



A monthly journal devoted to teaching theosophical and occult truths

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."—Hamlet

VOLUME XVIII

MARCH, 1952—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 1

IS REINCARNATION A FACT?

By T. H. REDFERN

(Continued from Last Month)

The more scientists reveal mysteries of life, the clearer does it become that the vast process of which we apparently form quite an insignificant part, is immensely complex, and indeed involves conceptions which require minds far more comprehensive and vast in scope than ours. Only as ours are stretched and developed can we grow in understanding and grasp of the living process of which we are a part. Sometimes we may feel very pleased with our mental ability compared with savage and primitive peoples, yet we should be wise to remember that what measure of thought we have so far developed must be puny compared with whatever Beings adequately perceive and control the complex processes increasingly being unveiled before our wondering eyes.

Obviously if reincarnation, heredity, the influence of environment and astrology, all have their substantial elements of truth, comprehensive understanding must embrace them all and show how they are related. Heredity, environment and astrology are all conditioning factors limiting the returning individual, who is also inwardly conditioned by his unfolding faculties and deficiencies. As between heredity and environment, scientists still debate how much of the similarities to be found in family characteristics are to be traced to genetic determinations, and how much to the imitativeness of early childhood. Heredity and astrological influences are operative before, at and after birth, and environment is the field in which these trends unfold. According to Eastern lore, largely formulated by men who have developed powers of the soul which we lack, there is in the unseen worlds an organisation under the guidance of certain super-physical Beings who, for lack of better English words, can perhaps be described as Recording Angels—the Sanskrit term is the Lipika—who guide each returning individual to birth at a time and place and in a family, where the combination of hereditary, astrological and environmental factors will provide the most fitting conditions earned by the lives of earlier personalities, and therefore providing the best opportunity for further evolutionary progress. Truly, we reap what we sow, say the Easterners, and our bodily and mental

(Continued on Page 6)

DISPENSING WITH THE DOCTOR

Is It Necessary In
Spiritual Healing?

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

Christian Scientists are insistent that the services of a physician may not be employed in conjunction with those of the practitioner. To do so, they declare, implies lack of faith in the spiritual process which is basic in healing by prayer. But, somewhat inconsistently, they allow surgeons to set broken bones, on the ground that the faith of most people is inadequate to perform so strenuous a feat. Also it is not uncommon for Christian Scientists, even practitioners, to avail themselves of medical or surgical aid when, after long effort, their own methods have failed them.

Lack of perfect faith, again, we are assured and an occultist would not deny the *theoretical* possibility of effecting cures by faith alone even in the most extreme cases. However Theosophy, which is nothing if not common sense, sees no point in doing things the hard way, especially if the outcome by such means is doubtful, when the results aimed at are far more likely to be obtained by an easier route—and with no sacrifice of principle to expediency.

The present writer has seen too many instances of stubborn refusal by "Scientists" to call in a doctor until too late, to be impressed by this method of demonstrating faith. Among his own friends and associates he knows of fatalities that in all probability could have been avoided had medical or surgical assistance been obtained in time. This is a physical world in which we are at present living. This is a physical body we are inhabiting. Physical remedies for physical ills are not always indicated. The doctors themselves are coming more and more to rely on mental therapy and psychiatry, especially where physical causes of the trouble cannot be traced. But sometimes physical means *are* necessary for a cure—drugs, surgery, radium—any of the valuable discoveries of medical science to which so many owe so much. And if these are supplemented by spiritual healing—or, it would be more appropriate to say if spiritual healing is supplemented by these—optimum results are likely to be obtained and there will be no later reproach that the patient died of neglect.

(Continued on Page 6)

THE JACOBY ARTICLE

By H. J. BUDD

Properly to analyze the Jacoby Article published in the October issue of ANCIENT WISDOM we believe it advisable to look into Mr. Jacoby's previous article, "*Karma and Brotherhood*," printed in the October, 1950 issue of *The American Theosophist*. This will acquaint us with his understanding of the Law of Karma.

On page 197 of *The American Theosophist* Mr. Jacoby has his Judge express himself as follows: (All italics are the writer's):

"For example, if a minority race is persecuted, oppressed, herded into concentration camps and thrust into gas chambers by a brutal murderous majority, then I say we are all, everyone of us, part of that terrible picture. We cannot stand aside unmoved by these horrible happenings and delude ourselves into thinking that they do not involve us. We cannot attempt to justify them by assuming that they must have been *deserved* else they would not happen. We cannot take for granted that Karma is working out its purpose and we are to turn our backs."

On page 265 of the book, *Ancient Wisdom*, Mrs. Besant states: "Collective karma may throw a man into the troubles consequent on his nation going to war, and here again he may discharge debts of his past not necessarily within the ripe karma of his then life . . . In no case can a man suffer that which he has not *deserved*."

She further states on page 3 of *A Study in Karma*: "The fundamental conception, on which karma rests, is that it is law—law eternal, changeless, invariable, inviolable, law which can never be broken, existing in the nature of things. It is the want of this conception which makes the uninformed Theosophist say: 'You must not interfere with his karma.' But whenever a natural law is working, you may interfere with it just as far as you can."

Mr. Jacoby's Judge states on page 198. ". . . then why do we have hospitals, and orphan asylums and institutions for the blind and countless philanthropic activities? These all interfere with the automatic and unfeeling working of Karma."

Yes, karma is automatic—very automatic—but "feeling" does not enter into it; it is neither "feeling nor unfeeling. It is the just fulfillment of an automatic Law supervised, to some extent, by the Lords of Karma. On page

(Continued on Page 7)

ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS

published monthly at

320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.
St. Louis 2, Mo.

CHARLES E. LUNTZ, Editor

ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, Publishers

Entered as second-class matter Sept.
25, 1936, at the post office at St. Louis,
Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Subscriptions: 1 year \$2.00; 6 months
\$1.20; Canada and abroad, 1 year \$2.50.

Single Copies, 20 cents

WHAT SORT OF FAITH?

Mark Twain wickedly referred to "the serene confidence which a Christian feels in four aces."

A poet named Samuel Hoffenstein profoundly observed:

"Little by little we subtract
Faith and Fallacy from Fact,
The Illusory from the True,
And starve upon the residue."

