

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 IX

AUGUST, 1943—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 6

SCIENCE AND THE OCCULT WORLD

By HAROLD D. CLAYBERG, M. D.

[Continued from Last Month]

Among scientists there are today undoubtedly those who stand ready at the borders of the invisible world about us. The religious groups have vocally rushed in centuries ago, know all about it, tell you vociferously, disagree with each other, and thereby exhibit their abysmal ignorance of it.

The scientists will go slower, but the ground they tread will, as always, be solid, their progress cautious but definite, though periods may occur, as with mass production of artificial rubber today, when rapid clearing of some certain sector may take place. But the scientists have the advantage of developed technics and the unrivaled point of view that their search is first and always for truth, with no authority to limit and no prejudices to blind.

They may not tackle this new realm tomorrow. But the time will come. Nor can I doubt that, in due course, instruments of precision will be at hand for the exploration, just as they have been evolved for each and every new field of human knowledge so far opened, where progress has been on an exact basis. The equipment has varied, but the rules and principles change not.

Having now read my definition of a scientist, I ask you, the reader, whether you conform to it. Have you helped, be it ever so little, to add to the mass of knowledge which has slowly accumulated through the ages? Or have you helped to spread and clarify any field? Or are you mainly an obstructionist, who strives to prevent the advances of others? Let me call attention to the old poem:

"Isn't it strange that Princes and Kings,
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings,
And common folk like you and me
Are builders of Eternity!

"To each is given a bag of tools,
A shapeless mass, and a book of rules.
And each must fashion, ere life be flown,
A stumbling block or a stepping stone."

[The End]

Dr. Arundale requests opinions as to how Theosophists can best serve the world after the war. We unhesitatingly offer ours that Theosophists can best serve after the war, the same as during the war and before the war, by giving Theosophy to all and sundry, as aggressively, diplomatically and intelligently as may be.

AN OCCULT INTERPRETATION OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

[Continued from May]

We think in Theosophy that hidden beneath the Ten Commandments there are several occult meanings and I am going to try to explain what those meanings are. I will have to take the full responsibility for what follows. I cannot saddle any part of it on to the Theosophical Society or on any of our Theosophical writers. All that our Theosophical literature tells us is that the Bible is largely an occult work and that the Five Books of Moses were undoubtedly written by an Occultist, probably by an Initiate, but the actual occult interpretation of the Ten Commandments, so far as I am aware, has never been attempted, so I am unable to refer anyone to authorities and I will have to stand or fall strictly by the merit or otherwise of my interpretation.

The introduction to the first Commandment starts, "And God spake all these words saying: I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage." I will ask you to recognize first that orthodox Christians all admit that the Ten Commandments were intended for the whole world and not only for one people. The Jews take this view also. Anyway the Ten Commandments are undoubtedly the corner stone of the entire Old Testament and if any part of the Old Testament was intended for the whole world, I should say the Ten Commandments were that part.

Now that being so, why did Moses (speaking in the name of God of course) say: "I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage?" God certainly brought the Children of Israel out of the Land of Egypt if the Biblical account is true, but it is equally certain that he *did not* bring the whole world out of the Land of Egypt. So that statement in its literal form cannot possibly be intended for the whole world and if that is the case what is the use of repeating it every Sunday in the churches? The minister reads: "I brought thee out of the Land of Egypt" and the congregation knows quite well that that statement is not true, they were never brought out of the land of Egypt.

It is things like this that I was looking for when I did my research work with a view of ascertaining where occult meanings might reasonably be expected to exist. I looked for things that did not appear to be right on their face and then I looked be-

[Continued on Page 48]

RUSSIA: A MODERN MIRACLE

By L. W. ROGERS

[Continued from Last Month]

At a frightful price the Russian people had at last won the chance to live in peace and develop the country, had won the boon of being forgotten and let alone. The present war has called attention to them again and now an astounded world is vaguely trying to recognize the waif of twenty years ago in the stalwart nation whose resources in trained troops, in generalship, in equipment, in economic stability, in statesmanship and in fighting morale has held the mightiest armies the world has ever known at bay for two years and given the other democracies time to create the material which makes certain the ultimate defeat of the German war machine.

The U.S.S.R. celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary on November 7, 1942 but it has not had twenty-five summers in which to rise from the ashes and agonies of its infant years. Its period of reconstruction began with the end of the famine in 1922. Until that date it was engaged in a desperate struggle for its existence. Its period of growth, therefore, is from 1922 to 1942, just twenty years. To understand the amazing achievements of that brief time we must glance at the old Russia. It was almost exclusively agricultural. A very heavy majority of the vast population consisted of the peasant class, living in rude huts and tilling the soil with the most primitive implements. In all its immense territory, comprising one sixth of the earth, there were but four thousand kilometers of hard-surfaced roads! Without interior development and inter-communication, with insanitary conditions everywhere, with a high mortality rate among all classes, with agricultural production dependent on the scythe, the hand sickle and the wooden plow, with ignorance and superstition general, the Russia of the Czars was a lingering fragment of mediaeval times.

The speed with which it has been transformed is the most astonishing chapter in all human history. In nine years its hard-surfaced roads increased from four thousand to *two million* kilometers. In twelve years the number of its postmen increased from less than seven thousand to more than a hundred and twenty thousand. In the United States of America, with a fertile, virgin soil, with immense natural resources, with a population speaking a single language (a very great advantage) the present high state of mechanism has been attained in about three-quarters of a century. The Soviet Union, starting with only the impover-

[Continued on Page 46]

ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS

published monthly at

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, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Subscriptions: 1 year \$1; 6 months 55c; 3 months 30c. Canada and abroad, 1 year \$1.25.

Single copies, 10c.

For convenience: Mail a \$1 bill.

THE HAPPINESS IN THEOSOPHY

It is grand to be a Theosophist; to go through life with the certainty that one is not living for the day or for the hour or even for the few years ahead, but for eternity. And not for a meaningless eternity with nothing in it but purposeless existence with no end and no aim, blissful though it may be; but for an eternity of constant progress, heights upon heights of evolution, depths upon depths of knowledge.

