

Advanced Thought

A Monthly Journal of

The New Thought, Practical Psychology, Yogi
Philosophy, Constructive Occultism,
Metaphysical Healing, Etc,

WILLIAM WALKER ATKINSON, Editor
ARTHUR GOULD, Business Manager

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
778205
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1918 L

Vol. II.

MARCH, 1917

No. 1

CONTENTS

Chips from the Old Block	William Walker Atkinson	1
The Phenomena of Mind	William Walker Atkinson	2
The Truth about Karma	Yogi Ramacharaka	6
Mind-Reading Experiments	Theron Q. Dumont	12
Ideas and Prosperity	Julia Catherine Gray	16
Spirited, not Spiritless	William Walker Atkinson	18
The Psychology of Woman	Margaret Van Norden	23
Will Our Future Life be Idle?	Arthur Gould	28

HEART-TO-HEART TALKS

(By the Editor)

One Year After.....	31	Stop, Look, and Listen!.....	33
Rising Prices	37	Back Numbers	37

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(Conducted by the Editor)

Knowing vs. Believing	38	The Passing Years	40
Correcting a Correction	41	Another Explanation	41
About Treatments	42	Personal Answers	43
Soul, Spirit, and Real Self	43	A Distinction Without a Differ- ence	45
Whew!	45	Getting an Answer	46
Help! Help!	47	The Spirit, Not the Words	47
Count Ten Before You Speak	48	Look Forward, Not Backward..	48
Just Try Me!	49		

INTERNATIONAL NEW THOUGHT ALLIANCE

Alliance News.....	22
--------------------	----

MISCELLANY, QUOTATIONS, ETC.

A Creed (Emily Bronte).....	10	Crowded Out	30
To the Individual	27	Recessional	49

Subscription Rates, Etc.

Single Copies, Ten Cents. Yearly Subscription (12 issues) \$1.10
(In United States, Alaska, Cuba, Porto Rico, Mexico, Hawaii and Phillipines)

In Canada, \$1.35 a year. In Foreign Countries, \$1.50 a year

(Copyright 1917, by Advanced Thought Publishing Co.)

Entered as Second-class matter, July 17, 1916, at the postoffice at Chi-
cago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Address all Subscriptions, or other communications to

Advanced Thought Publishing Co.

166 N. Michigan Avenue

Chicago, Illinois



KEYNOTE

For
Meditation

FOR MARCH, 1917

**I am able to find and dwell in the Silent Peace
which abides in the Heart of the Storm!**

*Sound the Mental Keynote. Your thought will
materialize in objective form and action—your
ideal will become real*



ADVANCED THOUGHT

A Monthly Journal of

The New Thought, Practical Psychology,
Yogi Philosophy, Constructive Occultism,
Metaphysical Healing, Etc.

WILLIAM WALKER ATKINSON, Editor

Vol. II.

MARCH, 1917

No. 1

Chips From the Old Block

By William Walker Atkinson

Americanism is (or should be) more than the mere accident of birth or change of residence. Its spirit is greater than this; it is an ideal, a mental attitude, a striving of the soul.

America stands for those ideals of the race which make for freedom of opportunity; self-government; democracy, and political equality—the look-forward, free field and no favoritism mental attitude—the “give me Liberty, or give me Death” soul-attitude.

These ideals are common to the great souls of the race, irrespective of national boundary lines. Their seeds were wafted Westward on the breezes of thought, from all lands; they found a fertile soil in the New World, and put forth shoots, blossoms, and fruit. The soil which nourished the American Tree of Liberty was drenched with the blood of liberty-loving men of many races—each land giving of its best to nourish the growth of the Ideal.

Racial ties were thrown aside in 1776, when the American sons of the Mother Country, though their hearts were sore, rebelled against the Old World reactionary powers in a fight for Freedom. And, in 1917, the world may see the American sons of the Fatherland, with equally sore hearts, struggling against the reactionary forces of the Old World in the new fight for Freedom.

Americanism, then, is not mere Racialism or narrow Nationalism—it is the struggle of THE RACE against Cæsarism, “Divine Right of Kings,” the Rule of the Sword, the Iron Heel, the Mailed Fist. It is true New Thought to live for these ideals—and if necessary, to die for them.

“With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right; let us strive on to finish the work we are in;
* * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”

But we must reinforce our American Wishbone with American Backbone. Let Righteousness, not Racial Hate, fill our hearts—but let us meet the issues not try to shirk them.

And, remember—“equal opportunity” should carry with it “equal responsibility.”

The Phenomena of Mind

By William Walker Atkinson

As I have pointed out in an earlier paper of this series, Science groups phenomena into three general classes, viz.: (1) the phenomena of Matter; (2) the phenomena of Force or Energy; and (3) the phenomena of Mind.

Accordingly, in earlier papers of this series I discussed with you what Science holds to be true concerning the phenomena of Matter, and the phenomena of Force or Energy. And, along the same general lines of discussion I shall in this paper call your attention to the subject of the phenomena of Mind. But, mark you this carefully, I shall not attempt to take up the question of what Mind is "in itself"; but shall confine myself strictly to the scientific view of how Mind acts or presents itself to the scientific observer of its phenomena.

Science does not recognize the existence of a "thing in itself" called Mind, any more than that of a "thing in itself" called Matter, or Force, as the case may be. As in the case of Matter or of Force, it considers Mind as a great category or class of phenomena manifesting under certain laws, rules and principles of activity. It does not concern itself with abstract "principles" called Matter, Force, or Mind, respectively—but merely with the activities of the class or category of things which it labels by those several terms. Accordingly, Science does not recognize the existence of "Mind" as an abstract principle separate and apart from the mental states known as sensations, perceptions, conceptions, ideas, thoughts, feelings, emotions, desires, activities of will, etc. It leaves all such questions of abstract principles to metaphysics or philosophy, deeming them out of its own legitimate field.

When Science inclines toward any form of philosophy at all, it shows a disposition to consider Matter, Force, and Mind as co-ordinated manifestations of a Something more fundamental than either, or perhaps transcending them all—as, for instance, Spencer's "Infinite and Eternal Energy," or Haeckel's "Eternal Substance." But strictly speaking, with even these Science, considered as a whole, does not concern itself; though individual scientists may indulge in such speculations.

Accordingly, as might be expected, Science contents itself with definitions of Mind representing this mental attitude toward it. For instance, the following is a fair statement of the modern scientific

definition of Mind, viz.: "The state, at any given time, of the psychological activities and processes known as feeling, thinking, and willing, together with their more complex derivatives."

The following quotations from competent authorities, in leading works of reference, will emphasize this conception of Science, which may prove disappointing to those of us who may harbor certain fixed metaphysical or philosophical conceptions of Mind as a "thing in itself." But even such of us will do well to ascertain the scientific angle of view, in order that we may balance the same with our views from our own angles. Here are the quotations referred to above:

"The popular view of Mind makes it a mind-substance. But such a view is wholly foreign to the spirit and to the requirements of modern psychology. It is unsupported by psychological evidence, and the assumption is superfluous. The new psychology keeps the term 'Mind,' but defines it as the sum-total of an individual's mental experience. Just as a 'plant' is the organized whole of the root, stem, leaves, and flowers, and not something above and behind these parts, so is Mind the organized whole of our mental processes, the interwoven totality of thoughts, feelings, desires, volitions, etc., and not something above and behind these manifestations of mentality.

"Not only is Mind, as a whole, a 'stream' of thought and feeling; but each separate element of mind or mental formation is itself a process. Every sensation rises, poises, falls, in its own characteristic way; even the 'idea,' the mental thing par excellence, is a 'variable process'; and such formations as emotion and volition bear the mark of process upon them. The 'stuff' of which Mind is made is essentially 'process' and not 'being.'

"The books which define Psychology as the 'Science of Mind,' have not a word to say about 'that which thinks and feels and wills.' They are entirely taken up with thoughts and feelings and acts of will—mental facts, in a word—trying to tell us what they are, and to arrange them in classes, and tell us the circumstances or conditions under which they exist. It seems to me that it would be better to define Psychology as the science of the experiences, phenomena, or facts of Mind—of mental facts, in a word."

The term "process" included in the above quotations, is used in scientific and philosophic discussions according to the following general definition: "A series of actions, motions, or occurrences, progressing in continuous forward movement." A "process" is akin to a "procession," which is "an act of proceeding in regular, orderly, and continuous progress." The distinctive mark of "Process" is **Orderly Change.**

How Mind "Proceeds"

Psychology shows us that Mind, or Mental Process, manifests in the following general forms or phases of activity:

Sensation. Sensation, well called "the raw materials of Mind," arises from the excitation of the sensory nerves which connect with the brain. This excitation is caused by the presence, contact, and activity of some material object external to the nerve-end. The sensory nerves transmit the report of the excitation to the brain, where it is translated into the mental state called Sensation.

The optical nerves report contact with certain etheric vibrations which we call "light waves" because they arouse in us the sensation of "light"; the auditory nerves report contact with certain atmospheric vibrations which we call "sound waves," because they arouse in us the sensation of "sound"; the olfactory nerves report contact with minute material particles which have entered the nostrils, and which we translate as "smell"; the gustatory nerves report contact with portions of material objects which we have taken into the mouth, and which we translate as "taste"; the tactile nerves report contact with material objects, which we translate as "touch" or "feeling." All sensations are believed to be evolutions of, or phases of, the elementary sense of touch or feeling. Each set of sensory nerves has its own apparatus or organs which at one end contact the material objects exciting it, and at the other end contact the brain.

All of our higher and more complex mental states, activities, and processes are built-up and composed of these simple sensations, which have been so reported by the senses. This "raw materials" of sensation are then manufactured into all kinds, grades and patterns of mental fabrics, from the most simple to the most complex. Without the basis of sensation, there would be no feeling, or thought, or voluntary action possible to the individual.

Perception. Perception is the conscious **recognition** of a sensation. Perception **interprets** the report of sensation, and translates it into a simple concept or idea. Sensation is simple, while perception depends for its efficiency upon previous experience and training.

Representation. Representation is the reappearance in consciousness of a previously experienced perception, or more complex idea or mental state derived from perception. Memory and Imagination are phases of representation; the first named merely **reproduces** the perception or idea, while the second named also **rearranges** these reproductions of memory.

How Thought Proceeds

Thought. Thought is the complex process arising from the analysis and synthesis (the taking-apart and putting-together) of previously experienced perceptions and ideas reproduced by the memory, and the making of logical deductions therefrom by the processes of reasoning.

Thought proceeds as follows:

- (1) It **gathers up** perceptions and the more complex ideas or concepts derived from them;
- (2) It **examines and analyzes** these mental states, for the purpose of **ascertaining the characteristics** of each;
- (3) It **compares** these examined mental states, in order to **ascertain likenesses and differences—agreements or disagreements** between them;
- (4) It **classifies** these compared mental states, according to their ascertained points of likeness or difference, agreement or disagreement, and **ties them up into bundles** which are called **classes or categories**;
- (5) It **forms a general idea**, called a "concept" or "notion" of each of these bundles of classified mental states; and also gives to each a name, or designation, which latter is called a "term." The "term" is then used as a **symbol** or "trade mark" of the concept or notion in future thought or discussion thereof;
- (6) It **reasons upon** and regarding these concepts, notions, or complex ideas, i. e., it **draws inferences** from them, **passes judgment** upon them, and thus evolves new knowledge and ideas concerning them;
- (7) It then **compares judgments and inferences**, and thus **derives higher judgments and inferences** from them; and so on, and on, and on—the limit depending upon the degree of intellectual power latent in the individual or developed in him by training.

This, then, is a brief picture of the processes of thought. But it must never be lost sight of that even in the highest exercise of reason the results obtained are entirely dependent upon the raw materials of sensation for their substance. Every report of reason is a structure built-up and composed of the material originally furnished by sensation.

(It is to be noticed that scientific psychology takes no account of what is called Intuition, regarding it as merely race-memory—the result of race-experience, etc. In a later paper I shall introduce some other views regarding Intuition.)

How Feeling Proceeds

Feeling. Feeling is "the simple agreeable or disagreeable side of any mental state." The agreeable side of a mental experience or state is called "pleasure"; the disagreeable side thereof is called "pain." That which **sensation** is to the more complex states of thought, so is **feeling** to the more complex mental states known as emotion, desire, and certain forms of will-activity. Feeling usually arises from a simple sensation; while Emotion usually arises from an idea, notion, or more complex derivative of sensation.

Emotion. Emotion is "a complex excitement of the feelings, whether pleasurable or painful." Emotion is a complex derivative of feeling. It usually "goes deeper" than simple feeling. It is usually derived from an idea or complex mental state, rather than from a simple sensation as is the case of simple feeling. Feelings have been compared to the smaller streams which flow into the river of Emotion and make it what it is.

Desire. Desire is "the wish, craving, or longing for the presence or possession of the object arousing the idea of pleasurable feeling or emotion." Aversion, or the wish, craving, or longing to escape from, or to avoid, some object arousing the idea of painful feeling or emotion, is but the negative form of desire. There must always be an **object of desire**, and a **subjective cause or motive for the desire**—the former must be something external to the individual; the latter depends upon his past experience or inherited tendencies.

Desire, on the one side, touches Feeling and Emotion; on the other side it touches Will.

How Will Proceeds

Will. Will is that quite complex mental state or process in which "activity" is the dominant spirit. Will is threefold in its manifestations, i. e., (a) it is called to activity by Desire and is blended therewith at one pole of its being; (b) it manifests in a middle-ground, or intermediate stage of Deliberation or Choice, in which the conflicting Desire-motives are weighed and balanced against each other and tested by the verdict of remembered past experiences and the judgments arising therefrom, until the strongest motive at the time, or the general average of the conflicting motives, finally wins the day and the choice or decision is made; (c) it manifests in action upon the lines of the determined choice or decision. Will-action, it is seen, has a direct sequence of descent from Sensation, **but along two distinct lines**, i. e., along the lines of Thought and Feeling, respectively.