Herman Melville, author of "Moby Dick" and no mean craftsman of words, gave utterance to this rather terrible declaration:

"There is no faith, and no stoicism, and no philosophy, that a mortal man can possibly evoke, which will stand the final test in a real impassioned onset of Life and Passion upon him. Faith and philosophy are air, but events are brass."

Sorry conclusions, these, and well-
aday for all of us, if true! We may at
first dismiss Mark Twain's cynical bit
of humor as not intended seriously, but
as we do so we are brought up short
with the reflection, "Maybe not too
exaggerated at that." Four aces in a
poker game are mighty comforting
things to hold, whether the player be
Christian or Atheist—or at least they
were, before the days of "deuces wild."
And can it be true that if we subtract
faith (as well as fallacy) from fact, as
Mr. Hoffenstein insists, the residue will
consist of such lean fare that we shall
starve on it.

Is it possible, as so emphatically pro-
claimed by Melville that faith is to
event as air is to brass? Well, if so, so
be it. *Man can live without brass but
not without air.*

And neither can he live without
faith which is, for any sort of real
achievement, as necessary as the air
he breathes is to life.

But what sort of faith? Should it be
the faith of the four aces—a pocket-
book faith, well buttressed by stocks
and bonds, annuities, cash in the bank?
Not much of faith there but still some
is required even then. We hope we are
not carrying Mark's poker playing
simile too far for some of our readers'
liking when we point out that even
four aces may be beaten by a straight
flush. Some peculiar faith in the "laws
of chance" (a silly phrase as chance is
the utter negation of law) there must
be, if the holder, with "serene confid-

ence," bets his head off, regardless of
the possibility that another player may
have cards that outrank his own. And
money loses its value, investments col-
lapse, banks do, or did go under—
insurance companies fail. Not often in
these times we grant you (except for
devaluation of money), but still an
element of faith must be present in
virtually every transaction of the hard-
est-boiled, most disbelieving sinner who
ever played golf on a Sunday morning
instead of going to church.

In the brief Hoffenstein verse this
poet-philosopher makes the point that
after deducting from what is factually
true all our illusions, fallacies and even
faith, nothing is left but a barren husk
on which to starve. He means to starve
spiritually, of course, and he is right.
But why bracket faith with illusion
and fallacy? Is that all it is? Is the
provably factual—the physically fact-
ual—the only reality? And when we
have stripped away everything else,
including faith, is that what remains
for us to gnaw at? What a spiritually
slimming diet! Theosophy must be all
wrong then. Men cannot have souls.
All the souls would have perished long
ago from Egoic malnutrition.

If faith—the right kind of faith, not
blind credulity—is indeed an illusion
this is (and we don't mean to be pro-
fane but factual) a hell of a world. We
can't understand in that case how it can
have progressed this far. There must be
some mistake in the way the great of
the earth have achieved and have help-
ed the race to improve itself and its
conditions. Because everywhere we
look, every history of outstanding ac-
complishment that we read, is a story
of the faith of some man or woman or
group. The struggles against the seem-
ingly impossible that have led man to
vanquish one entrenched evil after an-
other have all been buttressed by faith,
and often in their first stages by little
or nothing more. Millions have volun-
tarily died to sustain what Mr. Melville
brands as that airy thing, faith—but
not one to preserve or bring about some
brassy event, unless the event was con-
nected with something or was some-
thing built upon the faith for which
they died.

What is that "real impassioned onset
of life and passion" which he declares
cannot be withstood by stoicism, philo-
sophy or faith?

The most threatening of such onsets
presumably would be death itself and
here the declaration falls of its own
weight, for men and women, supported
by their faith which must embrace
their philosophy, die stoically every
day. We have seen Theosophists, sus-
tained by a faith so powerful that with
them it is knowledge, die with a calm
assurance that turns the above declara-
tion into idle babbling.

Or does the somewhat redundant
"impassioned passion" mean that philo-
sophy and faith are helpless in face of
overwhelming desire for the forbidden
which at sometime or other sweeps in-

to nearly every life with opportunity
for its gratification? That, too, is de-
monstrably fictitious. Yielding to temp-
tation is sufficiently common to give
superficial color to the statement, but
enough and more than enough ex-
amples of firmness even to death are
in the heavenly—and earthly—records
to refute it completely.

Men without faith may deceive them-
selves into believing that *they* are the
strongminded, *they* the uninhibited,
they the choice elect who alone repre-
sent truth in a world where so many
believe in what cannot be physically
proved and call it faith. But there is
plenty of physical proof of the kind of
world that men without faith succeed
in producing when they seize power.
One needs only to look at Russia and
its satellites, ruled by those who have
faith only in armaments, in force, in
terrorism, to see what residue is left
for their people to starve on.

Amid all the strange theological won-
derments that believing people believe
in there still exist principles of spiri-
tual grandeur that stand for a real and
abiding faith which far outweighs the
non-essential and the superstitious
which may cloud but can never destroy
it. How blessed then the Theosophist
whose mighty philosophy, consistent in
every detail with itself and with a Su-
preme Principle of Goodness, Order
and Design, is of itself selfproving be-
cause no loftier or nobler concept of
Life is possible—at least at our present
stage of development. He has, in the
words of the Bible, added to his faith
knowledge. And while, also in biblical
phrase, he walks by faith, not by sight,
it is a faith that gives an inner sight,
keener, truer, more lucent than all the
worldly experience of all the worldly
faith-denying men can ever confer.

THE FIRST OBJECT

The First Object of The Theosophical
Society is "To form a nucleus of the
Universal Brotherhood of Humanity,
without distinction of race, creed, sex,
caste or color." It is a worthy object
and to put it into effect is . . . we were
about to say a man-sized job, but that
is not adequate enough—it might al-
most be described as a God-sized job.
Certainly, after more than 75 years the
First Object is still an object—not yet
an achievement.

The dictionary defines *nucleus* as "a
central part or thing about which other
parts or things are grouped." It is perti-
nent then to inquire how much of a
nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood
of Humanity we really are. We talk a
lot about it, of course, but talk is not
achievement—often quite the reverse.
A lot of us don't eat animals, our
"younger brothers," who, by the way,
are not mentioned in the First Object,
but we "eat out" our brother man if he
happens to cross us or disagree with us.
To what extent then are we, the nu-
cleus, if we are as yet a nucleus, a nu-
cleus?

