

# SOME PROBLEMS OF HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS DEVELOPMENT IN ALICE A. BAILEY'S PRESENTATION OF ESOTERICIS AND THEIR HYLOZOIC SOLUTION

By Lars Adelskog

## *Introduction*

When studying esoterics you should always aim at grasping essentials. You may ask yourself whether there is any study of the esoteric world view that is more essential than the one designed to explain consciousness development.

In the new age teachings, there is much talk of consciousness development, but the account given is neither continuous nor logical. Often too much attention is directed to purely physical or physiological issues, such as the human DNA structure, but very little is said about the nature of consciousness. (I realize the difficulty of criticizing the new age teachings on account of their great variation and considerable mutual inconsistencies. But I could cite as an instance here the *Secret of the Flower of Life* books by Drunvalo Melchizedek, which illustrate fairly well what I am saying.)

Theosophy – C.W. Leadbeater being its most important systematic exponent – and the teaching of Alice. A. Bailey afford many details on consciousness development, but they have never explained in a satisfactory way the most basic fact of the process – the consciousness development of the self, of the monad – since the understanding of the fact that the self is a monad, a primordial atom, was absent from Oriental esoterics, which even Occidental esoterics made the basis of its presentation when appearing before the public after 1875.

Henry T. Laurency criticizes this deficiency of the theosophic teachings succinctly and to the point: "Many students of theosophical literature have vainly searched for the 'self', wondering where it is. They are aware that they are 'selves', but to theosophists the self is always something else and somewhere else. Theosophists appear not to have understood that the self is a primordial atom, that the self is the monad, that the self is the individual, and that the self is the personality, that the self is centred in the lowest triad." (Henry T. Laurency, *Knowledge of Life Three*, 5.24.1)

Only Pythagorean hylozoics has explained the basic esoteric fact of the monad. This will of course be elucidated in the following. The present writer, being a Pythagorean, finds it very hard to digest that the theosophists and subsequently Alice A. Bailey confused the monad with the third triad. You will need an intellectual machete to clear a path of understanding through the jungle of esoteric terms grown thick since 1875. Two clarifications to begin with:

(1) Only monads can be conscious beings. By "conscious beings" we understand self-conscious ones. The cosmos is made up of monads and envelopes for monads. An envelope is always conscious in a lower degree than the monad for which the envelope is intended. If an envelope (man's physical envelope, for instance) displays self-consciousness, it is only because the monad (or self) residing in it is self-conscious.

(2) It goes against logic and conflicts with reality to talk about someone's "higher self", for the lower (this someone) cannot possess the higher (the "higher self"), and the higher self must be the true self possessing (and by virtue of its possession using) the lower self, which therefore must be just an apparent self. The talk about someone's "higher self" reveals a thoughtlessness of the same order as is manifest in such expressions as "my monad" instead of the only expression possible in this connection: "I, the monad". Let us now proceed to

### *The Problem of the Self*

The two hylozoic fundamental teachings on the three aspects of cosmic reality and the atomic structure of cosmic matter logically emanate from the Pythagorean teaching on the monad. Because the fact that everything in the cosmos is by nature atomic depends on the fact that everything in the cosmos ultimately is made up of primordial atoms – monads. And the fact that everything in the cosmos is a trinity of matter, consciousness, and motion depends on the fact that the primordial atoms have those three aspects.

This monadology, this teaching on the monads, is part of the inmost essence of Pythagorean hylozoics, is part of what distinguishes hylozoics from all the other esoteric systems. It is to be seen that this teaching on the monads affords the explanation of a number of problems of the esoteric knowledge. Without monadology, these problems will remain unsolved, and in the absence of their solution fictions have arisen.

The first and foremost problem, *the problem of the self*, sums up the other four.

In the older esoterics, they avoided as much as possible to study the matter aspect. The object was to direct the disciples' undivided attention to the consciousness aspect, since this makes it easier to acquire the higher kinds of consciousness and the essential qualities. Man's attention to the material side of this process in himself – the exchange of lower molecular kinds for higher kinds in his envelopes, the activity of the various envelope centres (chakras), etc. – can only disturb (energy follows thought!) his natural evolution. Likewise, it is superstitious to believe, as do certain new age groups, that you develop your consciousness by working at “purifying your inner bodies” or “gaining control over your chakras” by meditating on them. It is superstitious because it is a confusion of cause and effect. You “purify your inner bodies” (that is to say, lower molecular kinds are replaced with higher ones in your envelopes) and you “gain control over your chakras” as results of your acquisition of a higher kind of consciousness with its stronger will or energy aspect (which has a purifying effect on the envelopes and a controlling effect on their chakras). However, this higher consciousness is an aspect of the life of unity. It can never be attained with egoistic motives of mere individual development but only on the path of unity: giving out love, sacrifice, service, work for mankind.

Therefore, the study of the consciousness aspect is the most important in hylozoics as well. There is an important difference from the older teaching, however. Today the study begins by explaining the matter aspect, the trinity of existence, the primordial atoms (the monads), etc., since it has been seen that incomprehension, absurdities, fictions are the result whenever one indispensable aspect of existence is neglected.

All the problems mentioned have their actual origin in the silence treatment given the primordial atoms, the monads. If when teaching elementary esoterics the theosophists had mentioned them, they had been forced to admit that everything has a matter aspect, everything in all worlds, since the monads, the least parts of matter, are the sole content of the cosmos, the necessary basis of consciousness and the medium of motion. But they preferred to think the matter aspect away. In so doing they deprived themselves of the possibility of explaining the self, since the self is the consciousness of the monad – of the primordial atom.

They could not avoid talking about the envelopes of the self, notwithstanding these are material things. But they led thought away from the fact of materiality by calling the envelopes “principles” and by simultaneously asserting (without explanation) that the organism “is no principle”. In the process they had created a concept covering both envelopes and envelope consciousnesses without forcing thought to touch ideas of “body” or anything material at all.

Problems pile up if you try to explain the human self on the basis of this teaching on “principles”. *What is the self?* Is it some one of the “lower principles”, namely the envelopes of incarnation – the mental, emotional, and etheric envelopes – and their consciousness? Our

everyday experience commands us to answer this question in the affirmative, since our perception of being a self is bound up with those envelope consciousnesses almost exclusively. But if that is so, then that self must dissolve at the end of physical life, and that renders evolution impossible in any esoteric sense, that is: the continuous progressive consciousness development of a permanent self as distinguished from perishable envelopes. If we hold on to evolution and therefore the immortality of the self, we must equate the self with what has been called the Spiritual Triad or the three highest principles (in theosophical parlance: atma, buddhi, higher manas), in hylozoic terms: superessential or 45, essential or 46, and causal or 47:1-3. However, since at the present general stage in the consciousness development of mankind we are seldom self-conscious even at the causal level, we must conclude from this that we really do not have self-consciousness.

