

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 XXI

DECEMBER, 1955—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 10

"OUR BIRTH A SLEEP AND A FORGETTING"

BY SYDNEY T. BUTLER

In our late President's fascinating little book, "How We Remember Past Lives," he quotes the following passage from the London Daily Telegraph, written by that paper's musical critic:

"Rain beat noisily upon the roof and thunder roared and rattled, but Mischa Elman went calmly on with his prescribed Paganini and Bach and Wieniawski. Calmly is the word, be it noted, not stolidly. We have had stolid wonder-children on our musical platforms: Mischa is not of them. Upon his face, as he plies the bow, rests a great peace, and only now and then, with a more decided expression, does he lower his cheek upon the instrument, as though he would receive from it the impulse of its vibrations and to it communicate his own soul-beats. The marvel of this boy does not lie in his execution of difficult passages. If it did, perhaps we should award it but perfunctory notice, seeing that among the children of our generation there are so many who play with difficult passages much as their predecessors did with marbles. We have gone beyond mere dexterity in bowing and fingering, and can say, in the spirit of one of old time, that from the babe and suckling comes now the perfection of such praise as lies within the compass of a violin.

"Asked to account for this—to explain why Mischa Elman, laying cheek to wood, reveals the insight and feeling of a man who has risen to the heights and plumbed the depths of human life—we simply acknowledge that the matter is beyond us. We can do no more than speculate and perhaps hope for a day in which the all-embracing science of an age more advanced than our own shall discover the particular brain formation, or adjustment, to which infants owe the powers that men and women vainly seek."

So much for the puzzled critic of The Daily Telegraph. And no wonder he was puzzled! Without the explanation offered by Reincarnation, how is it possible to account for such a phenomenon as Mischa Elman? Most of you will recognize my title as taken from Wordsworth's Ode, "Intimations Of Immortality." Here is the whole verse:

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;
The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar;

(Continued on Page 82)

KARMIC RESEARCH POSTERITY'S GREAT TASK

Reconciling Three Schools of Thought

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

(Continued From April)

When, perhaps centuries hence, our remote posterity gets around to investigating the workings of karma, it will have to do more than observe the mere physical effects of physical causes.

It will somehow have to reconcile three great schools of thought each of which appears to be in conflict with the other two. Theosophy, and Theosophy only, can reconcile them today. The first is the purely materialistic, the second the astrological, the third has many names but we may identify it by the generic term, power of mind.

The materialistic school is best represented by the Behaviorist philosophy, although this has lost favor of late, but either in full or modified form it still presents the materialistic concept of circumstance in its baldest (and to the Theosophist least attractive) shape.

The point is made that a human being (or an animal—same thing) behaves as he does at a given time and in given circumstances the way he *has* to behave. He can't help himself. He is merely responding to particular stimuli in the way he was bound to respond to them, taking into account his past history, including his heredity. (But certainly no past incarnation as he never had any). This, of course, robs the individual of any personal responsibility. He may think he is doing what he wants to do but he is a creature of his past. If anyone knew all about everybody's past history, including the history of everyone who ever lived, this omniscient being could predict what every person alive would be doing at a given moment. But as there is no such omniscient being, not even God, who is quite unnecessary in this scheme, of course only limited prediction is possible in special cases where enough is known of the history to permit conclusions to be drawn.

Does it sound nonsensical? Well don't tell us—tell it to the Behaviorists, of whom we don't happen to be one. And it is not so different from Calvinistic Predestination except that God doesn't enter in as in the latter scheme.

This is an extreme viewpoint, of course, most materialists not going so far but merely ruling out any metaphysical direction and attributing

(Continued on Page 83)

CAUTION AND INTUITION

Part II Intuition

BY E. W. PRESTON, M.Sc

"Intuition is a faculty of the Spirit, the Divine part of man."

—C. Jinarajadasa.

Intuition, the teaching or flash of inspiration from within, occurs at all levels, as the ONE LIFE presses down from the still subjective world. The emotional or mental intuition appears in the objectivized realm of our consciousness, but originates in the subjective or higher levels.

The INTUITION in daily life is consciousness in direct action. It is immediate and absolute. It uses the image-making power of the mind but is something more than imagination. It is not the rising of the personality to the ego but a coming forth of the ego to the world.

It manifests itself in every department of human life. A new process of manufacture is an intuition expressed in terms of action; a religious vision may be an intuition expressed in terms of emotion. A work of art is intuition expressed in form, a system of philosophy an intuition in terms of intellect; a great organization an intuition in terms of human will or power.

Today, because of the average level reached by human consciousness, we are perhaps most conscious of intuition when it manifests at the level of the synthetic mind.

Mental intuition has been familiar to us in a sudden flash of comprehension, an illuminating mental vision or a realization of a new truth. It appears as the discovery of a scientific law, a new invention or a unifying theory. Kekule, Newton, Whitehead, Russell, Rutherford, Einstein and many others have recorded such experiences. Here the scientist or the philosopher is winning knowledge from the higher levels and becoming its channels to the lower world. Their intuition of the higher mind is on the social or synthetic level but is of great importance for it represents that aspect of the ONE LIFE which is described in Theosophical literature as being the Third of the Divine Trinity, the Creative Activity of the Logos. The language used at this stage and the concepts manifested are those of integration, of the union of separated parts, of co-operation at all levels, from co-operative societies to the United Nations.

The full manifestation of INTUITION

(Continued on Page 82)

ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS
In 1935

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

IS IT WRONG TO WANT HEALTH, PROSPERITY, WELLBEING?

