

# **REINCARNATION**

VOL. V.

CHICAGO, JULY-AUGUST, 1919

No. 4

---

---

## *AMERICA MANDATORY FOR ARMENIA AND TURKEY*

The trend of the world's life to-day is toward the community of human interests whether the new unities be effected and maintained within states or between them, whether they be of one or of two or more continents. This our war-engendered sacrifices have vouchsafed for us.

The old order of retraction, of selfish withdrawal within fortified frontiers and the concentration of popular interest at a central point are phases of a statesmanship that was rendered obsolete by the quenching of the false fires of Germany. Happy the citizen, happy the statesman, who can recognize and act upon this principle. Co-operative activity is the order of the day. The com-

mon cry is: "Come, let us unite and carry out this work!" You hear this rallying cry on every hand.

America, that has held dear to her heart Washington's suggestion of isolation for our national life, must learn all anew the lesson that times have changed, that we must change with them and that we cannot remain aloof from the world's joys, its prosperity, or its sorrows and pains.

We have cleaned the world of Spain's belated tyrannies, we have taken on our shoulders the burden of Cuba's and of the Philippines' infantilism and we have borne a tardy but not un-heroic part in the great war.

But now the world needs help in many of the ways of peace. England's labor in upholding ancient India and venerable Egypt is not wholly selfish. The plan to give some of the steady-going nations protective powers over weak or crippled or backward lands is of brilliant conception, in harmony with the world's trend of progress.

America has reached the stage of her own existence and finds herself in the period of the world's life where she must share those burdens necessarily to be borne by the leading nations.

America's long-established interest in oppressed Armenia and her large tolerance of Turkey's crudities, combined with her ill-assorted friendship with the land of the Sultan make her the natural mandatory for these two countries.

And America should accept and play that rôle. The opportunity to restrain, to uphold, to teach and to discipline Turkey; and the felicity await-

ing the deliverer of Armenia, must not be lost to our land.

It will be at first a labor, a burden and a sacrifice to do this work. But the idealism of the country will rise to the requirement and the joy of unselfish achievement will infinitely more than repay the effort. And blessings that follow those who read the great lesson set for the men of an age or of a race to learn will fall abundantly upon us.

And with the efflorescence of the world's life now apparently ready to occur, both Turkey and Armenia should respond freely to our aid, joining in the march of civilization.

W. V-H.



LIBRARY  
GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY  
ILLINOIS.

22795

*CONCERNING "FATE"*

Who has not heard again and again the expression "as sure as fate"? One wonders what proportion of the great human family believes that fate is marked out for men and that there is no escape therefrom. More than that, one wonders how far they are from right.

When one starts in to collect data as to future events correctly foretold, it is surprising what is found. Dreams while sleeping, visions while waking, astrology, clairvoyance and premonitions, have all been agents for telling future happenings and, excepting the last, they seem to be means of bringing up the past as well.

The writer was particularly impressed by a simple case told by a friend. While thinking of nothing in particular there appeared before him a forest scene, a little water in the foreground, surrounded by a growth of timber and the ground covered by fallen leaves. He observed a fallen limb with one end on the bank and the other in the water, and perched on it was a little frog. Overcoming the startled feeling which the appearance of the vision gave him, he examined it rather deliberately and fixed what he saw well in his mind.

Two or three years later as he was walking through a piece of woodland, he suddenly had the feeling that the place was familiar to him, causing him to stop and look about, when there before him he recognized the pool of his vision, the stick partly submerged and thereon the little frog in his proper place and position, just as he had seen

him several years before that little frog was even a pollywog!

There is no end, apparently, of cases of visions true to the facts in every detail, seen years in advance of their happening in the physical world.

It was only after quite a search that the writer found a case where there was a change in detail between the vision and the later happening. In that case a man saw himself on the operating table, recognized the surgeon who was performing the operation and understood what the case was. Some years later he was operated on by that surgeon for the very condition he had sensed in his vision, but the operation was performed in a different manner.

Sometimes visions of the future are seen by people who do not seem to be concerned or connected with the happening.

Visions are seen that do not come true at all. The writer has been told of two cases in which the death of people was seen, but these people are still living after many years while a person seen as a spectator at one of the death scenes has passed away.

There are doubtless many kinds of dreams and visions, and some are symbolical, the ego speaking to the personality perhaps, which being taken for prevision of real concrete facts, are misinterpreted.

The more we seek to test the foretelling of future events by all the means available, the more are we driven to conclude that the forecast, vision or dream may be quite correct, quite wrong, or partly right and partly wrong.

Back as far as there is a record of human

thought there have been prophets who have attempted with more or less success or failure to foretell the future. Probably one of the boldest of such efforts, written many thousands of years ago is to be found in the *Book of Enoch*, and perhaps none are more true or more difficult to read aright.

What, then, is "fate"? The question can only be answered when we know what man is and what God's plan for him is. There is a fate (or destiny) for man, the surest of all sure fates, —to reach the goal God has set for man.

Man has two natures: one that will respond in a perfectly definite way to outer circumstances and if that were all there was to him he would turn endlessly on the wheel of karma, the victim of a fate he could not break. But man has another nature: the divine, that maketh its own road according to the "Word." Of the former we may say that it is ruled by "the stars," of the latter it rules "its stars."