The solution of this problem given by traditional esoterics starts from the doctrine of the existence of two different selves in man: the higher self – 45, 46, 47:1-3 – and the lower self – 47:4-7, 48, 49:1-4 (49:5-7 not being a principle, mind you!). The higher self is described as an independent being with a superhuman consciousness capacity: “omniscient and omnipotent in the worlds of man”, “free from karma”, etc. The higher self is said to send down “a ray of itself” into the lower self to gain experience in the lower self’s worlds. Omniscience has something to learn in the worlds of life ignorance! At the same time, the lower self – which we human beings anyhow must associate with the idea of “self” – is said to have as its prime purpose to establish a contact with the higher self and to come under its influence.

Apart from the absurdities just mentioned it is also evident that this doctrine is incompatible with hylozoic evolutionism. The reasoning is as follows.

Can the life of a human being in the physical, emotional, and mental, his consciousness, experiences, toilsome work in these worlds have any meaning at all, if he already has another self, a higher self that is self-conscious, omniscient, omnipotent, etc., in superhuman worlds? And how can that self exist on its high level? There seem to be only two options: (1) Either the higher self is the result of a process of evolution; (2) or the higher self has not evolved from something lower but has always and “from the beginning” existed on its high level. If we opt for (2), then the only possible explanation will be something similar to the Old Testament Story of Creation, where an omnipotent god in the beginning creates all the higher and lower beings in all their classes, investing them at the same time with the kinds of consciousness, higher and lower, which they are to have for all time to come. This option is incompatible with the evolution of consciousness and therefore must be cancelled. Option (1), on the other hand, is compatible with evolution. If we opt for it, however, we must conclude, if we are consistent evolutionists, that whatever is now a higher self has evolved through all the lower developmental stages in succession. And then the higher self has once been such a lower self mentioned above (either in the human evolution or in some evolution parallel to the human). And if what is now a higher self was once a lower self, then it is exceedingly probable, not to say imperative according to the logic of evolution, that what is now a lower self will become a higher self sometime in the future. However, we must then conclude that it really is about two individuals, the one more advanced in its evolution, the other less so. This conclusion of course makes it quite impossible make the higher self a part of man, to call it “man’s higher self”, “our higher self”, “man’s divine soul”, “man’s spiritual Ego” or whatever in the same vein.

The hylozoic solution of this problem is the simplest conceivable one. Whatever we call the self in man is a primordial atom, a monad, which in the evolution of its consciousness has reached the level where man normally has his waking consciousness (emotional and mental consciousness).

Since “death” is the dissolution of composite forms into their component parts (also atoms dissolve; that is to say, atoms of lower kinds dissolve into atoms of higher kinds), the monad,

being un-compounded, cannot dissolve or die in this manner. The monads are the sole immortals in the cosmos.

The monad can perceive the consciousness and matter of different worlds, can act in their reality by entering into envelopes made of the matter of those worlds and in so doing activate the passive consciousness of its envelopes. The monad subsequently identifies itself with this activated consciousness as its “self”.

The monad potentially apprehends the passive consciousness in all higher worlds, since this consciousness belongs to the different atomic kinds and these in the last analysis consist of primordial atoms – monads – having passive consciousness. All consciousness is consciousness in monads, actively or passively conscious monads.

However, the monad is actively self-conscious only in those kinds of consciousness which it has hitherto been able to activate through its evolution. This is of course true also of the monad in the human kingdom, the human self.

The highest envelope of the human self, of the human monad, is the causal envelope. This envelope will become a self-conscious being, when the monad at the end of its sojourn in the human kingdom, at the stage of ideality, centres itself in it. Before that stage, however, the causal envelope is a mere robot consisting of atoms and molecules with passive consciousness. In the causal envelope is stored the quintessence of all the experience the monad has had during its sojourn in the human kingdom. A momentary contact with this enormous storehouse of experience must certainly appear as a contact with a “higher self”. In this case, however, it is not a contact with a self-conscious, independent, active being. This is a fact that must be stressed.

#### *The Other Four Esoteric Problems*

Hylozoic monadology alone affords the solution of *the problem of the immortality of the self*. This has sometimes been formulated as the immortality of the “soul” or of “spirit”. However, the “soul”, namely the causal envelope, is not immortal, because it is dissolved when the monad leaves the human kingdom definitively and enters the fifth natural kingdom. Nor is “spirit” immortal, for what is meant by that is the 45-envelope of the second self, and it is dissolved, at the very latest, as the monad passes to the seventh natural kingdom or first cosmic kingdom (worlds 36–42). But how does the self, the permanent individuality, survive these dissolutions? If the individual self, self-awareness, self-identity, the perception of one’s own presence, “I am”, has no material basis limiting it against the rest of existence, all other individuals, it must dissolve when its envelope dissolves, and merge with the all, thus be lost as an individual self with a self-identity. And such a “nirvana” is certainly what exoteric pantheism, knowing nothing of the monads, teaches. The “self’s merging with universal soul”, however, would imply the end and nullification of the self’s evolution. Only an indissoluble primordial atom can be a permanent material basis of self-consciousness. Moreover: since the monad is an atom of the highest kind in the cosmos, there is in the cosmos no limit to its potential consciousness expansion; it can embrace the consciousness bound up with all the lower kinds of atoms (2–49), or (which is about the same thing) it can extend its consciousness beyond all the envelopes that it must put off in succession. If we equate the self with *any envelope whatsoever*, we must also accept that no evolution beyond the capacity of that envelope is possible.

This leads us on to the next problem solved by monadology: *god immanent and god transcendent*. In esoterics, and also in new age mysticism, it is an axiom that “all is divine in essence” or “all is inherently divine”. Monadology explains this in the simplest manner. All is divine in essence, since all, in all worlds, is matter consisting of atoms and, in the last analysis, of indestructible primordial atoms. Every one of these primordial atoms – monads – possesses consciousness, always to some degree, even if still just potential. Since memory is

indestructible, the monads cannot avoid collecting experience and thereby develop their consciousness and ability. Consciousness development of an indestructible self must, as time goes by, reach ever higher stages and finally the very highest one – cosmic omniscience and omnipotence. The monads that have already reached this highest stage collectively make up “god transcendent”. The monads that are still on their way to reach it – all of them, at all stages – collectively make up “god immanent”.

The third problem concerns *the worlds of the cosmos* (1–49). Esoterics teaches the existence of an invisible existence, as objective on its conditions as the visible reality is objective on its conditions. Esoterics teaches that invisible reality is divided into several different states. In mysticism, sharing a similar view, those states are one-sidedly described as levels of consciousness only, as “spiritual” in contradistinction to visible reality as “material”, whereas hylozoics affords an all-round description, clarifying that this “spiritual” reality has a matter aspect and motion aspect as well as a consciousness aspect.