An article in *Look* magazine for September 20th is entitled, "Is The Religious Boom A Spiritual Bust?" The author, a celebrated Protestant minister, appears to take a dim view of the religious interest stirred in recent years by such evangelists as Billy Graham, Norman Peale and Fulton Sheen. He dislikes the idea of "using God," as he quotes another clergyman, "to enable us to get what we want and enjoy life as we would." "Are we serving the god who furnishes motor cars and neatly packaged goods?" he inquires.

That he does not approve of spiritual healing and "the appearance of numerous healing cults" is also evident from his reference to "Apollo in the guise of Healer" as "another ancient idol." And—somewhat unfeeling, it seems to us, coming from one who is obviously secure in his calling—he writes, "one of the major spiritual issues of our time is the concern of the 'little man' for the security of his job. Important as this is, it would be tragic if men understood Christianity to be promising them prosperity and job security as a return for being polite to God."

At the end of his article he rather reluctantly admits that security, survival, health and peace are good in themselves. "They become evil," he writes, "only when they are lifted to the highest place and made into objects of man's ultimate concern."

Maybe, maybe—and then again, maybe not. If the article means anything, it must be interpreted as meaning that first comes belief—orthodox belief, of course; the article makes it very clear that this is meant. After that—and very much after—concern for health, security and peace of mind. The author doesn't seem to think much of the last named. "That is only part of the story," he says. "Another and important Christian value is the tension that ought always to be in a Christian mind between what is and what ought to be. The Gospel must not be distorted to give a sense of peace to men where there is no peace and ought

not to be."

We confess we do not like this religion of high blood pressure. We do not like the notion that health and security are of secondary concern as against a belief in "the right things." The wellbeing of man, his happiness, his ability to provide for his own future and the future of those dependent on him, must surely be of more concern to the Divine than the particular creed he believes in. We would even go so far as to suggest that creeds are of no interest to the Divine but that these other things most certainly are. For how can a man in poor health, unable to make a living, harried by every kind of woe and worry, take time out to "find his soul's satisfaction in the insights of an ancient faith," to use the author's closing words. What he wants to do is find a job, get his health restored so he can hold it and thus restore his peace of mind.

The reverend gentleman seems to be back in the middle ages when the alleged saints, if in good health, would starve and otherwise maltreat themselves in order to bring on bad health, in the belief that this was pleasing to God. Instead of useful work many of them begged, becoming parasites on those who did work—God's pleasure again. And as for peace of mind, worry about their soul's salvation effectively prevented this at any time. Is that the kind of "ancient faith" that is preferable to the sturdy self-reliance on oneself and one's inner God that the *Look* writer finds so objectionable?

We are not fond of the Billy Graham type of evangelism as, in spite of its immediate beneficial effects on churchgoing and reformation of character, we doubt if it does much in contributing to permanent spiritual progress. This is not a matter of emotional stirrings such as the evangelistic fervor whips up. It is an inner thing, high above the emotions or even the mind, though mind has much to contribute. But mind is usually very much subordinate to emotion in those who "hit the sawdust trail."

But to rule God out of the affairs of men—to negate the marvellous material and spiritual results obtained by recognition of the potency of Universal Mind—is, in our opinion, to play right into the hands of the materialists. They rule it out too, along with the "ancient faith" which it is, to the very great benefit of the race, supplanting.

And this "new" concept of the place of God in the affairs of men—minus all the creeds, dogmas, doctrines and other non-essentials invented by theology—is itself the most ancient of faiths, older by millenia than the "ancient faith" to which the clerical author refers.

There are Theosophists, too, who think it wrong to use positive thought and expectancy for material gain. "Black Magic," they call it or at best

"Grey." But how can the cause of Theosophy be advanced, how can what is needed be done to spread this marvellous teaching, unless funds are available for the necessary efforts? And where are these funds to come from—where have they largely come from—but from those blessed with the material means to come forward with their aid?

We have to live. We want to live decently. We want some of the cultural opportunities that life affords. We want security for our old age. These are not luxuries—they are essentials by today's standards in this country. We do not worship them—we strive for them. And if we know a little something about the workings of creative thought, we shall hold our minds in the right attitude to receive them.

It is not a matter of putting these things first and God second. If we live our philosophy God is, for us, in everything—in these things which enable us to do His work more effectively just as much as He is in the Church and in the Cathedral.

It is not wrong to want these things, to work for them, to pray for them. We can "seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness" in every act of our lives, and in our right desires as much as in our adoration.

We like once in awhile to read articles like the one with which this editorial deals. They make us feel even happier than usual that we are a Theosophist.

WHOM GOD HATH JOINED . . . ?

A Theosophist would be likely to honor Princess Margaret for her high sense of duty in refusing to flout royal tradition by marrying R.A.F. Group Captain Townsend. A Theosophist would equally be likely to hold in small esteem the reason advanced by the Anglican Church dignitaries for refusing assent to the marriage. It is denied that the Church brought pressure to bear but it is significant that the Princess is said to have announced her decision after a 50-minute talk with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who stated over the radio that the position of the Church regarding divorce remained unchanged and never would be changed.

The Church of England in many respects is liberal in its views. Individual members of the clergy appear to be allowed to express opinions that other churches would regard as rank heresy, without being unfrocked. A former Bishop of Birmingham publicly stated his doubt of the authenticity of the biblical miracles, including the Virgin Birth. Reincarnation is occasionally mentioned with approval from Anglican pulpits. But on the question of divorce, and the re-marriage of either

principal while the other is living, the Church of England has been even more adamant than the Roman Church. For the latter does sometimes grant the right to re-marry if the divorced persons are important enough and other factors are present. But the Archbishops who, under the reigning sovereign head the Church, have consistently refused to do so.

The scandal which resulted in the Abdication of Edward VIII is a case in question. That Britain probably benefited by the accession of George VI in his place has no bearing on the point at issue, which was that Edward's bride was a divorced woman.