Our thoughts, feelings and actions of to-day are soft and plastic as the potter's clay, but mixed with those of yesterday and to-morrow they will harden to make the iron bonds of our future. Only as our thoughts, feelings and actions carry in themselves no personal element will they cease to react upon us personally and enable us by degrees to break the bonds of fate and live the life that is in harmony with the "Law."

*Elliot Holbrook.*

## CONSCIENCE.

In the Sunday *New York American* of January 26th there appeared an editorial under the caption, "The Blind and the Lost Leader," illustrated by a picture of six blind men, six blind women, and a child, lost in a dark wood with their leader sitting dead amongst them. The following extract contains the gist of the article. The italics are mine:

This picture illustrates a strange, gloomy play, "The Sightless," born in the mind of Maeterlinck, who says he may not "lose his love for them," and says of himself and other human beings:

"In reality we live only from soul to soul, and we are gods who do not know each other."

There is only one scene in the play. The characters are twelve, living and blind, and one that had sight and could lead them sits dead among them.

The blind are living on a little island. They are supposed to represent the human race and their island, the world. A blind man asks, "Has anybody seen this island in other days, and can he tell us where we are?" The oldest blind woman answers, "We were all blind when we came here." The sixth old blind man says to the very beautiful young blind woman, "It is said that you are beautiful, like a woman that comes from some far place." The young woman answers, "I never saw myself." That is her sorrow. She cannot see her own beauty, and those around her are only old, blind men that cannot see it. The oldest blind man is made by Maeterlinck to describe human beings as they live together, not seeing each other.

He says: "We have never seen each other. We question each other and we answer each other. We live together, we are always together, but we do not know what we are. In vain we touch each other with both hands. The eyes know more than the hands."

As those unhappy blind lived, not knowing each other, so, Maeterlinck would have you understand, *human beings*

*mentally blind live together, talk and answer, but do not know each other.*

One of the blind men is deaf and dumb as well as blind. Three of them have been blind from birth. Three once had sight. The critics tell you to admire Maeterlinck's peculiar genius of observation at a point in the play when the blind discuss the sky.

Maeterlinck says, "All lift their eyes toward the sky, with the exception of the three that were born blind. They continue to look upon the ground."

Having never been able to see, the sky means nothing to them. When it is spoken of they do not lift their eyes toward it.

Those that *once could see*, and by them Maeterlinck means those human beings *formerly enlightened*, are different from the blind that have never had sight.

The young blind woman says, "I seem to feel the moonlight on my hands." The oldest blind woman says, "I think the stars are out; I hear them." The first man born blind says, "I hear no noise." The second born blind says, "I hear nothing but the noise of our breathing." The third born blind says, "I have never heard the stars." That is the Maeterlinck way of describing human intelligences. If you should tell Maeterlinck that such talk bored you, he would answer: "So it would bore my characters born blind."

Thus through the entire play blind men and women talk, the old women praying, the insane woman sobbing, the man blind and dumb seeing and hearing nothing, the child crying when frightened by the noise of birds flying in the darkness. Some of the blind people try to find their way out of the forest. They strike the rocks, are hurt by thorns, come back to their blind companions, cold and fearful.

They think they hear footsteps, coming through the wood.

The snow falls. The blind say, "Let us stay here and press on against one another close together."

The footsteps approach. It is death coming to them all. That is the end of Maeterlinck's play.

We are all blind, men and women, old and young. Some

of us are able to see in youth, for youth is the period of truth, vision, genius.

All of us are lost without the leader, which in the individual is what we call conscience, plus will, courage and other qualities that are slowly leading them out of the forest of savagery, selfishness and ignorance.

In the individual *when conscience dies*, and in the nation when its conscience dies, it will not get out of trouble until it finds a new leader.

When conscience dies? Does conscience ever die? Is there a man or woman who reads these lines who is willing to admit that conscience *can* die?

What is conscience? It is the faculty by which distinctions are made between the right and wrong in conduct and character. It is entirely conceivable that those of Maeterlinck's blind characters who never had sight (enlightenment), could not tell the sky from a dung heap, and could not have developed much conscience to speak of.

Those, however, who once had sight (enlightenment) could never have lost it. Maeterlinck's simile (blindness) is poorly chosen, for sight is a physical function, easily destroyed, while enlightenment is exclusively psychical, and, once attained, is ours forever and can not be lost again, no more than can the conscience that is awakened in us through enlightenment.

Of course, it is quite within reason to believe that circumstances might arise, as, for instance, a brutal war, that would for a time dull the conscience of men and nations, but it can never be truly said that conscience could become so utterly lost to the enlightened soul that it could not find a way to pilot it out of the dark wood of despair.

Reincarnationists can take issue with the editor

on his statement, "We are all blind, men and women, old and young. Some of us are able to see in youth, for youth is the period of truth, vision, genius." If we had sight (enlightenment) in youth, we surely have profited by it and have added to it as we grow older. If we have enlightenment to the extent of being able to keep our bodies in health and free from the decrepitude born of ignorance, we will always feel the everlasting youth that is the soul's heritage, no matter how old our bodies. And, what is more, as soul evolution is made only during incarnations, the mature years in each incarnation will be the most enlightened and also the most pleasurable.