In subsequent papers in this magazine I shall invite you to consider in greater detail the several stages of the mental process.

The Truth About Karma

By Yogi Ramacharaka

The term "Karma" has become quite familiar to the average Western student of philosophy or metaphysics, and is frequently referred to by Western writers on these subjects in order to illustrate some point of their own teachings. Moreover, the term is in general use by the many different teachers of New Thought, or kindred schools of Western thought; and is by them given many different shades of interpretation, some of which are not warranted by the best Hindu teachings.

To many Western persons who have acquired an elementary knowledge of the Hindu philosophies, the term "Karma" is thought to indicate a great universal principle of Retribution, or Punishment; and, indeed, by the uneducated masses of the Hindu race this or a similar meaning of the term is favored. But the educated Hindu, who is informed regarding the true teachings of the philosophies of his land and race, regrets this error or half-truth regarding this particular point of teaching; for to him Karma means something entirely different.

Karma is simply Spiritual Cause and Effect, nothing more, nothing less. Just as is the Law of Cause and Effect found to be operative on the planes of the physical and psychical processes, so under the name of Karma is it found to be operative on the plane of what might be called the "soul life" of the individual. But just as it would be improper to call the law of physical cause and effect "retribution," or "punishment," so is it improper to think of the Law of Karma in this way. Karma does not seek to "punish" or to "reward"—it simply works in the direction of bringing logical effects as a result of their appropriate causes.

Karma does not **punish** men for wrong-doing—it merely operates so as to bring to the individual the logical effects of his acts. Karma does not **reward** men for their good deeds—it merely operates so as to bring to the individual the logical effects of his acts. Karma is not a Person, nor is it administered by a Person—not even by a Divine Personality. Karma is a **LAW** inherent in the universe, and works out its results just as does any other universal law.

A child touches a hot stove and burns its hands. It has violated a natural law, and receives the effect thereof. But the burnt finger cannot be regarded as a **punishment**, in the usual sense of that term, although, of course, it may **act as a punishment** so far as preventing

a repetition of the error is concerned. Karma is a Teacher of Lessons, rather than a Principle of Punishment.

The Hindu teaching of Reincarnation and Karma are closely interwoven, for the reason that it is held that in each incarnation the individual is **what he is** by reason of **what he has thought, felt and done** in previous incarnations; and that **what he does, thinks and feels** in the present life will largely determine **what he will be** in his future lives.

The teaching also is, in another phase, that the individual **lives out** certain desires and traits of character in due time, and thus also **outlives** them and leaves them behind. So that there is not that endless chain of re-birth and re-experience which some persons complain of (and rightly) as being meaningless and purposeless were it a fact

Some hold that the doctrine of Karma is unjust, because it "punishes" us for things that we no longer remember, and rewards us for acts which we have forgotten—and that, therefore, one can never profit or gain by experience under such a law. Before answering this objection, let me ask you whether even this distorted conception of Karma is really any more illogical or unreasonable than is the conception of the Law of Heredity which the Western world holds "to blame" for many undesirable things, and also many desirable ones? If it is unjust, illogical and unreasonable to punish one for things long forgotten, what shall we say regarding the punishment of the individual for things that he **never has done**, but which **were done by his ancestors**? Karma teaches that **one inherits his own character and destiny**—not that created by his ancestors!

But there is a deeper meaning than this to Karma. While the individual may have forgotten his character and actions in his past life, there is some principle of his personality which has not forgotten them—but which stores up their essence and seeds: Falling back again on the previously used illustration of "the child, the stove and the burnt finger," we may say that this **subconscious part** of his personality **remembers very distinctly** the effect of the stove upon a finger, and, as a result, the child has **little or no desire to touch the stove again**. Sometimes, it is true, the lesson is only half-learned, or perhaps not even so well learned as that—only a slight lesson has been learned by past experience; in such case it will be found that the individual will feel an inner warning of "don't do it," even though his desire and inclinations may be so strong as to cause him to refuse to heed the Inner Voice. Why is it that certain things are no temptation to certain persons, while very attractive to others? Karma!

When the child learns that it is painful to be beaten with a stick, it begins to look upon stick-beating as "wrong"; and in time ceases

to desire to beat others with the stick. Until it has experienced this pain itself, it cannot sympathize with others having it—this sympathy finally becomes so strong that it causes the child to actually feel the pain of another suffering the punishment. And, so, by the Law of Karma the stick-beating propensity of the grown-up child of humanity draws upon him the opposite experience of being beaten—thus does the Law of Karma manifest the Law of the Opposites in its workings.

The child having thus experienced both of the Pairs of Opposites of the stick-beating, first being the beater and then the beaten, moves out of the field of stick-beating. Sometimes, before he has learned his lesson sufficiently well, he seeks to take revenge upon others for his own beatings—he wishes to “get even” in the game of beating; but this only involves him still deeper in the vibrations of beating, and brings to him the inevitable swing of the pendulum again and again, until he finally grows so sick and tired of the whole thing that the sight of the stick disgusts him, and he moves out of its field. This is a clumsy illustration, but it may serve.

In the same way, the individual learns to feel the desire for kind deeds and actions—for he has experienced them himself so strongly that he finds pleasure even in passing them on to others. And by his kind deeds and just actions, he attracts to himself the environment in which these come to himself. But he does not outgrow this field of action, as he did the opposite one, for **he finds pleasure and happiness there**, just as he found pain and unhappiness in the opposite field. For, at the last, the operation of Pleasure and Pain—the two opposite poles of feeling—is found to be the secret of the working out of Karma. When man finds that his greatest pleasure results from, and consists in, giving pleasure to others—then does he learn to do the pleasure-producing things; and when he finds that pain results from giving pain to others, and that the pain of others produces pain in himself—then he ceases to wish to produce pain.

What else is sympathy or sympathetic understanding except just this—the **feeling of the pain or pleasure of others?** When you learn (from subconsciously remembered experience) that giving pleasure to others results in pleasure to yourself; and that the giving of pain to others results in pain to yourself; then do you act according to the Golden Rule, even though you have never heard it, and even in absence of all moral instruction. And, indeed, all moral instruction operates only by arousing this subconscious realization of past experiences and lessons in the individual; if he lacks these all the preaching or teaching in the world will not cure him of unsocial and immoral traits and habits. This may seem like a hard saying, but the facts of life bear it out.

But there is another phase of Karma's operations which are generally overlooked by the students of the subject. I allude to the development of talents, tastes and aspirations in successive incarnations—the flowering in this life of the buds of the former life. Have you an unsatisfied longing for attainment upon some particular line of endeavor—some talent which you are unable to manifest in this life? Then do not give away to despair, for they shall spring into manifestation in the next incarnation—for Karma works out in this way also.

We often hear of persons complaining that one short life is not enough to allow them to reach perfection in their favored field of thought, endeavor and work. They complain bitterly of the irony of fate which creates a desire within the human soul which is impossible of attainment or fulfilment within one's lifetime. And they would be right if this were all there is to life—life indeed would be a tragic irony. But, according to the doctrine of Karma, the strength of the desire and longing will carry such a one into a new environment in which fuller expression would be possible. This is the explanation of the blossoming forth of genius in individuals, which cannot be accounted for by heredity. This is the explanation of the inner assurance of final expression which talent always brings with it, even though reason may indicate that fate has forbidden such expression. The desire, the aspiration, the ambition—these are but the seeds which carry implicit in their substance the power and means of their future sprouting, growing, budding and blossoming. Such are the teachings regarding this phase of Karma, according to the wise.

Sir Edwin Arnold, in his "Light of Asia," gives the Buddhistic conception of Karma, which is very close to that of the Hindu philosophies, at least so far as are concerned general principles. The following quoted verses from that poem may interest you.

"Karma—all that total of a soul
Which is the things it did, the thoughts it had.
The 'self' it wove with woof of viewless time
Crossed on the warp invisible of acts.

"Who toiled a slave may come anew a prince
For gentle worthiness and merit won;
Who ruled a king may wander earth in rags
For things done and undone.

"Before beginning, and without an end,
As space eternal and as surety sure,
Is fixed a Power divine which moves to good,
Only its laws endure.

"It knows not wrath nor pardon; utter—true
It measures mete, its faultless balance weighs;
Times are as naught, tomorrow it will judge,
Or after many days.

"Such is the law which moves to righteousness,
Which none at last can turn aside or stay;
The heart of it is love, the end of it
Is peace and consummation sweet. Obey!"

But, forget it not, that while the Hindu teaching of Re-Birth and Karma are important—yet they are but teachings of the exoteric or outer phases of Truth. There is an inner, or esoteric phase, which passes beyond these things. Its goal is Eternal Peace in Infinite Being—Peace in the Heart of the Storm; Being in the Center of Becoming!

A CREED

By Emily Bronte

No coward soul is mine
No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere;
I see heaven's glories shine
And faith shines equal, arming me from fear.

O God within my breast,
Almighty, everpresent Deity!
Life—that in me has rest,
As I—undying Life—have power in Thee!

With wide embracing love
Thy spirit animates eternal years,
Pervades and broods above,
Changes, sustains, dissolves, creates and rears.

Though earth and man were gone
And suns and universes ceased to be,
And Thou wert left alone
Every existence would exist in Thee.

There is not room for death,
Nor atom that his might could render void,
Thou, Thou art being and breath,
And what Thou art may never be destroyed.

Mind-Reading Experiments

By Theron Q. Dumont

I have been requested to give to you a couple of short articles containing some plain, simple directions for performing some interesting experiments in what is generally called "Mind-Reading."

At the beginning, however, I wish to call your attention to the fact that some authorities in psychology claim that the class of experiments to which I shall call your attention in these articles, are simply manifestations of what they have called "muscle reading," instead of being examples of true telepathy. That is to say, these authorities have claimed that in the case of experiments in which there is a muscular contact between the two persons taking part in the experiment, i. e., the "projector" and the "finder," there passes from the former to the latter a slight, practically unconscious or involuntary muscular impulse, which the "finder" interprets and acts upon, perhaps also without his or her conscious knowledge of the impulse.

In this connection, I will say to the reader that even granting that this be true, the fact that such impulse is sent and received by the **sub-conscious mind** of the two persons renders the phenomena worthy of careful consideration and respect, for in such case we have true "psychic phenomena," rather than a "trick" depending upon the physical action for its success. Moreover, I will say that those who acquire proficiency in this class of experiments will soon become convinced that there is an **actual passage** of thought-vibrations between the two persons, though over the nervous system (not the muscular system) of each person—this being akin to the passage of electricity over joined wires. And, finally, in many cases in which the physical contact is broken, it will be found that the vibratory current will practically **leap over** the gap, and be received by the "finder" as clearly as when the physical contact is maintained.

While ordinary telegraphy over wires may not be so amazing, wireless telegraphy, still it is sufficiently wonderful to demand respect, and the same is true in the case of this class of Mind-Reading when it is compared with the still more wonderful phenomena of telepathy. Moreover, one who becomes proficient in these experiments frequently develops an ability to give and receive true telegrams. And, even apart from this, the experiments have value which will repay anyone for their study and practice.

How to Begin the Experiments

These experiments are performed by means of two persons co-operating in the work. One of these persons is called the "projector," or sender of the mental current or impulse. The second person is called the "finder," or receiver of the current or impulse sent by the projector. Some persons are temperamentally best fitted for the role of the projector; others seem to be naturally adapted to the role of finder, or receiver. There is found a great difference in the degree of projective power, and of receptivity, respectively, among different persons—practice and experiment alone will show the degree of power of the person. Concentration of attention and will is the main requisite in either or both roles. Practice and repeated experiments will usually develop this power of concentrated attention and will, however. Some of the best results are obtained by persons who have developed the power slowly and gradually; so no one should be discouraged at poor results at the start.

The experiments should be begun by persons in sympathetic harmony with the subject of psychic phenomena, and more or less animated with scientific interest in the results. Persons who are unsympathetic with, or antagonistic to, the general subject should be avoided in these experiments, for their silent resistance will often neutralize the effect of the subtle mental or nervous current between the two persons. Moreover, anything like "skylarking" should be avoided; a serious, earnest mental attitude being desirable. It will be found, moreover, that certain combinations of persons are better than others; therefore, by experimenting until the right harmonic combinations are secured, you will obtain the greater measure of successful results. The ideal rapport conditions will result in an almost perfect, easy-working, harmonious manifestation of the power.

Establishes Harmonic Rhythm

The following preliminary experiment will do much toward establishing the best possible rapport conditions between any two persons:

Let the two persons sit down comfortably, each taking the other's right hand in his or her own right hand—clasping hands as in the case of ordinary hand-shaking. Then let the two persons begin to breathe in harmonic rhythm, mentally counting "one, two, three," at about the rate of the pendulum beats of a large old-fashioned clock. The rhythm will soon be established, and a feeling of rapport harmony will be experienced by each. This same method will restore rapport harmony at such times during the Mind-Reading experiment, itself, when there seems to be an interruption or disturbance of the rapport condition.

The **projector** is, of course, always aware of the object to be "found" by the finder or receptive person—he may select the object

himself, or it may be selected for him by a third person, or committee of persons appointed for that purpose by the audience. The **finder**, however, **must not know** the object selected, for such knowledge would of course destroy the value of the experiments, no matter how conscientious the finder happened to be. It is always well to begin the experiments, or the developing exercises, by selecting some large object—such as a book-case, large table, etc. Work up to the more difficult feats from the simpler.

Performing the Experiment

The projector stands some distance away from the selected object, holding the left hand of the finder in his (the projector's) right hand—the finder will find it helpful to raise the two hands to his or her own forehead, and hold them there for a few moments, while in a passive state of mind. (The finder should have his or her eyes closed—or blind-folded.) The projector should at the same time **concentrate** his attention intently upon the selected object. **He should think not so much of the appearance of the object, as of its LOCATION**, Thinking intently of the **place** where the object stands, he should mentally command: "**There, go there,**" willing forcibly that the finder **move in that direction**.