In the Townsend matter, there is no dispute that he was the innocent party. Never mind. He was divorced. That damns him for life in the eyes of the Church and never may he, with the blessing of the Archbishop of Canterbury, marry anyone, although many courageous Anglican clergymen would doubtless perform the ceremony in defiance of their spiritual leaders.

Paradoxically, churches far less liberal in other respects than the Anglican, offer no such rigid objections to the marriage of divorced persons. Naturally they discourage divorce and counsel all possible attempts to avoid it—as indeed a Theosophist would do. But rather than see the lives of two incompatible people permanently ruined by misinterpretation of the "Whom God Hath Joined" admonition, they do in extreme cases recognize that divorce is the only solution and the principals may marry others in a church ceremony.

Did Jesus really intend his injunction against man putting asunder those whom God had joined to be interpreted in the rigid fashion of the Catholic and Episcopal Churches? Common sense analysis of his words will show that he did not. His words were directed against the callous treatment of wife by husband permitted in the Law of Moses, which was the law of his day. Here it is (Deuteronomy XXIV:1-2):

"When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it comes to pass that she find no favour in his eyes . . . then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.

"And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife."

Simple!—No alimony. No divorce court. No waiting. Just hand her a warrant like a process server and that's it, Sister. You've had it.

Cruden in his Bible Concordance, states that the school of Hillel (a famous Rabbi who lived shortly before Jesus began his mission) "taught . . . that the least reasons were sufficient to authorize a man to put away his wife; for example, if she did not cook his food well, or if he found any woman whom he liked better."

To transfer in thought the primitive conditions of 33 B.C. to 1955 A.D., in order to apply the words of Jesus, uttered in the midst of these conditions, to modern divorces is anachronistic folly. Also Jesus himself recognized adultery as grounds for divorce in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. V:32). By implication, at least, he did not, in doing so, forbid re-marriage of the innocent partner.

"Whom God hath joined," he admonished, let no man put asunder. The Church has accepted this as meaning that no marriage by church rites can ever be dissolved except by death. But is a marriage rushed into by two adolescents after a night of roistering, even if celebrated in church, what Jesus had in mind when he spoke of "whom God hath joined"? Has God joined two individuals who soon after marriage hate each other and whose only wish is to be rid of each other? Has God joined two people who are unfaithful to each other or one of whom is unfaithful to the other? Does God sanction "shotgun" unions?

Misapplication of words—that is all these traditional doctrines and prohibitions amount to when based on utterances of centuries and millenia ago in a different world, to totally different people, in circumstances so different from our own that even comparisons are not possible.

(Continued on Page 84)

"SABBATICAL SNIVELLERS"

"The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."—*Jesus*.

To avoid shocked surprise of any ANCIENT WISDOM reader at the above caption, we hasten to say that the words are not ours but—of all things—those of an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. C. Gaul of Rand, Lincolnshire, England.

A Scottish magazine had expressed "pained regret" that the Duke of Edinburgh should have (horrors!) played polo on a Sunday and that (more horrors!) the Queen, the Queen mother and the Duchess of Kent should have watched him commit this sacrilege.

The Reverend Mr. Gaul—more power to his pulpit—not only characterized the objectors in the above lusty language but for good measure termed them "long-faced, lack humor humbugs."

And he added, in words ANCIENT WISDOM could not improve on, "It is strange how, in the name of religion, mercy, pity, peace and love can be chased through the window and hatred of innocent pastimes admitted through the door."

A London newspaper, the Daily Mirror, termed the criticism of the Royal Family obsolete rubbish, stating that there is nothing unchristian about a brighter Sunday.

No doubt the Scottish magazine would heartily approve of the New England Sundays of a century ago, immortalized by Robert Ingersoll. It was these Sundays among other things that drove him out of his church and into Agnosticism. In his lecture "Man, Woman And Child," he remarked:

"When I was a boy Sunday was considered altogether too holy to be happy in . . . when the sun fell below the horizon on Saturday evening, there was a darkness fell upon the house ten thousand times deeper than that of night. Nobody said a pleasant word; nobody laughed; nobody smiled; the child that looked the sickest was regarded as the most pious . . . If you were caught chewing gum it was only another evidence of the total depravity of the human heart . . . Dyspepsia was in the very air you breathed. Everybody looked sad and mournful. I have noticed all my life that many people think they have religion when they are troubled with dyspepsia."

We hope the Duke of Edinburgh will continue to play polo or any other game he desires, on Sunday and that his royal relatives will continue to look on and applaud him. The British Royal Family for generations has been noted for its common sense. And the "unco' guid" of the churches have been noted for exactly the opposite for many centuries.

Salutations to the Rev. Mr. Gaul and the Daily Mirror!

BRAVO, PASTOR CRIST!

The Rev. George P. Crist Jr., whether he knows it or not, has been preaching what most Theosophists would regard as pure Theosophy. As a result he was put on trial by his church on a charge of "adulterating the word of God."

The charges are in brief that he has denied the resurrection of Jesus, his ascension to heaven, his virgin birth and some of his miracles; that he has abandoned the fundamentals of scriptural interpretation as set forth by Martin Luther.

Mr. Crist, pastor of a Lutheran church in a small Wisconsin town, makes no bones about these denials. "I hold these views," he declares. "There is a truth behind the Bible. It is not the facts about Jesus that are important but Jesus himself. Belief is a matter of accepting as true the claims that he made, not about himself but about the meaning of life."

So Mr. Crist is accused of heresy or its equivalent, as was Martin Luther in whose name the charges virtually are made. And we read since this was written, that he was convicted.

