

# THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

*by*

J. E. Richardson



Author of

Vols. II, III, IV, V

and

Editor of Vol. I

HARMONIC SERIES

THE GREAT SCHOOL  
OF NATURAL SCIENCE

Copyright 1955  
*by*  
The Great School of Natural Science

Published July, 1955

*Addressed*  
*to*  
*The Progressive Intelligence*  
*of*  
*The Age*



## CONTENTS

	CHAPTER	PAGE
The Problem Presented . . . . .	I	7
Labor and Social Brotherhoods . . . . .	II	11
Religious and Fraternal Brotherhoods . . . . .	III	18
Political Brotherhoods (Socialism) . . . . .	IV	23
Competition and Cooperation . . . . .	V	31
Political Brotherhoods (Anarchism) . . . . .	VI	40
Political Brotherhoods (Communism) . . . . .	VII	45
The Definition of The Great School . . . . .	VIII	52
The Problem Resolved . . . . .	IX	61
Nature's Moral Standard . . . . .	X	65
Individual Education . . . . .	XI	69
Qualifications for Membership . . . . .	XII	75
The True Brotherhood of Man . . . . .	XIII	80





## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM PRESENTED

*The Brotherhood of Man* is an expression which has been used by students and thinkers throughout the entire world. The idea has been taught throughout the ages. It has been the objective of all great philosophers and Masters; but among all of these there is not one who claims to have originated it. It is the very foundation of the ethical structure of all the great religions and philosophies of the world.

And yet, it would seem to be an expression which no two individuals understand alike. The various definitions to be found in the literature of all countries fully verify this statement.

It is because of the fact that the expression has been used by students, teachers, thinkers and philosophers in a manner as to indicate a very hazy understanding of its basic meaning that a definition and elucidation of the subject from the standpoint of The Great School of Natural Science was undertaken.

Among the definitions which have been found in literature and taught, some of the following may be of more than ordinary interest:

"The Brotherhood of Man is the harmonious relation which each individual must sustain toward him or herself, and toward all mankind, to conform to nature's ethical principles."

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

"The Brotherhood is the universal spirit of unity to be established and exemplified by every individual in daily conduct."

"The lofty state of life in which men seek to serve each other and God continuously, constructively and unselfishly."

"It is the intelligent, constructive, cooperative motives, efforts and conduct of individual entities, thereby constituting a human fraternity."

"The Brotherhood of Man is the reaching of mankind to that stage in its evolutionary progress wherein it will live in harmony and cooperation, free from religious, racial and social prejudices and its dire consequences, like children well bred in one good regulated family who are ruled by one wise father, fed and readied by one loving mother."

" \* \* \* is the ideal concept of constructive co-operation in all things, under all conditions, at all times, between the units of human society."

"A term used to express the thought that all mankind represents one family of brothers and sisters claiming fathership in God and that as such, each is equally entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

"It is the relationship which exists between human souls when the spirit of love has dispelled all darkness of misunderstanding and only good will toward ALL remains to unite each and every soul into a harmonious whole."

"In the family and social relations there must be recognition of a common brotherhood to be the inspiration and obligation of all corporal life."

"Love and Service to humanity — a state that



## THE PROBLEM PRESENTED

can only be attained through living in harmony with one's fellowmen of all nations and creeds."

"It is man's recognition and application of his true relationship to God and his fellowman; or, we might say,—the thing most talked of and least practiced."

"When the race has developed under the universal principles of harmony to a recognition of its spiritual kinship and its cosmic responsibility; when the world has become the great Temple of God and in each heart abides Love, Tolerance, Charity—that shall be The Brotherhood of Man."

"It is—to the best of one's resources to enhance the prosperity and welfare of the community of one's fellow-brethren and of all mankind in general."

"To love all men."

"The Brotherhood of Man is the keystone of the triumphant arch, representing the gateway to abundant life."

All of the foregoing definitions are individual understandings of the meaning and significance of the expression—*The Brotherhood of Man*.

From the various concepts expressed it would seem that this most familiar and vital expression, though in common use throughout many hundreds of years and in virtually every civilization of earth, still fails to convey—even to men and women of lofty intelligence far above the general average—any single, definite, distinct and unequivocal meaning or concept. It is still open to interpretation by anyone who employs it or hears it. This means that, so far as the general public is concerned, the

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

term has never been so defined as to bring it clearly and definitely within the limits of exact science.

Nevertheless, there is a scientific basis upon which *The Brotherhood of Man* becomes as much and as truly a fact of nature as the planet on which we live, or the central sun about which our earth revolves. Moreover, the School of Wisdom wherein the demonstration of its practicality has been made is neither a myth, a dream, a fancy nor an illusion; it is an institution that has existed since the "memory of man runneth not to the contrary."

Hence it is that I am impelled to formulate into clear and definite English the definition of the Great and Ancient School of Wisdom, that it may be used as a Master Key by which any and all individuals may determine the scientific value of the various "Brotherhoods" among mankind as they exist today.

Before doing this, however, it will be helpful to have definitely in mind the various institutions which represent the best efforts of mankind, of the present day and generation, to organize themselves into specific groups and shall represent their various and somewhat conflicting ideas as to the fundamental Principle at the basis of "The Brotherhood of Man," as well as the many Brotherhoods Among Men.



## CHAPTER II

### LABOR AND SOCIAL BROTHERHOODS

That we may begin at the beginning and follow the trail of the general concept back of all "Brotherhood," let us first consider the generic term out of which all specific concepts of brotherhood have developed. This is the term "Brother." What is the most direct and definite meaning and concept given to the word?

The primary and fundamental meaning given to it by Webster's New International Dictionary is:

"A male person, considered in his relation to another person having the same parents."

Within this meaning, two men are "brothers" only when they have the same father and mother. By extension of this meaning to the animal, below man, it means two male animals having the same parents.

It will be observed, however, that this primary meaning has reference only to the purely physical relation—the tie of blood—otherwise designated as the relation of consanguinity. In the very early development of our language, let it be remembered that this was the only sense in which the terms "brother," "brothers" and "brotherhood" were employed. Hence, it is only by the operation of the law governing the evolution of our language that these primary terms, through variation, extension,

adaptation and growth came to suggest a number of other and different meanings.

Before proceeding to a consideration of these later developments, let us observe and note another item that is of some importance, in that there seems to have been inducted a new concept into the evolutionary development of the term, "Brotherhood."

For, we now have in mind the fact that, in its inception, the term had reference to the purely physical relation, and nothing more. But the purely physical, or blood relation of kinship, in some way not altogether clear, later came to imply that this blood relationship between brothers carried with it a natural concomitant of *love* or *affection* which does not exist between the male members of different families. For illustration, between you and your own physical brother (that is, another boy whose parents are your own father and mother) there is a deeper, more intense and enduring affection than is possible between you and any other boy who is born of other parents than your own father and mother.

The question we are here facing is whether this implication is true. This is a matter of much graver significance and importance than would seem to appear upon the surface. For, if it is found to be *not* true, or is, in fact, *untrue*, what ethical significance, if any, has the relationship existing between *blood brothers*, which does not likewise—and in equal measure—exist between the men of different families, or even of different tribes or races of mankind? There can be little doubt that those who accept the St. James version of the Christian Bible as authoritative, will accept the historic fact that

Cain was the first male child of Adam and Eve, and that Abel was the second. Hence, they were both boys, born of the same father and mother, and therefore physical brothers, or blood brothers, namely, brothers by the law of consanguinity. But is it not equally true (Gen. iv., 8) that "Cain rose up against Abel, his brother, and slew him"? Why? If the Bible is true, Cain became "very wroth," because the Lord accepted the offering of Abel in preference to that of Cain, his elder brother. It was evidently the green-eyed monster "Jealousy" that impelled Cain to do this dastardly deed. He did it, nevertheless. And is it not true that thereby he established the fact that, as between these, the *very first* two brothers—by the ties of blood relationship—the bond of affection was an exceedingly flimsy, unreliable and inadequate tie? Read the entire fourth chapter of Genesis, in this connection, and think it over.

Observe also the following which would seem to indicate that the tie of blood relationship may not be as close (in fact) as the tie of friendship may be in some instances. "There is a *friend* that sticketh closer than a *brother*." (Prov. 18, 24.) If this has any meaning or significance, it would seem very clearly to indicate that there is a quality of *friendship* that is more to be relied upon than is the blood relationship of brothers—especially that quality of brotherhood which is based upon the tie of which we speak so often and so familiarly.

Moreover, it is safe to assume that personal experience and observation on the part of those who have given the subject sufficient consideration to speak without prejudice, will convince the reader

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

that brotherhood by the physical tie of blood alone does not contain the vital elements that will successfully sustain the institution to which we refer when we speak of "The Brotherhood of Man."

By the natural evolution of the word, it has come to include those related to, or closely united with, their fellows by some common tie or interest, as of rank, profession, or membership in a society. In this case the tie, or bond, upon which the brotherhood rests wholly transcends that of blood relationship. It is much broader in scope and is founded upon the mutual bond of a common tie or interest. In other words, its purpose is to group mankind together, quite regardless of family ties or blood relationships, into associations that bring them together upon the basis of some mutual tie or interest wherein they all share.

Under this head, for instance, we have: The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; the Brotherhood of Carpenters; the Brotherhood of Barbers; the Brotherhood of Fruit Growers; the Junior Order of American Mechanics; the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., etc.

Let us take any of these Brotherhoods, as the Brotherhood of Carpenters, for purposes of study and comparison. Here the individuals have associated themselves together because of their mutual tie or interest in a certain business, that of building, or repairing wooden structures, etc. Around this mutual interest they organize a "Brotherhood" and give it a name. They formulate certain By-laws, rules and regulations by which the members agree to be governed, for the good of all. Therein they



## LABOR AND SOCIAL BROTHERHOODS

mutually agree to pay certain membership fees, dues and assessments, and perform certain services, as compensation for certain mutual benefits they shall be permitted to share because of such membership.

It will be observed that this is only a very limited sort of brotherhood, although it is broader than the brotherhood of family ties and blood relationships. True, it may include blood brothers also; but it may, and generally does, include a vastly larger number who sustain no blood relationship to each other at all.

There is a distinct and definite sense in which it may justly be regarded as a selfish institution, in that it has in mind and in purpose the advantage of its members *only*. It does not look, with any degree of approval, or concern, upon the welfare of those who are not within the ranks of its membership. Indeed, experience shows that it generally arrays itself in opposition to the best interest of such carpenters (within the scope of its business jurisdiction) as fail, neglect or refuse to identify themselves with it as members. They may, and often do, even seek to drive such non-members of its profession, or business, from the field of its operations that its members may control such business and thereby greatly profit from the misfortunes of their fellow carpenters who do not wish to become members of such a brotherhood. It thus becomes a competitor against those of its fellow carpenters who exercise their right of choice to remain outside and attempt to carry on their business, trade or profession independently. It cooper-

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

ates only with its members and competes with all others of its profession.

Inasmuch as we are seeking for the *fundamental, scientific* principle upon which to establish a real "Brotherhood of Man," does the above character of institution meet the conditions and requirements of a Brotherhood that shall seek to benefit all mankind, all businesses, trades, occupations, professions and callings, as well as all races, sexes, colors and previous conditions of servitude? There are reasons to justify our not thinking so.

There are, however, other expressions of the Law of Evolution which bring us to another extension of the meaning and significance of the term *Brotherhood*.

