

# ANCIENT WISDOM

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

NOVEMBER, 1952—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 9

## ABUSING ANIMALS

By H. K. SCHOLEFIELD

In our foolish youth we applied our first savings to the purchase of a shotgun, for no better reason than that it was generally deemed a fine thing to be a sport and to go a-hunting. Thus, the pressure of public opinion, and a malign thought form of great strength which had been building for many centuries, led to folly from which valuable experience was derived.

Most "practical-minded" materialists will admit value in the discovery that we shot badly from the right shoulder but very well from the left, indicating great need of visual correction. We fear, however, they will not grasp our emotional reactions to the experience of picking up injured birds, trembling with pain and fear of the impending death which it was our immediate duty to administer in merciful release from suffering with broken wings and torn and bleeding bodies. In many cases the boon of release was delayed or denied, as the poor creatures fluttered under thickets or hid themselves, and after a brief time we arrived at certain opinions upon the subject to which we still adhere with all the tenacity inherited from a Scotch ancestor, of whom it was said, "You can agree with such a man or you can kill him. There is no other alternative."

We did not need the bodies of those birds; a supply of other food was available to us without hurting anything. Had it been otherwise and were it necessary to sacrifice them to prevent starvation, there would be sound reason for killing them and it would be proper since our life, a more advanced one, was of more value to the cosmos than theirs; or so we assume and are open to correction. On the other hand, while we did not need those bird-bodies, the birds did; and in shooting them down we were guilty of a double crime against nature: we destroyed God's work which we could not replace, and we created more fear and pain on the face of this "sorrowful star" which is the schoolroom, too often a doleful one, for young sports of the current evolutionary cycle, numbering some 60 billions in and out of incarnation.

We immediately sold the shotgun and applied the proceeds to a pair of glasses, and have been able to see life's lessons with better clearness in consequence. There is nothing whatever but an instinct for butchery manifested when people get up early and refresh-

(Continued on Page 69)

## ENVIRONMENT, HEREDITY AND SOUL HISTORY

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

### VI

It is obviously impossible for a psychoanalyst to question a patient regarding events of his last life, and it is equally impossible for the sufferer to talk about them. The closed life is a closed book to any but a highly gifted clairvoyant and the nature of it may be arrived at only by inference, although the Fifth House of the natal horoscope does furnish clues. In this series we disregard astrological possibilities, however, as neither patient nor consultant are likely to have the requisite knowledge to track these down. Mental or nervous troubles, the origin of which is rooted in the events of a prior incarnation, will have to be deduced by other means.

In one sense, of course, everything that happens to us is a continuation of something that has taken place in the past—in the past of this life, the last life and lives prior to that. But the very fact that many cures via the psychoanalytic route do occur, shows that it is enough to get at the *proximate* cause or causes of the difficulty. If that were not so no cures could be brought about, as the Freudian technique and the technique of the other schools take no account of any life other than this one. But they do go back to the earliest recollections—the earlier the better—and we have to go them one better in this reincarnational technique by pre-dating any (brain) recollection at all. We must go back to birth and its environment—to heredity also, as the conventional practitioners do, but we consider it from a different angle.

We must ask ourselves first, why was that particular child born in that particular time and of those particular parents? It may be our question but it is not our answer. The subject of the analysis must give the answer—*after*, not before, he has completely accepted the fact of reincarnation. If he does not accept it—if he has any doubts, even—it is a waste of time to go further. No results will be obtained.

Assuming that he does accept it, and its twin teaching of karma, certain questions are to be put to him, or if this is a self-analysis, he should put them to himself. They must not be answered in an offhand way. He must fully cooperate, as he is expected to do in the conventional technique. Snap replies will not do. He may take as long as he

(Continued on Page 70)

## MEDITATION

By OLIVE HARCOURT

In all teachings of religious philosophy we find the injunction to meditate, to "enter into the silence," in order to gain expansion of consciousness. Actually every new idea contacted for the first time is an expansion of consciousness, but two kinds of expansion are specially sought for by both mystics and occultists, namely, development of spiritual power and a glimpse of that exalted form of expansion open to man—Cosmic Consciousness.

Ordinary objective clairvoyance, that is, seeing with open eyes while wide awake, is merely an extension of normal sight, a form of mediumship greatly coveted by a large number of people, often in order to obtain personal power or as a means of earning money.

All around us, constantly impinging upon our bodies, penetrating their countless cells, playing upon their nerves, influencing their brain matter, changing the form and colors of their auras, are millions of vibrations of which our senses are unaware. An excellent illustration of this has been put forward as follows:

"Imagine a piano forty-five octaves in length at which is seated a musician. He is not able to use more than two and a half octaves, all the rest is unplayable by him, and he does not even know that the rest of the piano exists. The piano represents Nature, the musician is humanity."

We are all musicians seated at the piano which is Nature, but contact only a small number of her mighty vibrations, all else is untastable, unsmellable, intangible, inaudible, invisible. But to those who have learnt to use a note or two more, the veil can at times entirely disappear, leaving pictures seen on other planes clear and steady.

Humanity has the senses in duplicate, the mind can perceive on its own, as it were, without the intervention of the physical senses, it is capable of receiving impressions recorded on the inner planes and of passing them on in the brain by a process of which we know absolutely nothing.

We call the next world the unseen world, but that does not mean that it is unseeable. It is veiled to us because it consists of matter strange to us, producing conditions which we do not grasp.

The peculiar sense of sight can be turned off at will and its corresponding supernormal sense substituted. We can

(Continued on Page 71)

## 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

### STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, MARCH 3, 1933 AND JULY 2, 1946

Of Ancient Wisdom, published monthly at 320 Merchants' Exch. Bldg., for Oct. 1, 1952, State of Missouri, City of St. Louis. Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Charles E. Luntz, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the publisher of the Ancient Wisdom, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Charles E. Luntz, 320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.; Editor, same; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, none.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the name and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Ancient Wisdom Press, not incorporated, sole owner Charles E. Luntz, 320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

CHAS. E. LUNTZ, Publisher

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of September, 1952.