Theosophists are nice people and we love 'em. But there are other nice and lovable people who are not Theosophists. Theosophists are of high character, devoted, earnest, sincere. But so are many church people and agnostics—even atheists. Theosophists are charitable, sympathetic, idealistic, seekers after Truth. But they have no monopoly on these qualities. Wherein then are we a nucleus, or even a nucleolus, of that Universal Brotherhood of Humanity that our First Object proudly declares we exist to form?

We know some readers are not going to like that question. We can almost see the frowning foreheads, the pursed-up lips indicating severe disapproval, as they rush to typewriter or writing desk to tell us off in biting terms for our presumption in asking a direct question that should have been asked—and answered—long ago.

Well, like the Biblical character, we have put our hand to the plough, or rather the fountain pen, and we shall not turn back. What sort of a nucleus are we, anyway? In what way does our nuclear composition radiate a Universal Brotherhood that attracts to our periphery other groups, other people, to become in their turn radiating and attracting centers of the same great Truth? That, as we see it, is the sixty-four billion dollar question and to answer it is going to be quite a chore . . . for someone.

If our object is Universal Brotherhood, it must, like any other great object, have a rallying center. Of itself it is not enough. The world will not flock around just because we cry Brotherhood. The world will not even pay any attention. The cry is old. It should not be stale, grand aim that it expresses, but it is. It should be inspiring, magnificent as is its scope, but it isn't. Readers will write us, as some have written us, that it is not old nor stale to them, that it does inspire them, arouse them, thrill them. Good! But the object is to be a nucleus. And a few people, inspired and devoted though they themselves be, cannot form an effective nucleus if others do not gather around it, fired by similar inspiration. In fact a nucleus out in the cold without attracting others to it is not a nucleus at all. It lacks the principal attribute a nucleus must have—that of drawing to itself those who have become like to itself.

We might find a homely example in the well-known nucleus in each cell of a human body. This cell contains a certain pattern of chromosomes or carriers of the heredity. All the cells of a single human being have chromosomes of like pattern, but no other human being in the world has an exactly similar chromosomal design. The chromosomes are made up of units termed genes and in a most marvellous way these genes govern every physical characteristic of the body.

The point we want to make is that each nucleus is therefore an individual-

ly unique thing, unlike (except for its fellow nuclei in the same body) any other nucleus of any other body anywhere. It has its own exclusive contribution to make toward the building of one human being—one and no other. It does not copy the nucleus of someone else. It is not an imitator but an originator. That, as we see it, is the function of a nucleus—the function of the nucleus Theosophists, under the First Object, should be trying to make of their collective selves. If we are to be a nucleus it must be a unique nucleus with its own specific pattern. Else it will disintegrate before it is half formed. Pretty words won't build it up. Impassioned declarations, protestations, proclamations, rhetoric, will contribute no whit to its accretion. If we want the world to gather around us in all-embracing Brotherhood, which is no small ambition, we will have to offer something more as a focus than a pale copy of a platform which hundreds of other organizations have adopted as their own.

We do have this vital element to offer. It is unique. It is our own. It copies nothing. It is worthy to be embodied in the nucleus we want to be—is, in fact, both the attracting and radiating component we need and the world needs if it is ever to get over its troubles and become the real Brotherhood of Humanity of which Object I attempts to make us the nucleus. What is it?—Just our specialized theosophical knowledge, that's all, presented as only Theosophists can present it because they are the only ones who possess it in its fulness. And by this we mean bedrock theosophical facts—the facts which explain Life and Death, the Hereafter, Rebirth, Cause and Effect, Dharma or what is right at a given time, Thought Power (the real thing, not the "pseudos" of other cults), the existence of perfected Beings who guide the destinies of nations, the Path of Liberation which all must some day tread—these and scores of other Cosmic Truths make up our basal pattern and can be made to form the central core of the nucleus to attract mankind.

It will be the work of centuries, perhaps of millenia, but it is *our* work. It will be work that calls not for easy goodwill, idle phrases, joining together of declamatory words to form sentences that tickle the ears but instill no spark of new knowledge and are forgotten ten minutes after they are uttered. It will be work that calls for the arresting presentation of the Truth in the tradition of Besant, of Blavatsky, of Leadbeater, of L. W. Rogers. But it must be more than traditional presentation. It must be dynamic, fresh, geared to the amazing new discoveries of our present era. And it calls for a high degree of intelligence, of masterful thought, purposeful assembling of the words that have to be our tools, aggressiveness in attack, even, on the false ideas that bar our way, resoluteness in defense of our own unassailable knowl-

edge that will stand up under every challenge the blind leaders of the blind can offer it.

That is the way to get action on the First Object. Prating about it in honeyed sentences is so much beating of air. The world is hungering for the spiritual food that Theosophy alone can give to it and it does not know for what it hungers. And the crumbs we scatter are too often soggy with maudlin and indigestible irrelevancies.

The First Object is a grand Object—the grandest of the three, but it needs what the other two provide to make it workable. Even Spirit cannot manifest without the material. Let us get to work on our job, put some real thought into it, change the defeatist attitude that the world is not ready for our Truth. It is ready, has long been ready, but it is not ready and never will be ready for the solemn unintelligibilities it is too often handed in the guise of some great revelation. Can we blame the world for reacting with "If this mishmash is Theosophy we want none of it?"

The way to form a nucleus is, to paraphrase Krishnamurti, to cultivate the individual uniqueness the Theosophical Society possesses and pass it on. Some day in the far distant future the world will make a beaten path to our door. How far distant that future is largely depends on the work that we—you and I and all of us—do now.

A WORD ON THE WAR

We frankly have no patience with the "informed" columnists and newspaper experts who profess to see great cunning and wisdom in Russia "inveigling" us into the Korean War. Always it is the other fellow who is so smart, while we are devoid of all intelligence in our handling of the situation and an easy prey for the wiles of our adversary.

