

ANCIENT WISDOM

A monthly journal devoted to teaching theosophical and occult truths

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."—Hamlet

VOLUME XVIII

JANUARY, 1953—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 11

WHY THE VICARIOUS ATONEMENT?

3. Inexplicable Explanations

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

The central doctrine of the vicarious atonement is that Jesus died not for his sins, for he was sinless, but for ours. The thought behind this is, of course, tied in with the ancient idea that if someone sins, someone must suffer but not necessarily the same someone. As shown in the previous articles of this series, the someone need not be human at all—it may be a goat, a bullock, a ram or a pair of turtledoves. Just so someone is killed, divine anger is appeased. Until that happens "justice" is not done—the sin remains unexpiated.

The Theosophist would say that *when* it happens justice most certainly is not done, but injustice is. Believers in the sacrificial theory of justice can't see it and it is quite useless to argue with them. Blood is necessary to wash away sin. In early biblical times it was the blood of animals. With the coming of Christ the shedding of his blood once and for all eliminated further animal offerings. Whoever accepted that sacrifice by professing belief in it was washed clean. In some sects that is all he had to do—in others, there were additional professions, rituals, formulae, etc., to be added. In still others his acts in daily life might be taken into account, but these were dismissed by some sects as of no consequence so far as salvation was concerned providing the belief—or, as usually termed, the *faith*—was there.

Alien indeed such concepts to what most Theosophists regard as Theosophy, but still held by a very large section of the religious population.

Until comparatively recent times no one but a few "heretics" questioned the validity or reasonableness of these theological ideas. It is true that had they been applied to any man-made law they would have been indignantly rejected as without logic, purpose or justice, but this is religion, a far different thing, which need not, indeed must not, be logical or reasonable by our puny standards of comparison. But as the human mind will at times burst the bonds authority imposes on its thinking and will insist on "explanations" of the illogical even in religion, the theologians themselves started to question the reasons which lay behind this unique sacrifice of "God's only Son" for the cleansing of the world.

(Continued on Page 87)

THE END OF PAIN

BY H. K. SCHOLEFIELD

In his progress out of the animal kingdom, through human evolution through many incarnations and into the superhuman status of Masterhood with full control over nature's forces, the human soul is faced with no more bewildering riddle than that of bodily suffering by disease and disorder through karmic precipitation upon his own head of consequences of his own misdeeds in this or in some former life. Divine cosmic law is one of balance of force; action and re-action are equal and opposite on all planes as fully and exactly as on the physical, and every smallest iota of force let loose by the evolving entity must accrue to him thereafter for good or ill as karmic debt to be restored by its maker to original balance "to the last jot and tittle." Whether such imbalance, self-engendered by the sufferer sometime, somewhere in his past, must be absorbed and disposed of in bodily pain over periods of years, or is to be more wisely countered and nullified by opposite karma in life-long efforts to improve the world and benefit mankind, is increasingly a matter of choice as evolution proceeds.

Efforts to serve his fellow-men bring fresh karma of opportunity to serve them more largely. As opportunities are grasped they recur with arithmetical increase until enormous powers are gained for selfless service, sufficing in a brief lifetime to cancel vastly great forces of evil accrued in the past and so dispose of them eternally and painlessly. "What can I do to bring such opportunities about?" cries the helpless invalid, the crippled or poverty-burdened sufferer, perhaps undergoing some heavy "crackdown" of karmic load after milder pressures in earlier incarnations had proved ineffective. Stubborn cases require heavy correction, and refusal to take heed brings still more concentrated pain into experience until the evolving soul takes thought and direction from his innermost wisdom. The most helpless sufferer can make a beginning in a chain-reaction of increasing improvement by at least being amiable in habit, by being considerate in his demands upon those who attend his helplessness. Each smallest opportunity leads to greater ones, and, as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow, this changed habit of life will initiate a new and better one: if not in the existing body, then very certainly in a

(Continued on Page 87)

THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND

BY PIERREPONT V. MARSHALL, PH.D.

Theosophy and kindred philosophies advocate the study of astrology; and with good reason, for the study of a correct birth chart shows a map of the unconscious mind. Sun shows the spirit (life) of individuality, and Moon (soul-record) shows the natural and instinctive mind by position in sign, house and aspects to the other points in the chart. Through individual directive thinking (Mercury) one may acquire any desired habit or habits to be incorporated in the Moon of the next birth chart.

Psychologists and Psychiatrists are not fully equipped to practice their profession unless they have a good basic knowledge of astrology and have a correct birth chart of the client to study. Digging into early childhood experiences is a help in understanding "mental blocs" and "behaviorisms," but the fundamental causes are shown by a study of the Unconscious Mind (birth chart) with its favorable aspects (earned opportunities) and its unfavorable aspects (frustrations and obstacles) as tests in the progress of evolution.

So-called astrological magazines specialize in Sun-sign readings which are pap for the gullible public, but sometimes contain articles written by real astrologers for the benefit of student astrologers. A correct astrological birth chart is a mathematical science based upon the exact latitude and longitude of the birthplace and set for the exact minute of first breath in the hour, day, month and year of birth.

You inherit from your parents a physical body no better than they can give you. If they have tendencies to heart disease, tuberculosis, etc., you will probably have those tendencies. You also inherit an early environment and early education. But your mental equipment you inherit from yourself, built up in previous lives. This is your present unconscious mind.

People speak glibly about different phases of mind, often without knowing just what the terms really mean. The subconscious mind is often spoken of as the unconscious mind, but the subconscious mind is the storeroom of memory of the past events of this life. Ingalese in his *History And Power of Mind* speaks of the subjective (divine) mind and the objective (human) mind. Astrology as an exact mathematical science is never wrong; but the human

(Continued on Page 88)

ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS

published monthly at
320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.
St. Louis 2, Mo.