ARNOLD JUST  
Notary Public

(My commission expires December 11, 1954.)

## THEOSOPHY IS EVERYONE'S TRUTH

It seems that there should be some clarification as to the position of The Theosophical Society in relation to Theosophy. The public is certainly at sixes and sevens as to this and so, apparently, are some of the members. Many of the religious sects have almost constituted themselves into proprietary affairs. It would be appalling if Theosophy ended up a proprietary religion. If it did, it would end up—period. And there are some signs—in this country at least—that it is going that way.

If this blunt statement offends the susceptibilities of any who find it difficult to look facts in the face where The Theosophical Society is concerned, let them take a brief glance down the pages of religious history. They might begin with the Old Testament. The Hebrew people claimed to possess the one, the only, true faith. The nations around them, including the enlightened Egyptians and the philosophical Babylonians, were dismissed as "the heathen"—outcasts in the sight of God. Yet dur-

ing the seventy years of exile in Babylon the Jewish people contrived to absorb and work into their religion concepts obtained from these same "heathen" which immensely enlarged and developed its formerly restricted outlook. One has only to compare the pre-exilic with the post-exilic biblical writings to recognize this.

The debt to the "heathen," was, of course, not acknowledged. They remained heathen, and it was taken for granted that the concept of the Deity as the God of all men rather than of one small nation had always been held. It is true that he had always been accorded supreme place in the pantheon. The gods of the nations were invariably branded as false or as devils, while Yahveh—the Lord—"made the heavens." But still he was (exoterically) the God of Israel in the earlier days—not yet the God of humanity. We are not now considering the few enlightened esotericists who knew what it was all about.

After the latter widened outlook on the Divine had found acceptance, however, the sense of "proprietaryship" was in no whit lessened. If anything, it was enhanced. Jesus found a fierce religious nationalism—a contempt for the Romans under whose dominion the land had fallen, equalled only by the contempt of the latter for the Jews. This curious mutual contempt of one religion for another or of one race for another has lasted well into modern times. From the standpoint of reincarnation it is a complete absurdity as the "contemptuous" of this incarnation may be the "contemptible" of the next—indeed is likely to be, if he carries his contempt too far.

The teachings of Jesus and their development by Paul seemed in a fair way to breaking down proprietary religion—among the gentiles if not among the Jews. But not for long. Christianity, which was to be the universal, the catholic religion (for the word *catholic* means primarily "universal," from the Greek *katholikos*, and only secondarily a religious body), broke up into countless "proprietaryships." Besides the Roman Catholic, there were, to mention a very few, the Arians, the Marcionites, the Pelagians, the Bogomils, the Metempsychi, the Catharists and, of course, the Greek Orthodox. Any number of others disputed the Christian field in the early days of the religion but ultimately all had to give way to the supremacy of the Roman Church. Only the Greek Orthodox approached in numbers and influence its western competitor.

For a thousand years the domination of Rome in the west remained almost unchallenged. Then came the Reformation, and once more Christianity was divided into segmentary beliefs. Hardly had Protestantism in England successfully asserted itself than the new authority—Episcopalianism—was challenged by a perfect multitude of dis-

senting beliefs. The Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Unitarians, Universalists, and a long list of others became the "seceders from the seceders" and sometimes the seceders from those who seceded from the original seceders. Later came the very radical (for that day) Christian Scientists, soon to become as rigidly orthodox in their own beliefs as the Roman Catholic Church remained in theirs. Then the inevitable "secession"—the Divine Scientists, Unity, New Thoughtists and the like.

A movement is on foot to unite the Protestant sects. It is a good movement and we wish it well. But it will still leave a number of "Proprietaries" outside of its union, even if it achieves the greatest success at which it aims. Always there is the Roman Catholic Church, which avowedly will not rest content until not only all of Christendom but all of humanity—Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, Confucians, Jews and those of every other faith—are gathered under the papal wing. The fact that this will never happen does not negative the challenging ambition.

What, then, of The Theosophical Society, which already has a score or more of "offshoots"? That in our own Adyar Society—yes in our own American Section—there is a powerful orthodoxy, cannot be denied. The human nature of Theosophists, or at least of some members of The Theosophical Society, seems closely to duplicate in this respect the human nature of members of the early Church, the Medieval Church and Churches, and the later split-offs. The first Christians were rebels, radicals, reformers, but soon, as their positions were consolidated, they turned conservative and orthodox. The seceding Christians of the Renaissance did exactly the same, as did their successors. The "dissenters" no longer dissent—they have their own orthodoxy and their own dissenters.

Not being a member of the orthodox wing of the Society, we have spoken out many times against the misguided attempts to crystallize Theosophy around the teachings of H. P. Blavatsky, the Masters' Letters, the writings of Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater. For all of these we have respect approaching reverence—but not worship. *The Secret Doctrine* is no theosophical Bible. It is an epic work, one of the greatest produced in modern times, but it is—as its compiler repeatedly declared—neither infallible nor complete. And neither is the work of any one of H. P. B.'s successors, as every one of them has reiterated times without number.

For Theosophy does not belong to The Theosophical Society—it belongs to God. As the very name implies, it is His Wisdom, His Truth—and everybody's Truth. The Theosophical Society is the great instrumentality, the only instrumentality at present existing, for disseminating that Truth in its purest form—at least so far as man can now

conceive it. That is why we deplore the waste—and we say it advisedly, the waste—of our limited energies in generalized propaganda which is foreign to our task of giving specialized Theosophy to the world, and to which it is certain the world pays not the slightest heed.

ANCIENT WISDOM will not fall into that easygoing method of evading our true responsibilities. It takes little or no thought to string beautiful—and meaningless—words together to impress the emotional, for they are the only ones they do impress—the thinking recognize them for the emptiness they are. It takes a lot of thought and sheer hard labor to devise constantly new ways of clothing our ancient Truths so that they may be acceptable to all kinds and conditions of men. But we would rather a thousand times discontinue the paper than shirk this labor and descend into the realm of idealistic generalizations not recognizable as Theosophy at all.