Reincarnationists can realize more than any others that souls which have become truly enlightened can never go back, but must go ever upward. They realize that the unenlightened soul, on the other hand, is forever slipping and uncertain as to its footing, needing the strong arm of its enlightened brothers to help it on its way. The strong should help the weak by helpful talks and writings, such as appear in this magazine, and in course of time, by slow degrees, we will come to the point where souls will have evolved so they *will know each other*, in spite of the pessimistic views of Maeterlinck. Nature has all the time and material, and is working for the best interests of all her children, but the mentally blind must be led to her for guidance.

*William W. Weiting.*

## EVIL

What is evil? Is it the work of beings of ill will, of chance, or is it a necessary part of the scheme of evolution? And what attitude should man take toward evil?

In the first place, evil is a relative thing. It does not affect all people equally. There is good reason to believe that some men have transcended evil, so that they are not affected by it. From this it may be concluded that evil is not external to man, but is within his own consciousness.

But while the evil is within the man, there may be something outside him which has much to do with the existence of evil. Man usually blames the external circumstances which are associated with evil and calls them evil. He does not want to admit that evil is within him.

When it is said that evil is within the man, this does not necessarily mean that the man himself is evil. Sometimes it is so, but usually he is pained by the outer condition and condemns it as bad. He thinks he is passing a final judgment upon the so-called evil outside, but in fact he is merely stating how *he himself* has been affected by it. Thus he is really judging himself, while he thinks he is judging something external.

The man who thinks that evil is real and outside himself is quite likely to believe that there are beings who are evil and who take pleasure in tormenting him. This is not a conclusion that would indicate a careful, logical thinker. An unprejudiced mind should be able to note that in the physical world there is an exact correspondence between cause and effect, that nothing ever

happens by chance, that there is always a physical reason for every physical change.

While evil is thought to be external, men will attack it outside of themselves. All the extremists, reformers and revolutionists are more or less deeply deceived by the illusion that evil is in the world rather than in men. Such people as have not yet learned that evil is really rooted in the hearts of men, are easily led by the evil tendencies within them to inflict cruelty upon other men in order to make them "good." Such were the leaders of the inquisition, the "Holy Office," so-called. Many extremists would kill those men who they believe are responsible for some evil that exists in the world.

The philosophy of karma is a wonderful eye-opener in dealing with the problem of evil. It teaches that the universe is majestically moving onward in evolution according to orderly processes, that the conditions in which men find themselves have been prepared by themselves. The evil which afflicts and pains men is, generally speaking, the result of the erroneous actions, or sins, as religionists would call them, of the men who see or feel the evil. While it is often wise to try to change external conditions, it is always wise to change one's own consciousness, or mode of life, to restore an equilibrium which has been disturbed, and thereby do away with "evil."

When some men who saw evil outside themselves, wished to stone the woman taken in sin, the gentle Christ said, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone." This served to turn their minds to the contemplation of their own hearts, and no doubt the presence of the great

consciousness of the Christ helped them to recognize the evil within, which they had, acting under illusion, projected outward. "To the pure all things are pure." "Look in the heart for the source of evil and expunge it."

From these facts and considerations may be concluded that man should always be careful how he attacks evil. If he sees evil outside himself with a feeling of hate or repulsion, it is at least highly probable that the evil is in his own heart. Under such circumstances to pronounce judgment and then to execute it, is to pronounce judgment against himself, and to open the way for the reaction, belonging to the action, to come to him in due time and strike him with the same intensity of feeling and action that he himself made use of in attacking the evil supposed outside.

It is a well-recognised principle in law that the judge must be personally disinterested in the case about to be tried. Few men are sufficiently disinterested to decide just where evil resides. For this reason it is much more safe and proper that men should work in constructive ways to make the world better, rather than that they should use the destructive methods of hate and condemnation. "He who draws the sword shall perish by the sword."

C. S.



## EVOLUTION VERSUS BOLSHEVISM.

Bolshevism is based on selfishness. The idea of Bolshevism is to get. Those who *have not* think that their time *to have* has come. It is a popular conception that the world is in a transition stage. Most everyone feels that there is going to be a new order of things, but just what that will be like no one seems to have a very definite idea. To many it simply means change from present conditons. And we find the strength of the appeal of Bolshevism rests largely in its promises of riches to the poor, homes to the homeless and food for the starving.

But whatever change comes to the world at this time, whether it be in supplying the physical wants of the needy or giving more leisure to the overworked or furnishing something to do for the idle rich, it must, in order to be permanent, be based on what is right and the idea of service.

It is a common misconception that there is injustice in the world. There is a deep feeling in all the laboring classes that our whole civilization is founded on injustice. The toilers of industry feel that they have not had a square deal. Without doubt, whatever acceptance Bolshevism finds with the masses is rooted in this sense of the wrong they feel has been done them. The tremendous forces we see gathered by the movement is the result of efforts to correct the suffering that the oppressed have endured for ages.