CHARLES E. LUNTZ, *Editor*

ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, *Publishers*

Entered as second-class matter Sept. 25, 1936, at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscriptions: 1 year \$2.00; 6 months \$1.20; Canada and abroad, 1 year \$2.50.

Single Copies, 20 cents

EVASIVENESS

"An honest tale speeds best being plainly told.
—Shakespeare.

We are all acquainted with the shuffling individual who cannot or will not answer a straight question with a straight reply—who is unable to state facts intelligibly or without repetition and irrelevancy. This may be due to bad heredity, imperfect education, poor environment or some other circumstance beyond his control, in which case he is to be pitied. However, unless he is mentally defective, there are plenty of opportunities for him by self-training, the study of books on the subject and in other ways, to correct his deficiency.

In business, the inability to get to the point and give busy people the information they want without beating about the bush, is an almost insurmountable barrier to success. In most of the professions also—as law, journalism, advertising, medicine, and many others—recognition of what is essential and what superfluous is one of the important keys to eminence. Only in religion, apparently, or at least in some religions and on some religious subjects, is evasiveness, discursiveness and irrelevancy apparently considered a virtue. Which may be, and probably is, the reason for the vast amount of increasing irreligion which the apostles of religious evasiveness are often the first to deplore.

It cannot be denied that in some of the old line communions, really thoughtful questions regarding the beliefs, especially if tinged with the slightest element of doubt, are considered akin to blasphemy. And the more thoughtful the question the greater the sacrilege. Questions that are *not* thoughtful—that carefully skirt anything deep or serious and confine themselves to easily answered inquiries which the inquirer could probably have worked out for himself had he taken the trouble—these are welcomed. The questioner is given a nice obvious explanation in response to his pious search for knowledge, together with a figurative pat on the head.

But let him dare to delve into the *real* problems of life—why "evil?" (a theological term, not ours)—why premature deaths?—why do the wicked

prosper?—why do the good so often meet with disaster?—Why? Why? Why? Fill out your own list of forbidden "whys," and be sure that if you are not given a rebuke for your impious curiosity in questioning the ways of the Lord, you will receive as answer either Formula No. 1 or Formula No. 2.

Formula No. 1 is: "These are sacred mysteries into which we may not pry."

Formula No. 2 is: "It will all be made right in the hereafter."

We have seen a third formula in the Questions and Answers column of a religious periodical which we happened to pick up while visiting a patient confined in a denominational hospital. This was a sort of combination of the rebuke method of both Formulas.

In reply to the question of an evidently troubled church member, to which any Theosophist, after a week's study of our elementary literature, could have given a completely satisfying reply, the clergyman-journalist snapped back:

"These things are God's business not yours. Attend to your own affairs. Follow the teachings of your religion strictly and leave the running of the Universe to God who made it. If you do that you may be sure that everything is being run right, in spite of outer appearances, the meaning of which you are not qualified to judge."

The poor devil who, out of the depths of a tortured heart, hopefully asked for an explanation of one he thought would surely be able to give it, must have winced at this brutal reply. Like the biblical character, he asked for bread and was given a stone. No masterpiece of evasion, this—merely an alarmed backing away from a "hot potato" inquiry, the answer to which was as recondite to the "authority" as to his interrogator.

People go to church to learn the answer to the riddle of life, only to be told that there is no answer except to live the good life, believe the "right" things and hope for the best—which may be an excellent admonition but certainly is no answer to the question. Some of them stop going to church and turn to materialistic science for the answer, which is exactly the same, minus the necessity of believing in anything particular. By this time many are pretty well conditioned into the assurance that there can't be any answer. Religion tells them so—aside from vague assurances of possible glory to come, which to many people is unrealistic and does not come to grips with the problem at all.

But this very conditioning to the idea that life either has no meaning beyond one short existence or that such meaning as is assigned has been invented by the religionists, makes it difficult for Theosophy to make an impress, even on those who reject the "pie-in-the-sky-by-and-by" thesis. If the religionist, aside from unacceptable

and vague pronouncements, does not know what life is all about and why things happen as they do, and the scientist admits that he, for all his physical knowledge, does not have the slightest idea, why should the skeptic accept the say-so of a Theosophist who claims that he *does* know, and has all the answers—in principle, if not in detail?

Why indeed? That is the demanding question, perfectly natural, reasonable and to be expected. It's no use getting angry about it and shrugging it off with highfalutin nonsense about people not being ready for Theosophy, being prejudiced against it or like easy "outs." There has been too much of that and it is just as absurd as the jabber about "mysteries into which we must not pry." It's only a different way of dodging the same issue. Evasion has no more place in Theosophy than in religion. The questioner has just as much right to ask us "*How* do you know?" as to ask his clergyman, "*Why* don't you know?"

And don't, for Heaven's sake, let us try to pass the buck with the inane "Blavatsky said so"—or Besant, or Leadbeater, or even the Masters. What proof is that for any non-Theosophist? It should not even be proof for a Theosophist unless he has thought it through for himself. It is true that actual phenomenal proofs can be shown to those with special senses evolved enough to react to them. We accept that fact because of the high character and probity of those who bear witness to having been given such proofs at first hand. But we still can't dismiss the insistent objections, "Maybe they were hallucinated. Maybe they wanted to be important. Maybe, in spite of their general integrity, this was their one weakness and in these things they misrepresented."

All this is possible but any of these "maybe's" would be greatly out of character for the persons concerned. Also it would immediately raise another question, for the skeptic himself to answer. Why do the accounts of the unseen worlds, of the invisible bodes of man, of the fact of reincarnation as viewed with higher vision and of the many other esotericisms Theosophy declares are true, invariably correspond on all major points, no matter where, when or by what responsible clairvoyant they are investigated?