In this instance, the common tie of interest may be of a purely social nature, as in case of a social club. Otherwise the same general conditions obtain as exist in a purely business brotherhood. That is to say, the members assume certain obligations and responsibilities, in return for the privileges, pleasures, conveniences and benefits they are permitted to enjoy with each other in the club. In this case, however, as in that of the business brotherhood, the purpose to be accomplished is solely for the benefit and pleasure of its members. It is a strictly exclusive association and of a purely selfish nature. Under the broadest and most liberal interpretation that could be given such a club, it is in no sense an altruistic association or brotherhood. It does not even intend to be of service or help to any but its own members.

Hence, the fundamental principle upon which such a brotherhood is based does not seem to be



## LABOR AND SOCIAL BROTHERHOODS

sufficiently broad or universal as to include all mankind. This fact, of its narrow limitations alone, would seem to suggest that it is fatally defective in the elements necessary to sustain a brotherhood such as we all have in mind when we speak of "The Brotherhood of Man."



## CHAPTER III

### RELIGIOUS AND FRATERNAL BROTHERHOODS

By another evolutionary extension, we arrive at the door of the religious or philosophic Brotherhood. Here we arise to the level of the intellectual, the moral, the religious and the spiritual elements that enter into the composite nature of humanity.

As a basis for analysis and study let us consider the religious Brotherhood first. For the purpose of making our efforts definite and specific, let us take any one of the various Christian brotherhoods, such, for instance, as the Baptist church.

Here we find that the mutual tie and interest which sustain the organization are, among other things:

1. Acceptance of a certain definitely defined, dogmatic religious belief.
2. Acceptance of certain church rules and regulations.
3. Social and spiritual fellowship, within certain limitations.
4. A limited education in religious doctrines and church discipline.
5. A work of propaganda for the purpose of bringing non-members into membership, in that particular church, and thus increase its members as far as may be possible.

There may be some other considerations of mutual interest which enter, to some extent, into the

bond or tie which brings the members of such a church, or brotherhood, together into mutual association.

Even here, however, in a character of brotherhood which is founded upon such a goodly number of fundamental elements and principles of life, it would be difficult to conceive that we have removed all the limitations which make this also a limited brotherhood, and exclude from its membership a very large percentage of the human family. A Baptist brotherhood cannot open the doors of its membership to a Catholic, a Mohammedan, a Hindu nor an Atheist; and this excludes a considerable percentage of the earth's inhabitants. Hence, in the Brotherhood of Baptists have we yet located the real "Brotherhood of Man"? Have we the good of all men in mind? It would seem not.

However, we have yet another evolutionary extension of the idea of Brotherhood, in the purely fraternal organizations, such as the Masonic Brotherhood, the Odd Fellows, the Knights of Pythias, and other similar fraternal bodies. Within the Masonic brotherhood the members are bound together in the fraternal spirit, by the tie of "Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth." The one fundamental tenet of this brotherhood is a belief in God. Therefore, in a strictly religious sense, it is far more inclusive than any of the dogmatic brotherhoods that are based upon the arbitrary teachings of theology. For it is true that there are comparatively few of the human family who do not believe in God — within the meaning of a great Universal Intelligence which is responsible for our planet earth, as well as for all it contains, including the multifari-

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

ous forms of individual life, and the Life Elements which they embody, throughout all the kingdoms of Nature. It is perhaps true that, now and then, there may be found a human being who will say to his brothers and fellows that "there is no God"; but in the very largest percentage of these instances, it will be found that the individual is not, in reality, an atheist but only one who does not believe in the anthropomorphic God — the god in human form and with human attributes and appetites. So that, on the basis of religion and philosophy there are very few who could not qualify for membership in such a Brotherhood.

But there are other restrictions and limitations, of a purely arbitrary nature, that would close the door of this form of brotherhood against a very large number of humanity. In the first place, it would exclude, in one class alone, at least one-half of the human race, in that it bars its doors against *women*. In addition to these, it closes its doors against all "old men in their dotage" and "young men in their nonage" — meaning young men who are not yet "of age."

Hence it would appear that this character of brotherhood does not yet contain all the elements that are vital necessities in any brotherhood that would include within its membership all that is involved in the real "good of humanity" or in the real "Brotherhood of Man."

There is yet another form of brotherhood which is worth consideration in our search for the ideal which shall meet all the terms and conditions of "The Brotherhood of Man." In one sense this might be embodied in the concept of a Brotherhood

of Nations. Assuming that it were possible to bring together into a brotherhood for the mutual good of all, each and every nation upon the face of the earth, this — in their purely national individuality — would include all mankind upon the planet earth.

Here, however, we have created a Brotherhood of Nations, or States, and *not* of the *individuals* who make up the humanity included within the physical boundaries of those states or nations. In their aggregate capacity such a brotherhood might be said to include the entire human race, and hence, to constitute a semi-, or quasi-“Brotherhood of Man.” But it must be clear that this is, not even yet, the ideal “Brotherhood of Man.”

It may be fruitful of good if we stop at this point and consider briefly whether or not we are merely chasing a will-o-the-wisp, a chimera, or seeking to locate the end of the rainbow, in our efforts to define a real and literal “Brotherhood of Man.” If so, we are but wasting our energies upon the desert air and spending our time in an unfruitful search for the impossible. On the other hand, if there is such a thing as we seek to define, we should be consoled by the thought that it is well worth our time, attention and intelligent effort to seek it out, find it and bring it to the definite knowledge and understanding of our fellows who have been concerned with the same problem throughout the remotest history of the human race.

In the event we shall find that there is, in reality, no foundation upon which we may hope to establish the “Brotherhood of Man” for which humanity has striven and prayed during all the generations

past, we shall have accomplished something of vast importance, even so. It is always well to face the *facts*, even though in so doing we may shatter fruitless dreams and find ourselves compelled to modify our methods of procedure, or even face about and follow an entirely antithetical course. In other words, it is better to be *right* than to spend our lives in fruitless efforts to attain the unattainable, even though we may find profound consolation in the indulgence of our fallacious dreams.

The discovery of our errors may set us in the way of finding the truth.



## CHAPTER IV

### POLITICAL BROTHERHOODS

#### 1. SOCIALISM

There are other Brotherhoods, in addition to those already mentioned, which it might be well to analyze, elucidate and define.

Some of these are certain forms of brotherhood which are generally, and very aptly, termed political. For the purpose of gathering as much exact information as may be possible concerning the various and different lines along which humanity has sought to develop the principle of Brotherhood, it is necessary to consider one or more of the political Brotherhoods with more care and much greater detail than has heretofore been done.

We recognize the difficulties in this undertaking, due chiefly to the utter lack of information in the definitions given to the world by those who are responsible for their formulation, and who should have defined each word with the utmost exactness and care. Even the men who have been looked upon, by the world in general, as accredited authorities, disagree as widely as any others, when they come to defining the terms employed.

First in the list of these political brotherhoods let us consider the Brotherhood of Socialism. Herein we find that the lack of uniformity, in both the ideal expressed and the definitions of terms in which those ideals are clothed, affords very little



basis on which to proceed without stimulating protests and objections from many directions, among those who have made a sufficient study of the subject to regard themselves as duly qualified to speak with *authority*. Indeed, it is not anticipated that we shall be able to run the gantlet of criticism unscathed.

That the reader may have some suggestion as to the difficulties surrounding the subject, however honestly and earnestly we may endeavor to avoid confusion or criticism, I quote a statement which was made to me by a close personal friend:

"The specific reason why I finally withdrew from Socialism and the entire Socialistic movement, was that I could find no two acknowledged socialistic authorities who were in entire accord on any of the supposed fundamentals of Socialism. In truth, the one man I finally came to regard as my only definite authority, over all others, disagreed with all of them, in virtually every important tenet of Socialism. And finally, I often found him disagreeing with *himself* quite as radically as with any of his lesser authorities."

That I may not justly be charged with prejudice, ignorance, nor with the formulation of my own definition of Socialism, only to palm it off upon my readers as that of an "authority" — the following definition of "Socialism" is given from Webster's New International Dictionary:

*Socialism*: "A political and economic theory of social reorganization, the essential feature of which is governmental control of economic activities, to the end that competition shall give way to cooperation, and that the opportunities of life and the



rewards of labor shall be equitably apportioned.

"Often, however, *socialism* is used to denote specifically the economic theories developed by Ferdinand Lassalle and Karl Marx, advocating the annulment of private ownership of capital and land, and maintaining that all values are the creation and just due of labor."

To explain more simply and clearly the meanings their authors attach to these, their own definitions of the terms employed to express their understanding of what the term *Socialism* means, let us assume that the members of that party were sufficiently numerous within our democracy to elect a majority of the congressional representatives, United States Senators, and the President. They then would have complete control of the law-making power, as well as the law-enforcing power of the government. They then could pass any law necessary to carry out their system of reorganization of our government from its present form into a socialistic form of government such as the foregoing definitions contemplate.

They then could proceed to enact laws "*annulling all private ownership of capital and land*"; which means the process of taking all capital and land away from you and me and every other citizen within the government, and giving it over to the government itself. To understand even a small fraction of what this would mean to us as individuals, it is necessary to know exactly what is meant by *capital* and *land*.

There again I shall not run the risk of defining the terms myself; well knowing that my own definitions would not meet the approval of a very

large percentage of those who call themselves *Socialists*. On the other hand, I shall use the definitions already formulated by the same distinguished authority—none other than the self-same dictionary from which I have quoted the definition of *Socialism*. By this method I shall hope to make it rather difficult for my critics to charge me with the “crime of ignorance” because of inexcusable want of knowledge as to the fundamental tenets of *Socialism*. I would have them know in advance against whom the shafts of their criticism are levelled before they release them.

*Capital*: “Economics: A stock of accumulated wealth; specif.: (a) the amount of property owned by an individual or corporation *at* a specific time, as distinct from the income received *during* a given period. (b) the amount of such property which is used for business purposes. (c) an aggregation of (economic) goods used to promote the production of other goods, instead of being valuable solely for purposes of immediate enjoyment. (d) the total amount of such goods in continuous existence.”

“Sense (a) is the one in which the word is ordinarily used by accountants; for example, in contrasting a *capital* account with an *income* account. Sense (b) corresponds to the usage of Adam Smith who specifically defines *capital* ‘as that part of a man’s stock which he expects to afford him revenue.’ Sense (c) is the meaning employed by the majority of later economists. Sense (d) is the meaning preferred by J. B. Clark when he contrasts *pure*, or *permanent*, capital with the perishable ‘*capital goods*’ composing it. Capital is divided into *fixed capital*, which is invested for recurrent use in

a particular manner, and *circulating capital*, which is consumed in production but is constantly recovered."

In the very first expression, under *Economics*, the term is defined generally as—"A stock of accumulated *wealth*." To understand the exact sense in which the term *wealth* is employed, it is defined:

"(a) In the private sense, all property which has a money value. (b) In the public sense, all objects, esp. material objects, which have economic utility. (c) Specif., called personal wealth. Those energies, faculties and habits directly contributing to make people industrially efficient."

Under these definitions, it must be clear that *capital*, as the word is used by modern socialists, has reference to virtually everything an individual possesses—except, perhaps, the clothes he happens to wear at the time.

*Land*: "All those elements in the wealth of a nation which are supposed to be furnished by nature; as distinct from those *improvements* which owe their value to the labor and organizing power of land."

"There are other utilities (than those creatable by man) over the supply of which man has no control; they are given as fixed quantity by nature and have therefore no supply price. The term '*land*' has been extended by economists so as to include the permanent sources of these utilities; whether they are found in land, as the term is commonly used, or in seas and rivers, in sunshine and rain, in winds and waterfalls." Alfred Marshall.