If you accept the common belief of the western world that the soul of man is something generated with the birth of the body, that each child is a new spark of the Divine Life just starting

its pilgrimage on earth, I do not see how you are going to get away from the philosophy of Bolshivism. By what sort of reasoning are you going to justify present conditions? Why is not one soul entitled to the same consideration and environment as another? Where is the justice in putting a brand new soul in a diseased or malformed body? Where is the fairness in starting some souls in poverty amid wretched conditions and others in places with every opportunity for health and education. Democracy gives us equality before the law. What the bolshevist wants is an equality of birth and living conditions. He wants every new soul to have an equal chance in the race of life. And according to the philosophy of the western world, is he not right in this demand?

To successfully combat the propaganda of bolshevism we need a right philosophy, the philosophy of evolution, or progressive growth. According to this philosophy of life, men are in different stages of growth. Consequently some are older souls than others, having been out of the animal kingdom for a longer period of time. This means that some souls have been on earth more times than others, have had more experience and therefore know more. Seen from this viewpoint, there is no injustice in conditions in which people are born, because they are placed just where they deserve to be. There is a just law regulating this fact of rebirth. There is no chance in this world. The law of cause and effect is undeviating. What we are we have made ourselves. Nothing can come to us but what we have caused. In whatever conditions we find ourselves at birth,

we may rest assured that those are the very conditions we prepared for ourselves in our previous lives. In other words, "We are our own children." Men are born rich or poor, weak or strong, because they deserve to be. And we are now sowing the causes that will give us our status in our later earthly lives.

Evolution teaches us that men are not equal, but are at various steps on the ladder of life. You cannot have a complete system of evolution, or progressive growth, without taking into consideration the growth of the soul. There must be a progressive expansion of consciousness as well as a continued improvement in the form in which it expresses itself. That men have different talents simply means that some have earned one talent, others another. Nothing is given in this world. This idea that gifts are God-given is a twin-brother to the other fallacy that there is such a thing as chance in a world of law and order. What we are we have earned, and we reap the effects of our own sowing. A just God could not establish any other kind of a universe.

We take the sting out of the bolshevist cry of injustice when we show that there is no injustice in the world. If this were the only life we have lived on this planet, there might be some question about the justice of certain conditions. But when we take into consideration the fact that we all have lived many times on earth and that there is a law of sequence that runs through them all we realize that existing conditions for which we cannot find any sensible cause in the present life probably had their origin in some past life. A man who believes in the law of cause and ef-

fect has no place in his philosophy for the word injustice. It may be that certain conditions are wrong, because that is wrong which retards evolution, but it cannot therefore be said to be unjust. Whatever helps evolution is right; whatever retards it is wrong. And no doubt there are many things which we will change so as to make easier the evolution of men.

The principle of service is the other element which any change in the world's conditions must have in order to be permanent. This embodies the idea of unselfishness as exemplified in the life and death of our Master. Christianity is founded on unselfishness. Bolshevism is rooted in selfishness. The idea of one is get; of the other, to give. One seeks to slay others; the other sacrifices self. The bolshevik will stop at nothing to gain his object; the Christian insists that the means must deserve the end. There is no compromise between these two ideas, and one or the other must fall in the death grapple that is going on in the world today.

True it is that we have to a certain extent commercialized Christianity. We have been taught that if we gave up certain earth pleasures that we would thereby gain heaven. In order to curry favor with our fellowmen, we have advertised our charities. These are both subtle forms of selfishness. When we realize that this one life on earth is not all, but that many lives on this planet lie before us, we begin to take into consideration what will be the effects in those lives of the things we do in this life. When we know that the operation of the law of cause and effect is sure and certain, we see the oppressor

of today the oppressed of tomorrow. Then we see that it is the duty of the strong to protect the weak, and the right of the weak to be protected. If shorter hours of toil are necessary to afford time for study and recreation, if child labor should be prohibited in order that the body may have a chance to perfect itself so that it may become a better vehicle for the soul's use, if labor should more fully enjoy the profits of industry, thereby stimulating the individual to greater effort; in other words, if these and many other things will aid in the evolution of the race they are right and should prevail.

In this time of discussion of changes and outward conditions, let us not overlook the most important change of all—that of the individual. Utopia inhabited by selfish creatures is still a lion's den. It isn't the scenery but the individual that counts. Give us people of peace and love—unselfish love—and they will change the most wretched spot on earth to a paradise. Really there are only two kinds of people on earth: those who help others and those who do not. One is represented by the Christian and the other by the bolshevik. One is doing for others, the other is grabbing for self. One sends kind thoughts and gifts to his fellow men, the other expresses his love with a bomb.

Some have been on earth more times than others and are therefore older souls. They are the more advanced individuals of the human race. They are particularly their brother's keeper. And it rests upon them to show mankind a new and better way. They must light anew the idea of sacrifice on the altar of humanity. We have in

our literature and educational life burned into the heart of man that the great thing in the world was to have and to do for one's self. These leaders of the van must now scorn those who do for self alone, and honor only those who do for others. This will now become the password to the hall of fame: "*What has he done for others?*" And in this criterion, it is not how much did he do, but what sacrifice did he make. The man who sacrifices all, though that all be small, has made the great gift. Humanity is at the cross-roads. Those who realize that the stones with which we build—the individuals—are of more importance than the size and shape of the structure, will bend every effort to the hewing and shaping of those stones. In this work there is no greater help than that of telling and teaching others the correct philosophy of life, that is, that of evolution. The philosophy of evolution takes into consideration the growth of the soul as well as that of the body, and in order to do this takes cognizance of the fact of rebirth and the great law of cause and effect. When you give this knowledge to your fellow men you are helping them to help themselves, for they then have an answer to life's riddles. Having solved their individual problems, they become efficient workers in the world's work. When the world receives this correct philosophy of evolution, it will then have in its hands the double-edged sword of what is right and the idea of service with which it will slay this demon of bolshevism—selfishness.