For proof of this we refer the doubter to *The Secret Doctrine*—six volumes full of highly documented evidence. Whether in ancient or modern times—in the Eastern or Western Hemispheres—regardless of the race or faith of the occult observer, the main facts, except in details, do not vary, do not contradict one another. Whether the country be India or Mexico, Egypt or Peru, Babylonia or Greece—whether the period be 5000 B. C. or 1000 A. D., the esoteric tradition is amazingly consistent throughout. Of course some of

those with superphysical sight knew of the findings of their predecessors and may have been influenced by them, but what of countries having no contact with each other, the very existence of some being unknown to others, yet still the same general consistency, the same pronouncements, the same observations? Are hallucinations as alike as that? Can peoples unknown to one another construct fictional systems of cosmogony and universal order and purpose so similar in all respects, merely by coincidence?

To the Theosophist such coincidences, so many and so prolonged, seem to require a much greater faith—credulity rather—than acceptance of the fact that the similarity is not due to coincidence but to the veracity of the observations reported.

But there is a higher and better proof. The occult system *makes sense*. It fits the facts. It gives a purpose and a significance to the evolutionary scheme, to the reason for the life of man and of animal, that no religious system (exoterically) affords and which no material scientist can begin to duplicate. It bestows an unspeakable peace of mind on those who can accept it—not credulously, not on authority, but after brooding deeply on all its implications. It is no system for the shallow thinker or for the tiresome gent who demands that it be explained to him in five minutes, the while he thinks of other things and interrupts every few seconds to get in his own vacuous remarks which have nothing to do with the subject.

For the acute reasoner with the necessary background of education and reading, and the capacity to recognize what is logic and what is not, the occult scheme cannot fail to hold powerful appeal if he will consider it in all its bearings and with all its implications. This does not mean that Theosophy is for the intelligentsia alone—a proposition advanced by A. P. Sinnett, one of the early T. S. leaders, but negated by the Masters. Theosophy is for all who care to accept it, and sometimes the intuition may supply what the educational background can not.

For, to use the great words of H. P. Blavatsky (*Sec. Dect. IV:85, Adyar Edition*): "The whole essence of truth cannot be transmitted from mouth to ear. Nor can any pen describe it, not even that of the Recording Angel, unless man finds an answer in the sanctuary of his own heart, in the innermost depths of his divine intuition."

There is no evasion here for, as H. P. B. also says—and we quote her, not as an authority, but because her words are so obviously the soundest of common sense and so transparently true:

(Paraphrase) "That which is accepted by the intuition must always be justifiable at the bar of reason."

Both reason and intuition have caused some of the greatest minds ever to function on earth to proclaim their con-

viction of the truth of the teachings we now call Theosophy. Many more great minds have not accepted it because they have never thought about it—others because they have misunderstood it because it was poorly explained to them—still others because, great as they were, a wall of religious or materialistic prejudice barred the way. The loss is theirs—and it is a loss so huge that it dwarfs every gain of mental or material possession they could acquire in a lifetime.

PERHAPS THIS IS THE ANSWER

"Men are most apt to believe what they least understand."

—De Montaigne

It is a continuing source of wonder to Theosophists that their own clear, logical and probable elucidations of life and its so-called mysteries are usually rejected in favor of wild, irrational, unlikely and unproved "explanations." The latter not only explain nothing, but being presented as dogmas they may not be questioned, thus insuring their acceptance by minds which prefer to lean on authority in matters of belief. Such dogmas seldom contribute anything of goodness or helpfulness to life, though the moral teachings of all religions, aside from the dogmas, most certainly do so and justify religion's existence. But why should millions, hundreds of millions, profess belief in theological declarations they seldom or never understand, while Theosophy, with its clean-cut, lucid and satisfying truths, cannot muster a hundred thousand adherents throughout the world?

There must be something in the words of De Montaigne quoted at the head of this article. Perhaps intelligibility in matters of spiritual belief is not desired by most at our present stage of development. Maybe there is some sort of fascination to believing in the impossible. Can it be that the glamour, if that is the word, is taken away from belief when logic enters in? Must man have his religion obscure, shrouded, equivocal? Can it be that the Bible writers, inspired by God, purposely embodied contradictions, conflicts of historical fact and other perplexities, because, as the pious insist, such bafflements are good for us?

It is not only the old-line faiths that must have their beliefs mysterious. The Christian Scientists, enlightened in many respects as their religion is, are almost equally nebulous when asked to explain some of the more enigmatic phases of their teaching. They do not take refuge in the last line of defense employed by the orthodox, "Mysteries of God into which we must not pry." Instead they attribute our inability to comprehend the incomprehensible to our "mortal mind" getting in the way—an equally effective method of putting a stop to embarrassing questions.

But why should any question relat-

ing to a belief one is called upon to make a part of his life be embarrassing? Why should it be necessary to devise some unanswerable formula for arresting the natural desire of the human mind to know? Theosophy has no such formula. It welcomes questions—the more searching the better. It offers straight, non-evasive answers that deal with every point raised, ignoring none. And these answers will stand analysis. Always they are buttressed by collateral evidence taken from analogies offered by nature herself. Never does Theosophy deal in obscurantism, never resort to double talk in the frantic effort to cover up ignorance or justify the unjustifiable.

And that, if Montaigne is right, is the reason most people prefer to believe something else—something they can understand only partially or not at all.

Where then, does that leave the Theosophist, who must have his beliefs intelligible or he will have none of them? Is he unusually endowed by nature with a mental grasp or understanding or with some spiritual sense denied at present to the world at large?

Certainly not. Nature endows no one with anything that he has not earned. As the gifted artist, musician, architect, engineer, has built into his Ego the outstanding faculty he employs to such good effect today, by many lives of effort, so the Theosophist has acquired his clarity of spiritual vision by the hard endeavor of past incarnations in search of basic spiritual truth. That happened to be his line—or one of the foremost. Nature has given him that for which he sought and paid the price in attempt and exertion oft-repeated. Others preferred a different line of activity, of research, of quest and they too "have their reward." For the few who willed it that way, there is real understanding of Divine Purpose and Plan, as far as so transcendent a scheme can be apprehended by finite minds. For the many, whose long range interests lie elsewhere, there remain at present either no beliefs in matters spiritual other than the professions of all good men, or else the elusive bewilderments which, as the race progresses, must necessarily give way to that which is meaningful.