We heard the same song in World War II. The super-genius Mussolini, the super-super genius Hitler and the whole collection of supreme geniuses making up the War Dictatorship of Japan—it would take years, decades maybe, to defeat them, if we ever could defeat them!

Based not only on astrology but on what we possess of common-sense, if any, we said "Bosh" to such views then and we say "Bosh" to similar views now. Russia was not clever in instigating the Korean War, but the reverse—for it brought the most powerful nations in the world to arm against her aggressive threats. Before that she had virtually her own way and her opponents were pitifully weak in armament no matter what they had in potential. Now that potential is rapidly being developed into usable might.

Maybe, as Hitler used to say of his blunders, the Kremlin "planned it" (Continued on Page 5)

OCCULTISM IN THE BIBLE

Third Degree

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

"Whence come ye?" demanded Prince Zaphnath-paaneah, *alias* Joseph, former slave and prison trusty. The new and more dignified name had been bestowed upon him by the Pharaoh after the famous dream interpretation episode. For the benefit of any interested philologist the marginal note announces, "Which in the Coptic signifies, *A revealer of secrets or The man to whom secrets are revealed.*" We might remember that. It has its place in the occult symbolism.

"Whence come ye?" barked Prince Zaph-etc., at the startled brethren.

This was a new one. The brothers were not asking for credit. They had journeyed a long way, as had thousands of others, to do some perfectly legitimate shopping in the only super market now open for business. Why should this gorgeous George of an Egyptian, all robes and rings and millinery, concern himself with where they came from?

No doubt they would have liked to retort, "None of your business. Sell us our groceries and don't ask questions." That, however, would merely have meant "No Sale" on whatever ancient Egypt used for a cash register and an entry in the royal records, "Ten strangers liquidated—the hard way." So the brothers meekly replied, "From the land of Canaan to buy food."

Joseph snarled back at them like an angry tiger-cat. "Ye are spies," he snapped. "To see the nakedness of the land ye are come."

This was plain nonsense, about on a par with the "neutrality violations" dreamed up by the Red Chinese during the August truce conferences. To begin with, Egypt was the only land that was *not* naked, in the sense of having nothing to eat, and all the world knew it, if the Bible is to be believed. Also why would the brothers waste perfectly good time and camel mileage trekking from Canaan to Egypt and back again "to see the nakedness of the land"? After they had seen it, what could they do with the information? Again the hot tempered brethren would doubtless have liked to retaliate with the Oriental equivalent of "Are you crazy?" but again they were forced to grovel. "Nay, my lord," they answered, "but to buy food are thy servants come. We are all one man's sons; we are true men; thy servants are no spies."

But Joseph was a man with a one-track mind. Like the mother bird in *Alice In Wonderland* who insisted that long-necked Alice was a serpent after her eggs, and rejected with scorn Alice's assurance that she was a little girl, Brother Joe returned always to his original theme:

"Spies! That's what you are. Spies!"

"Nay, nay!" protested the brethren.

"Ja! Ja!" insisted Joseph.

"I'm a little girl," wailed Alice.

"You're a serpent," hissed the mother bird. "That's what you are—Serpent! Serpent! Serpent!"

How does a little girl in a dream go about proving that she's not a serpent?

How could the brothers—who also felt as though they were dreaming—go about proving to an apparently obsessed Egyptian dignitary that they were not ten separate and distinct serpents with treacherous designs on the integrity of his county?

"Twelve brethren we are," they expostulated, "and behold the youngest is this day with our father, and one is not."

Well Joseph knew that one was "not." And why. The time had come for the putting into effect of Part I of his scheme of revenge. It might be termed "Operation Benjamin."

"Very well," said Joseph. "I maintain you are spies. You tell me you're honest men. Hereby ye shall be proved. By the life of Pharaoh ye shall not go forth hence, except your youngest brother come hither. Send one of you and let him fetch your brother, and ye shall be kept in prison that your words may be proved, whether there be any truth in you: or else by the life of Pharaoh surely ye are spies."

It was a cruel proposal as Joseph intended it to be. Also his reasons were far-fetched and made no sense. Joseph was aware that they were not spies, of course, but his brethren were not aware of it. But what logic was it, they must have thought, to make the production of a young brother the proof of the truth of their story. For a few shekels anyone could hire some wandering youngster to say he was their brother and tell whatever circumstantial story they put in his mouth. How would this crazed Egyptian with his babbling about spies and younger brothers know the difference?

It is to the credit of then ten unhappy prisoners that this way out does not seem to have occurred to them. Their concern was for their aged father. It would tear out his heart to risk the freedom, possibly the life, of his youngest and now his best loved son. For Jacob, learning no lessons in child psychology by what had happened to little Joe, now had enthroned little Ben as favorite in his place.

All the ministerial literature we ever read and all the sermons we ever heard on the subject give fulsome praise to Joseph for testing out the good faith of his brothers by this ingenious little plan. He wanted to see, they explain, if they had really repented of their former inhumanity or not. We propose to be the exception to this laudatory chorus. Assuming that Joseph was justified in subjecting his erstwhile tormentors to a dose of their own medicine, how could he be so brutally heartless as to wring the

heart of his doting father—an innocent old man who had loved him tenderly and who still mourned him with unutterable grief as dead? We can think of several terms that might be used to describe Joseph in this transaction. His brethren probably thought of several more—but what could they do?

Three days they remained in prison. Perhaps Joseph, with warped humor, arranged that they should occupy the quarters formerly assigned in the jail to him—if there was room. The third day he ordered them before him, having slightly relented. "Nine of you can go back," he informed them. "Leave one of you behind as a hostage for faithful performance. Take the corn you want and next time you come here, *bring me that youngest brother.*" There was menace in his words and in his look. His harassed relatives were quick to see the hand of karma in what had befallen them. As the Bible tells it, "And they said one to another, we are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us."

Reuben, who apparently was the family's "I told you so-er," reminded them, "Spake I not unto you saying, Do not sin against the child; and ye would not hear? therefore, behold, also his blood is required."

They spoke in their own tongue, unaware that the Egyptian prince would understand them, as Joseph, to keep up the deception, had used an interpreter in his dealings with them. He was not so tough as he appeared for, says the account, "he turned himself about from them and wept, and returned to them again, and communed with them, and took from them Simeon and bound him before their eyes."