If one can contrive even in smallest measure and at infrequent intervals to hold that outlook, to live upon that plane of thought, the life is transfigured. And every scrap of knowledge that has come down to us, from Blavatsky, from Besant, from Leadbeater, from Sinnett through Arundale and Hodson and the other great leaders the Society has been so fortunate as to possess, contributes in its own way to that realization. Happy we—if only we have wisdom enough to take what the kind karmic gods have bestowed, instead of wrangling about the personalities of leaders and wasting our energies in squabbling about this, that or other small point or difference between one teacher's view and another's.

A valued friend of the writer, a true Theosophist if there ever was one, plaintively inquired one day, "Why do Theosophists quarrel with one another? It seems to me that with their great philosophy of Brotherhood they should always work in harmony."

And so it seems to us. This perhaps will provoke a smile from those who so often find this journal a hotbed of controversy with the views of other Theosophists, but these controversies are not quarrels—at least not on our side. Our love for the Theosophical movement is intense and this is no rhetoric, no empty profession. There is no percentage in publishing an occult journal. It means hard work, expenditure of much time and energy and many financial headaches. It also not seldom means abuse of the most scurrilous nature from those who object to our views. All that is to be expected and we can take it without too much loss of sleep. We could probably eliminate much (not all) of the abuse by confining the paper to mild dissertations on the occult, never expressing an opinion except in such a way that we could easily take it back and avoiding all controversial matters like the plague.

Some occult publications do this, and grow fat and sleepy for lack of spiritual exercise. We have an idea that our usefulness would be greatly decreased if we adopted that policy. It is strange that circulation always increases when controversial matters find their way into our columns. We always expect it to decrease, but aside from the one or two cancelled subscriptions which is the way an occasional reader has of saying "pooh-pooh for you," it always goes the other way.

We believe these discussions are most definitely in the interests of the Theosophical movement. They make people think about Theosophy and what it stands for. Personalities should be kept out, and on our side they always are, but *issues* are the rightful subject of debate. How else can our movement thrive? This country is governed by difference of opinion. The two party system here and in Britain has been found the ideal way of getting the best thought of our ruling bodies upon all national, state and local matters. And with all the obvious defects of our system would we have it otherwise? Dr. Arundale has indicated his high approval of an opposition movement in the T.S., even to himself.

So if you, the reader, find articles devoted to airing differences of opinion on Theosophical matters, do not feel that this means quarrelsomeness. It does not. The editor has taken the most vigorous exception to policies of the present President of Theosophical Society in America. Yet never by word or inference has he questioned the utter sincerity and worthiness of Mr. Cook either as a Theosophist or as a man. And that goes for the President of the Canadian Section and for anyone else in high or low position whose opinions we may have challenged. Whether they feel the same toward us we know not. We think the President of the American Section does. But be that as it may, it makes no difference to our own attitude. The opinions of other personalities as to our own personality is inconsequential. Egos do not dislike each other—they hold only goodwill toward one another. And Theosophists are supposed at least to try at all times to live in the Ego.

But we have to carry on down here—and if the world only knew how a knowledge of and profound belief in Theosophy lightens the load and puts happiness into even the gloomiest day and the most tedious task, the world would be Theosophists to the last man, woman and child.

ONE DOWN, TWO TO GO

Mussolini, the man whose face is an insult to the rest of the human race, has resigned. The first black-hearted scoundrel to introduce the villainy of all-out dictatorship to the world is now all out himself. He and the unhappy nation he duped have long been all in. His "resignation," which Walter Winchell more aptly describes as the "bum's rush," will have no effect whatever on the United Nations' campaign except to cause them to eliminate his ugly mug from their war posters.

But psychologically the extinction of this saber-rattling, jaw rattling ruffian is of immense consequence to the Allied cause. It will give our fighting men a tremendous lift to know that the first of the venomous monsters they are battling has so quickly succumbed. Hardly had they occupied the initial segment of his country than he decided he was through. Of course, as poor little Victor Emanuel proclaims with chattering teeth, "Italy will fight on." But with what and for what?

It is a happy omen. The first to raise the banner of the Dark Forces was the first to lose his empire, the first to lose his job. Now for the arch-monster Hitler—then for the inhuman and sub-human Jap.

The light is breaking. The oceans of blood shall not have been spilled in vain. Great deeds of heroic valor, colossal sacrifices, unheard of expenditures of treasure still are before the avengers of the army of innocent dead, stark witnesses before Heaven of the titanic guilt of the three most poisonous reptiles ever spawned on the earth.

MUSSOLINI**HITLER****TOJO**

One down, two to go.

"ORTHODOX" THEOSOPHY!

We put an exclamation mark after the above because that is the effect it seems to have. *Orthodox* Theosophy! As well speak of a white blackbird. The two words are in conflict with each other. Theosophy cannot be orthodox—it cannot be unorthodox.

A discussion has been taking place for several months in the columns of the *Adyar Theosophist* on Orthodox Trends in Theosophy. It is now closed but the Editor of ANCIENT WISDOM would like to add his thirty cents' worth through our own columns. The originator of the discussion fears that the customary beliefs of most Theosophists in Reincarnation, Karma, The Path, The Masters, etc., are developing into dogmas, a sort of Theosophical creed. His remedy is to encourage Theosophists who hold no such beliefs—definitely disbelieve them, in fact (as they have a perfect right to do)—by giving them minority representation on the General Council, the international governing body of the T.S.

This is broadmindedness with a vengeance, but its impracticability is pointed out by another correspondent who logically asks why draw the line there? Why not give representation to those who believe in vivisection, meat-eating, alcohol drinking, smoking. One can be a good Theosophist and eat meat, (Mr. G. R. S. Mead did) drink liquor, (Mr. A. P. Sinnett did) smoke, (H. P. Blavatsky did) and even believe that vivisection is helpful to humanity. Most Theosophists disapprove these things, at least in principle, but certainly those who do not disapprove them cannot and should not be barred from the Society.

It seems to us that this problem can be resolved by mere consideration of the meaning of the word Theosophy—the Divine

Wisdom. We study what we believe to be the Divine Wisdom, we search for it, sometimes think we have found a minute portion of it, sometimes discover, or think we discover, later that we were wrong. Who is to tell each of us what the Divine Wisdom is? Who but the Self, the Intuition, within each one's heart? How can we talk about an "orthodox" Divine wisdom? Is the Supreme Being orthodox? Is He unorthodox?

