

UNITED WISDOM

The Roerichs and Living Ethics: Ideas, Sources, and Historical Context

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-28-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Roerichs and Living Ethics: Ideas, Sources, and Historical Context

> *“To see with the eyes of the heart.”*

Living Ethics, Heart, 1932, §1; Russian original, translated from the Russian for this article. The books in this corpus are associated with Helena Roerich's transmission; their claimed spiritual origin has not been independently established. Source.

About this article

An album of mountain landscapes, Helena Roerich's letters, and a book of short, numbered instructions stand on the same shelf. All three may belong to the same cultural circle, yet they speak in different voices. A painting invites us to look, a letter addresses a particular person, an instruction presents a general standard. Starting with their differences makes their connection more meaningful.

Nicholas and Helena Roerich took part in a shared cultural and spiritual project while retaining different roles. Here we examine Nicholas's cultural essays and public initiatives, Helena's place in transmitting and explaining Living Ethics, and the language of the heart, work, cooperation, and spiritual hierarchy. Historical scale matters: Russian culture, international travel, life in India, and the institutions through which their ideas reached beyond the family circle. We distinguish the published teaching, its participants' testimony, and events that documents can establish. Particular attention goes to internal tensions: universal cooperation sits alongside recognition of higher guidance, and demands for quality in everyday work alongside cosmic explanations. The practical section shows how to discuss a specific cultural undertaking while preserving participants' right to different beliefs. The article does not invite acceptance of a religious cosmology or turn spiritual language about energy into information about physiology.

I. Two people, several kinds of legacy

Roerich is a family name, not the name of a single author. Nicholas Konstantinovich Roerich was a painter who also took part in archaeological, educational, and public work; Helena Ivanovna Roerich left an extensive correspondence and held a central place in transmitting and interpreting the books of Living Ethics. Her letter cannot be signed with her husband's name, nor can a painting be treated as an illustration of a single proposition from the teaching.

The official biography published by the Nicholas Roerich Museum in New York describes Nicholas, his artistic education, his moves, the American institutions, and his Indian period. It offers useful institutional testimony, but the museum belongs to the community that preserves his legacy: its assessments of his achievements call for separate consideration. The biography does not replace a study of the movement as a whole. Nicholas Roerich Museum, “Nicholas Roerich”.

Related aims do not erase differences of genre. A picture of a saint can pose an artistic question even when the viewer does not share the painter's faith. A letter about disagreements reveals relationships within a particular circle. A book of instructions presents a broader account of a path. Moving between them requires us to ask again what we want to learn: a biographical event, the meaning of an image, a rule of conduct, or the origin of a teaching.

This distinction also has an ethical meaning. Helena does not become the unnamed assistant of a famous painter, or Nicholas merely the outward executor of spiritual messages. Their joint work is studied through each person's contribution. A strong shared project can include individual voices without dissolving them into a family legend. For the reader, this is the first way to approach the subject without ready-made devotion or dismissal.

II. Historical context: an idea seeks institutions

A teaching does not exist only in a notebook. Its spread requires people, languages, publishers, and meeting places. The museum biography names the American Master Institute of United Arts, the family's journey to India, and the Urusvati institute in the Himalayan region. These institutions connect the family's artistic, educational, and research plans. Yet founding a scientific institute does not, in itself, establish the scientific standing of every proposition in a spiritual corpus. Museum biography.

This context helps us understand the word “synthesis.” It may mean an artist and a researcher working together, a conversation between cultures, or a religious belief in their common source. The first calls for joint action and a division of expertise. The second requires accurate translation and recognition of differences. The third rests on beliefs that participants may accept or reject. A single international institution does not establish all three meanings at once.

Moving also changes the conditions of reading. A Russian author addresses readers in another country; a local image receives a new explanation; a letter circulates beyond its original recipient. Even a familiar word such as “the East” therefore needs clarification. It does not name a single school that agreed with the Roerich project. India, Buddhist cultures, and the European idea of hidden wisdom have their own histories.