This problem is about how to explain, on the one hand, the fact that each world has matter, consciousness, motion (series of vibrations, will), space and time perception of its own characteristic kind, which is totally different from those of the other worlds; on the other hand, the fact that all the worlds together make up a continuum, a unity held together, the cosmos. This unity is most clearly manifested in the fact that all the kinds of consciousness belonging to the ever higher worlds embrace and include all the lower kinds.

This problem is solved by explaining that all the worlds of the cosmos are material and of an atomic nature, just like the physical world. Every world is made up of its own atoms, which are different from all the others. Consciousness and motion are always limited in their possibilities and modes of expression by the matter that is the necessary basis of these two aspects. The coarser, more massive the atoms, the more sluggish the motion, the slower the vibrations, and the duller, more mechanical the consciousness. The finer the atoms, the swifter, more intensive the vibrations, and the clearer and more purposive the consciousness developing in the atoms.

Every atom of a certain kind consists of a number of atoms of the next higher kind, each one of these atoms is in its turn made up of a number of atoms of the next higher kind in the series, etc. in the direction of the primordial atoms. This of course implies that each atomic kind contains all the higher kinds or, expressed differently, higher atoms penetrate all the lower atoms and the monads therefore penetrate and build all matter in the cosmos. In consequence, all the atomic kinds have an inner connection with one another. Energies of a higher atomic kind act on all the lower kinds. Atoms of the same atomic kind have the same kind of consciousness, and from the consciousness point of view they form a collective with a common consciousness. This collective also includes the collective consciousnesses of all the lower atomic kinds, since atoms of lower kinds consist of nothing but atoms of higher kinds. On the other hand, lower consciousness cannot apprehend higher, a fact that we can all realize when we ascertain that by sense perceptions (49) such as vision, hearing, touch, etc. we cannot apprehend desires and feelings (48) or thoughts (47), and by desires and feelings we cannot grasp thoughts; whereas by desires and feelings we can apprehend sense perceptions, so that we can, for instance, sort them into agreeable and disagreeable ones, and by thoughts we can grasp (understand, judge) desires and feelings as well as sense perceptions.

The fourth problem concerns *the genesis of the cosmos*, the original formation of the atomic kinds, etc. Theology solves the problem conveniently by handing it all over to an omnipotent and eternal god. Hylozoics cannot avail itself of that recourse, since it does not admit of the existence of other gods than such monads as have reached the various cosmic divine kingdoms, and particularly the seventh and highest divine kingdom (1–7) after having passed all the preceding, lower stages in the process of manifestation, including involution, evolution, and expansion. Our cosmos has existed for so long that monads have already

managed to achieve this and in so doing have made the cosmos a perfect organization. But how was it in the beginning of cosmic existence? Were all those monads then as unconscious as the ones created in primordial matter right now? How could an accumulation of primordial atoms ever form those composite atomic kinds and forms that are expedient for the evolution of consciousness? It would be exceedingly difficult to solve this problem, if there were only one cosmos. There are countless cosmic globes, however, and there have always been. Thus they exist simultaneously and everywhere in the universe, and there are such cosmic globes at all the stages of manifestation from the recently formed to the fully constructed and those in the process of being dismantled. The monads that have reached the highest (seventh) divine kingdom of their cosmos make up collectives that perform the function of supreme guardians of the law, supervisors of evolution, and shapers of matter where that globe is concerned. According as younger monads reach up to the highest kingdom (1–7), the older ones are set free for other tasks. The latter can, if they so desire, leave their cosmos in a collective formation in order to build a new cosmos somewhere in primordial matter with its infinite store of unconscious primordial atoms, in so doing affording countless monads the experience of life. They received this gift of life themselves from other cosmos builders once in an immensely distant past, and now they are carrying the baton. And so it goes on without beginning and without end. The cosmos builders thus do not create the monads – this supreme omnipotence is reserved for eternally unconscious, “blind” dynamis – but they make them enter into a cosmos, compose them to form the 48 lower atomic kinds. Thanks to the cosmos builders, the cosmos receives from the very beginning the highest degree of finality possible with its primordial atoms, still only potentially conscious.

Let us now examine somewhat how the evolution of the human self is explained in some of the esoteric works published in the name of Alice A. Bailey. And let us then begin with an introductory survey of the terminology used. There will be some repetitions, but they are quite intentional and designed to make it easier for the reader to follow the reasoning.

*“Man’s Three Aspects” According to Alice A. Bailey*

Man’s three aspects are said to be (I have not retained the capitalization of certain words):

1. Spirit, life, energy.
2. Soul, the mediator, or the middle principle.
3. The body, the phenomenal appearance. (WM 23–50)

or

1. The monad, or pure spirit, the father in heaven
2. The ego, the higher self, or individuality .
3. The personality, or lower self, physical plane man. (LOM, Introduction; CF 608f)

Also, each one of these three aspects (in CF 608 also called “fires”) is threefold, so that nine aspects in all are obtained (CF 608).

In hylozoics, these three “aspects” of man are called the three triads of man:

- the third triad (43:4, 44:1, 45:1)
- the second triad (45:4, 46:1, 47:1)
- the first triad (47:4, 48:1, 49:1)

As you see they are numbered from “below”, from the physical world up, since they are activated from “below” by the monad during its evolution.

In CF there are numerous references to “fire by friction”, “solar fire” and “electric fire”.  
In hylozoics:

fire by friction = the energies of the first triad  
solar fire = the energies of the second triad  
electric fire = the energies of the third triad. (CF 38)

In CF other terms for the three triad energies are also used. “Fire of matter” (CF 35) is the energies of the first triad, “fire of mind” (CF 221) denotes second triad energies in general (thus not just causal-mental energy, although this is what is generally intended), and the “electric fire of spirit” (CF 1227) is the energies of the third triad.

In WM 525f we find the following terms as well: “spiritual energy” = third triad energy, “sentient energy” = second triad energy, and “pranic energy” = first triad energy. The use of the last term intimates that the etheric envelope is the most important of the envelopes of incarnation from the energy point of view.

What Bailey calls “man’s three aspects” are three triads, three material units, not just consciousness and energy units. Each one of them consists of two atoms and one molecule, a fact that is not generally known to esoteric students. In the theosophical terminology, which Bailey largely adopted without revision, this fact was obscured by using the term “triad” only for the second triad, whereas the first triad was called the quaternary (CF 48) or the “personality” (numerous occurrences, *The Rays and the Initiations*, 115, for instance), and the third triad “the One” or the “Monad”. The last term is especially remarkable. It must be considered exceedingly inappropriate to call the third triad the “Monad”. Monad, meaning “unity” in Greek, was the term used by Pythagoras for the primordial atom, the self, and must not be used for any composite atom of lower kind, least of all for anything that is not a unity but a compound of three. There is no disputing the fact that monad is an original Pythagorean term. Therefore, it should be used in the original Pythagorean sense or not at all.