The glory of Theosophy is its boundless tolerance of all beliefs, of all seeking after truth. If Theosophy is not that it is nothing. Theosophy is not Blavatsky, not Besant, not Leadbeater nor Judge nor Sinnett nor Arundale nor even the early letters of the Masters. Theosophy is everything that is true and right, wise and good. It covers an immense amount of territory—all the territory there is, in fact. And if it seems to devote more attention to Reincarnation, Karma, the Masters, the Path and like teachings it is because these are neglected territories. Other teachings ignore them. It is our dharma at this stage to stress them.

There is a place for all in Theosophy: the "Back to Blavatskies," the "Forward with Arundales," the Theosophists who believe that Mars and Mercury are part of our Chain and the Theosophists who believe they are not. There is a place for those who are convinced that wisdom died with H.P.B. and for those who think that it was only born with her. There is a place for those who believe that the personality goes straight to devachan after physical death with no astral stop *en route*, and a place for those who believe the opposite. There is a place for all—*except for those who would deny to others the freedom of belief they claim for themselves*. For those, the intolerant ones, we do not believe Theosophy has a place until they learn to be tolerant, because they negate the First Object of the Society, Universal Brotherhood, which presupposes equal right of conscience for all. But the moment they acquire that tolerance they belong in the Movement, if they wish to belong there.

There is no problem of orthodoxy in the Society. Heaven forbid! Many of us joined the Society to get away from orthodoxy. God help us if we find it there too. The writer of this article searched for what he found in Theosophy for nearly half a lifetime before he discovered it. The day that orthodoxy becomes a part and parcel of Theosophy, he will leave it and start looking for something else. May that day never come!—And we believe it never will.

A reader protests against our treating as a joke the attempts of the antis to discredit our leaders. But they do not deserve to be treated seriously. The people who are attacked so overtower the attackers that the efforts of the latter as compared with the achievements of the former *are* a joke.

Often when some particularly virulent letter reaches us we find the writer is not even a subscriber. That is usually the case with those who wish us to change the entire policy and content of the paper.

PERHAPS IT'S A TEST

I has always seemed to us that one of the things our earthly experiences (perhaps our astral experiences too) are most concerned with developing is Faith. Faith in ourselves and in our ability to accomplish any right thing on which we set our mind. Faith also in others who have helped us toward undersanding life and its meaning, the finest thing one person can do for another and one which a lifetime of gratitude is not too much to repay.

Faith can only be strengthened and deepened by withstanding assaults upon it. There is no other way to foster that weak little germ which in its early stages tends to wither up and die on the slightest provocation or on no provocation at all. And it is evident that life itself has made ample provision for testing it. Let one acquire a belief in something just a little different than the conventional world believes in or in someone who teaches something a little different. No matter how good, how noble, how helpful the belief may be, there are thousands waiting for the chance to kick it to pieces—not physically but by sneer, innuendo, double talk. No matter how lofty and pure minded may be the teacher, there are always the envious, the scoffing or just the generally ill-natured with no special object in view, who will assail him, his motives, his life, his teachings, everything about him.

This is especially true regarding occult teaching and teachers. The aspirant will not have gone far before his faith in what he has learned and the people who have imparted it to him, will be violently assailed. It will be no easy test to which he is subjected. It will be cunningly devised to break him down at his weakest point. It will be carried out by those who seem to have all the logic and right (at first) on their side. His painfully acquired knowledge will be shown, apparently, as a tissue of absurdities. He will be ridiculed and held in contempt for his credulity. Those to whom he felt so beholden will be pitilessly branded as frauds, charlatans or worse.

No amateurs will be his critics. Their case will be carefully constructed and vigorously prosecuted. Very likely his own family and close friends will turn on him with shouts of indignation for having disgraced them by his stupid beliefs, his other worldliness, his interest in things no sane person bothers with.

If he is a young soul or a weak one he will undoubtedly succumb. It takes battle-field courage to stand up against the sort of insidious attacks the sophisticates know too well how to deliver. Few can "take it." They retire unhappily from what seems to be an unequal contest, disillusioned and miserable. Life is never quite the same after that. Assured that their golden discovery is after all only brummagem tinsel, they have no heart for further search. But they may take heart. They were not quite ready, not quite strong enough in spirit. They will hear the same truth next time in some far off life. They will experience similar tests. And

next time they won't give up. Perhaps all of us have to react badly the first time. Maybe those who don't, went through the ordeal centuries ago and then failed. But if we can stand up under it we may thank the blessed karma which gave us the vision to distinguish the things of God which the natural man receives not, from the foolishness of men.

And here it is in action:

H. P. Blavatsky, one of the outstanding lightbringers of the modern world, sincere, outspoken, the soul of integrity, hating trickery and underhandedness, was accused of the things she most hated. She was guiltless, of course, but those of her followers who, not recognizing the test for what it was couldn't "take it," left her, dropped her teachings and with them their newly found peace of mind.

Annie Besant, who lived her entire life for others, selflessly, usefully, achieving even outside of Theosophy a position as a leader never in many respects equaled by any other woman, was accused of vaulting ambition, deception and intrigue. False, of course, but again many who were once proud and honored to call her leader, did not recognize their testing and, sadly enough, failed. They too will do better next time.

C. W. Leadbeater to whom so many owe so much, exponent of the Ancient Wisdom in language of unexcelled beauty, purity, loftiness, gave up all the material comforts of life to serve the Master who called him. Vilified, abused, his motives misinterpreted, his great clairvoyant powers impugned, he serenely pursued his even course. Never deigning to notice his screaming critics, not giving them even the negative satisfaction of his contempt, he, as he himself expressed it, never lost one night's sleep by reason of their malice. But some of those who had believed in him lost many nights' sleep. They couldn't "take it." They fell away. And in so doing hurt no one more than themselves.

