

ANCIENT WISDOM

A monthly journal devoted to teaching theosophical and occult truths

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

VOLUME IX

SEPTEMBER, 1943—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 7

RUSSIA: A MODERN MIRACLE

By L. W. ROGERS

[Continued from Last Month]

It was in the science and art of war that Russia was destined to give the world the most breath taking surprise. The German armies had won the reputation of being invincible. They had swiftly crushed Poland, they had laughed at the great Maginot Line, swept past and behind it, pushed the French and British armies into the sea and occupied France with a speed that left the world dazed and terrified. The German generals regarded the Red Army with the disinterested contempt with which a lion might look at a sheep it intended to devour. Neutral military analysts looked over the situation as the German armies advanced and predicted that the Red army might last eight weeks. It was said that its leaders were no match for the experienced German generals, that Russian railways would not stand the strain of mobilization and that, aside from other disadvantages, the comparative strength of the two armies was about 3 to 2 in men and 2 to 1 in armament in favor of Germany. The eight weeks dragged out into many months. The Red army did not collapse and the German army did not take the capital city. At the date of this writing two years have gone by and the German hope of victory has changed to the well grounded fear of the complete destruction of the Nazi armies.

To the Red army goes the honor of the first defeat of the German war machine. It exploded the myth of German invincibility. At the cost of millions of dead and maimed it stopped the onrush of the German Moloch. Had there been no efficient Red army Germany would now hold Asia, Africa and nearly all Europe, with consequences to humanity too frightful to contemplate. Russian heroism deserves the undying gratitude of the world. It saved both Russia and civilization.

What is the explanation of this astounding transformation from mediaval life and national inertia to leadership in modern civilization? How does it happen that one of the most backward nations in Europe, accustomed for generations to docile submission to absolute monarchs, to being shot down by the hundreds for presuming to present petitions, suddenly rises from its knees, takes charge of its own affairs and in twenty years makes a record of success in peace and war that amazes mankind? Twenty years in the life of a nation is almost too brief for measurement. It is no more than a nation commonly takes for a single great enterprise. It is almost exactly the time re-

[Continued on Page 56]

GREMLINS: SATURN'S CHILDREN

By IDELLE G. LUNTZ

Saturn in MidHeaven opposition Moon and Planetary Ruler and square Sun.

Yes, I say Saturn's children because they are the little imps responsible for banging me about. Did you ever say to yourself, "Why should these things always happen to me?" I did, until I learned that Saturn (representing my past karma, of course) was responsible for all my bumps and bruises. If I were to list the bumps and bruises I have received, through no fault or carelessness of my own, you would hardly believe such a thing possible.

A trivial incident which occurred today is a case in point. I was walking along the street, minding my own business, having just purchased a bottle of ink. The ink was wrapped in the package, which I was carrying under my arm. For no reason at all the bottle of ink broke through the package, bounced on the cement sidewalk, didn't break but rebounded with an awful smack and hit me on the ankle bone. It left a nice big welt.

Another instance: Some years ago the children upstairs were skating in the room above me. My chandelier fell down and landed on my head. It didn't break—the chandelier, I mean—but raised an awful bump on my head.

I couldn't count all the times I have fallen down the steps. I am so careful, I watch every step, yet time and again something seems to toss me down.

When it comes to service cars all I have to do is to ride in one. The driver may never before have had an accident, but this time he has me with him—and my accompanying gremlins. In one instance the car in which I was riding slowed down and pulled to the curb to pick up a waiting passenger. A service car driver behind us decided to pick up the same passenger. He piled into our car, hitting it, of course, exactly at the spot where I was sitting, knocking me to the floor doubled up over two small suitcases which I had on my lap.

Another time, as I left a service car, the metal binding around the running board which had stripped loose, wrapped itself around my feet and pitched me headlong into the gutter on my hands and knees. Just recently, after I had rung the bell to get off the bus, the driver applied the brakes so violently that the abrupt stopping of the bus pitched me against one of the metal

[Continued on Page 56]

NEW LIGHT ON THE PROBLEM OF DISEASE

PART II THE ROOT CAUSE OF DISEASE

By GEOFFREY HODSON

The root cause of every individual case of disease lies in a resistance to the right of the ego to rule his personality and a refusal to listen to the voice of conscience. This root cause is divisible into two subsidiary classifications. The first is karma, which is the effect of the waywardness of the personality and the deliberate closing of the ears to the voice of the higher self. This results in what are known as the sins of commission, those positive acts which are contrary to the law of unity. The second cause is the weakness of the ego and his failure to provide the necessary guidance to the personality, resulting in the sins of omission, self-indulgences and failures in self-discipline. Between these two divisions are many variations which partake of the nature of both, with one or the other predominating.

The sins of commission result in active disease; whilst those of omission produce latent disease conditions which may or may not work out as active physical complaints; they show themselves more especially as deficiencies in character and the absence of those qualities in the personality which make for a healthy life. Perfect examples of the two classes are extremely rare, as they are more generally found in combination. The classification will, however, serve as a useful guide to treatment.

Regarding the two classes as failures of action and of inaction respectively, those diseases in which the first class appears to predominate respond to purely physical treatment, whilst those of the second class require psychological methods. As combinations are more common than perfect examples, these two methods must generally be combined, either method being accentuated as the condition of the patient may require.

All men have latent disease karma, as they also have latent qualities and characteristics. The presence of a latent disease constitutes a continual source of danger. The evolution of medical science must, therefore, be directed towards the perfection of prophylactic methods. The educational system of the future will include efforts in this direction; the curriculum will be so designed as to eliminate the qualities of character which made possible the karma-producing actions; to train the individual to exert opposing

[Continued on Page 56]

ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS

published monthly at

Merchants' Exchange Bldg., St. Louis, (2) Mo.

CHARLES E. LUNTZ, *Editor*ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, *Publishers*

Entered as second-class matter Sept. 25, 1936, at the post office at St. Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

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

Single copies, 10c.

For convenience: Mail a \$1 bill.

READY BUT UNAWARE OF IT

In the Annual Report of the National President of the T. S. in America, Mr. Cook records a net increase in membership of 112 or about 4 percent. This is the second year an increase has been achieved and while neither of them were large they yet represent a gratifying reversal of the dismal trend in the opposite direction which prevailed for so many years previously. ANCIENT WISDOM therefore congratulates the Administration on the increase, which it hopes may be maintained and enhanced year by year.