The finder will soon feel a desire to **step out**, which desire must be followed. No matter whether in the right direction or not, the finder should step out when this impulse is had.

As soon as the finder steps out in this way, the projector should move forward also, **allowing himself to move in unison with the finder**. But the projector should never fail to **think and will** that the finder should move in the direction of the object—he should **steer** the finder, **mentally**, in the right direction, just as the driver of an automobile or a bicycle physically steers the machine in the desired direction. It is wonderful how quickly the finder will move in the right direction in response to this mental steering. At first, the finder may feel timid, but will soon recover confidence and will allow himself or herself to be **steered mentally**.

The finder will find himself or herself being swayed by a strange, gentle, vague impulse to move. Sometimes it will take the form of a general moving around in any direction—sometimes several directions in turn—until, suddenly there will come a stronger impulse in one certain direction, and an assurance that "this is the right direction." If the movement is in the wrong direction at the start—or if the finder gets "sidetracked" later on—there will be found a gentle, unmistakable sense of "wrong, wrong," and a subtle urge away from the wrong direction, and toward the right one. As the experiment proceeds, these "right" and "wrong" directions will take on the

form of a consciousness of "right, right, keep on," or "no, no, wrong, wrong, not this way"—the finder will soon learn to distinguish these different feelings or messages, and will act upon them also automatically.

Finally, when the finder reaches the place where the article is located, there will come the positive message or feeling of "**stop**, this is the place," which once experienced will ever after be recognized. When this is felt, the finder reaches out his or her right hand, and moving it around in obedience to the continued messages of the projector, finally locates the particular thing selected. This once found, the finder should be told so at once, and allowed to rest for a while before trying another experiment. This same rule holds good whether the article be a large one like a bookcase, or a small one like a penknife hidden under a sofa cushion.

The finder should retain hold of the hand of the projector all through the experiment, of course; for it is over the nerves of the arm of the projector that the mental waves travel. Most finders keep the right hand extended all through the experiment, as it seems to aid them in reaching the selected object. The finder should be assured that the projector will take good care of him or her, and will not permit an accidental "bumping into" anything, or stumbling over a stool or other obstacle. Otherwise, the finder will have his or her attention distracted by fear or divided attention. The projector must be careful to adequately protect the finder in this way.

Sometimes the finder will move away (accompanied by the projector) in a slow, halting manner; but again sometimes the finder will move ahead very rapidly, often fairly dragging the projector along. When the conditions are best, the desired object will seem to pull the finder toward it like a magnet.

It is remarkable how practice will develop the power to receive and interpret the mental messages from the projector. The instructions to the hand "to the right," "to the left," "up," "down," etc., are soon easily distinguished from each other. Even quite complicated directions, such as picking up a sofa pillow and discovering a penknife under it; or lifting a corner of a rug, to find a card placed beneath it; will be received and interpreted. Practice and perseverance will soon develop even the most unpromising finder; and the poorest projector will soon become quite proficient in this way. But, remember that the best results are obtained by couples who are in harmony or rapport with each other—experiment determines this, of course.

In the next article, I shall give you details for practicing many interesting experiments of this kind.

Ideas and Prosperity

By Julia Catherine Gray

“Ideas are the pure gold of the spirit. They are the treasure in Heaven, the gift of Divine Mind to its offspring. Through ideas we recognize our real nature as creators, and bring forth abundance for ourselves, and enrich the consciousness of the race.”

Ideas are bringing high prices. The man or woman with an idea has something which fills a need. But how to get the idea? It is no wonder we ask ourselves that question, for thought power is at a low plane of vibration. We move along the line of least resistance. We do not know that there is more real satisfaction in overcoming inanimate obstacles than there is in taking an army or a city. We do not know the irresistible power of ideas, nor the joy of digging to discover our own hidden talent. In a vague way, we wish for them, and it is at the moment of wishing that they may be on the road to us, but we proceed to turn them in another direction by giving them a cold reception. We do not respect them properly simply because they are ours.

The active principle of the universe is spiritual energy. Thought is its motive power, the power that sets it vibrating in our lives. Desire calls it into action. After we have named our need, there is the further requisite of faith—faith in our own idea, and in the ever-present supply of the Divine Spirit that is the underlying substance of all life. Spirit is active. We may call upon it and let it work for us.

We grow into the likeness which we set for ourselves by our thought power. The human being molds his form and his environment by his ideas, and their grotesqueness is easily apparent. In the same way he breeds the lower animals according to the types which he desires. The man of wealth has held his ideal positively and incessantly and followed his impressions. The hopelessly poor man has dwelt positively on his desire to escape his environment, but has steadfastly believed in his inability to do so, and has thus become solidified within it.

Now we are not to get our supply simply by a transference of a portion from our neighbor's store, nor by skimping, hoarding and drudging until soul and body shrivel. There is no record that the increase in the loaves and fishes, which fed the multitude and left a large surplus, came by sending a messenger into the village. A blessing was pronounced and abundance was manifest.

There is no more virtue in poverty than there is in sickness. God-like Affluence is a factor in our spiritual inheritance. Divine Abund-

ance is a real substance, a faith-substance. The measure of it within our reach depends upon our ability to assimilate it by belief in it. If we could believe this as absolutely as we know that our daily food is a real, tangible substance, we should have no more cause for worry, and why not believe it?

"Prove me now and see if I will not pour out a blessing upon you so great that there shall not be room to receive it." Why not test this spiritual substance by our own experimenting? We have tried hard scrabbling, grinding, deadening labor, becoming mentally befogged over our financial condition. We have even loafed on the job and waited for something to turn up.

"Freely ye receive, freely give." It goes back to the old law of sowing and reaping. Opening the mind and letting our ideas come out for an airing is one way. Not by foisting them upon others, but submitting them to our own higher, spiritual understanding. Give ideas a chance to grow, bring them out to the light. Accord them proper respect. Give freely of them wherever you give your services. Suppose we do not succeed in inventing an aeroplane. If we give the suggestion to some one else, we shall have done just as much, and the proceeds will come back to us. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be meted out to you."

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you." By getting into a condition of mental harmony, a good soil is provided for the growth of ideas. Right-use-ness, then, of our inherent ability is the stepping stone to prosperity. No burying of our talents in a napkin; no still-born ideas; but a ten-fold increase by making constant use of them. We are to bless them by right usage, to develop them lest they lie buried within that immeasurable inner darkness of our minds which is so full of undiscovered treasure. By putting into circulation that which we have, to us shall be given that which we have not. By hoarding even that which we have shall be taken away.

It is possible to charge our ideas with a spiritual magic which shall in turn communicate itself to our deeds and possessions. Spiritual abundance will give us only so much as we are able to vitalize. It will protect us from the tyranny of "things," from the bitterness and crudity of want.

Let us not continue, then, to go about like babes in toyland, at the mercy of our personal whims and desires. Smiting the rock of personal possession and accepting the idea of universal ownership will bring to us the living waters of abundance. Temporal abundance is the natural consequence of spiritual riches.

Spirited, Not Spiritless

By William Walker Atkinson

One of the texts which should be preached over and over again to the world of listeners is that which emphasizes the universal truth of the existence of The Opposites; and the wisdom of maintaining the Golden Mean. Oh, yes, I know that I have spoken of this to you before, but I intend to keep on expounding it to you from time to time, for you need it.

The spirit of this text is that wisdom consists in the Balance between the two opposites which are always to be found in everything. Fanaticism frequently leads us to push out as far as possible to the extreme end of that phase of the truth which appeals to us; and the result of this is that we inevitably defeat our own ends and purposes. A good thing may be carried too far, much too far, by being pushed to one extreme of its polarity. This law explains the reaction which invariably sets in after a certain principle has been pushed too far. Everything strives to find its true balance, and the result is that things, mental and physical, are found swinging like a pendulum from one extreme to another.

Did you ever hear of that old Athenian whom his townsfolk wished to banish from the city because they had grown tired of hearing him called "The Just"? We have had examples of this sort in our American political life, more than once. How often do we do things just to "be contrary"—from sheer perversity arising from having been "preached at" too much? The children who were constantly warned "not to stuff beans up your noses," took the first possible opportunity to do just that particular thing. There is a law in operation here, and we will do well to always remember it. The solution is: **strive for a sane balance!**

I have been impressed once more with the truth of this old principle or law by much that I have been hearing of late regarding "sweetness," "meekness," "gentleness," "forbearance," "self-sacrifice," "renunciation," and other excellent things when taken in their proper proportions and not served as an exclusive spiritual diet. There has been such an insistence of late upon a certain "sickly-sweet" sentimentality which someone has called "Pollyannity," that I feel impelled to say a few words in the direction of maintaining a sane balance. Too much "sweetness" often produces mental and spiritual nausea.

Spirituality, to me, does not mean that particular form of emotional feeling usually associated with "sweetness," "meekness" (of a

certain type), or goody-goodness in general. Rather does it mean, to me, **liveliness, vitality, activity**. We express this idea when we say that one is "spirited," or "filled with spirit," or that he enters into the thing "with spirit"—the opposite state is expressed by the terms "spiritless," "dispirited," etc. Spirit, at the last, means distinctively **LIFE, ACTIVITY, That-Which-Expresses-Itself-in-Action**. We cannot think of "dead" Spirit, or "lifeless" Spirit, can we?

Arising probably from an overdose of, and reaction from, the doctrine of personal assertion, aggressive personality, domineering personality, and other similar instances of the **extreme expression** of one pole of being, we find present quite a popular tendency which expresses itself in much talk about "self-sacrifice," "self-abnegation," "renunciation of self," and much more along the same lines. This would be very useful in establishing a sane balance, were it confined to its legitimate field; but when it is **overemphasized**, as it is now in many quarters, it is as dangerous and false as is the overemphasis of the other extreme.

If the expression of Spirit means anything at all, it means the development of, and manifestation through, the Individual. All Nature (the outer veil of Spirit) is seen to be striving to create, develop and maintain the individual—for through him or her is the race leavened and made to rise. Individualism, however, when carried to the extreme, is objectionable; and the Law of Balance tends to curb its activities and to destroy it when it becomes too assertive and active. Individualism, in order to be sane, must be balanced by Co-operation and Mutual Endeavor. The wise recognize this, and ever strive to maintain the sane balance.

But, alas! there are many persons who lack the perception of the existence of The Opposites, and the desirability of Balance. They shudder at the manifestation of overemphasized Individuality, and in their desire to escape it they fly to the other extreme, and proceed to overemphasize the Renunciation of Individuality. Seeing the futility of extreme Resistance, they seek extreme Non-Resistance, utterly ignoring the very important principle of Passive Resistance which, itself, is often the most potent form of Resistance. Failing to see the wisdom of Balance, they transform that which is normally a virtue into that which becomes often actually a vice.

All the activities of Nature and Life—and therefore of Spirit—consist of action and reaction, the "give and take" of the Cosmic activity. Philosophers have told us that "there can be no existence without resistance"; and this principle is illustrated in every activity of the Cosmos. When we walk, we react to the resistance of the earth and push against it, actually "kicking" against it, and thus move forward. The same thing is true in the push of the locomotive wheel against the

rail; the push of the wheel or propeller of the steamboat against the resistance of the water; the pull of the rudder against the resistance of the stream; the push and pull of the swimmer; the pressure of the wings of the flying bird; the explosive power of chemicals, etc. **This action and reaction is always needed in order that work may be done, and action accomplished.** We "get nowhere" without it.

So much for Resistance—now for Non-Resistance. Non-Resistance, carried to its extreme would defeat the manifestation of Spirit. If manifested throughout Nature for a single moment it would result in Chaos and Absolute Inertia. In the affairs of human life extreme Non-Resistance would destroy all progress and advancement. Progress has always consisted of resistance to objectionable things, and advancement by reason thereof. New things are created by the destruction of old things. This is the Law. There can be no Existence without Resistance. The Pair of Opposites are always present—you can not have one without the other. There is no Action without Reaction—no Reaction without Action. So true is this, that if you will take the trouble to closely analyze the life and the teachings of the preachers of extreme Non-Resistance, you will find that these persons really practice a very decided form of Resistance though they do not use that term in speaking or thinking of it.

But there is another form of Resistance to be considered here—a form which many seem to consider Non-Resistance. I refer of course to what has been called Passive Resistance, which in many cases is really the strongest and most efficient form of Resistance. "Resistance" means "Opposition, active or passive." Here are illustrations of two forms: The brittle reed actively resists the strong wind—it breaks; the flexible reed bends to the strong wind, and then rebounds. The piece of cast iron resists the pressure, and cracks; the highly tempered piece of steel bends, and then springs back to its original shape. The stone cracks at the blow, while the piece of rubber yields and then resumes its original condition. But, here is the point: **the apparent yielding is as much resistance and opposition as is the unyielding**—the gist of the thing is in the **spirit of the act**, not merely in the mode of action.

The strongest Will often acts like the highly tempered steel, rather than like the piece of brittle iron—but it does so not because of inherent weakness, but because of inherent strength. Such a Will acts as it does by reason of its **strong spirit**, not because of its lack of spirit. He who from expediency "stoops to conquer," is not necessarily weak—he may be very strong indeed. If the spirit in such a one is so strong that it will cause him to assume temporary defeat in order to attain ultimate victory, then there is certainly no weakness shown. The strong individual is not always the fighting one—often he is apparently

a very pacific one; the "iron hand in the velvet glove" is the strongest kind of hand, in many cases.

The Russians who "resisted not" Napoleon, but who burned their towns and fled before him, only to impose defeat upon him ultimately—these were not Non-Resistant people, but rather Passive Resistant folk. If the water wished to oppose the progress of the boat through it, it might practice the most effective form of Resistance by becoming so subtle that the wheels or oars might not "take hold." If the rails are so slippery that the wheels of the locomotive fail to "bite," they really are resisting most efficiently. These things have their analogies and correspondences on the plane of mental and spiritual life—Passive Resistance often is the most potent form of resistance in the affairs of men, on the mental and spiritual plane. This principle is a valuable one, when rightly understood; but it must be seen for just what it is, and not mistaken for its negation, i. e., Non-Resistance.