Nowhere in the vast Bailey literature is there any unambiguous explanation of the fact that the evolution of man within the solar system is effected through three atomic triads. There are allusions and hints in CF, however, and there is in just one place a bare mention of the fact without further explanation. Since this important information is scattered here and there in CF and put in between less important data, probably only those readers who have a previous knowledge of Pythagorean hylozoics will perceive it. In all likelihood, the majority of readers have passed it by without noticing it.

Thus the “higher triad” mentioned in CF 884 is obviously the third triad (which Bailey usually calls the “Monad”), and the same is true of the “Upper Triad” referred to in CF 1101 (point 5.), because it is clear from the context that the second triad (Bailey’s “spiritual triad”) is not meant in these two places. The first triad (which Bailey generally terms the “quaternary”) is actually called the “lower triad” in CF 1000.

And most important, there is indeed a mention of “three permanent atomic triads” in CF 940.

#### *The “Soul” in Alice A. Bailey: Introduction*

“Soul” is a word used in everyday speech as well as in theology, mysticism, and esoterics to denote consciousness in general but also consciousness of some specific kind. Everybody has his own idea of what is meant by “soul”. If such an over-used term is to be utilized as an esoteric term, it must be given an unambiguous sense that is clearly stated; or, if used in many senses, it must be defined in each particular case where it occurs. If not, the vast majority of readers simply will not understand what is intended, will misunderstand it and be confused. The result will not be clear insight but fictionalism.

In the extensive Bailey literature, “soul” is a term frequently used. Regrettably, it is a term used in many different senses without clear indications that this is the case. The results are obscurity, vagueness, and sometimes obvious contradictions. These undesirable results could have been prevented with a more reflective and expedient choice of terms. A few examples, all of them taken from WM, will suffice to show these incongruities:

It is said on the one hand that the soul is omniscient (“as the omniscience of the soul is tapped...”, WM 291), but on the other hand that it “may lack knowledge in the three worlds [the worlds of man, 47–49] and in this way be deficient” (WM 180).

It is moreover said that the soul is omnipotent (WM 153, 231), but nevertheless that “the soul is organising itself for effort, re-orienting its forces, and preparing for a fresh and powerful impulse,” (WM 89).

It is said that “only the soul has a direct and clear understanding of the creative purpose and of the plan,” “only the soul, whose nature is intelligent love can be trusted with the knowledge, the symbols and the formulas which are necessary to the correct conditioning of the magical work,” “only the soul has power to work in all three worlds at once, and yet remain detached, and therefore karmically free from the results of such work,” etc. (WM 126). At the same time, however, “it is at first almost impossible for the onlooking soul to dissociate its own astral mechanism from the astral mechanism of humanity as a whole, and from the astral mechanism of the world.” (WM 222)

From the quotations cited in the last paragraph it is clear that “soul” sometimes denotes an entirely superhuman consciousness level (with freedom from karma, etc.) and sometimes quite normal and everyday human consciousness. The fact that “soul” thus has reference to two quite different levels of consciousness, belonging to two different natural kingdoms (the human kingdom, 47:4 – 49:7, and the fifth natural kingdom, 45:4 – 47:3) is commented upon in one place: “It must be remembered that none of these names and these activities refer to the soul on its own plane but only to human souls in incarnation on the physical plane. This must be stressed, for on its [sic! – substitute their for its] own plane the souls of all men stand free from illusion, and neither can be destroyed, deluded nor manipulated. It is only ‘the souls in prison’ who are subject to the activities of the forces of evil and only for a term.” (WM 241)

It is evident, therefore, that the term “soul” is used in the Bailey literature in several widely different meanings. But which are they? And even if we could state them in a general sense, out of context, how can we know what is meant by “soul” in context, in each individual place throughout the Bailey books? As will be demonstrated below, this is no trifling problem but one that is essential to the clear understanding of the whole teaching given through this literature. It is nevertheless a problem that can be solved with hylozoic knowledge and method.

If you cast a glance again at the tables in the beginning of the chapter “Man’s Three Aspects According to Alice A. Bailey”, you will see that “soul” is a term for the “second aspect”, that is: the second triad. Thus we can make a distinction between

- (1) “soul” in the sense of consciousness in general and of any kind, and
- (2) “soul” in the sense of consciousness at the level of the second triad (45–47).

The first sense of soul is not common in the Bailey literature. The second sense, consciousness on the second triad level, is far more common.

In the following, we shall examine the Bailey use of “soul”, in the first sense to begin with, and then in the second sense.

*“Soul” in the Sense of Consciousness in General and of Any Kind*

Hylozoics teaches that “The thing most essential for understanding the consciousness aspect of existence is to know that there is only one consciousness in the cosmos, the cosmic total consciousness, of which every monad has an inalienable part. This consciousness is an amalgamation of the consciousness of all monads in the cosmos.” KofR 2.4.1

Therefore, it is important to realize that different kinds of *collective* consciousness are meant in the following statements:

“It should be borne in mind that the soul of matter, the anima mundi, is the sentient factor in substance itself. It is the responsiveness of matter throughout the universe and that innate faculty in all forms, from the atom of the physicist, to the solar system of the astronomer, which produces the undeniable intelligent activity which all demonstrate. It can be called attractive energy, coherency, sentiency, aliveness, awareness or *consciousness*, but perhaps the most illuminating term is the quality which every form manifests.” (WM 33; italics by L.A.)

“This soul manifests differently in the various kingdoms of nature, but its function is ever the same,” (WM 35)

“Students must not get confused by the complexity of the subject. They must learn certain large generalisations, and remember that as the omniscience of the soul is tapped, the more detailed knowledge will gradually fall into place.” (WM 291)

In the quotation last cited, “soul” means the same as the “universal soul” or anima mundi, that is, the planetary collective consciousness in atomic worlds (not molecular worlds) 46–49. There is an explicit reference to the “universal soul” in WM 47.

Hylozoics teaches us that “The collective consciousness is the primary and common one; the individual self-consciousness the individual must acquire by himself throughout ever higher natural kingdoms, this being possible because of his very participation in the collective consciousness.” (KofR 2.4.2)

There are also some places in WM, where “soul” denotes individual human consciousness of an unspecified kind. In these places, “soul” is afforded specified meanings by the addition of various qualifications, such as “animal”, “divine”, “human”, “onlooking”, “on its own plane”. etc.