But Joseph was not through playing games. He ordered that when the corn was sacked each man's money should be placed in the mouth of the sack. One of them opened his sack en route home in order to feed his animal and . . . well . . . imagine his embarrassment and the embarrassment of all of them when they discovered the unasked for and unwanted refund. "What is that God hath done to us?" they sadly asked, one of another.

But it wasn't God, except by indirection—it was Joseph.

Now all of this, of course, is purely esoteric in its meaning. Literally it is fable and legend. There never was a Joseph, a Benjamin, a Jacob or a Jacobean family—or if there was, it was a mere peg on which to hang these fantastic adventures which assuredly did not happen as narrated. Egyptian history, detailed in every particular by the historian Herodotus, is completely silent regarding the famine, the 7-year stock-piling of grain, the administration of anyone named Zaphnath-paaneah, or the subsequent immigration of Hebrews into Egypt and their

sensational exit, as recounted in the Book of Exodus. Earth shaking events and not a line about them!

Yet the inspired genius who composed the story wrought better than any modern playwright or novelist, for he not only produced a drama of thrilling interest exoterically but woven within it contrived to embody, in occult and astrological symbology, the greatest story ever told—the story of the Ego and its many personalities, of spiritual evolution, of the role of the twelve signs and houses in human development, and of the purification and perfection over the ages, of man and his bodies.

The literal story must first be completed before we can consider its marvellous symbology. For the time being we leave the unhappy brethren wending their dismal way back to Canaan and wondering how under heaven to break the terrible news to their waiting father—no more corn unless and until little Benny makes a trip to Egypt—and Brother Simeon already tied up in jail to guarantee Benjamin's appearance.

Father was not going to be pleased. Father was going to tell them in no uncertain terms that they had messed things up. Life with Father was not going to be easy from now on.

(To Be Continued)

MINSTRELSY

A Selection from the Poems of Patience Worth

Words

I am jealous of word.
I have no love for prattle.
I care little for preachment.
I am mute within myself.
In this muteness mayhap
I might agonize.
Yet I find no answer
In creeds or prating.

If the Russians were smart in instigating Korea, Hitler was smart in invading Poland, Mussolini in marching on Ethiopia, the Kaiser in violating Belgium and Napoleon in trying a winter campaign in Russia.

We suggest that no one make the mistake of selling Britain short. C.W.L. clairvoyantly saw it flourishing 650 years hence.

"Who invented the fantastic thing called Astrology?" writes a disbelieving reader.—God.

The newspaper poet's a commonplace fellow—
The humblest may know what his poetry means.
But clearness is treason, and so, for this reason,
He never gets into the big magazines.
—D. A. McCarthy

DO YOU KNOW—

That you may disbelieve reincarnation and still be a perfectly good Theosophist and member of The Theosophical Society?

* * * *

That you need not believe in karma, clairvoyance, the planes, the invisible bodies or even the Masters, to be a T. S. member?

* * * *

That you do not have to believe in God to be a Theosophist?

* * * *

That you must believe in Universal Brotherhood or you cannot be a member, but you may put your own construction on what it means?

* * * *

That no one may tell you, "This, that or the other thing is or is not Theosophy," unless they qualify it by adding, "in my opinion."

* * * *

That whether you are a new member or an old one, or whether your instructor be Lodge President, National President or International President, you have a perfect right, if you wish, to dispute his opinion and express your own?

* * * *

That this is not necessarily an invitation to challenge the opinions of those who, because of more profound and lengthier studies, may be well qualified to advance them, but to assure you of the unabridged privilege the Society confers on every member?

* * * *

That obviously this privilege should not be abused nor used for mere trouble-making or "show-off" purposes?

* * * *

That when it is temperately exercised, the one whose opinion is challenged has no right to resent the challenge as such, though he assuredly has the same right as the challenger—to try to justify his own opinion?

* * * *

That while differences of opinion should never be permitted to degenerate into wrangles or name calling—a highly untheosophical procedure—they should be encouraged to explore and develop new points of view?

* * * *

That presiding Lodge officers should handle such differences, even when they themselves are the objects of criticism, with tact and lack of resentment, and above all should avoid a "king can do no wrong" attitude?

* * * *

That the "peace" for which all Lodges strive does not mean the peace of the graveyard, with everyone afraid to utter a word of disagreement for fear of official displeasure, but a harmony founded on the mutual respect of the members for each others views, even when they differ?

EGOIC PREVIEW

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

Before each incarnation
And the interpenetration
Of the astral and the mental with the physical,

Does the Ego reconnoiter
And about his new home loiter
Observing this and that, with glances quizzical?

After several contemplations
Of his soon-to-be relations,
Should he find them just a trifle disconcerting—

Crude, perhaps, or overbearing,
With inadequacies glaring—
Would he feel with Earth he'd rather not be flirting?

And the ties he's now renewing,
With their karma that's been brewing
From the time that he was last reincarnated—

If he sees his old foe Flanagan,
Does he cry, "Why, there's that man again!
I thought that he'd long since disintegrated."

The blonde who turned him down—
Does she draw his wrathful frown
If he notes she'll be his kin, and stupid . . . rather?

And the man she later wedded,
Though the marriage came unthreaded,
Is—Good Lord!—the one who's going to be his father.

For these relationships,
Though they seem poetic quips,
Are, in nature's workings, perfectly believable.

We're here for education
And our new affiliation
Is, to karma, just an old "Account Receivable."

No, the Ego doesn't mind
What for him has been designed
By the Powers in charge of human evolution.

But though he may see Reality—
If shown his Personality,
It would likely try to start a revolution.

She had that peculiar feeling, experienced by all at times, of having once been someone else, which accounts for so much belief in the transmigration of souls.
—John Galsworthy

Men's weaknesses are often necessary to the purposes of life.

—Maeterlinck

A WORD ON THE WAR

(Continued from Page 3)

that way." Or maybe, like the Axis they planned not wisely but too well. We advertise our mistakes—shout them to high heaven. Our opponents always keep quiet about theirs, but when defeat overwhelms them and the mistakes come out, they are found to be ten times as bad as our own.