We believe most profoundly that these tests were foreordained as part of the ordeal which every would-be occultist must successfully pass before he may make further progress toward the Path on which he would set his feet. We count it a high honor to be attacked and vilified by those who attack and vilify them. There have been many courses of action of which we were not sure, which we took with hesitation hoping for the best. But of our course in believing in and defending Blavatsky, Besant and Leadbeater we have never had a moment's doubt. For what we owe to them in peace of mind, happiness, certainty for the future, it is little enough but it is all that we can now give. And if this declaration means, as it probably does, more vituperation and revilement, we shall be very proud.

Now someone should write a book on being born, which is also a recurring experience, and much more unpleasant than dying. That is probably why the dying seldom cry and those aborning nearly always do.

ANTI-REINCARNATION ARGUMENTS ANSWERED

14. Q. Belief in reincarnation requires too many suppositions of things which may or may not be so, but for which no proof exists.

A. It is curious how the average human mind balks at the possibility that it may believe too much, while the idea that it may believe too little troubles it not at all.

Before attempting to show that so far from no proof existing for our "suppositions" there are many, let us examine the suppositions on which other beliefs are based and see if they are more provable than our own.

The beliefs we will review will be those which anyone may hold and still be perfectly "respectable," not like the alarming Theosophists who would keep dragging man back from the hereafter to dose him with more years of earth-life.

Let us take then (a) The belief that man is punished or rewarded after death. (b) That there is no hereafter at all. (c) That he may go to an eternal hell or an eternal heaven and once in either place there he stays.

These will be enough to go on with. They are selected because those who hold them are in entirely good standing (philosophically speaking) with the rest of the world while those who believe in reincarnation are (also philosophically speaking) outcasts. We refer to the western world, of course.

(a) Belief in after-death punishment or reward. Note that punishment is mentioned first, as it usually is by those who preach it. On what supposition or set of suppositions is this belief based? Anyone can answer that, and the answer can only be that it is logical to *suppose* that it would be so. Evil "deserves" punishment, good "deserves" reward. Also the Bible says so.

If these suppositions are more provable than ours, we would like to have that fact demonstrated. Why is it so logical? It certainly does not always happen here on earth. Sometimes the "sinner" is punished. Often he escapes. "Ah, but his conscience punishes him," we are told. How does anybody know that? Sometimes it does, undoubtedly, but have our friends who are so sure of that pleasing *denouement* examined the conscience of each sinner to be sure for themselves that it is properly flagellating him? They have been told, perhaps, by a choice collection of sinners that such was the case. But perhaps the sinners, or some of them, were lying. Do we not all know of people who go through life breaking every law of God and man and die in the odor of sanctity, not in the least disturbed by their villainies so far as anyone can detect—rather proud of them, in fact?

"They will get theirs, hereafter," our pious brother assures us and we can only reply, "You hope." But hope is not proof, and nothing we see on earth is proof either conclusive or even inconclusive that things are arranged differently in the beyond.

Or let us consider the converse—the good man who reaps only trouble on earth—and

there are more of him than the other kind. Who knows that he will wear a crown, play a harp or hold a sceptre in the "kingdom," if he is so fatuous as to want to do these inane things? Who knows he will have any kind of a reward? Seemingly he has been punished here for being good and the wicked brother has been rewarded for being bad. What proof is there that it won't be the same "over there?" A horrible idea? Truly. But you called on us for proofs and we are calling on you. You have hopes, you have beliefs, you have assurances, you have, no doubt, what you would call inner knowledge. But these are not proofs. Certainly it is outrageous to suppose that in the hereafter one would reap punishment for being good and reward for being bad? We agree, but it happens or seems to happen here—quite often. Why couldn't it happen there? It shouldn't. Certainly not. Of course it ought to be made up to the suffering good man when he dies and of course the happy bad man ought to "get his." But how do you know that it works out that way? You suppose? Friend, suppositions are not proofs. You told us so.

The Bible? As yes, the Bible. Or perhaps the Church. But words written in any book, no matter how sacred, or spoken by any man or set of men, no matter how holy, ARE NOT PROOFS. And it was proofs upon which you insisted, was it not?

Our atheistic friend who espouses Belief (b) that there is no hereafter, will highly approve the foregoing but he need not feel too elated. His own hopeless creed will stand no closer examination. What evidence has he that the body contains no invisible principle that survives its dissolution? It is on the assurance that there is no such principle because he can't see one that he bases his nihilistic philosophy. A flimsy supposition. Our senses are constructed to apprehend material things. Any soul or spirit that outlasts the body must of necessity be immaterial. If it could be seen it would not be a soul but something made of matter and therefore perishable with the body. Our materialist, who prides himself so strongly upon his common sense in disbelieving anything he cannot see, has no better case than the credulous religionist.

How about the flaming Belief (c) held by the permanent hell-fire fans, who also accord endless blessedness to the right believer after one short earth incarnation? If they have to produce material proofs they are certainly in a bad way. There is not the remotest analogy in anything that we can see happening here for the startling supposition that our destiny for all eternity hereafter rests on what we do or believe or accept while living on earth. It can only be supposition piled on supposition—authority piled on authority. But neither the suppositions nor the authorities have the slightest validity from the evidential standpoint. They may be very old, but age is no proof of the truth of anything. Belief in reincarnation is thousands of years older than belief in eternal heaven and hell, so if age is proof of truth it should be several times as true. It may be accepted by mil-

lions, but millions more accept the idea of rebirth, so that again is valueless as evidence.

The only answer is to say, "I was taught it as a child, have grown up believing it. I have confidence in those who taught it to me. They devoted their lives to studying such things." We have no quarrel with that answer. We have respect for that person's faith, but in fulfillment of our present task we would point out that any Hindu, or Buddhist or Confucian or even one raised a Theosophist could make the same rejoinder with the same sincerity. And each of them would be believing something different. So obviously this constitutes no proof.

There does not seem to be much left of the objection unless it is permitted to apply to any religion, philosophy or intangible idea in which anyone, including the objector, sees fit to believe. In the next installment, however, we will try to be more positive and to show that there are proofs, as solid and substantial as anything material, yes infinitely more so, to which one can point with absolute certainty. They buttress the belief in rebirth as the most logical probability that has ever entered the mind of man.