The soul... is that in man which makes him aware of his environment and his group, which enables him to live his life in the three worlds of his normal evolution as the onlooker, the perceiver, the actor. This is what enables him eventually to discover that this soul in him is dual and that part of him which responds to the animal soul and part of him recognises his divine soul. The majority however, at this time will be found functioning as neither purely animal nor purely divine, but can be regarded as human souls.” (WM 36f)

(About conditions in the emotional world) “Because the forces in the aspirant’s own body are equally in disorder, he blends in with the surrounding chaos to such an extent that it is at first almost impossible for the onlooking soul to dissociate its own astral mechanism from the astral mechanism of humanity as a whole, and from the astral mechanism of the world.” (WM 221f)

“It must be remembered that none of these names and these activities [of the evil forces] refer to the soul on its own plane but only to human souls in incarnation on the physical plane. This must be stressed, for on its [sic!] own plane the souls of all men stand free from illusion, and neither can be destroyed, deluded nor manipulated.” (WM 241, quoted above)

*“Soul in the Sense of Consciousness on the Level of the Second Triad*

As is clear from our discussion in the chapter “Man’s Three Aspects According to Alice A. Bailey”, the terms “soul”, “ego”, and “higher self” are used to denote consciousness in the second triad. There is an important difference seen in the use of “soul” on the one hand and “ego” and “higher self” on the other. In contradistinction to “soul”, “ego” and “higher self” are never used in the sense of consciousness in general and of any kind earlier discussed. Where “higher self” is concerned, this is self-evident; the very choice of the word “higher” precludes its use for everyday human consciousness, which by definition is “lower” (“lower self”, etc., compare the second tabulation in the beginning of the chapter “Man’s Three Aspects...”). Therefore, we shall also discuss the sense of “ego” in this chapter.

But before we proceed any further, we must remind the reader of three very important hylozoic principles. Without having them in mind, there can never be any true understanding of the issues discussed here.

(1) *There is no consciousness but consciousness of matter*, consciousness in matter. Expressed differently: consciousness is always bound up with matter, has always a material basis. This implies in its turn that you can define any kind of consciousness by referring to the kind or kinds of matter corresponding to it. In fact, this is the only possible way of dividing, defining, or classifying consciousness. This principle is called the *basic materialism* of hylozoics.

(2) *There is no consciousness but as a result of the process of manifestation* (the process of involution followed by the process of evolution). This implies that, however high a level of consciousness a being is on, this being must have reached that level by evolving from a lower level and, in the last analysis, from the very lowest. Consequently, this being must have gone through all the stages not just of the process of evolution but of the whole process of manifestation. This principle is called the *consistent evolutionism* of hylozoics.

(3) *There is no self-consciousness but inherent in a permanent, material monad, which is different from its envelopes*. Consistent evolutionism implies or presupposes that one and the same individuality evolves from the subhuman natural kingdoms to the human kingdom, from there to the superhuman and divine kingdoms. This individual consciousness, or self, must have a material basis. This material basis cannot be any one of those three called “man’s three aspects” by Bailey (called the three triads in hylozoics), since the individuality will abandon them in turn and as its consciousness evolves beyond them. The material basis of the self is in all kingdoms a primordial atom which is called the monad. This hylozoic principle is called *monadology*.

Starting from the three principles just mentioned, we must, when trying to grasp what Bailey means by “soul”, answer two questions one of which occasions an attendant question.

Question (1): What kind of consciousness in the second triad is intended: causal (47:1-3) or essential (46:1-7) or even lower superessential (45:4-7)? Attendant question: What degree of awakening (self-activation) is intended?

These two questions concerning kinds of consciousness and degrees of self-activation are important, since there is a considerable difference in consciousness capacity between an individual, say, at the stage of culture in the human kingdom who is having his first conscious contacts with causal consciousness (in 47:3), and an individual on the highest levels of the stage of unity, that is to say, an individual who has left the human kingdom and is functioning with permanent self-consciousness not just in 47:1 but in 46:1-7 as well.

Question (2): When Bailey differentiates between man's "higher self" (ego or soul) and "illusory self" and by the latter means our ordinary physical, emotional, and mental self-consciousness, how is this teaching to be understood in the light of hylozoics, which teaches that man's self is the monad consciousness on any level – physical, emotional, or mental – wherever it is to be found?

Let us first try to answer Question (1). Often there are no sure indications whether causal (47:1-3) or essential (46) consciousness or both are intended when "soul" or "ego" is spoken of. Readers of Bailey perhaps think that "soul" and "ego" always mean causal (consciousness or body), since "egoic body" is a synonym for "causal body", but this need not always be the case. Here, for instance, we have two passages in WM, where "soul" obviously refers to essential (46) consciousness:

"1. Only the soul has a direct and clear understanding of the creative purpose and of the plan.

2. Only the soul, whose nature is intelligent love can be trusted with the knowledge, the symbols and the formulas which are necessary to the correct conditioning of the magical work.

3. Only the soul has power to work in all three worlds at once, and yet remain detached, and therefore karmically free from the results of such work.

4. Only the soul is truly group-conscious and actuated by pure unselfish purpose.

5. Only the soul, with the open eye of vision, can see the end from the beginning, and can hold in steadiness the true picture of the ultimate consummation." (WM 126)

"The soul is group conscious and group controlled, and (until the causal body has been overcome and liberation from its control achieved) the real significance of purity will not be comprehended." (WM 258)

It is clear from the two quotations last cited that "soul" refers also to consciousness and ability above the causal and beyond the human kingdom.

However, often "soul" means the self-consciousness of the human monad in its causal envelope, or, to express it more exactly, in its second triad 47-atom. It is very important to understand that human causal self-consciousness awakens or develops gradually, that it has not been there all the time as an "omniscient higher self" of sorts. Below a few quotations from WM are cited, where "soul" means the awakening causal self-consciousness of the human monad.

"Inspiration originates on the higher levels; it presupposes a very high point in evolution, for it involves the egoic consciousness and necessitates the use of atomic matter, thus opening up a wide range of communicators. It spells safety. It should be remembered that the soul is always good; it may lack knowledge in the three worlds and in this way be deficient; but it harbours no evil." (WM 180)

(Two remarks: the "atomic matter" mentioned is 47:1, the "three worlds" are 47, 48, and 49.)

"The day comes, however, when the soul awakens to the need of dominating the situation and of asserting its own authority. Then the man (spasmodically at the beginning) takes stock of the situation. He has to discover first which type of energy preponderates and is the motivating force in his daily experience. Having discovered this, he begins to re-organize, to re-orient and to re-build his bodies. The whole of this teaching can be summed up in two words: Vice and Virtue.

“Vice is the energy of the sheaths, individual or synthesised in the personality, as it controls the life activities and subordinates the soul to the sheaths and to the impulses and tendencies of the lower self.

“Virtue is the calling in of new energies and of a new vibratory rhythm so that the soul becomes the positive controlling factor and the soul forces supersede those of the bodies. This process is that of character building.” (WM 202f)

Henry T. Laurency paraphrases the last two paragraphs thus: “Vice is the energies of the envelopes of incarnation, synthesized in the personality, because they keep the self in its envelopes and counteract the causal energies.