Some time ago we stated that so long as the membership rolls showed an increase, no matter how small, we would refrain from further criticism of Headquarters' policies, and we have done so since the first increase was reported last year. We shall continue to do so this year, and we hope for all years to come. We do, however, take friendly exception (and this is not intended as criticism) to a passage in the President's report, which reads as follows:

"It is sometimes denied that only those who are ready will respond, yet we have it clearly demonstrated that great ideals and principles do not appeal until a nation or an individual has felt the need of something more satisfying than that which he already has. Our own national history in the past quarter century has provided us with ample evidence that a nation cannot respond before its time; so it is with individuals. There must be great depression, the depths for the human soul, the feeling of kinship sometimes through suffering, before the cause of brotherhood can make its appeal and the appeal be heard."

Leaving aside the question of nations, which would carry us too far afield, we take leave to question if most people who join the Society do so because they are attracted by its First Object: To form the nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity . . . Would it were so, but we are afraid it is not. That may and should come when the member is saturated with theosophical thought, has acquired the theosophical "sense" which comes from constant association with those who believe in and try to practice theosophical ideals and also from profound and purposeful study of theosophical literature.

But it is far more likely that one or other or both of the two remaining Objects are the real focus of attraction—perhaps the study of comparative Religion, Philosophy and Science; more probably the prospect of investigating unexplained laws of Nature and the powers latent in man.

Still more probable is it that the newly joined member is rather hazy about the Objects (some of our older members might have a hard time reciting them if called upon), but finds himself in harmony with the basic theosophical ideas of which he has heard: reincarnation, karma, the Masters, the Path, constant progress of the Soul, and the rational, orderly scheme of life which Theosophy holds out to him. These are not specifically mentioned in the Objects at all, and while the golden thread of Universal Brotherhood certainly runs through them all, it is only indirectly apparent to the neophyte.

Our exception to Mr. Cook's view is that he writes as though no one may be considered "ready" or likely to join the Society at all unless he has passed through such harrowing experiences as to have chastened and mellowed him to the point that he can accept the transcendent Theosophical complications.

There may be some who join the T. S. for this very reason. We are quite sure that most do not. It must not be forgotten that other organizations besides ours regard Brotherhood as their cornerstone—the Masons for instance. That is not the unique thing about our Movement, and if we rely on it and it alone to build our membership, we are likely to be disappointed. One may search earnestly for a satisfactory philosophy of life without necessarily having plumbed the depths of human sorrow, at least in this incarnation. And one may find it in its fullness in Theosophy, appropriately presented *via* the medium of one's own already formed philosophical interests and concepts.

We fully agree with Mr. Cook that it would be grand if the magnificent appeal of Universal Brotherhood were the sole magnet to attract membership to our ranks. Perhaps as the cooperative Sixth Race develops and matures it will be. But there are many—tens of thousands we would say—in the competitive Fifth Race who, without consciously knowing it, have yearned all their lives for just what Theosophy and Theosophy alone can give them. They are "ready" without being aware of it. And surely Theosophy is for all . . . even for the least of these.

"NAW; WE AIN'T GOT NONE"

A minor unpleasantness of the war, with its shortages of consumer merchandise and service is the abominable attitude of rudeness and independence it has developed in many of those who have something to sell that the public needs. From the executive heads of business institutions down through the snippy little sales clerks there often seems a concerted effort to ride, harass and annoy the already sufficiently bedeviled cus-

tomers. "They can't do anything but take it" is the theme song of these shortsighted individuals. "There's a war on and they know it. Why bother about them?"

Why? Well, even if most customers don't have long memories and will not hold it against these arrogant advantage-takers when they are again begging for trade, there is such a thing as common decency in dealing with others.

It is partly in protest against this miserable and high handed attitude that the writer, who in private business also sells a commodity for which the demand now far exceeds the supply, has adopted exactly the reverse attitude. He and his employees lean over backwards in trying to soften the disappointment a buyer experiences when he cannot obtain goods he urgently needs. The utmost courtesy and consideration is extended to all customers, and so far as peacetime service can be rendered under the difficult merchandising conditions of today it is always given. Customers may remember this later or they may not. It doesn't matter. There is something more to business than merely making money. There is the self-respect which comes of trying to treat decent, well-meaning people decently. And whether it pays monetary dividends or not (we believe it does) it certainly pays huge dividends in the things of the spirit—the things that we are down here to acquire.

WE SHALL NOT BE DRAWN FROM THE ISSUE

We have to smile at the subtle attempts made by the dozen or so people who keep torturing themselves by reading our obnoxious views on A.B. and C.W.L., to drag us into a discussion of the old controversies of the 'nineties and early nineteen hundreds.

Disregarding the fact that we have repeatedly stated that these issues are dead and mouldering and we have no intention whatever of making these columns a playground for their ghosts, they try to goad us into discussing them willy-nilly.

It is insinuated that we don't know anything about them, have never studied the weighty documents "proving" this, that or the other terrible thing about Besant or Leadbeater—that therefore we have not the least right to criticise or even to answer those who have a perfect right to criticise us and our leaders all they please.

Save your stamps, Brethren, and also your peace of mind. We have read all or most of the material to which you attach such profound importance. Read it years ago in fact. As related to the issue we are fighting it is mere trivia dressed in important garb. That issue is whether we have a right to our own opinion of the worth of Besant and Leadbeater and their works to the Society or whether we must throw them and their writings into the discard because our critics prefer it that way. Nothing else is germane to the issue, and our simple advice has been—Read their books and from them make up your mind. They are the best evidence—the books themselves. Even in a court of law the thing itself—*res ipsa*, we

believe it is called—is regarded as the best evidence.

Never mind anything else. Dr. Besant was a world figure, respected and admired alike by Theosophists and the world at large. One does not achieve fame of that kind without making enemies and there is always material to be found in anybody's actions for attack. Terrific importance can be assigned to trifles, base motives imputed for perfectly ordinary actions or errors of judgment to which any human being is liable. It's done every day to those the world envies. It has been done to A.B. and to the colleague she so highly valued, C.W.L.

Every time we say read their books we get another blast from those who obviously do not want people to read their books because the reading so completely disproves everything that can be said about them except that they are lofty in concept, magnificently lucid in expression, casting the clearest light on the Theosophy which has come down to us through the ages veiled in darkness. Blavatsky started the great work, Besant and Leadbeater caught up the torch from her dying grasp and carried it high. Others have taken it from them and will carry it on. There shall never be an end to our acquirement of new knowledge and we have the faith to believe that this above all is what H.P.B. would and does most ardently desire.