[To Be Continued]

GEOFFREY HODSON ON "BACK TO BLAVATSKY"

There has appeared in recent years a "Back to Bibles" movement. This title may not be quite accurate, but it is a back to something beginning with a "B" and would appear to mean much the same thing. Such a movement has a legitimate place in a free thinking Society as long as its members concede to those who do not join it the freedom of opinion they claim for themselves. But when they are heard denouncing those who differ from them, and declaring unorthodox and therefore untrue, newly polished facets of the diamond truth not uncovered when their Bibles were written, they become a danger to the health of the movement.

[From a MS. "Our Work, Some Personal Views," in possession of the editor. To be published later as a complete series.]

H. P. BLAVATSKY ON CRITICS

From her Introductory to *The Secret Doctrine*

To my judges, past and future, therefore—whether they are serious literary critics or those howling dervishes in literature who judge a book according to the popularity or unpopularity of the author's name, who, hardly glancing at its contents, fasten like lethal *bacilli* on the weakest points of the body—I have nothing to say. Nor shall I condescend to notice those crack-brained slanderers—fortunately very few in number—who, hoping to attract public attention by throwing discredit on every writer whose name is better known than their own, foam and bark at their very shadows.

PERSONAL OPINIONS

By L. W. ROGERS

WENDELL WILLKIE'S BOOK

[Continued from Last Month]

Mr. Willkie has very definite ideas about what should now be done. "America must choose one of three courses after this war," he says,—"narrow nationalism, which inevitably means the ultimate loss of our own liberty; international imperialism, which means the sacrifice of some other nation's liberty; or the creation of a world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation," and he expresses great confidence that our choice of the latter will be overwhelming. To succeed he holds that three things are necessary:—"first, we must plan now for peace on a world basis; second, the world must be free, politically and economically, for nations and for men, that peace may exist in it; third, America must play an active, constructive part in freeing it and keeping its peace." He does not let his readers forget for a moment that the freedom he has in mind is personal as well as national, is economic as well as political, and declares "political internationalism without economic internationalism is a house built upon sand." He assures us that "no nation can reach its fullest development alone,"—an obvious truth to the student of evolution.

The most impressive thing to be found in *One World* is the universal awakening that its writer observed in all the countries he visited. He says: "When I say that in order to have peace this world must be free, I am only reporting that a great process has started which no man can stop. Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually and spiritually. After centuries of ignorant and dull compliance, hundreds of millions of people in eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them . . . They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent." That is the great and vital fact that is destined to transform our modern civilization. It is a vast evolutionary movement that is slowly lifting the submerged portion of humanity to the surface.

In the chapter on "Our Imperialisms at Home" the author reminds us that we use grand language about the failure of other nations to grant full freedom while we are silent about the denial of it to our own minorities, and says: "Freedom is an indivisible word. If we want to enjoy it and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin. We cannot, with good conscience, expect the British to set up an orderly schedule for the liberation of India before we have decided for ourselves to make all who live in America free." Incidentally he brings out the point that public opinion in the British Empire may be ahead of that in the United States in the matter of freedom for others. Referring to the Atlantic Charter

he says that he was somewhat disturbed by the remark of Mr. Churchill that its provisions did "not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of British Empire." He says that in practically every country he visited he was asked by prime ministers and foreign ministers if that meant that the Atlantic Charter was to be applied only to western Europe. And he continues: "I have been cheered since, however, by discussion with many British now resident in the United States, by following the British press, and by an amazingly large and steadily continuing correspondence from people in England and all over the British Empire, to find that British public opinion on these matters is even ahead of opinion in the United States. The British have no doubt—and, so far as I can see, little regret—that the old imperialism must pass and that the principles of the British Free Commonwealth of Nations must be extended at a rapidly accelerating pace to all corners of the British Empire."

People everywhere, says Mr. Willkie, are watching to see whether the leaders who have given us a statement of grand and unselfish principles to fight for "really meant what they said"; and he thinks that if the world is disappointed in that the peoples will "turn to a corrosive cynicism that will destroy every chance "of world order"; a conclusion with which most of us will probably agree.

[The End]

A quality not often stressed by spiritual teachers, but of enormous consequence in enabling life to be lived purposefully is *indifference*. Indifference as against identification. Indifference to insult, to slights, to attack, to ridicule—to everything that by recognition would disturb the peace of mind without one being able to do anything about it. This does not mean indifference to things about which one can do something. But every day and in every life aggravations occur about which nothing can be done. The old saw, "What can't be cured must be endured" would better read "What can't be cured should be ignored." But people identify themselves with all these annoying trifles, pour thought into them, enhance them. And accomplish thereby not the slightest good, only harm. As such things try to enter your consciousness image them in your mind as being swallowed up by a mountain of good feeling and then annihilated by a swift rush of complete indifference to what they are, who said them, who did them. You will live longer, more happily, you will get more worthwhile things done. Try it. What have you to lose except headaches?

We have decided that we may safely reincarnate here in 750 years or so. It won't take that long to dispose of Hitler and Tojo. For awhile it looked bad.

WHEN WE ARRIVE ON THE ASTRAL PLANE

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

When we arrive on the Astral Plane,
After we've dropped this physical wrapping,
We shall find we have made a remarkable gain
If the Angel of Death didn't catch us napping.
More familiar to most than are Greece or Spain
Is our old acquaintance, the Astral Plane.

There's no physical pain
On the Astral Plane;
No clothes to be bought—
We shall make them of thought.
No money to earn,
But lessons to learn.

When we arrive on the Astral Plane
There'll be plenty to do for those intellectual
But the layout up there, it is perfectly plain,
For our worldly affairs will be quite ineffectual.
No bosses to whom we must cater or truckle;
No games—neither baseball nor bridge nor pinochle.

For we cannot raise Cain
On the Astral Plane;
But there's music and art
In a subplane apart.
There is loving and living,
But no marriage giving.

When we arrive on the Astral Plane
If we've lived a good life we shall certainly like it;
If our grading is low there'll be chances to hike it;
But with things that uplift we must be in accord
Or there's no doubt at all we'll be frightfully bored.

Yes, there we must go
For three decades or so,
To purge out the dross
Ere to Heaven we cross.
It is natural enough,
In fact very old stuff.