If this is what is meant by the teachers of Non-Resistance, all well and good—it is valuable teaching. Remember the definition: "Resistance is **opposition**, active or passive." But, for the love of Truth, do not indulge in the hypocrisy of ascribing to it the quality of Non-Opposition, and raising to the rank of virtue that which really is naught but rank weakness, cowardice, and lack of "spirit." Do not tell human beings that they may become Masters by practicing that which has well been called "slave morality," and which is naught but cowardly hypocrisy.

Do not confound the "spiritness" of the steel spring which runs the watch or clock or phonograph, with the flabbiness of the sour dough which is dead and spiritless. Do not confound elasticity and resiliency with flabbiness and actual non-resistance. Do you know what causes the difference between the piece of "soft" wire, and the steel spring? Just this: the presence or lack of "temper" in it—and here "temper" means that which we call "**Spirit**."

Therefore, be ye Spirited, i. e., animated, full of life and vigor, lively, vivacious, active, virile, bold, courageous—for are ye not of the Spirit which is Life Itself? And be ye not Spiritless, i. e., destitute of spirit, lifeless, dejected, depressed, vigorless, wanting courage. Beware of making a virtue of spiritual flabbiness, or softness. Let the fires of the Spirit "temper" you until you become even as the "Sword of the Spirit" which, as has been said, "hews open the path, as the lightning flash splits the darkness * * * pierces shadows like a flash of glory, dashes through the jungle of appearances like the horn of the unicorn."

THE INTERNATIONAL New Thought Alliance

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS

802 WASHINGTON LOAN AND TRUST BUILDING
Washington D. C.

JAMES A. EDGERTON, President

MISS GRACE WILSON, Secretary,
MR. R. C. DOUGLASS, Auditor,

WILLIAM E. HUTTON, Treasurer,
JAMES LEE BOST,
Chairman Publicity Committee,

ALLIANCE NEWS

On January 22, 1917, the International New Thought Alliance was organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of federating "various groups of people throughout the world who are teaching and practicing spiritual healing and applied spirituality, and to that end send out lecturers and organizers; hold conventions, issue bulletins, collect and distribute funds, conduct circulating libraries, and do all such other things in general consistent with the purposes of that institution, that it may secure standing before the business world to command the admiration and respect of all people."

This action was taken in pursuance of the instructions given the Board of Trustees at the Congress at Chicago in September, 1916. The Board of Trustees for the year consists of James A. Edgerton, Miss Emma Gray, Miss Grace Wilson, James Lee Bost, Mrs. Mary E. T. Chapin, R. C. Douglass, William E. Hutton, Mrs. Rose M. Ashby, and John M. McGonigle.

The Board of Trustees met at Headquarters Friday, January 26, and formally adopted the Constitution and By-Laws as revised at the 1916 Chicago Congress. The same list of officers was also elected for the corporation. The corporation is "not for profit," and no stock will be issued; the sole object being to give the New Thought Alliance a definite position in the world. A Declaration of Principles, showing "just what New Thought stands for," will be prepared and presented to the next Congress for ratification and adoption.

The officers have decided to establish a Book Department at Headquarters, the purpose of which will be threefold: (1) to select New Thought books considered standard; (2) for the sale of these books; and (3) to co-operate with the various centers belonging to the Alliance in establishing circulating libraries. The President has appointed a committee to make a list of books considered standard, and these will be on sale. A list of these books will be published and will be furnished upon application to the Secretary.

The February 15, 1917 Bulletin contain the following notes:

"The Alliance is now organizing a Publicity Committee to carry on a New Thought Propaganda in such ways as may seem suitable.

"At the last meeting of the Executive Board, it was voted to start a Book Department which will not only standardize various New Thought books, but will plan circulating libraries in the various centers."

The Psychology of Woman

By Margaret Van Norden

The average man or woman, and in fact even some of those who would pose as "authorities" upon the subject of the psychology of the sexes, usually assume as granted the idea that there is a fundamental difference or distinction between the "mind" of Man and the "mind" of Woman—some mental difference which is inherent in the very nature of Man and Woman, and which will always remain in spite of changed conditions. Such persons seem to think that the difference here is akin to that which Kipling has asserted as existing between the Oriental and Occidental civilizations: "for East is East, and West is West; and never the twain shall meet." This view I hold to be erroneous.

I hold that the differences observed—and it is futile to deny that such differences are apparent—are the result of "specialization" on the part of Man and Woman, respectively, which has resulted from the nature of the difference in activities and work between the respective sexes. I hold that if we were to place Woman for a few generations in the environment of Man, she would manifest precisely the same qualities and traits of mind as has Man under the same conditions—this result is obtained in the lifetime of individual women in even a single generation, for that matter. The same would be true of Man were he placed in the environment of Woman long enough for the traits to become fixed.

We do not have to travel far for proof of this contention. We have but to observe the result of "specialization" in the work of Man to see what marked and clearly defined differences are manifested by different individuals subjected to certain environments. There are as great differences between the different classes of men engaged in certain occupations, as there are differences between Man and Woman as a whole—and from the same reasons, causes, and principles. Woman by "specialization" has become what she is, psychologically; Man by "specialization" has become what he is psychologically. There is no deep mystery here—merely a logical result of certain causes operating along certain lines. With this preliminary understanding, let us consider some interesting features of the "psychology of Woman."

Woman has ever been a great mystery to Man. This not only because Woman, by the very nature of her evolved psychological character, must be and is the opposite of Man in many respects; but, also by reason of the fact that Man has attributed to her a certain com-

plexity of nature which she does not possess. The psychology of Woman really is far more simple and elemental than is that of Man. Though her methods of approach and procedure may be more indirect and circuitous than those of Man, nevertheless her mental processes are far more direct and effective than are his. The complexity of Woman is largely superficial—she is simplicity itself when it comes to basic thought and action.

In order to begin to understand Woman, Man must put out of his mind all ideas that she dwells in the clouds of sentimentality. He must realize that her sentimentality is merely a superficial appearance, and that she is far more practical and direct than is Man when it comes down to the real facts of life and living. She allows Man to dwell under the illusion that she is unreasonable and irrational—for that is a part of her general policy. In reality, Woman knows what she wants, when she wants it—and she moves always with the fixed idea of obtaining that which she wants, though necessity causes her to proceed in an indirect and circuitous manner in order to obtain it.

Woman appears paradoxical to Man, because of the contrast between the real motives of her actions, and the apparent motives which she wishes Man to believe are the ruling ones. She must act upon her inner motives, while presenting an aspect of thinking and acting upon entirely different ones. She is forced to cloak her real motives and thoughts from Man, in self protection, and by reason of her acquired instinct arising from the necessities of her foremothers; while at the same time she endeavors to act according to her real desires and interests. Thus is she caused to manifest a paradoxical aspect toward Man.

No woman is deceived by this paradox when manifested by another woman. She pierces the exterior superficial indirectness and concealment of motives, and goes right to the heart of the real motives and thought of the other woman. Every man has noticed this phenomenon, and has been at a loss to explain it. Or, rather, he has sought to account for it by attributing to the mind of Woman a marvelous complexity which he cannot explain, but which a like complexity on the part of the other woman enables her to penetrate. He never dreams that the other woman is able to solve the problem simply because she gets down to first principles of desire and action, and, realizing the "bluff" of the first woman is able to discard it and interpret her actions by reference to the natural elementary motive which inspired it.

If Man would understand Woman, he must learn to cast aside this illusion of her complexity—this idea of remote desire and far-away action. He must look for a direct desire-motive inspiring every action on her part—though she proceed along a circuitous and devious path

in order to attain her ends. In short, when puzzled regarding the actions of a woman, he should ask himself this question: "What would natural elementary human nature, undeterred by sentimental side-issues, naturally **desire under the circumstances?**" Having found this answer, let him rest assured that this is the **real motive** inspiring the action of the woman, in spite of her complex activities, and in spite of the reasons which seem to be actuating her. Woman has all the frank and naked desire of the child for that which appeals to its nature—but she instinctively cloaks and covers it by a mass of apparent sentimentality, indirect methods, and far-fetched excuses and reasonings. She is compelled to do this, as otherwise Man would perceive her purposes and defeat her aims.

To men this idea of Woman really being free from sentimentality may seem absurd. Man has accustomed himself to thinking of Woman as essentially sentimental, and of himself as being free from sentimentality. But, as every woman knows, this is wrong. While assuming the role of sentimentality, Woman is essentially practical where her own interests, or those of others in whom she is interested, are concerned. Man, on the contrary, while assuming a practical, unsentimental character, really is far more sentimental than is Woman when it comes to matters concerning his own interests. The most practical man has hidden within him a mass of sentimentality which would surprise even himself were it exhibited to him as a whole. Likewise, the most sentimental (in appearance) woman, has a streak of the hardest kind of practical, ruthless, self-interest, which she endeavors to disguise even from herself.

I should not be understood as endeavoring to cast reproach upon Woman, in thus pointing out what I consider to be the hidden qualities which are dominant in her character. On the contrary, I would absolve her from all blame in the matter—particularly from the blame and reproach of Man. I believe that Woman is exactly what she is because Man has made her so. I believe that the character of Woman, as we find it today, is the result of her natural instincts coming in contact with the circumstances and environment with which Man has surrounded her. She has been compelled to combat Man's physical strength and economic control by means of subtlety, tact, diplomacy, and indirectness. She has been compelled to maintain an inner egoism, cleverly concealed, in order to obtain that which Man, by reason of his control of the sources of supply, would otherwise have withheld from her.

Woman is what she is today, solely by reason of a natural self-defensive mental attitude forced upon her by conditions for which Man has been largely responsible. These qualities, so originally

created, have been fostered by heredity according to the laws of evolution known as the "survival of the fittest." The traits which were best adapted to Woman's protection and interests survived in the "struggle for existence." The woman who manifested them survived and transmitted the traits to her daughters; while the woman lacking in them fell by the wayside, defeated in the struggle, and thus did not transmit the less "fit" traits to her offspring—for she had no offspring.

The combination in Woman of her natural instincts of tenderness and love for mate and offspring, together with her more ready sympathy for suffering and pain, on the one hand; and her elementary egoism and keen self-interest, made necessary in the struggle for existence with Man, on the other hand; has resulted in a two-sided emotional character which puzzles and mystifies Man. Seeing her at the same time the tenderest and the hardest; the most sympathetic and the most unfeeling; the most forgiving and the most relentless; the weakest and the strongest—no wonder that Man is perplexed. Yet there is no real contradiction here—she is true to herself in both sets of qualities, though the difference of the poles seems to separate them. She reserves each for its appropriate employment and manifestation. By reason of her more responsive feelings, and emotional perception, she is apt to go to extremes in either direction—she deals in superlatives. In almost any strong emotional activity, the adverb "very" is applicable to her feeling, character, and action. It is difficult to keep her in the middle of the road—she usually goes far to one side or the other.

So far as are concerned the reasoning qualities or faculties of Woman, one is apt to be misunderstood when speaking of them. I would say, however, that when we remember the comparatively limited opportunities for general reasoning on the part of Woman, arising from the restricted field which until but very lately has been hers, we must grant that she has done well on the whole in the matter of practical judgment. When she has been given the opportunity, she has often amazed Man who has fondly considered himself to be the reasoning member of the race.

It may be true that Woman, as a whole, finds it difficult to reason clearly regarding "**detached**" principles or **abstract propositions**—this from her acquired tendency to consider things in the light of detail and personal application. But we must admit that in her judgments concerning practical action, along the lines most familiar to her, she is far more direct and practical—far less distracted by non-essentials—than is Man. As a rule, she does not allow herself to be distracted by irrelevant side-issues—she "sticks close to her knitting." In matters in which her own feelings are not particularly involved, she may

be careless in her decisions, but where her own interests are involved, or her feelings awakened, she will make a straight, short bee-line of decision between that which she desires to happen and the action tending to make it happen. She may give apparently illogical reasons or excuses for the decision but it will be found, usually, that she has hewn pretty close to the line.

In fact, we find that, making allowance for the wide difference in opportunity, there is often a striking resemblance between the methods of Woman in general and those of certain "Men of Action" in the affairs of the world—men of **action**, I say, not the men of **thought**; the men who have done things, not those who have merely theorized about or explained them. In both cases, we find the mind working along a straight line, with self-interest in view, with the practical rather than the ideal governing the process. In both cases do we find the idea of "get there" predominant, and everything else sidetracked. In both cases there is a certain apparent hardness, and a lack of consideration for others opposed to the main idea—a certain impatient brushing aside of the interests of those who stand in the way. In both cases there is often that which might be called ruthlessness and a lack of fine scruples. In both cases is there evident the feeling and idea that "the end justifies the means."

(To be continued next month)

TO THE INDIVIDUAL

Nature's law is producing strong individuals—fall in with it and Nature will come to your aid, for then you will be one of its chosen ones. Fall in with the law of evolution—do not run contrary to it. In the one case you are nourished, supported, strengthened and encouraged—in the other, you are relentlessly crowded out by the operation of the law.

If you are a weakling, and prefer to remain so instead of rising and claiming your birthright of strength—your heritage of power—then leave these teachings for the others of your brethren who will not sell their birthright of power for the mess of pottage of negative content and sheep-like passivity, but who boldly claim their own and demand their rightful portion—these strong brothers of yours, the individuals who are the coming inheritors of the earth.

Plunge into the thick of the fight, filled with the Berserker rage like the old Icelandic warrior, shouting your war-cry of "I Can, I Will, I Dare, I Do!" and mow your way through the ranks of negativity and inertia until you reach the heights beyond and claim the prize which awaits the victor.

This is my Message to YOU—the Individual.