We know that a very substantial minority of the membership is heartily in accord with our strong feeling on this tremendously vital matter. And as more and more members come to the same realization, we believe that a change in presentation of the Theosophy which is everyone's Truth *must* come about, for it will be demanded and insisted upon.

For Theosophy, the greatest thought on the greatest subjects in the world, rates the best from those who are privileged to publish it to the world. Nothing less will do, and those who have the accomplishment of this lofty task so powerfully at heart cannot, if they are to fulfill their dharma, be satisfied with anything less.

## CLEOPATRA WASN'T A GROUP SOUL

Perhaps one of the reasons for refusal of the general public to take the fact of reincarnation seriously is the well advertised tendency of certain lunatics and near lunatics to hold themselves out, if female as reincarnations of Cleopatra, if male of Napoleon.

Just why anyone should wish to trumpet their supposed Egoic relationship to this precious pair is hard to surmise. Not one in a million of the Cleopatra fans is probably aware that this is not the name of any one woman but the designation applied to all the Egyptian queens in the Ptolemaic dynasty, commencing with the wife of Ptolemy V. This is the case also with the Egyptian kings, all of whom were called Pharaoh, though the Bible (as translated) would lead one to believe that Pharaoh is the proper name of the monarch.

It would therefore be quite appropriate to inquire of the Cleopatra addicts—if there were any point to making conversation on so inane a subject—"Just which of the many Cleopatras do you suppose yourself to be?" If the hallucinated unfortunate, who usually

is as unregal and unbeautiful as the Cleopatra was regal and beautiful, is able to identify the latter, it will be as the beloved of Julius Caesar and Mark Antony. This was the Cleopatra who was the daughter of Ptolemy XIII. She became queen at the age of 17, her younger brother sharing the throne with her. In accordance with the gruesome practice of ancient Egyptian royalty, she then married him. She lost her throne in a few years, her brother-husband being killed in a war undertaken by Julius Caesar on her behalf to recover her rights. A still younger brother took over as Pharaoh and Cleopatra affectionately poisoned him.

Later in Rome she lived openly as Caesar's mistress until his assassination, and then in a similar role with Mark Antony. The Romans strongly disapproved of this infatuation and Augustus, first of the Roman emperors, declared war upon the pair, Antony being ruler of the eastern half of the empire and Augustus of the western half. Antony was badly defeated and Cleopatra, having no further use for him, agreed at the behest of Augustus to assassinate him. She tricked him into committing suicide in the belief that she herself had already done so, and then turned her wiles on Augustus who, however, had no intention of risking the fate of her former lovers by yielding to her seductions. Realizing that the game was up, the scheming and unscrupulous Cleopatra allowed an asp to bite her to death. This is not quite the way Shakespeare tells it but accords with the historical facts as narrated by the Greek writer Plutarch, whose famous *Lives* are accepted by scholars as generally authentic records of events.

In the light of all this, is Cleopatra the sort of character one might rejoice to have been a couple of millenia ago? What kind of karma must she have piled up for future lives by her intrigues, her complete lack of morality, her murderous nature and her treachery? Yet not all the fatuous females who are sure they are reproductions of this Egyptian Jezebel are in asylums. Some of them are at large, cherishing and blazoning their conviction that they are the beautiful fascinator of antiquity reborn.

Cleopatra would have to be a Group Soul—large economy size—to ensoul the hosts of credulous women who claim her as their spiritual ancestress. Strangely enough no man, to the best of our knowledge, ever alleged that he formerly was Cleopatra—an odd omission as the sex often changes from one birth to the next. Nor have we ever heard of a woman who believed she was a reborn Napoleon, which shows that technical knowledge of the processes of rebirth is decidedly lacking in those with delusions of grandeur centering about their former lives.

Theosophists, fortunately, are not prone as a rule to imagining themselves as reincarnations of great historical characters. A scant half-dozen may

have possessed the necessary faculties, developed over many lives of hard training, to enable them to know something of their own reincarnational background and that of others. There is no way of proving the correctness of what they have given out in such works as *Man, Whence, How and Whither* or *The Lives of Alcyone*, other than the faith one may have in their competency and *bona fides*. A Theosophist may accept, reject or suspend judgment on this as on all other matters, according to his pleasure.

Most of us are very little people this time, which is pretty good evidence that we were very little people last time. There is no percentage, if one has not done so well in this life, in preening ourselves that we were great historical characters in the last one. The odds are very much against it. Evolution is said to proceed by jumps, but they are short jumps. Yet if one finds consolation in the feeling that his Egoic line contains personalities who made their mark on their times, let him hold it if he will. Hold it, but never breathe a word about it to anyone. It is his secret, true or false. The only bore who is a bigger bore than the one who tells you about his dreams is the one who tells you about his former incarnations.

They don't matter much now. They are over and done with, everything worthwhile about them long since absorbed into the permanent stock of the Ego. The details are mere chaff. It might be nice to know something of them or it might be otherwise. The analogy of the man who paid a genealogist \$50.00 to look up his family tree, and then \$500.00 to say nothing about it, is a good one. We might not be at all happy with what we discovered in those past lives.

And if a reincarnated Cleopatra is really walking the earth in this year of 1952 A. D., let us hope she is a better and wiser person than she was in 52 B. C. Else there may be another asp up the karmic sleeve. Or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

## MINSTRELSY

A Selection From The  
Poems of Patience Worth

### Sincerity

(In Three Epigrams)

A garment to wear next thee afore thine armor.

\* \* \*

He is sincere who knows himself a fool  
and takes all men into accord.

\* \* \*

Eh, Sirrah! Well said. And I'll tell thee  
this: Sincerity be a mask through which  
many a fool peers the day.

## THE ZODIAC IN "QUOTES"

Scorpio

The valiant man and free.