A question of scale is useful here. What has already happened: a book published, a circle formed, an institution opened? What is still promised: universal union, humanity's

transformation, new knowledge? History allows us to respect real work without presenting it as the fulfillment of the widest possible program. Projects that speak for all humanity especially need this way of reading: a particular encounter remains valuable even when the whole world has yet to agree.

III. Living Ethics as a corpus of instructions

The books of Living Ethics consist of sequences of short propositions. In Agni Yoga, published in 1929, the preface joins different yogas through the image of one tree. This is the teaching's account of itself, not an established agreement among all Indian schools. The reader first learns what unifying perspective the text offers, and only then compares it with particular traditions. Agni Yoga, preface.

A numbered paragraph is easily taken out of context and made into a universal formula. Yet an aphoristic form does not remove its dependence on neighboring propositions. Words such as “teacher,” “fire,” or “aspiration” may be intelligible to an ordinary reader while retaining a special meaning within the corpus. Changing that meaning creates a new interpretation; it needs to be named, rather than presented as the original's only content.

Authorship also calls for careful wording. For a follower, the books are associated with the guidance of spiritual Teachers, with Helena Roerich as the person who transmits and explains them. A historical reader can confidently study the available published corpus, her letters, and the circumstances of publication. These records show what was claimed, and how, but do not authenticate a superhuman source of the messages.

This distinction does not empty a work of meaning. A work of fiction can be studied without establishing the reality of every character; a religious text without accepting every metaphysical premise. A promise of objective knowledge about the world, however, makes additional demands. If one sentence describes a spiritual path and another explains the state of the body, they require different kinds of assessment. A research article should preserve that difference where it affects a conclusion, rather than repeat a general qualification after every line.

IV. The heart: a center of the teaching and the limits of metaphor

In Heart, the heart means more than an organ or a feeling. The opening paragraphs already connect it with spiritual perception, guidance, and cosmic order. Within this system, it is a center through which a person participates in a wider world. Reducing the whole meaning to “emotions” substantially narrows the teaching. Heart, §§1–3.

Such a reduction can be useful if it is acknowledged. Someone may use the image of the heart to describe an effort to listen more closely to another person. This does not test the cosmic

model. Just as the literary phrase “a heavy heart” is not the result of a medical examination, a spiritual term does not become a physiological measure by bearing the familiar name of an organ.

The opposite danger is to dismiss the image as mere decoration and overlook what it requires. If the heart is a center of spiritual knowledge, the text sets out a particular way to recognize truth, authority, and direction. The reader may ask how such recognition differs from strong conviction, what to do when people disagree, and whether another person can check the grounds of a decision. These questions concern how knowledge works, rather than whether people need kind feelings.

It is more fruitful to preserve both levels. We can study the heart as a concept in a particular corpus; discuss it as a metaphor for an attentive relationship; and test a specific factual claim by ordinary means. These approaches can coexist without replacing one another. Spiritual speech need not pretend to be a laboratory account, and care for another person acquires no false guarantee of truth from a beautiful image.

V. Work, obstacles, and quality of execution

Agni Yoga §160 treats failure as part of an experience that can strengthen one's movement forward. This is a demanding view of obstacles, rather than a promise of easy growth. It does not, however, yield a rule that every difficulty should be endured without end. Agni Yoga, §160.

In her letter of September 8, 1934, Helena Roerich connects cultural work with ethical improvement and the development of skill. What matters is not only proclaiming the beautiful, but being able to do the work. The letter allows us to discuss concrete labor alongside a lofty program while preserving its particular audience and historical character. Helena Roerich, letter of 08.09.1934.

Our analytical conclusion from this comparison concerns the difference between effort and quality. Working for a long time does not yet make the result good. An exhibition needs clear labels and well-preserved exhibits; a translation needs knowledge of the language; a meeting needs room to hear another person. Here a criterion can be stated, feedback requested, and an error corrected. Respect for skill shows itself in a detail that can be checked.

Obstacles also differ. A lack of skill calls for learning, a lack of time for a change of scope, a mistaken goal for its revision. Calling every case a test of spiritual endurance is convenient, but offers little help in acting. Endurance becomes more meaningful when a person distinguishes what they are continuing, and why. Sometimes fidelity to a cultural undertaking means abandoning a poor way of carrying it out. This is a contemporary application, not a new interpretation offered in Helena Roerich's name.