We won't balk at all at the Astral Plane.
We've been there so often we'll feel quite at home,
We shall meet all our friends—John, Bill, Mary and Jane
And all those that we knew, from Miami to Nome.
To see them our necks we will not have to crane,
One can look front or back on this excellent plane.

There we'll all be again
On the Astral Plane.
There is nothing to fear,
God is there same as here.
For our progress He made it;
With Love overlaid it.

RUSSIA: A MODERN MIRACLE

[Continued from Page 41]

ished war wreck, handicapped with many different languages, arrived at the same goal in twenty years and without any financial assistance from abroad, while some of America's greatest enterprises enjoyed practically unlimited foreign credit. Russian enterprises not only compare favorably with those of the United States but in some instances surpass them. The Dnieper dam was one of the world's greatest engineering feats; but it was only one in a series of dams linking rivers and lakes into a vast transportation system, supplying power for all sorts of manufacturing and lighting the nation from the cities to remote villages and farms. If we Americans are inclined to be a bit boastful of our great power plant at famous Niagara Falls we may cultivate modesty by remembering that the Dnieper plant alone supplies nearly twice the power of Niagara! In all Europe there is nothing that even approaches that electrical Hercules.

Not long ago the United States led the world in the manufacture of agricultural machinery but now holds second place to Russia. In the machine building industry America is still first with Russia close behind. Notwithstanding the immense American factories at Detroit, Russia is said to have the world's largest automobile plant. One of her engine works supplies the Russian railways with more than a thousand locomotives a year. The manufacture of machinery of every description seems to be included in the mechanization plan and the capacity of the plants is rapidly growing. The Five Year Plan is so named because the productive capacity doubles in that time! American Ambassador Davies, commenting favorably on Russian art, says "Public improvements—bridges, roads, canals—are impressive not only in themselves but in the speed of their projection." In the city of Moscow in one year (1937) 157 school buildings were erected! If governments may be said to have hobbies, education is that of the Soviets. Not only is it absolutely free but it includes everybody, from the kindergarten to the oldest of the adults. Commenting on the educational system Ambassador Davies remarks that illiteracy has practically disappeared in Russia.

In the beginning the U.S.S.R. had, of course, to import both machines and engineers; but it set its own citizens to work with the machines turned out by the new factories. Naturally the waste was appalling for a time. While the earliest of the enterprises were under way thousands of young Russians were being trained and educated. Buildings for technical schools and colleges were quickly constructed and equipped. By 1935 over five hundred thousand students were enrolled in them. Long before that date those graduated in the earlier years had replaced the imported talent and in the field of mechanics Russia was self sustaining. Some idea of the progress can be had from the fact that the total output in 1924 was six billion rubles while in 1937 it was eighty-five billion rubles.

Perhaps nothing shows more clearly the character of a government than its expendi-

tures for education and social welfare. The Soviet outlay for those essentials in 1924 (the second year after the famine) was one and a half billion rubles. In 1937 it was twenty-six and a half billion rubles. The government was spending about one-fourth of its income on that for which the Czars spent almost nothing. In the latter days of the Czars the reports show that 72% of the population was illiterate and that about four in every hundred citizens were receiving some sort of education. In some of the countries universities, and even secondary schools in the native language were forbidden. Education is always dangerous to autocracy.

The stupendous task of carrying out the Soviet ideal of universal education will be better understood by recalling the fact that nearly forty tribes in Asiatic Russia had no written language and alphabets had to be provided for them. But illiteracy does not mean stupidity. The ability to learn, and rapidly, was there. Merely the opportunity was lacking. In one of the Asiatic republics of the Union less than 4% of the people were literate in 1926. Thirteen years later 70% were literate. In order to remove the last vestige of hindrance to education the Soviet scheme provides for the payment of wages to students, a wage based upon earning capacity, but with a minimum sufficient for subsistence in any case.

Nothing is more indicative of the spirit of progress, and of the ability to see things in correct proportion, than the views held on the equality of the sexes. In the early stages of evolution physical force governed absolutely and therefore women were slaves. Only very slowly has the weaker sex advanced toward equality and in most parts of the earth still has a long way to go. When the race is at last fully civilized women will possess every right and privilege that men enjoy, not only politically but socially and economically. Russia is the one nation in the world today where such equality exists both as an ideal and as a constitutional guarantee. When the present Russian government came into power the status of women in Asiatic Russia was probably the worst known to modern times. Child marriage was more firmly established than in India. A wife was chattel goods and was bought and sold like other property. A wife was a slave in every sense of the term. To change in a few years this state of affairs, which had existed for unnumbered generations, seems like an impossible task. But hundreds of women volunteers from European Russia invaded the East, established tent social centers for women only. With the advent of these missionaries the U.S.S.R. launched an educational crusade, sending thousands of men and women to reside temporarily in the East and teach in whatever practical ways might be necessary to establish a higher type of life. An international Woman's Day was decreed, and the time finally arrived on March 8, 1928, —an emancipation day—when all women were invited to gather in the centers of the cities and towns, remove the huge black veils they had worn from childhood and burn those badges of their previous slav-

ery. That dramatic method, backed by governmental authority, appears to have been remarkably successful. Sex equality is absolute. There is no trade or profession from which a woman is excluded and no office in the nation which she may not hold. Nearly two hundred women now sit in the Supreme Council, which corresponds to the American Congress. Qualification, proved by a record of past success, seems to be the only requirement. The President of Tashkent, metropolis of Central Asia, rose from the ranks of illiterate servant girls. Among the Russian women are more than one hundred thousand engineers and technicians. A study of Soviet affairs seems to indicate that the manager of a factory arrives in that position by working up from the bottom and becoming familiar with all the details of the institution. Agronomy appears to be attractive to Russian women and they are conspicuous in winning medals and other awards for distinguished service in agriculture and horticulture. With its vast territory and varied climates Russia seems to present unusual opportunities and in all the sciences relating to plants and soil it is easily a world leader. The Russian system of public nurseries and kindergartens enables any woman to have her children well cared for during the hours she wishes to give to study or professional pursuits, and this is undoubtedly an important factor in her new freedom and accounts for the large number of women in active service, from agriculture to the purely intellectual professions.