But in the "Day of Judgment," which to the Theosophist is any day and every day, we have an idea that he will come out all right. We are not so sure about his accusers.

WHY ANCIENT WISDOM IS "CONSTRUCTIVELY COMBATIVE"

We publish below a letter from a British reader and the Editor's reply because the question raised seems to be of general interest. A word of preliminary explanation may be in order. The reference to other T.S. publications as not being "combative" was not intended as a criticism but as an explanation for the reverse policy adopted by ANCIENT WISDOM. We recognize that as a matter of policy the official journals of the National Societies cannot present Theosophy in the way that ANCIENT WISDOM has found effective. It would doubtless be unwise for them to stress the contrasts between conventional and theosophical beliefs as ANCIENT WISDOM constantly does in order the better to demonstrate the complete logic and probability of the latter. This can only be done effectively in our view by pointing out the illogic and improbability of the former.

ANCIENT WISDOM, although the official publication of St. Louis Lodge, is independently owned and published and can therefore be indifferent to considerations which must necessarily be taken into account by the sectional magazines.

But we must stand literally by what is said regarding the apologetic attitude of some individual members for their Theosophy. For this we see no manner of excuse for surely we should vigorously uphold the truth that is within us—not by brawling or by loud or discourteous speech but by firm insistence, when appropriate occasion arises, on the validity of our beliefs, backed by solid, intelligent evidence presented with all the ability at our command. We will let the correspondence reproduced below furnish the contrasting viewpoints in this matter.

From an English reader:

"I am encouraged by the March number of ANCIENT WISDOM and its account of letters received, to write you with a little constructive criticism. I hope this will be welcome, as it is sent in all humility.

"The first copy of ANCIENT WISDOM which I received, I admired a great deal. It was indeed a jewel among the dross of everyday literature. But I took certain matter I read as reflecting the tone of the publication for that particular month whereas I found as months passed by this particular tone was a constant ingredient in the theosophical pudding. The explanation may lie in the fact that the publication is not intended for Theosophists only, but to open the eyes of others to the truths expressed therein. And it may be that when Americans write for Americans they express in a more aggressive way than do the English, and what an Englishman would take for

subtlety might be interpreted by an American as lack of punch.

"Anyway I find a tendency to be (surprisingly enough) on the defensive, i.e. a defense through attack. The contribution 'DO YOU KNOW' best illustrates this attitude. It seems to sneer rather at other modes of thought, the general tone being 'Of course they will eventually come round to our way of thinking, but in the meantime how tiresome that they are so blind.'

"The March DO YOU KNOW refers to the 'Quaint notion that each person has only one earth life.' This is very revealing of the attitude of the writer, which has little tolerance for the beliefs of those outside his own circle. This is especially undesirable in a Theosophist, who should always respect the beliefs of those who have a different concept from their own; otherwise our concept of Theosophy will crystallize into a set form of beliefs which can no longer expand as truth evolves.

"The answer to this question (since I claimed to be constructive) is that a positive line of thought should be taken whereby attention could be drawn to expressions of the ancient wisdom found in various philosophies instead of looking for the narrow and restricted views expressed. Comparison can then be made with books written by Theosophists, so exercising propaganda without descending to a less elevating level. Here I am unconsciously expressing the truth that one gains more by giving than by grasping.

"Another point for criticism might be the large percentage of space given to the tenets of reincarnation. There might be no objection to this if the periodical were intended for Theosophists only, but I understand this is not the case. I believe in reincarnation, but I think we fail to realize that the general public have a complete misconception of what is meant by the word. They think you mean that Charles Luntz (for example) has lived before, and they do not realize the difference between the personality and the individuality. Since we teach that the personality does not reincarnate, the 'quaint notion' referred to above is not so quaint after all.

"In any case, it seems to me that reincarnation is given a prestige out of proportion to its importance. It is possible to have a religious conviction that one starts on the earth with one's evolution, and progresses from plane to plane as one becomes sufficiently aware, pure and unselfish to warrant such advance. While reincarnation is a beautiful and desirable truth, provided it is not believed in for egotistical reasons, it is not essential to believe in it before one advances spiritually, and it should not therefore be apparently insisted upon as part and parcel of Theosophy.

"On the other hand, I don't have to tell you how much I appreciate such

elevating articles as THE OCCULT INTERPRETATION OF OMAR KHAYYAM."

The Editor's reply:

"I certainly do appreciate your letter of April 22nd and I recognize that your criticism is intended to be wholly constructive. That kind of criticism is always welcome and I will do my best to answer the points you raise and try to explain the reason for our sometimes 'combative' attitude.

"First let me thank you for the kind things you say about our publication. Then, taking your letter paragraph by paragraph, it might be well to mention that I should be familiar both with the English and the American styles of expression as I was born in England, educated at an English Public School and lived in England almost 20 years before coming to America. I don't think the Americans interpret the English 'subtlety' as lacking in punch. On the contrary, when employed as only an Englishman can employ it on an opponent, it seems to infuriate them far more than the unobtrusive aggressiveness of an American.

"However, ANCIENT WISDOM is not published to infuriate anyone but very definitely to explain, uphold and—where necessary—defend the logic of theosophical teachings. Its policy of attempting to put those who question them on the defensive is a long-standing one, carefully calculated, though it does not necessarily manifest in all articles or all issues. I would like to explain clearly the reason for this policy and your letter shows such evident desire to be fair that I am sure you will not dismiss this explanation without weighing it well.

"ANCIENT WISDOM is combative at times, firstly because other theosophical publications of the Adyar affiliation are not. Too many Theosophists are almost apologetic for their beliefs. They let criticism, even stupid and uninformed criticism, go by default, never venturing to answer it or stand by their convictions. This 'sweetness and light' policy has not paid off. It has encouraged slurring attacks on the Society and its leaders and misrepresentation of its beliefs.