THE MASTER'S PIPE

Our paragraph regarding the Master smoking a pipe seems to have raised a small furor. Several readers inform us he really did smoke it and admitted doing so without any compunction. Doubtless true, but it isn't important enough to verify and our reaction is, what does it matter? Do not let us become so interested in trifling details of this kind that we can't see the woods for the trees. One of our differences with the extreme Blavatskites is their pharisaical addition to "the letter that killeth." They study the wording of the Masters' letters and even the lightest sayings of H.P.B. with all the zeal of an antiquarian poring over some ancient palimpsest. And what have they when they have completed their self-imposed and useless task? Something to argue about and with which to try vainly to confound those who decline to waste their time similarly.

We submit that this is no way either to study or to use the Ancient Wisdom. It is given to us to make over our lives, to enlighten others, to acquire a grander, broader, deeper view of our place in the great Scheme of the Divine. The Christ had some pungent words for those who split hairs about passages and interpretations. If the Master smoked a pipe, Sinnett a cigar or Blavatsky cigarettes that was their affair. It is not ours. These are matters not worth proving or disproving. The private lives, idiosyncrasies, and deficiencies of those who offer knowledge, Theosophical or otherwise, are not the business of their students. We are concerned only with whether what they offer is true, uplifting, helpful and suited

to our way of life.

The Master's pipe is a symbol of the things that *don't* matter in Theosophical literature—the Master's teaching a grand symbol of the things that do.

WE ANSWER A QUESTION

Why are we so insistent in maintaining the works of the later Theosophical writers? Why do we urge so strongly that every occult student read and study them? Was not Blavatsky the fountainhead of Theosophy in the West? Why is it not enough to read and study her own great works, which we ourselves regard as of stupendous importance to the world?

This is a sort of summing up of the milder questions to which we have been subjected by correspondents who are not too concerned with slinging us to forget that they do have questions to ask?

These are fair questions and we will try to give them a fair answer.

Blavatsky brought Theosophical knowledge to the western world. She performed a magnificent piece of work. She carried out the task entrusted to her better than perhaps any other person of that day and age could have carried it out. Why not, when her Master selected her from all others for the task? But Blavatsky had her limitations, her deficiencies. She herself recognized them, frequently referred to them. She was in ill health, and she herself gives this in her Preface to *The Secret Doctrine* as one reason for the long delay in its promised appearance. She was a Russian woman with imperfect knowledge of the English language, a knowledge acquired late in life. This too she states in the same preface. She quite clearly forecasts that others who will come after will add to the knowledge she communicates. "Once the door" (of occultism) she writes in her Introductory, "is permitted to remain a little ajar, it will be opened wider in every century."

Besant, Leadbeater and others have opened it wider. They have also clarified teachings which in the original Blavatsky language were so obscure as to be understandable only by scholars. Theosophy is not merely for the *intelligentsia*. It is for all. Not a human soul but can be reached by its transcendent teachings if they can but be conveyed in intelligible language. Besant and Leadbeater did just that. To C.W.L. particularly, slandered, persecuted, hounded, misrepresented as he was, the race owes the greatest of debts. He has, in his clear and beautiful English presented the higher planes, the after death conditions, the invisible bodies, the way to the Masters, in terms so marvellously lucid, that new vistas of hope and comfort have opened up to the bereaved, the despairing, the unbelieving. Most of these would have gained little or nothing from the works of Blavatsky, grand though they are. *The Secret Doctrine*, *Key To Theosophy*, *Modern Panarion* and the rest are encyclopaedic in their scope. Without them there could have been no Theosophy for the west; but why is the Society of Besant

and Leadbeater still the strongest in the world, while he offshoots that owe allegiance only to Blavatsky somehow seem to have made little headway? Valuable work indeed they are doing. But Adyar is still far outstanding in the Theosophical field. Why?

They had their chance after the Judge secession, particularly in America. Yet only a few years later the Adyar group again was in the forefront. The antis love to dwell on the large number of members the Society has lost, and which they lay entirely at the door of the teachings of A.B. and C.W.L. They can lay a good many at their own door. Certainly they have done their utmost to drive as many as they possibly could, out of the Society.

And for what purpose?

Do they think that the people who, with hope and light in their hearts, felt that at last they had found a philosophy of truth have been benefited because cruel words about those in whom they had faith have once more banished them into pitiless unbelief?

We are against the critics of our leaders—against them steadfastly and determinedly—because where we seek to build they seek, or appear to seek, only to tear down. We have Blavatsky, too, and her *Secret Doctrine* in the finest, clearest and most modern edition in which it has ever been given to the world. And we have, besides, writers who have clarified the abstruseness which she well recognized and have added of their own labors to her primary stock of knowledge.

We do not address ourselves to those who oppose us. It is useless. They are set in their ways—they listen to no arguments—they want to hear none, only to give them. We address ourselves to our readers who love Theosophy as we love it—for its simplicity as well as for its depth. To them we say again: Keep your faith in the works of Besant and Leadbeater. Do not let slander and abuse draw you away from these greatest of interpreters of the Ancient Wisdom. You have everything to lose, nothing to gain, by yielding to those who would take away from you what it took you so long to find.

We give you this advice because we had to fight that battle ourselves alone some twenty years ago. We should have been more than grateful then if someone had said to us what we are venturing to say to you now. We are thankful every day of our life that we won this battle, and whatever it is within our humble power to do to help others to win it, we pledge to the memories of these greatest of leaders that we shall do.

There are no absolute standards of right and wrong, philosophers are agreed, but occasionally we get a letter from a dissenting reader which not only indicates that there are, but also that he has found them.

The ego has habits. Reincarnation is one of the most firmly fixed.

Theosophists may differ on externals but they are brothers under the skin. A mutual belief in reincarnation is a powerful bond.

RICH MAN, POOR MAN, BEGGAR MAN, THIEF

By BOYD SMITH JOHNSON

The desire to acquire something more than it has seems to be an inherent trait in every so-called human soul. The awareness of lack seems ever greater than that of possession—and this condition, broadly put, is not only responsible for our individual efforts, prayers, and striving, but might be said to also be behind the struggle of families, associations, nations, and all groups.

I think it is well that it is so but feel that, as individuals, there is a *modus operandi* not generally realized that is neither complex nor unattainable which offers solution. It is simple and at hand, and this is an effort vaguely to suggest it.