VI. Hierarchy and cooperation: two demands side by side

In Helena Roerich's letters, cooperation is connected with spiritual guidance and hierarchy. The letter of October 19, 1929, addresses relationships within the circle and calls on participants not to become judges of one another. Yet mutual respect sits alongside recognition of higher guidance. Letter of 19.10.1929.

For a follower these demands need not conflict: a shared spiritual point of reference may support coordinated work. A researcher must nevertheless see the question of how the right to decide is distributed. Who interprets the guide's will? What happens when two participants each believe their understanding to be correct? Can ordinary feedback be discussed without an accusation of spiritual disobedience?

Distinguishing disagreement with a person from rejection of a shared undertaking is especially important. A participant can suggest changing an exhibition plan while retaining an interest in culture. They can reject a religious premise while continuing to help preserve a library. If every particular objection is declared a rejection of the higher goal, practical work loses its means of correction.

This reading is not an accusation against every Roerich community. It identifies a tension within the concepts themselves, which may be resolved in different ways. A particular group requires particular evidence: its rules, actions, and answers to questions. A teaching cannot be judged solely by its friendliest participant; people cannot be judged solely by the strictest line of a teaching. Between a text, a community's structure, and an individual act, room remains for research and personal responsibility.

VII. Culture in Nicholas Roerich: knowledge, beauty, and protection

In “Defense,” an essay in Invincible, Nicholas Roerich connects culture with knowledge, beauty, active goodness, and constructive work. The essay is dated 1936, Urusvati, Himalayas. He also speaks of defending the homeland: a perspective embracing humanity does not erase his historical belonging. Nicholas Roerich, “Defense”.

This is Nicholas's primary Russian text, and it is useful to read it separately from the books of Living Ethics. It addresses public action and a people's dignity. That address reveals a cultural project wider than inner discipline: things are made, achievements preserved, and the possibility of future work sustained. A painting or library needs care whatever spiritual explanation its keeper prefers.

At the same time, “culture” carries a strong normative weight here. It includes a particular image of a better human life. A reader can agree with protecting knowledge and question how

nobility or ignorance is defined. Elevated language does not remove the question of who gains the right to speak for culture, or how dissenters are treated.

A public idea is tested most strongly by how accessible its actions are. Can people see the collection, receive an education, join the discussion? Has a monument been preserved, a sound translation prepared? This kind of assessment does not exhaust the artistic meaning, but protects it from becoming a ceremonial signboard. If culture matters in daily life, it should be visible in the treatment of people who came to it by a different path.

VIII. The Pact: a proposal takes diplomatic form

L. S. Rowe's letter to the United States Secretary of State of April 15, 1935, allows us to trace several steps in a cultural initiative. First, the conference of American states in Montevideo in 1933 recommended signing the Pact. The Governing Board of the Pan American Union then gave its principles the form of an inter-American treaty; in 1935 the document was opened for signature or adherence by states around the world. A note connects the proposal with Nicholas Roerich. FRUS, 1935, volume I, document 384.

The sequence matters more than the impression made by a famous date. Between an author's proposal and a diplomatic subject stand a conference, a board, a draft, and a procedure for adherence. The idea becomes something institutions can work with, as well as people who share a belief. Common purpose gains a specific object here: protecting cultural institutions and historic monuments.

Compare this language with Nicholas's cultural essay. There, protection is grounded in dignity, knowledge, beauty, and constructive work. In Rowe's letter, the decision and the document being transmitted are central. This does not impoverish the idea; it changes the work the text does. An essay invites us to recognize a value; a diplomatic procedure makes it possible to discuss a form of obligation between states.

Different beliefs can meet around such an object. One participant values a temple as a place of faith, another as a monument of art, a third as part of a people's memory. To discuss its protection, they need not first agree on the origin of Living Ethics. A shared task becomes possible through a sufficiently clear object while differences of motive remain.