"If examples are needed I could quote them by the score but I will content myself with two. Life Magazine, with a circulation of over 5 million, recently referred to Dr. Annie Besant as 'an eccentric British mystic,' and informed its readers that Theosophy was 'a colorful blend of Hinduism, Buddhism and Fabian Socialism.' An ex-Catholic Priest (an Englishman) turned Atheist wrote a book which he entitled 'The Nonsense Called Theosophy.' It had an enormous sale in a cheap edition.

"Now if it were merely a question of hurt feelings among Theosophists, who are not supposed to let such attacks

(Continued on Page 83)

L. W. ROGERS, WHO FOUNDED ANCIENT WISDOM FOUNDED THE THEOSOPHICAL BOOK GIFT INSTITUTE

It was very close to his heart. He felt, as ANCIENT WISDOM feels, that no theosophical activity offers greater promise of extending the work than the getting of many theosophical books into many libraries.

That is what the Theosophical Book Gift Institute (T.B.G.I.) exists to do—and grandly have they done it. During the past year 4,773 books have been placed in 738 libraries. The moving spirit is the Institute President, Miss Edith Gray, who herself contacted 628 of the libraries.

Many T.S. members obtained their introduction to Theosophy by reading a book found in a public library—often seemingly by accident. What better karma than to aid thus in providing the means for theosophical contacts by those who are "ready"?

Year by year ANCIENT WISDOM has urged support for this great theosophical undertaking and is proud to do so again. The Treasurer, Mr. H. A. Kern, himself a most generous contributor to the Institute, will welcome donations for carrying on this supremely useful work.

ANCIENT WISDOM endorses and recommends it. Checks should be made payable to H. A. Kern, Treasurer, T.B.G.I., and mailed to him at 6316 W. 66th Place, Chicago, Ills.

HEALING

By ELLA WELGE

O Lord my God, I cried unto thee and thou hast healed me. *Psalm XXX:2.*

Spiritual healing does not refer to physical well-being alone but to the establishment of a healthy and harmonious state of character. Without effecting a change for the better in character the physical healing is not enduring.

The purpose of the spiritual life is the gradual unfolding of the soul to its ultimate goal of perfection. Keeping of this truth in mind and working spiritually toward the cleansing and purifying of our inner selves will bring about the healing of the whole man. Everyone who seeks permanently to be whole, in mind, body and affairs, must adhere to this principle.

The first step is to free the consciousness of prejudice, discouragement and other negative conceptions of the human mind that have held us in bondage. And as we work in our own consciousness as a gardener works in his garden to keep out the weeds and to water and nurture the ground and plants with health-giving care, the purer, the truer, the more selfless we become.

Our spiritual understanding increases, our soul expresses the truth of being and it follows that physical wellbeing is restored. Inner peace and stability takes possession of us because we have applied a divine law.

For the spiritual ministrations of the Healing Group write the group leader, Mrs. Ella Welge, care of the Theosophical Society, 5108 Waterman Ave., St. Louis 8, Mo.

JUST THINK!

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

Just think if Winston Churchill, with his genius for narration,
Had chosen once to write a piece about reincarnation.

What could he not have done with it—
this great world-famous figure!
But other tasks he had to do and they were even bigger.

Just think if Julius Caesar who, in Latin,
wrote of Gaul
And all the wars he fought there, hadn't fought in Gaul at all;
But in the Mystery Schools had learned about the higher planes
And wrote of them, instead of wasting ink on his campaigns.

Just think if William Shakespeare,
with his educated pen,
Had found some ancient literature,
and studied it, and then
Composed a play that dealt with all the Chains and Rounds and Races
And various other things that our Theosophy embraces.

Ah well! These vagrant fancies, though amusing to pursue,
Are not of any consequence—they never could come true.
So as no occult writing bears the Caesar-Shakespeare label,
We'll still in ANCIENT WISDOM strive to do the best we're able.

DO YOU KNOW?—

That the twin teachings of Reincarnation and Karma are the only possible explanations of the terrible afflictions of body and mind that some people have to endure?

That, in particular, extraordinary suffering, far beyond the lot of most people, signifies extraordinary need for a lesson that will burn itself into the permanent consciousness?

That such suffering is not intended by karma as punishment, no matter how heinous the offense, punishment, as such, being unknown in the cosmic scheme?

That necessarily it may seem as punishment to the uninformed, but this does not alter the karmic intent, which is always correction and education?

That very great and barbaric cruelties have been wrought by man on his fellow man in contravention of the Divine Scheme, which has always benevolent ends in view?

That somehow the cruel must be brought to realize the enormity of their cruelties, for the sake of their future spiritual progress and for the sake of the rest of mankind?

That while theoretically such realization may be achieved without the repercussion of similar pain on themselves to that which they inflicted on others, in practice karma may usually find it necessary to take its bitter course?

That while similarity of repercussion need not necessarily involve exactly the same type of distress as was dealt out by the offender, clairvoyants state that there is a very definite correspondence between the misery for which he was responsible and the misery he experiences?

That right reaction to this unpleasant karma is to recognize that, harsh though it seems, we needed it—and though we probably do not remember what deed or deeds invoked it, karma intends it for our own very great good?

That the Ego, our Superconscious, is fully aware of the reason his current personality is suffering and if we are sufficiently advanced spiritually, we shall consciously be aware of it, too, a short time before reincarnating?

That as elementary examples of the workings of karma may be mentioned that so-called "brainwashing," which is no new thing but has been practiced in religion and government for ages, obviously brings its appropriate reaction in the brainwashing of today?