—William Walker Atkinson.

Will Our Future Life Be Idle?

By Arthur Gould

When we leave this earth do we go to a heaven where rest and worship are eternal? "Do you want immortality with nothing to do?" If you were offered such a life for the future would you not refuse it, if you could? Would you not rather be extinguished than to live in a world with nothing to do?

In order that life may be interesting, there must be periods of activity and relaxation. There must be work and play. There must be sleeping and the awakening periods. After a struggle there must be a period of calm.

"As above, so below" is an old mystic saying. Is there an idle heaven? If immortality is anything like the life we know, there must be activity in the future state. When the soul leaves the body is it merely preserved or embalmed in an arrested state? Does death end all of our weary struggles? No, I think not. If there is a heaven, as most of us think, it is a place for moral progress and improvement and if this is true, it must be a place of moral effort. There must be some form of work.

If we should suddenly find ourselves in such a heaven as is pictured in some books wouldn't we soon get tired of it? We get our greatest enjoyment out of doing really interesting work. The only kind of heaven we will not be disappointed with is one where our future life will give us something to do that is worth doing, and supply us with the means to do it.

Our future life you can rest assured is not to be an idle one, but the activities will be different, for we will then be in a spirit world.

Will the mind survive physical death? How can the mind remain after the loss of the brain, which we have always supposed was its organ? This seems hard to believe, but most of us believe it is true. We do not know how it is possible, but we believe it on faith, and I will attempt to show you why we have a good hypothesis for our belief.

The soul or spirit in man is not something distinct from his intelligence, his feeling, his will. But we do feel there is a difference. When I speak of mind I mean all those thoughts, feelings, and volitions which make up our life. In referring to our soul, I do not speak of it as if it was some subtle, vital principle of essence, as the ancients did, but as our true self, or that which distinguishes us from some-

one else. So I say the whole of man, his real personality survives the death of the body. If this does not then nothing else is desirable.

If man will get into the habit of believing that everything that goes to make up his personality survives, he will give more attention to building up qualities of a lasting nature.

It is hard for us to conceive a future state where those that have led an active life could be happy if there was not something for them to do—some activity. What have they been doing all these years since they have left us behind? If they are still their real selves, doing that which they are best fitted for, they must have taken with them all the qualities they had while here—their memory, reason, and all those peculiarities that made them distinct individuals. That is why we have got a right to think that when death comes we will still possess everything that we now have and will only be minus the physical body.

Our future life must be an active, and not an idle life. But what can we do if we have no physical body? In a dream we get along without the use of our physical body. We do most everything that we can do when we are using it. After the death of the physical body we could be equipped with senses more acute and ways of expression more accurate and more forceful, than any we now use. If a spirit was able to know, able to wish but not to do, sensitive to force, but without the means of exerting force he would be useless. If that which survived death did not have a means of doing that which we do with hands and lips, then we would be like a prisoner in a cell after death; there is nothing to make us believe this is the case, but rather we have been led to believe immortality means more freedom. If then we are able to do things we must possess a body. But what kind of a body can we have? What will be its nature and limitations? We are sure of one thing and that is that the physical body is left behind, but we can only speculate on the question of what kind of a spiritual body we will have, and whether we will have a voice for speech, or whether we will possess feet to walk with, or hands to labor with.

A generation ago we knew less about the future state than we do now. We have received some information supposed to have come from the other side that is hard for us to think is not genuine. When the human voice can be heard from the banks of the Potomac to the Eiffel Tower, and its echoes roll half way around the world to Honolulu, telepathy does not seem an impossible violation of natural law. When force can cross space without any medium save the hypothetical ether, almost anything seems possible.

The possible activities of a purely spiritual world will now be considered. Have you not felt or thought you saw something that seemed mortal but vanished from your sight? Have you not heard an inaudible whisper in the soul? Have you not been commanded to do

things in a mysterious way? Are we guided and influenced by those that have gone on ahead of us? Do they help us now? "From those hills whence cometh all my help." We know there is an influence that comes to us unawares, at times, and which instantly fill us with joy and makes us happy for the rest of the day. The chances are you have never even thought about it. If you will observe yourself closely for a week you will find that you receive a great many messages of various character. Do these messages come from those that have gone on before us? Do we at times share the rich, deep wisdom of the dead? Has not God invisible helpers, that are ever trying to make us better? Have we not unseen friends that are helping us all we will let them? These are some of the activities that are possible in the spiritual world. Maybe some are able to exert a good influence upon some spirits of both worlds.

If we are helped and influenced by spirits now on the other side, and I know I have been guided and helped many times, then some time in the future it will be our duty, our privilege to help others.

I have talked to men and women that have ridiculed the possibility of a communication between spirits of two worlds. But they did believe that prayers are sometimes answered, that spiritual communion with the unseen sometimes may take place. It may be that God is able to communicate immediately with us through prayer, but if he can, he must have many assistants that can also. How can anyone believe that prayers are answered and not believe that we receive spiritual influence from the invisible world?

"Be near me when my light is low,
When the blood creeps, and the nerves prick
And tingle; and the heart is sick
And all the wheels of Being slow.

* * * *

"Be near us when we climb or fall;
Ye watch like God the rolling hours
With larger, other eyes than ours,
To make allowance for us all."

—Tennyson.

My next month's article will be "Activities of a Purely Spiritual World."

CROWDED OUT

Owing to the press of other articles in this number of the magazine, the monthly instalment of "Old-New Thought" (Emerson's "Self-Reliance") has been crowded out. The continuation of the essay aforesaid will appear in the April number.—Editor.

Heart-to-Heart Talks

By the Editor

In this department the editor gathers his readers around him in a family circle and has a little talk with them, informally and "friendly-like," in the good old-fashioned way.

ONE YEAR AFTER

Well, here is the beginning of the second year of the life of this magazine, "Advanced Thought." This issue bears the inscription "Vol. II, No. 1." The first milestone has been passed, and we are on the first lap of the second mile. The journey of the first year has been a pleasant one to me, and I trust has been the same to you, the readers of this magazine.

The magazine "found itself"—and a large circle of readers—at the very start. I have made some changes from month to month, and purpose keeping on making changes from month to month. I do not believe in keeping in the same old place. I believe in the constant striving for better things. And this striving manifests in changes from time to time.

Some of the things tried out have "made good." Others have not. And the same thing is probable in the future. I am not afraid to try experiments in the conduct of the magazine. And I am not afraid to confess to having made mistakes, when such happens to be the case. I am willing to change my mind, or my policy, at any time—provided this is indicated as the proper course. I do not purpose to be bound down, or tied up, with the cords of the fetich of "consistency" or "reconciliation." I am prepared to cast overboard my best beloved pet idea, and to take on board my most detested "bete noir" idea, if I find that my judgment or taste has been wrong.

All this does not indicate a trimming of sails to catch the passing breeze, or a change of course in order to please the opinions of critics or fault-finders. Not for a moment—if I think that I am right, I care nothing for the critics, fault-finders, or those who wish to have things their own way or they won't play. But, equally strong is my determination to make changes even if such may seem like a catering or truckling to the opinion of others, if such changes seem to me to be right and desirable from the point of principle.

I have a big general idea and ideal always in view—this I shall hold strictly to, and shall always keep in mind. I shall always steer my ship toward this port, though I may change my course by a few points of the compass this way or that way during the voyage, in

order to travel to the best advantage. I believe that success in any undertaking depends largely upon one keeping in mind **the general direction** of the desired goal, and the sacrificing of minor things along the way in order to keep that general direction. I believe in the wisdom of giving up the unimportant things, if necessary, in order to gain the Big Thing.

I have received many letters of encouragement and commendation from the readers of this magazine; and but remarkably few of the opposite tenor. As a whole, the readers seem to be pretty well satisfied with the magazine as it has appeared during the year. But, **I am not satisfied with it.** It falls far short of my ideals, and of my desires. Some things that have appeared in its pages, I like very well—and this includes some of my own work. And some things that have appeared in it, I do not like at all—and this also includes some of my own work. Accordingly, I shall apply the pruning knife wherever it seems to me to be needed. And, better than even this, I shall add features which seem to me to be desirable, but which have so far been missing.

No, I do not hope to please everybody. The man who attempts this usually ends in pleasing nobody. Such attempts manifest in a constant trimming of sails, and a course of toadying to everyone who voices an opinion. If it should ever be made apparent to me that I must do this in order to succeed with the magazine, then will I cease editing a magazine and shall get out of the work, giving my reasons for so doing. But I have no fear whatsoever of this—I believe that there are enough people who respect honesty of opinion and expression, even though they may not always agree with the conclusions or forms of expression of the person having the same. That is the way I feel about it, anyway; and I purpose fighting it out along that line.

My advice to the readers of this magazine—or any other magazine, for that matter—is to take for their own whatever appears in its pages which appeals to them, and to let the rest go. Because you do not like a certain thing is no proof that another might not like it—individuals have their own tastes in these things as well as in food and dress, you know. If any number of any magazine contains a **single** article which is of value to you, then that number is well “worth while” to you, and you can afford to let the rest go. Things of value are scarce, and if you get only one good thing in a magazine you have been repaid. I have read entire books from which I have not gained a single valuable, or even interesting idea; and if I get one real “thought” from a book, I think that I have been well rewarded for my trouble in reading it. And if, in this magazine, I manage to “get over” even one thought, idea, or suggestion of real value to you, I shall feel very well satisfied indeed, whether you do or not.

I shall always be glad to hear from the readers of this magazine, giving me the opinions regarding the things they like, and the things they do not like, in this magazine. I am just as pleased to hear a "kick" as a "boost," providing that the former is given in the right spirit. True friendship is often best displayed in the calling of one's attention to things which are deemed a detriment or a mistake; and such service is often of great value.

I care nothing for flattery, "jollyng," or "soft soaping"—so please do not think it necessary to feed me with anything of this sort. If you really like something in the magazine—tell me about it, and why you like it, that I may gain knowledge from your experience. And, do the same thing when you really dislike anything in these pages—and for the same reasons.

Remember, however, that in making this request, I am not trying to play the part of the politician seeking to cater to the largest number; if I know that I am right, the opinions of all of you would not affect me—but if I am making a mistake, I certainly would thank you for calling my attention to it, that I may consider and pass judgment on myself in the case. I take it that you are sufficiently interested in this magazine to help in making it what it should be—and I realize the help that you can give me, if you will. I am perfectly selfish in making this request, however—I am seeking my own good and the success of my work, and not making the plea "for the good of the Cause."

"STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN"

The above warning sign appears at dangerous railroad crossings all over the country. It signifies that there is possible danger at that particular point, and that it behooves all to take the proper precautionary measures to avoid the danger. All wise persons heed it.

I was reminded of this warning sign when I read of certain plans of the International New Thought Alliance, which are stated on another page of this number of the magazine, as follows:

"The officers have decided to establish a Book Department at Headquarters, the purposes of which will be threefold: (1) To select New Thought books considered standard. * * * The President has appointed a committee to make a list of books considered standard, and these will be for sale. A list of these books will be published."

The February 1917 Bulletin of the Alliance also contains the following item: "At the last meeting of the Executive Board, it was decided to start a Book Department which will not only **standardize various New Thought books**, but will plan circulating libraries in various centers."

Now, this is all right as far as it goes, but——! I approve of the Book Department, and I approve of its managers having the right to exercise their best judgment in the selection of the books which they desire to handle in the department. Moreover, I have every confidence in the judgment and fairness of Mr. Edgerton, or of those working under his direction, in the matter of selecting the books best representing the ideals of New Thought in its various phases. But is there not a possible source of danger in the attempt to establish a "standard" New Thought literature? What shall determine the **standard**? Where is the dividing line to be drawn? And who is to draw it? Who are to constitute the Board of Censors? And is their decision to be final; or is it possible to appeal therefrom? Where and how is the circle to be drawn?

No one could object to the absolute right of judgment regarding selection of books to be stocked, on the part of the Book Department of the Alliance, were it not for the fact that at least a strong color of "official sanction" is given to the books classed as "standard," and a strong shade of official disapproval placed upon those rejected from the list. Would not the members of the Alliance, and the general New Thought public, be justified in regarding the classification as the "official" approval or disapproval of the Alliance, as the case might be? And might there not gradually grow up an "officially sanctioned" class of New Thought books on the one hand; and an Index Expurgatorius of "forbidden" books on the other hand? Might there not develop in time (under some future administration of the Alliance) an attitude similar to that of the Roman Catholic Church, or of the Christian Science organization regarding "approved" or "disapproved" literature? Might there not in time develop an official "**Approved by the I. N. T. A.**" notice printed in New Thought books?

To those who may think that I am borrowing trouble, or raising a man of straw in order to throw sticks at him, I would say that many equally objectionable institutional customs have originated in just this simple and apparently harmless manner. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," as we have been told for many years. The nose of the camel of institutional officialism and bureaucracy once admitted to the tent of the Alliance, the whole body of the animal might gradually work its way in and push out the original occupants. And, therefore, I would urge great care and caution in this matter on the part of the officers of the Alliance.

So far as are concerned Mr. Edgerton, the present President of the Alliance, and Miss Grace Wilson, its present Secretary, such a question would not need to be raised—for these two individuals are broad, liberal, fair-minded, and beyond narrow prejudices or favoritism. But we may not always have Mr. Edgerton with us, and Miss

Wilson may see fit to make a change in her work—and who can say who would succeed them. And, again, who can predict the mental attitude of a committee given the right of censoring books, or stamping "O. K." or "N. G.," respectively, upon books passing before them for judgment?

How often we hear the captious criticism: "That is not true New Thought," in reference to some book or teaching. To the "Divine Science" school much of the New Thought literature is quite "off color," speaking metaphysically and "spiritually!" I knew of earnest early-days New Thought teachers who considered Helen Wilmans' books and magazines as "impossible." And as for Shelton's "Christian," in the early days, why to many of the good souls in New Thought it fairly reeked of brimstone and sulphur. And I have heard vague murmurs of "Black Magic," and "M. A. M.," accompanied by gentle shudders and frightened glances over one's shoulders, in connection with some of my own earlier books.