“Virtue is for the self to utilize the causal energies and by means of them to control the personality (the energies of the envelopes of incarnation).” Henry T. Laurency, *Knowledge of Life One*, 5.13.10, 11

(The envelopes of incarnation are the mental, emotional, etheric and organic envelopes.)

“The stage wherein the soul, through concentration and meditation succeeds in imposing its ideas and impressions upon the mind held ‘steady in the light’ and so enables the mental body to respond to impressions and contacts emanating from the subjective and spiritual worlds.” (WM 227)

“All great scientists and workers in the realm of objective nature have worked as souls.” (WM 333)

Therefore, the “world of souls” (WM 211) is the causal world (47:1-3), and when the pineal gland is said to be the “seat of the soul” (WM 183), it means that it is the seat of causal consciousness.

It is clear from her writings that Alice A. Bailey was not familiar with the teaching on the monad in its original Pythagorean sense. Otherwise she would have mentioned the monad when describing activities of the self-conscious individuality in the human kingdom. Instead she used the term “soul” in this sense as well. To forestall confusion, however, she was obliged to qualify the term “soul” with attributes such as “onlooking” and “human” to distinguish it from “soul” in the sense of causal consciousness, which she calls “soul on its own plane”. Two instances of this from WM are given below:

(About conditions in the emotional world) ”Because the forces in the aspirant’s own body are equally in disorder, he blends in with the surrounding chaos to such an extent that it is at first almost impossible for the onlooking soul to dissociate its own astral mechanism from the astral mechanism of humanity as a whole, and from the astral mechanism of the world.” (WM 221f)

”It must be remembered that none of these names and these activities refer to the soul on its own plane but only to human souls in incarnation on the physical plane.” (WM 241, previously quoted)

To sum up the discussion so far and also to answer Question (1) posed earlier, we say that the term “soul”, when not meaning collective consciousness of any kind whatever (which is not a common meaning in the Bailey literature), means the individual’s, the monad’s consciousness in some one of the three units of the second triad and, through it, in the pertaining envelope. In general, this implies the human monad centred in the second triad 47-atom and active, therefore, through the causal envelope, or the superhuman monad centred in the second triad 47-atom and 46-atom and active, therefore, in both the causal and essential

envelopes. All stages of activation are implied, from the first, sporadic contacts with causal consciousness, where this is almost wholly passive and the individual's self-active consciousness is almost wholly concentrated on mental and emotional levels, to full sovereignty in the causal and essential envelopes through a self-conscious centring in the second triad 47 and 46 atoms.

Now to Question (2). If, where man is concerned, "soul" (when not meaning consciousness in general, which we have already discussed) only had reference to his awakening, incipient and, therefore, embryonic, faint causal and essential consciousness, we cannot understand and explain the references, numerous throughout the Bailey literature, to some other self-conscious principle in man, a principle which possesses superhuman consciousness and ability, *and which is likewise called soul*:

"The disciple on the physical plane and the inner teacher (whether one of the Great Ones or the 'Master within the Heart') need to know each other somewhat, and to accustom themselves to each other's vibration." (WM 65)

"It is a safe rule for aspirants to assume when they contact a high vibration and stimulus, that it is their own soul contacting them, the Master in the heart, and not run off with the idea (so flattering to their pride and personality) that the Master is endeavouring to reach them." (WM 171)

In this meaning of "soul", also "Ego", "higher self", and "Solar Angel" are used interchangeably:

[The aspirant is supposed to effect] "An harmonious cooperation with his solar Angel, so that solar force may impose its rhythm upon the lunar forces." (WM 571)

(Note: "solar force" means energy from the second triad, the "lunar forces" mean the first triad energies.)

"The Ego on its own plane, realizes *consciously* its relationship to the Master, and seeks to transmit that consciousness to the Personality.

"The Higher Self on its own plane, is not trammelled by time and space, and (knowing the future as well as that which is past) seeks to bring the desired end nearer and make it more rapidly a fact.

"The Higher Self or Ego on its own plane has direct relationship with other egos on the same ray, and on a corresponding concrete or abstract ray, and – realizing that progress is made in group formation – works on that plane at the helping of his kind." (LOM 33f)

[About the Ego's own development it is said that the Ego makes] "frequent attempts to definitely control the lower self, a thing distasteful to the Ego, whose tendency is to rest content with consciousness and aspiration on its own plane." (LOM 37)

When reading the passages just cited and other ones in the same vein, it is hardly possible to draw any other conclusion than that man is presented as consisting of two separate beings, two different selves, a higher self (or Ego), which is fully developed to a superhuman level of consciousness and activity and is content to remain there, and a lower self (the "personality"), our everyday self with its experience of the physical world and self-consciousness in it (between incarnations in the emotional and mental worlds as well).

Such a "two-selves doctrine" agrees fairly well with Indian exoteric pantheism (Shankara's advaita). According to the latter, man's true self is a divine being (atman) at home in a higher

world, whereas the self-consciousness man experiences and identifies himself with as his self has only a shadowy, unreal, and illusory existence. The implication is that the entire human existence, nay, the whole of evolution, is absurd. Why must we live as shadows and unreal illusory beings in an imperfect state, when our true self already lives in a divine state or even has been there always? This cannot possibly be the genuine and original esoteric teaching. It is in unresolvable conflict with consistent evolutionism and monadology, which both are true esoteric teachings.

A propos this Laurency makes a few observations that are noteworthy:

“The fundamental divergence of Pythagoras’ hylozoics and Shankara’s pantheism is that advaita assumes that consciousness can exist without a material basis, while according to hylozoics consciousness cannot have a separate existence independent of matter, but is always and necessarily bound up with matter.

“According to pantheism, life must be without a rational purpose. The universal soul separates from itself the individual soul, which after meaningless wandering about (metempsychosis) through the four natural kingdoms, finally succeeds in attaining nirvana, and is annihilated by being reabsorbed into an eternally immutable universal soul that works blindly and automatically without a purpose. It is understandable that self-consciousness as having no firm point for its own existence, must be assumed to merge with the primordial soul once it is freed from matter.” KofR 7.2.24f

According to consistent evolutionism, the human monad possesses no higher self-consciousness than what it has managed to acquire (activate) through its own work (according to the law of self-activation) in the process of evolution from the lowest world (the physical world) up.

According to monadology, there cannot *simultaneously* be two separate levels of self-consciousness in man, if by man we mean the human monad. If there is reference to some higher principle in contact with man, self-conscious as man is self-conscious, then it must be *another individual, another monad*, than the human monad.

It must not be assumed that the facts just mentioned were not known to the real author or inspirer of the Bailey books, 45-self D.K. Of course they were. However, his amanuensis, Alice A. Bailey, was apparently not familiar with them or, at any event, did not adapt the terminology she had taken over from the earlier theosophists to reflect these facts.