*Fred Humphrey.*

## CHARITY.

Old Touriri, prince of Bagdad, was very rich, very learned and considered wise and good.

In his palace and garden he gave hospitality to beautiful women, without asking anything of them except to be beautiful; he entertained poets who would write verses when the fancy seized them, and philosophers who would discuss the nature of God and the origin of the world.

One morning in spring Touriri was walking on the main street of Bagdad. Piles of oranges and masses of roses were filling the vendors' carts; throngs of gorgeous red, blue, and green robes were flashing in the white street; magnolias were bending over the walls of the courts; and the waters were splashing musically in the fountains. The young women were like flowers, subtly fragrant.

Because of all this and the joy which filled all things, wise Touriri felt his old body becoming supple and he was pleased with the world and with life.

He met a little girl of five who seemed to admire his long beard or perhaps the mysterious animals embroidered on his mantle. And because she was pretty, Touriri kissed her and put two gold pieces in her little hand.

Then he met a little boy, ten years old, homely, ragged, freckled, muddy-eyed. The boy held out his hand and rattled off from memory a story of a sick mother, seven little brothers and not having had food for three days. Touriri frowned and gave him one gold piece.

Then he saw an old beggar with back bent, red eyes without eyelashes, whose wheezing voice repeated over and over again: "Have pity on a lame man who can not work! The Lord Ormuz will recompense you!" And the foul breath of his prayer had the smell of strong drink. Touriri, from a distance, held out a silver coin, which fell to the ground and the old beggar knelt down painfully to pick it up.

Immediately after Touriri met a woman carrying a new-born child whose head was covered with ulcers. Humbly bent down, she followed him, murmuring in a low voice her persistent prayer. Not hard-hearted but vexed, Touriri walked faster, but the plaintive voice followed.

He felt in his purse and angrily threw to the woman a few copper coins.

Then he perceived a man without arms or legs, propped against a wall. This man was loudly singing in a discordant, false voice a love song of Firdusi, full of flowers, sunlight and birds,—and it was horrible to hear. Touriri crossed over to the other side of the street.

He continued his walk for some time, but no longer felt the joy of living. He said, "This hot sun is insupportable," and returned to his palace.

Having thought over these events, he called his steward and told him to go on the main street, to give to the old beggar a gold piece, to the woman with the babe two gold pieces, and to the man without limbs three gold pieces. And thereafter whenever he walked in the city a servant went ahead, gave money to the beggars and commanded them to get out of the way, so that his master should not see them.

And Touriri became more and more compassionate and charitable. In the lower halls of his palace, every day, food and money were given to all who came. He founded hospitals and asylums. And whenever he was told that someone had feigned to be sick or poor, he would say, "Let me alone. I have not time to look into the lie."

He spent thus more than nine-tenths of his immense wealth. He even reduced his expenses, kept only the youngest women, the laziest poets and the least positive of his philosophers. He never visited his hospitals or the halls where the poor were fed.

One day in the city the poor surrounded him and kissed the hem of his robe, but he grew angry thereat. The people considered him the saintliest man of Persia.

When he felt death approaching he kept at his bedside only a beautiful maiden of sixteen, asking her to look at him with her lovely blue eyes. He died.

The poor, the former poor, of Bagdad followed the whole funeral and many wept.

\* \* \*

Somewhere beyond time, space and forms the soul of Touriri appeared before Ormuz to be judged. Ormuz asked him: "What hast thou done on earth? What are thy works?"

Touriri, undisturbed as to the judgment, answered modestly and sincerely: "Of course I have been weak, being but a man. I found delight in beautiful lines, colors, sounds, perfumes and words. But I have founded four hospitals and have given to the poor nine parts of my wealth, keeping only one part for myself."

"It is true," said Ormuz, "that thou wast not wicked, and that thou wast frequently led by kindness. Nevertheless thou shalt not enter this time into my paradise. But thy soul will descend into another body; thou wilt live another earthly life, in order to expiate and to learn."

Touriri, very surprised, asked, "What have I to expiate, Lord?"

"Review your own conduct," replied Ormuz, "and learn to know thyself better. What was thy thought when giving alms? What didst thou feel when thou metst the old beggar, the woman and babe, and the man without limbs?"

"An immense pity for human pain," answered Touriri.

"Thou liest," said Ormuz. "The sight of them was at first disagreeable. Thou didst feel ill will toward them for offending thine eyes. Thou wast angry with them because of their sordidness. Thou wouldst not let the poor prove to thee that they were not unworthy of thy kindness. I, who fathom conscience, tell thee that there was revulsion and hatred in thy charity.

"But," replied Touriri, "what I hated was not these wretches; it was the suffering, the evil; it was Ahriman, your eternal enemy."