That this will be Theosophy, under whatever name it may then be called, we do not doubt. It will not come soon, not in this lifetime nor in many lifetimes, but it will come. And we shall be around to see it. Meantime it is our earned privilege to do our mite to bring it about.

From Moscow comes the news that it was not Columbus but a Russian who discovered America. Any day now we expect an announcement from the same source that it was not God who created heaven and earth, but a Russian named Alexander Popovitch.

OCCULTISM IN THE BIBLE

Ol' Meaniel

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

The Joseph story now moves rapidly to its climax. He had gained his point. The trembling brethren stood before him—eleven of them now, for Simeon the hostage was permitted to rejoin them, and Benjamin, around whom all the dispute had raged, was in their midst. As for Joseph, he had not yet exhausted his fund of practical jokes nor was he satisfied that his brethren, for all their abjectness, had been punished enough. His plans had long been laid. He intended to teach his former tormentors a lesson that would last through life, and with flint-like hardness he played the game through to its bitter end—and, to the brethren, bitter indeed it was.

His first move in the new act was to invite them to dinner—nothing to worry about, it would seem; but in the ancient Orient an invitation to dine could be, and often was, an invitation to die. The brethren were not intrigued by this novel hospitality. They were customers merely, come to do a bit of purchasing. Why should the top brass of Egypt show such favor to a group of cattle farmers from another country, who could not possibly do him any good? They had brought double payment with them to make up for that strange money-back episode narrated earlier and which they still did not understand. Perhaps that was what ranked in the mind of the Egyptian prince. Hear the Bible tell it:

"And the men were afraid, because they were brought into Joseph's house; and they said, Because of the money that was returned in our sacks at the first time are we brought in; that he may seek occasion against us, and fall upon us, and take us for bondmen, and our asses."

A marginal note explains that the real translation of the Hebrew rendered "seek occasion against us" is "that he may roll himself upon us." Rather an undignified proceeding for the second high man of Egypt, but the brethren had been so thoroughly mowed down by previous events that the prospect of this foreign Nemesis spreading them out and rolling over them must have seemed quite in character.

There was no rolling, however. Upon their tremulously explaining to Joseph's head steward that somehow their money had found its way back into their sacks and they had therefore brought double money this time, that functionary dumbfounded them by declaring, "Peace be to you, fear not: your God, and the God of your father, hath given you treasure in your sacks: I had your money." A white lie, but a pleasant one!

Came noon and came Joseph and down went the brethren on all fours, after which they presented the gifts

thoughtfully provided by their parent. Courteously Joseph inquired after the health of their father—his father—to which they replied, "Thy servant our father is in good health, he is yet alive." The former fact would seem of necessity to imply the latter, but in such matters the Bible writers invariably choose to be explicit, otherwise the less intelligent reader might suppose that Jacob, being in good health, was also quite possibly dead. Once again the brothers prostrated themselves, in deep gratitude for Joseph's amazing condescension in inquiring after their father. Ancient Oriental courtesy must have been somewhat trying to both sides, but apparently they loved it.

At this juncture Joseph "lifted up his eyes" and observed Benjamin. Keeping up the farce he inquired, "Is this your younger brother of whom ye spake unto me?" Then with deep affection said to Benjamin, "God be gracious unto thee, my son." Overcome by emotion Joseph retired for awhile to his own room, and returning ordered "Set on bread." The dinner then resolved itself into a first-second-third class affair, Joseph eating by himself, the Egyptian officials by themselves and the visitors at still another table, "because," explains the narrator, "the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians." Segregation, even in 1700 B. C.!

Joseph then obtained a cheap reputation as a clairvoyant by seating his brothers in order, according to their ages. "And the men marvelled one to another."

Everyone had plenty to eat, but Benjamin, favored full brother, received five times as much as anyone else. No wonder his father, in the well-known "blessings," declared, "Benjamin shall raven (devour) as a wolf." After dinner "they drank and were merry," but their merriment was short lived. Once again the heat was on. Out of their hearing Joseph said to his steward "Fill the men's sacks with food, as much as they can carry, and put every man's money in his sack's mouth. And put my cup, the silver cup, in the sack's mouth of the youngest, and his corn money."

What new devilment was this? Hadn't the unhappy brethren been tortured enough? Not for Brother Joseph. He was out for his pound of flesh and the last drop of blood. We never did like him much—at least not in his exoteric dress—and he seems to be getting meaner by the minute. But we haven't seen anything yet—and neither have the brothers!

(To Be Continued)

THE ZODIAC IN "QUOTES"

Capricorn

Have time to worry over little trivial things.

—William McFee

"ONLY THE CREDULOUS . . ."

See May ANCIENT WISDOM for explanation of the above caption.

ROBERT BROWNING

Is it too late then, Evelyn Hope?
What, your soul was pure and true,
The good stars met in your horoscope,
Made you of spirit, fire and dew—
And just because I was thrice as old,
And our paths in the world diverged
so wide,
Each was naught to each, must I be
told?
We were fellow-mortals—nought
beside?

No indeed! for God above
Is great to grant, as mighty to make,
And creates the love to reward the
love:

I claim you still, for my own love's
sake!

Delayed it may be for more lives yet,
Through worlds I shall traverse not a
few:

Much is to learn and much forget
Ere the time be come for taking you.

But the time will come—at last it will,
When, Evelyn Hope, what meant (I
shall say)

In the lower earth, in the years long
still,

That body and soul so pure and gay?
Why your hair was amber, I shall
divine,

And your mouth of your own gerani-
um's red—

And what you would do with me, in
fine,

In the new life come in the old one's
stead.

