses of Whitechapel, Limehouse, Stepney, etc., it is as uncultured and almost as barbarous as Europe was in the early centuries of our era, and its denizens, moreover, have acquired a form of brutality quite unknown to those early ages, and never dreamt of by the worst savages or modern heathen nations. And it is the same in every Christian metropolis, in every town and city; outward polish, inward roughness and rottenness — a Dead Sea fruit indeed!

From Amazons' theo-astronomical dance around the Sun, at the Mysteries, to women whirling round the ballroom clasped in the arms of strangers,[2] **of men who are neither their husbands nor their brothers, progress has been on a downward spiral.**

The simple truth is that the word "civilization" is a very vague and undefined term. Like good and evil, beauty and ugliness, etc., civilization and barbarism are relative terms. For that which to the Chinaman, the Hindu, and the Persian would appear the height of culture, would be regarded by the European as a shocking lack of manners, a terrible breach of Society etiquette. In India the traveller is disgusted whenever he sees the native using his fingers instead of a pocket handkerchief. In China, the Celestial[3] is profoundly sickened at perceiving a European storing carefully into his pocket the product of his mucous glands. In Bombay the Puritan English woman regards, suffused with blushes, the narrow space of bared waist, and the naked knees and legs of the native woman. Bring the Brahmanee into a modern ballroom — nay, the "Queen's Drawing-room" — and watch the effect produced on her. Several thou-

---

[1] [*Cf.* "Life is about people, not about things,
About relationships between people.
We must love people and use things,
Not use people and love things."
— National Council for Travelling People in Ireland]

[2] [Look up "Blavatsky hated balls" in the same series. — ED. PHIL.]

[3] [Nineteenth century term for Chinese emigrants to the United States, Canada, and Australia. From Celestial Empire, a traditional name of China.]

sand years B.C., the Amazons danced the Circle Dance around the "Great Mother," at the Mysteries; the daughters of Shiloh, bare to the waist, and the prophets of Baal divested of their clothes, whirled and leaped likewise at the Sabæan festivals. This was simply symbolical of the motion of the planets around the Sun, but is now branded as a *phallic dance*. How then will future generations characterize our modern ballroom dances and the favourite *waltz*? What difference is there between the ancient priestesses of the God Pan, or the Bacchantes, with the rest of the sacred dancers, and the modern priestesses of Terpsichore? We really see very little. The latter, nude almost down to their waists, dance likewise their "circle dance," while whirling round the ballroom; the only distinction between them being, that the former performed their dance without mixing with the opposite sex, while the waltzers are clasped in turn in the arms of strangers, of men who are neither their husbands nor their brothers.

How unfathomable are thy mysteries, O sphinx of progress, called modern civilization!

Suggested reading for students.

She being dead, yet speaketh.

- “Blavatsky about to unveil Isis”
- “Blavatsky against Ecclesiastical Christianity”
- “Blavatsky against Spiritualism”
- “Blavatsky cuts down to size a carping critic of heterodoxy”
- “Blavatsky defends Isis Unveiled”
- “Blavatsky enlightens the sceptics of her Motherland”
- “Blavatsky expels a friend of Communists”
- “Blavatsky hated balls”
- “Blavatsky on a Case of Obsession”
- “Blavatsky on a Heavy Curse”
- “Blavatsky on an Intro- and retrospective dream”
- “Blavatsky on Animal Souls”
- “Blavatsky on Bulgarian Sun Worship”
- “Blavatsky on Christmas and the Christmas Tree”
- “Blavatsky on Elementals and Elementaries”
- “Blavatsky on foeticide being a crime against nature”
- “Blavatsky on Hindu widow-burning”
- “Blavatsky on Jesuitry in Masonry”
- “Blavatsky on Marriage, Divorce, and Celibacy”
- “Blavatsky on Nebo of Birs-Nimrud”
- “Blavatsky on Occult Alphabets and Numerals”
- “Blavatsky on Occult Vibrations”
- “Blavatsky on Old Age”
- “Blavatsky on old doctrines vindicated by new prophets”
- “Blavatsky on Plato’s Timæus”
- “Blavatsky on Religious deformities”

- “Blavatsky on Ritualism in Church and Masonry”
- “Blavatsky on Shambhala, the Happy Land”
- “Blavatsky on Spinoza and Western Philosophers”
- “Blavatsky on Sunday devotion to pleasure”
- “Blavatsky on Teachings of Eliphas Levi”
- “Blavatsky on the Boogeymen of Science”
- “Blavatsky on the Book of Enoch”
- “Blavatsky on the doomed destiny of the Romanovs”
- “Blavatsky on the elucidation of long-standing enigmas”
- “Blavatsky on the Harmonics of Smell”
- “Blavatsky on the hidden Esotericism of the Bible”
- “Blavatsky on the history and tribulations of the Zohar”
- “Blavatsky on the introversion of mental vision”
- “Blavatsky on the Key to Spiritual Progress”
- “Blavatsky on the knighted Oxford Sanskritist who could speak no Sanskrit”
- “Blavatsky on the Letters of Lavater”
- “Blavatsky on the Luminous Circle”
- “Blavatsky on the modern negators of Ancient Science”
- “Blavatsky on the Monsoon”
- “Blavatsky on the New Year and false noses”
- “Blavatsky on the New Year’s Morrow”
- “Blavatsky on the Qabbalah by Isaac Myer”
- “Blavatsky on the quenchless Lamps of Alchemy”
- “Blavatsky on the Rationale of Fasts”
- “Blavatsky on the Roots of Zoroastrianism”
- “Blavatsky on the Secret Doctrine”
- “Blavatsky on the Teachings of Eliphas Levi”
- “Blavatsky on the Vishishtadvaita Philosophy”
- “Blavatsky on Theosophy and Asceticism”
- “Blavatsky on whether the Rishis exist today”
- “Blavatsky rebuts unspiritual conceptions about God”
- “Blavatsky's last words”
- “Blavatsky's open letter to her correspondents”

- “Gems from the East”
- “Inductive reasoning leads to fake deductions”
- “Madame Blavatsky enlightens the sceptics of her Motherland”
- “Madame Blavatsky on the philosophical mind of the Chinese”
- “Obituary to Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov”
- “Obituary to Pundit Dayanand Saraswati”
- “Open Letter to the American Section of the Theosophical Society”
- “Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury”
- “Open Letters to the American Convention”
- “Pages from Isis Unveiled”
- “Pages from the Caves and Jungles of Hindostan”
- “Pages from The Secret Doctrine 1 - abridged”
- “Pages from The Secret Doctrine 2 - full text”
- “Pantheistic Theosophy is irreconcilable with Roman Catholicism”
- “Rosicrucianism was an offshoot of Oriental Occultism”
- “Rosicrucians emerged as an antidote to the material side of alchemy”
- “The Hermetic Fire of the mind is the key to the Occult Sciences”
- “The real meaning of the first line of Genesis”
- “The Secret Doctrine (1888) Vol. 1 of 2 on Cosmogenesis”
- “The Secret Doctrine (1888) Vol. 2 of 2 on Anthropogenesis”
- “Thoth is the equivalent of Hermes and Moses”
- “Unpopular Philosopher on Criticism and Authorities”
- “Unpopular Philosopher on the Eighth Wonder”
- “Unpopular Philosopher on the Morning Star”
- “We are more often victims of words rather than of facts”
- “Without the revival of Aryan philosophy, the West will fall to even grosser materialism”

Further reading.

- "Christianity has retarded the Woman's progress"
- "Why women should avoid the Church like a plague"

— *in our Black versus White Magic Series*.