Are we not constantly seeking to know and realize more than we have while we are failing to know and realize all that is actually ours *now* (and I write in neither metaphysical nor mystical sense)? Is it not our own failure to make par in the game of Life to the degree that we have already acquired ability, that obstructs us? We seem separated from what we desire by an impassable barrier, an illusion which takes no more effort to destroy than a decision on our part to do so. In giving us free will, God has given us the master tool with which to accomplish it. Yet we kneel before Him in supplicatory prayer, and we blame Him—quite unconsciously, I grant—for holding that which we seek from us. Is that just? Is it reasonable? If a child pleaded to a parent for candy and the parent had already placed a coin within that child's hand, what would be our opinion of the child if he continued to plead? But I am wondering if that isn't the literal position of most of us today?

Perhaps the greatest blessing in the world is health. It certainly is the theme of most prayers. Now the sun shines by day, the moon and the stars by night, the earth yields forth fruit in abundance, and we are surrounded by a great host of others resembling ourselves. To each of these we bear a relationship and the nature of that relationship is a factor in our lives. If we would keep our lives on a wholesome basis we would see that the factor of each relationship was fully—and properly—realized. I know there are other and more subtle things—but these are enough to touch upon here.

Let us consider the sun for just a moment. Is there one who doesn't know its potencies for more than he utilizes them? They are very great. The sun marks the period of our daily activities and energy—to what degree do we use it, to what extent do we appreciate it, to what length do we claim it? How much of it do we miss of mornings, how much of it do we absorb each day? It shouldn't be necessary to do more than merely suggest the point for consideration. Let's talk to ourselves about it during the times we might otherwise be kneeling in supplicatory prayer. Let's follow our own reaction. We won't need any help from God there. Is it a coin in our possession

that we are not using?

Surrounding us, too, in infinite measure, is the vitality of the air—full of oxygen and life-giving elements. Personally, I like to think of it as God in gaseous form constantly surrounding me. Yet I am told that most of us, in breathing, use but about one-eleventh of our lung capacity. Is this another coin of wealth we are not investing?

Perhaps no more sadly neglected possession is that of our own thoughts. Endowed with free will as to choice of what we will or will not think, are we permitting thoughts of anger, irritation, ill will, malice, jealousy, revenge, fear, and the other countless negative thoughts that externalize themselves in trouble, pain, and suffering, to dominate us? Are we "sour pussies" wandering here and there with long-drawn faces, begging alms of sympathy and pity, trailing gloom in our homes and neighborhood, and otherwise infecting every one we contact with the virus of despair? We have the privilege of choosing which such qualities of thought we shall entertain. Are we doing so? Is this another coin in our possession?

'Round about us on every side is evidence of pain and trouble and suffering. How much of it could be lessened if each one—you and I personally, that is—would pause in our daily occupations to dispense a cup of cold water in the form of a cheerful word? The Law says it returns to us thrice blest. This, then, is a coin of opportunity that will return three coins to us. Are we taking advantage of this coin in our hand?

The law of Right Action is simple—but profound. Are we making promises idly and failing to carry them out, thereby adding to the disappointment in the world—and stealing coins from others? Do we make appointments and keep them on time? It's easy to do so—merely a matter of habit. Do we meet our financial obligations as they are due, or are we dilatory so as to make impossible for others to whom we owe money to meet theirs, and thus throw a long line of right action askew? Do we invest occasionally in a postage stamp to write a kindly note—perhaps just a few words to some one in appreciation of a kindness—or do we pile up unanswered correspondence and merely "let it go" . . . and eventually write nothing—thereby accepting kindness but failing to pass any kindness on? Is this a coin in our hand that's gathering rust to be reflected as dead, unattractive metal in our character? There's nothing occult or mysterious about these simple things—each way may be called right or wrong. The question is—which way are we following?

Is there one among us who knows not the damage of gossip, slander, and criticism? How many of us are big enough to keep our conversation free of their taint? Their presence in our talk marks us as small and petty and narrow; and, if we are trying to live a life that will be high and broad and helpful—which is the happy, healthy life—is this a coin in our hand we have never used?

In our daily work—here, there and everywhere—do we leave examples to which we might add the postscript, "This is my best,"

or would it be truer to say, "Well, I got by with this?" If we're doing less than our best, why pray to have things added unto us when we have clear, first-hand evidence in this very fact that we have *something* more than we're using?

Is the nature of our work unpleasant? Would we have home conditions changed? Dark earth is perhaps not an agreeable place for a seed. But it doesn't complain—or pray. It purchases every energy the ground offers with the coins it possesses and eventually rises into the kingdom of the sun. This is a law of Nature extending throughout all kingdoms—mineral, vegetable or animal. When we have fully appreciated and utilized the place wherein we stand, we are moved to another. Whether it be the digging of earth, the baking of a cake, or the management of a great empire, success is inevitable if we take all that each offers by applying all our ability in the place we stand now. Stagnation and imprisonment bind—or, at least, materially retard—him who fails to take full advantage of the place and position he holds regardless of what or where it may be. Divine Providence (or call It whatever you will) endows every man with the faculty of knowing whether or not he's doing his best—conscience, it is called—whether it be the formation of a written word by careful penmanship or careless scribbling, or the erection of a skyscraper by the use of imperishable granite or inferior sand. The ability to change our work and environment—our entire life—is a coin in our hand. Let's not bother God about it. He's done His part.

Material possessions are not an index to a man's worth. I think one's character is his Real, Eternal possession. And it is within himself. Its aspects may be likened to coins of every quality—coins that are helping others—coins that have been stolen from others—counterfeit coins, the possession of which bring penalty—coins that are bringing dividends to us in every moment of our lives—and, by our inventory of these possessions and consideration of how they are being used, it is easy to know whether we are, in the sight of God and, therefore, in Reality—rich man, poor man, beggar man—or thief—and the responsibility in each case lies wholly within ourselves.

Correct reaction to life's unpleasant occurrences is to have no immediate reaction. Wait. In a little while you will see the thing in its right perspective and then you may find it isn't worth having any kind of reaction about it.

THE ZODIAC IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

(Citations are from the Adyar Edition)

6.—Virgo

"Astraea, the Goddess of Justice, is the last of the deities to forsake the Earth, when the Gods are said to abandon it . . . Astraea is Virgo."