That the hideous tortures of the Inquisition and of medieval ordeals to extort confessions have their consummation in the bodies of the torturers, who may be born maimed, sightless, deformed or diseased—or later acquire these infirmities, depending upon the nature and extent of their former inhumanity?

THE ZODIAC IN KIPLING

Sagittarius

When your Daemon is in charge, do not try to think consciously. Drift, wait, and obey.

—Posthumous Autobiography

O world invisible, we view thee,
O world intangible, we touch thee,
O world unknowable, we know thee.

—Francis Thompson

WHAT MAKES SENSE?

It Makes No Sense That—

Believers in Reincarnation should construct imaginary previous lives for themselves, especially if they fancy themselves to have been famous characters of history.

It Makes Sense That—

Such fantasies merely bring the exalted teaching of rebirth into disrepute, and involve the misguided individual who boasts of his former incarnations in ridicule.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

As the asylums are full of Julius Caesars, Cleopatras, Napoleons and other former world figures, the Theosophist should not be especially careful to avoid even self-deception in his own thinking on the subject.

It Makes Sense That—

As no one but a gifted and trained clairvoyant able to function on very high planes can tell anything about a past life, a mere impression that one was a particular individual "last time" is unlikely to have any substantial basis in fact.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

A personage so outstanding that history has preserved his record would reincarnate in some obscure family and remain in obscurity and mediocrity all his life.

It Makes Sense That—

While U. S. Presidents have been born in log-cabins and great industrialists in humble surroundings, the fact that they were formerly characters of note is evidenced by their ability to rise from these lowly beginnings to the top.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

The mighty teaching of Reincarnation, only one segment of the still mightier system embraced by Theosophy, should be used to inflate the little egos of little people by leading them to believe themselves the re-embodiments of the famous.

It Makes Sense That—

The illusory nature of these unwholesome daydreams is shown by the fact that practically no one has the conviction that in his last life he was a ditch-digger, highwayman, lackey, menial or bond-slave, although these unattractive occupations were a million times more numerous than the exalted positions which are invariably assigned to "the last incarnation"?

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

This should be taken as ruling out the logical assurance of responsible theosophic clairvoyants that rebirth in a family a year or two after the death of a small child in the same family may very likely be an immediate re-incarnation of the identical Ego.

It Makes Sense That—

The bereaved family may properly be allowed this consolation and if there are signs that the child seems to recall a previous birth without any hint from the parents, such evidence is at least persuasive.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

Findings of disinterested T.S. seers investigating the incarnations of important people should be rejected out of hand if they seem logical—as Queen Victoria was said to be reincarnated King Alfred, Lord Kitchener a reincarnation of William The Conqueror, Edward VII of Edward I, Dante of Virgil and Tennyson of Omar Khayyam.

It Makes Sense That—

While no one without high clairvoyant vision can either prove or disprove these "successions," they are at least more plausible than Cleopatra reincarnated as a housemaid, Julius Caesar as a taxi-driver or Napoleon as a window cleaner.

"OUR BIRTH"

(Continued from Page 77)

Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home.

There are literally hundreds of such passages in poetry from the earliest times up to the present day. Those who disbelieve in the theory (and their number is getting less every day) explain all this away by "poetic license" and the use of transcendental terms to make the lines more effective. The present English poet laureate, John Masefield, can hardly be included in this category, seeing that he declares his belief in Reincarnation in unequivocal terms:

"I hold that when a person dies
His soul returns again to earth;
Arrayed in some new flesh-disguise,
Another mother gives him birth.
With sturdier limbs and brighter brain
The old soul takes the road again."

There are still people who in spite of the numerous contradictions and incongruities—yes, even the degrading statements—in the Bible, persist in believing that every word, from cover to cover, is divinely inspired. These people say: "If Reincarnation is true, it would be definitely taught in the Bible." There are many passages where it is implied and taken for granted. For instance, in *Matthew VI: 13 and 14*: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied unto John. And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come."

In *Matthew VI: 13 and 14*, "When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying: Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? And they said: Some say that Thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others Jeremias or one of the prophets."

Matthew XVII: 10-13. "His disciples asked Him, saying, Why then say the

scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, that Elias has come already, and they knew him not . . . Then the disciples understood that He spake unto them of John the Baptist."

Luke IX: 7-8. "Now Herod . . . was perplexed, because that it was said of some, that John had risen from the dead; and of some, that Elias had appeared; and of others, that one of the old prophets was risen again."

But perhaps the most significant, for our purpose, of all the passages pointing to the fact that in the time of Christ reincarnation was taken for granted, occurs in *John IX: 1-4*. "And as Jesus passed by, He saw a man which was blind from his birth. And His disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither did this man sin nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." We note that Jesus does not reprove the disciples for asking such question, as He assuredly would have done if the question had been a foolish or wrong one. He simply took the possibility of reincarnation for granted and replied that the reason was quite a different one. However coldly the orthodox Church of later centuries looked upon the doctrine of Reincarnation, there can be no question that it was thoroughly well-known in early Christian times.

(To Be Continued)

CAUTION AND INTUITION

(Continued from Page 77)

INTUITION appears on its own plane, the Buddhic. It manifests in man when this level of consciousness begins to pass from the subjective to the objective. It is the Second Aspect of the Divine Trinity, that of Wisdom.

Wisdom is the essence of understanding and implies that *loving union* without which understanding is impossible.

In the realm of the true INTUITION synthesis is on the level of global thought, the world as a whole rather than a joining of units, however close. In modern philosophic thought we have the idea of *wholeness*, a reaction against any separation of the parts of a man, even to comprehend him. It includes an *infusion* of love rather than an outpouring by or through or for or toward any individual, however great.