And, I remember the publisher of the first magazine with which I was connected, actually declining an advertisement of one of Elizabeth Towne's earlier books, because the advertisement announced as one of the chapters thereof this awful (!) title: "What God is Good For"! Some good persons used to condemn Elizabeth Towne for saying "I AM the Whole Darned Thing," and for using slang, just as Elizabeth now finds fault with Shelton for saying a few "damns" when they are needed. Some persons find fault with our own magazine for publishing articles on "Clairvoyance," just as others once bitterly criticised "Nautilus" for publishing a series of articles on "The Nervous System of Jesus." So, you see how hard it would be to get a Board of Censors beyond prejudice.

About fifteen years ago, a certain eminent New Thought exponent—a Brahmin of the Brahmins in New Thought (he admitted this himself)—became obsessed with the idea that he was by Divine Right the CENSOR of New Thought. He conceived it to be his duty to write the smuggest, most priggish letters imaginable, to other exponents of New Thought, reproving them for their shortcomings and errors of teaching. He told Helen Wilmans that she was "all wrong, all wrong"; and he said of a certain popular New Thought journal (not mine, by the way) that he "would handle it only with tongs, on its way to the fire." This Meddlesome Mattie of New Thought would gravitate to the Board of Censorship as surely as a meteor gravitates to the earth (it would be a safe bet that he is on the "standardizing" Committee already, for he would be one of the first ones to be thought of in this connec-

tion). I don't know whether to laugh, or to weep—or to yawn—when I think of this latest development in the Alliance.

But, you say, "there is to be no Board of Censors—the Committee is to be nothing like that"! Certainly, I understand that; and I want to do what I can to prevent that Committee, or its successors (particularly the latter) from ever venturing to assume the duties of censorship, or to arrogate to themselves the rights of "O. K"-ing, or "N. G."-ing any books, publications, or anything of the kind, under the sanction or seal of the Alliance. I am looking to the future, and wish to forestall any such assumption of authority on the part of anyone connected with the Alliance in an official capacity. There is always this tendency of certain officious persons in an organization to gradually arrogate to themselves the right and privilege of passing judgment on what others shall eat, drink, wear, think, read, or believe—and I wish to ask members of the Alliance to be ready to whack the Hydra-heads of any such tendency if such presents itself in this movement.

Frankly, I think the better plan would be for the Book Department of the Alliance to content itself with selecting such books as it desires to sell to members and others, leaving out such as it does not desire to handle (no matter which books these may be), and let it go at that—such action being divested of any semblance of "official" censoring. I am opposed on principle to any semblance of branding any books as "standard" or of tacitly implying that others are not "standard" by reason of their omission from the "official list."

That I may be unmistakably understood in this matter, I wish to say here that I know of no authority given to any person or persons, officers or committees, by the Alliance, in its Constitution or By-Laws, or by special resolution, under which they would be justified in separating New Thought books into "sheep and goat" categories, under cover or color of "official sanction" expressed or implied.

The Alliance should not only be free from all trace of institutionalism; but also, like the well-known and somewhat overworked Wife of Caesar—above suspicion on this score. Let each New Thought individual decide for himself what is or is not "standard"—it is a matter between himself and the writer of the books. It is no more possible for anyone to say authoritatively just what constitutes a "standard" New Thought book, than it is to decide "how big is a piece of chalk"; or to decide where "heat" ceases and "cold" begins. There is no such thing as "standard" New Thought—there is no official mandate to determine it, for there is no "official" New Thought, at least none that I recognize, or to which I acknowledge allegiance.

BACK NUMBERS

Those readers who have been with us from the beginning will remember that I cautioned them to carefully preserve the back numbers of the magazine each month, so as to have a complete set of the magazine. The magazine pages are not plated, and there have been no reprints; consequently many of the earlier numbers are now out of print, and cannot be supplied at any price. Other numbers are rapidly disappearing from view. We have had several letters offering us as high as twenty-five cents a number for the issue of certain months—but we had to decline the offers, for we had none to sell. So hold on to your back numbers, friends; they are getting scarcer every day, and soon will be at a considerable premium, if my previous experience goes for anything.

RISING PRICES

The publishers of this magazine assure me that they have no desire to increase the subscription price of this magazine—although, if the price of paper keeps on climbing up toward the skies, they **may** be compelled to raise the price to \$1.50 per year. You have doubtless noticed that many of the other magazines have increased their subscription prices; for instance: "Cosmopolitan," from \$1.50 to \$2.00; "McCall's," from 50 cents to 75 cents; "McClure's," from \$1.00 to \$1.50; "Metropolitan," from \$1.50 to \$2.00; "Nautilus," from \$1.50 to \$2.00; and about twenty others are announcing advances of from 25 cents to \$1.00 or more a year. Paper is now about doubled in price; and all other items of expense in publishing are rapidly increasing. So it may be possible that our publishers may have to follow suit—though they are fighting hard against it.

Although I dislike to write anything in these pages which may savor of a "come on" to subscribers, yet I feel justified in saying that, under the circumstances, it might be wisdom for many of you to renew your subscriptions at this time, **at the present price**, even though your subscriptions do not expire for several months to come. All subscriptions renewed now at the present price will remain "good" even though the price of the magazine is increased by the time your present subscription expires. You have nothing to lose, and possibly something to gain, by following the suggested plan. However, the matter is one entirely for the exercise of your own good business judgment. I have merely made the suggestion in your own interest—it is of no possible benefit to me which way you decide in the matter, of course. Well, that's enough about the business end of the magazine—I like my own end far better.

"Questions and Answers"

Conducted by the Editor

In this department the editor publishes and answers communications from the readers of this magazine. Its pages are open to all honest inquirers who ask questions on subjects in which they are interested for the purpose of getting information, or being "set straight" on any points which have perplexed them. No attention, however, will be paid to communications obviously intended to exploit pet fads of the writers, or to abuse or revile the honest opinions of others. It is understood, of course, that the subjects of the questions shall come within the general field and scope of this magazine, as indicated by our title page. The subjects of Economics, Sociology, Politics, etc., are out of our field, please remember. Make your inquiries as clear, concise and practical as possible, and the editor will do his best to give them the consideration that they merit. The names of inquirers will not be printed, nor need they be given in full if inquirers prefer it—initials serve every purpose in the case.

KNOWING VS. BELIEVING

E. J. S. writes: "In reincarnation, at what time does the 'old soul' enter the body of the individual?"

My friend, at one time in the course of my mental evolution, I would have no doubt given you a decided answer to your first question; such answer, however, would have been based entirely upon the teachings or theories of others—for I did not then, nor do I now, know anything certain regarding the matter from actual personal experience.

At the present time, I do not feel justified in even answering you in this way, for I do not feel that I possess sufficient information in the matter to justify me in even announcing a theory regarding it. The various accepted authorities on the subject of reincarnation vary greatly in their theories on this point—I refer you to them for an answer. But at the same time I think that both you and I are justified in asking these authorities this question: "Do you really know the truth in this case? And, if so, how do you know?" There is a vast difference between believing and knowing, though we frequently lose sight of this distinction.

The chronic "Doubting Thomas" is apt to be a nuisance; but it is well for us to cultivate at least a degree of the "Missouri" mental attitude, and to demand to "be shown" by those glibly announcing tremendous statements of "all about it"—or exhibiting diagrams of the Cosmic Plan. Too much blind reliance upon "authority" is not good for us—and it tends to encourage carelessness and arrogance in the "authorities," so it is not good for them either. It does the authorities good to have their hands "called" once in a while; and it prevents us from having things "put over" on us by a bluffing would-be authority.

There are certain things in the world concerning which no one knows so very much more than anyone else; and when an individual arises who claims to "know" very much more than do the rest of us concerning such things, then we should never fail to demand to "be shown" the source of his knowledge, or the process by which he has arrived at the knowledge. If it is a matter of plain belief, or general notion or opinion on his part, then all well and good—

but let him be frank about it, and not claim it as positive knowledge. Belief, and opinions based upon a general "notion" or sense of intuition are all right in their way, and deserve respect in many cases; but they should not be announced as positive knowledge gained through actual experience.

When I listen to arguments, for and against, concerning subjects of this kind, I frequently grow very weary and find myself yawning. At such times I am forcibly reminded of the celebrated remark of Huxley, who said: "If anybody can answer that question, he is just the man I want to see. If he says that it is so, I must ask him how he knows that; and, if he says that it is not so, I must put the same question."

There is no reason why we should not boldly announce "I do not know," to many questions. Such an answer is often the mark of real intelligence, for it takes a very intelligent man to understand that he does not know, in many cases. The ignorant man not only does not know that he "does not know"—he often also does not even realize that any problem exists. For instance: Gravitation is beyond the power of the most advanced minds of the race to explain—it has defied Science and Philosophy, and remains today the most baffling problem of physical science. The person of average intelligence does not realize this, however; he thinks that he understands gravitation because he knows the laws of its operation—he does not realize the difficulty of a scientific explanation. As for the uneducated man, he does not even know why any question exists; to him objects "drop down," because they can't fall in any other direction—that's all there is to it; and he is apt to think that anyone is a fool to imagine that there is any mystery whatsoever about the whole thing. Nordau has well said that: "The ripest and rarest fruit of the Tree of Knowledge is the realization of our own Ignorance." Therefore, let us boldly say "Ignoramus" ("we do not know"), when it needs to be said.

About the matter of "souls," however, it has always seemed to me that we usually take hold of the wrong end of the stick when we consider this question of body and soul. We speak of the Ego as "entering" the body—why? Why not speak and think of the Ego as "growing" a body around itself—or, possibly, as "working up" a body around itself just as one works up a lather from a bit of shaving soap? We speak of the "soul" as "leaving" the body which it has "inhabited"—why not speak and think of the Ego as "sloughing off" the sheath of the body, just as the growing plant sloughs off the confining sheath? Instead of the Ego "inhabiting" the body, why not think of it as "wearing" the body just as the latter wears a suit of clothes? I read of someone recently saying that "the body dies off the soul." I rather like that idea. Many of us think of the body as the "Self" of us, the soul being regarded as "something within me" instead of "I" having a body outside of itself. Oh, yes, it is true that these are just matters of terms and forms of expression and symbols of thought—that's all; but try the two plans and see which one results in the greater consciousness of Real Being.

I'm sorry, friend, that I cannot answer your question just as I would a question in simple mathematics. I simply don't know. Oh, dear me, yes indeed: you can find lots of persons who can answer such questions—the woods are full of them. They will not only give you a "Thus saith the Lord" style of answer, but they will also furnish you with a chart or diagram of the whole thing, so simple that even a child could understand it—and you will understand it just about as well as the child does, providing you do not demand to "be shown" the authority and reason of the answer. But there is a growing tendency to demand to "be shown" in these matters now-a-days—the orthodox

preachers are about the only ones left who can "get away with" answers of this kind, and even they can do so only because it is considered "wicked" to ask them the dreadful question: "How do you know this?" or to speak in the Missouri tone of voice saying: "Show me, mister!"

THE PASSING YEARS

Mrs. F. H. C. writes: "Your photograph in the January magazine was a pleasant surprise. It is a splendid likeness. My family agree with me in stating that you make a mistake in telling your age so publicly."

Thank you, my good lady, for the nice little compliment implied in your last sentence. But bless your heart, the matter of my age is the least of my worries. I do not care how old I am, or may be. I want to keep active and well so long as I am using this body, and I believe in one taking good care of his body while he is using it (though I often forget the latter when I am busy or interested in other things); but the mere matter of the addition to my list of years disturbs me practically not at all. In the first place, I feel that I have "all the time there is" in which to live—I do not fear approaching Death, for I do not intend to die. Oh, now, don't run away with the idea that I intend to hold on this particular physical body forever, for I have no intention or desire to do so—there is plenty of good material for bodies in the universe, and I will "work up" another body all right when I need one, never fear. You can't keep a live soul "dead" very long, take my word for it!

As for "getting old" I would say that each and every year of my life has brought me something that no other one of the years could have brought with it. I have lost some things and gained others—and have been well satisfied with the trade. I believe in the Law of Compensation in this, as in many other things. When I was a youth, I thought that Youth was the whole thing, and that Age was a curse. Now that I have left the days of Youth behind me, I think that the things of Youth were but "fool things," and that the things centering about Middle-Age are the real things of life. A little later on, I shall probably think and talk of the "mellow days of Old-Age"—I shall think that all the rest was but a preparation for that. As I have lived, I have thought that each particular period of life was the "best ever" of the entire calendar of Life.

No, this is not a case of "sour grapes," not a bit of it! If I were offered the chance of going back to the days of youth again, and at the same time losing the experience and acquired knowledge that has come to me with the years, I should laugh at the folly of the proposition. Why, nothing could induce me to go back to the "calf stage" of my existence, leaving behind me all that has come to me since. What we mean when we say that we would "like to be young again" is to have the body of our youth renewed, but the experience and mind of maturity left to us—we want the penny and the cake at the same time.

No, thanks! I am quite well satisfied with my age, and am not worrying the least little bit at the report of the calendar. No, this is no bluff—I mean every word of it. Youth, Middle-Age, Old-Age—each in its own time, turn, and place—all look alike to me, and all look good.

There are several ways of taking Life—just as there are several ways of eating an orange. (I remember reading some writer, about thirty years ago, who used the same figure of speech; and I shall follow his idea—sorry I don't know his name.) Some tear open the orange, as does an ill-trained child, biting into it as into a piece of cake, squirting the juice all over oneself and

the ground. Others bore a little hole in the orange, and then suck it carefully, squeezing it until at last it grows bitter and unpleasant to the taste. A third class peel the orange carefully, and separate its sections, taking care not to waste any of the juice; then they eat and enjoy every portion of the orange, from first to last; and then when finished, they feel satisfied and contented, and wipe their hands on the napkin, and pass on. Which is the wisest? Oh, no, I have not always acted wisely in eating of the orange of Life—I have been all kinds of a fool about it—"do not as I have done, but as I tell you to do," as the old preacher said.