The letter we have read records the treaty's preparation and opening, not the fate of every protected monument. A history of implementation would require other documents. This distinction allows us to acknowledge a real step without turning it into a guarantee of results. The Pact's significance here lies in the way it shows cultural conviction being translated into a shared procedure. The procedure itself still needs action, resources, and checks on its implementation.

IX. Disagreements begin with different grounds

Disputes around Living Ethics concern several separate questions. One concerns the content of a spiritual teaching. Another concerns the origin of its messages. A third concerns the value of the artistic and public legacy. Establishing or rejecting a single proposition cannot settle all three. An unconfirmed message about a Teacher does not erase a painting's existence; a preserved painting does not confirm the message.

In her letter of September 8, 1934, Helena Roerich herself distinguishes ethical cultural work from fascination with psychic phenomena, warning against the latter. A picture of the movement as simply encouraging every unusual experience therefore fails to represent this letter's position. Letter of 08.09.1934.

An internal warning, however, is not external evidence that all the other claims are correct. It shows that the corpus contains its own distinctions and limits. They deserve study even if the reader does not accept their basis. A more precise disagreement starts with a particular sentence and a question about it, rather than a label that replaces the whole material in advance.

Religious criticism also differs from historical inquiry. A representative of another faith may reject the cosmology on theological grounds. A historian asks about sources, authorship, dates, and available evidence. A physician assesses a health claim by other means. These perspectives can converse, but they do not thereby gain the same expertise on every question. Preserving their boundaries gives each objection a chance to be considered on its merits.

X. A letter becomes a cultural society's program

Helena Roerich's letter of September 8, 1934, turns a general appeal to culture into a program of joint work: lectures, concerts, artistic and scientific subjects. Alongside this it discusses the quality of participants, ethical effort, and skill. Such a text is particularly useful for understanding the movement: a lofty proposal gains a list of earthly forms through which it is meant to be carried out. Letter of 08.09.1934.

A list of events, however, is not evidence that every one took place. A letter may contain advice, a plan, or a demand. Establishing the society's subsequent history would require programs, reports, correspondence, and visitors' accounts. This distinction matters: it does not diminish the proposal's value, but shows what further research is needed. A recommendation cannot be counted as completed activity simply because it was stated with authority.

The program joins two tasks that can diverge. The society wants to spread culture among a wide audience while making demands on its own spiritual quality. Its participants may share

the teaching; a concertgoer may come for the music. If joining an open cultural event requires prior agreement with the whole system, the audience narrows. If the event is open, cooperation across different grounds becomes possible.

A society's name alone cannot settle this question. Actual conditions are needed: a clear program, access to materials, the opportunity to ask questions, freedom to decline further participation. Our analytical comparison concerns these conditions. It does not attribute contemporary organizational rules to the letter or claim that all later groups acted alike.

The merit of a letter's particular address is also worth seeing. It responds to specific work and can therefore clarify a general slogan. Abstract love of culture gives way to the need to learn a skill, prepare a meeting, or choose a subject of study. The reader sees that a spiritual project presupposes labor, as well as agreement with an elevated picture of the world. This concreteness opens a discussion about the quality of results in which people with other beliefs can also take part.

XI. Cultural service: three texts, three audiences

Nicholas's essay, Helena's letter, and the diplomatic document can all be asked one substantial question: to whom is cultural service addressed? In “Defense” of 1936, Nicholas starts with the homeland and connects its defense with dignity and cultural work. In Helena's letter of September 8, 1934, the program addresses a group offered educational activities and preparation for women working in different fields. Rowe's letter of April 15, 1935, connects the initiative with states. “Defense”, letter of 8.9.1934, FRUS 384.

In Nicholas, local belonging does not disappear when the scale shifts to humanity. The homeland takes on meaning within a wider care for culture. A tension remains: a concern for humanity must not make a particular land seem unimportant, while love of one's own land must not close off the human perspective. His essay offers readers a positive connection between two scales, beyond merely guarding against patriotic or universalist simplification.

In Helena, scale passes through the group's work. Lectures, art, and skill must become forms of participation, rather than ornaments of a spiritual vocabulary. Religious hierarchy remains alongside them: not every participant in the educational setting receives the same role in studying the teaching. Openness in cultural activity and the demands of the spiritual circle therefore need to be distinguished within the program itself, rather than declared identical in advance.