Vol. IV: p. 353

PERSONAL OPINIONS

By L. W. ROGERS

Life After the War

Life after death has always been a thrilling subject for progressive thinkers, but life before death just after the war has ended, is even more interesting. What kind of life we are to have for the rest of this incarnation comes pretty close to being the true riddle of the sphinx, for if we guess wrong life may be the forfeiter; or putting it less dramatically a bad guess may mean at least the loss of material prosperity and our peace of mind.

There is no lack of prophets and plans and one that is attracting considerable attention is that by Walter Lippmann, *U. S. Foreign Policy*. Many people are repelled merely by that title. Foreign policies, tariffs, trade agreements, seem to them to be dry-as-dust themes with which they are wholly unfamiliar and they have no desire for acquaintance with them. But it is only because we Americans have done but little thinking along those lines that the subject seems difficult and, with the rapid shifting of world scenes, there is every indication that we are about to be plunged into a study of all sorts of political and economic matters whether we like it or not. Things that touch us vitally, that mean prosperity or starvation, that threaten the income of every citizen from the wealthiest to the poorest, that can determine whether we shall have a very long period of peace or sporadic warfare for the remainder of the incarnation, deserve thoughtful study; and a very little study will dispel the illusion that they are at all prosaic. At a matter of fact they are as thrilling as war itself and war cannot be understood unless foreign policy is understood.

In *U. S. Foreign Policy* Mr. Lippmann has made a useful contribution to a subject that has had far too little attention in this country. With very much of what he says an occultist can heartily agree. The most definitely useful thing he has done is to make clear that the United States really has no settled foreign policy at all and therefore no unity of public opinion upon which the government can rely in making vital decisions. This difference of views on foreign affairs, for example the opposite views on imperialism, isolationism, etc., led, we all know, to our failure to grasp the great opportunity that the League of Nations offered us, to take a leading part in preserving the peace of the world. He holds that were we all better informed on the subject of foreign policy those differences of opinion would disappear because our true self-interest would become so obvious that none would oppose it.

Mr. Lippmann's answer to what we should have after the war to preserve the peace is the old scheme of balanced power, so he searches for the fundamental principles that make nations natural allies because they have a common purpose and common interests; and he believes that from that viewpoint the United States, Britain

and Russia constitute a natural allied group. He says:

"Our primary interest in Europe, as shown during the Napoleonic and the two German Wars, is that no European power should emerge which is capable of aggression outside of the European continent. Therefore our two natural allies have been and are Britain and Russia. For they have the same fundamental interest—to each of them a matter of national life or death—in preventing the rise of a conquering power in Europe. And that is why Britain and Russia, though they have been at odds in the near East, the middle East and in Asia, have been allies against Napoleon, against William II, and against Hitler. Here, then, founded on vital interests which have been tested and proved in the course of generations, is the nuclear alliance upon which depends the maintenance of the world order in which America lives. Combined action by America, Britain and Russia is the irreducible minimum guarantee of the security of each of them, and the only condition under which it is possible even to begin to establish any wider order of security."

That seems to me a very confident declaration based upon a very slender foundation,—the *only* condition under which it is possible *even to begin* to establish *any wider order* of security! That combination of nations is a fine thing to have and we shall probably retain it notwithstanding the efforts of various writers and prints to create distrust of Russia; but to say that it is the *only way in which world peace security can be brought about* is to overlook much. It is merely juggling the old cards into a new combination. He believes he has found a fundamental tie between Britain and Russia and this thing that will hold them firmly together is nothing higher or stronger than the intention to see to it that no other combination of European nations becomes mightier than they are! What else has been going on in Europe since nations have been nations?

A thing about which we are sure is that each nation is moved to action by what it believes to be its own best interests. A course that it took yesterday may not be the one it will take tomorrow. We have to look back only to the first World war to see that nations that were then allies are now enemies. Nobody can accurately guess what issues in the future may arise to make present allies future antagonists. Mr. Lippmann thinks he has found a *fundamental* ground for alliance between Britain and Russia and cites the fact that they combined to fight Germany in both world wars and against Napoleon in the previous century. He says nothing about the fact that England ninety years ago combined with France and Turkey to fight Russia. The ostensible cause of that Crimean war was the use of force by Russia to protect her Christian citizens in Turkey. Historians say that it was England's fear of the growing power of Russia south-eastward. Whatever it was it does not help Mr. Lippmann's hypothesis. The difficulty is that *it rests upon national lines and we are dealing with a world problem.*

If the architects for building our new world would get rid of the habit of thinking of all human problems in the terms of nations and look at them in the light of world citizenship most of the difficulties would disappear. We need neither the return of the old balancing of one group of nations against another with such accurate skill that neither of them dare begin a war, nor a combination of the three most powerful of *all* nations that shall have the same relationship to the world government that each American state has to our general government. Each of our states has its own duly elected government and is absolutely free to manage its own affairs, but over all the 48 is a president, a congress and a supreme court. With all its imperfections it is generally regarded as the best scheme of government yet devised and is sometimes copied by younger nations. There, then, is a pattern for a World Confederation of Nations that really can put an end to wars but to do so it will have to be so constructed in its details that there shall not only be religious and political liberty but also economic justice throughout the earth.

WHO IS "IMMATURE?"

The Editor of The Canadian Theosophist has for the nonce transferred his attentions from Besant and Leadbeater to Dr. Arundale. In the June issue of his paper he berates the latter along the familiar lines for stating that the Masters were concerned with The Theosophical Society and with the spread of Theosophy, and that some are left in the Society who do know them face to face. To Mr. Smythe this is rankest heresy. How dare the head of The Theosophical Society intimate that the Masters exist and that it is possible to be guided by them?

He concludes with the usual blast at "formal 'religion' with its ornaments and garb, its crosses and phylacteries, its ritual and ceremonial."

"These priestly toys," writes Mr. Smythe, "are dear to Dr. Arundale as to all immature souls, but he will progress with time."

This from Mr. Smythe to Dr. Arundale is, of course, sheer impertinence. In another article answering well-merited criticism of his attitude by the General Secretary of the English Section and by Jean Delaire, Editor of "The Christian Theosophist," Mr. Smythe writes: "It is President Arundale of The Theosophical Society that we impeach. Our correspondents are more concerned about 'poor dear' Dr. Arundale than they are about Theosophy and The Theosophical Society, when they seek commiseration for the personality in order to shield the official."

It should be understood also that any criticism in ANCIENT WISDOM of Mr. Smythe, is directed at Mr. Smythe, Editor of "The Canadian Theosophist," and not "poor dear" Mr. Smythe the personality.

Don't you WANT to reincarnate? Strange person. After so many times you should really be used to it by now.