—Tennyson

## HOW TO DRIVE AWAY MEMBERS

BY THE EDITOR

The Editor loves Theosophy and loves The Theosophical Society. Theosophical activities of one kind or another have been his main preoccupation outside of family and business for over 29 years. He served for a number of years as a National Director and enjoys the personal friendship of leaders in the movement both here and abroad. Through ANCIENT WISDOM he has come in contact with thousands of members, former members and non-members to whom the theosophical philosophy is also the very breath of spiritual living. And he has in past years visited and spoken in many Lodges throughout the nation in cities to which his business trips have taken him.

And from all of this experience, including the long Editorship of this journal, the much longer Presidency of his Lodge, which has been described by Mr. L. W. Rogers as among the half-dozen leading T. S. Lodges of the world, has necessarily come some knowledge of the problems of T. S. work. It is a wider experience, perhaps, than comes to any private member, and to most T. S. officials. So perhaps no apology is necessary for the expression of views as to certain shortcomings in the Society which are apparent to those who have its welfare strongly at heart but to which some members complacently shut their eyes, lulling themselves with platitudes that all must necessarily be for the best in this best of all possible Societies—"and are we not protected and guided by the Masters? How can anything go wrong?"

What the Masters thought of this absurd taking of their names in vain is shown by their early letters. We need not labor the point. And what karma thinks of it is also made clear by the dismal record of scores of surrendered or cancelled Lodge charters. Somehow neither the Masters nor karma seem to come to the rescue of Lodges that go on the rocks due to hidebound policies and inefficiency. Not all failures of the local centers are due to these causes, of course. Some are the victims of circumstances over which they had no control. But enough, unhappily, trace to the maintenance of Nineteenth Century methods in the middle of the Twentieth Century to give pause to the apostles of sweetness and light who are so sure—so *very* sure—that "if we all think beautiful thoughts of brotherhood, peace and harmony, all will be well." The beautiful thoughts unfortunately last only until some more discerning member strives to inject a little common sense into the proceedings. Surprising it is how quickly the atmosphere of peace, brotherhood and harmony vanishes amid the angry expostulations of those who have been foremost in preaching it.

We are moved to these reflections by receipt of a thoughtful letter from a member who grants full permission for use of name and address. As this would identify the Lodge we think it best to keep these from publication. We did not inspire the letter and knew nothing about it until its receipt. We mention this to head off kindly critics who are always sure that when a letter like this is published the Editor wrote it himself or caused it to be written. We certify that the letter is in our files, that the statements in the preceding sentence are true and that we have not in any way altered those parts of it that we quote. Any National Director desiring to inspect it may do so on request. The letter is a long one and space will not permit full reproduction, but the most significant parts of it are as follows:

"Perhaps I shouldn't burden you with my troubles and views, but perhaps what I relate has a bearing on what ANCIENT WISDOM has been advocating and which is so well stressed in the current issue.

In my estimation our local lodge has gone pretty well 'to pot.' The president and past-president are Theosophists of long standing and have run it so long that they seem to take it upon themselves to say what is and what is not Theosophy and what phase of it should be studied (exclusively) for the good of our souls . . .

The persistency of this attitude . . . has set up an antagonistic atmosphere in the lodge that anyone can feel and one that has persisted and grown to the extent that about eight of us no longer feel that we 'belong' there. Because of this personal resentment, which is not conducive to the harmony that should prevail at a Theosophical meeting, I had not attended for several weeks. However, happenings propelled it to a head and . . . I got the lodge together Sunday eve. . . and we had it out. I frankly and honestly presented my plaint and a couple of other members did likewise. During this time I took occasion to read excerpts from current ANCIENT WISDOM, as I told them, because they illustrated my point better than I could shape sentences to do. More about that later.

Read them the "Three Articles" (Objects. *Ed.*) "and Freedom of Thought from front cover page of *American Theosophist* and gave my interpretation: objected to their 'running' instead of 'conducting' the lodge: objected to the particular course of studies undertaken for the past three winters: maintained that all are equal and each individual has a right to express himself on anything coming under the broad outlines of the three principles . . .

In '50 we studied a course . . . concerning rounds, chains, races and sub-races, Days and Nights of Brahm and so forth. Ditto last winter—and this winter Man and His Bodies. I wanted them to study some phase that was

warm and close and inspiring—something that would help us to live in this body today, something that we could use to help someone else if the occasion appeared. If I don't know myself, how am I going to be able to understand my fellow man, and if I can't understand him, how, HOW, am I going to help him? If I fall down a stair and break my leg, how will it solace me to know that on the Atmic Plane there is eternal peace and calm? If my fellow man is at his wits' ends because of trouble, I can scarcely see him relieved of his burden if I give him a lengthy and learned discourse on the Solar Logoi, the Rounds, Chains, Races and Sub-races.

Those subjects are all right for one who has that particular turn of mind, but I feel that what I can know of them now must of necessity be sketchy and incomplete. They are as far above me and as cold as the stars. When I have grown, in the far off future, to where I have need of that knowledge, the best conception that I am able to form today will be as obsolete as the Paleozoic fossils . . .

My mention of the fact that the national membership had dropped to half in the last twenty-five years and a plea for something new and liveable left them cold (or hot).

People come to the open meetings and are seemingly interested, or even join, and are full of fire for a time, but drop out. Then . . . 'Well, they weren't ready for Theosophy.' I mentioned this and told them what an opiate that statement was: what a world of complacency and self-satisfaction it covered. "They are not ready for Theosophy, poor things. They can't understand us. Well, perhaps in the next incarnation—"

So the old battle raged—fought to a draw. I found out how hard those people had worked and slaved to keep the little Lodge together—lo, those many years—how hard it was to preside at the meetings, was reproached because I had not delivered more talks at open meetings instead of forcing them to assume most of the burden and asked how many new members I had brought in, and informed that there were Theosophists in several states whom they had caused to see the light . . .

I was informed that they took a dim view of one Chas. E. Luntz and that he even objected to the word 'Brotherhood,' whereupon I immediately said that I didn't think much of it myself." (Then follows an account of some abusive personal criticism of the Editor, in language one might expect at a political meeting but hardly in a T. S. Lodge room. While this seems to have upset our correspondent it did not disturb the Editor, who has long-since come to expect it from some of the more vociferous exponents of "Brotherhood." The more "brotherly" the exponent the more vituperative the language) . . .