[To Be Continued]

We have tried without avail to fathom the extraordinary intolerance of the so-called Blavatskyites for those who find good in Besant and Leadbeater. We confess that we are completely stumped by their medieval viewpoint. None of us is angry with them for rejecting the later teachings if they want to. That is their privilege. But why must they, in the most approved 14th Century style, try to crowd their beliefs on us? Can't we live and let live, Brethren? Can it be possible that old souls really act that way? We wonder, when they reach the other shore and proudly boast to H.P.B. how they persecuted her well-beloved pupil, Annie Besant, if she will not admonish them in the words of one yet greater than she: "I never knew you. Depart from me."

THE ZODIAC IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

(Citations are from the Adyar Edition)

"Whenever twelve are mentioned, they are invariably the twelve signs of the Zodiac."

*Vol. II: p. 377***5.—Leo**

"The highest group" (of Creative Powers) "is composed of the Divine Flames, so called, also spoken of as the 'Fiery Lions' and the 'Lions of Life' whose esotericism is seemingly hidden in the zodiacal sign of Leo."

Vol. II: p. 377

THOSE "CONFLICTS"

Asks our reader: "How about all this literature that has been put out by our leaders concerning the Liberal Catholic Church and Mr. Leadbeater being a priest in the same? If I understand it aright, Mrs. Besant says that Master K.H. advised it. Mr. Leadbeater claims that this same Master was a priest in a former life. The Master K.H. does not write in the little book "At The Feet Of The Master" as he does in his letters to Mr. Sinnett. How explain this?"

* * *

We would do better in answering these questions if exact references were cited, i.e., just where Dr. Besant states that the Master advised Bishop Leadbeater to become a Liberal Catholic priest or where C. W. L. claims that the Master himself was a priest in a former life. Often the exact wording of a passage and its context throw a great deal of light on the exact meaning of a quoted utterance.

It is not at all unlikely, however, that Bishop Leadbeater acted under inspiration or direct advice of his Master, to whom he was bound by the closest of karmic ties when he took the step referred to.

As to the Master himself being a priest in some prior incarnation we should require to know the details of this priesthood—in what race, religion and period of time. If our reader will furnish the exact reference we will be very glad to deal with the question.

Before going into the matter of the Liberal Catholic Church and Bishop Leadbeater's connection with it, we may dispose of the difference in the Master's style in the letters to A. P. Sinnett and in the little book referred to. There is no problem here. In the letters the Master was instructing a mature man, keenly intelligent, highly educated, the editor of a widely read newspaper and, incidentally, a bit on the skeptical side.

In the "Feet Of The Master," the instruction was directed to a 13 year old Indian boy, whose knowledge of English was limited, who had no such outlook or background as the man, who was not at all skeptical but a devout believer. How in the world could the Master use the same style or anything approaching it in dealing with two people so utterly dissimilar? Mr. Sinnett would certainly have resented the fatherly tone, the simple expressions, the homely language of the Krishnamurti instruction and the latter would hardly have comprehended a sentence if the Master had employed the scintillating phrases of his communications to Mr. Sinnett. Also the letters were composed about 30 years before the book. Style had been simplified, the ornate phraseology of the 'eighties largely supplanted by a simpler, more direct mode of expression. Had there been no change in style, that in itself would be the strongest possible evidence of forgery, of someone taking pains to imitate the Master's known modes of speech. The fact that not the least trace of such attempt is in evidence is a

striking proof of the genuineness of the book.

Now as to that much discussed institution The Liberal Catholic Church, for which by the way we hold no brief whatever, not being a member of it and having had our own troubles with overzealous church members who tried to bring the Church into the T.S., where most emphatically it does not belong.

Freedom of religion is guaranteed by the Constitution of this country and by the laws of the countries comprising the British Commonwealth. It is curious that those who display such untheosophical hatred toward the Liberal Catholic Church which teaches reincarnation, karma, existence of the Masters and the Path, in fact everything that the Theosophical Society teaches, have little or no objection to a Theosophist belonging to the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian or any other Christian Church which do *not* teach these things but abhor them. Where is the consistency? One would think a Theosophist, any Theosophist, would be delighted that a Church, any Church, followed its teachings so closely.

"But the ritual, the ceremonies, the Eucharist," the disapproving Theosophist rejoins. H.P.B. and the Masters condemned all such. Again we are faced by the impassable gulf between the traditional religions of their day and their superstitious use of these adjuncts to piety, and the highly enlightened employment of them by Liberal Catholics. Not everyone cares for ceremonial—we do not ourselves—but there are devotional natures that crave it and whose religious instincts cannot be satisfied without it. Is it not better for these to find it in the congenial theosophical atmosphere of this earnest little group of worshippers than to be forced into a communion which frowns on the basic truths of their philosophy of life? Persecution by Theosophists of the Liberal Catholic group is senseless and untheosophical. Yet the Church has not been blameless—or rather some members of the Church, for no official sanction so far as we know has been given their ill-advised efforts.

A great disservice has been done to their movement by the insistent attempt in some

cases to mingle Theosophical and Church activities. Enlightened Liberal Catholics deplore this as much as non-Catholic Theosophists. The heads of the Church deprecate it. It is no longer the problem it once was, as even the most ardent L.C.'s now seem to recognize that their cause can only be harmed, not helped, by identification with the T.S.

But while we have had our differences with the L.C.C. on matters such as this, we champion their right to exist and the right of a Theosophist to join, if he wishes, either this or any other Church. Actually, not more than two or three members of St. Louis Lodge are Liberal Catholics, so far as we know.

We think the Liberal Catholic movement has done much good and would have done much more had the zeal of its members to identify it with The Theosophical Society been more restrained. But that is now water over the dam and members of this Church or any Church or even of the T.S. are yet people—human beings with human frailties, and perfection is still a long way off.

As to Bishop Leadbeater's right to be a Liberal Catholic priest, why not, if he was so disposed? Col. Olcott became a Buddhist and actually wrote a catechism for Buddhist children which is still in use. But then, he was Col. Olcott, while C.W.L. whether bishop, priest or archangel, would be equally disapproved by those hundred percent Blavatskyites, *plus royaliste que le roi*, who forget that the first words their idol wrote in her Introductory to the *Secret Doctrine* were a quotation from Shakespeare, "Gently to hear, kindly to judge."