On this level all becomes luminous, not clouded by personality or mind or emotion, not conditioned or formed by the mind or even self-consciously synthesized, but all-pervasive. This is the light that lighteth every man. Faith or belief may be concrete mental; hope of emotion or inspiration is on the higher mental level; Love, not emotion

or feeling, is the "greatest of these." In it is UNION, a recognition of something even beyond our globe, of planetary consciousness stretching out to embrace the whole Universe.

Above this there is only the First Aspect of the ONE LIFE. That aspect is at one time the universal *Energy* within matter, the *will* in man and the *Power* which pervades this Universe.

Summing up we may remember that the first lesson taught to an Initiate is Caution or Silence; and we may coin one of the INTUITION:

Believe nothing without proof but have faith that can move mountains.
(The End)

KARMIC RESEARCH

(Continued from Page 77)

events either to human planning, to natural occurrences or to chance. And they do not subscribe to Alexander Pope's definition of chance: "All chance" (is) "direction which thou canst not see."

The astrological school may be divided into the fatalistic and non-fatalistic. The former regard people as the puppets of the stars, planets, aspects and positions. Although their concepts range beyond the physical, they are as soulless as the preconditioning of the Behaviorists. We never could understand why anyone would want to consult a fatalistic astrologer and ask him what to do about his "fortune" or lack of it, when obviously, if astrology is a fatalistic science, there is nothing he can do about it. We might call it "Kismet Astrology."

The other body of astrological thought adopts the ancient motto, "The stars incline but do not compel." This is the only kind of astrology with which a Theosophist who understands his Theosophy will have anything to do.

Finally there is the "mind" school. This embraces the Christian Divine and Mental Scientists, the Applied Psychologists, New Thoughtists and similar groups. The Christian Scientists deny that they have anything in common with other "Scientists," but analysis by an unbiased outsider shows that, apart from the personality of this or that founder or leader, and the proclamations made about sources or reasons (which in no way alter the natural facts) all are using the same indwelling force—Universal Mind—which refuses to be packaged or branded by any group for the exclusive benefit of its members or followers.

Now Theosophy most certainly embraces non-fatalistic astrology and attaches the utmost importance to the use of creative thought. Theosophists also are, or should be, prepared to vie with the most materialistic of mankind in applying common sense, close observation, research and experiment to their undertakings. The kind of "Theosophy" that waits for the Masters to

rescue a T. S. Lodge falling to pieces through apathy of its members is responsible for scores of surrendered Lodge charters.

Karmic research which, in our opinion, is the philosophy of the future, will recognize that nature has many modes of working and the attempt to oversimplify natural causation will not do. And she works on all planes at once—a profound natural truth which is responsible for the fact that none of the philosophies, none of the theories attempting to account for the sequence of events in human or natural life, ever quite jell. Philosophies multiply by the dozen and by the hundred, contradicting each other at point after point, but always at some point there is a missing link. In human life it is, of course, reincarnation. In circumstance it is karma, which may be a thing of one life or many, of a minute, an hour or a thousand years.

Life has never been explained by materialism and never will be. It is rendered purposeless and stupid by fatalistic astrology. Even thought alone, powerful as it is when permeated by faith, needs physical action to implement it and favorable astrological cycles for its manifestation. The three things work together and that indeed is the problem of "reconciling" them.

There will be "Case Histories," thousands of them to furnish evidence beyond question for the truth of these "theories," when science begins to take them seriously and the great Foundations furnish the funds and organization needed to do the practical work of research.

But each of us is a "Case History" himself and by watching the events of his own life, learning something of elementary astrology so he may correlate it with these events—learning also how to use his thoughts for purposeful activity—he may prove up this "theory" beyond a shadow of disbelief.

And in so doing add greatly to his understanding of life and to his own wellbeing.

(To Be Continued)

THY ANCIENT WISDOM IS "CONSTRUCTIVELY COMBATIVE"

(Continued from Page 80)

disturb them, it would not much matter. Unfortunately the wide currency given to the attacks, often in the form of approving reviews in the press of any book disparaging Theosophy, is in my opinion mainly responsible for the preposterous notions the public has of our grand philosophy. To smile amiably and let all this pass as part of the lot of all suffering martyrs (as I am afraid some of our people do) seems to me to be a lazy way of meeting a situation that certainly calls for intelligent counter-action.

"So as no other theosophical publication saw fit to do anything about it,

ANCIENT WISDOM appointed itself the instrument to present theosophical truths *in contrast* with popular beliefs where the two are in conflict. Orthodox people are strong for 'The Church Militant.' Should there not be a 'Theosophy Militant,' alert to blazon abroad for the benefit of those utterly dissatisfied with their own indoctrinated beliefs, the logic, reasonableness, hopefulness and comfort to be found in fullness only in Theosophy?

"We know the answer to that one, too. 'Why not present the theosophical ideas without questioning the ideas of others even though in conflict?'"

"Our answer to this answer is that it cannot be done effectively unless the *illogic* of the opposed ideas is shown. It is not a matter of intolerance. ANCIENT WISDOM has repeatedly stressed that we seek no proselytes, we have no wish to disturb the peace of mind of those who have it through their own faith. But there are millions who have neither faith nor peace of mind. They will pay little attention to statements regarding life, death and purpose as set forth by Theosophy unless the popular concepts, nearly always wrong, relating to these things can be demolished in their minds by showing that they *are* wrong and that it is not strong-minded to accept them just because almost everybody else does, but actually is weak-minded.