AN OCCULT INTERPRETATION OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

A LECTURE

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

[Continued from Last Month]

Then we come to that bone of contention, "Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." People say: "How can God be so cruel and unjust? No man would do such a thing unless he were brutal and debased to the last degree." Now if you will refer to your Bible you will find that there are a number of words printed in italics and the explanation of these italics is that they were inserted words which do not appear in the original language, but were put in by the translators because the sentence did not make sense without them. Your minister will conform this explanation if you ask him the meaning of the italicised words in the Bible. If you will look at the Ten Commandments in your Bible you will find that the word "generation," in that Commandment we have just been considering, is in italics, indicating that it was not in the original, the original language, therefore reading: "Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth." It does not say the third and fourth what. The translators evidently felt that they could not leave the sentence incomplete that way—they had to put in something to make sense and the word "generation" appeared to them to be the only thing that would make sense, so they used that word.

If Moses had wanted to use the word 'generation' there is no reason why he should not have done so. You can find the word generation, not in italics, scattered all through the Bible, indicating that there is a word which could have been used had Moses seen fit to do so. Why then did he miss it out? Does it not seem as though he did so probably because he wanted to bury an occult meaning in that commandment, and the translators, not knowing anything about occult meanings, felt that they must insert the word 'generation' to complete the passage. I think that word should be 'incarnation'. Then that would accord perfectly with our occult teaching that a man suffers in one life for sins he has committed in a previous life or lives. That would be perfectly understandable. So the phrase would then read: "Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth incarnation."

But you may say, "It says children—isn't that plain enough?" The word children is quite appropriate when you realise that in a large sense we are the fathers of our own subsequent incarnations. You have the phrase in everyday use, "The child is father to the man," meaning that the thoughts and ways and actions of a child father the thoughts and ways and actions which will be his after he has grown up, and so the thoughts and ways and actions of a man in one incarnation—the causes that he generates—FATHER the effects he will reap in

his next life on earth. So don't you see the word children is quite appropriate and is the word an Occultist would naturally use in trying to veil a hidden reference to karma and reincarnation in the guise offered by this Commandment?

Then follows: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain." I find that the literal translation is: "For vain things." I want to call your attention to the fact that this is the only commandment which contains an implied threat of punishment. Even the commandment not to kill has no penalty attached to it in the text. Why is this?

We might also consider the fact that in the New Testament Jesus stated: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but he that sinneth against the Holy Spirit shall never be forgiven." You know in Biblical times they used to practise what they called magic. We do not believe in magic but we do believe in thought power, the creative power of thought, the possibility of healing or of materialising desired conditions by strong sustained thought combined with will, or by coming into a realization of our unity with God. These things form the basis of modern applied psychology, Christian Science and New Thought, which is really a part of the very oldest thought in the world. The ancients used exactly similar methods and they obtained the necessary concentration of will by invoking the name of a deity. In performing so-called miracles of healing or other "mighty works" the Prophets would always call on the name of God. Jesus performed his works in the name of the Father, which of course was the same thing. By using that name with the tremendous faith and power it generated in them, they did accomplish results just as people do to-day. You will remember that the Pharisees accused Christ of performing his "miracles" by invoking the power of Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils, and he was very indignant at being thus accused of black magic and he stated emphatically that this was the one unforgivable sin, to use the Divine Power, the power of thought, the creative power of the mind, plus the will engendered by strong concentration on God's name, for evil purposes and that, I think, is what the occult significance is of the phrase of "Taking God's name in vain" or for vain things. That is why God stated, "The Lord will not hold him guiltless" of that sin which Jesus also states was unforgivable.

Then the admonition, "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy": the reason given being that in six days God made Heaven and Earth and rested on the seventh day. I do not think anyone outside of the very orthodox seriously believes to-day that God created the world in six days of 24 hours each. We have no right to set an arbitrary time limit to the "days" which are here meant. In the Hindu belief, what they call a Day of Brahma (Brahma being the Hindu word for God) is one hundred million years or thereabouts. If that is what

[Continued on Page 56]

ANTI-REINCARNATION ARGUMENTS ANSWERED

Last month it was stated that proofs do exist for the truth of reincarnation "as solid and substantial as anything material, yes infinitely more so." Before considering them let us see what evidence the objector would require to accept the truth of our thesis. He might say, "Well, if I remembered living before I would believe it."

But if he remembered living before how could he be sure he was not hallucinated? It is not impossible to hypnotize a subject, suggest to him that he will remember all the details of a past life or several past lives; carefully outline to him the details he is to remember—a regular scenario, in fact, and couple with this the fact that he is not to remember he has been hypnotized.

There are many, especially children, who have not been hypnotized and who do claim to remember, supporting their claims with amazing descriptions of places they could not possibly have visited in this life. Such claims have often been verified. The literature of supernormal perception is full of them. Yet Theosophists do not rely on such evidence mainly or even largely in support of the reincarnation theory. There are other and stronger proofs.

For these proofs we need not rely on affidavits or on assertions of anyone, no matter how trustworthy. We need not depend on our own memories, real or imagined. We need not lean on scripture, nor on the pronouncements of prophets, seers or teachers, nor on the authority of religion or of church. All we have to do is look about us and observe Nature's methods of working and achieving her results—then use common-sense and make a few intelligent deductions.

And the first thing we note is that Nature does nothing in the physical realm that is without purpose. Sometimes her processes appear to be very strange, but always if we contrive to pursue our investigation of them to a conclusion we find that there is plan and purpose behind them. Nature knows exactly what she is doing—she is no crazy old lady cutting out paper dolls—her adaptation of means to ends is logical, perfect, incomparable.

This has occasionally been disputed by scientists, with an arrogance that must cause Mother Nature to laugh if she has a sense of humor or if she would trouble to laugh at the vagaries of her funny little humans. We saw an article by a specialist in optics intensely critical of the clumsy construction methods of Nature in making the human eye. Full of contempt, the gentleman was, for the inefficient arrangement of rods and cones. We gathered that if a first class designer of optical goods had been hired by the Deity to do the job, a far superior instrument of vision would have been produced. All that is wrong with the picture is that the billions of eyes Nature has provided over the ages have seen a lot and have enabled their possessors to translate that sight into the myriad achievements of the human race. There is no record of a scien-

tist ever having made an eye, human or animal, that saw anything at all.