"Ahriman, that is I. Good cannot spring except from evil; virtue cannot rise except from suffering. Evil passes away. It exists only to produce happiness and virtue. When the earth disappears and all the souls of the righteous are with me, then it will be as if evil had never existed."

"But what do I owe those creatures beyond relieving their misery?"

"It is to teach thee what thou owest them, that I send thee back to the earth."

\* \* \*

There was nothing more simple and sad than the life of Tirirou. He was born at Eschoub, of very poor arti-

sans; in his infancy he was insufficiently fed and often beaten. He learned a trade which procured him a bare living. He had some virtues, those of poor people, he was quite honest, kind and very resigned, but he lacked dignity and refinement, the luxuries of the soul.

He married in order not to be alone. His wife and his two children died of want. One day he fell from a scaffolding and, because of bad care of his wounds, remained crippled in both legs, with one arm paralyzed and an incurable wound on the other.

He had to beg. At first he did not know how; he was ashamed of it. He dared not insist and received almost nothing. Little by little he became used to it; he held out his persistent hand like a fishing pole. Then he got just enough to keep him from dying. Having no joy in the world, he would drink cheap fermented liquor of corn.

A very poor young girl living near his hovel took pity on him. Every morning she came to wash his wound, make his bed, cook his soup and mend his clothes, without asking anything for it. Her name was Krika. She was not beautiful, but her eyes were kind. Tirirou would watch for her coming every morning.

One day as Tirirou was begging, as usual, a rich man threw to him with disgust a gold coin. That same moment Ormuz permitted the soul of Tirirou to remember that it had been the one of Touriri. And Tirirou saw why Touriri had been condemned by Ormuz.

The next morning he saw that Krika's eyes remained gentle and tranquil, and that she was truly good and holy. He kissed her hand and wept.

And that same night Ormuz granted him His mercy, so that he died very gently.

*Translated from the French of Jules Lemaitre and adapted by members of the Legion.*

*FRANKLIN'S EPITAPH FOR HIMSELF.*

Was Benjamin Franklin a believer in reincarnation? The inscription on his tombstone, written by himself, seems to show that he was. It might be said that the "new edition" refers to his "heavenly body." But, if so, the analogy between the earthly body and the book cover is not well chosen. Furthermore, Franklin says the "new edition" is to be "corrected and amended." Would this not best take place in earth life? Certain it is that reincarnation gives the most beautiful explanation of this interesting epitaph.

The Body  
of  
Benjamin Franklin  
(Like the cover of an old book,  
Its contents torn out,  
And stript of its lettering and gilding),  
Lies Here Food For Worms;  
Yet the work itself shall not be lost,  
For it will (as he believed) appear once more  
In a New  
And more beautiful Edition,  
Corrected and Amended  
by  
The Author.

## FROM "CECIL THE SEER"

. . . . . I thought  
 That, if a soul must live hereafter, why,  
 It must have lived before. You know the Christ  
 Did not rebuke those who confessed they thought  
 Elias had returned; but, in an age  
 When all believed he might return, confirmed them.  
 And then our creed—Where can it come to pass,—  
 The body's resurrection?

. . . . . Where?  
 . . . . . Where but  
 In that new earth of Hebrew prophecies?—  
 Which would have but misled, had those that heard  
 Not had it in their power themselves to be  
 Restored to life in that restored estate.  
 . . . Seems life so bright then? You would live it over?  
 . . . No, no; so sad that I would solve its reason.  
 If we have lived before, we are all born  
 In spheres to which our own deeds destine us.

. . . . . Who ever  
 Met mortal yet whose memory could recall  
 A former state?

. . . . . He might recall the state  
 Without the circumstance. To know, bespeaks  
 Experience. To be born with intuitions  
 And insight, is to know. To sun new growth,  
 Why should not all be given an equal chance  
 Unshadow'd by dark memories of the past?  
 . . . . . But if the past were bright?  
 . . . . . If wholly so,  
 Would one need progress; or could he be cursed  
 With deeper woe than thought that could recall,  
 Enslaved in flesh, a former liberty?  
 Why lure to suicide, that, breaking through  
 The lines determining development,  
 May plunge the essence down to deeper depths  
 There planted till new growth take root anew?

*George Lansing Raymond, L.H.D.*  
*(Professor in Princeton University).*

*GLIMPSES OF NEO-PYTHAGOREANISM*

The Neo-Pythagoreans, as is well known, exercised a very great influence upon Christianity. When the doctrines of Christianity came to find resting-place in the minds of intelligent and educated Greeks and Alexandrians they were obliged to meet in conflict or in harmony the theories and principles of the often re-elaborated teachings of Pythagoras' later followers.

Dean Inge\*, of St. Paul's, comments upon their doctrines quite happily, although himself devoid of knowledge of the facts concerning soul evolution, as follows:

They (the Neo-Pythagoreans) laid great stress on human immortality. The original doctrine was that the soul of the race is reincarnated in each generation, passing through the 'wheel' of alternate life and death for ever. This doctrine has no moral significance. But it soon came to be modified by another view, really quite distinct from it, according to which the Soul falls through error from its state of purity, undergoes a long purification from its sins both here and in a purgatorial state hereafter, and at last returns to heaven. With this was combined the doctrine of transmigration or rebirth, incorrectly called metempsychosis. Thus the older idea was moralised, but at the same time changed, since now the individuality of the Soul persists from one life to another. And since reincarnation is always for the sake of punishment or discipline, the 'weary wheel' of existence is regarded as something to be escaped from, a notion which was far from the view of those who like Heracleitus, maintained the older doctrine.