The diplomatic letter changes the audience again. States are invited to adhere to a particular document. This does not require accepting the family's spiritual biography as the basis for every decision. We see a path from personal conviction through organized activity to a form of

discussion between states. These transitions explain the legacy's historical scale better than a single broad epithet, “synthesis.”

This reading also leaves room for disagreement. One can respect the cultural work and discuss the structure of spiritual authority; value a task that concerns humanity and dispute how it is carried out. A legacy becomes the subject of a living conversation when its separate proposals are clear enough to see. A shared world is built through shared words, but also through work whose audience, form, and result can be discussed.

XII. A shared world begins with precise distinctions

The Roerichs' legacy joins artistic work, spiritual discipline, and public cultural projects. Their connection is interesting precisely because they do not coincide completely. Nicholas speaks through paintings and essays, Helena through letters and explanations of the teaching; a diplomatic document answers questions an aphorism about the heart cannot settle.

Synthesis becomes meaningful when it preserves differences between participants. If unity requires us to stop identifying sources and questioning claims, it can too easily become agreement with a single system. An encounter between cultures requires more work: understanding another's language, seeing a shared task, and recognizing where the grounds diverge.

These materials offer a demanding thought about the quality of everyday work. Care for culture appears in elevated words, but also in a preserved object, a craft learned, an accurate translation, and a respectful conversation. This is our conclusion from the comparison; it does not require declaring every cosmic proposition a fact. Nor does it exhaust the corpus's religious meaning for its followers.

Return to the shelf with the album, the letters, and the book of instructions. Each object now has its own role. We can look at a painting, check a letter's date, challenge a norm, and support a monument's protection. This possibility of an independent relationship makes the legacy a living part of culture: it is read, clarified, and discussed, preserving the right to distinguish participation in a shared undertaking from acceptance of an entire worldview.

What this means in practice

Choose a small cultural undertaking: describe a family archive, prepare an open reading, help a library, or translate a short text. First name the result so another person can understand it without sharing your faith. For example, “compile an accurate list of twenty letters,” rather than “raise every participant's consciousness.” A larger goal may accompany the work, but does not replace its object.

Then divide roles according to skills. One person checks dates, another describes images, a third helps with language. Agree on how participants can correct an error. This is a contemporary organizational practice; it can be compared with the Roerichs' interest in cooperation and skill, but is not a spiritual prescription made in their name.

If disagreements arise, separate the question about the result from the question about beliefs. Preserving a letter does not always require agreement about its religious origin. Conversely, discussing a religious proposition requires more than saying that participants work well together. Each conversation then gains an appropriate basis.

Check the work when it is complete: is the list accurate enough, is the label clear, has access to the materials been preserved? State what remains unknown. This check does not measure a person's spiritual stature. It reveals the quality of a particular action and allows the work to continue. A participant may decline a task or a religious interpretation while retaining respect for others. At this scale, cooperation becomes an observable relationship rather than a promise of obligatory harmony.

For a family archive, it helps to separate information by provenance at the outset. Distinguish the date written on a letter from a date reconstructed through a relative's account. Distinguish the author's signature from a later label on a folder. Mark an unknown name as unknown. This is simple work with sources: it allows memory to be preserved without adding a beautiful story where evidence is still missing.

When finished, show another person one entry and ask them to find an unclear point. An abbreviation may need explaining, a transcription correcting, or an attribution marking as tentative. Such revision does not diminish the work already done. It makes the material more accessible to the next reader. A shared cultural result grows through participants' ability to refine the work, rather than obligatory agreement about their spiritual status. This contemporary example has a limited scale and does not promise to transform a whole community through a single act of archiving.

Key quotation

> *“Culture is the song of peaceful labor in its endless refinement.”*

Nicholas Konstantinovich Roerich, “Defense,” Invincible, 1936, paragraph defining culture; Russian original, translated from the Russian for this article. Source. For this article, the sentence links a lofty cultural aim with the quality of continuing work. It does not authenticate another corpus's spiritual origin or exempt an individual result from checking.