Yet it is very clear from the writings penned by Alice A. Bailey, *A Treatise on Cosmic Fire* (CF) in particular, that the higher self, Ego, the soul or solar Angel, to which there are numerous references, is neither the human monad nor any kind of mere passive human consciousness, but another monad, another individual, who is self-conscious and self-active in superhuman worlds, independent of whether and when the human monad is self-conscious and self-active in its worlds. But these beings nevertheless have a very close connection with man, “for these solar Angels concern his own essential nature, and are also the creative power by which he works.” (CF 680)

They are far evolved beings, corresponding to second selves (45:4 – 47:3) of the human evolution, “Nirvanis from a preceding Mahamanvantara.” (CF 681)

(Note: A nirvani is an individual who has attained nirvana, or world 45; a mahamanvantara is the period of the manifestation of a solar system, see PhS 2.49)

Their work consists, among other things, in building the causal envelope in 47:1 matter and in so doing connect man’s first and second triads. They derive their origin from world 46 (“the logoc middle principle”, CF 681, 689ff), and have at least 46:1 consciousness.

In Pythagorean terminology, which is preferably used by students of hylozoics, the solar Angel is called Augoeides. This Greek word means the “shining one”; in English the singular

is distinguished from the plural by never having the definite article. The work of the Augoeides with human beings begins at the latter's causalization (Bailey: "individualisation"), the transition of the monads from the animal to the human kingdom) and consists in being the agents of the law of destiny where individuals and groups are concerned, in inspiring man from causal levels (possible only at the stage of culture on), but never in leading man in the manifest way that the so-called spiritual guides of the emotional world do.

The Augoeides have long ago passed through the stage corresponding to the human kingdom in consciousness development (CF 686, 699f). However, they have never been human beings (at least their majority), since they belong to another line of evolution than the human, a parallel evolution called the deva or angel evolution. That they are devas, or angels, is clear from CF and also from the terms used in that book: fire devas, manasa devas, solar angels; it is also clear from WM 100f. Augoeides is called a "radiant angelic existence" in IHS 115 and the "Ego, the Thinker, the Solar Lord, or Manasadeva" in IHS 136.

In the following, I cite some interesting information on Augoeides gathered mostly from WM. I must emphasize here that in these quotations, the "soul" or "Ego" referred to is not a mere higher envelope of man, such as his causal envelope, but another individual, another monad, using man's causal envelope as a means of contacting the human monad. I beg the reader's pardon, if I appear tedious or repetitious, but I believe there is no subject in theosophy or of the Bailey literature about which confusion is more thorough and rife:

"The white magician is one who is in touch with his soul." (WM 57)

"As the man seeks to reach control of the mind, the soul in its turn becomes more actively aggressive." (WM 88)

"The flowering forth of the mind in men, which so distinguishes the present age, indicates to the solar Angel a second crisis, of which the first was but the symbol. That for which the solar Angel exists is making its presence felt within humanity, and another strong pull is being exerted upon the solar Angel which this time will produce a second fecundation. This will give to man those qualities which will enable him to transcend human limitations, and become part of the fifth or spiritual kingdom in nature. The first effort of the solar Angel turned animal-men into human beings; the second will turn human beings into spiritual entities, plus the gains of experience in the human family." (WM 88f)

"Such disciples are in conscious contact at times with their own soul forces and for them there is no defeat nor turning back. They are the tried warriors, scarred and tired, yet knowing that triumphant victory lies ahead, for the soul is omnipotent." (WM 231)

"The darkness may be intellectual, and is consequently still more difficult to penetrate, for in this case the power of the Ego *must* be called in, whereas in the former frequently the calm reasoning of the lower mind may suffice to dispel the trouble. Here, in this specific case, the disciple will be wise if he not only attempts to call his Ego or Higher Self for the dispelling of the cloud, but calls likewise upon his Teacher, or even upon his Master, for the assistance that they can give." (LOM 133)

In LOM 294 (page 290 of the first edition, 1922), Augoeides is called the "doorkeeper".

Where the human monad is concerned, the task of Augoeides is to guide it through its evolution in the human kingdom. Augoeides is the keeper of the human monad's second triad (45:4, 46:1, 47:1), until the monad can take possession of it self-consciously.

Augoeides has his higher counterpart, the keeper of the third triad (43:4, 44:1, 45:1). In order to come under his inspiration, man must be able to function consciously in his second triad. The Pythagorean term for the keeper of the third triad is Protogonos (Greek for “firstborn”). Augoeides and Protogonos are the “two connecting principles” (connecting the second triad with the first triad, and the third triad with the second triad, respectively) mentioned in CF 681. The “Presence” and “Father in Heaven” mentioned in IHS 117 have reference to Protogonos.

Augoeides has accomplished his task when man essentializes (in theosophical and Bailey parlance: takes the fourth initiation) and, so to speak, becomes his own Augoeides. Reference to this is made in IHS 117, 137:

“The solar angel hitherto contacted has withdrawn himself, and the form through which he functioned (the egoic or causal body) has gone, and naught is left but love-wisdom and that dynamic will which is the prime characteristic of Spirit. The lower self has served the purposes of the Ego, and has been discarded; the Ego likewise has served the purposes of the Monad, and is no longer required, and the initiate stands free of both, fully liberated and able to contact the Monad, as earlier he learned to contact the Ego.” (IHS 117)

(Notes: “Love-wisdom” means 46-consciousness; “dynamic will” and “Spirit” have reference to 45-consciousness. It is very important to realize that Bailey’s Monad is not the Pythagorean monad, the self-atom, but the third triad and its deva keeper, Protogonos.)

“By the time the fourth initiation has been reached, the work of destruction is accomplished, the solar angel returns to his own place, having performed his function, and the solar lives seek their point of emanation.” (IHS 137)

(Notes: the “fourth initiation” refers to the causal self’s transformation into a 46-self, essentialization. The “work of destruction” means the dissolution of the causal envelope at essentialization. The “solar lives” and their “point of emanation” concern the evolutionary collective beings of tertiary matter which make up the four centres of the causal envelope, and which at the dissolution of the envelope return to the planetary store of causal tertiary matter.)

The “Ego” mostly means Augoeides. There are some places, however, where the “Ego” has reference to man’s causal envelope and its developing consciousness. Below I cite one such instance from WM, and another from LOM.

“He begins to realise that his Master works with his soul and that it is his ego, therefore, which is en rapport with the Master and not the personal self.” (WM 170)

(Notes: Here “soul” and “ego” are synonyms, with the possible distinction that “soul” has more bearing on the consciousness aspect of the causal envelope, and the “ego” more on the matter and energy aspects of that envelope. The “personal self” means the first triad and its envelopes: the mental, emotional, etheric envelopes, and the organism.)