"So I suppose I have created a rift

that will be hard to heal. As one of them said, 'We can forgive but not forget.'

If there is no spirit of fellowship and harmony when I attend Lodge, I will not go, that they may attain it without me, for the harmony of a lodge gathering is precious and I would do nothing to mar it. But why must people, because they have been in Theosophy for a number of years, assume that they are to sit upon Olympus?

They look upon the rest of us as younger brethren and insist on bringing us up in their way. Though we do not like it, we must take castor oil or lse. One lady even said, 'we don't want a lot of members. We aren't in the lightest interested. We want harmony.'

We all came into Theosophy because we dared to think and found the teaching of our particular philosophy or religion lacking. If we had not thought, we would now be content to listen to some brand of theology dished out to us each Sunday, or if we were not religious, we would be frequenting night clubs, cheap shows or go hunting or fishing—anything where we wouldn't have to think. But because we do think, we want freedom of thought and expression in the same measure as we grant to others. Therefore to find ourselves crowded between the walls of what some choose to call Theosophy is just as abhorrent as it was in the particular theology that we left . . .

Theosophy to me must be a state of ever becoming, of advancement and the dictates of my own conscience . . . Though they be the words of a Master, if they find no place in my innermost being, I cannot make them my own . . . We must appeal to people through that in which they are interested and get their enthusiasm working. Then with emotion as a stimulus to reason we are better able to teach them—to lead them to broader things. But after they are in, let's not put them in a cell, close the door and say: 'Now listen to me. Thus and so is Theosophy, and nothing else. Mind, no nonsense, now!' . . .

With best personal regards, I remain, still a Theosophist."

\* \* \* \*

The above may enrage some but it will cause many others to think . . . and deeply. This member—and there have been thousands like him—is a good Theosophist, sincere, earnest, devoted. Can we afford to drive members like him out of the Society, when such members are the very backbone of the Society—the hope of the future? What has the Society to look forward to if its destinies are to be dominated by such as oppose, antagonize and thwart him in his brave attempt to maintain that very Freedom of Thought which is monthly publicized as its most precious possession? The Editor would be proud to have this man as a member of his own Lodge and could promise him complete liberty of expression whether he agreed or disagreed with the policies of the Lodge management.

**DO YOU KNOW?—**

That the policy of The Theosophical Society in relation to new members has usually been to wait for the person interested in joining to make his own application?

\* \* \* \*

That the drives for membership common to other organizations are virtually unknown in The Theosophical Society?

\* \* \* \*

That solicitation to join is likewise rare, and perhaps this somewhat aloof attitude has been carried too far?

\* \* \* \*

That it may also have its advantages, seeing that an applicant who makes the move for himself is likely to be much more interested and earnest than one who was urged into it or carried away by mass emotional appeal?

\* \* \* \*

That while there is value in refraining from undue persuasion or the "selling" tactics of other bodies, there is also the hazard that the would-be applicant may feel that the T.S. is a sort of exclusive club and that he might not be welcome?

\* \* \* \*

That, as a matter of fact, The Theosophical Society is eager for new members and must have them to replace the old members who eventually will pass out of the picture?

\* \* \* \*

That there is, with many people, a certain shyness or backwardness in making application to join any sort of organization?

\* \* \* \*

That, recognizing this, other groups often go out of their way to make such application easy or even almost to force it—and sometimes where it is not desired?

\* \* \* \*

That it is not recommended that these tactics be adopted in the Society, but that thought might be given by Lodge officers as to whether there may appear to the interested "prospect" to be any barriers or difficulties to his making application?

\* \* \* \*

That if any reader of this column has contemplated membership, but for the above or any other reason has failed to make application, the Editor of ANCIENT WISDOM would be delighted to hear from him?

\* \* \* \*

That he will be informed, if he so desires, of the address of his nearest T.S. Lodge and the name, address and phone number of the President, also the meeting place of the Lodge?

\* \* \* \*

That he will also be instructed how to make application and, if he wishes, the Editor will write the President of the Lodge that he is interested and wishes to join?

And there would be nothing either to forgive or to forget.

(The End)

**OPEN LETTER**

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

*To "Brotherhood" fans who bristle Whenever the word we question, We dedicate this epistle, By way of a mild suggestion.*

Dear Brotherhood Exponents:  
We are not your opponents,  
But concepts so upraising  
Deserve a better phrasing.

It seems a bit absurd,  
This fuss about a word.  
Words should be pertinent  
To what they represent.

But this poor frayed-out term  
Is aged and infirm.  
Its ancient fire is gone.  
It's just a hanger-on.

A boon to feeble writer  
And platitude reciter;  
Convenient as a filler,  
But certain interest killer.

It makes a weak talk weaker  
And marks the frothy speaker  
Who seasons grandiosity  
With meaningless verbosity.

Like you we're dedicated  
To friendship integrated,  
To goodwill and to peace,  
To amity's increase.

You see, we're on your side.  
The aim we don't deride.  
But let's find a word that's stronger,  
For it fits the thought no longer.

**ABUSING ANIMALS**

(Continued from Page 65)

ed and ready for the new day's enterprise, to look out of the window and exclaim, "It's a beautiful day. Let's go out and kill something!" The instinct so manifest is a carryover from a primitive incarnation when failure to kill meant failure to eat. We see it most strikingly manifest in a cat which, having caught a choice fat mouse, enjoys playing with it as long as the mouse can wiggle.

By abusing the mouse, the cat is made to feel bigger, stronger and more robust. We once saw a sign over a flower-stand in a little town in Mexico. It read, "Wear one of our gardenias and feel important all day." We may reflect that such a personality-gratification is not at all perfect but is a vastly bettered instinct than that of the killer, whether human or feline. It springs, however, from the same basic instinct, once crassly crude and ultimately evolved to a degree of harmlessness.