They were ascetics on principle. The 'Pythagorean life' was a recognised discipline, which involved the observance of many excellent and some unwise precepts. They were also stern guardians of purity in family life.†

---

[\**The Philosophy of Plotinus*, Vol. I, p. 86 et seq.]

†The Pythagorean philosopher Theano (for women were

Iamblichus represents Pythagoras himself as preaching against the loose manners of Croton. We have three lives of Pythagoras, by Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and Iamblichus. They are of little value as history; but they are accurate portraits of what the ideal Pythagorean was expected to be. The life of Apollonius of Tyana, already referred to, is another valuable document of the same kind. The Pythagorean sage regarded the Sun as the highest revelation of the supreme Being; but he took part in almost every pious rite, and was initiated into all the great mysteries. In spite of his austerity, he eschewed the coarseness and brutality of Cynic asceticism.

Pythagoreanism, as Mr. Cornford says, was an attempt to intellectualise the Orphic religion, while preserving its social form. It was also an attempt to moralise it; more importance is attached to purity of life, and less to ceremonial. We can trace three strata in this complex product. The oldest was that which taught the unity of all life, the unending cycle of births and deaths, and the conception of a common Soul of the group. The more definitely Orphic element is the doctrine of the fall of the Soul, and its return by means of purifying discipline. But Orphism also valued the passionate emotion aroused by sacramental participation in the sufferings of the god. This kind of communion was what Orphics meant by contemplation—*theoria*. The Pythagorean influence, as distinct from the two factors just mentioned, tended to intellectualise *theoria*. It now meant that free exercise of the Soul's highest faculties which leads to spiritual enlightenment. The excitements of emotional religion are merely a hindrance to the attainment of this calm wisdom. Nor should the mortification of the flesh be carried too far; its object is merely to liberate the mind from the importunities of the body.

In almost all its teaching, the resemblance of Pythagoreanism to the later Platonism is very close.

---

prominent in this school), says that an adulteress must be permanently excommunicated from the temple worship, and Phintys, another female Pythagorean, says the same. Farnell, *Higher Aspects of Greek Religion*, pp. 38, 41.

*THE REINCARNATION OF PEOPLES*

In his recent lectures entitled *Theosophy and Modern Thought*, Mr C. Jinarajadasa has dealt, most instructively, with the subject suggested by our title. We quote somewhat freely:

*Ceylon*

Let me illustrate by another instance the hidden drama of nations. Six centuries before Christ, a turbulent Indian princeling of Central Bengal was exiled by his parents and sent out of India with his disreputable companions to make his fortune. From Broach in Western India they sailed down the coast, and finally landed in Ceylon on the day the Lord Buddha passed away in North India. A mere coincidence, says the modern historian; yet the Sinhalese historians of Ceylon for centuries have considered it no coincidence at all but somehow a part of a plan for the welfare of the world. What could this plan have been? To discover that, see what has happened to Buddhism; it passed practically away from India, first to the south to Ceylon, when in the third century B. C., Asoka sent his son and daughter as missionaries to the descendants of this Prince Wijeyo who landed in the island the day the Buddha passed away; and secondly to Tibet, China and Japan by way of Nepal. Now it is from Ceylon we get the Buddhist scriptures in their old original Pâli tongue; it disappeared elsewhere in India. In spite of revolutions and invasions the people of the little island never forgot the custody of the treasure sent to them. Ages pass and the Portuguese possess the island, and then the Dutch, and finally the English. With the coming of the English the Buddhist scriptures are taken to the West, transliterated, published, and translated year by year. The little nation has lost its national existence, but it has retained the gift sent to it, the wisdom of the Buddha, which now is the whole world's possession. All this I say was planned long ago, that an Indian adventurer should found a little nation in order that twenty-five centuries later his descendants might hand

over to a conqueror from the West the Law of Righteousness that was sent for its help and for the welfare of the world.

*Greece*

Greece was made to be what it was by bringing out of many nations such souls as were ready to usher in the age of Art. A new message was to be given to humanity of the synthetic power of the intuition; the subtle influences of sea and land and sun were utilised to develop the Celtic temperament of the Greeks to a high pitch of sensitiveness to thought and emotion. The unseen Guides, the patron "Gods" of many a Greek town and temple, working under the Supreme Teacher, cultivated their charges, till the Periclean age was about to dawn. Then we have the miracle, the sudden efflorescence of Art. But this was only possible because of the unseen work of One who brought down from the Divine Mind the archetypes of forms, and inspired the human creators to fashion those works of art that are our models to-day.

When that work was done—it took barely a hundred and fifty years—the "glory that was Greece" was over, and she ceased to be a creator and merely lived on a tradition, till she passed away. But she left behind her the message of the Beautiful.