Finally, they say that a man is as old as he feels. Then I wonder just how old I am? For sometimes I feel as if I were living in the very spirit of Youth, so far as my emotions and thoughts are concerned. And again, I feel as if I were as old as the Sphinx—far older, in fact; at such times I feel that I could count off the centuries on my string of Life, just as the maiden runs over the beads on her rosary. [Is this merely imagination; or is it reawakened memories of the past? Yes! that's what I think about it, myself; glad that you agree with me.] Then how old am I, or you, or anyone else?—for these are experiences common to most of us.

I was once very fond of a little verse written by a man named Orr. I used it in almost every other thing that I wrote, until folks got tired of seeing it in print. I will venture to use it just once more—it's so old now that it may seem new to you. Here it is:

"Lord of a thousand worlds am I,
And I've reigned since Time began;
And Night and Day, in cyclic sway,
Have passed while their deeds I scan.
But Time shall cease, ere I find release;
For I AM the Soul of Man!"

Do you get it, children?

CORRECTING A CORRECTION

T. H. writes: "Just for fun, while we are at it, let us get that quotation straight:

"W. W. A. (in October 'Advanced Thought'): 'The world is a comedy to those who see; a tragedy to those who feel.'

"A. Z. (criticising the above, in January 'Advanced Thought'): 'Life is a comedy to him who thinks; and a tragedy to him who feels.'

"Horace Walpole, in 1770, wrote, in a letter to Sir Horace Mann: 'The world is a comedy to those that think, a tragedy to those who feel.'

"This last I get from Bartlett, who is 'the' authority on quotations. It is interesting to see that W. W. A. is much nearer correct than is A. Z. who ventured to 'correct him.'

Well, I'm glad to get this straightened out. Not that it makes any particular difference; but because it helps to get the quotation well fixed in our minds. Thank you, T. H., for setting us right—both of us, I mean, A. Z. and myself.

ANOTHER EXPLANATION

Dr. H. H. writes: "Your answer to Mrs. C. W. B. in your October issue lacked your usual spiritual insight. I think that Mrs. C. W. B. would have been better satisfied with an answer like this: 'Dear Lady: The reason of your attraction to the motherless young man can be explained by the fact

that you regarded the young man, after the loss of his mother, with a feeling akin to pitying love; and, thinking of your own son in this connection, you felt what an awful happening would have been such an event to him. This last step opened your mind, and served to attract to you the largest and most glorious Principle in the universe—Mother Love. As this great, living, striving, acting Principle, manifested through you, you felt its power and loving glow, and of course accepted it as your own. Every subsequent thought or regard for the boy called forth a fresh expression of this Principle, until finally you established yourself as a center for it, the boy acting as a focal point.'

"How does that strike you, Mr. Editor? And don't you think those great befogging powers, 'Dan Cupid,' 'Reincarnation,' 'Elective Affinities,' 'Soul Harmonies,' etc., 'put one over' on you this time, and caused you to miss the Simple Truth? Oh, I know, it is easy enough for me who am looking on, and not in there like you, striving to tell you 'all about it.' Thanks for your 'personal confession'; in getting that out of your system, you also purged mine of the same complaint. I think your magazine is filling a great want, as it is dispelling so much 'moonshine.'"

Well, now, to be honest with you, Doctor, I don't quite agree with you that the "befogging powers" put one over on me when I answered the query to which you refer. Rather do I think that your evident warm appreciation of "Mother Love" (which I, too, recognize and appreciate) "put one over" on you, and befogged you into raising it to the plane of a Principle, instead of a manifestation. The "great, living, striving, acting Principle" is generally considered to be "Life," which in its striving to exist and perpetuate itself, sometimes takes on the manifestation or appearance of both "Dan Cupid" and "Mother Love," in order to accomplish its ends. "Mother Love" is a wonderful force and active power in the universe—but it is not the whole thing. However, I shall be glad to pass on your suggestion to our readers, in order that they may compare it with my own (not any too clear or complete) attempt at answering the question put by this inquirer. It does us good to see, hear, and consider all sides of every question.

Thank you for your kind words regarding my work, Doctor. It is good to know that my readers feel towards me as did the friends of the cowboy who died out West in the early days—they voiced their sentiments in the inscription placed upon the tombstone which they lovingly erected to his memory, which read: "He did his durnedest."

ABOUT TREATMENTS

Many Inquirers write: "Do you give personal or absent treatments? If so, please send me particulars."

No, I do not give treatments, either personal or "absent." My time is entirely taken up with my work of editing this magazine, doing some other writing, some other kinds of work, studying, and pursuing research work. This gives me a very busy day—each day, every day, all days—and I could not conscientiously take up the work of giving treatments, under the circumstances. The successful healer should be able to devote his time and complete attention to his healing work—and this I cannot do. Accordingly, I refuse to take the money of prospective patients (and I have scores of applications each month) because I cannot give to their cases what I consider to be the right attention—"right" in the matter of time, quality, and degree of concentration. I thank

you all for your kind regard and confidence, shown in your desire to place your respective cases in my hands; but I cannot see my way clear to answer other than as above.

PERSONAL ANSWERS

Many Friends write me very interesting letters, and evidently expect that I will be able to answer them personally, although I have several times stated that it is a physical impossibility for me to do so. Friends, you do not realize just how sorry I am to be compelled to have to remain silent after I receive your good letters. My natural impulse is to start in to answer each and every one of you—but sober second thought shows me the impossibility of this course. I can only say once more that I can answer you only in this column, or "in the spirit"—and the last is not to be despised, let me say with all due modesty. Try it! But, remember this, always: there is nothing I enjoy more than reading letters from my friends and readers—I read every one that reaches my hands, carefully and to the last word. And I ALWAYS SEND A MENTAL ANSWER thereto—of that rest assured. So keep on writing me—for I like it, and it does me good to come in contact with your ideas; but do not expect a personal answer through the mails. So please forgive me, won't you? But, once more, be sure and write me, whenever you feel like it, and whatever you feel like saying to me—it will do noth of us lots of good, in many ways, if the writing is done in the right spirit and with the right understanding. Remember always (as good old Elbert Hubbard used to say), that "Across the miles, I clasp your hand."

SOUL, SPIRIT, AND REAL SELF

J. G. C. writes: "Is the Spirit and Soul one? Is it true that the Spirit leaves the Soul, as the Soul leaves the body? If so, what becomes of the Soul? and is it conscious of its own existence after the separation? Is the 'I' the Soul, and the Real Self the Spirit; or is there any difference between the 'I' and the Real Self?"

The difficulty about answering this question so as to adapt it to the many different points of view, opinions, beliefs, and understanding of terms held by the family of readers of this magazine, will be recognized by such of my readers who may have taken even a short excursion into the land of metaphysics, philosophy, and occult science. The main trouble arises from the fact that each school of thought along those lines has its own favored definition of such terms as "spirit," "soul," the "I," "Real Self," etc. This being so, an answer based upon one set of definitions would be unintelligible or, at least, very confusing, to those familiar only with the other set. These terms have special definitions, and special forms of usage, independent of the ordinary "dictionary definition" and common usage. But I think that I know exactly which school of esoteric philosophy this young lady refers to, and which set of definitions is favored by that school. So I shall proceed accordingly.

Now then, J. G. C., listen carefully to me, please. It's like this: The school of philosophy to which you belong, or rather which you have been studying, regards the "soul" as merely the aggregation of feelings, thoughts, desires, etc.—your personal "mental and emotional character" so to speak. There are higher and lower phases of this "soul" for that matter. But, according to this view, this "soul" is not YOU, any more than your body is YOU—it is merely something which you have built up, and which you carry around with you, just as is the case with your body. The "spirit" is held to be the per-

manent "I," which you assert when you say "I AM"—it comprises your individuality, while your "soul" constitutes your subjective personality, and your body constitutes your objective personality. Of course there is much more than this to it—I am merely giving you the general outlines of your favorite philosophy.

The "I," "Ego," or "Real Self" of the individual is the individual Self, considered as apparently apart from the One Self of the universe. This "I," "Ego," or "Real Self"—is to be thought of as Spirit, rather than Soul (i. e., thought, emotion, desire, etc.). The "I" (self-conscious Spirit) has a soul, mind, feelings, desires, thoughts, etc., just as it has a body—these are things which it has gathered around it in its evolution, but which are not its "real self"—they "belong" to the Real Self, or "I," instead of being identical with it: do you get this clearly?

Well, then, the teachings of your school of philosophy are to the effect that when you reach the end of your present life in the body, you will slough off the body just as the snake does his skin, or the butterfly its chrysalis-shell—it will "die off of you"—and you will then be clad in a body of ethereal substance, infinitely finer than the forms of Matter with which you are familiar. Shortly after, this too will be sloughed off, and you will exist on a plane still higher, in which you will have your "soul" intact, your "I" (Spirit) still having use for it. A little later on, you will slough off the lower phases or garments of your "soul," leaving the "I" (Spirit) clad only in the garments of the higher phases of your "soul," though the essence of the lower phases are stored up in its "soul" paraphernalia, unless, happily you have evolved so far as to have left the lower part of your nature behind you forever on the path of spiritual evolution. Thus will you abide on the planes of Life for which you are fitted, and to which you are entitled, until your time comes for a new "bath in the physical," when you will rapidly build up for yourself a new body, and will grow a new "soul" from what has remained of your own one (including the stored up "essence" spoken of).

Now, if you wish to go further into the matter, I will say that your favorite philosophy teaches that this "I" of YOU (Spirit) is not really a separate and distinct Something—its separation is merely a "working fiction" of the universe. It is really a drop from the Ocean of Spirit, a Ray from the Sun of Spirit, a Spark from the Flame of Spirit—never totally divorced from its Source and Home. The teachers of your school of philosophy further announce that, finally, all the drops flow back into the Ocean; all the rays again reach the Sun; all the sparks again are absorbed into the Flame—and there is then nothing but that One, whether we think of it under the symbolic figure of Ocean, Sun, or Flame. This One is SPIRIT, Pure Spirit, unencumbered with "soul" or with "body"—having no need for these.

Well, we have climbed up the mountain of Philosophy quite a little way, haven't we, Jessie? Now, don't get excited about it—don't think that you have to understand it all in a day; you have all the time there is in which to understand it, and there is no danger of you losing anything that you ought to know—"you cannot escape your own good," as Emerson said. Don't try to get all these things assimilated at once—you might get mental indigestion if you do; give yourself time for mental digestion and assimilation. Take your time about it, Jessie. And, above all, hold on to the "I AM" consciousness which has developed within you—never let go of that, even though you cast aside every other bit of this particular philosophy, or of all philosophies for that matter—for that is the essence of all true philosophies.

Oh, yes! I hear some of you good people just waiting to get a chance to remind me of what I said about "knowing" and "not knowing" in the first answer in this department, this month—just burning with impatience for the opportunity of telling me that I am inconsistent, and that I should have told this young woman that "I do not know." You didn't catch me napping, though—I saw you there all the time I was talking, and knew what was in your minds all the time, so I did.

I didn't tell this young woman anything as "gospel truth" reached as the result of my own experience. I simply explained to her certain teachings of her own philosophy upon which she desired enlightenment—that's all!

If you insist upon my telling you of something that I really "know" (in the ordinary meaning of this term), I will tell you that I DO know that "I AM," and that this consciousness is my "awareness" of the Essence of Being; and that my reason informs me that the Essence of Being must be Eternal—that there can never have been a time when that Essence did not exist, or when only Nothing was. And this Essence is what I mean when I say "Spirit"—to me, Spirit or Essence is Pure Being. And the only self-consciousness that I can conceive of Spirit having is simply "I AM." And the only absolute statement of Being that I can conceive of the Infinite making is just what the Scriptures of the Hebrews report IT as saying: "I Am THAT I Am!" This because I can't conceive of there being anything else for IT to say without denying and limiting its Infinity of Being. Now run along and ruminate upon that, and don't accuse me of inconsistency.

A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE

W. F. T. writes: "Allow me to put a question which has been in my mind for some time, i. e., What is the difference between a Metaphysical Healer and a Spiritual Healer?"

My own private opinion, friend W. F. T., is that there is no real difference when one gets right down to brass tacks. The alleged differences are found to be like the C. S. conception of evil, i. e., "all in the mind" of the person thinking it. There are so many different conceptions of what "spiritual" really means, however, that unless one knows just how the other person is using the term he cannot know whether he agrees or disagrees with him. But don't waste time seeking distinctions and differences—seek rather for points of agreement and likeness. Read what that old Bohemian woman said (see page 585, last paragraph, February issue of "Advanced Thought") and try to get what she found—"IT, just IT, that's all." That poor woman drew the circle wider than do any of the disputing sects, cults, schools and factions of Healing—she went right to the heart of things, found what she sought, and made use of it.

WHEW!

C. G. D. writes: "Of all the idiotic drivel that I ever waded through, 'Advanced Thought' is the worst. I don't want to waste any more time looking it over."

I wonder which of the pet corns of this testy individual I happened to tread upon! Something seems to tell me that this gentleman has a constitutional impediment which renders him incapable of appreciating the good stuff with which we sought to nourish him. And, after all, he is probably quite right in following the report of his intuition in the matter, for, unless he has acquired the taste, he will not find this magazine helpful to him. As Elbert Hubbard used to say in his "Philistine"; "Those who do not know how to take

this magazine, had better not." I respectfully suggest that this departing brother should subscribe to Shelton's "Scientific Christian," judging from the statement in a letter just received from another good friend who says that she takes Shelton's journal "for the good of my liver." This good man's liver evidently needs jolting up—and Shelton's the boy to jolt it, take my word for it. Farewell, dear brother, "Peace to thee be multiplied"—but look out for that liver of yours, it needs attention.