We recall one or two other occasions when we borrowed a rifle and joined a party to hunt wild pigs, which we succeeded in missing very well indeed after our previous experience in marksmanship. Our more "practical" friends did better and the product of their accurate shooting demonstrated another of nature's lessons. The pig in its wild state is not a dirty creature and has a pink skin like that of a rabbit; it wash-

(Continued on Page 70)

## WHAT MAKES SENSE?

*It Makes No Sense That—*

*In The Theosophical Society, where Freedom of Speech, of Thought and of its fearless expression is constantly and officially emphasized, any member should feel constrained to subordinate his own reasoned opinions to those of any other member, or of any book, or even of any T. S. leader, past or present.*

*It Makes Sense That—*

A member should at all times uphold his own intellectual and spiritual dignity by refusing allegiance to unacceptable pronouncements or ideas, no matter by whom enunciated or written.

\* \* \* \*

*It Makes No Sense That—*

*This principle should be made the excuse for petty cavilling over trifling differences of opinion, nor for imputing wrong motives or belittling the fellow-member who does not agree with our views.*

*It Makes Sense That—*

This principle, which is a great principle, should be translated into action only when the issue involved is worthy of its application.

\* \* \* \*

*It Makes No Sense That—*

*A member who exercises this privilege with due courtesy and consideration should be regarded by other members who disagree as some sort of a heretic or backslider, to be shunned, disciplined or otherwise brought to book.*

*It Makes Sense That—*

As these are the age-old methods of orthodox to force conformity and regimentation of thought, the last place they should be found is in The Theosophical Society, which prides itself on its democracy and liberality.

\* \* \* \*

*It Makes No Sense That—*

*The slightest dictation in matters of belief or practice should be attempted either by Lodge President, National or International President or by anyone else within the Society.*

*It Makes Sense That—*

Where such attempt is made it should be resisted or ignored, though any member, highly placed or otherwise, has the same right as any other member to express his opinions or beliefs as such and without attempting to impose them.

\* \* \* \*

*It Makes No Sense That—*

*The Theosophical Society, unique among all other bodies in the boundless breadth of its teachings and the sublime grandeur of its philosophy, should descend to the level of the sanctimonious pietists who would force their smug little bigotries on everyone else.*

*It Makes Sense That—*

The Theosophical Society, at all levels of organization, should show itself worthy of its deathless mission and set the greatest of examples in the free-

dom it accords to variance of thought among its members.

\* \* \* \*

*It Makes No Sense That—*

*Differences of opinion should be the pretext for the formation of factions or schisms within the Society. Dr. Arundale's deft slogan, "Together differently," pointing the true path for those who, differing in method, are at one in aim.*

*It Makes Sense That—*

Those theosophical bodies which seceded from the parent Society and now press for fraternization should, in good faith, accord to fellow Theosophists the fullest right to accept or reject the teachings or statements of anyone they see fit, whether they (the former) agree or disagree, and should carry out this accord in both letter and spirit.

## ABUSING ANIMALS

(Continued from Page 69)

es daily in mountain streams when it can and it subsists on edible roots and fallen fruit. The domestic pig wallows in mud only because men fail to provide clean water, and is dirty not by choice but because it has a demonstrated power to survive under insanitary conditions which no other animal would tolerate. Man takes advantage of this porcine tenacity of life and raises swine under horrible conditions of filth which produce the undeserved reputation of the evil-smelling hog. It is not by choice that pigs live on garbage. On the other hand it is entirely a matter of choice for people, including a few hog-farmers, to subsist upon such choice viands as garlic and mephitic cheese, to carry dead cigars in their pockets or slick their hair down with smelly hair oil. They set a very poor example to the unfortunate swine.

We readily grasp the Hebraic doctrine that the pig is an unclean animal unfit for food. Certainly the odor of garbage-fed pork is often apparent and we were never able to determine why domestic fowls, also frequently raised under dirty conditions and ready to consume matter that a pig will reject, is considered so choice. The process of evisceration, necessary in preparation of chicken-dinners, produces a most vile stench in the kitchen. The laws of Moses were very wisely drawn in this respect and the primitive population of his day observed better sanitation rules in restricting use of animal food to the grass-eaters, and in great care to avoid diseased meats. The next step in advancement will be one already taken by many Theosophists, although it is wholly a matter of individual choice and there are no rules whatever in the Society respecting diet. The slightly more evolved man arrives at a point where any flesh food becomes displeasing and he prefers to live without it. We personally have eaten none for 22 years and do not lack bodily strength or weight, nor do we labor under suppressed cravings such as are commonly

attributed to vegetarians who are presumed to yearn for rare steak but won't admit it.

This is altogether untrue; so much so that instead of requiring three meaty meals per day we subsist very comfortably upon two, of vegetable derivation. This cannot be done except by careful attention to sufficient substitute proteins such as peas and beans, lentils, peanut-butter, eggs, cheese and milk. The latter three items are of animal origin but we consider them proper human food because no slaughter is attached to them. An egg feels no sensation of discomfort upon being killed and it is exactly upon this division-line that we make our selection. If it experiences no pain when it dies, we eat it, and are wholly satisfied in being one of a large minority who will one day become leaders of social usage when the custom of eating animals will be looked back upon with astonishment and some disbelief.

The late George Bernard Shaw is quoted as having said he wanted his funeral procession to include a large herd of cattle and sheep, the lives of which he had saved by not eating them. A little computation will show how right he was over a lifetime. One man's life represents the consumption of some eight or more tons of dressed meat or a ten-ton burden of slaughtered bodies from the animal kingdom to satisfy a needless craving, as demonstrated in the fact that half the earth's population lives wholly upon farinacious food through pressure of necessity, and multiplies prolifically the moment it is freed from the burden of flood and famine. Fecundity among eastern races, living upon rice, far exceeds that of west.

(The End)

## ENVIRONMENT

(Continued from Page 65)

wants to formulate them, even going away to think them over and returning later. Time does not matter, but seriousness of thought does. Humor is out of place in the interrogation. This is an earnest business and must be so regarded.

Question one is, Have you ever wondered, since you accepted the facts of Reincarnation and Karma just why you were born to the particular parents who were your father and mother, and why in the special place and under the exact environmental conditions that existed there?