—Evelyn Hope

FROM A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MEMBER

Mrs. Arundale's visit to the Southern California area seemed but a continuation of the triumphant success reported of her cross-country tour. Her Lodge and public lectures brought out large and enthusiastic audiences—quite the largest since she and Dr. Arundale were last here together.

No other T.S. speaker of these days is comparable to her in combining eloquence, magnetic platform presence, depth of wisdom, ability to inspire others, power to make friends through innate human affection.

Her old T.S. friends remarked how greatly she had "matured," even since her visit to America only four years ago. There is discerning appreciation, too, of her unique capacity, intellect, spiritual fitness for the Presidency.

Consequences will not follow without causes being set up to provide for them. That simple truth governs spiritual progress as well as the processes of manufacture.

—A. P. Sinnett

DO YOU KNOW?—

That because one becomes a member of The Theosophical Society, he does not necessarily divest himself of all the weaknesses and foibles of the non-Theosophist?

* * * *

That the naive belief that somehow membership in the Society insures a sort of perfection not possessed by those outside of it is akin to the equally naive belief that the "righteous" communicant of the "right" church goes to heaven forever when he dies?

* * * *

That, of course, comparatively few T.S. members adopt the sacrosanct attitude referred to, most members possessing a full share of commonsense, but there are enough of the former, especially when placed in positions of leadership at any level, to arouse the resentment of the latter and to damage Theosophy in the eyes of the world?

* * * *

That the brand of self-deception in question ranges from delusions of special inspiration from high spiritual entities to an absurd belief in personal infallibility?

* * * *

That it may also include the assurance that some teacher or leader is or was infallible and the authorized spokesman for Adept wisdom on any and all matters?

* * * *

That if belief in one's own inspiration is held silently and acts as a spur to good work, no fault can be found with it and it may indeed be true, but if it is advertised and trumpeted, it may safely be dismissed as an illusion, as the "still, small voice" does not broadcast?

* * * *

That this view of the impertinence of anyone who dares in the T.S. to set himself up as an authority, spokesman, or intercessor with the Masters or with God has been severely condemned by a Master himself?

* * * *

That in a famous letter of more than fifty years ago to Annie Besant, published in 1937 in facsimile in the *Adyar Theosophist*, the Master K. H. expressed himself most forcefully on what he termed "the cant about Masters."

* * * *

That in it he declared that The Theosophical Society was "slowly manufacturing a creed"?

* * * *

That he also declared that the Adepts never subjected to themselves the will of another?

* * * *

That he further stated that the only spiritual allegiance owed by a T.S. member was to his own highest self?

* * * *

That ANCIENT WISDOM has striven constantly to uphold this essential

A MASTER ON ORTHODOXY
IN THE T.S.

★ ★ ★

From LETTERS FROM THE MASTERS OF THE WISDOM, 1870-1900, First Series, transcribed and Compiled by C. Jinarajadasa, Third Edition, 1945. Published by Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras, India. Sold by the Theosophical Press, Wheaton, Illinois, U. S. A.

★ ★ ★

Page 111—LETTER 46. (The last Letter, written in 1900, received nine years after the death of H. P. Blavatsky.)

★ ★ ★

"TO ANNIE BESANT:

The T. S. and its members are slowly manufacturing a creed. Says a Thibetan proverb 'credulity breed credulity and ends in hypocrisy.' How few are they who can know anything about us. Are we to be propitiated and made idols of . . .

No one has a right to claim authority over a pupil or his conscience. Ask him not what he believes . . . The crest wave of intellectual advancement must be taken hold of and guided into Spirituality. It cannot be forced into beliefs and emotional worship. The essence of the higher thoughts of the members in this collectivity must guide all action in the T. S. . . .

We never try to subject to ourselves the will of another. At favorable times we let loose elevating influences which strike various persons in various ways. It is the collective aspect of many such thoughts that can give the correct note of action. We show no favours. The best corrective of error is an honest and open-minded examination of all facts subjective and objective . . .

The cant about 'Masters' must be silently but firmly put down. Let the devotion and service be to that Supreme Spirit alone of which each one is a part. Namelessly and silently we work and the continual references to ourselves and the repetition of our names raises up a confused aura that hinders our work . . .

The T. S. was meant to be the corner stone of the future religions of humanity. To accomplish this object those who lead must leave aside their weak predilections for the forms and ceremonies of any particular creed and show themselves to be true Theosophists both in inner thought and outward observance.

K. H."

★ ★ ★

Mr. Jinarajadasa commenting on this Letter says (pp. 154, 155):

"This letter is perhaps the most remarkable of all the Letters received bearing the signature 'K. H.', as it was received nine years after the death of Madame Blavatsky in 1891."

Photographic reproduction of this letter and description of the circumstances in which it was received will be found in THE THEOSOPHIST of May, 1937.

Truth which is Theosophy itself, and that any act by any Theosophist in either high or low station which would tend to deny it cannot be Theosophy and should be resisted vigorously?

OLD BUT STILL TRUE

We came across a clipping recently from *The Christian Century* of several years ago. It is so much in line with views often expressed on the same subjects in ANCIENT WISDOM that we cannot refrain from reprinting it, with a bow to Canon Weisbauer for his enlightened (and unconsciously theosophical) viewpoint:

"Canon Henry Weisbauer of Denver condemned the Protestant clergy for having confused respectability and redemption.

'Sin within Protestantism has come

to mean alcoholism, anything sexual, wife beating and bank robbery—period,' he said. 'But we blink at race prejudice, anti-Semitism, anti-labor attitudes and practices and pitifully inadequate public assistance grants. We are great believers in separation of church and state, but we have carried this to mean that our variety of religion is so "spiritual" that it seldom touches the temporal at the local community level.'