GETTING AN ANSWER

W. S. B. writes: "I have just finished reading the December number of 'Advanced Thought,' and am yielding to the impulse to criticise. When you responded to the toast, and said that the Pioneers of New Thought were NOT DEAD, you expressed your idea in a way which has always seemed to me to be objectionable. Of course all understand what is meant, but why not use language that conveys the idea? The Pioneers were dead. How could it be said that they were dead, and yet were not dead? Christian Scientists frequently say: "There is no such thing as death." What is the sense in talking in that way? There is such a thing as what we call death—the absence of life from the body. Why not then use the word as it was designed to be used? The body becomes dead: there is no question as to that. Now if we wish to speak of the soul as not subject to death, why not say so?"

The correspondent evidently stopped writing at this point, and "took another think," for the next paragraph reads as follows: "I had proceeded so far before I saw that the language you used was really appropriate, for YOU are not your body; your body is what YOU use; and when YOU give up its use, YOU are still alive in some other form."

I have printed this communication not alone for the views presented in it—these are interesting and instructive—but also for the purpose of calling your attention to the quite interesting (though generally overlooked) fact that one frequently answers his own questions while he is asking them. That is to say, one part of one's mind is preparing an answer to the question which the other part of the mind is asking at that moment; when the first part stops talking, or writing, then the other part starts in to announce its reply.

Moreover, this particular psychological phenomena seems to be concerned in some way with the action of the mind of a second person who is being addressed (mentally) by the first one—it does not seem to manifest nearly so frequently, or so clearly and forcibly, when one is merely writing down his thoughts for his own pleasure, or is "talking to himself." There seems to be the need of the reaction from the contact with the mind of the other person. I receive many letters asking questions; and in the next mail, receive later letters from the same persons, telling me that they have received their answer shortly after having mailed the first letter (long before the first letter has reached my hands, be it noted). And, I frequently have personal callers put questions to me, and before I can get my mind to work out an answer they will say: "Oh, never mind; I have just thought of the solution!"

Now, what do you make of that? What psychological principle is called into play? What part (even passive) does the mind of the second person play in the phenomenon? I have my own ideas on the subject—not clearly worked out as yet, however. But I want to start you folks thinking about it. What is your guess?

HELP! HELP!

I. V. P. writes: "Each planet gives its own light. The Ether, the Sun, and God are the same, and one universal power. Man has not grasped it yet, but will do so and have dominion over all things. Man is the object of its activities. The Sun is the center of all life, and is in the center of the earth. I have long studied this subject."

Well, here's something new about the Sun. I find myself incapable of grasping it. I shall have to call for help. I think Shelton is the man to settle this—he's the New Thought authority on the SUN.

THE SPIRIT, NOT THE WORDS

Mrs. M. J. M. writes: "I have friends near or at a distance whom I am anxious to have changed in health or disposition. Some teachers advise me to hold or send them a thought, silently or verbally, something like this: 'The abiding peace of Almighty God is fully established in you, and through you, and you are made whole and free in the name of Jesus Christ.' Why is not the result the same if I ask God to restore them to health or to cure them of some bad habit?"

My dear lady (I came very near to calling you "mother," for I can catch the "mother" vibrations in your letter), don't you bother about the form of the words you use in your effort to bring about the normal conditions in those whom you seek to help. Just use the words that come to your lips, from your heart, and all will be done that can be done by the use of any formula. It is the spirit of the thought, not the words of its expression. New Thought does not consist of stereotyped phrases and forms, possessing some magical virtues or qualities—it seeks rather to have one express himself or herself naturally, freely, and according to whatever forms may appeal to one. If you feel moved to express yourself by means of a good, old-fashioned prayer—in the old familiar terms—accompanied with a fervent faith and expectation of the desired result, it will work just as well as the formula of the best New Thought teacher in the land. Don't fall into the error of thinking that The Infinite demands "new" forms—the old ones are just as efficacious, if used in the proper spirit. An old-fashioned "Lord help me!" is just as good as any formal "statement" of "I am this, or that or the other" of the most self-satisfied metaphysical teacher who ever sought to enlighten the multitude. You don't need to have anyone else to tell you how to "talk to God"—you are just as near to Him as anyone else in the world. "The Right Knock" is the words that come from your heart, provided they are accompanied by faith and expectation of results. You can do business direct with the Lord, good mother-heart—you don't need to bother with spiritual "middle-men" in Old Thought or New Thought. "For what are they all, in their high conceit; when man with God in the bush may meet!"

You New Thought boys and girls over there near the window, who are snickering at this "old time" idea, would do well to get busy and cultivate the spirit of the good old sayers of prayers, instead of trying to formulate "high statements" which, like the charms of the ignorant savage, are hoped to work miracles. If I could get the spirit of a good old-fashioned prayer meeting into an up-to-date New Thought gathering, I would be willing to bet my hat that there would be instantaneous cures in great numbers performed right there in that room, or in other places to where the healing was directed. People are being healed by prayer every day, all over the land, by the efforts of people who have never even heard the term "New Thought." The Principle is there,

awaiting the call—make the call in your own way, using your own terms, but always accompanying it with Faith and Earnest Expectation. "IT is there—IT does the work."

COUNT TEN BEFORE YOU SPEAK

F. F. B. writes: "Please tell me how to go about it to gain sufficient control of one's mind, when irritated or angry, to keep from speaking until there is time to think as to whether it is advisable to say anything at all. Personally, I am quick in all that I do, and this very bad habit of speaking so quickly must be overcome. When I succeed in doing this I will feel like I have reached the stage for wings to sprout."

F. F. B., do you see what I have said in the title-head of this answer? Old-time advice, but perfectly good to date. I think that much of your trouble comes from your habitual picture of yourself as addicted to this bad habit. You see yourself that way, and try to "fight against" the habit by opposing it. Why not try to starve it out? The way to starve out a bad habit is to think of its opposite. The attention cannot be fixed on both poles at the same time, and one pole suffers for want of nourishment—it is up to you to select which pole you wish to nourish, and which you wish to perish.

Picture yourself as always speaking calmly when under pressure. Rehearse the thing mentally. See yourself in all sorts of trying situations, and always as keeping cool and speaking calmly. Study this part as if you were going to perform it in some great play, and keep at it until you become "letter perfect" in it, down to the smallest detail of gesture and tone of voice. If you will do this in the right spirit, and will keep it up long enough, in spite of discouragements and back-slidings, you will make this rehearsed action "second nature" to you, and will instinctively act it out in real life. Drill, drill, drill! Play the part in your imagination until it becomes thoroughly embedded in your subconscious mind—then will your "reflex" action correspond to it.

Oh, no, I'm not fooling or joking—I'm in dead earnest. And this is not child's play either—it has the sanction of the most practical, hard-headed scientific psychology. Patience and perseverance required? you say; why surely! I am taking it for granted that you are in earnest in making the request, and I am expecting you to show it by sticking to this plan until you have won victory. It's worth all the time and trouble that you put into it, and you know it. Now get busy, start to work, and make good.

LOOK FORWARD, NOT BACKWARD

Mrs. N. H. writes: "Many years ago my only child died. A year ago my husband was buried. And now I am all alone. I do not sleep well of nights, and I awake with my heart like lead; and then I go over my past life, and think perhaps I might have managed better, and not been left a lonely old lady nearly seventy with nothing to look forward to. If I could only interest myself in something, it might help me. Perhaps some little word of yours may be just the one thing to help me."

Dear Playmate in the Kindergarten of God, what can I say to help you? I have lots of things that I know might help, if I could speak so that you would understand just what I mean, and catch the spirit of my thought—but words seem cold when written on paper, and I shall have to try to reach you in another way. I am going to ask such of my readers who may feel interested in this letter, to send this good sister a comforting, uplifting thought and message in the Silence—it will reach her, never fear, if it be for her good.

If I were to confine myself to a cold "scientific" statement, I would tell her that she should look forward, not backward as she is doing; that she has **everything** to look forward to, instead of nothing as she thinks; that her work is not ended, nor her life lived out, nor has she really **lost** those from whom she is parted temporarily. But this seems too much like "preaching" to suit my temperament and tastes—too trite, too much like cant and pious mouthings. But it is true just the same!

"If I could only interest myself in something," she says. Why not try "treating" others for their troubles, by thought and mental message? I have known of persons who have lifted themselves out of the slough of despond by just this method—they did not try to shoulder the burdens of the others; they simply gave to them the mental and spiritual help that they had been seeking for themselves. And it is surprising what an inflow of Power comes to one when he follows this course—a Power that helps not only the persons being treated, but also the person doing the treatment. I know a man who was a successful healer, but who was unable to rid himself of a physical complaint of old standing. He refused to take similar cases in other people, feeling that the physician should heal himself first. Finally, he was forced against his will to take a case of this kind—the same trouble with which he, himself, was afflicted; the patient would take no refusal, and circumstances made it imperative that he proceed with the healing work. And lo! when the patient was cured, the healer himself was also cured. He had been bathed in the healing power that was flowing through him to the patient, and without a thought for himself he was perfectly healed. This is not a "fairy story," but a statement of scientific fact coming under my own personal notice. There is a hint here for not only this good lady, but for many others of you also.

Now, let's all get to work and send to this "seventy years young" sister a Message of Cheer, Help, and POWER. DO IT NOW!

JUST TRY ME

E. D. writes: "Here is a question which you are undoubtedly highly qualified to answer. Supposing a man were to come into your office and ask you how you would advise him to spend \$50,000 or more for the best interest of his fellows. What would be your answer?"

Well now, Edward, I'm a bit too modest to say right out in public what I think that man should do with that money—but I have a very decided opinion on the subject. You bring that man here to Chicago, and into my office, and I will whisper in his ear the right answer. Fifty thousand dollars, did you say, Edward? Is there that much real money in the world? Aren't you ashamed to arouse the hopes of a New Thought editor in that way, Edward? Well, I guess I'll wake up in a moment, as usual, and find that it's all a dream. Quit your kiddin', Edward, and let me go back to my work.

RECESSIONAL.

God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung battle-line,
Beneath whose awful Hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget! —Kipling.



FREE YOURSELF FROM FEAR AND NERVOUSNESS

Dr. C. Franklin Leavitt has written a great book containing 44 splendid chapters on Self Healing by Auto-Suggestion. It is called—

Mental and Physical Ease and Supremacy



These Subjects and Many More:

- Influencing the sub-conscious.
- Emotional causes of disease.
- Loss of balance between will, intellect and feeling the chief cause of disease.
- Neurasthenia and how it is caused.
- Mental attitude toward sex and the part it plays in health.
- Suggestion without hypnosis.
- Freud's dream theories as to cause of disease.
- Telepathic curative methods.
- Self re-education. How to make these lessons effective.
- Self-persuasion. Formulas for auto-suggestions.
- Manner of giving auto (or self) suggestion.
- Psychoanalysis by the self. Practical self treatment by psycho-analysis.
- Commanding the self. The hidden nature of energy and startling phenomena to which it gives rise.
- How to get rid of the devils of disorder.
- Seven power developing exercises in deep breathing.
- Seventeen health building, physical exercises and how to use them (illustrated).
- Regulating the habits for health.
- Those overwhelming feelings.
- Controlling the feelings.
- Another word about fear. Getting rid of fear.

It teaches you how to overcome physical ailments.

It teaches you to develop the power within yourself.

It teaches you how to deal with trials and overcome obstacles.

It teaches you how to control your moods.

It teaches you how to become strong.

It teaches you how to be of use in the world though old.

It teaches you how to recover your grip on life.

It teaches you how to drive away your griefs and fears.

This is not a book of theory. Dr. Leavitt is an educated physician, who has studied abroad besides being a graduate of a leading medical college in the United States.

He has had an experience as healer and physician with thousands of cases. This book contains the methods by which he is teaching people to heal themselves through auto-suggestion.

The book gives you complete and thorough instruction on just how to use auto-suggestion to make it effective in healing yourself, and includes many formulas of the most effective statements to apply to yourself.

It tells you how to practice the famous psycho-analysis method with yourself in such a way as to break down the formidability of your ailments and open the way to cure.

It outlines a complete and valuable system of deep breathing and physical exercise.

It contains some valuable chapters for the old.

Read the letters in the right hand column from users of this great book, then write your address on the coupon and send your order NOW.

"Mental and Physical Ease and Supremacy" is printed on good paper, large, clear type, handsome cloth binding, gold stamping, nearly 400 pages. Price, \$2.00. USE COUPON.

30 Days' Trial

You may return this book any time within 30 days from date of purchase and get your money back if the book is not satisfactory in every way.

CLIP HERE.

Advanced Thought, Dept. 1, 168 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

Here is \$2.00 for Dr. Leavitt's big book on Self-Healing called "MENTAL AND PHYSICAL EASE AND SUPREMACY" on 30 days trial.

Name

Address

What This Book Does For Its Users.

"MEANT HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS".

"The study of this book has already meant hundreds of dollars to me. It has filled me with a self-confidence, enthusiasm and ambition, that I never had before."—R.S. Fitzgerald, Chicago, Ill.

LOST OLD FEARS.

"Your new book has helped me in a wonderful way. I have lost practically all the old fears, I wrote you about." — Miss Minnie Robinson, Edgewood, Iowa.

CHANGED LIFE.

"I have already been able to change several of the weaknesses I have found in self through the method you suggest. There is so much room for improvement in all that I will make the statement that ALL should possess your book."—Miss Jessie Ardner, Cleveland, O.

"A DIFFERENT WOMAN."

"Mentally I am a different woman for having read your book and I thank GOD that He directed me to you."—Miss Lela Dickson, Tupelo, Miss.

WORTH SEVERAL TIMES ITS COST.

"I would gladly pay several times what you ask for the book now I know how valuable it really is. I read some in the book daily, and no longer DREAD the future as I once did."—Mrs. Joe Wilson, Abbeville, S. Car.