

## **Boscovich in the Esoteric Tradition of Blavatsky's Secret Doctrine**

Roger J Anderton

R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

Boscovich is mentioned in Blavatsky's book "The Secret Doctrine" but appears to be written in an obscure way to divert attention of people interested in the Esoteric tradition.

Blavatsky says in her book "the Secret Doctrine" [1] : "Faraday, Boscovich, and all others, however, who see, in the atoms and molecules, " centers of force," and in the corresponding element force, an entity by itself, are far nearer the truth, perchance, than those, who, denouncing them, denounce at the same time the "old corpuscular Pythagorean theory" (one, by the way, which has never passed to posterity as the great philosopher really taught it), on the ground of its " delusion that the conceptual elements of matter can be grasped as separate and real entities." "

Now Boscovich had a unified theory of point-particles and Faraday was in part working from those ideas. She is linking that to Pythagorean theory and pointing out it has come down through the centuries not in the "pure" form. Boscovich's theory is a unified theory of Pythagorean physics.

It is easily missed in the context that she talks, which in the full context was:

"This fact was well known to Faraday, and other eminent men of Science. Atoms, Ether, evolution itself — all comes to modern Science from ancient notions, all is based on the conceptions of the archaic nations. " Conceptions " for the profane, under the shape of allegories ; plain truths taught during the Initiations to the elect, which truths have been partially divulged through Greek writers and have descended to us. This does not mean that Occultism has ever had the same views on matter, atoms and ether as found in the exotericism of

the classical Greek writers. Yet, if we believe Mr. Tyndall, even Faraday was an Aristotelean, and an Agnostic more than a materialist. In his "Faraday, as a Discoverer" (p.123) the author shows the great physicist using "old reflections of Aristotle" which are "concisely found in some of his works." Faraday, Boscovitch, and all others, however, who see, in the atoms and molecules, "centers of force," and in the corresponding element force, an entity by itself, are far nearer the truth, perchance, than those, who, denouncing them, denounce at the same time the "old corpuscular Pythagorean theory" (one, by the way, which has never passed to posterity as the great philosopher really taught it), on the ground of its "delusion that the conceptual elements of matter can be grasped as separate and real entities.""

Where she talks about Faraday and then casually mentions Boscovich as being similar to Faraday without emphasising that Boscovich had worked out a unified theory.

The whole of esotericism seems based on Pythagorean ideas, as it is one of the main traditions as to how ancient wisdom has come down to us; and she hides the connection to Boscovich by talking about it in a flippant way as if it isn't important.

From what I gather this is one of the methods used to hide secret information, namely put it in plain sight and act like it is not important.

Relevant words are defined:

Esoteric [2] : Intended for or likely to be understood by only a small number of people with a specialized knowledge or interest:

Exoteric [3] : 1. suitable for or communicated to the general public. 2. not belonging, limited, or pertaining to the inner or select circle, as of disciples or intimates. 3. popular; simple; commonplace. 4. pertaining to the outside; exterior; external.

So it seems that there are layers to knowledge/understanding. A general level (exoteric) and a deeper level (esoteric).

This all gets tied in with words like "occult" meaning hidden, and other terms like that; where certain people are prejudiced against because they view it as

superstition.

These people who are prejudiced then act as making it secret/esoteric because they try to suppress it. Example follows where they try to rewrite history to hide this tradition from science.

Jeff Hughes in his paper “Occultism and the atom: the curious story of isotopes” points out the revision that has happened in the history of modern physics.

Modern physics was influenced by the occult tradition (I.e esoteric) but that was an embarrassment to the physics establishment so they created a revisionist history.

Hughes says [4]: “In the history of physics, for example, the discovery of isotopes by Frederick Soddy and Francis Aston is usually cast as part of a linear sequence of discoveries in atomic and nuclear physics. The story, we are told, began with the discovery of radioactivity in the 1890s, continued with the discovery of the nucleus (1911), isotopes (1913), wave mechanics (1920s) and the neutron (1932), before leading to nuclear fission (1938) and, ultimately, the atomic bomb (1945). This bomb-directed story naturally emphasizes the key scientific elements of atomic weapons. But in doing so, it over rationalizes the way in which these discoveries were achieved, and gives a deceptive picture of the process of scientific discovery and of the reasons why science develops as it does. If we look at the actual course of events without the benefit of hindsight, we learn that fact can, indeed, sometimes be stranger than fiction...”

Hughes then points out his discovery that the history of what actually happened was contrary to the “deceptive picture” outlined above, and it was actually based on Blavatsky's Theosophy.

He tells us: “Theosophy – meaning “divine wisdom” – was a centuries-old system of philosophical and religious belief concerning the nature and processes of the divine and their relationship with the phenomenal universe. In its modern form, organized theosophy was a social and intellectual movement founded in the US in the 1870s, and popular in Britain and Europe from the 1880s. One of a number of systems of belief that came to prominence in this period as alternatives to organized religion and scientific rationalism, theosophy drew on ideas from Eastern philosophy, mysticism and ancient occult traditions dating back to Pythagoras. Its blend of esoteric wisdom and spiritual philosophy (including a belief in reincarnation) appealed to Victorian audiences

disenchanted by the materialism of much modern science and by a Christianity that they saw as having become compromised by science.”