He reported that questioning of 62 families in a New York city block revealed that in 57 specific emergencies they had sought advice from relatives 36 times, from the corner drugstore 31 times, from a bartender 29 times, a Catholic priest 12 times, the local labor leader six times, the political leader four times, a Protestant minister four times, and a policeman two times."

WHAT MAKES SENSE?

It Makes No Sense That

Because The Theosophical Society is primarily a spiritual organization, its material affairs at all levels should not be managed with businesslike efficiency by businesslike people.

It Makes Sense That

The absurd notion which has been the ruin of some Lodges that inefficiency in such matters will be somehow counteracted by "higher powers" should be sternly checked whenever it rears its foolish head.

* * *

It Makes No Sense That

While everyone concerned with the management of a Lodge should by all means maintain a thought attitude of highest faith in the outcome of all affairs of the Lodge, this by itself should be considered as full insurance of success regardless of proficiency.

It Makes Sense That

Although faith is of the utmost importance, for groups as for individuals, in the desired outcome of every undertaking, it is equally important that it be implemented by skill in action.

* * *

It Makes No Sense That

Some badly planned or executed project should produce brilliant results because engaged in with faith or started under the finest astrological aspects, if the venture itself was unsound or poorly carried out.

It Makes Sense That

As we are in physical incarnation to learn how to handle physical circumstances and material, if thought power alone were sufficient to guarantee the success of any half-baked enterprise, the entire purpose of physical life would be defeated.

* * *

It Makes No Sense That

Either skill without faith or faith without skill should be relied upon, as both are equally necessary for substantial accomplishment.

It Makes Sense That

Faith—meaning confident assured thought—should be given its rightful place in all life's concerns for though physical preparation and thoroughness is needed in everything one does, the ingredient of faith supplies an essential component which may be omitted only at the grave risk of failure.

* * *

It Makes No Sense That

Because a worthwhile project appears difficult or almost impossible it should not be undertaken, in view of the fact that virtually every successful enterprise appeared difficult or almost impossible at the outset.

It Makes Sense That

In such cases faith is the imperative prerequisite and has always been present in full measure where worldly prudence counselled relinquishment of an

ambitious but uncertain undertaking.

* * *

It Makes No Sense That

That the element of faith should be invoked to bolster crackbrained schemes or by itself attempt cures for bodily conditions which obviously call for skilled medical or surgical treatment.

It Makes Sense That

This element should be employed only in connection with matters worthy of it and (in sickness) to aid and reinforce the services of the physician.

THEOSOPHY AS RUKMINI SEES IT

Would you like to know what the Devas are like? Look at a beautiful dance; it comes from the Devas. Do you want to see something that comes from the Highest and yet belongs to the ordinary world, something marvelous that God has created? There is a flower right before your eyes.

* * *

Art is something that, so to speak, is placed right at your feet. Here before your eyes is your divine self. You think the artist is someone outside yourself. You yourself are the artist, and a creation of Art is your own creation. You have it in you to create.

* * *

You can make beautiful poetry, you can write a wonderful book, you can sing this song. You will say, "I cannot do any of these things. I am afraid even to attempt them." How is it then that another human being like you can do them? This means you can do it also.

* * *

Art is a direct message from the Higher to the lower. Beauty is the most perfect language there is. You want the divine to speak. But we are hearing the divine speaking always. If we know how to hear music, we are hearing the divine speak. All of us have heard, only we do not know.

* * *

We have seen the Art of the divine—though we do not realize it—when we have seen a great dancer. But then we may say, "she is, after all, but a human being." However, when she dances, it is the divine spirit in her that dances, and not the mere human body.

If we learn to think this way, we will understand Art and its marvelous message.

—The True Spirit of Art.

Thrice have I taken birth in the Land of Purity,

And of these three times the last hath given unto me the fullness of peace.

—Japanese Buddhist Psalm

I see but one rule: to be clear. If I am not clear all my world crumbles to nothing.

—De Stendhal

"NO INTELLIGENCE IN NATURE!"

We suggest to the "No Intelligence Direction" brethren who are quite sure that nature is a congeries of automatisms, mindless and senseless, that they read "The Mysterious Power of Human Sight" in the September *Reader's Digest*. Condensed from a book, "Man On His Own Nature" by Sir Charles Scott Sherrington, it is awesome in its indirect but stunning evidence of Infinite Intelligence at work. Sir Charles is described by the Digest as "one of the great creative intellects of the era." A Nobel Prizewinner, President of the Royal Society and of The British Association for the Advancement of Science, he describes the formation of the eye, a miracle of miracles, and declares, "It suggests purposive behavior . . . the impression of concerted endeavor comes, it is no exaggeration to say, with the force of self-evident truth."

This from a "great creative intellect." But the little intellects, if they can be dignified by a term connecting them up with an intelligence they deny to nature, will continue their yak-yak about eternal law that knows not what it is doing.

No intelligence in nature or in nature's works! Well, perhaps not too much in the "works" that assert automatism to be capable of creating and directing itself.

TEMPERAMENTAL LEGHORNS

Observations of a Theosophical Farmer

BY ALFERD ANDERSON

I have to do considerably with white leghorn hens, as I market eggs. They are a flighty breed of chickens and are at once on the alert and ready to stampede when a stranger comes around. If I radically change my clothing, such as going to the hen house dressed in a suit, they fly at once in all directions and raise a great commotion.

Whether or not that is a group soul memory brought over from the time that the preacher, who was generally dressed in Sunday clothes, came round and one or more of the flock served as the meat course, I am not prepared to say. However, I have noticed that while the flock is laying well and there is nothing out of the ordinary to disturb them, they are quite tame, and appear to be happy in their characteristic way. But come moulting time, or let something happen so that they no longer shell out the eggs, and they look upon my approach with a baleful and suspicious eye and are at all times ready to take off at the fall of a feather.