To the on-looking Hierarchy it is apparent that the divine fire is permeating and warming and radiating throughout the causal body, and that the Ego is becoming ever more conscious on his own plane, and ever more interested – via the permanent atoms, – in the life of the Personality.” (LOM 26f)

(Notes: The “divine fire” is the energy of the third triad, the “permanent atoms” are the first triad. The “Personality” is the human monad in the first triad.)

Now we are ready to answer Question (2). When in the Bailey literature distinction is made between man’s “higher self” (the “Ego” or the “soul”) and “lower self”, or the “personality”

(the “personality” meaning our everyday physical, emotional, and mental self-consciousness), and this implies that there is self-consciousness on two quite separate levels simultaneously, this must be understood as referring to two separate individuals or monads: Augoeides as a monad and the human being as a monad. In contrast, whenever there is mention of self-consciousness in the first triad and in the second triad at different occasions, this can also be understood as meaning that the self-consciousness of the human monad shifts between the two, but it is by no means certain, and to decide in each particular case what is the intended meaning may prove difficult.

### *Summary and Conclusion*

In the Bailey literature, the use of the poorly delimited and therefore vague terms “soul” and “Ego”, on the one hand, and the absence of the teaching on the monad, or the self, in the original Pythagorean sense, on the other, present serious obstacles to students desiring a clear understanding of consciousness development. Factors adding to confusion are: the incorrect use of the term Monad for the third triad, the talk of man as consisting of multiple selves (“lower” and “higher” ones), and the failure to distinguish clearly between higher envelopes of the human monad and Augoeides (the “solar Angel”).

The main difficulties may be summed up as follows:

Every thinking human being is aware that he is a self, but when reading the theosophical and Bailey literature, he is informed that this is not his true self, but the “lower self”, and that his true self is the “higher self”. This is absurd on at least three points, since it implies (1) that evident human experience is denied, (2) that two or three self-conscious beings in man are posited, and (3) that the continuity and permanence of the self is denied when equating the self with perishable envelopes for the monad, such as the second or third triad.

Pythagorean hylozoics resolves these difficulties by teaching that the sole content of the cosmos are imperishable primordial atoms, or monads, and their compositions. Monads that have acquired self-consciousness are selves. Monads that have not yet acquired self-consciousness make up composite atoms of lower and higher kinds, and these composite atoms, in their turn, make up envelopes for self-conscious monads. The human self is a self-conscious monad. Man’s multiple bodies are envelopes for the monad, but so are his triads as well, those beings which Bailey calls the “quaternary” or the “personality” (the first triad), the “soul”, “Ego” or “Triad” (the second triad), and the “Monad” (the third triad). Any one of these envelopes is a self to the monad whenever the monad identifies itself with its consciousness; for example: the human monad is an emotional self when identifying itself with the consciousness of its emotional envelope (or “astral body”), and a mental self when identifying itself with the consciousness of its mental envelope. However, this identification of the monad with its envelopes results from the monad’s ignorance of itself. Man, for instance, is sometimes aware that he is self-conscious, but even then he is ignorant of the fact that this self-consciousness is the monad’s consciousness. But upon learning that he is an imperishable monad, he should not, when self-conscious, say to himself, “my monad is self-conscious now”, but “I, the monad, am self-conscious now”.

There are at least seven clearly distinguishable, different uses or meanings of the term “soul” in the Bailey literature, namely (1) consciousness in general and as a universal phenomenon; (2) the causal envelope and its (at lower human stages) passive consciousness; (3) the second triad and its passive consciousness (passive before the human monad has become a second self); (4) the human monad in general (then it is often called the “human soul”); (5) the human monad after its acquisition of self-consciousness in the causal envelope (being then a causal self); (6) the superhuman monad after its acquisition of self-consciousness in the 46-envelope (being then a 46-self); (7) Augoeides (often called the “soul

on its own plane”). The term “Ego” is used interchangeably with “soul” in all the senses just cited above, except (1).

There are serious problems involved in using the same term for several things and several terms for the same thing, such as the uses of the terms “soul”, and “Ego” in the Bailey literature. This inexactitude in the use of terms makes it impossible for students to reach the requisite clarity. Instead, fictions are produced in their minds, in two ways:

(1) They will necessarily confuse different things, for instance, the consciousness aspect in general with a particular envelope for consciousness, or the mere passive causal consciousness at lower human stages with the self-active causal consciousness at the highest human stage and at superhuman stages, or the human monad with Augoeides, since all these different things are called “soul”.

(2) And they will tend to *entify* terms such as “soul” and “Ego”, that is, believe that there exists some being called “soul” and characterized by all the mutually contradictory functions and attributes the Bailey literature confers on the “soul”, and also believe that there is some being called the “Ego”, similarly characterized by its stated peculiar functions and attributes, and therefore that “soul” and “Ego” are distinct beings, because distinct terms are used for them, whereas the opposite to this is the case: different beings or things are denoted by “soul”, and yet “soul” and “Ego” are used interchangeably.

The failure to give out the teaching on the monad in its true, original Pythagorean sense, while retaining the term monad and, therefore, using it erroneously has, as Laurency says, “occasioned an irremediable confusion of ideas” (Laurency, *Knowledge of Life Three*, 5.24.3).

All of the confusions, mix-ups, and misuses of terms cited in the present paper are part and parcel of the “heritage of Blavatsky”. Blavatsky was unconcerned with terminology to the point of carelessness, it is true, but she was also seriously limited by the constraints imposed upon her by her teachers and informants, who did not wish too much of the esoteric knowledge to be revealed at the time, and so rather preferred vagueness, ambiguity, and confusion, regarding them as protective coverings as it were.

However, even after considerably more knowledge was permitted for publication through 45-self D.K., the original vagueness, ambiguity, and confusion were not much remedied. Bailey was about as little interested in terminology as Blavatsky, and D.K. did not force the issue. Besides, why should he have done so? It is implied by the iron-hard law of self-realization that whatever can be done by human beings must be done by us, and not by superhuman beings. And it can be done by human beings, as Henry T. Laurency has demonstrated in his writings. If the present paper can in some measure serve as a continuation of the pioneer work he initiated, it has fulfilled its purpose.

#### Abbreviations used in this paper

CF – Alice A. Bailey: *A Treatise on Cosmic Fire*  
IHS – Alice A. Bailey: *Initiation Human and Solar*  
KofR – Henry T. Laurency: *The Knowledge of Reality*  
LOM – Alice A. Bailey: *Letters on Occult Meditation*  
PhS – Henry T. Laurency: *The Philosopher’s Stone*  
WM – Alice A. Bailey: *A Treatise on White Magic*

All the works by Henry T. Laurency referred to in the present paper are to be found on-line at The Official Website of the Henry T. Laurency Publishing Foundation, [www.laurency.com](http://www.laurency.com)

Copyright © by Lars Adelskog 2006. All rights reserved.  
Last corrections entered May 26th, 2022.