Then there has been criticism of Nature's early efforts in the animal kingdom. Gigantic creatures with tiny brains perished because they did not possess the necessary sense to enable them to survive unlooked-for cataclysms. Nature is lectured for her lack of foresight in properly equipping them. But as they did survive for millions of years, and as they eventually culminated in finer and better types of animal, including the highly evolved domestic creatures of today, Nature seems to have accomplished what she set out to do. And who shall say that Nature did not plan it that way? The lowly evolving life quite evidently could acquire needed experience in those awkward bodies of the early ages. Impacts were violent, life a continual battle with other monstrous beasts, nearly all experience was fraught with pain—but it *was* experience and it did something that was necessary to the elementary consciousness within.

It can always be demonstrated that Nature has known exactly what she was doing and where she was going, every foot of the way. In her physical realm she is an expert of experts. She is never foolish or illogical—but we are both if we deny to her in the moral and spiritual realms what she so obviously possesses in the physical.

Let us ask ourselves—forgetting all preconceived ideas, early teaching, religion, scripture or what not—what obvious object Nature must have in creating human beings at all? Do not let ourselves be misled by the silly half-truths the would-be wise ones offer for our consumption. One of the silliest is that she is aiming at production of a perfect human being and that all of us have to live and suffer and die so that some day this marvellous consummation may be brought about. So then what? After Nature has her perfect human being—millions of him—what is she going to do with him? Let him live a lot longer than we do, perhaps, making the world a garden spot, co-operating, helping, living like the angels above. Grand! But then what? Sooner or later he dies too—his whole generation is gone and whatever comes after can't be any better because he will have been the *ne plus ultra*. And eternity will roll on. He will have lived, we shall have lived, our ancestors will have lived—and that will be that. *A quoi bon?* as Blavatsky used to say.

We just don't believe that's all there is to it, and neither does anyone else who has gone to the trouble to make comparisons and think the thing through. Nature doesn't go imbecilic in the non-physical realms when she is so patently sane and wise in the things we can actually see her doing. She has put hints all around us if we are not too blind and stubborn to take them. Her works fairly shout REINCARNATION at us. The trees "reincarnate" year by year. Life for all practical purposes goes out of the hibernating animals with the winter and returns with the spring—again, year by year. The crops are harvested—the ground is apparently dead—but it "re-

incarnates" with new crops, and the process is repeated each twelve months.

Nothing dies—no speck of matter or energy can perish—but the consciousness of man, so painfully evolved, so carefully nurtured, so precious for what it can see and feel and do—that, we are asked to believe, either perishes completely or is dealt with in so extraordinary a fashion that it is either pickled in cosmic bliss or annealed in a cosmic super-furnace for ever. Such beliefs cannot be true because Nature would have to go insane on the higher planes for them to be true. There would be no reason, no purpose, no logic, no motive, no sense in such proceedings. Whoever invented these ideas was a long way from comprehending the orderliness, beauty and majesty of all natural processes. It was a bungling amateur job, but the amazing thing is that the thinking world has taken it at its face value.

Consider the beauty, orderliness and majesty of the noble teaching of reincarnation. Isn't it completely of a piece with everything we see unfolding about us? Isn't it the way Nature works? Would it hurt anyone? Would it outrage anyone's sense of the fitness of things? Doesn't it fit in precisely and accurately, with no loose ends, to everything natural that we know of?

See what it makes possible: Constant progress, eventual adjustment as life succeeds life of all inequalities and injustices. Equal opportunity for all. A taste of prosperity for all—yes and poverty and hardship too, for why should one be favored over another when all are sons of God?

And when that perfected race does come, we who have borne the heat and burden of the day shall find ourselves in and of it. Why should we work for posterity if posterity will not even know of us, will care nothing for us, may doubt that we even lived? But if we are that posterity, what a different story! We are working for ourselves, for our own future happiness as well as the happiness of others—and this is not selfish. God has put the longing in our hearts to be happy as well as to bestow happiness. We follow only our own nature.

These are the proofs for reincarnation—as convincing as any proofs could possibly be. Deny them—they remain. Scoff at them—they remain. Curse them and us for advancing them if you will—and they still remain.

Reincarnation is true because Nature is true. She can only work in her own orderly and purposeful way to achieve her ends and we challenge anyone to show how her ends could be more purposefully or as purposefully accomplished with respect to the human soul as by reincarnation—truly, the Hope of the world.

[To Be Continued]

If you hero-worship anyone let it be your own Monad.

Time is going to hang heavy on our hands when we reach the astral plane unless they let us edit an occult journal and instruct a T. S. Lodge.

REINCARNATION PRAYER

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

As I'm to be born here again, O Lord,
In a time not so terribly distant,
Might I make some requests without being ignored
If with karma they're not inconsistent?

It's my understanding we're given the chance
When we're fairly along on our way,
To help call the tune to which later we dance.
May I do my selecting today?

Perhaps, Lord, it's very presumptuous of me,
So to say, to be jumping the gun;
For they tell me that dead—very dead—I must be
Ere the right to select I have won.

If that is the case, your good pardon I ask
But if you decide I'm in order,
I could possibly make a suggestion or two
Before I cross over the border.

For example I'd like to be born in a race
In the vanguard of civilization,
And somehow to help in improving the place,
Never mind what my rank or my station.

I'd like to fight evils and underwrite good,
Spread knowledge, treat everyone fairly;
And, Lord, I'd be greatly obliged if you would
Send Theosophy to me quite early.

For the rest, a good name, if it please thee
O Lord,
A heritage sound, no afflictions,
Fair conditions of life and my loved ones restored
And, oh yes, no religious restrictions.

At the moment that's just about all I've in view,
I crave not for fame nor for money;
But with all the rest if they came along too,
Well that would be . . . that would be FUNNY.

"Do the Adyar authorities know and approve of your latest A.B.-C.W.L. campaign?" inquiries a correspondent.

We don't know. We haven't asked them. We think they probably would approve as Dr. Arundale in December (before he could possibly know of our campaign) wrote in similar vein in his own publication; a fact unknown to us until last month.

But whether Adyar approves or disapproves this is our campaign, and it is our opinion that Adyar has too much respect for the liberty of opinion which is a fundamental of The Theosophical Declaration of Principles to take the slightest exception to our expression of views. This is The Theosophical Society, where one may fearlessly say or write anything he sees fit, within the limits of courtesy and consideration for others—which we try to observe.