These definitions have been given, in this connection, so that the reader may not find it necessary

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

to read through the large number of text books on Socialism to hunt out their meaning. With these as the basis upon which to establish an understanding of *Socialism*, and determine what changes would be necessary to reorganize this government of ours into a socialistic institution, the following conclusions would seem both logical and inevitable:

1. Under such a government, a man may own a house, a barn, a pigpen, a chicken coop, a rabbit hutch—but not the *land* on which these sit.

2. He may own such money only as he earns by his personal labor. If a carpenter, he may build houses, barns, etc., for his neighbors, and own the money he receives for the bare labor he puts into them; but not from any profits he might otherwise derive from furnishing the lumber and other materials necessary for their construction. In other words, if he furnishes the materials for the buildings he erects, he must do so at actual cost.

3. He may invest a sufficient amount of money in groceries to set him up in the grocery business; but once he has done this, the groceries become his *capital*; from the sale of which he may obtain enough money to replenish his stock, from time to time, with just enough profits to meet his actual living expenses.

If he ever desires to discontinue the grocery business, it is not quite clear just how he would proceed, without forfeiting to the government such groceries as he had at the time he closed out his business; because his stock is his *capital*—and the fundamental tenet of Socialism is the annulment

of capital and giving it over to the control of the government along with the *land*.

4. If he were a physician he could keep enough of his earnings to cover the actual cost of his own living and that of his family, as well as all others who may be dependent upon him; but he could not charge \$500, or \$1000, for a surgical operation and put the money in a bank, because it then becomes *capital* and belongs to the government.

5. If he were a plumber, he might charge for his labor alone. But if he furnished the materials necessary to complete a given job, he could charge only the cost price of the various articles of merchandise necessary to that end. But what if his business did not afford him sufficient compensation in actual *labor* to cover the cost of a living for himself and his family and all those dependent upon him? What will he do? How can he meet the deficit? It does not seem that this particular brand of Socialism, carried out to its legitimate and logical conclusion, could possibly provide for this particular contingency. Nor does it seem that it can meet many other equally logical conclusions that must arise under such a system—carried out to its ultimate and logical conclusion.

Furthermore, it is stated, without equivocation or mental reservation, by the authorities quoted, that the ultimate aim and legitimate end of Socialism is that, through the annulment of private ownership (personal property) and governmental control of all economic activities, we shall ultimately bring about the Utopian condition where *competition* shall give way to *cooperation*, and the oppor-

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

tunities of life and the rewards of labor shall be equitably apportioned.

In other words, here is a purely theoretical Brotherhood that bases its right to intelligent consideration upon its promise to accomplish that which neither God nor Nature has ever yet succeeded in bringing to pass. By this is meant the elimination of *competition*, or the establishment of universal *cooperation*.

In truth, wherever we turn our attention, in a critical and intelligent observation and estimation of the methods by which God, or Nature, carries forward the activities and processes of the planet earth on which we live, or even those of the greater universe, so far as we can follow them—from the lowest round of the mineral kingdom through all the rounds of the vegetable kingdom, upward and onward even to the highest round of the animal kingdom, and to man himself—we find that *Competition* seems to be quite as universal as *Cooperation*.





## CHAPTER V

### COMPETITION AND COOPERATION

That we may verify the great, fundamental fact of Nature—that Competition seems to be quite as universal as Cooperation—go with me down to the very depths of the mineral kingdom, then follow up through the higher kingdoms to that of Man himself.

To the physical senses the solid crystallized *rock* seems to be one of the established conditions within the mineral kingdom of Nature. If we trace the purely physical and chemical mutations occurring within it, we find that through the grinding power of glaciers, the disintegrating effects of heat and cold, the burning results of the sun's rays and the crumbling effects of the winds and rains, the largest and the hardest granite boulder, in due time will crumble into the individual particles of which it was originally composed.

These are the "hostile forces" against which the solid rock had to contend in order to maintain its existence as such. Do we find anything here but *competition* of the elements of Nature with the established conditions within the stone? So far as the stone is concerned, certainly there is nothing observable that would strongly suggest the kindly influence of *cooperation*.

Now take the same boulder and consider its life in relation to the next higher kingdom of Nature,

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

the vegetable. In due time, through the vitalizing influence of the same elements, Nature forms a covering of moss upon the outer surface of the stone. Immediately the moss begins to grow and in so doing it saps the vitality of the stone and materially aids the glacier, the heat and the cold of the outer world, the wind and the rain, the frost and the dry heat of the sun, in the disintegrating process. Thus we observe that the stone is also in direct *competition* with the vegetable kingdom which lives off its inner life element. Hence, we find that the mineral kingdom is not only in competition with the elements both within and surrounding it, but also must compete with the vegetable world which lives directly upon it.

Let us go forward to the very highest form of life, where also we find that man himself becomes a most powerful contributing factor in the disintegrating process that is constantly destroying the stone.

Take a brief survey of some of our beautiful mountains—that were. Observe how man, with his steam shovels, trucks and tractors, is tearing and wearing the solid granite into dust and to some extent denuding the mountains of much that makes them beautiful. Is this done through man's *cooperation* with the individual rocks, or even with the mineral kingdom as a whole? No. Instead, here again we find a powerful competitive agent in man himself. Nowhere, however, have we discovered that *cooperation* has had any place, so far, in Nature's progressive plan of action, nor in the method and process whereby she accomplishes her results.



Cooperation, nevertheless, *does have a place* and a most important one, when properly understood.

Now let us examine the vegetable kingdom, that we may discover the method which God, or Nature, employs in the activities of this next higher kingdom.

Here is a forest of pine trees that has grown from infancy to stately majesty. The individual trees all developed out of the same general conditions. They drew their life and sustenance from the same soil, the same sunlight, the same water and the same air. In the beginning they did not interfere with one another, but as they grew larger they became more and more crowded for space, until the soil did not contain sufficient nourishment to sustain the further growth of all the individual trees. What followed? The more rugged trees absorbed more than their equal share of nourishment and, to do this, had to take it away from the others. By degrees the less rugged trees began to suffer and fall behind in point of vital energy and growth. These weaker ones finally began to languish and die until at last they withered and fell to the ground. They had lost out in the competitive struggle with their stronger and more vigorous brothers.

This situation fairly represents what Darwin defined as — "The struggle for existence in the midst of a hostile environment" — so far as the individual tree is concerned. If the competition of its brothers became too great for any individual tree, it died, and thus made room for its competitors to go on growing, as some of the *sequoia*, or "Big Trees," of California have done for 4000 to 5000 years.

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Here we see also the evidences of *cooperation* running side by side with *competition*. But for the cooperation of the mineral kingdom in furnishing nourishment, light, heat, water and air, even the most rugged of all the trees could not have survived to maturity, nor even at all. They could not have come into being to make the struggle for existence but for these conditions.

Let us now go down into the realm of the animal kingdom where the fishes live, into the depths of old ocean. Here is a realm of individual life which should give a fair and definite reflex of the method and process by which God or Nature carries on the activities which guide the destinies of individual intelligence; for here each individual, whether large or small, low or high, weak or powerful, intelligently keen or dull, finds itself in direct competition with those more powerful, more individually capable, and of superior intelligence. The small, the weak, the slow and the primitive all must run the gantlet of their superior fellows—only to be eaten and destroyed in the end. The tiniest minnow is pursued by virtually all other fishes large enough to swallow it; and if it succeeds in growing up to normal fishhood of its kind, it is because it is wise enough, or clever enough, or swift enough—or all these combined—to compete for its own life among them. If it fails, it is swallowed by the first larger fish that is fast enough and clever enough to compete with it in the race for its individual life. But the fish that catches it is, at the same time, running from some still larger fish, and this, in turn, from one that is after it. Thus it is that within the realm of the fishes the

large fish eat the smaller ones, those larger eat *them*; and throughout the entire world in which they live this contest goes on, so that in this particular realm of individual life, the very fundamental principle seems to depend as much upon *competition* as it does on *cooperation*.

Take it now from the viewpoint of *man's* relation to the fishes, and here we find that man himself becomes one of the most destructive agents with which the fishes must contend. Indeed, the fishes constitute one of the prolific sources of the food supply of all mankind.

Make the journey throughout each and every department of individual life and you will find that the same process goes on, in varying degrees; everywhere we find that the individual life is always in competition with its fellows and with all the kingdoms of Nature seemingly pitted against it.

These are some of the facts of Nature which impelled Darwin to promulgate the doctrine that individual life is "a struggle for existence in the midst of a hostile environment". And likewise that, in this struggle, "only the fittest survive".

Whether Darwin was correct in his conclusions or not, he furnished an abundance of evidence in the facts of Nature he compiled, to justify us in hesitating to accept—without vastly more positive evidence than we have been able to accumulate from history throughout the known life of humanity upon the earth—the idea that a government, even among the most highly developed and intelligently advanced human beings, entirely free from the element of competition, is a scientific possi-

bility. In truth, if we confine ourselves to the actual known facts of Nature, and the demonstrated facts of science, we should be justified in holding that *competition* and *cooperation* are *concomitant factors* in the great scheme of Nature, both animate and inanimate.

The Competitive Principle and the Cooperative Principle in Nature as they are exemplified within the three lower kingdoms of Nature are the concomitant factors employed in the "evolution of Individualized Intelligence". Within these lower kingdoms the Competitive Principle may be destructive to individual life, though Nature never loses sight of the ultimate goal of Individual Evolution upon the higher kingdom of man.

Within the *human* kingdom, where the individual becomes morally accountable and personally responsible, the two principles are still concomitant factors in the evolutionary process; but here the Competitive Principle becomes doubly destructive when wrongfully employed for *purely selfish purposes*—in that it destroys the individual, who abuses it, as well as the individual or individuals, against whom it is employed. In this kingdom the Cooperative Principle is constructive, and when rightly used by the individual becomes doubly powerful in its evolutionary impulse to the individual, in that it unites the impulse of the Individual to that of Nature toward the same evolutionary goal of *Self-Completion* on the part of the individual, and Nature's reward therefor which is *Individual Completion* and *Perfect Happiness*.

Socialists tell us that the present "measure of

values" (our current monetary system) is responsible for many of the present ills and inequalities of economic conditions. To remedy this they propose to substitute *labor* as the measure of values. This means that a day's labor will be made the unit of value, instead of our present paper money and metal coins.

In just what particular this simple substitution alone would change, or improve present conditions, doth not yet appear. At present our government owns a certain number of ounces, pounds or tons of gold bullion, stored away in its depositories. For the accommodation of the people and to relieve them of the necessity of carrying around enough of the heavy gold to meet the demands of their daily business, the government issues Federal Reserve Bank certificates—issued in the form of "paper money"—a substitution for the actual gold and gold coin itself.

These various forms of currency can be readily used as a medium of exchange and, together with personal checks, bank drafts and other forms of "paper money obligations," the entire business of the people of our government is carried on with smoothness and despatch. It is an item worth remembering, that over ninety percent of the entire business of our country is transacted by paper money, checks, drafts and certificates of credit in various forms, without disturbing a single ounce of the gold bullion in the United States Depositories.

Let us suppose that labor were substituted for our present medium of exchange, it would become necessary to provide a method of issuing certificates

for each and every day's work done by every individual in the United States. These labor certificates would then take the place of the present silver certificates, coins and Federal Reserve Bank notes as a medium of exchange; the mere checking up of the number of day's labor actually performed, and the issuance of certificates to cover them each twenty-four hours — to say nothing of providing fractional currency to take the place of the present penny, nickel, dime, quarter and half dollar — involve a method of registering and verifying the number of days of actual labor performed in each and every little community, and the issuance of certificates therefor. And this method must be such as to guard against dishonest reports of labor actually done, as well as of fraud in the issuance of certificates.