IT MAKES NO SENSE THAT—

There should be a sort of worship of words by the religious and sometimes even by Theosophists, when a word (when descriptive of an idea) is merely a tag which identifies more or less imperfectly the idea associated with it.

* * * *

Because our English word for the Deity is "God," we should, for example, refuse recognition to the Supreme when He is addressed by the people of other faiths as Brahma, Ishvara or Allah.

* * * *

Those for whom ceremonial, ritual and religious rites hold no appeal should either despise or condemn those who find inspiration and upliftment in these observances.

* * * *

One of opposite temperament should despise or condemn those who find no inspiration or upliftment in church services or ritualism and who therefore elect to disregard them.

* * * *

The arrogation to oneself of superior holiness because of the construction one may put upon words, whether God, religion, salvation or even brotherhood, should accord in any way with the true facts, facts not being dependent upon or affected by the word used to describe them.

* * * *

A Theosophist, even of long standing, should try to give himself a spiritual rating as to soul age and advancement, when a multiplicity of factors of which he is not even aware would necessarily qualify any conclusion in this respect at which he might arrive.

IS REINCARNATION A FACT

(Continued from Page 1)

Equipment, environment and natural propensities are the direct outcome of our ways of thinking, feeling and living in past lives. This is the law of karma, the principle of action and reaction, emotional and physiological processes as in physics. Our lives are the product of our past, and if we do not like them the remedy is to improve our future by the way we live in the present.

The Eastern teachers say that physical life starts with about 7 years without responsibility, and Western psychologists assert that many of the patterns and habits of behaviour that bind us for the rest of our lives are formed in this period. Is there any indication that, during this phase of life, the growing child can exercise formative power upon its own life? At a recent meeting of the Lodge Miss Nellie Horne told us from her experience as a teacher, that during this time there is a natural spontaneity in children which seems to be lost a little later. This change is not an event on the seventh birthday, but a

IT MAKES SENSE THAT—

A word which may have identified an idea very well when first it was applied can wear out its original meaning by being latched on to other ideas with which originally it had nothing to do.

* * * *

If the worshipper is obviously praying to his own highest concept of the Infinite, by whatever name he calls it, we should recognize that his God is our God and he is no heathen because he uses religious terminology that differs from our own.

* * * *

The Theosophical Society, to its lasting credit, has recognized this slighted truth by establishing, on its Indian headquarters grounds, buildings dedicated to the religious use of each of the great faiths.

* * * *

It is a preposterous impertinence to criticize anyone for his private beliefs or lack of them, seeing that he is accountable for these only to karma and to his own Ego, and not to his critic or anyone else.

* * * *

The religious, the non-religious and the Theosophist alike should be very humble in appraising their own status "before the Throne," since the perspective of the most saintly is so small and that of the Divine so infinite.

* * * *

A Theosophist, recognizing the superlative nature of the karma responsible for his being a Theosophist at all, should highly resolve to utilize to the utmost the opportunity he has been given to spread enlightenment among those who have accepted as unfathomable the paradoxes of life.

process which takes place more or less around that time, though in some cases linkage of the reincarnating individual with the forming psycho-physiological personality, normally taking place around the age of 7, does not happen at all, and in consequence intelligence is lacking and the result is an idiot. Normally however many personality traits are shaped in the child by the age of 7, and they represent a large part of the problems for that life, for the returning individual meets life through them, and his reactions and those of others to these karmic maskways greatly affect the working out of his affairs.

(To Be Continued)

DISPENSING WITH THE DOCTOR

(Continued from Page 1)

Theosophical healing as practiced by the well known St. Louis Lodge Group, works in full harmony with any physical treatment the patient is receiving and indeed may arouse in him or his advisers the impulse to adopt some particular form of therapy which will effect a cure. The notion that somehow

physical and spiritual healing are antipathetic finds no favor with occultists. A physical body needs physical nourishment, physical exercise, physical rest and, where disease exists due to physical and not psychic causes, physical remedies may be necessary. There is no fanaticism in true Theosophy (though there is in the pseudo variety). Faith in Spiritual Healing, amply justified by its magnificent results, does not bar faith in the skill of a competent medical man, an experienced osteopath or a skilled surgeon.

And why should it? If physical evolution takes place to subserve the ends and aims of spiritual evolution, why should not the physical body be recognized as an entity, temporary though it be, and subject to physical impacts, whether detrimental or beneficial? Indeed this is the only satisfactory way to regard it for practical purposes even though from the highest metaphysical standpoint we agree with our Christian Science friends that matter is unreal. However, the highest metaphysical standpoint is incapable of being realized from any altitude lower than that of the Absolute Itself, as every other standpoint is of necessity lower. And as even the most advanced among us is several million aeons away from re-absorption into that Ultimate Oneness whence we emanated, it seems a trifle unfeasible to operate as though we were there already. Else one is confronted with the dilemma of the Christian Scientist whose life, to the non-"Scientist," appears to be a perpetual compromise with the matter he does not believe exists yet is compelled perforce to use.

This dilemma is usually met with declarations which may mean something to the followers of Mrs. Eddy (sometimes we wonder if they do) but are completely without meaning to anyone else. Thus a spokesman for the Christian Science Church makes the incomprehensible statement (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* Vol. 5, page 639), "Christian Science does not ignore what it regards as unreal." Just how does one go about recognizing something that he regards as unreal? And if the physical body is indeed unreal, how can it be healed of an unreal disease? It is true the disease (according to "Science") was never there in the first place. But neither (according to "Science") was the physical body. Neither are the magnificent debt-free Christian Science Churches, which certainly are built of unreal physical bricks and mortar, though unlike many other Churches they have no pesky unreal mortgages to pay off with unreal money.

To one unversed in the study it seems as though the Christian Scientist, from his standpoint, merely chooses which unrealities he likes best and these he does not ignore—but the ones he objects to he brands as "error" and "evil" and (in the words of the above authority) "forsakes and overcomes

them on the basis of their unreality." But the desirable unrealities he clings to with just as much fervency as his brother who walks in darkness.