If the answer is yes, you can go on from there. If it is no, the subject should be instructed to do some hard thinking about it (from the point of view of karma) and come up with the answer next time. Just as the practitioner is especially interested in getting the patient to talk about the things he shies away from in the conventional routine, so he must be made to give some sort of a rational answer. The question must not be "fluffed off." What lesson does he think his special heredity

d environment were intended—not to teach but to lay the foundation for further teaching? Can he trace anything which he can be reasonably sure? as he born with some defect of sight, hearing, of body? Has he learned anything from it? Did he always resent it? Does he resent it now? Does he understand clearly that it is not punishment for something he did in a past life but the natural and benevolent make that clear, *benevolent*—karmic tempt to remedy some deficiency in the reincarnating entity (himself from one life to life) that has to be corrected before progress in certain directions can be made? It may be that the defects are not even indicate a deficiency but the karmic effort to force his steps to some path of endeavor which is his particular mission in life and without which a major purpose of the incarnation would not have been fulfilled. Environmental shortcomings may be likewise provided with similar incidents.

Thus out of the boyhood miseries of Charles Dickens and his hateful employment in the blacking warehouse came the keen understanding of the sufferings of the poor which he so vividly portrayed in his many novels. And these novels so stirred the conscience of the English people that much amelioration of these conditions resulted. Were these early trials penalties for the shortcomings of a past life? Were they even a corrective for deficiencies in the character of an obviously advanced Ego? Or were they karma's way of ringing out the genius built up over hundreds of lives and putting it to service for the edification and betterment of humanity?

The shockingly limited education of Thomas Alva Edison—three months in the public school at Port Huron, Michigan—was an environmental limitation of the first order—apparently. But had he been born of rich parents and gone to Yale or Harvard instead of becoming a railroad newsboy, would the driving ambition that forced out his colossal inventive genius have had a similar pur-

Did the "handicap" of impoverished parents spoil the career of George Bernard Shaw who never went to the University but instead, at 15, became a clerk in a real estate office at a salary of \$1.65 per week?

Yet other geniuses may not need this sort of "conditioning." Winston Churchill was figuratively born to the purple. Albert Einstein was the son of well-to-do parents. George Washington's father owned six plantations. Adversity, prosperity, limitation, abundance—all karmic tools for our shaping! In one life errant karma may mete out one type of condition, in another life its opposite. The personality may make a great deal about it, but the Ego understands the underlying reason. The personality may resent, but resentment is foreign to the Ego—and there we put our finger on the aim of this psychoanalytic

technique. It is to get the personality to react in the right way to whatever condition is responsible for the trouble which led him to the consulting room. And as, in this instance, no such condition has been traced to anything occurring in the present life—else there would be no need for the extended technique herein suggested—the operator or the subject or both must arrive by inference at the nature of the condition as it traces back to the last or prior lives, bring it into the open and by so doing dissolve its morbid effects.

Here are some further questions which may be asked, following the first one:

2. If you had been able to change your heredity or the environment of your birth, what changes would you have made?—

(a) A different type of father? What difference?

(b) A different type of mother? What difference?

(c) More or less brothers or sisters.

(d) Different type of brothers and sisters? What difference?

(e) A different land or city from the one you were born in?

(f) What, if any, would you have preferred?

(g) A different religion—if so what?

(h) Different sex? Why? (If answer is yes)

3. Do you have any bodily, emotional or mental handicaps that date to birth and that you would have eliminated if you had the power? What are they?

4. Have you throughout life consistently wished that you had been born with some talent or ability that you do not possess? If so, have you tried to acquire it or resigned yourself to not having it? Was this resignation (if you did so) before or after you had made attempts to develop it?

5. Add any observations of your own to the above answers, but confine them strictly to conditions existing at birth not those which developed later.

6. Your answers have necessarily been given from the standpoint of this personality. You are now to attempt to revise those answers from the standpoint of the Ego. (The higher Ego or Soul, not the principle meant by conventional psychology when using that term). You must first completely realize that although you, the incarnating fragment of restricted knowledge, might have altered many of your natal conditions, they were provided by errant karmic knowledge and for purposes wholly beneficent. Your progress in spiritual evolution was what karma had in mind—that and nothing else. Your material comfort, financial success, physical wellbeing and general happiness were all subordinate to this one great aim. And in all this you, the Ego, entirely concurred, cooperated and were supremely grateful. Not that karma or the Ego wanted you to be unhappy, uncomfortable or limited in any way merely for the sake of being that way. But the overall purpose came first

and if limitations were necessary to contribute to it, limitations were provided.

They might be for the purpose of making you struggle to overcome them, thus developing will and imagination, or they might be to force you off one or more lines of activity not in your best interest at your present stage, and onto some other line which *was* for your best interest. But they were purposeful and benevolent, never doubt it.

In the next installment we will go over those questions and the subject's possible answers again and see what we get. For, we may tell him, if you follow this technique of substituting the big YOU, the Ego, for the little you, the personality, in your outlook and reaction to the things which have for so long been troubling you, your difficulties must by that very reaction disappear. An Egoic outlook is incompatible with a psychoneurosis. They cannot exist together in the same mind.

It should be understood that in using the second person singular in formulating the above questions and observations, we are not addressing the reader but the hypothetical sufferer who is submitting to the Reincarnational Psychoanalysis. We would like very much to help him and we believe that this suggested technique, if sincerely followed, will almost certainly do so.

(To Be Continued)

### MEDITATION

(Continued from Page 65)

then see with eyes either shut or open.

The wonder is that the brain can record and remember that which the physical senses have never recorded. That one can, for instance, see in meditation places and people, and hear the latter speak, is not so surprising as the fact that one can remember that which the portion of the brain recording these happenings has never seen or heard with the physical senses at all.