Thus far, no socialist has ever explained to my satisfaction how all this is to be accomplished in such manner as to guarantee honesty and reliability in the volume of labor money thus issued.

Assuming that such a system might be possible, in what way is an arbitrary labor standard of values and medium of exchange, an improvement over our present arbitrary standard of values and medium of exchange? Our present monetary system may need improvement, but the proposed labor certificates does not seem to be the answer.

There are many other difficulties to be met in substituting a labor standard of value and a labor medium of exchange for our present system, all of which seem to spell failure in advance—if it should end with the simple substitution.

Furthermore, this suggestion seems to be fully



## COMPETITION AND COOPERATION

verified and confirmed by every attempt thus far made. Until history can point to one unqualified success, over a period of years, on a national scale, the burden of proof is still on Socialism, and not on its opponents. Until it succeeds in substituting Cooperation for Competition, with government control of all capital and the annulment of private ownership of capital and land, I seriously doubt it will ever command the approval or support of the people of the United States.



## CHAPTER VI

### POLITICAL BROTHERHOODS

#### 2. ANARCHISM

*Anarchism* is a form of brotherhood, based on the "*political and social theory that all government is an evil*".

"In its broadest form it demands absolute emancipation from all law, moral as well as economic and political, outside the individual."

"In its more practical form, Anarchism is a variety of communalism, having for its ideal the formation of small autonomous communities the members of which respect one another's individual independence while they unite to resist outside aggression."

"At its best, it stands for a society made orderly by *good manners* rather than by *law*, in which each person is supposed to produce according to his power and receive according to his needs."

"At its worst, it stands for a terroristic resistance of all present government and social order."

From these various definitions, it seems evident that there are many different concepts of the term *Anarchism*. It would not be fair to judge it "*at its best*" by what it has proven to be "*at its worst*".

In any view of it, there can be no doubt that it is founded upon the general concept that "*all government is an evil*", and complete "*emancipation from all law*" is the ideal state of society.

It would be a matter of intense interest to apply



the principle of logic to these various concepts, both social and economic, as well as individual and political, and see where it would lead us.

From the viewpoint of a *Brotherhood*, it does not seem to offer anything but chaos. This is because the mind cannot conceive of any society, in which each individual does whatever he pleases, without his doing many things that must inevitably clash and conflict with the things his neighbors desire to do.

An illustration of how these individual interests clash, and of what these clashes lead to, may be found in the history of the Western United States during the time when men recognized no legal restraints nor obligations:

The public domain was open to stock raisers. One man elected to raise cattle, and his neighbor elected to raise sheep. But wherever the sheep grazed they cut the grass so short that little was left for the cattle to feed upon.

A sheep raiser and a cattle raiser both selected the same territory in which to feed their stock. When they turned both sheep and cattle on to the same grazing land the sheep soon ate the grass so short that the cattle were left without sufficient food. The first result was that the cattle grew thin while the sheep grew fat. These *brothers* did not happen to possess the "*good manners*" which anarchists are supposed to depend upon to keep out of trouble and preserve perfect order in the midst of all their conflicting interests.

On the other hand, the cattle raiser who was getting decidedly the worst of the deal, went to the sheep raiser and expostulated with him. The sheep

raiser only laughed at him and replied: "This is a free country and this grazing is as much mine as yours." But the cattle raiser said: "Look at my cattle. They are getting thinner every day and slowly starving. Soon they will begin to die if you permit your sheep to graze over all the land, and I shall be ruined." The sheep raiser replied: "What has that to do with me? I am a sheep raiser, and I am doing fine. I am not raising cattle, and I have no interest in preventing your cattle from starving. That is your affair. I have as much right to graze my sheep on the public domain as you have your cattle, and that is just what I'm doing."

You already know the outcome. The history of the West is a history of human strife with the sacrifice of human life on almost every section of land throughout the Western country. The cattle raiser finally served notice on the sheep raiser that if he did not relinquish part of the land he would kill him on sight. They finally met in a duel to the death. They shot it out and one of them was killed.

This is exactly what occurred, not once but thousands of times, during the sheep and cattle wars of the past, in this country, when there was no law that could be enforced throughout the western stock lands, because there were not sufficient government peace officers to patrol the territory and prevent these destructive wars.

Here was a practical illustration of the actual working of the principle at the basis of *Anarchism*. It proves that men do not possess the "good manners" on which Anarchism depends as the only means of preventing "disorders" in society. It proves that whenever the interests and desires of

men conflict, trouble, sorrow, destruction and death reign supreme—*until* the majesty of the *law* comes and establishes its supremacy. Only then do men cease their hostile attitudes and seek to settle their conflicting interests by peaceful means. And it is only when the law is accompanied by the power to enforce it that men learn to respect it and acknowledge its benefits.

In our present state of development *law* is about the only influence in society that is strong enough and great enough to command the respect of mankind. Such "*good manners*" as mankind possesses today are not enough to preserve the peace alone for one hour without the restraining power of the *law*.

If today the peaceful influence of the law were removed from society, it would not be long until the destructive impulses and tendencies of human nature would be openly flaunted on every hand; and "*good manners*" would be a thing of the past.

From which it would seem that any social institution founded upon the "emancipation of its individual members from all law" as the ideal social state, has opened the flood gate of evil and destruction by which it will work its destruction inevitably and speedily.

Anarchism, in every conceivable form, and under every concept that has ever been defined, has come down to us through every human era. Wherever it has been definitely inaugurated, as the established social state, only social and political chaos has resulted. This is because the elements necessary to perpetuate a constructive *Brotherhood* have been omitted.

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Hence, does it not seem that we are warranted in concluding that Anarchism does not in any of its varied forms, constitute the constructive basis necessary to "The Brotherhood of Man"? At least not in the present state of human development, nor does it seem possible until several millenniums have come and gone and humanity has attained to a much more exalted level of "good manners."



## CHAPTER VII

### POLITICAL BROTHERHOODS

#### 3. COMMUNISM

This brings us to a consideration of *Communism* as a possible brotherhood such as "The Brotherhood of Man."

That we may not be guilty of taking anything for granted in this consideration of the subject, it is necessary that we define the term *Communism* at the outset, in the exact terms used by those who stand sponsor for the Communistic concept and social ideal. To that end note the following definitions:

1. "A system of social organization in which goods are held in common."

2. "The opposite of the system of private property."

3. "A system of social organization where large powers are given to small political units, or communes."

4. "Any theory or system of social organization involving the common ownership of the agents of production, and some approach to equality in the distribution of the products of industry."

5. "Unformulated Socialism."

The popular usage of the word *Communism* conforms to the third of these definitions. The scientific usage sometimes conforms to the first alone, and sometimes alternates between the first and

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

second. The former was the traditional English practice. The latter is followed by writers influenced by the works of the French authorities, who as a rule use the term indiscriminately in the two meanings.

Having been a student of the subject for many years, and having made a critical study of virtually all the leading writers of both Europe and America upon the subject, I believe I am within the facts when I say that "*the holding of goods in common*" might justly be termed the fundamental tenet of *Communism*. While other considerations necessarily enter into the problem, they cluster about this central concept of *ownership in common*.

This Brotherhood, as well as that of Socialism, confines itself to the distinctly materialistic aspects of life. It does not extend its efforts and activities to the educational, the mental, the moral, the spiritual nor the scientific departments of Nature—except in the very limited sense in which these may be involved in the purely physical aspects of common ownership of material possessions.

It is just here that its dominant limitations would seem to disqualify Communism as a real "Brotherhood of Man".

As in Socialism, one of its efforts is to reorganize existing government upon such a basis that "competition shall give way to cooperation". In plain terms, this means to establish a government solely upon the basis of *cooperation*, and entirely to eliminate *all competition*. To this end all members are expected to become *producers*, in whatsoever departments of human endeavor they elect to engage; and whatsoever they produce they *contribute*

to the *community holdings*, and they *receive* therefrom whatever they *need*.

The very terms thus employed to define the contributions to, and the disbursements from, the community assets, or holdings, raise some of the problems to be met and solved. For instance, is each individual member to be judge of how *much* and *what* he shall produce? If he is, what incentive does this system provide which will impel or inspire him to produce the full measure of his productive capacity? Does it not, on the other hand, rather hold out to him a strong inducement to put forth the least productive energy necessary to make him a sharer in the community assets? If some one or more of the community outside himself shall be charged with this responsibility, how will they proceed to impel or inspire each member to exercise the full measure of his productive energy? How shall they be able to offset the natural tendency of human nature to impel each member to exaggerate his "needs" in proportion to his voluntary contribution to the community fund?

Again, who shall determine what are the "needs" of any individual member? Shall each individual be the final judge of his *own* "needs"? In other words, shall each individual within the community be the sole arbiter as to what percent of his productive capacity he will contribute to the community holdings, and how much he shall draw therefrom to cover his own "needs"? If not, then just how will these matters of contribution and consumption, or of income and outgo, be determined so that exact equity shall be guaranteed?

Or, shall the community interests be limited to



## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

the necessities of life such as food, clothing, shelter and a place to sleep? If so, by what method shall these be apportioned? And if the apportionment is not equitable and just, what assurance is there that the individual members are going to be satisfied and contented under such a system?

In other words, has any advocate of *Communism* developed an automatic, or self-determining system, or method, by which to determine for each member of such a community the exact value of his contributions to the community holdings, and the exact amount and value of his individual needs?

Inasmuch as the earning capacity of one man may be vastly more or vastly less than that of his fellow member, and the value of his needs may be likewise more or less than others of his fellows, an equitable adjustment of contributions and needs among the individual members of such a community would seem to be one of the impossibilities to be solved before such a community can guarantee to its members either justice, or equity, or satisfaction, or contentment, or any adequate inspiration to employ the full measure of their productive energies and personal efforts.

Until Communism shall discover some process that will reduce the *needs* of each and every one of its members to one and the same standard in amount, and raise the productivity of each and every member to identically the same standard, it will find itself with a vital problem unsolved.

If it ever should succeed in its solution, that very fact will raise another equally vital problem which must be met and solved. It arises out of the following facts of Nature:



1. In point of productivity (earning capacity) if the community takes the full earnings of the man of superior capacity and offers him nothing in return for himself as a reward for the surplus he produces, what inducement has the community to offer him that will be sufficient to impel him to go on producing more than his fellow member whose earning capacity is only one-fourth as great?

2. If the superior producer receives from the common fund only the same to cover his needs that is apportioned to the most inferior producer, does Communism hold this to be *equity*?

3. What effect is that likely to have upon the superior producer?

4. When he sees himself producing four times as much as a fellow member, but at the same time observes that his fellow (who produces one-fourth as much as he) receives from the common fund as much as he does, is he not going to feel that he is being placed upon a level with the most inconsequential producer of the entire community?

5. How long does it seem to you the superior producer is going to be satisfied with this quality of equity? Is he not going to raise the question: "Since I receive only the same amount from the community holdings as the least contributor thereto, why should I go on contributing four times as much as he? Why not give one-fourth of my productive energy and time to the community, and take the other three-fourths for myself—playing golf, or pitching horseshoes, or playing the violin? I will still be giving as much to the community fund as the most inferior producer, and will not be doing him an injustice."