Reason: When laying stops, a hen quickly ceases to be an asset and is a liability, so whole generations of them have found their way to the butcher as soon as they quit laying. I believe that the group soul takes cognizance of the fact, which it passes on to its units as they incarnate.

(The End)

WHY THE VICARIOUS ATONEMENT?

(Continued from Page 81)

The earliest theory is thus set forth in an article on Christianity in the *Briannica*:

"Man is reconciled to God by the Atonement and not God to man; the change which it effects is a change in man rather than a change in God."

This may make sense to a theologian but to a layman it suggests a mere semantic quibble. The dictionary definition of "reconcile" is to bring into agreement or harmony. If A's view is in opposition to B's, then B's view must necessarily be in opposition to A's. Man does the sinning—God hates the sin, and (in the more hidebound theologies) the sinner also. How can A be reconciled to B unless B is reconciled to A? And how can the ignominious death of God's only-begotten Son "reconcile" a sinner to God when the sinner has done nothing but accept the sacrifice made for him (and billions of others) and has not suffered in any way himself nor learned the lesson such suffering may have taught him?

The new school of theology which came into being at the Reformation went even further. Again we are indebted to the *Encyclopedia*: "They" (the Reformers) "were deeply convinced that human sin is the violation of an eternal law which has its basis in the very being of God and is the expression of God's justice, which must be satisfied."

But the article, surprisingly enough, as it is written by a theologian, continues, in happier vein:

"This is the conviction embodied in the Protestant creeds, and worked out by means of metaphors so legal and even mechanical in character that modern theology has been marked by a widespread revolt against every form of it."

The new theories produced by this revolt do not seem greatly superior to those that preceded it, some of which were horrific. Thus from the 3rd to 11th Century the accepted notion was that "Christ paid a ransom to Satan to induce him to release men from his power." A later modification was that the Atonement was a satisfaction to God's honor, not a ransom or penalty." The name for this is the "Satisfaction Theory." The Calvinists evolved the "Penal Theory"—that the punishment deserved by men was borne by Jesus instead. There are many other theories, none of which seem to come to grips with the real problem, if one exists.

Of the new and more humane ideas, one is that "Christ endured no penalty but identified himself in perfect sympathy with the sinner in equivalent repentance." We don't know what this means; we merely quote it. Another is that divine justice was satisfied by Jesus offering up to God a perfect confession for the sins of mankind and an adequate repentance for them. How one

can repent for the sins of another and thus relieve the other of the consequences remains the theological question. Still another is that Christ's death is not required by the personal demand of God for propitiation but that honor may be paid to an ideal law of righteousness.

It is very obvious that this doctrine, regarded with highest reverence by most of the Christian world, has been confusing even to the erudite theologians who have attempted to interpret it. Most of the interpretations are mutually exclusive of one another. The average churchgoer, and perhaps the average minister, is satisfied with the declaration that "Christ died to save sinners," and goes no further into reasons or even into the justice of the procedure.

And so, as we don't seem to have gotten very far in our examination of Theology's views on the Vicarious Atonement, we will try to do better in the next installment by advancing the views of Theosophy on this controversial question.

Like all theosophical explanations of "mystical" dogmas, doctrines, allegories and rituals, they don't evade, they do explain and they not only make sense but furnish food for the highest spiritual thought.

(To Be Continued)

THE END OF PAIN

(Continued from Page 81)

new one, a whole one, lacking no members or functions nor racked by pain or spasm. If nature is harsh, that is because unevolved humanity is sluggish and requires harsh stimulus. In the mineral kingdom nothing less than the fiery blast of a Bessemer furnace converts raw iron into useful steel. In vegetable life, warm sunshine suffices to sprout planted seed and produce good grain, while in human affairs the tender love of a mother brings an infant to maturity. Appropriate force is applied as required, and intense suffering long endured is such a force for certain ultimate purpose.

But nothing that is thus said is to be taken as reason to accept karma without attempt to overcome it, to nullify it or to amend the suffering or disease by any means on any plane within grasp of the consciousness so troubled. Indeed this effort is proper and is part of nature's process of finishing the job, and no sufferer can possibly thwart karma by the weight of a hair. Success in betterment of the condition, if attained, is a happy indication that the weight of such karma has abated; it may be nearly ended. Another unfortunate idea is that no method other than physical treatment is useful, possible or even permissible. This is altogether foreign to fact. If karma admits of a cure—as it must, the moment the force causing disease is expended or balanced out—it can and should be accorded upon the plane or planes on which it can be accomplished

with least expenditure of force. A new surgical process or new medication may solve the problem or change of viewpoint. Reading a new book or recourse to prayer or laying-on-of-hands in a healing circle may just as properly alter life's course. All these methods are correct; those best adapted to emotional acceptance by the patient are most efficient.

But after all, why does imperfection exist in a world presumed to be created by Divinity and which should therefore reflect perfection? The error in that question lies in its grammatical form which is constantly set forth thus but never with accuracy. God should not be said to have created the world. He is **CREATING** it and the process with respect to human evolution is hardly more than "Half Way Through," as has been explained under that caption in these pages. "A thousand years are but as yesterday" in the creative field, and the haste displayed by Occidental temperament has no part in it. We must learn not to drive the car at 80 miles an hour in order to arrive somewhere in time to smoke a cigarette. Creation is not begun or ended in one lifetime or one manvantara.