The Theosophist is not intrigued by these obscurities. To him matter is temporarily real, and usable for purposes of Spirit which, without matter of some kind or another, could not manifest. It is the interlinkage of the two that constitutes life as we know it. And even when the current physical body is sloughed off, what remains is far from being pure Spirit. Another body of finer matter, but still of matter though not responding to physical laws, takes its place, and so on up and up, and then down again into physical reincarnation without which the "borrowed" ray of Spirit which is man could not fulfill its destiny.

The inconsistency of the Christian Science position on healing is evident when it is contrasted with its position on what is termed "demonstrating prosperity." Obviously this can only come by physical intervention. It may be an unexpected raise in salary, legacy, opportunity for a new position, success in business or investment—in any one of a thousand ways but all strictly physical. Prosperity is not going to appear out of spirit land and the beneficiary find himself, without any visible cause, surrounded by all the appanages of luxury and affluence. If the demonstration is for a home, it will have to be bought and paid for or else deeded by someone else. It will not, like Aladdin's palace, rise out of nowhere by rubbing the demonstration lamp.

Yet that is precisely how, if the Christian Science thesis is pushed to its ultimate conclusion, healing is supposed to take place. Why should not physical intervention also come in here if the trouble traces to some physical cause? Why should not the sufferer, by the ministrations of the spiritual healers, be led to the right doctor, induced to follow the correct regimen of cure, or in some other way be placed on the road to recovery?

Which is not to say that in some, perhaps in many cases, the healing processes of his own body may not be aroused into activity by these ministrations without the necessity for calling in medical aid at all. The writer bears grateful testimony to the fact that this has repeatedly happened in his own case and in the case of his family and others known to him. But sometimes it has worked by impelling him—or others—to adopt some special form of treatment which has functioned successfully.

Theosophical healing is rational and consistent. It has not been publicized to a tiny fraction of the extent of Christian Science healing. Everyone knows about the latter. Few indeed are aware that there is such a thing as theosophical healing. ANCIENT WISDOM has done its utmost to carry word of the achievements of the great Healing

Group of The Theosophical Society of St. Louis. It is our profound conviction that no organization, no group, no church, has excelled the results obtained, though on a smaller scale, by this devoted body of earnest Theosophists, working steadfastly and silently without compensation for those afflicted in mind or body.

A stream of letters from all over the nation bear witness to the potency of Spiritual Healing as it is practiced in The Theosophical Society by this united group of trained minds, selfless and consecrated to a task than which none more noble exists. There are Forces—Intelligent Forces—in nature whose work is that of healing and whose aid can be invoked by those who have the knowledge and the purity of life. That there are other and less potent ways of bringing health to the sick by spiritual means is also conceded.

Do not dismiss your physician, your osteopath, your chiropractor or naturopath if you have confidence in him. But if, after our Healing Group begins its ministrations, your doctor suddenly suggests, with no prior request from you, some new form of treatment which speedily cures or if the old treatment, perhaps not too effective up to that time, begins to show new or more striking results, do not be surprised. That is the way in which it often may be expected to work.

And have faith—real faith. We will say for the heads of the Christian Science Churches and of the Mother Church that they practice what they preach. They rely on their own methods of healing by the Power of Spirit. But we never heard of the Pope or any of the Cardinals or other dignitaries of the Church, when sick, making a pilgrimage to Lourdes, nor of any of them reported to have been cured by spiritual means. Always they have their personal physicians or when illness strikes call in some famous medical man or surgeon.

We do not counsel against that but we do urge that the great power of Spiritual Healing as it is exemplified by our T.S. Healing Group in St. Louis be employed also. It is yours for the asking. Write Mrs. Ella Welge, Group Leader, c/o Theosophical Society of St. Louis, 5108 Waterman Ave., St. Louis 8, Mo., or care of ANCIENT WISDOM. Mention this article if you wish. Don't tell your doctor unless he is a Theosophist or in sympathy. Don't tell anyone else even after being helped unless they are very understanding and sympathetic. Jesus himself, after healing a sick man, enjoined him, *Ora medeni eipes*: "See thou tell no man." And He knew.

(The End)

THE JACOBY ARTICLE

(Continued from Page 1)

123 of *Thought Power*, Mrs. Besant writes: "Perhaps it is well to interject here the remark that the half-instructed Theosophist should not take alarm,

and refrain from giving to a friend any thought-assistance of which he is capable, by the fear lest he should be 'interfering with karma.' Let him leave karma to take care of itself, and have no more fear of interfering with it than of interfering with the law of gravitation."

The Judge further states on page 198: "And you cannot seek refuge in the submission and surrender of the *fatalism* of Karma."

Irving Cooper on page 59 of *Theosophy Simplified* writes: "Fatalism always implies that we are bound on an iron wheel of circumstances from which no effort of our own can free us. Karma, on the contrary, says that while in truth we are bound by what we have done in the past, yet each moment we live we are moulding and modifying the future by the decisions and choices we make. Free-will certainly does not mean that we are free to change the conditions of nature in any way that our whims may dictate, but that we are free to choose what we shall do within those conditions. If each one of us had power to modify the world according to our several fancies, what an inconceivable chaos would result."

From the above quotations from Mr. Jacoby's article and the quotations from Theosophical sources we may conclude that Mr. Jacoby either does not have an understanding of the Law of Karma or his theories are at variance with the proved facts. He therefore reads into the Law that which is not there and takes exceptions that are neither logical nor true. We cannot change the Law of Karma to meet with our particular likes or theories any more than we can change the law of gravitation, but we may work with both laws.

Now, coming to Mr. Jacoby's article as published in the October issue of ANCIENT WISDOM in criticism of C. J.'s article, "Is War Better Than Peace?" in the January 1951 issue of *The American Theosophist*, we believe that he has missed the point of the article and has again misinterpreted the facts of Karma, for he states:

"It (war) slaughters the flower of mankind; it produces widows and orphans; it maims mentally and physically untold numbers of persons."

Of course war does all of this and more. To whom? To those who have—"Then said Jesus unto him, Put up the sword into his place; for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword."

Untold millions have gone to war and taken life in their previous lives and they go to war yesterday, today and tomorrow that the law may be balanced. No harm, no hurt can come to a soldier who has no harm or hurt coming to him. We believe that the Lords of Karma are well capable of doing their work wisely and efficiently.