"Popular writers and some very erudite ones refer to reincarnation as a quaint superstition or in words to that effect. Certainly we have a right so to brand the popular misconception that there is only one life. One can be tolerant of the beliefs of his neighbor and should be where that neighbor is concerned. But if he is also tolerant in a lecture or magazine article devoted wholly to showing the logic of a theosophical concept as against beliefs diametrically opposed, then he will do a very poor job—and it will not be fair to those who are seeking the truth and want to be convinced that it is the truth. Jesus was not tolerant of what he believed false, neither was H. P. Blavatsky, nor the Masters in their letters. Their words were highly pungent. We have to speak out against harmful ideas and to my mind the one-life notion held by a minority of the world's population, but by a majority in Europe and America, is definitely harmful to a real understanding of life.

"I cannot, I am afraid, agree that reincarnation should not be stressed over and again in a publication such as ours. It is not 'insisted upon as a part and parcel of Theosophy'—nothing is. A Theosophist may believe what he sees fit so long as he accepts Universal Brotherhood. But most Theosophists do so regard reincarnation and I certainly do. Without it, to my mind, the entire occult scheme falls apart. It is fundamental to it and life makes no

"A GREAT LOVE GOES HERE WITH A LITTLE GIFT"

—Theocritus
(THIRD CENTURY B. C.)



A gift subscription to ANCIENT WISDOM for Christmas is indeed "little" from the standpoint of price—only \$2.00—but we do believe that with it must go a far greater love than is possible with gifts of jewelry, nylons, ties, handkerchiefs, money . . . even automobiles or mink coats.

For these latter things cater to the physical side of man—or woman—and those to whom they are given may have them, or their equivalents, already. Not seldom Christmas giving means merely piling up into homes things now there in abundance—things not needed, that may even find their way ultimately into other homes as bridge prizes, birthday presents, anniversary gifts or what not?

Though we are not cynical about Christmas giving. A lot of love, friendship, true affection, may go with a large gift as with a small one. But we submit, with respect, that no love can quite equal that which accompanies a desire to bring the light of understanding to troubled souls who may have sought it for the best part of a lifetime and at last decided that for earth dwellers it did not exist.

Into this kind of life ANCIENT WISDOM can bring such illuminated happiness that not all the merchandise in all the department stores could confer. This is not mere rhetoric—not hyperbole. Hundreds (or by now it may be thousands) of letters in our files testify to the enlightenment that ANCIENT WISDOM has brought into darkened lives.

If your Christmas giving is past when you read this, as well it may be—that doesn't matter. Let us start the subscriptions for your friends with the New Year.

Two dollars is a very small price to pay for the great love that can go with your little gift—no, with your GREAT gift of ANCIENT WISDOM.

sense otherwise. This is my conviction, to which I should be completely false if I pushed this mighty fact of evolution into the background. Without it Theosophy has, in my opinion, little to offer that cannot be found in other systems. Its implications ramify in every direction, and whatever Theosophy teaches must in some way be related to it.

"I am glad you like the Omar Khayyam series, though somewhat surprised, as if you have read the earlier installments you cannot fail to have noticed that they are more 'combative' than almost anything else in the paper. We set out among other things to disprove the accepted folly that Omar was a wine guzzler, a drunk and a believer in no future life. We had to deal roughly with these ideas and say some not very complimentary things about the minds of those who hold them. We have not gone nearly that far in the matter of religious beliefs. Finally may I say that apart from the constant

stream of letters our readers write us, almost all approving, and of which we printed a tiny selection in March, ANCIENT WISDOM has endured longer than any independent occult publication on this continent.

"I seriously doubt that this would be the case had we adopted the customary bland approach to Theosophy at which people nod their heads approvingly—and forget the next minute. Our approach may be a bit rugged at times, but it sticks."

WHOM GOD HATH JOINED . . . ?

(Continued from Page 79)

Tradition dies hard in the Anglican as in the Roman Catholic Church. But antidisestablishmentarianism is likely to die in relation to the former as it has died in country after country in relation to the latter. This twenty-eight letter word, which little Gloria Lockwood spelled over TV much more easily than most people can define it, is

the opposition to disestablishing an established church. The Church of England has for centuries enjoyed a privileged position as against all other churches, but it is not too secure. Rumbles have long been heard from people who do not belong to it objecting to its state bounties, subsidies, tithes it is authorized to collect, and even to its association with the reigning family—the Queen being its titular head.

Its stand at the abdication of Edward VIII did it little good and its repetition, far less justified, in the Margaret-Townsend romance is likely to shake its prestige and its hold on the British people still further. When the iron hand of the Roman Church pressed too heavily on the people of France, of Mexico and of other nations, the Roman Church was disestablished. It could happen in the Anglican communion if its rulers hold too strongly to outmoded and irrational traditions never intended for modern conditions or for a modern people.

"Whom God hath joined . . ." Many a marriage before a Justice of the Peace or (in England) before a Registrar, has turned out far more happily than many a marriage before a clergyman. Which couples are the ones really joined by God?

Princess Margaret has made her decision. It was her dharma to do so and that of no one else. No one dare question it—and no one, as a Theosophist sees it, should have questioned it had it been the opposite.

The Church is said to be founded on a rock, but its attitude in the matter of re-marriage of innocent divorced persons may be the rock on which it will founder.

The Bible is *not* the "Word of God" but contains at best the words of fallible men and *imperfect* teachers. Yet read *esoterically* it does contain, if not the *whole* truth, still "nothing but the truth," under whatever allegorical garb.
—H. P. Blavatsky

When religious argument limps and stumbles, it can have no prop like the crutch of authority.

—E. C. Farnsworth

Criticism comes easier than craftsmanship.
—Zeuxis 400 B. C.

Dogmatism is puppyism come to its full growth.
—Douglas Jerrold

Many of the great poets are unconscious Theosophists in the sentiments their verse expresses. Browning, Longfellow, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, and a host of others use phrases that would seem quite at home if found in *The Secret Doctrine* without quotation marks.