NEW LIGHT ON THE PROBLEM OF DISEASE

[Continued from Page 49]

energies which will modify and eventually neutralize that karma; in addition, physical measures will be applied to eliminate the latent disease from the physical body. We may enunciate the paradoxical axiom that disease must be cured before it arises, for the child must be treated for the elimination of latent disease.

In those cases where karma is so acutely adverse as to make all efforts apparently ineffectual, treatments should be steadfastly continued, even to the end of life. Such treatments and especially such efforts as the patient makes, though apparently of no avail, are actually prophylactic as regards later incarnations.

[To Be Continued]

THE OCCULT INTERPRETATION OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

[Continued from Page 54]

is meant by "days" then I think the Biblical account of creation becomes intelligible and we can conceive that God evolved the world perhaps in six days of one hundred million years each, or some such figure.

In Theosophy our teaching as to the evolution of the Solar System, which is similar to that found in the esoteric teaching of various religions, is that God evolves the Universe through seven Chains, each Chain consisting of seven Globes, around which the life wave sweeps seven times, each such time being termed a Round, and the life wave remaining on each globe during a period of seven Root Races, which in turn are made up of seven Sub Races, in their turn composed of seven Family Races. This is a huge subject on which time will not permit me to elaborate to-night. It has already formed the topic of one of these Open Forums and we have a large amount of literature about it in our sales and lending libraries and in the Public Library, so I will have to content myself with saying that this unquestionably is the meaning of the Biblical reference to God having made the world in six days and rested on the seventh, because the Seventh Race and the Seventh Round and the Seventh Chain, etc., are in every case, so to speak, culminations of the six which have gone before, a sort of "reaping of the fruits of the previous six Chains or Rounds or Races and a sort of resting on the seventh, although you cannot talk about God or Nature ever resting, because the Universe is in constant activity and no rest, as we understand it, is possible or the whole of creation would collapse.

[To Be Continued]

Life can never be uninteresting to a Theosophist. All he has to do is to watch events unfolding in his life and the lives of others, and he can learn something new from this exercise alone, every day.

Nature is as skilful in working on circumstances as in working on matter. She knows exactly what she is doing and it is always, in the final analysis, the right thing.

GREMLINS

[Continued from Page 49]

poles. My ear and the side of my face were the casualties this time.

On another occasion, a winter's night, the streets were icy and it was raining. The bus on which I was driving was proceeding cautiously when an elderly gentleman in an automobile drove through a stoplight. The bus driver saw him too late to get out of the way, jammed on the brakes immediately, almost pitching me through the windshield. Again an iron pole stopped me, resulting in a slight concussion.

Years ago when my son was a little boy, I went down town to get some favors for his birthday costume party. It was raining very heavily and at 12 noon was almost as dark as midnight. While crossing the street I was knocked down by the driver of a coupe who could not see through the windshield on account of the rain. Windshield wipers were not then in common use as they are now. The blow on the head and leg knocked me unconscious but fortunately the water in the street from the heavy rainfall brought me to. I was laid up for three months.

I could go on indefinitely but this would get very tedious. I would like to give two or three more instances, however, to prove my point that I am and always have been very cautious and careful; yet in spite of all my precautions, somehow, some way, misfortunes constantly come into my path. So I am convinced that it must be Gremlins, Saturn's children, (doubtless the product of past karma) which are responsible for all my bumps and bruises. The final cases seem particularly to indicate this.

A friend from Chicago was visiting me, and being a singer was particularly interested in our well-known Municipal Opera. She wanted to see the famous outdoor theatre in Forest Park where the opera is held, as many people do who visit St. Louis. It was mid-winter and everything was covered with snow. We walked through the snow toward the Opera stage, which was reached over a wooden bridge. As we arrived at the porch of the dressing room, which was at the approach to the bridge, I dropped right through the flooring onto my knees, scraping the flesh off both legs. The flooring was rotted, which was not noticeable as it was covered with snow and—at that time—I carried no excess weight to account for it giving way.

I have fallen down my own front steps, doing a high dive onto the concrete and landing on my hands. On a friend's invitation to see her lovely flower garden, and to take a short cut through the side entrance, I had just started to walk down the steps when I noticed that all of them were piled full of lumber. It was too late to do anything about it. I had already shifted my weight forward to go down the steps, and down I went, skipping all seven of them or more. I landed neck first on a garden shovel. Fortunately I gathered my bones together and regained my equilibrium but three months later I learned I had broken toes as a result of the fall, and I

had been painfully walking on them in the meantime.

I certainly fall hard for these Gremlins, Saturn's children. If I am paying off the karma of some past life when I went around tripping people or pushing them down flights of stairs, I certainly hope I am nearly through with the atonement. I can't imagine myself doing anything like that but who knows how I may have acted centuries ago? There certainly must be a reason for the way these Gremlins push me around. But I don't care—they haven't killed me . . . yet.

[The End]

P. S.: Since the above article was written I have added to the sorrowful record by falling down the steps of the Municipal Building. I inquired the time of a man passing me as I walked up the steps. He replied "There's a clock right behind you, lady." I turned to look. "Now's our chance," shouted the head Gremlin—and . . . Doctor's verdict, "No bones broken, only bruises and contusions, but stay in bed for at least a week." Begremlend, that's what I am.

[Editor's Note: As the paper goes to press, Mrs. Luntz has actually been laid up from her latest Gremlin escapade over three weeks and it will probably be three weeks more before she can be up and about. Evidently the Gremlins did a better (or worse) job than she gave them credit for. Perhaps they didn't like her writing about them.]

RUSSIA: A MODERN MIRACLE

[Continued from Page 49]

quired by the United States to create the Panama canal, including the necessary preliminary planning. In the time required by an author to write a few books, an inventor to perfect a machine, a nation rises from political and economical slavery to freedom, develops the country's natural resources, covers the land with a network of highways, builds new sanitary cities and towns, harnesses the power of its great rivers, constructs canals, floods the nation with electric light, establishes colleges, technical schools, libraries, hospitals, recreation centers by the hundreds, changes poverty to plenty and creates an army capable of successfully defending the nation!

[To Be Continued]

Marie Corelli, famous novelist of a generation ago, dedicated one of her books: "To all those Churches who quarrel in the name of Christ." *The Master Christian*

Almost we are persuaded that a book could be written and dedicated: "To all those Theosophists who quarrel in the name of Blavatsky."

Sergt. Charles Luntz, Jr., who wrote the article in the July issue, "This Soldier's Philosophy," received his good karma at once. Immediately thereafter he was sent on a military mission to (of all places) Hollywood, and spent a glorious three days there.