Your God within is eager to act, not for you but as you. No need to implore him to come to your rescue. He will hearken to the faintest call, if it be only sincere.

If you don't like yourself, try being your SELF.

Next month: An article by Idelle G. Luntz—GREMLINS, SATURN'S CHILDREN.

THE ZODIAC LOOKS WESTWARD

A new book on astrology, which correlates the trends of civilizations past and present with the cosmic precession of the equinox. Each portion of the globe is subjected to a complete analysis, and trends are given for each of the twelve sun signs. Students of history will find this volume fascinating to the extreme, while those interested in occult research will gain unshakable evidence of cosmic forces upon the life of man.

PRICE . . . \$1.00

Order From:

The Theosophical Society of St. Louis
5108 Waterman Avenue
St. Louis, Mo.

Good "Prospects" For Ancient Wisdom— Mental Scientists Divine Scientists And Kindred Groups



We have a list of Practitioners in every State of one of the largest of these groups (NOT Christian Scientists) and a donation of \$25.00 from a reader for one-year subscriptions to be sent to 25 of them.

ANCIENT WISDOM is matching this with \$25.00 from "The Editor's Discretion Fund" and will send 25 more. Fifty practitioners will receive ANCIENT WISDOM for a year—and these liberal-minded people are usually interested in the occult. Frequently they believe in and teach Theosophical ideas and welcome new presentations of occult fact.



FOR EVERY DOLLAR YOU SEND US TO CULTIVATE THIS NEW FIELD WE WILL ADD \$1.00 OURSELVES. WE WANT TO GET ANCIENT WISDOM INTO THE HANDS OF ALL THESE PRACTITIONERS, NOT JUST A FEW. IT SEEMS TO US TO BE A SOUND ENTERPRISE, WELL WORTH TRYING.



Distribution of sample copies do no good, in our experience. Short subscriptions are little better. One year free subscriptions have brought a surprisingly large number of renewals by the recipient himself. It seems they get used to receiving the paper, like it, and don't want it discontinued.

YOU WILL HELP, WON'T YOU?

ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS

320 MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE BLDG.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

THE OCCULT INTERPRETATION OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

[Continued from Page 41]

neath the surface of those things.

Now, getting back to this first part of the Commandment, which is really not a commandment at all but an introductory statement, the true consciousness of man, the monad, the Eternal Spirit, is occultly said to have come up from the mineral, vegetable and animal and then blended with something from a far higher plane and formed a human soul. Darwin's theory is that we came up from the animal, that is, our bodies were evolved through animal forms. We go a step further and tell you that a part of your consciousness came up that way also. That which is the real YOU—the reasoning power, the Divine Fragment—came down from God himself, but prior to that union or blending of the Divine with the evolved animal consciousness you functioned through animal bodies, and before that through vegetable forms, and before that through mineral encasements.

Now if the Ten Commandments were written by an Occultist he would have knowledge of that very old esoteric teaching of the origin and evolution of human consciousness. It is quite clear that Moses

must have been possessed of occult knowledge. You will remember that he was brought up at the Egyptian Court as the adopted son of an Egyptian Princess. The Biblical account will be familiar to many of you. It tells how the Egyptians, alarmed at the rapidity with which the Israelites were multiplying, indulged in the habit of throwing all the first-born sons of the Israelites into the river and Moses' mother, not wanting her son disposed of in that way, made a little ark or floating cradle for him and hid him in this under the bulrushes at the river's edge. Pretty soon, along came the King's daughter and observing a little baby, apparently abandoned, decided to adopt him, and she took him home and brought him up as her own son. In those days the kings, or Pharaohs of Egypt as they were called, were also the High Priests of Egypt and as such had a thorough knowledge of the esoteric or hidden teachings of the Egyptian religion which were in many respects identical with what we now call Theosophy.

So you see that, if Moses had wanted to bury that Occult Truth of the progress of the Ego or Soul or Spirit of man through the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms, what finer allegory could he have used than

to refer to these lowly forms in which the consciousness first manifested, as a "House of Bondage, a Land of Egypt." So I am going to submit this as my interpretation of the first Occult Truth hidden in the Ten Commandments.

The next part of the Commandment is: "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." I think that word "before" is very ambiguous. Most people would consider that this sounded as though you might have as many gods as you wanted to after the true God, providing you did not place any other before him. To get this straight I looked up the Latin version of the Ten Commandments and found that the word translated "before" was the Latin word *coram* which means "in the presence of." What God's words meant were "Thou shalt have no other gods in my presence." I mention this, although there is no occult meaning, to make it clear to anyone who may have wondered about that word "before."

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God." People wonder how God comes to speak of Himself as being jealous. In Latin the word used is *zelotes* which means zealous rather than jealous and indicates that God was zealous or jealous for the faithfulness of his people to Himself. I found a note in one of the commentaries stating that the word which stands for "jealous" in the original Hebrew means only jealous as applied to God and not to man. The word jealous was used just because there was no other word in the English language that would express the meaning.

[To Be Continued]

And now Mr. C. Jinarajadasa, former International Vice-President of The Theosophical Society, is taking the Editor of *The Canadian Theosophist* to task for objectionable statements made about C.W.L. (See correspondence in the July issue of that journal). This is heartening, following upon Dr. Arundale's castigation of the Blavatsky idol-worshippers and the letter of the English General Secretary, Mr. John Coats. If others, highly placed in the T.S. are going to carry on this fight, perhaps we can drop it, at least for the moment. We feel that we have done our share and it is still our hope that it may be taken up by the official organization in this country and carried to the noisy opposition. They have been gently dealt with for 25 years or more, and seem a trifle stunned that anyone should have the temerity to give them an answer. However, we will be back in the fray at any time we feel that our efforts are needed.

A sense of proportion is a good thing to possess when writing to a publication. We are often amazed at the multiple-page letters readers who disagree with us take the trouble to write about some insignificant fact not worth even the effort of looking up. We are reminded of the Latin proverb: "The mountain labored and brought forth a ridiculous mouse." Note: If it was a Greek proverb please don't bother to write us. We haven't space for a retraction.