The souls that united in a common work in Greece scattered and have since gone forth into many nations. The sculptors and painters reincarnated in the middle ages in Italy as the great masters of painting; the architects appeared as the great cathedral builders of France, Germany and Italy. A few of her dramatists were the Elizabethan dramatists of England; and in many countries of Europe the souls that co-operated in the Renaissance were mainly egos from Greece. Every so often individual Greeks still appear in the nations, and their temperament is unmistakable. Goethe, Schiller and Lessing in Germany, and Byron, Keats and Shelley in England, are typical of these returned Greeks. But there is no reincarnation of the Periclean Greeks as a body, making a separate nation; Greece was as a forcing house, and her brilliant egos were selected out

of all nations, and were returned to their normal homes to carry back with them the leaven that Greece gave.

### *Rome*

We shall see later, when we come to speak of England, how the Roman people are reincarnated in the English of to-day; it will be interesting to see also that the purpose for which Rome was made an empire is the same that has made England an empire to-day.

### *Mediaeval Europe*

When the Roman Empire ended new nations sprang up: Gauls, Teutons, Saxons, Italians, and others. It was to these peoples that Christianity was sent from the East, for it was in the great plan that they should slowly usher in western civilisation as we have it to-day. Each nation during its growth has had its vicissitudes, but every leader in each has been used to his utmost capacity by the unseen Guides. So we see King Arthur used to establish chivalry, and St. Francis of Assisi to restore to Christianity something of its original life. One of these many leaders among the peoples who is most noteworthy is Hunyadi, "the White Knight of Wallachia."

In the fourteenth century, Mohammedanism under the Turks was sweeping westwards, and the Turks were at the gates of Vienna. But the West was not the field for Mohammedanism; its destiny lay in Persia, Turkey, Africa and India. Had the Turks in the fourteenth century won Europe, the mission of Europe would have become impossible. Then it was that the unseen Guides sent their messenger to uphold the cause of right, and Hunyadi organised the resistance that finally hurled back the oncoming tide. As sweet St. Francis with his tenderness upheld civilisation, so too did Hunyadi Janos as he dealt death and destruction. For to the unseen Guides evil is what hinders the welfare of men and good what fosters their growth; and the great men everywhere are those that are the tools of these Guides who rule with power and pity.

### *England*

Of the peoples of India I have already spoken, and we shall consider America later on. The English to-

day are in the main reincarnations of the ancient Romans. I do not mention this merely as a point of psychological interest, but in order that you may look deeper into the events of the present and of the future.

### *England's Mission*

I said at the beginning that Rome was made into an empire in order that she might establish the peace during which Christianity could spread. Rome reincarnated is England to-day, and what was well done of old gives her another privilege to-day. For a mightier empire is now hers than was ever possible for Rome; India is with her now and the young races of the English colonies. It is England's mission once again to establish a world peace during which the new Gospel of Life and Action that is to come can spread for the welfare of the world; all the nations will join in the common work of the Federation of the World, but without England as leader it cannot be, and without India by her side England cannot accomplish. It is for this that the Armada failed and even the winds fought on England's side; it is for this that India has become a conquered people, and groaneth and travaileth to be a Nation to-day.

### *The Pageant of Nations*

This then is the message of History in the Light of Reincarnation—that all events pre-exist in a Divine Mind, and the world enacts a rôle, and history is but the pageant of nations that the Divine Dramatist has written, for His delight and for our growth. We are as puppets in the pageant now perhaps—mere automata having but little will of our own; but it is our privilege, as we understand, to be the marshals of the ceremonies. Nations come and nations pass away; but nations are reborn too. By what we do in them now to serve them we earn the right to be their inspirers and leaders in their future transformations. Time may pass us by, and we grow old and "die"; but that is only an illusion. We are immortal souls, and the world's history is only the alphabet of our speech, and we fashion the future as we will to fashion it.

## FIELD NOTES

Mrs. van der Hell writes from Holland that "after a time of depression in our work we can now decidedly perceive a change for the better. I think that the conditions at the end of the war were the cause of the decreased demand for our distribution literature and consequently we had only a small increase in members. But at present I can report that there is a good deal of interest in our teachings. As a rule lectures have not been as successful as the distribution of free literature. People like to have a thing written out before them and to read it over and over again, to ponder over it and then to take it in slowly or quickly, depending on their temperament and their comprehension.

"We always ask those who apply for literature to pass it on to others, giving some pamphlets in duplicate. These others frequently ask for more free information and for more leaflets.

"We are getting more and more subscribers for our Dutch magazine."

One of our recent members writes interestingly, "Why cannot the *Legion* with some pains prove the fact of reincarnation, if it be a fact of nature, like the Society for Psychical Research has proved life after death or continuity of consciousness after physical death?" He proposes that cases of people who recall past lives be collected in documentary form, and believes that a large number of cases would enable one to say that reincarnation was proved. He offers to contribute twenty-five dollars towards this work.

The *Legion* will gladly receive details of such cases and regards this as part of its work. But even a very large number of such "recollections" would not constitute legitimate, acceptable proof of reincarnation. They would have value as material for study and for calling the attention of people to the teachings of reincarnation. In these important times of transition and improvement of world conditions, would it not be much more desirable to acquaint the public with the fundamental ideas of rebirth and karma, and let them be tested and verified as the master-keys in explaining life's problems?