Connections between traditions

The following are our analytical comparisons. They preserve differences of genre and grounds; direct influence between the selected passages has not been separately established.

Positions and sources	Basis and limits of the comparison
Nicholas Roerich, “Defense” and Epictetus, Enchiridion, XXIV	Cultural work and a citizen's usefulness raise the question of service to a shared world. Roerich speaks in terms of the homeland and cultural treasures; Epictetus links usefulness with fidelity in one's own conduct. A similar question does not make their political and spiritual grounds identical. Each particular undertaking requires its own assessment.
Helena Roerich, letter of 08.09.1934 and Matthew, 7:16–20, KJV	The demand for quality in activity is compared with recognition by fruits. The shared question is what elevated words yield in action. The Gospel passage does not confirm Living Ethics, and a well-run cultural event does not authenticate its cosmic propositions. The comparison supports checking action while preserving differences of faith.
Heart, §§1–3 and Tao Te Ching, §8, Legge	A person's spiritual center and the image of water offer different ways to speak of a relationship with the world. In Legge, water is linked with benefit and an absence of rivalry. We compare images of relationship without equating the heart with the Tao or deriving a physiological theory from a poetic parallel.
Helena Roerich, letter of 19.10.1929 and Crowley, “Of Liberty”	Guidance and independence create a tension in two systems. Both allow us to ask how obedience is understood. Yet Living Ethics' spiritual hierarchy and Thelemic Will have their own grounds; a similar organizational difficulty does not establish that the teachings, or relationships in every community, coincide.
Helena Roerich, letter of 08.09.1934 and Blavatsky, The Key, section III	A cultural program and brotherhood offer universal aims. We compare the move from an aim to joint work. A letter to a particular recipient and a society's program are different kinds of document. Practical cooperation is possible despite disagreement about a spiritual source; historical continuity requires further evidence.

Primary sources

1. Agni Yoga (1929), Russian text, Agni Yoga Society. Primary corpus; the preface and §§159–160 were read, not the whole book.

2. Heart (1932), Russian text, Agni Yoga Society. Primary corpus; §§1–3 were read, distinguishing the spiritual concept from physiology.

3. Helena Ivanovna Roerich. Letters, volume I, 1929–1935. Primary Russian letters; the publisher's preface and selected letters were read, especially 19.10.1929 and 08.09.1934. Not the whole volume.

4. Nicholas Konstantinovich Roerich. “Defense,” Invincible (1936). Primary Russian essay, read in full; electronic transcription, without comparison against a facsimile.

5. Nicholas Roerich Museum. Biography of Nicholas Roerich. Official museum biography; the main text was read, and its author's assessments were not treated as independent expert judgment.

6. L. S. Rowe to the Secretary of State, 15 April 1935. FRUS, 1935, I, document 384. Primary diplomatic document; read in full, used for the Pact's history.

Additional primary texts for the comparison map:

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, English translation by Thomas Wentworth Higginson. §§I–IV and XXIV were read; comparison of the relationship to nature and action. The modern preface does not support this article.

• Laozi. Tao Te Ching, translation by James Legge. §§1–2 and 8 were read; an English intermediary, not the Chinese original. Comparison of the limits of naming and the relationship to action.

• Gospel of Matthew, 7:16–20, King James Version. The whole selected passage was read; comparison of an ethical declaration with the fruits of action, without a conclusion that religions agree.

• Crowley. De Lege Libellum, section “Of Liberty”. Primary English text, the section read in full; comparison of independence and guidance.

• Blavatsky. The Key to Theosophy, 1889, section III. The section on the society's aims was read; comparison of a universal program.

Tags

Roerichs, Nicholas Roerich, Helena Roerich, Living Ethics, Agni Yoga, Heart, Invincible, Defense, letters, culture, Roerich Pact, Urusvati, Himalayas, India, art, painting, cultural heritage, cultural society, skill, work, cooperation, guidance, hierarchy, spiritual authority, historical context, Russian primary sources, diplomatic document, source criticism, intercultural dialogue, independence

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of the United Wisdom project. He researches inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.