Note: the Pythagorean tradition again; the other things about reincarnation gets too weird for the purposes of this article.

He continues: “In particular, theosophy’s emphasis on esoteric wisdom gave it a strong appeal to intellectuals. They saw in it a way of exploring and expressing hidden realities in an increasingly materialistic world without moral or spiritual values. It is well known, of course, that several notable British physicists of this period – including Lord Rayleigh, Oliver Lodge and Thomson himself – were members of the Society for Psychical Research and were interested in what we might now call paranormal phenomena. ...”

Starting to get even weirder; so end it there.

Aston was working from theosophical ideas and Hughes says: “It is here that the Orwellian rewriting of history begins. In his Nobel lecture and in his influential 1922 textbook *Isotopes*, Aston reconstructed the history of his own work to make the link between neon-22 and isotopes seem straightforward. The language of “meta-elements” was (correctly) attributed to Crookes, but dismissed as a false path on the now artificially straightened road to the nuclear interpretation of isotopes. All reference to occult chemistry was eliminated. This reconstructed history quickly became accepted as the conventional account. By the time he addressed the BA again in 1935 in Norwich, Aston’s subject – “The story of isotopes” – had become a familiar parable in the history of nuclear physics. But it covered up the complexity of the intellectual work that had gone into the reinterpretation of meta-neon and how isotopes and the nuclear atom had been brought together.”

And :” .....Aston’s rewriting of scientific history served a purpose. It disconnected isotopes and the nuclear theory from a set of ideas that he and his new mentors would have found embarrassing. It made the nuclear theory seem always to have been the obvious and plausible account of atomic structure, and effaced one of the sources of his own earlier work. And perhaps, too, it was typical of a certain scientific approach to history!”

Picking up on this Pythagorean tradition that Boscovich ties into.

Richard S Westfall [5] says: “Throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century the Pythagorean tradition, represented by Kepler and Galileo, stood in tension with another equally basic theme of the scientific revolution, the mechanical tradition,

represented by Descartes and innumerable others. Where the Pythagorean tradition pursued the geometric description of phenomena, the mechanical tradition strove to purge natural philosophy of occult superstition by seeking mechanical causes. The two traditions seemed to refuse every effort to bring them into harmony. Vortical theories of the universe did not yield Kepler's laws. Mechanistic explications of the descent of heavy bodies did not yield Galileo's kinematics. It was Newton who brought the two into harmony by expanding the mechanical philosophy to include the concept of force at a distance. Although mechanical philosophers of strict persuasion resisted this eruption of the occult for a generation, the power of Newtonian science in deriving quantitative results quickly swept them into oblivion and crystalized the enduring pattern of modern science.”

So there is conflict between traditions and it was not really solved by Newton.

Stanford says [6] : “Leibniz eventually accused Newton of regarding gravity as a kind of “occult quality”, that is, as a quality of bodies that is somehow hidden within them and beyond the philosopher's understanding.”

Newton gets very occultist in his outlook [7]. There has always been conflict between the two traditions those Pythagorean tradition (with its esoteric, occult side) opposed by those who look upon it as superstition and trying to suppress it, and rewrite history of science to try to exclude it.

So we see what happens with Boscovich's theory in the Pythagorean tradition, there are those in the esoteric tradition writing in an obscure way making it hidden, and there are those in the exoteric tradition opposed to it and trying to suppress it.

## References

[1] The Secret Doctrine: the synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy, by H P. Blavatsky p.507

[http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCcQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.holybooks.com%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FThe-Secret-Doctrine-by-H.P.-Blavatsky.pdf&ei=r2XNU7TfD\\_Oy7Aan-IH4Aw&usg=AFQjCNG9afdOb7NKBIUREV2PxfJfHXRpxQ&bvm=bv.71198958,d.ZGU](http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCcQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.holybooks.com%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FThe-Secret-Doctrine-by-H.P.-Blavatsky.pdf&ei=r2XNU7TfD_Oy7Aan-IH4Aw&usg=AFQjCNG9afdOb7NKBIUREV2PxfJfHXRpxQ&bvm=bv.71198958,d.ZGU)

[2] <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/esoteric>

[3] <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/exoteric>

[4] Occultism and the atom: the curious story of isotopes, Jeff Hughes  
From Physics World, September 2003

Hughes notes that “Despite his [Aston's] rewriting of history, interest in the theosophical interpretation of the atom has not died out entirely. In the 1980s the British theoretical physicist Stephen Phillips resurrected Besant and Leadbeater’s *Occult Chemistry*. His book *Extra-sensory Perception of Quarks* points to remarkable similarities between Besant and Leadbeater’s atomic structures and results from elementary particle physics.”

[5] Newton and the Fudge Factor, Richard S. Westfall, Science 23 Feb 1973,  
vol. 179 number 4075 p 751

[6] Newton's Philosophy, first published Oct 13, 2006, revision May 6, 2014,  
Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/newton-philosophy/>

[7] See for example: ‘The Last Magician’: Isaac Newton’s ‘Dark Secrets’  
[http://dangerousminds.net/comments/the\\_last\\_magician\\_isaac\\_newtons\\_dark\\_secrets](http://dangerousminds.net/comments/the_last_magician_isaac_newtons_dark_secrets)

c.RJAnderton21July2014