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

6. What would be the effect upon the small producer? Would he not be inclined to say: "Inasmuch as the community allows me just as much to cover my 'needs' as it allows to the man who contributes the largest amount to the community holdings, it is evident that the community holds me to be just as important as he. I am just as good as he, even if he can and does produce four times as much as I do for the community. I consider myself most lucky, for I am able to make just as prosperous a showing as he. My wife can have anything his wife can have. She can wear just as good clothes and go in just as good society as his wife. But I can't help wondering what *he* thinks about it."

7. To sum it up in a single question: "Does not any system which eliminates all competition, at the same time eliminate one of the basic inspirations which makes any government prosperous and progressive?"

8. Is it not equally true that it is only the absolute assurance that he shall receive full value for all his earnings that inspires the individual to employ *all* his time and productive energies? Is it not just this, that enables him to "get ahead" in the *marathon of life*?

9. Let us look at the other side of this problem: Is it not true that any system of government that eliminates all competition and substitutes therefor cooperation, thereby kills the inspiration to productive activity, invites inactivity and stagnation, and reverses the wheels of progress?

Those who base their communistic ideas of government upon the concept that Nature's *laws* are all *cooperative*, and nowhere sanction *competi-*

*tion*, have only to study the illustrations set forth under the head of *Competition*, to realize a complete disillusionment upon that subject. They will be surprised to find that progress, in all the kingdoms of Nature, is inseparable from competition; that wherever competition is eliminated, or stifled, stagnation, retrogression, deterioration and devolution follow in rapid succession, and with as much certainty and precision as the seasons follow in their order.

This, however, must not be construed to mean that Nature does not sanction nor provide for *cooperation* as well as *competition*. It means only that both competition and cooperation are *vital concomitants* in Nature's evolutionary process. It means that both these factors are necessary to complete Nature's plan and method of procedure. And this finally means that any social or economic plan or method of procedure which wholly *eliminates* either competition or cooperation is in direct contravention of Nature's laws. Such a system cannot endure because it omits one of the vital elements necessary to the perpetuity and continuity of Nature's established plan of action and method of procedure.

Does it appeal to your intelligence and to your sense of logic that any *Brotherhood* such as *Communism*, with the element of competition entirely *eliminated* could possibly be "The Brotherhood of Man" which has been sought throughout the ages and down to the present time?



## CHAPTER VIII

### THE DEFINITION OF THE GREAT SCHOOL

This brings me to the definition which the Great School of Natural Science has formulated to express its own concept of what it means by "*The Brotherhood of Man.*"

By analysis and comparison we shall then be in position to determine wherein, if at all, it differs from the various concepts already defined. Here is the definition:

*The Brotherhood of Man: "The exemplification of Moral Accountability in the mutual discharge of Personal Responsibility among Mankind."*

The purpose is to indicate a *Brotherhood of Man* that has come into mutual association for the express purpose of exemplifying something very definite and specific. That is, to live their lives in such manner that each individual shall seek to *prove* something of the most vital importance to the life and well-being of the *Brotherhood* of which they are all members. This means that each *individual* member shall endeavor to accomplish something which every other member shall recognize to be of value to him and to all his fellows. It is therefore something which all his fellow members will approve. Hence, it is something that is for the general good of the *Brotherhood*, as such.

## THE DEFINITION OF THE GREAT SCHOOL

In other words, it is something that will make for the perpetuity and continuity of the life and development of the Brotherhood itself.

What is this vital thing which each individual member seeks to *exemplify* that will be of benefit to each individual member, as well as of constructive value to the Brotherhood, as such?

*Moral Accountability.* This means that there is a Moral Order of the Universe; that *Morality* is as much a Law of Nature as *Gravity*, or *Polarity*, or *Attraction*. It is, therefore, a matter that falls as definitely within the limitations of exact science as are the movements of the heavenly bodies.

In this connection let me call attention to the fact that, according to the findings of Natural Science—"Morality is the established harmonic relation which man, as an individual intelligence, sustains to the constructive principle of Nature".

It is an *established* relation; hence, it is, therefore, a *fixed and determined* relation. But, whatsoever becomes a fixed and determined thing in Nature, is a scientific *fact*. Therefore, *Morality* is a scientific fact, as truly as is the fact that the earth revolves upon its own axis. These are both *facts of Nature*, and are clearly within the limitations of exact science.

Moreover, the relation is not only established by Nature, and therefore scientific, but it is a *harmonic* relation. This means that it is constructive and in harmony with the *Constructive Principle of Nature*.

We have learned also that *Morality* is not only a matter of exact science, but has definite and specific reference to the *relation* which *man*—as an indi-

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

*vidual intelligence*—sustains to the *Constructive Principle of Nature*.

Our definition of "*The Brotherhood of Man*" includes the "*Exemplification of Moral Accountability*." What is Moral Accountability?

It is man's recognition of the scientific fact that the relation he sustains to his fellows, and to the Constructive Principle of Nature, is founded upon a *Moral Order* of the Universe. This means that Nature, or God, has established a Moral Order on the basis of exact science and that man recognizes the fact of that Moral Order, and holds himself bound by it, and accountable to its requirements. And he proceeds to live his life in such manner that he shall exemplify his Moral Accountability under the Law.

In conformity with the terms of the definition of the "*Brotherhood of Man*," the individual man must exemplify his own moral accountability in a certain definite way (along with each and all of his fellows), namely, "*in the mutual discharge of Personal Responsibility among Mankind*."

Here, however, another profound problem must be faced which but few individuals of the present day and age grasp in all its scientific aspects and significance. Reference is made to the scientific meaning of the term "Personal Responsibility." For the definition says that the individual *Brother* must so live his life that he shall make it an "exemplification of Moral Accountability *in the mutual discharge of Personal Responsibility among Mankind*."

Before it is possible for him, however, to do this effectually, it is necessary that he first know the



exact scientific meaning of the significant term—"Personal Responsibility."

Since it has reference to a law which applies to and governs all mankind, it must be entirely clear that it has reference to each and every Individual who becomes a member of the "Brotherhood of Man." None is omitted.

The very fact that the term "Personal" is used, establishes the fact that the kind of "Responsibility" referred to is that which applies to *each person*. This means that every person who is a member of the "*Brotherhood of Man*" is necessarily bound by the *character* and *quality* of Responsibility that applies to *all* members.

Please note the important fact that the word "*degree*" is omitted. It has not been said that every member of the Brotherhood is bound by the *degree* of Responsibility that applies to all members. Make special notation of this omission, for the reason that it marks a point of the most vital importance to the scientific exactness of the analysis and final summary. This point will be elucidated later.

We come now to the term "*Responsibility*." What does it mean, as Natural Science uses the expression?

It will be evident to every individual who is at all familiar with the general concept of the term, especially to those who are accustomed to using the term as an integral part of their own individual and distinct vocabulary, that it involves an *Obligation* on the part of the individual — and this means to each and every individual of the human family — to do or not to do the things designated or included in the obligation itself.

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Another point of vital importance is in the fact that an *Obligation*, to be binding upon those for whom it is intended, must be a definitely *fixed* obligation. Otherwise it is fatally lacking in stability and certainty, and falls below the requirements of exact science. We would not hold it binding nor worthy of our recognition if it were subject to modification or change at the whim of the individual to whom it applies. It is therefore clear that it must contain the element of *fixity* in order that it may reach the dignity of an Obligation, or a Responsibility.

This fact presents the problem of who shall *fix* such an Obligation upon us. It must be evident to every individual capable of reasoning upon the problem at all, that *authority* is the element necessary to fix and make binding an Obligation upon the members of such an organization as the "*Brotherhood of Man*."

This means adequate, positive and unquestionable authority. In this case there are no qualifications. The authority must be *absolute*. It must be of such quality, dignity and power that no man shall have the temerity to question it.

But where, with reference to the individual man himself, shall we identify a source of authority that is adequate to sustain and enforce its decrees?

Could *You* acknowledge your fellow man—even the wisest of them—as an authority of sufficient wisdom to command your absolute obedience to any decree he might impose upon you, regardless of its appeal to your intelligence or your sense of right? As the Scotchman would say: "I ha'e me doots."



We see the verification of this weakness of human nature in the fact that our fellows—many of them of high intelligence, wide knowledge and great wisdom—have formulated and passed the man-made laws that constitute the body of our statutory laws. The very purpose of these laws is to fix upon men and women who make up the vast body of human society certain *obligations*. One of these laws fixes upon us the obligation that we shall not steal the things that belong to our neighbors. The great aggregate individual which we call "*the state of California*" or Florida, or Indiana, sanctions this law against theft to give it *authority*. But does that fact prevent the individual members of society from violating the obligation imposed by the statutes? Even though the law provides severe penalties for its violation, men continue to steal from each other, the world over. They refuse to recognize the authority of man-made laws, and the men who are charged with the duty to enforce them do not succeed.

The men and women who violate the state laws do so because they know that many of their fellows do the same thing and often succeed in evading and avoiding the penalty which the men who made the laws prescribed. This fact proves to them that the authority back of these laws is not adequate nor convincing. It is possible to evade or avoid their penalties, if one is clever enough; and those who are clever enough, or who think they are, take the chance and go on disregarding the laws and their penalties. In effect, these law-breakers say to the law-makers—"Catch me if you can"—and in many instances the individual is never caught, and the

penalty prescribed by law is never enforced. This proves the penalty is not sufficiently fixed to be absolutely unavoidable. This is because the *authority* back of the law is not sufficient to command the respect of society.

Is there any other authority that is more capable of enforcing its laws than man himself? Yes, there is one of which we know something. That is God, or Nature. (We are using these terms synonymously.) We know that the Great Universal Intelligence whose laws govern the movements of the planets, including our earth, is the Intelligence back of all the activities and decrees of Nature. We will, therefore, not be misunderstood when we use the term *Nature* to express the authority that is more powerful than man. For we know that man is a product of Nature and that her laws and decrees apply to him, as well as to every department of his individual being.

We have come to realize, from our own individual experiences, that there is such a thing as "*Nature's Laws*". We know also that Nature's Laws are absolute and apply to all men. She is no respecter of persons. She makes no exceptions. Her penalties are just as absolute and just as inviolable as her rewards are certain and dependable.

Moreover, our personal experiences have proven to us the fact that the penalties she fixes for the violation of her laws and decrees are inviolable. They cannot be evaded nor avoided. They are self-acting and automatic. However strenuously man may endeavor to do so, he *cannot* evade nor avoid even the least of her penalties, whenever he violates one of her laws. This is because whatever

## THE DEFINITION OF THE GREAT SCHOOL

penalties Nature provides for the violations of her laws are *fixed and immutable*. Man has not the remotest chance of violating a natural law *without suffering the exact penalty which Nature has prescribed for such violation*.

In these facts we have the positive assurance that her authority is *absolute*, and hence, it is *adequate*.

Of course, we know that man may, if he so elects, violate any or all of Nature's laws for the government of mankind. But we know, at the same time, that he cannot do so *without suffering the penalties prescribed therefor*.

Hence, when man knowingly and intentionally violates a natural law, he knows also that he thereby invokes upon himself a penalty which Nature has the power to exact and enforce, and that she will not shade nor mitigate that penalty in the slightest degree.

If an individual deliberately takes a deadly poison into his system, he knows that Nature will exact his own life as a penalty for this violation of her constructive law of individual life. If he does such an act, he does it well knowing that he cannot avoid nor evade the natural penalty. This is because he recognizes the absolute authority of the Law-Maker, as well as the automatic certainty and inevitability of the penalty prescribed therefor.

If a man deliberately puts a bullet through his own heart, he knows at the time that the unavoidable penalty for his violation of the Law of Individual Life is *death*. He invokes the penalty upon

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

himself, and Nature is careful to see that it is paid in full. There is absolutely no escape.