How, then, can we get a better mental concept of these processes and so direct them intelligently? That too is a matter of evolution, and the suffering we sustain is wholly educative in bringing our attention back again and again to that very question, as it strays down many a glamorous by-path. But in the end we absorb a basic lesson which sets our feet upon a path towards rapid ending of this entire earthly course. That is the concept of the truth that the man is not a body; he has and uses or misuses a body but it is not he. Neither is he the producer of emotion; he "emotes" with his astral apparatus but that is not he. Nor is he the machine which thinks. He has and uses mental machinery, or permits it to use him more usually at its own pleasure. Nor is the man a combination of these things and provided with an appendage called a "soul" insecurely attached to him as by a fragile string, which he is liable to lose or be cheated out of in barter and trade with the devil: all these concepts are wrong. The evolving man in his own being is a living light, a spark or fragment of the Logos, immersed in matter and using the mental, emotional and physical bodies in which he is hidden for the time from his own recognition while learning many lessons which he could not otherwise learn and which in the end will make him a greater being than the angels. The immediate need is to recognize this relationship, to seek this inner light dilligently in its hiding place within his consciousness, to accept it joyfully as the center of his being and his unity with God; in the end his consciousness becoming identified with and co-extensive with that of the Logos.

This is no pleasant hyperbole of

THIS IS OUR RELIABLE AUTHORITY

★ ★ ★ ★

We are asked who is the "Reliable authority" referred to in our item at the top of page 72 November issue. In answer we publish the following communication from MR. HENRY HOTCHENER by express written permission of Mr. Hotchener:

"Hollywood, Dec. 6, 1952

Re your 'box' on last page of A.W. for Nov., titled 'Readers May Judge.'

'Three named Rukmini, two named Sri Ram, one named Sidney Cook, one named all three.'

This is the EXACT text of a telegram, dated Wheaton, Aug. 29, 1952, sent to Henry Hotchner, and signed by James S. Perkins. It was sent in response to a telegram sent by me earlier the same day, reading as follows: Please telegraph collect number of votes received by each Presidential Nominee. Greetings.

You are at liberty to use this as you like.

(SIGNED) H. Hotchener."

pretty exaggeration and fancy terms; it is a fact, a deep human experience, assured in the initiation which is due some day to every human soul, waiting only the readiness of each of us in maturing evolution, and no less a landmark in progress than that ancient time, probably on a previous planet, when we emerged from the animal kingdom and became human. It is no new or extraordinary doctrine. It was taught in the Pythagorean schools; it was known in Egypt before that and was basic esoteric doctrine when Atlantis was in its prime. Christ said it very plainly many times to many people: "I and My Father are One." "I am in Him and He in Me, and I in ye." Each day thousands of pious Asiatics in Tibet and elsewhere repeat, "Om Mani Padme Hum"—"The Jewel in the Lotus": a symbolic expression adapted to focus attention on this aspect of nature which is too high for human words to encompass it at all.

The Lord Buddha, when asked how to bring such perfection into being, wrapped it all up into one 4-line verse:

"Cease to do evil;
Learn to do well;
Cleanse your own heart;
This is the religion of the Buddhas."

These radical changes must not only apply to what the body is permitted to do in the physical world; they include what we permit our emotions and thoughts to do even more importantly, since all action has origin in thought and feeling. All the vehicles then fall into their relative places and functions and their owner can rapidly subdue their clamor, purify their vibrations and render them his obedient servants.

Disease vanishes, for on every plane Divine Harmony is restored, God is present in His temple and, with full attainment of these perfections, further incarnation is no longer compulsive but can be taken, in Divine compassion, to help the less evolved brothers through their troubled earth-life more rapidly.
(The End)

THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND

(Continued from Page 81)

element may err in interpretation and judgment.

This planet, earth, has a north magnetic pole and a south magnetic pole, with magnetic currents flowing from north to south. As the earth spins on its axis it is a gigantic armature turning in the electro-magnetic field from our entire solar system. Man thinks he invented the radio, but the sun, moon and planets have been broadcasting their influences for ages. Each human being carries with him his birth chart in his aura and it can be clairvoyantly seen and each point identified by color. These planetary-force-centers are receiving points and what they receive influences the thinking. "As a man thinketh, so is he" is an old and true saying.

Your progress in evolution and self-control will determine your reactions to these influences. There are no evil planetary influences but your reactions may be evil. A system known as Planetary Progression will determine when you will receive these planetary influences, and a study of your unconscious mind (birth chart) will determine the nature of such influence.

(The End)

"VERY BUSY WITH THE UNIMPORTANT"

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

Theosophists, Theosophists, why do you quarrel so

About obscurities that only Adepts really know?

What if some words Blavatsky wrote seem disaffirmed by Besant!

These "Great Ones" have been dead for years—we're living in the present.

And is it kind or brotherly a lot of junk to fish up

Decrying Bishop Leadbeater because he was a Bishop?

If he thought ceremonial would help one on his way,

Are we quite sure we're well informed enough to say him nay?

The early Christians fought about the nature of the Trinity.

They argued pro and con as though they hobnobbed with Divinity.

Futilities like this to us T.S.'ers seem inane.

But how we fuss about what worlds belong in our Earth Chain!

The sects are quite divided over faith opposed to works

Each feels, in wrong belief, a hazard to salvation lurks.

But harsh is our own struggle as to whether lifeless man

In astral regions lingers or goes straight to Devachan.

So if our past in these respects shows room for some improvements,

We've little call to criticize the strife in other movements.

For, as was said in Bible times, we all are very prone

To see the mote in other's eye, the beam not in our own.

A reader sends us a booklet bearing the title, "It's Great To Be A Catholic." We wouldn't know about that, never having (in this incarnation) been one. We do know that "It's Great To Be A Theosophist," and no Catholic can be more thankful for his faith than we are that through some amazing good karma we were led to discover, or re-discover, the only Truth that for us can ever be worth while—Theosophy.

Those who bring sunshine to the lives of others cannot keep it from themselves.
—J. M. Barrie.

MINSTRELSY

A Selection From The Poems of Patience Worth

Tedious Work

If my task be dull
The day is a golden thing.
There are the starry paths
And the moon,
And the sun is the scepter of God.
So . . . I am a worshipper
At the shrine of day.