C. J.'s article did not advocate war. It recognized the necessity of war under existing conditions. It pointed out

ANCIENT WISDOM'S PLATFORM

★ ★ ★ ★

With the opening of ANCIENT WISDOM's eighteenth year of publication we thought it might be appropriate to set forth the platform of this journal, which is based wholly on The Theosophical Society's Three Objects. We are stating these Objects and our interpretation of them as applied to the work of ANCIENT WISDOM.

1. *To form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex caste or color.*

This does not mean, as we see it, paying lip service to an unimplemented and vague ideal of Brotherhood. It does not mean attempting tasks for which other organizations are better equipped. It means performing the one great work for which the Theosophist, and the Theosophist alone, is better equipped than for anything else and than anyone else—unsparingly disseminating Theosophy over a constantly widening field. For as men accept and practice theosophical Truths—as they recognize the certainty of reincarnation, its logic and its need—as they understand also the twin truth of karma, without which rebirth would be pointless—the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood must thereby be inevitably created. ANCIENT WISDOM's special contribution to all theosophical Truths in the simplest, most intelligible and acceptable form to the public it now reaches, and the constant devising of new methods and forms to appeal to a continually enlarging public.

2. *To encourage the study of Comparative Religion, Philosophy and Science.*

ANCIENT WISDOM has covered the field of Comparative Religion in a way not duplicated by any theosophical publication known to us. Its "Occultism In The Bible" series, now in its eighteenth year and still not quite through the first Book, is, we believe, the most comprehensive correlation of Biblical symbology to occult truth ever attempted. Its past series such as "Theosophy and Orthodox Christianity," and the series now running, "The Christian Denominations," together with individual articles such as "Holy Communion Can Be Yoga," and "Eternal Damnation, A Two-Thousand Year Old Hoax," have introduced a new and vital element into the study of Comparative Religion.

In Philosophy it has been the continuing task of ANCIENT WISDOM writers to present theosophical concepts, which we believe to be the last word at present written in that sphere, in lucid and clean cut fashion. Other systems are constantly examined and compared with our own, as in the Environment, Heredity and Soul History articles now appearing. Writers of note in their particular fields such as Dr. Marc Edmond Jones, Dr. Alvin Boyd Kuhn and others contribute their highly specialized knowledge in the departments of Philosophy, Religion and Symbology.

In Science ANCIENT WISDOM is constantly alert for fresh Scientific discoveries or even theories (changing though these are) which confirm or support the age-old Esoteric Wisdom teachings. Valuable articles in this department come from the pen of our staff writer H. K. Scholefield.

3. *To investigate the unexplained laws of nature and the powers latent in man.*

We are of opinion that this Third Object is the one most exclusive to Theosophy and is itself contributory to the realization of the other two Objects. The work of the great theosophical clairvoyants, derided though it has been by the prejudiced and the half-learned, marks one of the most noteworthy steps since the Reformation in freeing the minds of men from dread of the beyond and enlightening them as to what goes on behind the scenes of life and death as outwardly manifested. This is specialized Theosophy, which ANCIENT WISDOM has always recognized as the supreme gift of The Theosophical Society to the world. It would be superfluous to detail any of the countless articles and series in this publication which are embraced by the Third Object. Virtually all of them are, even those which are within the range of Objects One and Two. For it is our view that the Society's Three Objects form an indivisible but understandable Trinity—a three-in-one, one-in-three program—but the fundamental basis of all three of those characteristic and unique principles which are—at present—Theosophy and nothing else.

★ ★ ★ ★

Our platform is to continue along the lines of the above interpretation of the Objects, aiming always at presenting the greatest system of enlightenment in the world plainly, simply, unambiguously and in an interesting—sometimes perhaps even in an entertaining—way. Our readers seem to like us just as we are. They write in by the hundreds and tell us so. If, therefore, ANCIENT WISDOM has somehow acquired the happy knack of presenting theosophical Truth in such a way as to hold the interest of its readers, it can only do its utmost to maintain that knack and wherever possible improve it. As a Resolution at this, the beginning of another year of publication, its Editor faithfully promises that it will.

that wars serve a good purpose (although this is not the mass opinion) and it is to this that Mr. Jacoby appears to take exception. He does not take into consideration the betterments of war—the betterments that resulted from the French and American revolutions, for instance. It is this betterment to which that C. J. has reference.

Mrs. Besant has this to say on war (page 194 in *Talks with a Class*): "War will thus become merely a swift and certain way of accomplishing in a few years the work of centuries, of insuring an unexampled progress toward a nobler and better civilization. Thus, we are among those who see also in the war the clearing away of many hoary forms of evil, the destruction of otherwise irremovable obstacles in the way of the coming of a World Teacher."

Until the time comes when most men have eliminated selfishness from their natures, war must go hand in hand with so-called peace. Surely we must recognize that selfishness is all about us. The Theosophist is told again and again that it is best when he is discharging a debt of Karma. That is, when he is balancing the law by living through an experience that is not to his liking. Just so, a nation has its debts to pay to the Law of Karma and war is one of the debts that nations must pay. And while the nation is paying, the individuals, who make up the nation, are paying in this life debts that they contracted in various past lives. Some die in burning buildings, some in airplane crashes, some in auto wrecks, some in sinking ships and some are shot in fighting at war. "In no case can a man suffer that which he has not deserved." All are balancing the Law of Karma in accordance with the plans of the Logos. It cannot be otherwise. It does not matter what theories we hold, the plan on the trestle-board must and will be carried out. But while the Law is at work we are at fault for attaching too much importance to "death" or the "manner of death."

(The End)

Twenty-five million Catholics in the United States will doubtless approve the proposal to appoint a full-fledged ambassador to the Vatican. Many among the hundred-and-twenty-five million non-Catholics will strongly disapprove this violation, in spirit at least, of the complete separation of Church and State. There is no more justification for sending an official envoy to the Roman Pontiff than for sending one to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem, or the President of The Theosophical Society at Adyar.

THE ZODIAC IN ALEXANDER POPE

Pisces

He says in verse what others say in prose. —Epistle I