If the statutory laws carried with them automatic penalties, as inevitable and unavoidable as are the penalties which Nature prescribes for the violation of her laws, it is certain that the conduct of men, in their human relationships, would greatly improve. This improvement would come as a direct result of definite knowledge that there is no escape from the penalties of violations of the law.

For illustration: If a thief knew in advance that the penalty for stealing his neighbor's purse would be confinement in Sing Sing prison, at hard labor, for a term of ten years, and then in spite of everything he might do to avoid that penalty he could not do it, he would have a most powerful reason to exercise self-control over the desire and impulse to steal that purse. If, however, he believed that he could steal it and *escape the penalty*, he might take the chance, as many people do take such chances under present state laws.



## CHAPTER IX

### THE PROBLEM RESOLVED

At this point a question arises which has been asked many times. It is something like this:

Suppose the members of the "*Brotherhood of Man*", such as herein defined, should undertake to live their individual lives in obedience to Nature's laws and suppose they do not know many of the laws that are absolutely vital to their success and well being, both as individuals and as a Brotherhood, what then? Is there a sufficient remedy for such a condition as this? Most assuredly. What is it? It is purely *educational*.

In fact, the education of such a Brotherhood as we have in mind in a definite knowledge of Nature's Laws, would constitute a complete remedy—in just so far as such education were successfully carried forward.

Does not this suggestion carry with it the assurance that *education* is the one most powerful constructive factor in the perpetuity and continuity of our "*Brotherhood of Man*"? Would not that soon become the common and most intense struggle of the members of such a Brotherhood—namely, to know the law that they may obey it?

What is Education? Natural Science defines it thus:

*Education* is the process by which the Individual

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

acquires a definite knowledge of all the facts of nature in all the realms of human interest—physical, mental, moral, spiritual and psychical. It is also the accumulated knowledge thus acquired.

With this definition impressed on Consciousness, it is for all members of "The Brotherhood" to strive to become "educated". There is no greater nor more important work to which they can possibly devote themselves.

When it is known that, through education, it is possible for man to advance his knowledge of Nature and Nature's laws to realms of spiritual life and nature far beyond the limitations of this physical life, one can readily appreciate what a powerful incentive this would be to elevate the standard of education in such an institution to the highest level possible.

Permit me to call attention to the fact that, just here in this matter of education in an exact and definite knowledge of the meaning and application of Nature's laws, is one of the vital points wherein the various Brotherhoods so far examined make a fundamental error. This is in the fact that they do not seem to understand or appreciate that the most powerful and vital interest in which their members must share is the *community of knowledge*. This means the *community of education*. Omit this factor from any Brotherhood among mankind, and the vital element upon which its very life and perpetuation depend has been left out.

Let us now go back and see how far along we are with the definition of Personal Responsibility in this connection.

## THE PROBLEM RESOLVED

Following the analysis as far as we have gone, we find that "*Personal Responsibility* is the *Obligation* which *God*, or *Nature*, fixes upon the *individual*" \* \* \*

But what is that obligation? What does it involve? What does it exact from the individual upon whom it is fixed?

Inasmuch as the measure of any obligation is the exact and definite *knowledge* the individual has, at any given time, of its meaning, and the law of Constructive Growth is the *Right Use* of that knowledge, and *Nature's purpose* is the evolution of the individual intelligence, and the only *standard* of *right use* is the full measure of *knowledge* which the individual possesses at any given time; therefore, the obligation which God, or Nature, thus fixes upon the individual is to *conform his life to his own standard of Equity, Justice and Right*.

*Moral Accountability* is the soul's recognition that there is a *Moral Order in Nature*, and that the Individual Intelligence, or Soul, is bound by that Moral Order to exemplify *Morality* in the living of his life, to the full measure of his knowledge.

But Nature is never unjust. She does not hold any individual personally responsible beyond the measure of his own individual knowledge. His Personal Responsibility, therefore, is "the Obligation which God, or Nature, fixes upon him to conform his life to his *own standard* of Equity, Justice and Right." Why his *own standard*? Because, for him, there is no other.

By the process of elimination of the terms defined, and the substitution of the definitions of Natural Science therefor, we have the following



## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

extended definition of "*The Brotherhood of Man*":

*"The exemplification by each individual of a Moral Order of Nature, and of the fact that he is bound by the Moral Law to discharge the Obligation which God, or Nature, fixes upon every such member, to conform his life to his own standard of Equity, Justice and Right."*

Such is the TRUE meaning of *The Brotherhood of Man*.





## CHAPTER X

### NATURE'S MORAL STANDARD

One of the problems of human life which has puzzled many of the wisest and ablest men of all time, is whether or not there is such a thing in Nature as a definite "standard of Morality, or Morals."

The confusion arises out of the following deductions:

1. God, or Nature, is just.
2. No two individual human souls are the same in point of development.
3. No two possess the same knowledge of Nature's laws.
4. No two have the same power of Self-Control.
5. No two have the same degree of intelligence or understanding.
6. No two are influenced by the same environment.
7. No two have the same evolutionary unfoldment.
8. There are all shades and degrees of development, knowledge, self-control, intelligence, understanding and education among the human family.
9. How, then, is it possible for Nature to establish any single, definite, arbitrary and unvarying

standard of Morality, or Morals, that will include and apply to all mankind?

10. How can it be possible, in justice, to establish any arbitrary standard of Morality or Morals, which shall apply to all these children of men, the same?

11. It must be that Nature is unjust.

But Nature says to us: "I am Just; for in fixing a standard of Morality, or Morals, I have taken into account every element, fact and condition you have mentioned, as well as an almost infinite number of additional inequalities; and I have formulated a Standard that fits them all, with absolute scientific exactness and precision.

"I have done this by making *knowledge*, and *soul growth* the basis on which I measure the degree of Moral Accountability and Personal Responsibility. In exact measure with his knowledge, at any given time, I make man Morally Accountable and Personally Responsible."

The infant, at physical birth, is neither Morally Accountable nor Personally Responsible, from our human measure of values. Why? Because it has no intelligence or knowledge which, as yet, measures up to our man-made standards.

Under statutory laws your own boy does not reach the full stature of Personal Responsibility and Moral Accountability until he has arrived at the physical age of 21 years. The day before he reaches his "majority" he is still an "infant" — under the law of the land. The day afterwards he is a *man*. At the age of 18 he may possess greater knowledge and wisdom than your neighbor of 50 who is the father of half a dozen children. Never-

theless, your son is an infant, under the law, and your neighbor is a *man*. But the boy is not morally accountable nor personally responsible for his actions, according to our human standards, while your neighbor is. Does this seem to exemplify Equity, Justice and Right? Clearly not.

Nature, however, measures the accountability and the responsibility of both boy and man, each by the sum of his individual knowledge and individual soul development. But this is his *own* individual standard. It is neither yours nor mine nor that of any other individual whomsoever. It is the individual's *own personalized standard*.

This gives to each of them the definite knowledge and soul growth by which he may determine his own exact and just moral standard and the degree of his own personal responsibility. Neither can bind the other by any but the individual's own standard. I cannot hold you to my standard, nor can you hold me to yours.

Nature does not even so much as attempt to do so. On the other hand, she holds each individual morally accountable and personally responsible only in strict accordance with his *own standard* — which means his own knowledge and full development. In truth, by what other standard could even Nature justly measure the degree of any individual's accountability and responsibility under her Law? None whatever.

Under the definition, which expresses Nature's own concept of Moral Accountability and Personal Responsibility, it will be observed that each individual is bound to conform *his life solely and*

*entirely to his own standard of Equity, Justice and Right.*

Under this standard which Nature holds each of us bound by, there are as many different standards of Moral Accountability and Personal Responsibility as there are different individuals upon the earth at any given time. Even so, each standard fits the individual to which it belongs, and it cannot possibly fit any other.

Compare this, the meaning of the measure of Moral Accountability and Personal Responsibility, with another phase of Nature's plan and purpose, and observe how perfectly they supplement each other.

Natural Science does not hesitate to assure us that, measured by all the exact knowledge it has acquired, up to the present time, the apparent purpose of Nature in reference to man as a human being, is the evolution of an *Individual Intelligence*.

Note the important fact that the process is one which has to do with the *Individual Intelligence* only. This is a natural concomitant of the Moral Order of Nature which gives to every man an individual moral standard that is scientifically adjusted to him and him only. Take note also that this does not even contemplate a *single* Moral Standard for all mankind regardless of individual knowledge, soul growth or individuality achieved.



## CHAPTER XI

### INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION

There inevitably comes a time, in the evolution of the Individual Intelligence and Soul Growth, when its knowledge of Nature's laws and purposes is sufficient to emancipate it from the individual status of "Psychic Infancy" and irresponsibility, and give to it both Moral Accountability and Personal Responsibility.

When this evolutionary point is reached the Individual Intelligence or Soul, has attained to a degree of personal knowledge and psychic development where he becomes a conscious and voluntary cooperator with Nature in the evolution of his individuality and soul growth. At this point he becomes an intelligent and voluntary factor in his own individual evolution. From this point forward he adds the impulse of his own voluntary and intelligent efforts to the effort of Nature, and thus greatly accelerates the progress of his own individual development.

Until he reaches the point of "Psychic Majority and Emancipation", however, Nature carries forward his evolutionary progress alone. Up to this point, therefore, his evolutionary unfoldment is less rapid than it is thereafter, whence the individual adds the impulse of his own intelligent personal effort to that of Nature.

In the process of individualizing and evolving a

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

human soul, therefore, it is of the most vital importance to the individual that he reach the point of psychic emancipation as early as possible, that he may thereafter add his own personal effort to the impulse of Nature, thereby increasing the rapidity of his own evolutionary unfoldment and development.

This naturally leads to the question: What is Nature's evolutionary process by and through which the individual human may attain Psychic Emancipation and Moral Accountability?

There is but one. It is definite, simple and direct. It is the *Education* of the individual in a definite, exact and scientific personal knowledge of Nature's laws, to the point where he shall attain his psychic majority and thereafter apply his knowledge to aid Nature voluntarily in his own soul growth.

It is this *Education* of the individual that becomes the central impulse and most uplifting inspiration of every individual member of "*The Brotherhood of Man*" which answers perfectly the terms and conditions of our definition.

It can now be seen with clearness and certainty that the great central and most exalted purpose, as well as permanent *occupation* of such a *Brotherhood of Man*, becomes that of carrying forward the great work of Individual *Education* as rapidly and perfectly as possible, to the end that each member of the *Brotherhood* shall achieve psychic emancipation and soul independence which shall invest him with the knowledge and power to supplement Nature in her Evolution and Unfoldment of Individual Intelligence, by his added voluntary and



intelligent personal effort, to the full measure of his personal knowledge and power.

Viewing the subject from the standpoint of the individual member of such a *Brotherhood*, it appears that the logical, impelling and inspiring impulse and inevitable occupation of each and every member of such a *Brotherhood* is twofold:

1. Helping Nature, by the added impulse of his own personal effort, to carry forward his own education as rapidly as possible and attain the most exalted evolutionary individual unfoldment.

2. Helping those who are less developed than himself, to arrive at the point of their psychic emancipation, as rapidly as may be possible, that they also may add the impulse of their knowledge and voluntary power to the effort of Nature in carrying forward the Great Work of Evolution and Soul Growth.