If we have a strong desire to expand our consciousness on higher planes by entering into the silence of meditation, let us see how this can be done. Let us find a quiet nook, either indoors or out, and arrange to be undisturbed for at least an hour, or better still, for an indefinite period. Having secured this interval of peace, let us sit still with shut eyes, composed in body and mind, and prepare ourselves against evil by a short prayer or by pronouncing a sacred Name. Then let us imagine ourselves in the midst of a beautiful landscape, or in a building, say a church, creating it in our minds as we should like to have it. The picture must be kept firmly before the mental sight and not be allowed to slip away to right or left, as it will do if not persistently kept in front, usually only in the case of a beginner.

Perhaps for a long time nothing will happen, but it may also be that the very first time we make our attempt we will be shown beautiful and inter-

## READERS MAY JUDGE

★ ★ ★

In ANCIENT WISDOM'S Election Supplement, published with the October issue we stated that the National Directors VOTED as follows for three nominees:

Rukmini Devi Arundale .....	4 Votes
N. Sri Ram .....	3 Votes
Sidney Cook .....	2 Votes

Exception has been taken to our recording the above as VOTES, on the ground that if they were Votes, and as there are 7 Directors (each entitled to name 3 nominees) there would have been 21 Votes instead of only 9.

ANCIENT WISDOM does not feel that this distinction is acceptable. There is no compulsion on any Director to use all three of his votes, and the fact that he chooses to vote only for one candidate or for two is within his own judgment.

ANCIENT WISDOM was informed on reliable authority that the Directors expressed their preference as follows:

"THREE NAMED RUKMINI, TWO NAMED SRI RAM, ONE NAMED SIDNEY COOK, ONE NAMED ALL THREE."

It was on this authority that ANCIENT WISDOM published the figures, and whether the "naming" is termed a vote or otherwise, it is difficult to see what conclusion as to the Directors' preference could have been reached other than appears above.

esting things.

In any case there will be gradual unfolding of powers and faculties. These will bear fruit later on. So long as consciousness is preserved, so long as we remember that "I am I" and that "I am here," we cannot be obsessed. We must remain conscious of this world, even if that consciousness be for a while far in the background, for then there will be left enough of the "I" to stand on guard.

Relatives will of course say "It is all imagination." What is imagination? It was called by the ancients the Diaphane, because it lets through its transparent quality the impressions it receives from the inner sight and conveys them to the physical senses. It is the power of conceiving images; it is the reflection in man of the creative energy of God. It is a reality, the power behind all the great deeds that sway the world, behind the inspired words of the Scriptures, the work of the great poets and writers, and the teachings of the founders of religions. The powers of all these are largely based upon meditation, called today "entering into the silence," where alone God can be found.

No amount of ordinary training can lead to development of intuition, we have to reach a new level of consciousness, where Truth is revealed. This kind of building up is called "creative imagination."

All who meditate in this way learn in time to discriminate between the false and the true, between their own building up and those flashes of intuition which initiate genuine occurrences (I do not like to call them phenomena)

and the appearances of beings whom we can both see and hear. For by this system clairaudience as well as clairvoyance can be developed.

One learns to recognize that which is true by signs peculiar to one's own individuality. This cannot be explained to others, for the miracles of form and sound thus revealed are for oneself. The existence of that which we can see and hear can be tested by synthesis and by that alone. If seers all down the ages in many lands and working quite independently of and unknown to each other, see a certain object or occurrence on higher planes while in deep meditation, then that object or that occurrence can be regarded as actually existing. It is in this way, by persistent and patient receiving, recording and transmitting to succeeding generations, that occult knowledge has been obtained.

Valuable seership includes, of course, "reading the Akashic records." Akasha is a Sanskrit word meaning "the Shining Light." The Israelites called it "The unknowable Wisdom." One of its symbols is a shut eye, which is significant.

A novice in meditation, unless specially gifted, may at first merely see pictures, but later he may hear words standing out in letters of light, or see symbols and receive teaching in that form.

Are visions less likely to be true because they are invisible on the material plane? The eternal things are all invisible to physical eyes, such as electricity in its higher forms, gravitation, centripetal and centrifugal force, the gases, and so on, to say nothing of the great spiritual forces which rule the world, Love for instance, Wisdom, and

Intuition. The things which are invisible are eternal.

By means of meditation we may learn in time to contact ultimate reality through the veils of complexity and diversity which break up into a thousand facets the working of our mind. Ruskin said that if we think beautiful thoughts we can build houses without hands for our souls to dwell in. On the outside of a very old house in Germany I once saw the following inscription:

"We build here on earth big houses and forts,  
And are but alien guests,  
While in the realms above, where we shall  
live for long,  
We build not at all."

An argument frequently put forward by the skeptic is that the things we see in meditation cannot be true because they are not made of matter. The Four Elements of which, according to the Ancient Wisdom, all matter is composed, exist, according to that Wisdom, on every plane of being, becoming more and more spiritualized as they ascend the scale. The higher regions of being are metaphysical regions where the physical no longer holds sway, region of both consciousness and matter, for every state of consciousness has its own grade of matter.

As for the fear sometimes felt by beginners as to what they might experience of evil or ugliness, they should remember that protected by purity of purpose we can, with practice, exclude evil, and can arrive at faith in the reality of a life beyond the grave, of Love and Wisdom, and come to believe with Victor Hugo, that "the tomb is not a blind alley, it closes on the twilight and opens on the dawn."

Every vision, every intuitional revelation of the spirit, is one more clogging sheath of the spirit cast off, one more veil pushed aside of the many which hide from us the glories of other planes.

Meditation is a help towards making the link between our lower and higher selves. When God called to Adam in the Garden he is said by some to have been summoning the spiritual—or Celestial—Adam, the higher self hidden in each human being which endure through all incarnations.

"Arise from thy sleep and remember thou art  
a King's son.

Arise and shake off thy foul body of dust."

A great German seer who has passed on to that further shore he knew how to describe so wonderfully, tells us

"If you can see soul pictures and reproduce them in such a manner that other people can understand them you are already on the Path, for you are calling up in them the desire to redeem the world. All who are filled with that desire are alive; all the rest are asleep."

We live unconsciously in many worlds at the same time. It is a relief and a consolation to reach in meditation a realm where we can find beauty, peace and love.

(The End)