If the student and reader will make a careful and logical study of the outline of the activities of such a *Brotherhood* as has been defined, he can hardly fail to arrive at the conclusion that in the establishment of "*The Brotherhood of Man*", such as has been outlined, elucidated and defined, we have arrived at the point along the path of evolution, where in human relationships, *competition* has virtually been eliminated from the field of human activities and purposes, and *cooperation* has become the basic and central inspiration.

Having achieved psychic emancipation, and entered upon the *cooperative* endeavor to add the impulse of his own voluntary effort to the effort of Nature in his behalf, the combined impulse thereafter gives birth to what the world knows as



*Altruism.* It is the impulse to help his fellow man over the evolutionary pathway he has travelled, and give to him the benefit of the same education and evolutionary unfoldment that were received by him, and thus give to his fellows a full equivalent of the definite knowledge he has received.

In this connection a study of the working of the Law of Compensation will explain why the members of such a Brotherhood enter with intense enthusiasm into the occupation of giving to their less advanced fellows the knowledge they have received from those who are yet beyond them in knowledge and unfoldment. It is because they have arrived at a degree of unfoldment where to *know the law is to obey it*. Under the Law of Compensation, having *received* in such generous abundance from their fellows, they know that they must *give* in equal measure to those who are following in their footsteps. As ye receive, so shall ye give; this is the law of life. Those who receive most must also give most; and the business of life is now that of *Receiving and Giving*. Those who receive the knowledge which the Brotherhood has to give know that they must balance the Law of Compensation by giving in equal measure to those who need what they can give.

This will suggest *why* and *how* it is that such a Brotherhood becomes a truly great educational institution. It will explain why it is that the utmost care should be taken to guard against mistakes in the methods of instruction to be employed, as well as in the curriculum of education to be covered. This latter must be such that it shall cover every department of constructive human character, every

## INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION

phase of individual evolution along constructive lines.

It must not be limited to the facts of Nature and of Nature's laws upon the plane of physical life and knowledge only.

Neither must it be limited to education concerning the facts of Nature even upon both the physical and the spiritual planes of life and activity; for that would omit the most vital of all the realms of individual life, namely, the realm of the Soul itself.

In other words, the curriculum of study necessary to meet the needs of the real *Brotherhood of Man* must be such that it shall cover a definite knowledge of the facts of physical life and physical laws, spiritual life and spiritual laws, and finally, psychical life and psychical laws—as far as these can be definitely unfolded to human intelligence.

Since Nature fixes upon each Individual Intelligence the obligation to balance his account under the Law of Compensation, it follows that he must hold himself bound under the Great Law to pass on to his fellows the knowledge he has received. Hence, one of the most important objective points along the pathway of his own development is to qualify himself for the active work of *instruction*. Every student along the way should be made to understand and appreciate the fact that, so long as he occupies that status, he is primarily a *Receiver* who must ultimately become an Instructor before he can pass on the knowledge he has received, become a *Giver*, and pay his debts to Nature.

This will suggest how important it is that each individual member of "*The Brotherhood of Man*"

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

charge himself, at the beginning of his real studentship, with the responsibility of becoming an Instructor fully qualified to pass on to others, who need such help, the knowledge he has received from his own Instructor.

This, however, is one of the responsibilities which many of the members are most reluctant to acknowledge and discharge. They put it off as long as possible, often because they feel themselves lacking in the qualifications of a good instructor, or in the ability to impart the knowledge they have so generously received. If such is the case, then it is clear that they have not completed the work of *studentship*; for no student has completed his course of instruction, as such, until he has taken the full course in *how to instruct*, and proven himself duly qualified as a competent Instructor. For then only is he prepared to repay his indebtedness under the Law of Compensation, by passing on his knowledge to those of his brothers who need and are entitled to *receive* what he has received and is ready to give in return.

Thus only is it possible for the individual to become a real member of "*The Brotherhood of Man.*"



## CHAPTER XII

### QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

That each and every individual may have a clear and comprehensive understanding and appreciation of the responsibilities he voluntarily assumes, or is asking that he be permitted to assume, when he applies for membership in the "Brotherhood of Man", let us digress far enough to inform ourselves as to what constitutes the chief qualifications of a good Instructor in such an institution. Here they are:

*Intelligence:* Such an Instructor must have the intelligence necessary to receive the definite instruction, in the form prescribed by the Brotherhood itself. He must be able to understand and appreciate the exact meaning and intent of the knowledge which such an instruction embodies. He must be able to know each step in the process of acquiring an exact knowledge of the full and complete curriculum of study to be covered. He must have the intelligence to acquire a definite knowledge of the exact terminology in which the instruction is formulated and given; and he must be able to give it as he receives it, *in the purity of its terminology.*

*Desire for Knowledge:* He must have an honest and earnest desire to receive the definite knowledge which will justify the Brotherhood in accepting him as a worthy member.

*Honesty:* He must exemplify the quality and degree of Honesty that entitles him to the confidence of the members of the Brotherhood with whom he desires to associate himself. He must be honest in his purpose and in his efforts to make only a constructive use of such knowledge as he shall be able to receive. He must be honest in his efforts to give his knowledge so received, in its purity, to those who are entitled to receive it from him in return. He must be honest in that he shall not misrepresent the Brotherhood or its teachings, in any way, by substituting his or any other teachings for those of this Brotherhood.

*Courage:* He must have the courage of frankness and sincerity in all his dealings and associations with the Brotherhood and all its members. He must have the Courage to exemplify the spirit of the teachings of the Brotherhood in passing on his knowledge to those entitled to receive it from him.

In this connection, he must know that the highest quality of Courage often demands of him that he withhold from his students, or fellows, the knowledge he has received, even when his sympathy and natural desires would impel him to give it. He must know that his responsibility as an Instructor may even demand of him that he suspend the instruction of a student at any time, in the interests of the Brotherhood. When this occurs, he must have the courage to discharge that responsibility without the least equivocation or hesitancy. If his student proves unworthy of confidence, as such, or that he is not ready to receive the knowledge he desires, he must have the courage to discontinue

## QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

his instruction until such time as he shall qualify for further instruction.

*Humility:* He must exemplify the quality and degree of Humility which is free from egotism, vanity of intelligence, self-exploitation, or the desire to command public attention or public applause. He must not seek to command attention, or curiosity, or fictitious importance, or false knowledge, through psychic phenomena, or exhibitions of spiritual powers. He must have the humility to refrain from unnecessary talking, and from exploiting his knowledge for any ulterior purpose that is not constructive and uplifting and of value to those who hear. He should bear in mind that the fewer the words in which he can express his knowledge and instructions, the less he will obtrude his personality upon his student and distract his attention from the knowledge to be conveyed. True humility is, in truth, one of the rarest characteristics and virtues of a wise Instructor.

*Unselfishness:* The qualified Instructor will never seek to commercialize the knowledge or instruction he has received as a gift from his instructor to qualify him for the responsibility of passing on his spiritual and psychical knowledge in the course of the curriculum of the Brotherhood.

*Tolerance:* The duly qualified Instructor must be free from criticism, and the disposition or tendency to judge his fellows. He must be able to differentiate and distinguish between mistakes and deliberate wrong doing, and exemplify a generous forbearance toward the errors and frailties and the imperfections of his fellow man.



## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

He must be kind and considerate with all his fellows. He must be cheerful and trustworthy. He must strive with all his intelligence and strength, to exemplify the spirit of constructive service in his own life, that he may thus make it a beacon light to guide the students and members who shall pass that way.

While it is admitted that this is setting an exalted standard of individual character by which to measure the qualifications of a Good Instructor in the real "Brotherhood of Man", nevertheless, the measure is strictly within the powers of those who are willing to assume the responsibility, and labor in good faith to discharge it to the full limits of their abilities.

Does it seem possible to you, reader and friend, that there is such a "Brotherhood of Man" upon this physical earth of ours, having a definite curriculum of study covering so vast a field of actual knowledge as I have so briefly indicated and outlined?

Would my unqualified personal assurance of that fact carry with it to your mind any assurance that I have been giving you, in substance, but a brief outline of a great educational institution which has been in actual existence for many, many years, having a curriculum covering even a broader field than that outlined?

Such, indeed, is the case. The name by which it is known at the present time is — "*The Great School of Natural Science*". Moreover, this Great School, throughout the history of many past generations, has been seeking to give to the world such



of its knowledge of Individual Life, here and hereafter, as lies within its power.

This School has carried its scientific researches beyond the plane of the purely physical inquiry, into realms of the spiritual and the psychical departments of Nature. It has accumulated a vast store of definite knowledge in these higher and finer realms of its researches, and is ever ready to pass it on to those who are able to prove their right to receive its instruction.

This, however, does not imply that the School of Natural Science has accomplished a definite and exact knowledge of all the facts of physical nature. Neither does it indicate a scientific knowledge of all the facts of either spiritual or psychical nature.

It does mean, however, that this Great School of Natural Science, during the period of authentic history, has been acquiring and accumulating a wide range of exact and definite knowledge in all the departments and on all the planes of individual life, physical, spiritual and psychical.

It means also that this Great School has developed a definite and complete method of imparting its knowledge to the world, as rapidly as earnest seekers desire to receive it and can demonstrate to the School that they are duly and truly prepared, worthy and well qualified to "keep the secrets of the Masters", and exemplify their teachings in their daily lives and conduct, thus becoming "living lamps to guide the feet of the just and true", in the Way that leads to Spiritual Life and Soul Illumination.



## CHAPTER XIII

### THE TRUE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

We come now to the final analysis, the final step, the final measure, the final TEST, by which we shall determine, with scientific certainty, whether our "*Brotherhood of Man*" meets the requirements of "*The Great Universal Brotherhood*" by which God, or Nature, fixes the full measure of its final value and determination.

By the simple test of *universality* alone, we have found that among all the many Brotherhoods, such as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Carpenters, the Brotherhood of Barbers, the Brotherhood of Fruit Growers, the Junior Order of American Mechanics, the American Federation of Labor, the various Religious Brotherhoods, the Social Brotherhoods, the Fraternal Brotherhoods, the Political Brotherhoods, the Brotherhood of Socialism, the Brotherhood of Anarchism, the Brotherhood of Communism — every one has proven inadequate and insufficient. Its failure and imperfection are proven by two distinguishing facts:

1. That the tie of mutual interest which binds the members together is selfish.
2. That its membership is strictly exclusive and limited to a single class.

The same may be said, with equal sincerity and

## THE TRUE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

truth, concerning every other form of Brotherhood among men, limited to the same conditions.

Its fatal weakness lies in the fact of its selfishness and lack of universality.

Wherein, if at all, does "*The Brotherhood of Man*" which has been defined, analyzed, and elucidated, fall short of the exalted standard of our definition? Let us submit it to the final test, that there may remain no shadow of uncertainty as to its accuracy, sufficiency and universal application. It meets every condition, as follows:

1. The tie of mutual interest is one which binds its members in one common bond with the broad, universal, prevailing and all-comprehensive purpose which unites them in a single fellowship with a mutual endeavor as its central inspiration to action.

2. It is a work of *education* in which all members are inspired by the same motive and impulse to *Give* and *Receive* under the great Law of Compensation, without material fee or reward.

3. It has in mind the greater benefit and evolutionary unfoldment and development of all men, both within and without the strictly limited membership of the Brotherhood.

4. It has the unselfish desire and purpose to become worthy and constructive servants of humanity and thus extend the helping hand of Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth to all mankind.

Bear in mind that the definite purpose and *occupation* of each and every individual member of "*The Brotherhood of Man*" are those of *Education*. As a *Brotherhood* it is one great, crystallized

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Educational Institute in which the business of every member is to acquire the knowledge which the Brotherhood has to give, then become a duly qualified Instructor to pass on the curriculum of study to his less advanced fellows. Thus each member *receives* and he *gives*, and thereby finds that his purpose and occupation become one, in that he thereafter devotes himself to the business of life — the discharge of his Personal Responsibility, under the great Law of Compensation. He is now an Educator, charged with the business of serving his younger brothers as guide and fellow traveler along the evolutionary pathway of Life toward the goal of Individual Endeavors.

In this School of Individual Effort he is seeking not alone for knowledge of life upon this planet of earth. He has come to know much of the life of the spiritual, and something of the life and evolutionary unfoldment of the Soul. Thus, the vista of knowledge, of wisdom, of power and of possibilities of individual human unfoldment gives to him an evolutionary perspective that inspires his courage, hope, faith and determination to go onward and ever onward toward the limitless expanse of the infinite.

But there is one vital point you are not to overlook nor forget. It is this:

While it is true that the *active membership* of "*The Brotherhood of Man*" is limited to those who have received the Instruction and have themselves become Instructors, all of them, both *Receivers* of Knowledge and *Givers* of Knowledge concerning the Great Problems of Life, are vastly

## THE TRUE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

more than mere *members* of the Brotherhood of Man.

They have reached the point of individual evolution where they are recognized, and, likewise recognize themselves, as *Brothers of All Mankind*.

They know that they are Brothers, real *Soul* Brothers, of the Black Man, the Brown Man, the Red Man, the Yellow Man and the White Man.

They know that they are, deep down within their inmost Soul, Brothers of the evolutionary infants of earth life, for whom it is their privilege, their responsibility, their pleasure and their pride, to render such constructive service as lies within their power.

They know that they are, likewise, Brothers of the evolutionary *children* of earth, the youth, the mature and the aged, whom it is their mission to serve.

They know that they are Brothers of the weak, the strong, the great, the small, the wise, the ignorant, the good and the evil.

They know that they are Brothers of the criminal, the dishonest, the bestial, the murderer, the selfish and the greedy, whom they must help.

They know that they are Brothers of those who foment strife, agitate discord, incite wars, live upon the crimes of lust, rapine and every form of degradation and sin; and yet, these are their charges, for whom they are responsible.

They know that they are Brothers of *All Mankind*; that it is their mission, their duty, their responsibility, their earnest desire and endeavor to serve them ALL.

They have affection for them because they are

all Children of God, or Nature, and the protecting shelter of the Great Law rests over them.

They would go out, in gentle charity and tender mercy, to all who have not grown to the evolutionary stature of responsibility. These they would lead by the "Hand of Love"; they would serve them and help them and instruct them in a knowledge of Nature's beneficent purposes, and finally would point them to the Pathway of Duty.

These are not mere figures of speech. They are the simple facts of Nature and they are exemplified every day, the world over, by those who have entered into the Work of the *Great School of Natural Science* and found their educational stations where they can best serve those who most need the help of an *Elder Brother of Humanity*.

This also is the occupation, the business and the profession of a member of the real *Brotherhood of Man*, to render to his "younger brother" whatever service he shall need, whether physical, mental, moral, spiritual or psychical.

The responsibility is on the real Brother, because of his greater knowledge and richer wisdom, to determine the real need to be supplied and the service to be rendered. To his keener vision and broader knowledge, he may observe that his younger Brother who has not yet arrived at the evolutionary status of discretion, is lacking the knowledge, the wisdom and the discretion to determine, in advance, that which shall render to him the largest service and richest reward, at any given time. As the loving mother may find her child lacking the knowledge and discretion to determine the appropriate need or service of the hour, the respon-



sibility of fitting the need to the occasion becomes hers and not the child's. With all the mother-love of her heart she accepts the burden, with joy and enthusiasm, because she knows the immaturity and the lack of judgment that would impel the child in its immature decision and choice.

So with her great discretion she may find it the part of wisdom to deny the child the present fulfillment of its childish dream. She may find that personal responsibility shall compel her to withhold the coveted prize, that time and circumstances shall prove the wisdom of her judgment.

So it is that the Elder Brother shall give or withhold from his younger Brother whatsoever his greater knowledge and experience shall suggest to his greater discretion and wisdom. He must carry the burden of responsibility and point the way to constructive unfoldment.

In the *Great School of Natural Science* the Masters point the way for their Students. They journey with them over the pathway of initiation. They also must give or withhold whatsoever the constructive unfoldment of the student demands—physical, spiritual, mental, moral or psychical. They must not only know the Way that leads to the goal of Mastership, but they must see that the Initiate, through his Personal Effort, travels every step of the way, conforming his life to the constructive demands of the Great Law.

The *Brotherhood of Man* is but another name for the same great Work. It is but the crystalized and perfect *Ideal* of which the School of Natural Science is the working model and the living exemplification. Together they constitute a splendid



unit, in scope, method and purpose; and henceforward the Ideal and the Working Model shall merge into the REAL "Brotherhood of Man."

Thus have the Masters among mankind glimpsed the perfect design which God has placed upon the Trestleboard of Nature, and patterned upon the Evolutionary Scheme of Individual Life. By his conscious and voluntary Personal Effort has *Man* become the working unit in the Great School of Life. By his intelligent personal effort and accumulated wisdom of experience has he added the Evolutionary Impulse of his individual energies to the greater impulse of Nature; and together the two, working in conscious and intelligent harmony to one sublime culmination, have attained their final consummation in — —

## “THE GREAT UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.”

We are all Brothers in this sublime organization. We are all, as Individuals and as Brothers, obligated to help each other to travel the way of Evolutionary Unfoldment. We are all, as Elder Brothers who have gone before, responsible to guide and uplift our younger Brothers as they climb the mountain of Individual Growth and Development. We are all fellow travelers. We are all here to live and to exemplify the *Universal Brotherhood of Man*.

And now that we have found our working stations within the greatest Institution of which humanity has definite knowledge, let us go forward, with ever-increasing courage and determination, toward that great goal of Nature's Universal *Brotherhood of Man* — that goal which is the —  
“*Exemplification of Moral Accountability in the Mutual Discharge of Personal Responsibility.*”

So Mote It Ever Be!



The following page contains a list of  
the publications of  
The Great School of Natural Science

# LITERATURE

## of

### THE GREAT SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCE

Vol. I. Harmonies of Evolution, Florence Huntley .....			\$4.00
<i>The Struggle for Happiness, and Individual Completion Through Polarity or Affinity.</i>			
Vol. II. The Great Psychological Crime.....	}		\$4.00
<i>The Destructive Principle of Nature in Individual Life.</i>			
Vol. III. The Great Work .....			\$4.00
<i>The Constructive Principle of Nature in Individual Life.</i>			
Vol. IV. The Great Known .....		J. E. Richardson TK	\$4.00
<i>What Science Knows of the Spiritual World.</i>			
Vol. V. The Great Message .....			\$4.00
<i>The Lineal Key of the Great School of the Masters.</i>			
Vol. I. Self-Unfoldment	}	J. E. Richardson, TK	\$3.00
Vol. II. Self-Unfoldment			\$3.00
<i>The Practical Application of Moral Principles to the Living of a Life.</i>			
The Brotherhood of Man, J. E. Richardson, TK.....			\$2.50
Who Answers Prayer? PO, RA, TK.....			\$2.00
To You (MAGAZINE) per year .....			\$3.00

PIONEER PRESS  
25355 Spanish Ranch Road  
Los Gatos, California

---

---

# For Progressive People

---

THE GREAT SCHOOL, OR THE SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCE, is the modern name for that venerable School of Wisdom whose records are the most ancient at this time known to man. For many thousands of years this School has influenced the civilization and work of every great nation of earth, and with unceasing labors its members have toiled for the advancement of the human race from ignorance to knowledge, from darkness to light.

In 1883 this Great School established its personal Work in this country, and since that time thousands of "Progressive People" have become readers and students of the Science and the Philosophy which have now been presented in eight published volumes or text-books of the School. Each book is complete in itself. These textbooks are known as the "Harmonic Series."

Vol. I, HARMONICS OF EVOLUTION. By Florence Huntley. This initial volume covers that universal principle in nature of individual affinity, and individual love, which operates throughout the mineral, vegetable, animal and human kingdoms. It is a declaration and a scientific and philosophical exposition of the following three propositions, viz:—

THERE IS NO DEATH.

LIFE AFTER PHYSICAL DEATH IS A FACT SCIENTIFICALLY DEMONSTRABLE.

LIFE HERE AND HEREAFTER HAS A COMMON DEVELOPMENT AND A COMMON PURPOSE.

This work constitutes a light and guide to modern men and women engaged in the "Struggle for Happiness in a seemingly hostile environment."

Price \$4.00

---

---

# THE GREAT WORK

J. E. RICHARDSON, TK

Vol. III  
Harmonic Series

This book is also from the pen of the author of "THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN," and is a presentation, analysis and elucidation of the fundamental principle and working formulary of The Great School of Natural Science, which principle and formulary are known to the "Masters of the Law" and their students and friends as the "constructive principle of nature in individual life."

The author of "The Great Work" was the American Representative of The Great School of the Masters, a School which was hoary with age when the foundation of the great Pyramid was laid; a School which antedates all present authentic history and records; a School against which the waves of superstition and ignorance have dashed in vain, because its foundation is the rock of TRUTH.

This book shows that there is a great difference between Belief and Knowledge, and proves that mere beliefs are of little value to the one who would prove that there is a life beyond the grave. He must Know and Do, and this book points the way.

"The Great Work" is unique in that its statements are verified facts which every reader may prove for himself under right guidance if he but have the "Intelligence to know, the Courage to dare, and the Perseverance to do." The Philosophy taught in this book appeals to both Reason and Conscience, and is an inspiration to "live the life and know the law." Every student realizes that, if he so wills, he may be an heir to the Wisdom of the Ages.

"The Great Work" belongs in your Library.

Price \$4.00



# THE GREAT MESSAGE

by

J. E. RICHARDSON TK

Vol. V

Harmonic Series

This inspiring book is an introduction to the findings of The Great School of the Masters. The Great School is that great Central Source and Reservoir of Knowledge (Religious, Philosophical, Moral, Physical, Spiritual and Psychical) which the best intelligences of all ages have intuitively sensed and definitely accepted as the great beneficent, constructive, uplifting and progressive influence in the Evolution of Mankind from Spiritual Infancy and Darkness to Soul Maturity and Illumination.

The records of The Great School contain a detailed account of the Life and Work of the Master Jesus. To this school He went for His spiritual instruction. In it He spent the years of His special preparation. From it he went forth to preach the Gospel of Peace on Earth and the Kingdom of Love. For the cause it represents, He labored and suffered and died.

Besides our own Master Jesus, there were numerous other Masters, who were commissioned by The Great School to bring its Message of Life, Light and Immortality to the world. Some of the most well known are, Confucius, Zarathustra, Buddha, Moses, Krishna, Eliola, Pythagoras and Melchizedek:

The pathway of The Great School of the Masters is again open to true seekers after Truth, and the duly and truly prepared, worthy and well qualified may find the way to its Temple of Light and without money and without price receive such knowledge as they may merit.

A modern movement known as The Great School of Natural Science has been launched by the Great Parent School of the Masters to give to the Progressive Intelligence of the twentieth century a definite and scientific presentation of *THE PHILOSOPHY OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE* as taught by its members throughout all the past ages.

Those who find in THE GREAT MESSAGE an inspiration to seek further Light will have a new and broader outlook on life, and renewed zeal to make the most of it. The door to the Temple of Wisdom is ajar.

\$4.00